

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 6/30/2023 11:17:47 PM

First name: Michael

Last name: Garrity

Organization: Alliance For The Wild Rockies

Title: Executive Director

Comments: June 30, 2023

Lolo National Forest Supervisor's Office?c/o Amanda Milburn, Plan Revision?24 Fort Missoula Rd.?Missoula, MT 59804

Emailed to: SM.FS.LNFRevision@usda.gov

Please acknowledge receipt.

Thank you for the opportunity to object on the Lolo National Forest's Draft Assessment for the Forest Plan Revision. Please accept these comments from me on behalf of the Alliance for the Wild Rockies, Center for Biological Diversity, Council on Wildlife and Fish and Native Ecosystems Council.

June 30, 2023

Lolo National Forest Supervisor's Office

c/o Amanda Milburn, Plan Revision

24 Fort Missoula Rd.

Missoula, MT 59804

Emailed to: SM.FS.LNFRevision@usda.gov

Please acknowledge receipt.

Thank you for the opportunity to object on the Lolo National Forest's Draft Assessment for the Forest Plan Revision. Please accept these comments from me on behalf of the Alliance for the Wild Rockies, Center for Biological Diversity, Council on Wildlife and Fish and Native Ecosystems Council.

The Draft Assessment is a violation of NEPA, NFMA, the APA and the ESA because it will harm habitat for grizzlies, lynx, wolverine and big game and other wildlife and violate the Eastside assessment.

1. The Draft Assessment fails to analyze habitat effectiveness, and fails to demonstrate that the Forest Service is maintaining habitat effectiveness, in violation of NEPA, the APA, ESA, Clean Water Act, and NFMA. Forest Plan Forest-wide Standard C-1(2) mandates: "Utilize the general concepts presented in Agriculture Handbook No. 533, Wildlife Habitats in Managed Forests. . . . When more site specific management recommendations are available through the Forest Service or [Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks] those recommendations will be followed."The most recent site specific management recommendations available through the Forest Service and Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks for elk habitat management on this Forest are set forth in "U.S. Forest Service and Montana Department of Fish Wildlife and Parks Collaborative Overview and Recommendations for Elk Habitat Management on the Lolo National Forest which is commonly referred to as the "Eastside Assessment."

Thus, in order to comply with Forest-wide Standard C-1(2), the Eastside Assessment recommendations must be followed. An elk habitat effectiveness analysis should be conducted.

Please disclose the cumulative impacts on the Forest-wide level of the Lolo National Forest's policy decision to replace natural fire with logging and prescribed burning. If the Forest Service did not conduct NEPA for the Fire Plan, please disclose the cumulative effects of Forest-wide implementation of the Fire Plan. Specifically analyze the decision to prioritize mechanical, human-designed, somewhat arbitrary treatments as a replacement for naturally-occurring fire.

Moreover, in the event that the revised Forest Plan eliminates hiding cover standards which were designed to protect and conserve elk habitat, please analyze the impacts of having no protections left for elk and grizzly habitat. Chronic, illegal road use is reasonably foreseeable and must be addressed in the cumulative effects analysis. Please evaluate and analyze in the environmental baseline, effects of the action, and cumulative effects, how the removal of all wildlife standards may affect grizzly bears, wolverines, big game, birds, monarch butterflies, lynx, or lynx critical habitat.

Cumulative effects are the impacts on the environment that result from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions.

Please analyze the direct and indirect effects of removing all wildlife standards from the Lolo revised Forest Plan, including standards designed to protect hiding cover and limit open road densities on big game species and habitat (including security), grizzly bears, grizzly bear habitat, grizzly bear movement and recovery, lynx, lynx habitat, and lynx critical habitat.

Please analyze the cumulative effects of removing all wildlife standards from the Lolo revised Forest Plan, including standards designed to protect hiding cover and limit open road densities on big game species and habitat (including security), grizzly bears, grizzly bear habitat, grizzly bear movement and recovery, lynx, lynx habitat, and lynx critical habitat. Other activities occurring on the Lolo National Forest, including livestock grazing, recreational uses, logging, and climate change are having and continue to have a cumulative effect on big game species and habitat, grizzly bears, grizzly bear movement and recovery, lynx, lynx habitat, and lynx critical habitat. The Forest Service's failure to analyze the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of removing all wildlife standards

would be arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with NEPA.

NEPA requires the Forest Service to adequately consider and analyze a reasonable range of alternatives.

Under NEPA, the alternatives analysis is "the heart" of the environmental analysis because it presents impacts of the proposal and the alternatives in comparative form, thus sharply defining the issues and providing a clear basis for choice among options. The alternatives analysis guarantees that agency decision makers have before them and take into proper account all possible approaches to a particular action (including total abandonment of the action) which would alter the environmental impact and the cost-benefit balance. Please consider and analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to removing all wildlife standards from the Lolo Revised Forest Plan.

Please evaluated keeping some of the wildlife standards.

Please evaluated an alternative that includes specific Management Area direction with standards in areas deemed critical for big game habitat and security. The Forest Service never evaluated and compared a wide range of new and varying standards with varying numeric limits for managing big game habitat and security on the forest based on the best available science.

Page ix of the Executive Summary states:

Warm Dry Forest. At lower elevations, the ecological integrity of the Warm Dry Forest ecosystem is low. On these sites, there is potential for conversion to nonforest due to the combined effects of exotic species and reduced natural tree regeneration as the climate gets warmer and drier. Further, the introduction of invasive species has compromised the provision of wildlife habitat. At higher elevations with more productive forest types, ecological integrity of the Warm Dry Forest is moderate. In these forests, the reduced frequency of low severity fires and management legacies have led to denser forests with fewer large trees and a more shade-tolerant species composition. These changes have led to forests that are less resilient and more prone to large, stand-replacing disturbances. However, natural regeneration is less of a concern here compared to lower tree line communities.

Across Warm Dry Forests, the potential to increase ecological integrity through active management is high due to the potential to implement restoration treatments.

Warm Moist Forest. The ecological integrity of the Warm Moist Forest ecosystem is low. Over a century of fire suppression has increased shade tolerant species and the potential for stand-replacing disturbance events and simultaneously reduced the recruitment of large trees and early seral species. Moreover, climatic trends are projected to lead to more drought stressed trees and more

frequent high severity fire, thereby further reducing the resiliency. The increased potential for large-scale, high severity fire threatens ecosystem services associated with productive environments with low fire return intervals including long-term carbon storage and the maintenance of unique wildlife habitat such as large snags with big cavities. The potential for management to help restore this ecosystem is high. Restoration of western larch and complex in-stand and landscape forest structure can improve ecological integrity. Although limited in extent, restoration of white pine can also occur by planting blister rust-resistant seedlings.

Cool Moist Forest. Ecological integrity in the Cool Moist Forest ecosystem is currently moderate. This ecosystem is highly productive and relatively resilient to stressors. Because of greater water availability, there is little risk of type conversion. However, in the long-term, the interaction of climate change, invasive species, and disease (such as blister rust and root rot) does present a risk to the long-term sustainability of this ecosystem and its associated ecosystem services. The potential for management to help restore this ecosystem is moderate. Actions such as invasive species management, planting early seral species, and reintroducing heterogeneity through use of fire and timber harvest can help restore this system. Nevertheless, provision of ecological services related to water quantity and quality may be compromised if climate change results in reduced snowpack storage and regulation.

Please see the attached paper by Dr. William Baker titled: "Are High-Severity Fires Burning at Much Higher Rates Recently than Historically in Dry-Forest Landscapes of the Western USA?"

Dr. Baker writes: "Programs to generally reduce fire severity in dry forests are not supported and have significant adverse ecological impacts, including reducing habitat for native species dependent on early-successional burned patches and decreasing landscape heterogeneity that confers resilience to climatic change."

Dr. Baker concluded: "Dry forests were historically renewed, and will continue to be renewed, by sudden, dramatic, high-intensity fires after centuries of stability and lower-intensity fires."

Based on Dr. Baker's paper, the revised forest plan will not meet its purpose and need. Baker writes on p. 20:

"Management issues

The evidence presented here shows that efforts to generally lower fire severity in dry forests for ecological restoration are not supported."

Dr. Baker's paper is the best available science. Please explain why the revised forest plan is not following the best

available science. The Draft Decision Notice is in violation of NEPA.

Remedy, choose the No Action Alternative or write an EIS that complies with the law.

In "Fire Ecology in Rocky Mountain Landscapes" by William Baker, Dr. Baker writes on page 435, "...a prescribed fire regime that is too frequent can reduce species diversity (Laughlin and Grace 2006) and favor invasive species (M.A. Moritz and Odion 2004). Fire that is entirely low severity in ecosystems that historically experience some high-severity fire may not favor germination of fire-dependent species (M.A. Moritz and Odion 2004) or provide habitat key animals (Smucker, Hutto, and Steele 2005)." Baker continues on page 436: "Fire rotations equal the average mean fire interval across a landscape and are appropriate intervals at which individual points or the whole landscape is burned. Composite fire intervals underestimate mean fire interval and fire rotation (chap 5) and should not be used as prescribed burning intervals as this would lead to too much fire and would likely lead to adversely affect biological diversity (Laughlin and Grace 2006)."

Please find (Laughlin and Grace 2006) attached.

Dr. Baker estimates the high severity fire rotation to be 135 - 280 years for lodgepole pine forests. (See page 162.).

Baker writes on page 457-458 of Fire Ecology in Rocky Mountain Landscapes:

"Fire rotation has been estimated as about 275 years in the Rockies as a whole since 1980 and about 247 years in the northern Rockies over the last century, and both figures are near the middle between the low (140 years) and high (328 years) estimates for fire rotation for the Rockies under the HRV (chap. 10). These estimates suggest the since EuroAmerican settlement, fire control and other activities may have reduced fire somewhat in particular places, but a general syndrome of fire exclusion is lacking. Fire exclusion also does not accurately characterize the effects of land users on fire or match the pattern of change in area burned at the state level over the last century (fig 10.9). In contrast, fluctuation in drought linked to atmospheric conditions appear to match many state-level patterns in burned area over the last century. Land uses that also match fluctuations include logging, livestock grazing, roads and development, which have generally increased flammability and ignition at a time when the climate is warming and more fire is coming."

Schoennagel et al (2004) states: "High-elevation subalpine forests in the Rocky Mountains typify ecosystems that experience infrequent, high-severity crown fires []. . . The most extensive subalpine forest types are composed of Engelmann spruce (*Picea engelmannii*), sub-alpine fir

(*Abies lasiocarpa*), and lodgepole pine (*Pinus contorta*), all thin-barked trees easily killed by fire. Extensive stand-replacing fires occurred historically at long intervals (i.e., one to many centuries) in subalpine forests, typically in association with infrequent high-pressure blocking systems that promote extremely dry regional climate patterns." Please find Schoennagel et al (2004) attached. Schoennagel et al (2004) states: "it is unlikely that the short period of fire exclusion has significantly altered the long fire intervals in subalpine forests. Furthermore, large, intense fires burning under dry conditions are very difficult, if not impossible, to suppress, and such fires account for the majority of area burned in subalpine forests. Schoennagel et al (2004) states: "Moreover, there is no consistent relationship between time elapsed since the last fire and fuel abundance in subalpine forests, further undermining the idea that years of fire suppression have caused unnatural fuel buildup in this forest zone."

Schoennagel et al (2004) states: "No evidence suggests that spruce-fir or lodgepole pine forests have experienced substantial shifts in stand structure over recent decades as a result of fire suppression. Overall, variation in climate rather than in fuels appears to exert the largest influence on the size, timing, and severity of fires in subalpine forests []. We conclude that large, infrequent stand replacing fires are 'business as usual' in this forest type, not an artifact of fire suppression."

Schoennagel et al (2004) states: "Contrary to popular opinion, previous fire suppression, which was consistently effective from about 1950 through 1972, had only a minimal effect on the large fire event in 1988.

Reconstruction of historical fires indicates that similar large, high-severity fires also occurred in the early 1700s. Given the historical range of variability of fire regimes in high-elevation subalpine forests, fire behavior in Yellowstone during 1988, although severe, was neither unusual nor surprising."

Schoennagel et al. (2004) states: "Mechanical fuel reduction in sub-alpine forests would not represent a restoration treatment but rather a departure from the natural range of variability in stand structure."

Schoennagel et al (2004) states: "Given the behavior of fire in Yellowstone in 1988, fuel reduction projects probably will not substantially reduce the frequency, size, or severity of wildfires under extreme weather conditions."

Schoennagel et al (2004) states: "The Yellowstone fires in 1988 revealed that variation in fuel conditions, as measured by stand age and density, had only minimal influence on fire behavior. Therefore, we expect fuel-reduction

treatments in high-elevation forests to be generally unsuccessful in reducing fire frequency, severity, and size, given the overriding importance of extreme climate in controlling fire regimes in this zone. Thinning also will not re-store subalpine forests, because they were dense historically and have not changed significantly in response to fire suppression. Thus, fuel-reduction efforts in most Rocky Mountain subalpine forests probably would not effectively mitigate the fire hazard, and these efforts may create new ecological problems by moving the forest structure outside the historic range of variability."

Please find Schoennagel et al (2004) attached.

The NEPA requires a "hard look" at climate issues, including cumulative effects of the "treatments" in the revised forest plan when added to the heat, drought, wind and other impacts associated with increased climate risk. Regeneration/Restocking failure following wildfire, prescribed fire and/or mechanical tree-killing has not been analyzed or disclosed. There is a considerable body of science that suggests that regeneration following fire is increasingly problematic.

NEPA requires disclosure of impact on "the human environment." Climate risk presents important adverse impacts on cultural, economic, environmental, and social aspects of the human environment. - people, jobs, and the economy - adjacent to and near the Lolo N.F.. Challenges in predicting responses of individual tree species to climate are a result of species competing under a never-before-seen climate regime - one forests may not have experienced before either.

In an uncertain future of rapid change and abrupt, unforeseen transitions, adjustments in management approaches will be necessary and some actions will fail. However, it is increasingly evident that the greatest risk is posed by continuing to implement strategies inconsistent with and not informed by current understanding of our novel future....

Achievable future conditions as a framework for guiding forest conservation and management, *Forest Ecology and Management* 360 (2016) 80-96, S.W. Golladay et al. (Please, find attached)

Stands are at risk of going from forest to non-forest, even without the added risk of "management" as proposed in the Lolo N.F.. The revised forest plan is currently in violation of NEPA, NFMA, and the APA.

An unprecedented study (Baker 2023) was published in the peer-reviewed journal *Fire*, exposing a broad pattern of scientific misrepresentations and omissions that have caused a "falsification of the scientific record" in recent forest and wildfire studies funded or authored by the U.S. Forest Service with regard to dry forests of the western

U.S. Forest Service related articles have presented a falsified narrative that historical forests had low tree densities and were dominated by low-severity fires, using this narrative to advocate for its current forest management and wildfire policies.

However, the new study comprehensively documents that a vast body of scientific evidence in peer-reviewed studies that have directly refuted and discredited this narrative were either misrepresented or omitted by agency publications. The corrected scientific record, based on all of the evidence, shows that historical forests were highly variable in tree density, and included "open" forests as well as many dense forests. Further, historical wildfire severity was mixed and naturally included a substantial component of high-severity fire, which creates essential snag forest habitat for diverse native wildlife species, rivaling old-growth forests.

These findings have profound implications for climate mitigation and community safety, as current forest policies that are driven by the distorted narrative result in forest management policies that reduce forest carbon and increase carbon emissions, while diverting scarce federal resources from proven community wildfire safety measures like home hardening, defensible space pruning, and evacuation assistance.

"Forest policy must be informed by sound science but, unfortunately, the public has been receiving a biased and inaccurate presentation of the facts about forest density and wildfires from government agencies," said Dr. William Baker in their press release announcing the publication of their paper.

"The forest management policies being driven by this falsified scientific narrative are often making wildfires spread faster and more intensely toward communities, rather than helping communities become fire-safe," said Dr. Chad Hanson, research ecologist with the John Muir Project in the same press release. "We need thinning of small trees adjacent to homes, not backcountry management."

"The falsified narrative from government studies is leading to inappropriate forest policies that promote removal of mature, fire-resistant trees in older forests, which causes increased carbon emissions and in the long-run contributes to more fires" said, Dr. Dominick A. DellaSala, Chief Scientist, Wild Heritage, a Project of Earth Island Institute concluded in the press release.

The Forest Plan Revision is therefore in violation of NEPA, NFMA and the APA .

THE AGENCIES MUST REINITIATE
CONSULTATION ON THE NORTHERN ROCKIES
LYNX MANAGEMENT DIRECTION.

The Northern Rockies Lynx Management Direction is inadequate to ensure conservation and recovery of lynx. The amendments fail to use the best available science on necessary lynx habitat elements, including but not limited to, failing to include standards that protect key winter habitat.

The Endangered Species Act requires the FS to insure that the revised forest plan is not likely to result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat. 16 U.S.C. §1536(a) (2). Activities that may destroy or adversely modify critical habitat are those that alter the physical and biological features to an extent that appreciably reduces the conservation value of critical habitat for lynx. 74 Fed. Reg. 8644. The Northern Rockies Lynx Management Direction (NRLMD) as applied in the revised forest plan violates the ESA by failing to use the best available science to insure no adverse modification of critical habitat. The NRLMD carves out exemptions from Veg Standards

S1, S2, S5, and S6. In particular, fuel treatment projects may occur in the WUI even though they will not meet standards Veg S1, S2, S5, or S6, provided they do not occur on more than 6% of lynx habitat on each National Forest.

Allowing the agency to destroy or adversely modify any lynx critical habitat has the potential to appreciably reduce the conservation value of such habitat. The agency cannot simply set a cap at 6% forest-wide without looking at the individual characteristics of each LAU to determine whether the revised forest plan has the potential to appreciably reduce the conservation value. The ESA requires the use of the best available science at the site-specific level. It does not allow the agencies to make a gross determination that allowing lynx critical habitat to be destroyed

forest-wide will not appreciably reduce the conservation value.

The FS violated NEPA by applying the above-mentioned exception without analyzing the impacts to lynx in the individual LAUs. The Revised forest plan violates the NFMA by failing to insure the viability of lynx. According to the 1982 NFMA regulations, fish and wildlife must be managed to maintain viable populations of Canada lynx in the planning area. 36 C.F.R. 219.19. The FS has not shown that lynx will be well distributed in the planning area. The FS has not addressed how the revised forest plan's adverse modification of denning and foraging

habitat will impact distribution. This is important because the agency readily admits that the LAUs already contain a "relatively large percentage of unsuitable habitat."

The national forests subject to this new direction will provide habitat to maintain a viable population of lynx in the northern Rockies by maintaining the current distribution of occupied lynx habitat, and maintaining or enhancing the quality of that habitat.

The FS cannot insure species viability here without addressing the impacts to the already low amount of suitable habitat. By cutting in denning and foraging habitat, the agency will not be "maintaining or enhancing the quality of the habitat."

This Lolo N.F. is in Canada lynx habitat. In order to meet the requirements of the FS/USFWS Conservation Agreement, the FS agreed to insure that all project activities are consistent with the Lynx Conservation Assessment and Strategy (LCAS) and the requirements of protecting lynx critical habitat. The FS did not do so with its analysis. The revised forest plan will adversely affect lynx critical habitat in violation of the Endangered Species Act. The BA/BE needs to be rewritten to reflect this information to determine if the revised forest plan will adversely modify proposed critical habitat for lynx and if so conference with USFWS.

The Custer Gallatin National Forest (HLCNF) is home to the Canada lynx, listed as a Threatened species under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). In December 1999, the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management completed their "Biological Assessment Of The Effects Of National Forest Land And Resource Management Plans And Bureau Of Land Management Land Use Plans On Canada Lynx" (Programmatic Lynx BA). The Programmatic Lynx BA concluded that the current programmatic land management plans "may affect, and are likely to adversely affect, the subject population of Canada lynx."

The Lynx BA team recommended amending or revising Forest Plans to incorporate conservation measures that would reduce or eliminate the identified adverse effects on lynx. The Programmatic Lynx BA's determination means that Forest Plan implementation is a "taking" of lynx, and makes Section 7 formal consultation on the Lolo revised Forest Plan is mandatory. Implementation of the revised Forest Plan constitutes a "taking" of the lynx. Such taking can only be authorized with an incidental take statement, issued as part of a Biological Opinion (B.O.) during of Section 7 consultation. The Lolo National Forest must incorporate terms and conditions from a programmatic B.O. into a Forest Plan amendment or revision before projects affecting lynx habitat, can be authorized.

The Programmatic Lynx BA's "likely to adversely affect"

conclusion was based upon the following rationale. Plans within the Northern Rockies:

- * Generally direct an aggressive fire suppression strategy within developmental land allocations. ...this strategy may be contributing to a risk of adversely affecting the lynx by limiting the availability of foraging habitat within these areas.

- * Allow levels of human access via forest roads that may present a risk of incidental trapping or shooting of lynx or access by other competing carnivores. The risk of road-related adverse effects is primarily a winter season issue.

- * Are weak in providing guidance for new or existing recreation developments. Therefore, these activities may contribute to a risk of adverse effects to lynx.

- * Allow both mechanized and non-mechanized recreation that may contribute to a risk of adverse effects to lynx. The potential effects occur by allowing compacted snow trails and plowed roads which may facilitate the movements of lynx competitors and predators.

- * Provide weak direction for maintaining habitat connectivity within naturally or artificially fragmented landscapes. Plans within all geographic areas lack direction for coordinating construction of highways and other movement barriers with other responsible agencies. These factors may be contributing to a risk of adverse effects to lynx.

- * Are weak in providing direction for coordinating management activities with adjacent landowners and other agencies to assure consistent management of lynx habitat across the landscape. This may contribute to a risk of adverse effects to lynx.

- * Fail to provide direction for monitoring of lynx, snowshoe hares, and their habitats. While failure to monitor does not directly result in adverse effects, it makes the detection and assessment of adverse effects from other management activities difficult or impossible to attain.

- * Forest management has resulted in a reduction of the area in which natural ecological processes were historically allowed to operate, thereby increasing the area potentially affected by known risk factors to lynx. The Plans have continued this trend. The Plans have also continued the process of fragmenting habitat and reducing its quality and quantity. Consequently, plans may risk adversely affecting lynx by potentially contributing to a reduction in the geographic range of the species.

- * The BA team recommends amending or revising the Plans to incorporate conservation measures that would reduce or eliminate the identified adverse effects to lynx. The programmatic conservation measures listed in the Canada Lynx Conservation Assessment and Strategy (LCAS) should be considered in this regard, once finalized.

(Programmatic Lynx BA, at 4.)

The Programmatic Lynx BA notes that the LCAS identifies the following risk factors to lynx in this geographic area:

- * Timber harvest and pre-commercial thinning that reduce denning or foraging habitat or converts habitat to less desirable tree species

According to the most current understanding of lynx ecology and behavior, timber harvest has the potential to affect lynx productivity through impacts on foraging habitat (USDA Forest Service 2007a pg. 2; Ruediger et al. 2000).

In northwestern Montana, Holbrook and others (2017a) found that lynx use mature stands in proportion to their availability and that mature spruce-fir forests are used more than any other structure stage or species. The value of the mature forest component as foraging habitat for lynx (within occupied home ranges in this study) is likely highly variable and dependent on existing horizontal cover values at the local scale. Within their home ranges, female and male lynx increasingly used advanced regeneration forest structures as they became more available (up to a maximum availability of 40%). Advanced regeneration was found to provide the greatest snowshoe hare abundance, while mature forest is where lynx appear to hunt most efficiently. Intermediate snow depths and the distribution of snowshoe hares were the strongest predictors of where lynx selected their home ranges.

Lynx were found to exhibit decreasing use of stand initiation structures (up to a maximum availability of 25%). The definition of stand initiation structure used in Holbrook and others (2017a) includes very young stands with very few trees and open canopies resulting from recent disturbances. SI structures as defined in this paper and the SI structural stage defined in the NRLMD are not comparable; stands in the SI structural stage as defined in the NRLMD (and that apply to standard VEG S1) approach 20-25 years of age before moving to advanced regeneration structures that provide snowshoe hare habitat during winter. The stand initiation structure defined by this publication is therefore a subset of the SI structural conditions used in NRLMD standard VEG S1 to establish the 30% SI condition threshold.

Holbrook and others (2017b) examined habitat relationships of snowshoe hare in a mixed conifer landscape in northwestern Montana. The authors found that occupancy and intensity of use by snowshoe hares were positively related to horizontal cover. This study also indicated that dense horizontal cover within multistoried forests with a substantial component of medium-sized trees (i.e., 12.7-25.4 cm) produced the highest use by snowshoe hares and that lodgepole pine and spruce-fir are indicators

of snowshoe hare habitat in the northern Rockies. This study also found that disturbance (vegetative treatment or burning) in multistoried stands with high horizontal cover may have negative short term impacts on snowshoe hare, but would ultimately benefit hares and hare habitat in the future (20-50 years) by allowing for development of horizontal cover.

Squires and others (2010) found that lynx habitat selection varied by season in northwest Montana. They found that multistory structure was particularly important in the winter and that lynx broadened their use of habitat during the summer to include early successional stands with high horizontal cover (Squires et al. 2010). Squires and others (2010) indicated that retention of a habitat mosaic of abundant and spatially well-distributed patches of mature, multistory forests and younger forest stands is needed to support lynx and their preferred prey.

Recent scientific findings undermine the Forest Plan/NRLMD direction for management of lynx habitat. This creates a scientific controversy the FS fails to resolve, and in fact it essentially ignores it.

For one, Kosterman, 2014 found that 50% of lynx habitat must be mature undisturbed forest for it to be optimal lynx habitat where lynx can have reproductive success and no more than 15% of lynx habitat should be young clearcuts, i.e. trees under 4 inches dbh. Young regenerating forest should occur only on 10-15% of a female lynx home range, i.e. 10-15% of an LAU. This renders inadequate the agency's assumption in the Forest Plan/NRLMD that 30% of lynx habitat can be open, and that no specific amount of mature forest needs to be conserved. Kosterman, 2014 demonstrates that Forest Plan/NRLMD standards are not adequate for lynx viability and recovery.

Also, the Forest Plan essentially assumes that persistent effects of vegetation manipulations other than regeneration logging and some intermediate treatments are essentially nil. However, Holbrook, et al., 2018 "used univariate analyses and hurdle regression models to evaluate the spatio-temporal factors influencing lynx use of treatments."

Their analyses "indicated ...there was a consistent cost in that lynx use was low up to ~10 years after all silvicultural actions." (Emphasis added.) From their conclusions:

First, we demonstrated that lynx clearly use silviculture treatments, but there is a ~10 year cost of implementing any treatment (thinning, selection cut, or regeneration cut) in terms of resource use by Canada lynx. This temporal cost is associated with lynx preferring advanced regenerating and mature structural stages (Squires et al., 2010; Holbrook et al., 2017a) and is consistent with previous work demonstrating a negative effect of precommercial thinning on snowshoe hare densities for

~10 years (Homyack et al., 2007). Second, if a treatment is implemented, Canada lynx used thinnings at a faster rate post-treatment (e.g., ~20 years post-treatment to reach 50% lynx use) than either selection or regeneration cuts (e.g., ~34-40 years post-treatment to reach 50% lynx use). Lynx appear to use regeneration and selection cuts similarly over time suggesting the difference in vegetation impact between these treatments made little difference concerning the potential impacts to lynx (Fig. 4c). Third, Canada lynx tend to avoid silvicultural treatments when a preferred structural stage (e.g., mature, multi-storied forest or advanced regeneration) is abundant in the surrounding landscape, which highlights the importance of considering landscape-level composition as well as recovery time. For instance, in an area with low amounts of mature forest in the neighborhood, lynx use of recovering silvicultural treatments would be higher versus treatments surrounded by an abundance of mature forest (e.g., Fig. 3b). This scenario captures the importance of post-treatment recovery for Canada lynx when the landscape context is generally composed of lower quality habitat. Overall, these three items emphasize that both the spatial arrangement and composition as well as recovery time are central to balancing silvicultural actions and Canada lynx conservation.

So Holbrook et al., 2018 and Holbrook 2019 (attached) fully contradict Forest Plan assumptions that clearcuts/regeneration can be considered useful lynx habitat as early as 20 years post-logging.

Results of a study by Vanbianchi et al., 2017 also conflict with Forest Plan/NRLMD assumptions: "Lynx used burned areas as early as 1 year postfire, which is much earlier than the 2-4 decades postfire previously thought for this predator." The NRLMD erroneously assumes clearcutting/regeneration logging have basically the same temporal effects as stand-replacing fire as far as lynx re-occupancy. Kosterman, 2014, Vanbianchi et al., 2017 and Holbrook, et al., 2018, Holbrook 2019 demonstrate that Forest Plan direction is not adequate for lynx viability and recovery, as the FS assumes. Holbrook 2019 such all lynx habitat must be surveyed. You have not done this.

Grizzlies

How many road closure violations have there been in the last 5 years in the Lolo National Forest?

It is fair to assume that there are many more violations that regularly occur and are not witnessed and reported. It is also fair to assume that you have made no effort to request this available information from your own law enforcement officers, much less incorporate it into your analysis.

Considering your own admissions that road density is the primary factor that degrades elk and grizzly habitat, this is

a material and significant omission from your analysis- all of your ORD and HE calculations are wrong without this information.

Moreover, in light of the fact that eliminated hiding cover standards in the revised Forest Plan which were designed to protect and conserve elk habitat, there are no protections left for elk and grizzly habitat. Chronic, illegal road use is reasonably foreseeable and must be addressed in the cumulative effects analysis.

Additionally, your emphasis on elk populations across entire hunting districts is disingenuous and has little relevance to whether you are meeting your Forest Plan obligations to maintain sufficient elk habitat on National Forest lands. As you note, the Forest Plan estimated that 70% of elk were taken on National Forest lands in 1986. What percentage of elk are currently taken on National Forest lands? Have you asked Montana FWP for this information? Any honest biologist would admit that high elk population numbers do not indicate that you are appropriately managing National Forest elk habitat; to the contrary, high elk numbers indicate that you are so poorly managing elk habitat on National Forest lands that elk are being displaced to private lands where hunting is limited or prohibited. Your own

Forest Service guidance document, Christensen et al 1993 states: "Reducing habitat effectiveness should never be considered as a means of controlling elk populations."

The recurring problem of road closure failures undermines the foundation of the Forest Plan's wildlife security standards, which relies on these road closures to achieve certain densities of open and total roads both inside and outside the Recovery Zone. The agencies must address this problem and its impacts in an updated ESA consultation for the revised Forest Plan.

Roads pose a threat to big game and grizzly bears because roads provide humans with access into big game and grizzly bear habitat, which leads to direct bear mortality from accidental shootings and intentional poachings. Big game flee onto private lands during hunting season. Human access also leads to indirect bear mortality by creating circumstances in which bears become habituated to human food and are later killed by wildlife managers. Human access also results in indirect mortality by displacing grizzly bears from good habitat into areas that provide sub-optimal habitat conditions.

Displacement may have long term effects: "Females who have learned to avoid roads may also teach their cubs to avoid roads. In this way, learned avoidance behavior can persist for several generations of bears before they again utilize habitat associated with closed roads." Both open and closed roads displace grizzly bears: grizzlies avoided

roaded areas even where existing roads were officially closed to public use.

Females with cubs remained primarily in high, rocky, marginal habitat far from roads. Avoidance behavior by bears of illegal vehicular traffic, foot traffic, and/or authorized use behind road closures may account for the lack of use of areas near roads by female grizzly bears in this area. This research demonstrated that a significant portion of the habitat in the study area apparently remained unused by female grizzlies for several years. Since adult females are the most important segment of the population, this lack of use of both open-road and closed-road areas is significant to the population.

In addition to having a significant impact on female grizzly bears, displacement may also negatively impact the survival rates of grizzly cubs: "survivorship of the offspring of females that lived in unroaded, high elevation habitat was lower than that recorded in other study areas in the [Northern Continental Divide Ecosystem]. The majority of this mortality was due to natural factors related to the dangers of living in steep, rocky habitats. This is important in that the effects of road avoidance may result not only in higher mortality along roads and in avoidance of and lack of use of the resources along roads, but in the survival of young when their mothers are forced to live in less favorable areas away from roads.

Please clarify what percent of roads that revised forest plan call to be closed will actually be closed. What percentage of roads that are called for to be closed will not be closed because you are still waiting for funds to close or obliterate those roads? This distinction matters because you cannot honestly claim that you are meeting road density standards promised by the Travel Plans' EIS and Decision if you have not yet completed the road closures/obliterations promised by the Travel Plans. Furthermore, as noted above, you have a major problem with recurring, chronic violations of the road closures created by the Travel Plan, which means that your assumptions in the Travel Plan that all closures would be effective has proven false. For this reason, you cannot tie to the analysis in the Travel Plan because it is invalid. You must either complete new NEPA analysis for the Travel Plan on this issue or provide that new analysis in the NEPA analysis for this Revised forest plan. Either way, you must update your open road density calculations to include all roads receiving illegal use.

The revised forest plan is in Violation of the ESA - failure to address and evaluate effects to grizzly bears in the lower-48 States or grizzly bear recovery. Section 7 of the ESA requires the Forest Service to consult with FWS on how the revised forest plan may affect listed species, including grizzly bears, which are listed as a single,

threatened species in the lower-48 States.

Proctor et al 2020 conclude:

Motorized access has been shown to influence grizzly bears at the individual and population levels. People in motorized vehicles affect grizzly bear habitat use, home-range selection, movements, population fragmentation, and demography including survival and reproduction, which ultimately affects bear density, population trends, and conservation status. Integrating habitat quality into road management improves the efficiency and effectiveness in reaching management goals, such as managing for few or no roads within 500 m of habitats containing late summer and autumn hyperphagia food resources, such as major berry fields, salmon streams where bears can effectively catch fish, and high-quality white-bark pine stands. Further, in populations with moderate habitat quality and close to human settlements,

2

road densities near 0.6 km/km with >60% secure habitat (i.e., >500 m from an open road) are meaningful thresholds that, if not exceeded, may allow female grizzly bears to have sustainable survival rates. In other areas, population-specific thresholds may be appropriate, such as where conservation is a major concern, because poor habitat quality limits reproductive rates and very little human-caused mortality can be sustained. In areas that are further from human population centers and have large patches of high-quality habitat, the bear population could tolerate higher overall road densities provided large, high-quality patches have no roads.

Our consensus of prioritizing the use of motorized access management across occupied grizzly bear terrain was that "Threatened" populations, or populations of conservation concern (documented or suspected population declines, excessive reported mortality, and areas with high human footprints), were a first priority. Next, we conclude that habitat quality is an integral part of understanding grizzly bear responses to roads and, if integrated, will increase the efficiency and effectiveness of road management programs. Therefore, managers should allow for habitat security with zero or low road densities in high-quality foraging habitats where major summer-autumn hyperphagia energy-rich food sources are used heavily. This could entail maintaining low road densities in currently safe habitats (where habitat quality is high and mortality risk is low) and applying motorized access controls in areas of sink habitats (where habitat quality and road densities are high).

Please follow the best available science. Please find Proctor et al attached.

Please consider and evaluate how the revised forest plan

and removal of all wildlife standards may affect grizzly bears in the lower 48 states or grizzly bear connectivity or movement and grizzly bear recovery in the lower 48 States is arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with ESA.

Please evaluate and analyze how its decision to remove all wildlife standards for big game may affect grizzly bears, wolverines, monarch butterflies, lynx, and lynx critical habitat.

Please evaluate and analyze in the environmental baseline, effects of the action, and cumulative effects, how the removal of all wildlife standards may affect grizzly bears, wolverines, monarch butterflies, lynx, or lynx critical habitat.

Please evaluate and analyze in the environmental baseline, effects of the action, and cumulative effects how removal of all wildlife standards may affect grizzly bears, wolverines, monarch butterflies, lynx, or lynx critical habitat. Please evaluate and analyze how the removal of wildlife standards may affect lynx critical habitat.

The removal of all wildlife standards in the revised forest plan is likely to adversely affect grizzly bears, wolverines, monarch butterflies, lynx, lynx critical habitat, and connectivity on the forest and is an important and relevant factor that must be (but was not) considered during the consultation process.

Failure to consider and evaluate how the removal of all wildlife standards may affect grizzly bears, wolverines, monarch butterflies, lynx, and lynx critical habitat is arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with ESA. 5 U.S.C. § 706 (2)(A).

NEPA requires the Forest Service to adequately disclose, consider, and analyze the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of its proposed actions. Direct effects are caused by the action and occur at the same time and place. Indirect effects are caused by the action and occur later in time or farther removed in distance, but are reasonably foreseeable.

Cumulative effects are the impacts on the environment that result from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions.

Please analyze in the EIS for the revised forest plan the direct and indirect effects of removing all

wildlife standards from the Lolo Forest Plan, including standards designed to protect hiding cover and limit open road densities on big game species and habitat (including security), grizzly bears, grizzly bear habitat, grizzly bear movement and recovery, lynx, lynx habitat, and lynx critical habitat.

Please analyze the cumulative effects of removing all wildlife standards from the Lolo Forest Plan, including standards designed to protect hiding cover and limit open road densities on big game species and habitat (including security), grizzly bears, grizzly bear habitat, grizzly bear movement and recovery, lynx, lynx habitat, and lynx critical habitat. Other activities occurring on the Lolo National Forest, including livestock grazing, recreational uses, logging, and climate change are having and continue to have a cumulative effect on big game species and habitat, grizzly bears, grizzly bear movement and recovery, lynx, lynx habitat, and lynx critical habitat.

The failure to analyze the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of removing all wildlife standards would be arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with NEPA.

NEPA requires the Forest Service to adequately consider and analyze a reasonable range of alternatives.

Under NEPA, the alternatives analysis is "the heart" of the environmental analysis because it presents impacts of the proposal and the alternatives in comparative form, thus sharply defining the issues and providing a clear basis for choice among options. The alternatives analysis guarantees that agency decision makers have before them and take into proper account all possible approaches to a particular action (including total abandonment of the action) which would alter the environmental impact and the cost-benefit balance.

Please consider and analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to removing all wildlife standards from the Lolo Revised Forest Plan.

Please evaluated and compared a wide range of new and varying standards with varying numeric limits for managing big game habitat and security on the forest based on the best available science.

Please consider and analyze a reasonable range of

alternatives as required by the NEPA. 5 U.S.C. § 706 (2)(A).

Christensen et al (1993) states: "Any motorized vehicle use on roads will reduce habitat effectiveness. Recognize and deal with all forms of motorized vehicles and all uses, including administrative use." Please disclose this to the public and stop representing that roads closed to the public should not be included in habitat effectiveness calculations. The facts that (a) you will construct or reconstruct temporary roads under the revised forest plan, (b) you have problems with recurring illegal use, means that your conclusion that this revised forest plan will have no effect on open road density or habitat effectiveness is implausible to the point of being disingenuous. You cannot exclude these roads simply because you say they are closed to the public. Every road receiving motorized use must be included in the HE calculation. You must consider all of this road use in order to take a hard look that is fully and fairly informed regarding habitat effectiveness. In the very least you must add in all "non-system" roads, i.e. illegal roads, as well as recurring illegal road use (violations) in your ORD calculations.

Are all of the roads that the Travel Plans call for being closed, actually closed on the ground? Are the road closure barriers effective? If not all of your analysis based on the Travel Plan is not accurate.

Corridors

Please see the attached paper by Newmark et al. 2023 titled, "Enhanced regional connectivity between western North American national parks will increase persistence of mammal species diversity"

The Lolo N.F is an important corridor that species like grizzly bears need to survive over the long run.

Protected areas are the cornerstone of biodiversity conservation worldwide. Yet the capacity of most protected areas to conserve biodiversity over the long-term is under threat from many factors including habitat loss and fragmentation, climate change, and over-exploitation of
1-6

wildlife populations . Of these threats, habitat loss and fragmentation on lands adjacent to protected areas are the most immediate and overarching threats facing most national parks and related reserves (IUCN protected area categories I & II) in western North America. As a result, most parks and related reserves in western North America are becoming increasingly spatially and functionally
1,3,7

isolated in a matrix of human-altered habitats . This is particularly problematic because few parks and related reserves worldwide are large enough to conserve intact
8-11

plant and animal communities and many large-scale ecological processes, such as mammal migrations and 12-16

disturbance regimes . Consequently, there is an increasing effort worldwide to promote and establish protected area networks - networks of reserves 17,18

interconnected by protected linkages .

Please disclose how often the Lolo N.F. has been surveyed for wolverines, pine martins, northern goshawks, monarch butterfly, grizzly bears, whitebark pine and lynx.

Is it impossible for a wolverines, pine martins, monarch butterfly, northern goshawks, grizzly bears, whitebark pine and lynx to inhabit the Lolo N.F.?

Would the habitat be better for wolverines, monarch butterflies, pine martins, northern goshawks, grizzly bears, whitebark pine and lynx if road density was greatly reduced to no more than one mile per square mile in the Lolo N.F.?

What is the U.S. FWS position on the impacts of revised Forest Plan on wolverines, pine martins, monarch butterflies, northern goshawks, grizzly bears, whitebark pine and lynx? Have you conducted ESA consultation?

Please provide us with the full BA for the wolverines, monarch butterflies, pine martins, bull trout, northern goshawks, grizzly bears, whitebark pine and lynx.

Why are you trying to exclude stand replacement fires when these fires help aspen and whitebark pine?

Please disclose what is the best available science for restoration of whitebark pine.

Please disclose the last time the Lolo N.F. was surveyed for whitebark pine, grizzly bears, wolverines, bull trout, monarch butterflies, whitebark pine, pine martins, northern goshawk, and lynx.

Please disclose how often the Lolo N.F. has been surveyed for whitebark pine, grizzly bears, wolverines, bull trout, monarch butterflies, whitebark pine, pine martins, northern goshawks, and lynx.

Would the habitat be better for whitebark pine, bull trout, grizzly bears, monarch butterflies, whitebark pine, wolverines, pine martins, northern goshawks, and lynx if roads density were reduced to one mile per square mile in the Lolo N.F.?

Please see the attached paper by Six et al 2021 Whitebark Genetics 2021. Six et al found:

"Anthropogenic change is creating or enhancing a number of stressors on forests. To aid forests in adapting to these stressors, we need to move beyond traditional spacing and age- class prescriptions and take into account the genetic variability within and among populations and the impact our actions may have on adaptive potential and forest trajectories. Because so little is known about the genetic

diversity in most forest trees, and because it is key to effective conservation, studies of genetic diversity and structuring in forest trees should be a top priority in forest adaptation and conservation efforts."

Six et al conclude: Growth rate was the best predictor of survivorship with survivors growing significantly slower than beetle-killed trees over their lifetimes although growth rates converged in years just prior to increased beetle activity. Overall, our results suggest that *P. albicaulis* forests show considerable divergence among populations and within-population genetic sub- structuring, and that they may contain complex mosaics of adaptive potentials to a variety of stressors including *D. ponderosae*. To protect the ability of this tree to adapt to increasing pressure from beetles, blister rust, and climate change, a top priority should be the maintenance of standing genetic diversity and adaptive shifts in allele frequencies.

Please disclose what is the best available science for restoration of whitebark pine.

Not all ecosystems or all Rocky Mountain landscapes have experienced the impacts of fire exclusion. In some wilderness areas, where in recent decades natural fires have been allowed to burn, there have not been major shifts in vegetation composition and structure (Keane et al. 2002). In some alpine ecosystems, fire was never an important ecological factor. In some upper subalpine ecosystems, fires were important, but their rate of occurrence was too low to have been significantly altered by the relatively short period of fire suppression (Keane et al. 2002). For example, the last 70 to 80 years of fire suppression have not had much influence on subalpine landscapes with fire intervals of 200 to several hundred years (Romme and Despain).

Consequently, it is unlikely that fire exclusion has yet to significantly alter stand conditions or forest health within Rocky Mountain subalpine ecosystems. Whitebark pine seedlings, saplings and mature trees, present in subalpine forests proposed for burning, would experience mortality from project activity. Whitebark pine is fire intolerant (thin bark). Fire favors whitebark pine regeneration (through canopy opening and reducing competing vegetation) only in the presence of adequate seed source and dispersal mechanisms (Clarks Nutcracker or humans planting whitebark pine seedlings). White pine blister rust, an introduced disease, has caused rapid mortality of whitebark pine over the last 30 to 60 years.

Keane and Arno (1993) reported that 42 percent of whitebark pine in western Montana had died in the previous 20 years with 89 per-cent of remaining trees being infected with blister rust. The ability of whitebark pine to reproduce naturally is strongly affected by blister rust infection; the rust kills branches in the upper cone bearing

crown, effectively ending seed production. Montana is currently experiencing a mountain pine beetle epidemic. Mountain pine beetles prefer large, older whitebark pine, which are the major cone producers. In some areas the few remaining whitebark that show the potential for blister rust resistance are being attacked and killed by mountain pine beetles, thus accelerating the loss of key mature cone-bearing trees. Whitebark pine seedlings and saplings are very likely present in the subalpine forests proposed for burning and logging. In the absence of fire, this naturally occurring white-bark pine regeneration would continue to function as an important part of the subalpine ecosystem. Since 2005, rust resistant seed sources have been identified in the Northern Rockies (Mahalovich et al 2006). Due to the severity of blister rust infection within the region, natural whitebark pine regeneration in the Lolo N.F. is prospective rust resistant stock. Although prescribed burning can be useful to reduce areas of high-density subalpine fir and spruce and can create favorable ecological conditions for whitebark pine regeneration and growth, in the absence of sufficient seed source for natural re-generation maintaining the viability and function of whitebark pine would not be achieved through burning. Please find Keane and Arno attached. Planting of rust-resistant seedlings would likely not be sufficient to replace whitebark pine lost to fire activities. What surveys have been conducted to determine presence and abundance of whitebark pine re-generation? The agency is violating the NEPA by promoting fuel reduction projects as protection of the public from fire, when this is actually a very unlikely event; the probability of a given fuel break to actually have a fire in it before the fuels reduction benefits are lost with conifer regeneration are extremely remote; forest drying and increased wind speeds in thinned forests may increase, not reduce, the risk of fire. The agency is violating the NEPA by providing false reasons for logging to the public by claiming that insects and disease in forest stands are detrimental to the forest by reducing stand vigor (health) and increasing fire risk. There is no current science that demonstrates that insects and disease are bad for wildlife, including dwarf mistletoe, or that these increase the risk of fire once red needles have fallen. The agency is violating the NEPA by claiming that logging is needed to create a diversity of stand structures and age classes; this is just agency rhetoric to conceal the real of logging to the public. The agency is violating the NEPA by using vague, un-measurable terms to rationalize the proposed logging to the public. How can the public measure "resiliency?" What are the specific criteria used to define resiliency, and what are the ratings for each proposed logging unit before and after treatment? How is the risk of fire as affected by the

revised forest plan being measured so that the public can understand whether or not this will be effective? How is forest health to be measured so that the public can see that this is a valid management strategy? What specifically constitutes a diversity of age classes, how is this to be measured, and how are proposed changes measured as per diversity? How are diversity measures related to wildlife (why is diversity needed for what species)? If the reasons for logging cannot be clearly identified and measured for the public, the agency is not meeting the NEPA requirements for transparency.

The agency will violate the NFMA with a revised Forest Plan that allows logging of riparian areas; almost all wildlife species will be harmed by this treatment. The agency will violate the NFMA by failing to ensure that old growth forests are well-distributed across the landscape.

The Revised Forest Plan appears to not have standards for old growth lodgepole forests in violation of NEPA and NFMA. The revised forest plan is in violation of NEPA for not informing the public of this. The Revised Forest Plan is in violation of NFMA and the ESA for not insuring viable populations of native species including grizzly bears, lynx, and wolverines.

At-Risk Plant Species (PRISK)

Introduction

This section addresses plant species that are recognized as at-risk species. This includes species recognized as threatened, endangered, proposed, or candidate species under the Endangered Species Act by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and species identified by the regional forester as species of conservation concern. Species of conservation concern are species other than federally recognized species that are known to occur in the plan area and for which the regional forester has determined that the best available scientific information indicates substantial concern about the species' capability to persist over the long term in the plan area (36 CFR 219.9; FSH 1909.12.52). Emphasis added.

The regional forester's list of plant species of conservation concern for the Lolo National Forest and associated species-specific evaluation of distribution, abundance, population trends, habitat trends, habitat attributes, and relevant threats are found at the Northern Region land management planning webpage. Forest Service Manual 2670 provides additional at-risk species management direction.

In addition to plan components outlined below, meeting or moving towards the desired conditions outlined for each of the broad potential vegetation types found in the terrestrial vegetation and invasive species sections are intended to

also provide for long-term persistence of at-risk plant species.

Desired Conditions (FW-DC-PRISK)

01 Habitat conditions support the recovery and persistence of plant species that are recognized as at-risk species.

Ecological conditions and processes that sustain the habitats currently or potentially occupied by these species are present.

02 Whitebark pine promotes community diversity and community stability in high mountain ecosystems.

Ecological conditions and processes lead to an increase in cone-bearing trees, particularly in areas projected to be suitable under future climates, and a decrease in susceptibility to succession to more shade tolerant conifers, mountain pine beetle, wildland fire and blister rust.

There is no site-specific map for whitebark pine. There must be a detailed, "fine-filter" scale map of whitebark pine added to the NEPA analysis, public disclosure and project record. NEPA and ESA require an inventory and map to demonstrate the "site-specific," "fine-filter" data and analysis required of a project-level NEPA process. Neither the public, nor the USFS-USDA have any clue as to where or how many, nor the abundance and distribution of whitebark pine groups and individuals in the Lolo N.F.. No disclosure is a "no-go," deal-breaker extraordinaire. Forest management related road construction, maintenance, and use may also be part of vegetation management projects. Harvest of WBP has not been well tracked as records often group it with other species and incorrectly identify it as another species. Silviculture approaches create a system that excludes regeneration opportunities and increases competition by planting faster-growing species, and consequently, stands that contain WBP prior to harvest are not routinely replanted with WBP.

Projects that implement resetting the successional stage of the forest stands need to be carefully thought out and planned to increase WBP recruitment. Campbell and Antos (2003) noted that successional patterns in WBP forests are more complex than others have reported, finding that subalpine fir readily established after fire in their British Columbia study areas, and although subalpine fir density was increasing in older WBP stands with relatively open canopies, they estimated that succession to subalpine fir would take more than 500 years. Campbell and Antos (2003) reported that WBP in their study area was stress-tolerant (able to persist under conditions that restrict production), was capable of surviving long periods of suppressed growth, and was able to release upon reaching the main canopy after more than 150 years of low growth rates. The results of these studies indicate that the loss of

WBP due to succession to subalpine fir and Engelmann spruce in some areas may be an extremely slow process and that WBP may be more shade-tolerant and resilient to suppression than previously suggested. Further, thinning and timber harvest projects intended to improve WBP recruitment may increase WBP susceptibility to mountain pine beetle infestation, if the beetles do not have their preferred food sources during outbreak years. The densification of and succession of subalpine fir and Engelmann spruce co-occurred with WBP mortality caused by bark beetle outbreaks and/or blister rust; therefore, disentangling the effects of blister rust- and bark beetle-mortality on succession from the effects of fire suppression in these studies is difficult (Hartwell et al. 1997; Arno et al. 1993 in Keane et al. 1994; Flanagan et al. 1998). Projects including those in WUI, salvage harvests, and pest control efforts remove dead and diseased trees, and may encourage natural WBP recruitment. In large acreages of dead trees, salvage harvest and firewood cutting projects can be designed to avoid damaging or killing live WBP SA January 2023 32

WBP, which may be resistant to blister rust. Projects where the removal of surface and ladder fuels through hand cutting, piling of project generated materials, and burning the piles with the purpose of increasing stand resilience to fire may also be beneficial for the recruitment of WBP. Felling trees and creating skid trails for salvage harvests may damage or kill WBP seedlings and saplings and compress the soil and undetected seeds. Implementation of the conservation measures (e.g., CM 1-10, 12-14, and 16-21) in the revised forest plan design that avoid impacts to WBP seedlings, saplings, and live mature trees, and that minimizes soil disturbance and compaction that may destroy microsites for cached seeds, interrupts drainage, and limits tree rooting will have beneficial long-term impacts to WBP.

Recreation Development and Activities

The following recreational activities commonly occur in WBP habitat: construction and maintenance of hiking trails and roads (analyzed in the Infrastructure section); motorized use of trails year-round; (snow machines, all-terrain vehicles (ATV), utility task vehicles (UTV), motorcycles, electric bikes, and mountain bikes); operation of facilities (snow making, lift chairs analyzed in the Infrastructure section); firewood consumption; special use permits (hunting, photography); and horseback riding. There are recreation sites within WBP habitat in the Lolo N.F., including developed campsites, horse corrals, trail heads, parking areas, toilets, staging areas, scenic overlooks, and primitive campsites. Back country campers and hikers may burn WBP for campfires, cause ground

compression, climb on trees, or remove WBP when clearing trails. Motorized recreation activities, hiking, use of pack animals, and construction equipment used for trail maintenance and construction, may cause soil disturbance and compaction, destroy microsites for cached seeds, interrupt drainage, limit tree rooting, and damage seedlings. Over snow vehicles (OSV) could break the tops of trees or could damage branches or seedlings and saplings. We acknowledge that there may be some damage and death to WBP seedlings and saplings from authorized and unauthorized off-road motorized recreation activities which could affect individuals or local areas.

Agencies should educate the public about the role of WBP in the high elevation forest community, minimize (and prevent where possible) damage and removal of WBP by backcountry recreation, and allow trees to continue to produce seed and propagate seedlings.

Please analyze the cumulative effects of the number of individual, stands, acres or any other estimate of the number of whitebark pine that will be killed over the life of the revised Forest Plan in the Lolo N.F. Do not do this is a violation of NEPA, NFMA, the APA and the ESA, 16 U.S.C. §§ 1531 et seq., to ensure that its actions do not adversely affect whitebark pine and that their actions promote conservation and recovery of these species. The federal agencies' (USFS-USDA and USFWS) mandate is to protect and recover imperiled species and their habitats. The revised Forest Plan will harm whitebark pine in unknown numbers, with unknown adverse cumulative impacts.

Since Whitebark pine are now listed under the ESA, the USFS-USDA must formally with the USFWS on the impact of the revised forest plan on whitebark pine. To do this the Forest Service will need to have a complete and recent survey of the entire Lolo N.F. for the presence of whitebark pine and consider planting whitebark pine as the best available science. Keene et al. states that the only way to get new whitebark pine is to grow (seedlings) them (submitted in our DEA comments).

Hundreds of acres of clearcutting and burning threaten individual whitebark pine trees in the Lolo N.F, including miles and miles of new roads, and including clearings around individual whitebark pines. The Forest Service fails to disclose the level of "take" and the incredibly high failure rate of these practices as a technique for natural restoration, regeneration and recovery of whitebark pine under these conditions.

Please disclose or address the results of its only long-term study on the effects of tree cutting and burning on whitebark pine. This study, named "Restoring Whitebark Pine Ecosystems," included prescribed fire, "thinning",

"selection cuttings," and "fuel enhancement cuttings" on multiple different sites. The results were that "[a]s with all the other study results, there was very little whitebark pine regeneration observed on these plots." See U.S. Forest Service, General Technical Report RMRS-GTR- 232 (January 2010). These results directly undermine the representations the Forest Service makes in the revised forest plan analysis. More specifically, the Forest Service's own research at RMRS-GTR-232 finds: "the whitebark pine regeneration that was expected to result from this [seed] caching [in new openings] has not yet materialized. Nearly all sites contain very few or no whitebark pine seedlings." Thus, even ten years after cutting and burning, regeneration was "marginal." Moreover, as the Forest Service notes on its website: "All burn treatments resulted in high mortality in both whitebark pine and subalpine fir (over 40%)." Accordingly, the only proven method of restoration of whitebark pine is planting: "Manual planting of whitebark pine seedlings is required to adequately restore these sites."

Please analyze impacts on future projects to cut down trees around whitebark pine which will cause the whitebark pine to grow faster and then die from beetles. This is a violation of NEPA, NFMA, the APA and the ESA.

Please see the attached memo from the FWS about requirements for consulting with the FWS about whitebark pine now that they are listed as threatened.

For whitebark pine, spring or fall burning may kill seedlings susceptible to fire. For mature whitebark pine trees, the bark is relatively thin compared to other species such as ponderosa pine and susceptible to scorching from fire. Fires that approach the tree trunks may scorch the bark, diminishing the bark's protective properties from other stressors. Depending on the fireline intensity and residence time of lethal temperatures, the heat from the fire may also penetrate the bark, killing the underlying cambium layer. Harm to the bark and cambium may reduce individual tree vigor and also increase susceptibility to infections such as white pine blister rust or infestations by the mountain pine beetle. Whitebark pine seed banks and fine roots may also be impacted should fire move through an area when fuels and soil moisture is conducive to longer residence time of lethal temperatures. Seeds are buried by Clark's nutcrackers generally within one inch of the soil surface and may be susceptible to longer residence time of lethal temperatures. Fine roots located near the soil surface serve as the primary water absorbing roots for trees and may be harmed or killed with longer residence times of lethal temperatures when soil moisture is low which would lead to an increase in the penetration depth of lethal temperatures. In general, the proposed prescription would

attempt to achieve a low severity surface fire in which shrubs, needle cast and upper duff layers would be consumed. In some instances, including dense stands in which commercial or non-commercial thinning is not feasible, higher severity fire effects may be preferred to achieve the desired condition for those forested stands. In the long term, broadcast burning in the vicinity of living whitebark pine stands may improve the habitat suitability for seed caching by Clark's nutcracker; seed germination; and whitebark pine seedling establishment. Clark's nutcrackers prefer to cache seeds in recently burned areas as fire removes understory plants and creates soil surfaces that are easier to penetrate for seed caching. In addition, in the long term, broadcast burning may reduce the vigor of other species that would compete with whitebark pine seedlings for sunlight, soil water, and nutrients."

On December 2, 2020, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service issued a rule proposing to list whitebark pine (*Pinus albicaulis*) under the Endangered Species Act. The Lolo National Forest includes whitebark pine. The whitebark pine present in the Lolo N.F. represents a major source within the larger geographic area. The revised forest plan proposes tree cutting and burning across thousands of acres where whitebark pine may be present. Regardless of whether individual activities are intended to impact whitebark pine, whitebark pine may be affected by damage from equipment and equipment trails, cutting, soil compaction and disturbance, mortality from prescribed burning, scorching from jackpot burning, trampling of seedlings and saplings, and removal of necessary microclimates and nursery trees needed for sapling survival. Additionally, thousands of acres of whitebark pine habitat manipulation are proposed for the Revised forest plan, including intentionally cutting and burning Whitebark pine trees. No discussion on the success rate of natural regeneration under these conditions is provided. No discussion of the success rate of planting seedlings in clearcuts is provided. There have been no surveys for whitebark pine in violation of the ESA, NEPA, NFMA, and the APA.

The Forest Service admits that whitebark pine is known to be present in the Lolo N.F. and that the revised Forest Plan may impact individual trees. The Forest Service must disclose or address the results of its only long-term study on the effects of tree cutting and burning on whitebark pine. This study, named "Restoring Whitebark Pine Ecosystems," included prescribed fire, thinning, selection cuttings, and fuel enhancement cuttings on multiple different sites. The results were that "[a]s with all the other study results, there was very little whitebark pine regeneration observed on these plots." See U.S. Forest

Service, General Technical Report RMRS-GTR-232 (January 2010). More specifically: "the whitebark pine regeneration that was expected to result from this [seed] caching [in new open- ings] has not yet materialized. Nearly all sites contain very few or no whitebark pine seedlings." Thus, even ten years after cut- ting and burning, regeneration was "marginal." Moreover, as the Forest Service notes on its website: "All burn treatments result- ed in high mortality in both whitebark pine and subalpine fir (over 40%)." Accordingly, the only proven method of restoration of whitebark pine is planting: "Manual planting of whitebark pine seedlings is required to adequately restore these sites."

Please find attached "Restoring Whitebark Pine Ecosystems in the Face of Climate Change Robert E. Keane, Lisa M. Holsinger, Mary F. Mahalovich, and Diana F. Tomback" and "Restoring Whitebark Pine Forests of the Northern Rocky Mountains, USA Robert E. Keane and Russell a. Parsons."

CARBON

Please analyze or disclose the body of science that implicates logging activities as a contributor to reduced carbon stocks in forests and increases in greenhouse gas emissions. The EA fails to provide estimates of the total amount of carbon dioxide (CO) or other greenhouse gas

2

emissions caused by FS management actions and policies -forest-wide, regionally, or nationally. Agency policymakers seem comfortable maintaining a position that they need not take any leadership on this issue, and obfuscate via this EA to justify their failures.

The best scientific information strongly suggests that management that involves removal of trees and other biomass increases atmos- pheric CO .

2

The Lolo National Forest has not yet accepted that the effects of climate risk represent a significant issue, and eminent loss of forest resilience already, and a significant and growing risk into the "foreseeable future?"

It is now time to speak honestly about unrealistic expectations relat- ing to desired future condition. Forest managers have failed to dis- close that at least five common tree species, including aspens and four conifers, are at great risk unless atmospheric greenhouse gases and associated temperatures can be contained at today's levels of concentration in the atmosphere. (See attached map). This cumulative ("reasonably foreseeable") risk must not continue to be ignored at the project-level, or at the programmatic (Forest Plan) level.

Global warming and its consequences may also be effectively irreversible which implicates certain legal

consequences under NEPA and NFMA and ESA (e.g., 40 CFR § 1502.16; 16 USC §1604(g); 36 CFR §219.12; ESA Section 7; 50 CFR §§402.9, 402.14). All net carbon emissions from logging represent "irretrievable and irreversible commitments of resources."

It is clear that the management of the planet's forests is a nexus for addressing this largest crisis ever facing humanity. Yet the EA and Draft Decision Notice fails to project-

even provide a minimal quantitative analysis of or agency-caused CO emissions or consider the best

2

available science on the topic. This is immensely unethical and immoral. The lack of detailed scientific discussions in the EA and Draft Decision Notice concerning climate change is far more troubling than the document's failures on other topics, because the consequences of unchecked climate change will be disastrous for food production, sea level rise, and water supplies, resulting in complete turmoil for all human societies. This is an issue as serious as nuclear annihilation (although at least with the latter we're not already pressing the button).

There is a pittance of information on climate change effects on Lolo N.F. vegetation. There is no analysis as to the veracity of the revised Forest Plan's Purpose and Need, the revised Forest Plan's objectives, goals, or desired conditions. The FS has the responsibility to inform the public that climate change is and will be bringing forest change.

Please consider that the effects of climate change on the Lolo National Forest, including that the "desired" vegetation conditions will likely not be achievable or sustainable. Please provide any credible analysis as to how realistic and achievable its desired conditions are in the context of a rapidly changing climate, along an unpredictable but changing trajectory.

The Forest Plan does not provide meaningful direction on climate change. Please acknowledge pertinent and highly relevant best available science on climate change. To not do so is a violation of NEPA.

Please analyze or disclose the body of science that implicates logging activities as a contributor to reduced carbon stocks in forests and increases in greenhouse gas emissions. Please provide estimates of the total amount of carbon dioxide (CO₂) or other greenhouse gas emissions caused by

2

FS management actions and policies-forest-wide, regionally, or nationally. Agency policy-makers seem comfortable maintaining a position that they need not take any leadership on this issue, and obfuscate via this EA to justify their failures.

The best scientific information strongly suggests that management that involves removal of trees and other biomass increases atmospheric CO₂. Unsurprisingly the

FSEIS doesn't state that simple fact.

Please present any modeling of forest stands under different management scenarios. The FS should model the carbon flux over time for its proposed stand management scenarios and for the various types of vegetation cover found on the CGNF.

Please do not ignore CO₂ and other greenhouse gas

emissions from other common human activities related to forest management and recreational uses. These include emissions associated with machines used for logging and associated activities, vehicle use for administrative actions, and recreational motor vehicles. The FS has been simply ignoring the climate impacts of these management and other authorized activities.

The Committee of Scientists, 1999 recognize the importance of forests for their contribution to global climate regulation. Also, the 2012 Planning Rule recognizes, in its definition of Ecosystem services, the "Benefits people obtain from ecosystems, including: (2) Regulating services, such as long term storage of carbon; climate regulation..."

We have no more time to prevaricate, and it's not a battle we can afford to lose. We each have a choice: submit to status quo for the profits of the greediest 1%, or empower ourselves to limit greenhouse gas emissions so not just a couple more generations might survive.

The District Court of Montana ruled in Case 4:17-cv-00030- BMM that the Federal government did have to evaluate the climate change impacts of the federal government coal program. Please find the order attached. In March 2019, U.S. District Judge Rudolph Contreras in Washington, D.C., ruled that when the U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM) auctions public lands for oil and gas leasing, officials must consider emissions from past, present and foreseeable future oil and gas leases nationwide. The case was brought by WildEarth Guardians and Physicians for Social Responsibility.

In March of 2018 the Federal District Court of Montana found the Miles City (Montana) and Buffalo (Wyoming) Field Office's Resource Management Plans unlawfully overlooked climate impacts of coal mining and oil and gas drilling. The case was brought by Western Organization of Resource Councils, Montana Environmental Information Center, Powder River Basin Resource Council, Northern Plains Resource Council, the Sierra Club, and the Natural Resources Defense Council.

The revised Forest Plan would be in violation of NEPA, NFMA, the APA, the ESA for not examining the impacts of the revised Forest Plan on climate change. Forests absorb carbon. The revised Forest Plan will allow the destruction of soils in the Lolo N.F. Soils are carbon sinks.

Please see the following article that ran in the Missoulian on March 11, 2019.

Fire study shows landscapes such as Bitterroot's Sapphire Range too hot, dry to restore trees

ROB CHANEY rchaney@missoulian.com

Mar 11, 2019

Burned landscapes like this drainage in the Sapphire Mountains hasn't been able to grow new trees since the Valley Complex fire of 2000, due to lack of soil moisture, humidity and seed trees, as well as excess heat during the growing season. University of Montana students Erika Berglund and Lacey Hankin helped gather samples for a study showing tree stands are getting replaced by grass and shrubs after fires across the western United States due to climate change.

Courtesy Kim Davis

Fire-scarred forests like the Sapphire Range of the Bitterroot Valley may become grasslands because the growing seasons have become

too hot and dry, according to new research from the University of Montana.

"The drier aspects aren't coming back, especially on north-facing slopes," said Kim Davis, a UM landscape ecologist and lead investigator on the study. "It's not soil sterilization. Other vegetation like grasses are re-sprouting. It's too warm. There's not enough moisture for the trees."

Davis worked with landscape ecologist Solomon Dobrowski, paleoecologist Philip Higuera, biologist Anna Sala and geoscientist Marco Maneta at UM along with colleagues at the U.S. Forest Service and University of Colorado-Boulder to produce the study, which was released Monday in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences journal.

"What's striking is if you asked scientists two decades ago how climate warming would play out, this is what they expected

we'd see," Higuera said. "And now we're starting to see those predictions on the impact to ecosystems play out."

The study concentrated on regrowth of Ponderosa pine and Douglas fir seedlings in Montana, Idaho, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona and northern California. Field workers collected trees from 90 sites, including 40 in the northern Rocky Mountains, scattered within 33 wildfires that had occurred within the past 20 years.

"We did over 4,000 miles of road-tripping across the West, as well as lots of miles hiking and backpacking," Davis said. The survey crews brought back everything from dead seedlings to 4-inch-diameter tree rings; nearly 3,000 samples in total. Then they analyzed how long each tree had been growing and what conditions had been when it sprouted. Before the 1990s, the test sites had enough soil moisture, humidity and other factors to recruit new seedlings after forest fires, Dobrowski said.

"There used to be enough variability in seasonal conditions that seedlings could make it across these fixed thresholds," Dobrowski said. "After the mid-'90s, those windows have been closing more often. We're worried we'll lose these low-elevation forests to shrubs or grasslands. That's what the evidence points to."

After a fire, all kinds of grasses, shrubs and trees have a blank slate to recover. But trees, especially low-elevation species, need more soil moisture and humidity than their smaller plant cousins. Before the mid-90s, those good growing seasons rolled around every three to seven years. The study shows such conditions have evaporated on virtually all sites since 2000.

"The six sites we looked at in the Bitterroots haven't been above the summer humidity threshold since 1997," Higuera said. "Soil moisture hasn't crossed the threshold since 2009."

The study overturns some common assumptions of post-fire recovery. Many historic analyses of mountain forests show the hillsides used to hold far fewer trees a century ago, and have become overstocked

due to the efforts humans put at controlling fires in the woods. Higuera explained that some higher elevation forests are returning to their more sparse historical look due to increased fires.

"But at the lower fringes, those burn areas may transition to non-forest types," Higuera said, "especially where climate conditions at the end of this century are different than what we had in the early 20th Century."

The study also found that soil sterilization wasn't a factor in tree regrowth, even in the most severely burned areas. For example, the 2000 Sula Complex of fires stripped forest cover in the southern end of the Bitterroot Valley. While the lodgepole pine stands near Lost Trail Pass have recovered, the lower-elevation Ponderosa pine and Douglas firs haven't.

Another factor driving regeneration is the availability of surviving seed trees that can repopulate a burn zone. If one remains within 100 meters of the burned landscape, the area can at least start the process of reseeded. Unfortunately, the trend toward high-severity fires has reduced the once-common mosaic patterns that left some undamaged groves mixed into the burned areas.

Higuera said he hoped land managers could use small or prescribed fires to make landscapes more resilient, as well as restructure tree-planting efforts to boost the chances of heavily burned places.

Rob Chaney!

!

Natural Resources & Environment Reporter
Natural Resources Reporter for The Missoulian.

The NFMA requires in the face of increasing climate risk, growing impacts of wildfire and insect activity, plus scientific research findings, the FS must disclose the significant trend in post-fire regeneration failure. The forest has already experienced considerable difficulty restocking on areas that have been subjected to prescribed fire, clear-cut logging, post-fire salvage logging and other even-aged management "systems."

NFMA (1982) regulation 36CFR 219.27(C)(3) implements the NFMA statute, which requires restocking in five years. Forest managers must analyze and disclose the fact that the

Lolo National Forest can no longer "insure that timber will be harvested from the National Forest system lands only where...there is assurance that such lands can be restocked within five years of harvest?" (NFMA§6(g)(3)(E)(ii)).

The revised forest plan goals and expectations are not consistent with NFMA's "adequate restocking"

requirement. Scientific research can no longer be ignored.

"At dry sites across our study region, seasonal to annual climate conditions over the past 20 years have crossed these thresholds, such that conditions have become increasingly unsuitable for regeneration. High fire severity and low seed availability further reduced the probability of post-fire regeneration. Together, our results demonstrate that climate change combined with high severity fire is leading to increasingly fewer opportunities for seedlings to establish after wildfires and may lead to ecosystem transitions in low-elevation ponderosa pine and Douglas-fir forests across the western United States."

Wildfires and climate change push low-elevation forests across a critical climate threshold for tree regeneration, PNAS (2018), Kimberley T. Davis, et al. (Please, find attached)

Forests are already experiencing emissions-driven deforestation on both the post-fire and post-logging acreage. Areas where the cumulative effects of wildfire, followed by salvage logging on the same piece of ground are error upon error, with decades of a routine that can rightfully be described as willful ignorance and coverup. Where is the reference to restocking? Monitoring data and analysis? If monitoring has been done there is no disclosure documenting the scope and probability of post-fire regeneration failures in the Lolo N.F.. NFMA requires documentation and analysis that accurately estimates climate risks driving regeneration failure and deforestation - all characteristic of a less "resilient" forest.

"In the US Rocky Mountains, we documented a significant trend of post-fire tree regeneration, even over the relatively short period of 23 years covered in this analysis. Our findings are consistent with the expectation of reduced resilience of forest ecosystems to the combined impacts of climate warming and wildfire activity. Our results suggest that predicted shifts from forest to non-forested vegetation." Evidence for declining forest resilience to wildfires under climate change, Ecology Letters, (2018) 21: 243-252, Stevens-Rumann et al. (2018). (Please find attached)

The current Forest Plan is based on assumptions largely drawn from our past that no longer hold true. These assumptions, made decades ago, must be challenged, and amended, where overwhelming evidence demonstrates a change of course is critical. It is time to take a step back,

assess the present and future and make the necessary adjustments, all in full public disclosure to the Congress and the American people. Many acres of (conifers) In many areas, conifers haven't shown "resilience" enough to spring back from disturbance. Regeneration is already a big problem. (Emphasis added).

Both RPA and NFMA mandate long-range planning which impose numerous limitations on commodity production, including grazing, timber harvesting practices and the amount of timber sold annually.

These long-range plans are based on assumptions, which are based on data, expert opinion, public participation and other factors that all, well almost all, view from a historical perspective. Assumptions that drove forest planning guidance decades ago, when climate risk was not known as it is today, are obsolete today.

Present and future climate risk realities demand new assumptions and new guidance.

A proper reexamination of the assumptions relating to resilience and sustainability contained in the current Forest Plan is necessary. Scientific research supporting our comments focus on important data and analysis. A full discussion and disclosure of the following is required: 1) trends in wildfires, insect activity and tree mortality, 2) past regeneration success/failure in the Lolo N.F., and 3) climate-risk science - some of which is cited below.

Sec. 6. of the National Forest Management Act states:

(g) As soon as practicable, ... the Secretary shall ... promulgate regulations, under the principles of the Multiple-Use, Sustained-Yield Act of 1960...

The regulations shall include, but not be limited to-

(3) specifying guidelines for land management plans developed to achieve the goals of the Program which-

(E) insure that timber will be harvested from National Forest System lands only where-

(i) soil, slope, or other watershed conditions will not be irreversibly damaged;

NFMA regulations at 36 C.F.R. § 219.27 (Management requirements) state:

(a) Resource protection. All management prescriptions shall-

(1) Conserve soil and water resources and not allow significant or permanent impairment of the productivity of the land;

(b) Vegetative manipulation. Management prescriptions that involve vegetative manipulation of tree cover for any purpose shall--

(5) Avoid permanent impairment of site productivity and ensure conservation of soil and water resources;

Please dispose at the programmatic-level (Forest Plan) the current and future impacts of climate risk to our national

forests. NEPA requires cumulative effects analysis at the programmatic level, and at the project-level. The failure to assess and disclose all risks associated with vegetative-manipulation (slash and burn) units in the Lolo N.F. in the proper climate-risk context/scenario violates the NFMA, NEPA and the APA.

In the face of increasing climate risk, growing impacts of wildfire and insect activity, plus scientific research findings, NEPA analysis and disclosure must address the well-documented trend in post-fire regeneration failure. The Lolo N.F. has already experienced difficulty restocking on areas that burned in the early 2000s wildfires. NFMA (1982) regulation 36 CFR 219.27(c)(3) implements the NFMA statute, which requires adequate restocking in five years.

Given the forest's poor history of restocking success and its failure to employ the best available science, the adequacy of the site-specific and programmatic NEPA/NFMA process begs for further analysis and disclosure of the reality of worsening climate conditions which threaten - directly and cumulatively - to turn forest into non-forest-vegetation, or worse. The desired future condition described in the Purpose and Need, or in the Forest Plan is not deforestation.

The revised Forest Plan seems to be based on assumptions largely drawn from our past. These assumptions must be challenged, and amended, where overwhelming evidence demonstrates a change of course is critically important. It is time to take a step back, assess the future and make the necessary adjustments, all in full public disclosure to the Congress and the American people.

Please acknowledge the likelihood that "...high seedling and sapling mortality rates due to water stress, competing vegetation, and repeat fires that burn young stands," which will likely lead to a dramatic increase in non-forest land acres. Many acres of (conifers) trees already fail to regenerate. (Emphasis added). A map of these areas is required. In many areas, conifers haven't shown "resilience" enough to spring back from disturbance.

Looking to the Future and Learning from the Past in our National Forests: Posted by Randy Johnson, U.S. Forest Service Research and Development Program, on November 1, 2016 at 11:00 AM <http://blogs.usda.gov/2016/11/01/looking-to-the-future-and-learning-from-the-past-in-our-national-forests/>

Excerpt:

"Forests are changing in ways they've never experienced before because today's growing conditions are different from anything in the past. The climate is changing at an unprecedented rate, exotic diseases and pests are present, and landscapes are fragmented by human ac-

tivity often occurring at the same time and place.

When replanting a forest after disturbances, does it make sense to try to reestablish what was there before? Or, should we find re-plant material that might be more appropriate to current and future conditions of a changing environment?

Restoration efforts on U.S. Forest Service managed lands call for the use of locally adapted and appropriate native seed sources. The science-based process for selecting these seeds varies, but in the past, managers based decisions on the assumption that present site conditions are similar to those of the past."

"This may no longer be the case."

The selected scientific research presented above is only a sampling of the growing body of evidence that supports the need to disclose the consequences of the proposed action in a proper context - a hotter forest environment, with more frequent drought cycles. This evidence brings into question the Purpose and Need for the revised Forest Plan. It also requires the FS to reconsider the assumptions, goals and expected desired future condition expressed in the existing Forest Plan. Plan expectations must be amended at the programmatic level before proceeding with proposed project-level action(s). According to best available science, implementing the revised forest plan will most likely accomplish the opposite of the desired future condition. We can adjust as we monitor and find out more. However, to willfully ignore what we do know and fail to disclose it to the public is a serious breach of public trust and an unconscionable act. Climate risk is upon us.

The NEPA requires a "hard look" at climate issues, including cumulative effects of the "treatments" in the proposed revised forest plan when added to the heat, drought, wind and other impacts associated with increased climate risk. Regeneration/Restocking failure following wildfire, prescribed fire and/or mechanical tree-killing has not been analyzed or disclosed. There is a considerable body of science that suggests that regeneration following fire is increasingly problematic.

NEPA requires disclosure of impact on "the human environment." Climate risk presents important adverse impacts on cultural, economic, environmental, and social aspects of the human environment. - people, jobs, and the economy - adjacent to and near the Lolo N.F.. "Challenges in predicting responses of individual tree species to climate are a result of species competing under a never-before- seen climate regime - one forests may not have experienced before either.

In an uncertain future of rapid change and abrupt, unforeseen transitions, adjustments in management approaches will be necessary and some actions will fail.

However, it is increasingly evident that the greatest risk is posed by continuing to implement strategies inconsistent with and not informed by current understanding of our novel future....

Achievable future conditions as a framework for guiding forest conservation and management, Forest Ecology and Management 360 (2016) 80-96, S.W. Golladay et al.
(Please, find attached)

Stands are at risk of going from forest to non-forest, even without the added risk of "management" as proposed in the revised Lolo N.F. forest plan in violation of NEPA, NFMA, and the APA.

FIRE PLAN

1. Did the Forest Service conduct NEPA analysis (i.e. an EA or EIS) for the Fire Plan?

2. If the Forest Service did not conduct NEPA for the Fire Plan, please immediately start that NEPA process.

3. Please provide a map showing the WUI and the locations of all homes in comparison to the Lolo N.F.

4. If the Forest Service did not conduct NEPA for the Fire Plan, please disclose the cumulative effects of Forest-wide implementation of the Fire Plan in the DEIS to avoid illegally tiering to a non-NEPA document. Specifically analyze the decision to prioritize mechanical, human-designed, somewhat arbitrary treatments as a replacement for naturally-occurring fire.

5. Did the Forest Service conduct ESA consultation for the FirePlan?

Old Growth

Please disclose the current level of old growth forest in each third order drainage in the Lolo N.F.;

Please disclose the method used to quantify old growth forest acreages and its rate of error based upon field review of its predictions;

Please disclose the historic levels of mature and old growth forest in the Lolo N.F.;

Please disclose the level of mature and old growth forest necessary to sustain viable populations of dependent wildlife species in the area;

Please disclose the amount of mature and old growth forest that will remain after the life of the revised Forest Plan;

Please disclose the amount of current habitat for old growth and mature forest dependent species in the Lolo N.F.;

Please disclose the amount of habitat for old growth and mature forest dependent species that will remain after the

life of the revised Forest Plan;

Please disclose the method used to model old growth and mature forest dependent wildlife habitat acreages and its rate of error based upon field review of its predictions;

Disclose maps of the area that show the following elements:

Old growth forest in the Lolo N.F. area;

Will the revised Forest Plan leave enough snags to follow the requirements of sensitive old growth species such as flammulated owls and goshawks?

Will the revised Forest Plan violate the NFMA by failing to ensure that old growth forests are well-distributed across the landscape?

Roadless areas

Please analyze the wilderness characteristic of the Lolo N.F. both the inventoried and uninventoried roadless areas.

The roadless areas in the Lolo N.F. are proposed as wilderness in the Northern Rockies Ecosystem Protection Act, S. 1531. Please administratively manage all roadless lands as wilderness and please recommend all roadless lands be designated as wilderness.

The Forest Service recognizes the value of forestland unencumbered by roads, timber harvest, and other development. Sometimes these areas are known as "inventoried roadless areas" if they have been inventoried through the agency's various Roadless Area Review Evaluation processes, or "unroaded areas" if they have not been inventoried but are still of significant size and ecological significance such that they are eligible for congressional designation as a Wilderness Area.

Roadless areas provide clean drinking water and function as biological strongholds for populations of threatened and endangered species. Special Areas; Roadless Area Conservation; Final Rule, 66 Fed. Reg. 3,244, 3,245 (Jan. 12, 2001) (codified at 36 C.F.R. Part 294). They provide large, relatively undisturbed landscapes that are important to biological diversity and the long-term survival of many at-risk species. Id. Roadless areas provide opportunities for dispersed outdoor

recreation, opportunities that diminish as open space and natural settings are developed elsewhere. Id. They also serve as bulwarks against the spread of non-native invasive plant species and provide reference areas for study and research. Id.

Other values associated with roadless areas include: high quality or undisturbed soil, water, and air; sources of public drinking water; diversity of plant and animal communities; habitat for threatened, endangered, proposed, candidate, and sensitive species and for those species dependent on large, undisturbed areas of land; primitive, semi-primitive non-motorized, and semi-primitive motorized classes of

dispersed recreation; reference landscapes; natural appearing cultural properties and sacred sites; and other locally identified unique characteristics.

The revised Forest Plan would be in violation of NEPA, NFMA and the APA for not adequately demonstrating the revised forest plan will comply with the roadless rule, NEPA, NFMA, and the APA.

Bull trout

The best available science shows that roads are detrimental to aquatic habitat and logging in riparian areas is not restoration.

Fish evolved with fire, they did not evolve with roads and logging.

Although wildfires may create important changes in watershed processes often considered harmful for fish or fish habitats, the spatial and temporal nature of disturbance is important. Fire and the associated hydrologic effects can be characterized as "pulsed" disturbances (sensu Yount and Niemi 1990) as opposed to the more chronic or "press" effects linked to permanent road networks. Species such as bull trout and redband trout appear to have been well adapted to such pulsed disturbance. The population characteristics that provide for resilience in the face of such events, however, likely depend on large, well-connected, and spatially complex habitats that can be lost through chronic effects of other management. Critical elements to resilience and persistence of many populations for these and similar species will be maintaining and restoring complex habitats across a network of streams and watersheds. Intensive land management could make that a difficult job. (Rieman and Clayton 1997)

What are the redd counts in bull trout critical habitat in the Lolo N.F? Please also provide the all the historical bull counts that you have in the Lolo N.F?

The EIS must fully and completely analyze the impacts to bull trout critical habitat and westslope cutthroat trout habitat. What is the standard for sediment in the revised Forest Plan? Sediment is one of the key factors impacting water quality and fish habitat. [See USFWS 2010]

The introduction of sediment in excess of natural amounts can have multiple adverse effects on bull trout and their habitat (Rhodes et al. 1994, pp. 16-21; Berry, Rubinstein, Melzian, and Hill 2003, p. 7). The effect of sediment beyond natural background conditions can be fatal at high levels. Embryo survival and subsequent fry emergence success have been highly correlated to percentage of fine material within the stream-bed (Shepard et al. 1984, pp. 146, 152). Low levels of sediment may result in sublethal and behavioral effects such as increased activity, stress, and emigration rates; loss or reduction of foraging capability; reduced growth and resistance to disease; physical

abrasion; clogging of gills; and interference with orientation in homing and migration (McLeay et al. 1987a, p. 671; Newcombe and MacDonald 1991, pp. 72, 76, 77; Barrett, Grossman, and Rosenfeld 1992, p. 437; Lake and Hinch 1999, p. 865; Bash et al. 2001n, p. 9; Watts et al. 2003, p. 551; Vondracek et al. 2003, p. 1005; Berry, Rubinstein, Melzian, and Hill 2003, p. 33).

The effects of increased suspended sediments can cause changes in the abundance and/or type of food organisms, alterations in fish habitat, and long-term impacts to fish populations (Anderson et al. 1996, pp. 1, 9, 12, 14, 15; Reid and Anderson 1999, pp. 1, 7-15). No threshold has been determined in which fine sediment addition to a stream is harmless (Suttle et al. 2004, p. 973). Even at low concentrations, fine-sediment deposition can decrease growth and survival of juvenile salmonids.

Aquatic systems are complex interactive systems, and isolating the effects of sediment to fish is difficult (Castro and Reckendorf 1995d, pp. 2-3). The effects of sediment on receiving water ecosystems are complex and multi-dimensional, and further compounded by the fact that sediment flux is a natural and vital process for aquatic systems (Berry, Rubinstein, Melzian, and Hill 2003, p. 4). Environmental factors that affect the magnitude of sediment impacts on salmonids include duration of exposure, frequency of exposure, toxicity, temperature, life stage of fish, angularity and size of particle, severity/magnitude of pulse, time of occurrence, general condition of biota, and availability of and access to refugia (Bash et al. 2001m, p. 11). Potential impacts caused by excessive suspended sediments are varied and complex and are often masked by other concurrent activities (Newcombe 2003, p. 530). The difficulty in determining which environmental variables act as limiting factors has made it difficult to establish the specific effects of sediment impacts on fish (Chapman 1988, p. 2). For example, excess fines in spawning gravels may not lead to smaller populations of adults if the amount of juvenile winter habitat limits the number of juveniles that reach adulthood. Often there are multiple independent variables with complex inter-relationships that can influence population size.

The ecological dominance of a given species is often determined by environmental variables. A chronic input of sediment could tip the ecological balance in favor of one species in mixed salmonid populations or in species communities composed of salmonids and nonsalmonids (Everest et al. 1987, p. 120). Bull trout have more spatially restrictive biological requirements at the individual and population levels than other salmonids (USFWS (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) 1998, p. 5). Therefore, they are especially vulnerable to environmental changes such as

sediment deposition.

Aquatic Impacts

* Classify and analyze the level of impacts to bull trout and westslope cutthroat trout in streams, rivers and lakes from sediment and other habitat alterations:

Lethal: Direct mortality to any life stage, reduction in egg-to-fry survival, and loss of spawning or rearing habitat.

These effects damage the capacity of the bull trout to produce fish

and sustain populations.

Sublethal: Reduction in feeding and growth rates, decrease in habitat quality, reduced tolerance to disease and toxicants, respiratory impairment, and physiological stress. While not leading to immediate death, may produce mortalities and population decline over time.

Behavioral: Avoidance and distribution, homing and migration, and foraging and predation. Behavioral effects change the activity patterns or alter the kinds of activity usually associated with an unperturbed environment. Behavior effects may lead to immediate death or population decline or mortality over time.

Direct effects:

Gill Trauma - High levels of suspended sediment and turbidity can result in direct mortality of fish by damaging and clogging gills (Curry and MacNeill 2004, p. 140).

Spawning, redds, eggs - The effects of suspended sediment, deposited in a redd and potentially reducing water flow and smothering eggs or alevins or impeding fry emergence, are related to sediment particle sizes of the spawning habitat (Bjornn and Reiser 1991, p. 98).

Indirect effects:

Macroinvertebrates - Sedimentation can have an effect on bull trout and fish populations through impacts or alterations to the macroinvertebrate communities or populations (Anderson, Taylor, and Balch 1996, pp. 14-15).

Feeding behavior - Increased turbidity and suspended sediment can affect a number of factors related to feeding for salmonids, including feeding rates, reaction distance, prey selection, and prey abundance (Barrett, Grossman, and Rosenfeld 1992, pp. 437, 440; Henley, Patterson, Neves, and Lemly 2000, p. 133; Bash et al. 2001d, p. 21).

Habitat effects - All life history stages are associated with complex forms of cover including large woody debris, undercut banks, boulders, and pools. Other habitat characteristic important to bull trout include channel and hydrologic stability, substrate composition, temperature, and the presence of migration corridors (Rieman and McIntyre 1993, p. 5).

Physiological effects - Sublethal levels of suspended sediment may cause undue physiological stress on fish, which may reduce the ability of the fish to perform vital

functions (Cederholm and Reid 1987, p. 388, 390).

Behavioral effects - These behavioral changes include avoidance of habitat, reduction in feeding, increased activity, redistribution and migration to other habitats and locations, disruption of territoriality, and altered homing (Anderson, Taylor, and Balch 1996, p. 6; Bash et al. 2001, pp. 19-25; Suttle, Power, Levine, and McNeely 2004, p. 971).

* How will the revised forest plan affect native fish? What is the current condition in the riparian areas?

How will the revised forest plan protect rather than adversely impact fish habitat and water quality? No logging or road building should be done in riparian areas. There should not be any stream crossings. Roads should be decommissioned and removed, not upgraded and rebuilt.

* Hauer, et al. (1999) found that bull trout streams in wilderness habitats had consistent ratios of large to small and attached to unattached large woody debris. However, bull trout streams in watersheds with logging activity had substantial variation in these ratios. They identified logging as creating the most substantive change in stream habitats.

"The implications of this study for forest managers are twofold: (i) with riparian logging comes increased unpredictability in the frequency of size, attachment, and stability of the LWD and (ii) maintaining the appropriate ratios of size frequency, orientation, and bank attachment, as well as rate of delivery, storage, and transport of LWD to streams, is essential to maintaining historic LWD characteristics and dynamics. Our data suggest that exclusion of logging from riparian zones may be necessary to maintain natural stream morphology and habitat features. Likewise, careful upland management is also necessary to prevent cumulative effects that result in altered water flow regimes and sediment delivery regimes. While not specifically evaluated in this study, in general, it appears that patterns of upland logging space and time may have cumulative effects that could additionally alter the balance of LWD delivery, storage, and transport in fluvial systems. These issues will be critical for forest managers attempting to prevent future detrimental environmental change or setting restoration goals for degraded bull trout spawning streams."

Muhlfeld, et al. (2009) evaluated the association of local habitat features (width, gradient, and elevation), watershed characteristics (mean and maximum summer water temperatures, the number of road crossings, and road density), and biotic factors (the distance to the source of hybridization and trout density) with the spread of hybridization between native westslope cutthroat trout

Oncorhynchus clarkii lewisi and introduced rainbow trout
O. mykiss in the upper

Flathead River system in Montana and British Columbia.

They found that hybridization was positively associated with mean summer water temperature and the number of upstream road crossings and negatively associated with the distance to the main source of hybridization. Their results suggest that hybridization is more likely to occur and spread in streams with warm water temperatures, increased land use disturbance, and proximity to the main source of hybridization.

How many bull trout will be killed during the implementation of the revised forest plan?

Will the revised Forest Plan allow projects to adversely modify bull trout critical habitat in the short run?

One of the Endangered Species Act's strongest provisions, designation of "critical habitat" is required for all domestic species listed under the Act. Please analyze and consult with the FWS on how the revised Forest Plan will effect bull trout and bull trout critical habitat includes specific areas within a species' current range that have "physical or biological features essential to the conservation of the species," as well as areas outside the species' current range upon a determination "that such areas are essential for the conservation of the species." In other words, the original definition of critical habitat said it must include all areas deemed important to a species' survival or recovery, whether the species currently resides in those areas, historically resided in those areas, uses those areas for movement, or needs them for any other reason.

Critical habitat provides key protections for listed species by prohibiting federal agencies from permitting, funding, or carrying out actions that "adversely modify" designated areas. Designating critical habitat also provides vital information to local governments and citizens about where important habitat for endangered species is located - and why they should help conserve it. No increase in sediment should be occur under the revised Forest Plan in bull trout critical habitat.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service found that bull trout are exceptionally sensitive to the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of roads. Dunham and Rieman demonstrated that disturbance from roads was associated with reduced bull trout occurrence. They concluded that conservation of bull trout should involve protection of larger, less fragmented, and less disturbed (lower road density) habitats to maintain important strongholds and sources for naturally recolonizing areas where populations have been lost. (USFS 2000, page 3-82.

Hitt and Frissell showed that over 65% of waters that were rated as having high aquatic biological integrity were found

within wilderness-containing subwatersheds.

Trombulak and Frissell concluded that the presence of roads in an area is associated with negative effects for both terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems including changes in species composition and population size. (USFS 2000, pages 3-80-81).

"High integrity [forests] contain the greatest proportion of high forest, aquatic, and hydrologic integrity of all are dominated by wilderness and roadless areas [and] are the least altered by management. Low integrity [forests have] likely been altered by past management are extensively roaded and have little wilderness." (USFS 1996a, pages 108, 115 and 116).

"Much of this [overly dense forest] condition occurs in areas of high road density where the large, shade-intolerant, insect-, disease- and fire-resistant species have been harvested over the past 20 to 30 years. Fires in unroaded areas are not as severe as in the roaded areas because of less surface fuel, and after fires at least some of the large trees survive to produce seed that regenerates the area. Many of the fires in the unroaded areas produce a forest structure that is consistent with the fire regime, while the fires in the roaded areas commonly produce a forest structure that is not in sync with the fire regime. In general, the effects of wildfires in these areas are much lower and do not result in the chronic sediment delivery hazards exhibited in areas that have been roaded." (USFS 1997a, pages 281-282).

"Increasing road density is correlated with declining aquatic habitat conditions and aquatic integrity. An intensive review of the literature concludes that increases in sedimentation [of streams] are unavoidable even using the most cautious roading methods." (USFS 1996b, page 105).

"This study suggests the general trend for the entire Columbia River basin is toward a loss in pool habitat on managed lands and stable or improving conditions on unmanaged lands." (McIntosh et al 1994).

"The data suggest that unmanaged systems may be more structurally intact (i.e., coarse woody debris, habitat diversity, riparian vegetation), allowing a positive interaction with the stream processes (i.e., peak flows, sediment routing) that shape and maintain high-quality fish habitat over time." (McIntosh et al 1994).

"Although precise, quantifiable relationships between long-term trends in fish abundance and land-use practices are difficult to obtain (Bisson et al. 1992), the body of literature concludes that land-use practices cause the simplification of fish habitat." (McIntosh et al 1994).

"Land management activities that contributed to the forest health problem (i.e., selective harvest and fire suppression) have had an equal or greater effect on aquatic ecosystems.

If we are to restore and maintain high quality fish habitat, then protecting and restoring aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems is essential." (McIntosh et al 1994).

"Native fishes are most typically extirpated from waters that have been heavily modified by human activity, where native fish assemblages have already been depleted, disrupted, or stressed []." (Moyle et al 1996).

"Restoration should be focused where minimal investment can maintain the greatest area of high-quality habitat and diverse aquatic biota. Few completely roadless, large watersheds remain in the Pacific Northwest, but those that continue relatively undisturbed are critical in sustaining sensitive native species and important ecosystem processes (Sedell, et. al 1990; Moyle and Sato 1991; Williams 1991; McIntosh et al. 1994;

Frissell and Bayles 1996). With few exceptions, even the least disturbed basins have a road network and history of logging or other human disturbance that greatly magnifies the risk of deteriorating riverine habitats in the watershed." (Frissell undated). Also please see the attached comments by Frissell on the bull trout recovery plan.

"[A]llocate all unroaded areas greater than 1,000 acres as Strongholds for the production of clean water, aquatic and riparian-dependent species. Many unroaded areas are isolated, relatively small, and most are not protected from road construction and subsequent timber harvest, even in steep areas. Thus, immediate protection through allocation of the unroaded areas to the production of clean water, aquatic and riparian-dependent resources is necessary to prevent degradation of this high quality habitat and should not be postponed." (USFWS et al 1995).

Because of fire suppression, timber harvest, roads, and white pine blister rust, the moist forest PVG has experienced great changes since settlement of the by Euroamericans. Vast amounts of old forest have converted to mid seral stages."(USFS/BLM 2000, page 4-58).

"Old forests have declined substantially in the dry forest PVG []. In general, forests showing the most change are those that have been roaded and harvested. Large trees, snags, and coarse woody debris are all below historical levels in these areas."

(USFS/BLM 2000, page 4-65).

"High road densities and their locations within watersheds are typically correlated with areas of higher watershed sensitivity to erosion and sediment transport to streams. Road density also is correlated with the distribution and spread of exotic annual grasses, noxious weeds, and other exotic plants. Furthermore, high road densities are correlated with areas that have few large snags and few large trees that are resistant to both fire and infestation of insects and disease. Lastly, high road densities are

correlated with areas that have relatively high risk of fire occurrence (from human caused fires), high hazard ground fuels, and high tree mortality." (USFS 1996b, page 85, parenthesis in original).

In simpler terms, the Forest Service has found that there is no way to build an environmentally benign road and that roads and logging have caused greater damage to forest ecosystems than has the suppression of wildfire alone.

These findings indicate that roadless areas in general will take adequate care of themselves if left alone and unmanaged, and that concerted reductions in road densities in already roaded areas are absolutely necessary.

Indeed, other studies conducted by the Forest Service indicate that efforts to "manage" our way out of the problem are likely to make things worse. By "expanding our efforts in timber harvests to minimize the risks of large fire, we risk expanding what are well established negative effects on streams and native salmonids. The perpetuation or expansion of existing road networks and other activities might well erode the ability of [fish] populations to respond to the effects of large scale storms and other disturbances that we clearly cannot change." (Reiman et al 1997).

The following quotes demonstrate that trying to restore lower severity fire regimes and forests through logging and other management activities may make the situation worse, compared to allowing nature to reestablish its own equilibrium. These statements are found in "An Assessment of Ecosystem Components in the Interior Columbia Basin and Portions of the Klamath and Great Basins, Volume 3 (ICBEMP):

"Since past timber harvest activities have contributed to degradation in aquatic ecosystems, emphasis on timber harvest and thinning to restore more natural forests and fire regimes represent risks of extending the problems of the past." (ICBEMP page 1340).

"Proposed efforts to reduce fuel loads and stand densities often involve mechanical treatment and the use of prescribed fire. Such activities are not without their own drawbacks -- long-term negative effects of timber harvest activities on aquatic ecosystems are well documented (see this chapter; Henjum and others 1994; Meehan 1991; Salo and Cundy 1987)." (ICBEMP page 1340).

"Species like bull trout that are associated with cold, high elevation forests have probably persisted in landscapes that were strongly influenced by low frequency, high severity fire regimes. In an evolutionary sense, many native fishes are likely well acquainted with large, stand-replacing fires." (ICBEMP page 1341).

"Attempts to minimize the risk of large fires by expanding timber harvest risks expanding the well-established negative effects on aquatic systems as well. The

perpetuation or expansion of existing road networks and other activities might well erode the ability of populations to respond to the effects of fire and large storms and other disturbances that we cannot predict or control (National Research Council 1996). (ICBEMP page 1342).

"Watersheds that support healthy populations may be at greater risk through disruption of watershed processes and degradation of habitats caused by intensive management than through the effects of fire." (ICBEMP page 1342).

"Timber harvest, through its effects on forest structure, local microclimate, and fuels accumulation, has increased fire severity more than any other recent human activity. If not accompanied by adequate reduction of fuels, logging (including salvage of dead and dying trees) increases fire hazard by increasing surface dead fuels and changing the local microclimate. Fire intensity and expected fire spread rates thus increase locally and in areas adjacent to harvest". (USFS 1996c, pages 4-61-72).

"Logged areas generally showed a strong association with increased rate of spread and flame length, thereby suggesting that tree harvesting could affect the potential fire behavior within landscapes...As a by-product of clearcutting, thinning, and other tree-removal activities, activity fuels create both short- and long-term fire hazards to ecosystems. Even though these hazards diminish over time, their influence on fire behavior can linger for up to 30 years in dry forest ecosystems of eastern Oregon and Washington". (Huff et al 1995).

The answer, therefore, is not to try managing our way out of this situation with more roads and timber harvest/management. In summary:

- * Roads have adverse effects on aquatic ecosystems. They facilitate timber sales which can reduce riparian cover, increase water temperatures, decrease recruitment of coarse woody debris, and disrupt the hydrologic regime of watersheds by changing the timing and quantity of runoff. Roads themselves disrupt hydrologic processes by intercepting and diverting flow and contributing fine sediment into the stream channels which clogs spawning gravels. High water temperatures and fine sediment degrade native fish spawning habitat.

According to the U.S. Forest Service 82% of all bull trout populations and stream segments range-wide are threatened by degraded habitat conditions. Roads and forest management are a major factor in the decline of native fish species on public lands in the Northern Rockies and Pacific Northwest.

Carnefix and Frissell, 2009 make a very strong scientific rationale for including ecologically-based road density standards: Roads have well-documented, significant

and widespread ecological impacts across multiple scales, often far beyond the area of the road "footprint". Such impacts often create large and extensive departures from the natural conditions to which organisms are adapted, which increase with the extent and/or density of the road network. Road density is a useful metric or indicator of human impact at all scales broader than a single local site because it integrates impacts of human disturbance from activities that are associated with roads and their use (e.g., timber harvest, mining, human

wildfire ignitions, invasive species introduction and spread, etc.) with direct road impacts. Multiple, convergent lines of empirical evidence summarized herein support two robust conclusions: 1) no truly "safe" threshold road density exists, but rather negative impacts begin to accrue and be expressed with incursion of the very first road segment; and 2) highly significant impacts (e.g., threat of extirpation of sensitive species) are already apparent at road densities on the order of 0.6 km per square km (1 mile per square mile) or less. Therefore, restoration strategies prioritized to reduce road densities in areas of high aquatic resource value from low-to-moderately-low levels to zero-to-low densities (e.g., <1 mile per square mile, lower if attainable) are likely to be most efficient and effective in terms of both economic cost and ecological benefit. By strong inference from these empirical studies of systems and species sensitive to humans' environmental impact, with limited exceptions, investments that only reduce high road density to moderate road density are unlikely to produce any but small incremental improvements in abundance, and will not result in robust populations of sensitive species.

Thank you for your time and consideration of our concerns.

Sincerely yours,

Mike Garrity

/s/

(Lead Objector)

Executive Director
Alliance for the Wild Rockies
P.O. Box 505
Helena, MT 59624
406-459-5936

And for
Sara Johnson
Native Ecosystems Council
P.O. Box 125
Willow Creek, MT 59760
And for
Steve Kelly

Council on Wildlife and Fish
P.O. Box 4641
Bozeman, MT 59772
And for
Kristine Akland
Center for Biological Diversity
P.O. Box 7274
Missoula, MT 59807
kakland@biologicaldiversity.org
?