

1 MICHAEL R. SHERWOOD, State Bar No. 63702  
2 GEORGE M. TORGUN, State Bar No. 222085  
3 Earthjustice  
4 426 17th Street, 5th Floor  
5 Oakland, CA 94612  
6 (510) 550-6725

7 MICHAEL GRAF, State Bar No. 136172  
8 Law Offices  
9 227 Behrens Street  
10 El Cerrito, CA 94530  
11 (510) 525-7222

12 Attorneys for Plaintiffs Sierra Forest Legacy, Sierra Club,  
13 and California Native Plant Society

14 RACHEL M. FAZIO, State Bar No. 187580  
15 John Muir Project  
16 P.O. Box 697  
17 Cedar Ridge, CA 95924  
18 (530) 273-9290

19 Attorney for Plaintiff Earth Island Institute

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

15 SIERRA FOREST LEGACY, SIERRA CLUB, )  
16 EARTH ISLAND INSTITUTE, and )  
17 CALIFORNIA NATIVE PLANT SOCIETY, non- )  
18 profit organizations, )  
19 Plaintiffs, )  
20 v. )  
21 BERNARD WEINGARDT, in his official )  
22 capacity as Regional Forester, Region 5, United )  
23 States Forest Service, EDWARD C. COLE, in his )  
24 official capacity as Forest Supervisor, Sierra )  
25 National Forest, United States Forest Service, )  
26 ABIGAIL R. KIMBELL, in her official capacity )  
27 as Chief of the United States Forest Service, and )  
28 UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE, an )  
29 agency of the United States Department of )  
30 Agriculture, )  
31 Defendants. )

Case No:

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND  
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

(Administrative Procedure Act case)

1 **INTRODUCTION**

2 1. Plaintiffs bring this action to challenge the United States Forest Service’s approval of  
3 the Kings River Project (“Project”), a massive logging plan in the heart of critical habitat for the  
4 imperiled Pacific fisher and other sensitive wildlife species that inhabit the old forests of the  
5 southern Sierra Nevada. The Forest Service approved the Kings River Project despite widespread  
6 opposition from leading scientists and wildlife biologists concerned about the Project’s significant  
7 adverse impacts on the dwindling fisher population. The aggressive logging promoted by the agency  
8 is contrary to sound science and does not provide a management approach that will actually achieve  
9 the Project’s purported goals of conducting meaningful research or restoring a healthy forest  
10 ecosystem.

11 2. Plaintiffs allege that in approving the Kings River Project, defendants Bernard  
12 Weingardt, *et al.* (“defendants” or “Forest Service”) violated the National Environmental Policy Act  
13 (“NEPA”), 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321 *et seq.*, and the Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”), 5 U.S.C. §  
14 706, by failing to provide adequate information or analysis regarding the Project’s likely  
15 environmental impacts, failing to take a hard look at or consider a reasonable range of alternatives,  
16 and failing to respond adequately to public comments and scientific information. Plaintiffs also  
17 contend that the Kings River Project violates the National Forest Management Act (“NFMA”), 16  
18 U.S.C. § 1604, and the APA by failing to insure the viability and distribution of imperiled old forest  
19 species such as the Pacific fisher, and failing to gather and disclose legally required monitoring data  
20 for numerous at-risk species. Plaintiffs seek an order vacating and remanding the Forest Service’s  
21 approval of the Kings River Project to remedy the violations of NEPA, NFMA, and the APA, and  
22 enjoining the Forest Service from implementing the Project.

23 **JURISDICTION, VENUE, AND INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT**

24 3. This Court has jurisdiction over this action by virtue of 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (action  
25 arising under the laws of the United States) and 5 U.S.C. § 702 (Administrative Procedure Act), and  
26 may issue a declaratory judgment and further relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-02 (Declaratory  
27 Judgment Act). Plaintiffs have exhausted all administrative remedies available to them pursuant to  
28 36 C.F.R. Part 215.



1 the protection and restoration of the quality of the natural and human environment and to use all  
2 lawful means to carry out those objectives. For many years the Sierra Club and its members have  
3 advocated for the protection of forest ecosystems throughout California. These advocacy efforts  
4 have included forest mapping and identification of remaining ancient forest areas, lobbying for and  
5 achieving funding for numerous forest conservation efforts, and urging protection for imperiled  
6 forest species, including the Pacific fisher and California spotted owl. Since the late 1980s, the  
7 Sierra Club has actively tracked and participated in major policy decisions and research initiatives  
8 relating to Sierra Nevada national forest management and species conservation, including the  
9 California Spotted Owl Sierran Province Interim Guidelines of 1993, the Sierra Nevada Ecosystem  
10 Project of 1996, the 2001 Framework, and the 2004 Framework. The Sierra Club participated in the  
11 planning process for the Kings River Project, commented on the draft and final EISs, and  
12 administratively appealed the Project.

13 8. Plaintiff Earth Island Institute (“EII”) is a nonprofit corporation organized under  
14 California law and headquartered in San Francisco, California. EII’s mission is to develop and  
15 support projects that counteract threats to the biological and cultural diversity that sustains the  
16 environment. Through education and activism, these projects promote the conservation,  
17 preservation, and restoration of the Earth. One of these projects is the John Muir Project, whose  
18 mission is to protect all federal public forest lands from commercial exploitation. EII is a  
19 membership organization with over 15,000 members in the United States, over 3,000 of whom use  
20 and enjoy the national forests of California for recreational, educational, aesthetic, spiritual, and  
21 other purposes. EII through its John Muir Project has a longstanding interest in the protection of  
22 national forests, and accomplishes this objective by ensuring that the Forest Service relies upon and  
23 addresses all scientific evidence in its decision-making process and that its decisions comply with all  
24 federal environmental laws. EII’s John Muir Project and EII members actively participate in  
25 governmental decision-making processes with respect to national forest lands in California and rely  
26 on information provided through NEPA to increase the effectiveness of their participation. EII’s  
27 John Muir Project actively participated in the NEPA and NFMA processes associated with the  
28

1 development of the Kings River Project, including submitting comments on the draft EIS and  
2 administratively appealing the decision.

3 9. Plaintiff California Native Plant Society (“CNPS”) is a nonprofit organization  
4 organized under California law with nearly 10,000 members, both professional botanists and  
5 laypersons, dedicated to the preservation of California’s rich native botanical heritage. The mission  
6 of the California Native Plant Society is to increase the understanding and appreciation of  
7 California’s native plants and to preserve them in their natural habitat through scientific activities,  
8 education, and conservation. CNPS members work closely with Forest Service personnel and other  
9 State and Federal agencies to manage and conserve botanical resources. CNPS is particularly  
10 concerned with the conservation of California’s rare and endemic plant species and threatened plant  
11 communities. CNPS participated in the planning process for the Kings River Project, commented on  
12 the draft EIS, and administratively appealed the Project.

13 10. The plaintiff organizations described above each have members who live or work in  
14 communities located near or adjacent to the national forests in the Sierra Nevada, and specifically  
15 near the site of the Kings River Project in Sierra National Forest. Plaintiffs’ members use and enjoy  
16 areas in and around the Kings River Project for a variety of purposes including, but not limited to,  
17 hiking, backpacking, photography, botanizing, hunting and fishing, scientific study, and wildlife  
18 observation, including observation of rare, imperiled, and sensitive wildlife species. They intend to  
19 continue to do so on an ongoing basis in the future. Plaintiffs’ members derive recreational,  
20 scientific, spiritual, professional, aesthetic, educational, and other benefits and enjoyment from these  
21 activities.

22 11. Defendants’ approval of the Kings River Project in violation of NEPA, NFMA, and  
23 the APA as alleged below has harmed and injured, and is continuing to harm and injure, the interests  
24 of plaintiffs and their members by causing or threatening irreversible adverse effects to the Kings  
25 River Project area and to the imperiled wildlife and other objects of interest in Sierra National  
26 Forest. Defendants’ actions deprive plaintiffs and their members of the recreational, scientific,  
27 spiritual, professional, aesthetic, educational, and other benefits they presently derive from the Kings  
28 River Project area. Additionally, defendants’ actions deny plaintiffs’ members their right to have the

1 laws of the land implemented and enforced, and the satisfaction and peace of mind associated with  
2 witnessing the implementation and enforcement of this nation's environmental protection laws.

3 12. Consequently, plaintiffs and their members have been, are being, and will continue to  
4 be adversely affected and irreparably injured by defendants' approval of the Kings River Project.  
5 These injuries are actual and concrete and would be redressed by the relief sought herein. Plaintiffs  
6 have no adequate remedy at law.

7 13. Defendant Bernard Weingardt is the Regional Forester for the Forest Service's  
8 Pacific Southwest Region, which encompasses the Sierra National Forest, and in that capacity has  
9 the responsibility to ensure that the Forest Service acts in accordance with applicable laws and  
10 regulations. Mr. Weingardt's office denied the plaintiffs' administrative appeals of the Record of  
11 Decision ("ROD") approving the Kings River Project and its associated Final Environmental Impact  
12 Statement ("FEIS"). He is sued in his official capacity.

13 14. Defendant Edward Cole is the Forest Supervisor for the Sierra National Forest and  
14 was the official who initially approved the ROD and FEIS for the Kings River Project. In his  
15 capacity as Forest Supervisor, he has the responsibility to ensure that the Forest Service acts in  
16 accordance with applicable laws and regulations. He is sued in his official capacity.

17 15. Defendant Abigail R. Kimbell is the Chief of the Forest Service. The Chief is the  
18 highest ranking officer in the Forest Service. The Chief has the responsibility to ensure that the  
19 Forest Service acts in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. She is sued in her official  
20 capacity.

21 16. Defendant United States Forest Service is an agency of the United States government  
22 within the United States Department of Agriculture. The Forest Service has been delegated  
23 authority to administer the national forest system of the United States. In that capacity, the Forest  
24 Service must comply with NEPA and NFMA in planning and implementing projects which may  
25 have a significant effect on the environment.

1 **BACKGROUND OF AGENCY PROCEEDINGS**

2 **Forest Planning in the Sierra Nevada**

3 17. The Sierra Nevada’s eleven national forests contain some of our Nation’s most  
4 diverse and spectacular public lands. Covering approximately 11.5 million acres, these forests  
5 provide habitat for numerous wildlife species, including the Pacific fisher and California spotted  
6 owl. However, more than a century of logging, livestock grazing, road construction, development,  
7 and related activities have taken a heavy toll on the Sierra Nevada’s natural resources.

8 18. Beginning in the late 1980s, the Forest Service has developed land and resource  
9 management plans (“LRMPs”) for each of the national forests in the Sierra Nevada pursuant to  
10 NFMA, 16 U.S.C. § 1604. The Forest Service adopted an LRMP governing the management of  
11 Sierra National Forest, including the Kings River Project area, in 1992.

12 19. In 1998, the Forest Service initiated a process to develop new management direction  
13 for several urgent problem areas with Sierra Nevada-wide significance, including the decline of old  
14 forest ecosystems and associated species.

15 20. On January 12, 2001, the Forest Service signed a Record of Decision adopting the  
16 Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment (known as the “2001 Framework”), which amended the  
17 forest plans for all eleven national forests in the Sierra Nevada, including Sierra National Forest.  
18 The 2001 Framework struck a careful balance between reducing the risk of catastrophic wildfire and  
19 protecting old forests and wildlife. In particular, the 2001 Framework emphasized logging of small  
20 trees (generally less than 12-20 inches in diameter), which contribute the most to wildfire risk, while  
21 protecting medium and large trees (generally greater than 20 inches in diameter), which are most  
22 important for wildlife like the Pacific fisher and California spotted owl. To protect species  
23 associated with old forests, the plan required that logging projects should maintain at least 50 percent  
24 canopy cover in most westside forests, and prohibited the reduction of preexisting canopy cover by  
25 more than 20 percent. The 2001 Framework specifically protected habitat zones for old forest  
26 dependent species, including the “Southern Sierra Nevada Fisher Conservation Area” and spotted  
27 owl “Home Range Core Areas” around owl nest sites.

1           21.     On January 21, 2004, the Forest Service adopted a Record of Decision approving  
2 substantial revisions to the 2001 Framework (the “2004 Framework”), which again amended the  
3 forest plans for the eleven Sierra Nevada national forests, including Sierra National Forest. The  
4 2004 Framework substantially weakened the 2001 Framework’s protection of old forests and  
5 associated species. Compared to the 2001 Framework, the 2004 Framework allows larger trees to be  
6 logged (up to 30 inches in diameter in almost all land allocations) and allows greater reductions in  
7 canopy cover (down to 40 percent and less). The 2004 Framework, in nearly all instances,  
8 eliminates all of the legally binding standards and guidelines that were included in the 2001  
9 Framework to protect the Southern Sierra Nevada Fisher Conservation Area and spotted owl Home  
10 Range Core Areas, and allows such areas to be logged pursuant to the less protective guidelines for  
11 general forest areas.

12 **The Kings River Project**

13           22.     The Kings River Project proposes logging operations, herbicide treatments, and  
14 prescribed fire on 131,500 acres in the Dinky Creek and Big Creek watersheds of Sierra National  
15 Forest over the next 25 years. Phase I of the Project, which is the initial portion approved by the  
16 Forest Service, authorizes the “treatment” of 13,847 acres within eight management units. This  
17 phase authorizes the logging of trees up to 30 inches in diameter, including 6,000 acres of uneven-  
18 aged logging and 1,865 acres of defensible fuel profile zone (“DFPZ”) logging, and more than 9,000  
19 acres of prescribed burning. Approximately 7,600 acres of Phase I are classified as “commercial  
20 harvest” and are expected to produce over 23 million board feet of timber. Implementation of Phase  
21 I is expected to commence in 2007 and continue over a three-year period.

22           23.     Phase II of the Kings River Project is expected to involve similar treatments for 60  
23 additional units in the remaining acreage between 2011 and 2033. However, the Forest Service  
24 states that specific treatments for these units will depend on monitoring and research results from the  
25 eight units in Phase I, and that further site-specific NEPA analysis will be conducted.

26           24.     On January 27, 2006, the Forest Service issued a draft EIS for Phase I of the Kings  
27 River Project containing two alternatives: the proposed action (Alternative 1) and the no action  
28 alternative (Alternative 2). Plaintiffs Sierra Forest Legacy, Sierra Club, Earth Island Institute, and

1 California Native Plant Society submitted comments on the draft EIS for Phase I on or prior to  
2 March 28, 2006.

3 25. The Forest Service released its FEIS for Phase I of the Kings River Project in October  
4 2006, which contained a new “Reduction of Tree Harvest Size Alternative” (Alternative 3).  
5 Plaintiffs Sierra Forest Legacy and Sierra Club submitted supplemental comments on the FEIS on  
6 November 20, 2006, and plaintiff Earth Island Institute submitted supplemental comments on  
7 November 22, 2006.

8 26. The Forest Supervisor (defendant Cole) signed the Record of Decision for Phase I of  
9 the Kings River Project on December 20, 2006, selecting Alternative 3 from the FEIS as the decision  
10 to be implemented.

11 27. Plaintiffs Earth Island Institute and California Native Plant Society each  
12 administratively appealed the decision to the Regional Forester (defendant Weingardt) on February  
13 3, 2007, and plaintiffs Sierra Forest Legacy and Sierra Club filed an administrative appeal on  
14 February 5, 2007.

15 28. The Forest Service failed to offer plaintiffs a timely appeal resolution meeting as  
16 required by 36 C.F.R. § 215.17(b). Plaintiffs met with the Forest Supervisor (defendant Cole) on  
17 March 14, 2007 to make a substantial appeal resolution offer, but plaintiffs’ offer was rejected by the  
18 Forest Supervisor on March 16, 2007.

19 29. The Regional Forester (defendant Weingardt), acting through his Deputy, denied all  
20 administrative appeals of the Kings River Project on March 20, 2007, and affirmed the Forest  
21 Supervisor’s decision to approve the Project. Consequently, no legal obstacle now prevents the  
22 Forest Service from advertising and awarding timber sale contracts pursuant to the Kings River  
23 Project, and logging can begin as soon as conditions permit.

24 **Old Forest Wildlife and Sensitive Plant Species in the Kings River Project Area**

25 30. Numerous old forest dependent wildlife species occur or potentially occur in the  
26 Kings River Project area and will be adversely affected by implementation of the Project. These  
27 include several management indicator species, species at risk, Forest Service designated “sensitive”  
28 species, and at least two species found to be warranted for listing under the Endangered Species Act.

1           31.     The Pacific fisher (*Martes pennanti*) is a forest carnivore that inhabits dense, older  
2 forests in the southern Sierra Nevada, including the Kings River Project area, which is only a small  
3 portion of its historic range. The fisher is among the most habitat-specific mammals in North  
4 America, utilizing large areas of primarily coniferous forests with fairly dense canopies and large  
5 trees, snags, and downed logs. Recent research in the southern Sierra confirms that medium and  
6 large trees, such as those that will be logged by the Kings River Project, are an important element of  
7 high quality fisher habitat, especially in providing for fisher rest sites.

8           32.     On April 8, 2004, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (“FWS”) found that the west  
9 coast population of the fisher warrants listing under the Endangered Species Act, but deferred listing  
10 due to workload constraints (a “warranted but precluded” decision). 69 Fed. Reg. 18,770 (Apr. 8,  
11 2004). According to the FWS, “preliminary analyses indicate West Coast fisher populations,  
12 particularly in the southern Sierra, may be at significant risk of extinction.” *Id.* at 18,789. The FWS  
13 cites logging as one of the primary causes of fisher decline in the Sierra Nevada. *Id.* at 18,778.

14           33.     Recent data indicates that the southern Sierra population of the Pacific fisher may  
15 number between just 100 to 500 individuals, with as few as 50 female fishers remaining. Given the  
16 current low density of fishers in the southern Sierra Nevada, the loss of even a small number of  
17 individuals could significantly impact the population.

18           34.     In 2006, the Conservation Biology Institute (“CBI”), a non-profit scientific research  
19 organization based in Corvallis, Oregon, was commissioned by the Forest Service to conduct a  
20 “Southern Sierra Nevada Fisher Assessment,” which involves compiling all available data on fisher  
21 populations and habitat in the southern Sierra Nevada, assessing their current status, and predicting  
22 how they are likely to respond to various alternative forest management actions, as well as  
23 unmanaged events such as wildfires, drought, or bark beetle outbreaks. The assessment is designed  
24 to create a scientifically credible set of habitat maps and estimates of fisher population size and  
25 distribution in the southern Sierra Nevada based on current conditions, as well as an assessment of  
26 how fisher habitat and populations are likely to change in the future under a range of alternative  
27 scenarios.

1           35.     The Forest Service has decided to move forward with the Kings River Project, which  
2 authorizes logging in prime fisher habitat, even though the CBI assessment has not been completed.

3           36.     The Kings River Project is located within and encompasses approximately 5% of the  
4 Southern Sierra Nevada Fisher Conservation Area, a region designated for protection by the Forest  
5 Service in the 2001 Framework. Much of the Kings River Project area is considered to be high  
6 quality fisher habitat, and as many as 36 individuals may reside within the Project boundaries.  
7 Approximately 13,700 acres in Phase I of the Kings River Project may include portions of 13 fisher  
8 home ranges, including home ranges that extend beyond the Phase I project area.

9           37.     Implementation of the Kings River Project will adversely affect the fisher population  
10 by causing a significant loss of key habitat in the southern Sierra Nevada and threatening the  
11 survival of this species.

12           38.     The California spotted owl (*Strix occidentalis occidentalis*) is a medium-sized raptor  
13 with large dark eyes and mottled brown and white coloring. California spotted owls inhabit the  
14 Sierra Nevada mountain range from Shasta County in the northern Sierra Nevada south to Kern  
15 County, including the Kings River Project site within Sierra National Forest. The owl is closely  
16 associated with the structural attributes of older forests in the Sierra Nevada, including medium and  
17 large trees, dense canopy cover, and large snags and down logs. Preferred habitat for the California  
18 spotted owl consists of mixed conifer forests dominated by trees larger than 24 inches in diameter  
19 and with 70 percent or greater canopy cover for nesting and roosting and 50 percent or greater  
20 canopy cover for foraging. The Forest Service has designated the California spotted owl as a  
21 “sensitive” species due to its close association with older forests, and the owl population in Sierra  
22 National Forest is known to be in decline.

23           39.     The Kings River Project will adversely affect the California spotted owl, as Phase I  
24 alone is likely to impact more than 9,000 acres of suitable owl habitat, including a significant  
25 amount of owl Home Range Core Areas and related nest sites. The proposed logging will result in  
26 the loss of important elements of owl habitat, such as the removal of medium and large trees and  
27 severe reductions in canopy cover. The FEIS erroneously assumes that areas with trees greater than  
28

1 12 inches in diameter and 40% canopy cover constitute “suitable” owl habitat, and that there will be  
2 no impacts to owls as long as habitat is retained at these levels.

3 40. The Kings River Project area is host to a wide range of sensitive species-at-risk and  
4 management indicator species (“MIS”) that require annual monitoring under the Sierra National  
5 Forest LRMP and Appendix E of the 2001 Framework (which was retained by the 2004  
6 Framework). These include the Swainson’s thrush, a species-at-risk that depends upon dense, closed  
7 canopy forest conditions, and the Olive-sided flycatcher, a species-at-risk that depends upon burned  
8 forest habitat. The logging activities proposed in the Kings River Project will remove or degrade  
9 suitable habitat for the Swainson’s thrush and will create conditions that superficially mimic post-  
10 fire habitat, drawing Olive-sided flycatchers into an “ecological trap” where they are unlikely to  
11 survive or successfully reproduce. Monitoring for these species in accordance with the Sierra  
12 National Forest LRMP and the 2001 and 2004 Frameworks has not occurred.

13 41. The Kings River Project area also includes several rare plant species, including  
14 *Carpenteria californica* and *Lupinus citrinus* var. *citrinus*. Monitoring for these species required by  
15 the Sierra National Forest LRMP and the 2001 and 2004 Frameworks has not occurred.

## 16 **STATUTORY AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK**

### 17 **The National Environmental Policy Act**

18 42. The National Environmental Policy Act is our “basic national charter for the  
19 protection of the environment.” 40 C.F.R. § 1500.1. Congress enacted NEPA “[t]o declare a  
20 national policy which will encourage productive and enjoyable harmony between man and his  
21 environment; to promote efforts which will prevent or eliminate damage to the environment and  
22 biosphere and stimulate the health and welfare of man; [and] to enrich the understanding of the  
23 ecological systems and natural resources important to the Nation.” 42 U.S.C. § 4321.

24 43. To accomplish these purposes, NEPA requires all agencies of the federal government  
25 to prepare a “detailed statement” that discusses the environmental impacts of, and reasonable  
26 alternatives to, all “major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human  
27 environment.” 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C). This statement is commonly known as an environmental  
28 impact statement (“EIS”).

1           44.     The EIS process is intended “to help public officials make decisions that are based on  
2 understanding of environmental consequences, and to take actions that protect, restore, and enhance  
3 the environment” and to “insure that environmental information is available to public officials and  
4 citizens before decisions are made and before actions are taken.” 40 C.F.R. § 1500.1(b)-(c). The  
5 EIS must “provide full and fair discussion of significant environmental impacts and shall inform  
6 decision-makers and the public of the reasonable alternatives which would avoid or minimize  
7 adverse impacts or enhance the quality of the human environment.” *Id.* at § 1502.1.

8     **The National Forest Management Act**

9           45.     Congress enacted the National Forest Management Act in 1976 to reform the Forest  
10 Service’s management of the National Forest System, primarily by requiring greater recognition of  
11 non-timber resources, such as wildlife, water, and soils, constraining the use of clearcutting, and  
12 requiring greater opportunities for public participation in forest planning.

13           46.     NFMA provides for a two-stage approach to land management planning. The Forest  
14 Service is first required to develop land and resource management plans for each National Forest.  
15 16 U.S.C. § 1604(e). The LRMPs establish basic guidelines and set forth the planning elements that  
16 will be employed by the Forest Service in future actions in a particular forest, including use of the  
17 land for “outdoor recreation, range, timber, watershed, wildlife and fish, and wilderness.” *Id.* at §  
18 1604(e)(1).

19           47.     Once an LRMP is approved, direct implementation occurs at a second stage where  
20 individual, site-specific projects are proposed and assessed. A site-specific project or decision, such  
21 as the Kings River Project, must be consistent with the LRMP for the larger area. 16 U.S.C. §  
22 1604(i).

23           48.     NFMA requires the promulgation of regulations specifying guidelines for LRMPs  
24 that address a variety of resource management issues. 16 U.S.C. § 1604(g). In particular, the  
25 regulations must include guidelines that ensure LRMPs comply with NEPA, provide for the diversity  
26 of plant and animal communities in each National Forest, restrict timber harvesting to avoid  
27 irreversible damage to soils, slopes, and watersheds, and limit the use of clearcutting and other even-  
28

1 aged timber harvest methods (*i.e.*, harvest methods that result in a replacement stand of trees of  
2 identical age). *Id.*

3 49. As required by NFMA, 16 U.S.C. § 1604(g), the Forest Service promulgated  
4 regulations implementing the planning provisions of NFMA in 1982. 36 C.F.R. Part 219 (1982).  
5 The 1982 regulations apply to the Kings River Project since the Sierra National Forest LRMP, as  
6 amended by the 2004 Framework, was prepared in accordance with the 1982 regulations.

## 7 CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

### 8 FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

#### 9 **Violations of NEPA and the APA:** 10 **Failure to Adequately Analyze Impacts on Imperiled Wildlife and Plant Species,** 11 **Wildfire Risk, and Soils**

12 50. Plaintiffs re-allege, as if fully set forth herein, each and every allegation contained in  
13 the preceding paragraphs.

14 51. NEPA requires all agencies of the federal government to prepare a “detailed  
15 statement” that discusses the environmental impacts of, and reasonable alternatives to, all “major  
16 Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.” 42 U.S.C. §  
17 4332(2)(C). An EIS must analyze “direct effects,” which are “caused by the action and occur at the  
18 same time and place,” as well as “indirect effects which . . . are later in time or farther removed in  
19 distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable.” 40 C.F.R. § 1508.8. An EIS must also consider the  
20 cumulative impacts of the proposed federal agency action together with past, present and reasonably  
21 foreseeable future actions, including all federal and non-federal activities. *Id.* at § 1508.7.

22 52. An EIS must be clear and supported by evidence that the agency has made the  
23 necessary environmental analyses. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.1. NEPA requires that the agency use the best  
24 available data and ensure the scientific integrity of an EIS, disclose opposing scientific viewpoints,  
25 and follow specified procedures to address gaps in data and scientific uncertainty. *Id.* at §§ 1500.1,  
1502.9, 1502.22, 1502.24.

26 53. The FEIS for the Kings River Project fails to adequately analyze or take a hard look  
27 at the Project’s likely impacts on old forest dependent species and their habitat. For example, the  
28 FEIS provides inaccurate or inadequate information on the current status of the Pacific fisher, its

1 habitat in the Kings River Project area, and the significant adverse impacts of logging this habitat.  
2 The FEIS fails to consider the role of the Kings River Project in reducing suitable fisher habitat  
3 within the Southern Sierra Nevada Fisher Conservation Area. The FEIS also provides an inadequate  
4 analysis of the amount and distribution of high quality habitat, home ranges, connective corridors,  
5 and other important habitat elements for the fisher that will be adversely affected by the Project.

6 54. The FEIS fails to adequately evaluate impacts to the California spotted owl by  
7 inaccurately describing the species' habitat requirements and ignoring impacts from logging near  
8 nest sites and in Home Range Core Areas. The FEIS also underestimates the short-term impacts to  
9 the owl from habitat loss, and fails to analyze impacts to the owl and its habitat either at the home  
10 range or the landscape scale.

11 55. The FEIS fails to adequately analyze the Kings River Project's adverse impacts on  
12 sensitive plant species, including *Carpenteria californica* and *Lupinus citrinus* var. *citrinus*, resulting  
13 from ground-based logging, the conversion of early successional forests and native plant  
14 communities into conifer tree farms, and herbicide treatments intended to favor conifer growth.

15 56. The FEIS claims to evaluate effects of the Project on wildlife and wildlife habitats by  
16 estimating the effects on certain management indicator species and species at risk. As set forth  
17 below, however, defendants' monitoring and analyses for these species were inadequate and  
18 otherwise insufficient to support the conclusions in the FEIS. Thus, the FEIS fails to adequately  
19 analyze the Kings River Project's adverse impacts on management indicator species and species at  
20 risk.

21 57. The FEIS fails to take a hard look at the impacts of the proposed logging on fire  
22 resiliency, relying on a silvicultural modeling approach that does not reflect ecosystem conditions in  
23 the Project area. The logging of medium and large diameter trees proposed by the Kings River  
24 Project will result in the removal of the most fire-resistant trees and reductions in forest canopy that  
25 will create hotter, drier conditions on the ground, allow increased wind speeds, and accelerate the  
26 growth of flammable brush and of dense, flammable stands of small conifers. These conditions will  
27 not result in a more fire resilient forest but instead will increase the potential for and risk of severe  
28 fire in the Kings River Project area.



1 objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives,” and to “devote substantial treatment to each  
2 alternative . . . so that reviewers may evaluate their comparative merits.” *Id.*

3 63. NEPA also requires that an EIS “briefly specify the underlying purpose and need to  
4 which the agency is responding in proposing the alternatives including the proposed action.” 40  
5 C.F.R. § 1502.13. An agency must not define its project purpose and need so narrowly as to  
6 preclude consideration of reasonable alternatives.

7 64. The FEIS for the Kings River Project states that the “underlying purpose of the  
8 proposed action is to restore historical pre-1850 forest conditions across a large landscape,” and in  
9 doing so, to reduce wildfire risk and preserve wildlife habitat. The FEIS then analyzes in detail only  
10 two alternatives other than the No Action Alternative (Alternative 2) to meet this purpose: the  
11 Proposed Action (Alternative 1) and the Reduction of Tree Harvest Size Alternative (Alternative 3).

12 65. A number of reasonable alternatives were suggested during the scoping period and  
13 public comment period on the draft EIS for the Kings River Project, but were not analyzed in the  
14 FEIS. For example, the California Attorney General’s Office, the U.S. Environmental Protection  
15 Agency, and plaintiffs all suggested specific alternatives that would achieve the Project’s stated  
16 purpose and need of fire risk reduction and yet be more protective of old forest dependant species.  
17 These included an alternative that would apply the management direction in the 2001 Framework, as  
18 well as an alternative that would involve lower diameter limits and less intensive logging treatments.  
19 None of these alternatives was adequately evaluated by defendants in the FEIS.

20 66. In analyzing alternatives, the Forest Service also failed to take a hard look at whether  
21 alternatives with less environmental impact would achieve the agency’s stated objectives for fuel  
22 reduction, forest health, and restoration of historical pre-1850 forest conditions across a large  
23 landscape. For example, while the FEIS shows that the current average density of trees between 20  
24 and 30 inches in diameter is already within the “desired range” sought by the Forest Service for the  
25 Kings River Project, the agency improperly dismisses alternatives with lower diameter limits as  
26 failing to meet the Project’s purpose and need.

27 67. Defendants’ failure in the FEIS to adequately evaluate all reasonable alternatives to  
28 the chosen action and its failure to take a hard look at environmentally preferable alternatives

1 violated and is continuing to violate Section 102(2)(C) of NEPA, 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C), and  
2 NEPA's implementing regulations, and was arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, not in  
3 accordance with law, and without observance of procedure required by law within the meaning of  
4 the APA, 5 U.S.C. § 706(2).

### 5 **THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

#### 6 **Violations of NEPA and the APA:** 7 **Failure to Adequately Respond to Comments or Disclose and Respond to Scientific** 8 **Information and Opposition**

8 68. Plaintiffs re-allege, as if fully set forth herein, each and every allegation contained in  
9 the preceding paragraphs.

10 69. NEPA requires that the Forest Service respond to comments both individually and  
11 collectively in the FEIS. 40 C.F.R. § 1503.4. The Forest Service must respond by: (1) modifying  
12 alternatives, including the proposed action; (2) developing and evaluating alternatives not previously  
13 considered by the agency; (3) supplementing, improving, or modifying its analysis; or (4) making  
14 factual corrections. *Id.* at § 1503.4(a). If the Forest Service feels that no further response is  
15 necessary, it must "explain why the comments do not warrant further agency response, citing the  
16 sources, authorities, or reasons which support the agency's position." *Id.*

17 70. NEPA also requires that the Forest Service ensure the "scientific integrity" of the EIS,  
18 40 C.F.R. § 1502.24, and "shall discuss at appropriate points in the final statement any responsible  
19 opposing view which was not adequately discussed in the draft statement and shall indicate the  
20 agency's response to the issues raised." *Id.* at § 1502.9(b).

21 71. The FEIS for the Kings River Project fails to adequately respond to public comments  
22 submitted by plaintiffs and other interested parties on the draft EIS regarding the substantive issues  
23 and errors alleged herein, as well as to other substantive public comments submitted on other NEPA  
24 documents. For example, the FEIS ignored or failed to respond meaningfully to comments  
25 submitted by plaintiffs regarding scientific inaccuracies and inconsistent data in the Forest Service's  
26 analysis of the Kings River Project's impacts on imperiled wildlife and plant species and wildfire  
27 risk.





1 identified and selected as management indicator species” based upon a finding that “their population  
2 changes are believed to indicate the effects of management activities.” 36 C.F.R. § 219.19(a)(1).  
3 The regulations further provide that “[p]lanning alternatives shall be stated and evaluated in terms of  
4 both amount and quality of habitat and of animal population trends of the management indicator  
5 species,” and “[p]opulation trends of the management indicator species will be monitored and  
6 relationships to habitat changes determined.” *Id.* at § 219.19(a)(2), (6).

7 81. NFMA also requires that “[e]ach Forest Supervisor shall obtain and keep current  
8 inventory data appropriate for planning and managing the resources under his or her administrative  
9 jurisdiction.” 36 C.F.R. § 219.12(d). Further, “[f]orest planning shall provide for diversity of plant  
10 and animal communities and tree species consistent with the overall multiple use objectives of the  
11 planning area. Such diversity shall be considered throughout the planning process. Inventories shall  
12 include quantitative data making possible the evaluation of diversity in terms of its prior and present  
13 condition.” *Id.* at § 219.26.

14 82. To comply with the above provisions of the NFMA regulations, the Forest Service  
15 has designated management indicator species at the Sierra Nevada regional level as well as  
16 individually for each of the eleven Sierra Nevada national forests, including Sierra National Forest.  
17 Appendix E of the 2001 Framework requires annual population monitoring of certain designated  
18 management indicator species and species at risk in all Sierra Nevada national forests. This  
19 requirement was adopted in the 2004 Framework.

20 83. “Management indicator species” are chosen to represent groups of species with  
21 similar habitat requirements, such that maintenance of viable population levels of these species will  
22 provide for viable populations of the remaining species in the group they represent. “Species at risk”  
23 are those with a high level of concern regarding population status and that occur in old forest  
24 ecosystems.

25 84. The Sierra National Forest LRMP requires annual population and trend monitoring  
26 for several avian species in various habitats. The Sierra National Forest LRMP also requires the  
27 Forest Service to minimize or eliminate direct and indirect impacts from management activities on  
28

1 threatened, endangered, and sensitive plants unless the activity is designed to maintain or improve  
2 plant populations.

3 85. The Forest Service failed to follow the requirements for management indicator  
4 species and species at risk analysis and inventories specified in Appendix E of the 2001 Framework  
5 and the Sierra National Forest LRMP. Required population data for species at risk have not been  
6 gathered, and baseline, trend, and/or current inventory data for many management indicator species  
7 do not exist or have not been maintained.

8 86. For example, for eleven of the species analyzed in the FEIS for the Kings River  
9 Project, including the Olive-sided flycatcher, the monitoring required by the Sierra National Forest  
10 LRMP and Appendix E of the 2001 Framework has not been completed. There are also 28  
11 additional species listed in Appendix E, such as the Swainson's Thrush, which may be affected by  
12 Phase I of the Kings River Project but were not discussed in the FEIS.

13 87. Population trends for avian species in Sierra National Forest were reported by using  
14 information provided in the federal Breeding Bird Survey program. However, this program fails to  
15 meet the population monitoring requirements of NFMA because the survey routes selected do not  
16 occur on Sierra National Forest lands and do not provide data representative of population trends in  
17 Sierra National Forest. In addition, data from the Breeding Bird Survey program is too sparse,  
18 limited, and unreliable to comply with the requirements in Appendix E of the 2001 Framework.

19 88. The FEIS does not quantify habitat changes from past, present, or reasonable  
20 foreseeable reforestation projects that would permanently eliminate suitable habitat for sensitive  
21 plant species, and also lacks viability analysis based on annual inventory of sensitive species.

22 89. Defendants' failure to adequately monitor or obtain inventory information on  
23 management indicator species and species at risk prior to its approval of the Kings River Project as  
24 described above violated and is continuing to violate NFMA and its implementing regulations, 36  
25 C.F.R. §§ 219.12, 219.19, and 219.26, and is also arbitrary and capricious, an abuse of discretion, or  
26 otherwise not in accordance with law, and without observance of procedure required by law, within  
27 the meaning of the APA, 5 U.S.C. § 706(2).



1 standards for minimum numbers of large downed logs per acre or how the Project will further reduce  
2 current levels of large downed logs below the minimum regional standard.

3 95. Defendants' failure to comply with the soil quality standards for the Kings River  
4 Project as described above violated and is continuing to violate NFMA, 16 U.S.C. § 1604(g) and 36  
5 C.F.R. § 219.27, and was also arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, not in accordance with  
6 law, and without observance of procedure required by law within the meaning of the APA, 5 U.S.C.  
7 § 706(2).

### 8 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

9 WHEREFORE, plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court enter judgment in their favor  
10 and grant the following relief:

11 A. Issue a declaratory judgment that:

12 1. Defendants' approval of the Kings River Project and the associated Record of  
13 Decision and Final Environmental Impact Statement failed to comply with the National  
14 Environmental Policy Act and National Forest Management Act and their respective implementing  
15 regulations;

16 2. Defendants' approval of the Kings River Project and the associated Record of  
17 Decision and Final Environmental Impact Statement was arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of  
18 discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law; was without observance of procedure required  
19 by law; and was unsupported by substantial evidence, in violation of the APA, 5 U.S.C. § 706(2);

20 B. Hold unlawful and set aside the Kings River Project and the associated Record of  
21 Decision and Final Environmental Impact Statement, and enjoin implementation of the Project,  
22 including but not limited to the advertisement of timber sales, solicitation of bids, award of contracts,  
23 or authorization of the commencement of logging or other activities pursuant to the Project;

24 C. Order defendants to prepare an environmental impact statement for any new proposed  
25 Kings River Project that fully complies with NEPA and NFMA;

26 D. Award plaintiffs their costs and expenses (including reasonable attorney, expert  
27 witness, and consultant fees); and

28 E. Award plaintiffs such further relief as the Court deems appropriate.

1 DATED: May \_\_\_\_, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

2  
3 \_\_\_\_\_  
4 GEORGE M. TORGUN  
MICHAEL R. SHERWOOD  
MICHAEL GRAF

5 Attorneys for Plaintiffs Sierra Forest Legacy, Sierra  
6 Club, and California Native Plant Society

7 /s/ Rachel Fazio (as authorized 5/18/07)  
8 RACHEL M. FAZIO

9 Attorney for Plaintiff Earth Island Institute