

FILED IN THE
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

Jun 21, 2023

SEAN F. MCAVOY, CLERK

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

KETTLE RANGE CONSERVATION

GROUP,

Plaintiff,

v.

U.S. FOREST SERVICE; GLENN

CASAMASSA, Pacific Northwest

Regional Forester, U.S. Forest Service;

RODNEY SMOLDON, Forest Supervisor,

Colville National Forest; and TRAVIS

FLETCHER, District Ranger, Republic

Ranger District, U.S. Forest Service,

Defendants.

No. 2:21-CV-00161-SAB

**ORDER GRANTING
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

Before the Court are Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF No. 48, Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File Extra Record Evidence, ECF No. 46, and Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF No. 54. The Court heard oral argument on the motions on February 9, 2023, in Spokane, Washington. Plaintiff is represented by Claire Loeb Davis. Defendants are represented by Paul Gerald Freeborne and John Martin. Having reviewed the parties' briefing, applicable law, and administrative record, the Court grants summary judgment in Plaintiff's favor.

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT *1**

1 **BACKGROUND**

2 Plaintiff is an environmental organization challenging the U.S. Forest
3 Service’s (hereinafter “the agency”) adoption of a forest management plan for the
4 Colville National Forest in 2019. The Colville National Forest consists of 1.1
5 million acres of National Forest System land in northeastern Washington. Plaintiff
6 also challenges a restoration and logging project in the Colville National Forest,
7 known as the Sanpoil Project.

8 **A. Colville Forest Plan**

9 In 1994, Congress assembled a scientific panel to assess the condition of
10 old-growth forests in eastern Washington and Oregon. The panel determined that
11 the country’s old-growth forests had been transformed, and if logging rates
12 continued, old-growth stands would soon occupy less than 10% of the forests. The
13 panel found that only 1% of the Colville National Forest consisted of old-growth
14 stands protected from logging. The panel recommended adoption of a standard
15 referred to as Eastside Screens.

16 In 1995, the agency adopted Eastside Screens to protect the remaining old-
17 growth habitat in the Colville National Forest. Eastside Screens limited certain
18 timber sales and prohibited the cutting of trees greater than 21-inches in diameter
19 at breast height (DBH). This is known as the 21-inch rule. Eastside Screens also
20 required a historical range of variability analysis to compare current stand structure
21 to historical conditions.

22 In 2003, the agency began the process of reviewing and revising the forest
23 plan for the Colville National Forest. On October 21, 2019, the agency issued a
24 final Record of Decision (ROD) for the 2019 Forest Plan. As part of the
25 environmental review process, the agency considered six alternatives. The agency
26 ultimately selected a forest management plan called Alternative P, which will open
27 63% of the Colville National Forest to logging. It is estimated to produce up to 62
28

1 million board feet of timber. Alternative P also eliminates Eastside Screens and the
2 21-inch rule.

3 **B. Sanpoil Project**

4 The Sanpoil Project is a proposed action issued under the 2019 Forest Plan.
5 The Sanpoil Project authorizes timber harvests in 8,410 acres and prescribed burns
6 in another 19,129 acres, requires the construction of 3.7 miles of temporary roads
7 and improvements to roughly 8 miles of non-system roads, and opens 10,585
8 additional acres to grazing. The Sanpoil Project is estimated to generate 50 million
9 board feet of timber. The Sanpoil Project area is in the southern part of the
10 Republic Ranger District, which is part of the Colville National Forest.

11 The agency released a draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Sanpoil
12 Project on February 6, 2019, and a final EA on May 27, 2020. The agency issued
13 the ROD for the Sanpoil Project on December 11, 2020, and found the Sanpoil
14 Project would not have a significant impact on the environment. Therefore, the
15 agency did not prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS).

16 **DISCUSSION**

17 Plaintiff moves for summary judgment to vacate and remand the RODs for
18 the 2019 Forest Plan and the Sanpoil Project. Plaintiff argues the agency violated
19 the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), National Environmental Policy Act
20 (NEPA), and National Forest Management Act (NFMA).

21 Under the APA, a federal court shall hold unlawful and set aside agency
22 action, findings, and conclusions found to be arbitrary and capricious or without
23 observance of procedures required by law. 5 U.S.C. § 706(2). An agency's action
24 is arbitrary and capricious if (1) the agency fails to consider an important aspect of
25 a problem, (2) the agency offers an explanation for the decision that is contrary to
26 the evidence, (3) the agency's decision is so implausible that it could not be
27 ascribed to a difference in view or be the product of agency expertise, or (4) the
28 agency's decision is contrary to the governing law. *Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass'n of*

1 *United States, Inc. v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 463 U.S. 29, 43 (1983). An
2 agency must examine the relevant data and articulate a satisfactory explanation for
3 its action. *Id.* Courts resolve APA actions on summary judgment because there are
4 no triable factual disputes. *Lands Council v. Powell*, 395 F.3d 1019, 1029 (9th Cir.
5 2005). The NFMA and NEPA use the APA’s standard of review. *San Luis &*
6 *Delta-Mendota Water Auth. v. Jewell*, 747 F.3d 581, 601 (9th Cir. 2014).

7 **A. Scope of Review**

8 Plaintiff moves the Court to supplement the administrative record with the
9 Eastside Screens Report. Plaintiff claims the Eastside Screens Report is essential to
10 considering the merits of the case. This Court agrees.

11 Cases involving challenges to final agency actions under the APA generally
12 involve a review of only the administrative record. *Citizens to Preserve Overton*
13 *Park v. Volpe*, 401 U.S. 402, 420 (1971); *Powell*, 395 F.3d at 1029. However, the
14 Ninth Circuit recognizes four exceptions to the rule:

15 (1) if admission [of supplemental information] is necessary to determine
16 whether the agency has considered all relevant factors and has explained its
17 decision, (2) if the agency has relied on documents not in the record,
18 (3) when supplementing the record is necessary to explain technical terms or
19 complex subject matter, or (4) when plaintiffs make a showing of agency
20 bad faith.

21 *Id.* at 1030 (“These limited exceptions operate to identify and plug holes in the
22 administrative record.”); *Sw. Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 100
23 F.3d 1443, 1450 (9th Cir. 1996).

24 The Court will consider the Eastside Screens Report. The new guideline for
25 old-growth management in the 2019 Forest Plan was a substantial departure from
26 prior management policy. The Eastside Screens Report was cited in public
27 objections to the plan and is necessary to understand whether the agency
28 considered and responded to these public comments under the NEPA. It is
necessary to determine whether the agency conducted informed decision making,

1 considered all relevant factors, and adequately explained its decision before
2 adopting the 2019 Forest Plan. Federal Defendants also contended at oral argument
3 that the Eastside Screens Report supports the agency’s decision—specifically,
4 arguing that the report is outdated and based on crude science. As the agency relied
5 on documents in this case that are not in the record to justify its decision, the Court
6 concludes it is appropriate to review those documents.

7 **B. Ripeness and Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies**

8 The agency contends Plaintiff’s claims are not ripe for review and Plaintiff
9 did not exhaust its administrative remedies. The Court rejects both arguments.

10 1. Ripeness

11 Ripeness serves to prevent the courts from entangling themselves in abstract
12 disagreements over administrative policies, and to protect the agencies from
13 judicial interference until an administrative decision has been formalized and its
14 effects felt in a concrete way by the challenging parties. *Ohio Forestry Ass’n, Inc.*
15 *v. Sierra Club*, 523 U.S. 726, 732–33 (1998). To determine whether an issue is
16 ripe, courts should consider the fitness of the issue for judicial decision, such as
17 whether (1) the legal challenge is to a site-specific action that implements or is
18 consistent with the policy or practice to be challenged, and (2) there is any
19 hardship to the parties from withholding consideration of the issues. *Id.* at 733–35.

20 This case is ripe for judicial review. The agency formalized the 2019 Forest
21 Plan and Sanpoil Project through APA procedures, and Plaintiff’s challenges
22 became ripe when the agency issued RODs for both agency actions. This case is fit
23 for judicial decision because the Sanpoil Project is a site-specific action governed
24 by the 2019 Forest Plan. There is also a risk of prejudice to Plaintiff in delaying
25 review, as the Sanpoil Project is scheduled to commence this year.

26 2. Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies

27 Section 6912(e) of Title 7 of the United States Code requires a party to
28 exhaust administrative remedies before it brings an action against a federal agency.

1 The issues to be challenged must be raised to the agency first. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 704;
2 *see also* 36 C.F.R. Part 215 (establishing agency appeal procedures). Exhaustion
3 arguments are considered on a case-by-case basis. *Great Basin Mine Watch v.*
4 *Hankins*, 456 F.3d 955, 968 (9th Cir. 2006). For challenges under the NFMA, the
5 Ninth Circuit has stated that claims raised at the administrative appeal and in the
6 federal complaint must be so similar that the district court can ascertain that the
7 agency was on notice of, and had an opportunity to consider and decide, the same
8 claims raised in federal court. *Native Ecosystems Council v. Dombeck*, 304 F.3d
9 886, 899 (9th Cir. 2002).

10 Plaintiff submitted objections to the Forest Plan throughout the
11 environmental review and public comment process. On September 23, 2011,
12 Plaintiff objected to the agency's proposed guidance for large and old trees and
13 potential removal of Eastside Screens. On July 5, 2016, Plaintiff lodged a response
14 to the draft EIS, objecting to the proposed management plan and arguing it should
15 include a standard like Eastside Screens. Plaintiff presented detailed objections in a
16 letter dated November 5, 2018, arguing the draft EIS violated the NFMA by failing
17 to ensure wildlife viability, diversity, and connectivity. In addition, on November
18 6, 2018, Plaintiff submitted comments contending the EIS failed to comply with
19 the NFMA and adequately protect large and old trees; in those comments, Plaintiff
20 again objected to the agency's decision to eliminate Eastside Screens.

21 Plaintiff exhausted its administrative remedies. Plaintiff placed the agency
22 on notice of its claims thoroughly and consistently during the public comment
23 process. The record demonstrates Plaintiff's arguments regarding elimination of
24 Eastside Screens, and the agency's purported failure to satisfy the requirements of
25 the NFMA, were raised with the agency first. The agency had an opportunity to
26 consider and decide those claims prior to this action. They come as no surprise to
27 the agency, and the issues are now properly before the Court.

Challenges to 2019 Forest Plan

1. National Forest Management Act

Plaintiff contends the agency violated the NFMA, because the agency failed to explain how the 2019 Forest Plan maintains the viability of old-growth-dependent species. The Court agrees.

The NFMA requires the agency to develop regulations to “provide for diversity of plant and animal communities.” 16 U.S.C. § 1604(g)(3)(B). The implementing regulation mandates that fish and wildlife habitat shall be managed to maintain viable populations of existing native and desired non-native vertebrate species.¹ 36 C.F.R. § 219.19 (1982). It provides that diversity shall be considered throughout the planning process and inventories shall include quantitative data making possible the evaluation of diversity in terms of its prior and present condition. *Id.* § 219.26 (1982).

Forest plans should designate management indicator species whose population changes are believed to indicate the effects of management activities. *Id.* § 219.19(a), (a)(1) (1982). The agency must estimate the effects of changes in vegetation type, timber age classes, community composition, rotation age, and year-long suitability of habitat related to mobility of management indicator species, and adequately evaluate planning alternatives in terms of both amount and quality of habitat and of animal population trends. *Id.* § 219.19(a)(1), (2) (1982).

¹ The revised 1982 regulations are applicable. *See* 36 U.S.C. 219.19 *et seq.* (1982). The Forest Service adopted NFMA planning regulations in 1982. 47 Fed. Reg. 43,026–43,052 (Sept. 30, 1982). The agency revised these regulations in 2012, but included transitional provisions allowing it to apply the 1982 regulations to plans initiated before 2012. 36 C.F.R. § 219.17(b)(3). The Forest Service elected to apply the 1982 regulations to the 2019 Forest Plan, except that it developed the 2019 Forest Plan’s monitoring requirements under the 2012 regulations.

1 Courts afford agencies the highest-level of deference in their scientific
2 conclusions, *League of Wilderness Defs. Blue Mountains Biodiversity Project v.*
3 *Allen*, 615 F.3d 1122, 1130 (9th Cir. 2010), and independently review the record to
4 determine whether the agency has made a reasoned decision based on its
5 evaluation of the evidence, *Earth Island Inst. v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 351 F.3d 1291,
6 1301 (9th Cir. 2003) (*Earth Island I*). The Ninth Circuit has approved the use of
7 habitat proxies in place of direct population monitoring for management indicator
8 species. *Earth Island Inst. v. U.S. Forest. Serv.*, 442 F.3d 1174, 1175 (9th Cir.
9 2006) (*Earth Island II*), *abrogated on other grounds by Winter v. Nat. Res. Def.*
10 *Council*, 555 U.S. 7 (2008). The agency can meet the species viability
11 requirements of the NFMA by preserving habitat, but only where both the agency's
12 knowledge of what quality and quantity of habitat is necessary to support the
13 species and the agency's method for measuring the existing amount of that habitat
14 are reasonably reliable and accurate. *See Native Ecosystems Council v. U.S. Forest*
15 *Serv.*, 428 F.3d 1233, 1250 (9th Cir. 2005). The agency is required to support its
16 conclusions that a project meets the requirement of the NFMA with studies that the
17 agency, in its expertise, deems reliable. The agency must also explain the
18 conclusions it has drawn from its chosen methodology, and the reasons it considers
19 the underlying evidence to be reliable. *See The Lands Council v. McNair*, 537 F.3d
20 981, 994 (9th Cir. 2008).

21 In this case, the agency erred by failing to demonstrate that its data and
22 methodology reliably and accurately supported its conclusions about the viability
23 of old-growth dependent species under each planning alternative, and depicted the
24 amount and quality of habitat.

25 The agency assessed how the six forest planning alternatives would impact
26 the viability of wildlife. The agency analyzed four surrogate species that rely on
27 old-growth habitat—the (1) northern goshawk, (2) pileated woodpecker,
28 (3) American marten, and (4) white-headed woodpecker. The agency did not

1 monitor the species directly, but instead, utilized old-growth habitat as a proxy to
2 monitor their viability. FP 108667; FP 107840. The agency used LiDAR to show
3 late-structure tree data, claiming it could constitute a forest-wide old growth
4 survey. FP 107840. LiDAR is a remote sensing method that uses a pulsed laser to
5 measure ranges and generate three-dimensional information about the shape of the
6 Earth and its surface characteristics. FP 111371.

7 In assessing each alternative's contribution to the viability of the surrogate
8 species, the EIS concluded that Alternative P provided "High" viability outcomes
9 for the old-growth-dependent species. FP 108680 (Table 183). The EIS
10 incorporated graphs that depict the amount of habitat that will be available over
11 time for the four surrogate species. FP 103356–57. The graphs illustrated that, for
12 all species but the white-headed woodpecker, Alternative P provides worse habitat
13 outcomes. *Id.* In contrast, the data illustrated the No Action alternative provides
14 more habitat than the selected alternative for three of the surrogate species. *Id.* The
15 EIS also concluded that the No Action alternative "creates the most late structure
16 of any alternative," FP 108317, while Alternative P produces the third most late
17 forest structure, FP 108332; FP 108312 (Table 30).

18 However, the EIS concluded that the No Action alternative would not
19 improve the viability outcomes for the surrogate species dependent on old-growth
20 habitat. FP 108687. It found:

21 Overall, alternative P would provide greater protection for LSOF (late
22 successional old forest) habitats than no action, the proposed action and
23 alternatives B, O, and R . . . [and] would improve the viability outcomes for
24 surrogate species that are dependent on LSOF habitats.

25 FP 108687. In its discussion, the agency did not reference its data or explain why
26 Alternative P was chosen considering that data. The agency did not explain how
27 the No Action alternative was projected to create poor outcomes for the surrogate
28

1 species based on its effects on habitat, yet its own figures indicated that the No
2 Action alternative produces the most habitat. FP 108687.

3 The agency relies on Appendix B of the associated Wildlife Report to
4 support its claim that Alternative P is superior for old-growth species. FP 103354
5 (Table 14). The Appendix includes a table summarizing the viability outcomes for
6 each alternative. It assigns current and historical viability outcomes for the
7 surrogate species through letter grades. Neither the EIS nor the Wildlife Report
8 describe how the agency came to these scores for each species and action
9 alternative. The agency did not define its methodology for assessing the letter
10 grades, such as what factors it considered and the weight they were given. The
11 grades assigned to each planning alternative lack explanation.

12 The agency failed to explain how its own data supports its conclusions about
13 what alternatives provide the most old-growth habitat for surrogate species.
14 Instead, the agency offered an explanation for its decision that is contrary to the
15 record evidence, in violation of the APA.

16 The NFMA and its implementing regulations require the agency to maintain
17 the viability of diverse wildlife. 16 U.S.C. § 1604(g)(3)(B); 36 C.F.R. § 219.19
18 (1982). Here, the agency did not ensure that the 2019 Forest Plan would maintain
19 viable populations for species dependent on old-growth habitat. It is impossible to
20 assess the accuracy of the agency's conclusions without a transparent methodology
21 and explanation of how its data supported those conclusions.

22 The agency also did not provide a meaningful assessment of the amount and
23 quality of old-growth habitat, as required by 36 C.F.R. § 219.19(a)(2) (1982). The
24 agency claimed it used LiDAR structure data to perform a forest-wide old growth
25 survey, but it did not explain how the data meets its requirement to describe the
26 effect of its planning alternatives on both the amount and quality of old-growth
27 habitat. In response to public comments on the issue, the record referred to the
28 agency's evaluation of viability in the Wildlife Report, which does not discuss the

1 amount and quality of habitat and population trends in reaching conclusions about
2 how the planning alternatives would affect species viability. For the foregoing
3 reasons, the agency acted arbitrarily and capriciously when it offered explanations
4 that ran counter to the evidence before the agency and failed to satisfy the
5 requirements of the NFMA.

6 2. National Environmental Policy Act

7 Plaintiff claims the agency violated other requirements of the NEPA.
8 Plaintiff primarily argues that the agency erred when it failed to consider the
9 impact of eliminating Eastside Screens.

10 The NEPA mandates that agencies take a hard look at the environmental
11 consequences of an action. *Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizens Council*, 490 U.S.
12 332, 350 (1989). The statute's hard look obligation must involve a discussion of
13 adverse impacts that does not improperly minimize negative side effects. *N. Alaska*
14 *Envtl. Ctr. v. Kempthorne*, 457 F.3d 969, 975 (9th Cir. 2006). Agencies are
15 required to respond to all responsible opposing views at appropriate points in the
16 draft and final EIS, 40 C.F.R. § 1502.9, and they must respond explicitly and
17 directly to conflicting views, *Earth Island II*, 442 F.3d at 1172–73. An agency
18 must address public criticisms of the scientific bases that the final EIS relies upon.
19 *See Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 349 F.3d 1157, 1167 (9th
20 Cir. 2003).

21 The 2019 Forest Plan adopted a whole landscape approach, which the
22 agency claims will provide flexibility in responding to climate change impacts.
23 FP 108306. The 2019 Forest Plan replaced Eastside Screens and the 21-inch rule,
24 but still encouraged retention and emphasis of recruitment of individual large trees.
25 Large trees may be removed or destroyed for several reasons, including:

- 26 • Where trees need to be removed for public health or safety (such as, but not
27 limited to, danger/hazard trees along roads or in developed or administrative
28 sites),

- 1 • Where trees need to be removed to facilitate management of emergency
- 2 situations such as wildfire response,
- 3 • Where trees need to be removed to meet, promote, or maintain desired
- 4 conditions for structural stages,
- 5 • Where trees need to be removed to control or limit the spread of insect
- 6 infestation or disease,
- 7 • Where trees need to be removed where strategically critical to reinforce,
- 8 facilitate, or improve effectiveness of fuel reduction in wildland-urban
- 9 interfaces, and
- 10 • Where trees need to be removed to promote special plant habitats (such as,
- 11 but not limited to, aspen, cottonwood, whitebark pine).

12 FP 109776–77. The 2019 Forest Plan did not designate a minimum amount of old-
13 growth habitat for preservation. It also provided that, while individual projects
14 should generally be consistent with the forest plan’s guidelines, projects may
15 deviate by showing how the action would be as effective in contributing to the
16 maintenance or attainment of relevant desired conditions and objectives.

17 FP 109905.

18 Plaintiff submitted objections to the draft EIS, claiming the 2019 Forest
19 Plan’s approach to managing old-growth habitats was ambiguous, and its
20 exceptions too flexible to ensure preservation of old-growth forest and species
21 viability on the project-level. Plaintiff argued the 2019 Forest Plan should maintain
22 the 21-inch rule.

23 The agency responded that it believed maintaining the 21-inch rule would
24 reduce the ability to attain the desired future condition of having most vegetation
25 types in late structure, FP 109253, and science now supports a more ecologically
26 based approach to management of old-growth trees, FP 107839. The agency did
27 not provide citations or a response to the specific studies submitted in Plaintiff’s
28 objection, including the Eastside Screens Report. The ROD for the 2019 Forest
Plan explained that the agency’s motivation for eliminating the 21-inch rule was to
provide adequate management flexibility to respond to emerging resource issues.

1 FP 113689. In response to public objections, the agency stated the approach will
2 provide flexible strategies to better integrate old forest conservation goals with
3 other land management objectives—and specifically, to avoid numerous site-
4 specific forest plan amendments to permit individual projects to log trees greater
5 than or equal to 21 inches DBH. FP 107839–40.

6 The agency’s cursory rejection of the science was insufficient to satisfy the
7 requirements of the NEPA. Plaintiff’s public comments raised the initial scientific
8 rationale for adoption of the bright-line rule, as articulated in the Eastside Screens
9 Report. The Eastside Screens Report was not included in the administrative record,
10 and the agency continues to oppose its consideration upon judicial review. Its
11 absence demonstrates that the agency failed consider the scientific rationale for
12 adopting the 21-inch rule before deciding to discard it. The agency did not respond
13 to viewpoints that directly challenged the scientific basis upon which the final EIS
14 rests—and indeed, that was central to it. *Ctr. for Biological Diversity*, 349 F.3d at
15 1167. In doing so, the agency violated the NEPA. The absence of the Eastside
16 Screens Report also demonstrates that the agency did not consider an important
17 aspect of the issue, as required by the APA. *Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass’n.*, 463 U.S.
18 at 43.

19 The agency found that Alternative P would provide for the retention and
20 restoration of late-successional forest structure, but the agency did not consider
21 negative impacts, if any, from (1) elimination of the 21-inch rule or (2) retention of
22 the exceptions in the new guideline. The NEPA requires the agency to discuss and
23 not improperly minimize negative effects of a proposed action. *N. Alaska Env’tl.*
24 *Ctr.*, 457 F.3d at 975. In this case, the EIS did not assess how often the new
25 guideline’s exceptions will be invoked and how the exceptions may impact the
26 agency’s conclusions about the environmental effects and species viability. The
27 agency acted arbitrarily and capriciously when it failed to meaningfully
28

1 acknowledge and discuss any adverse effects of rescinding the 21-inch rule, in
2 violation of the NEPA and the APA.

3 **Challenges to Sanpoil Project**

4 Plaintiff brings three challenges to the agency’s approval of the Sanpoil
5 Project. Plaintiff contends the agency violated the NEPA and NFMA when it failed
6 to (1) analyze the environmental impacts of the Sanpoil Project, (2) maintain
7 species viability, and (3) develop an EIS.

8 **1. Impacts Analysis**

9 The NEPA’s hard look requirement directs agencies to consider all
10 foreseeable direct and indirect impacts. *Idaho Sporting Cong. v. Rittenhouse*, 305
11 F.3d 957, 973 (9th Cir. 2002). The NEPA regulation requires agencies to assess the
12 direct and indirect effects, as well as the cumulative impact, of their actions on the
13 environment. 40 C.F.R. §§ 1502.16, 1508.25(c). A “cumulative impact” of an
14 action is defined as

15 the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of
16 the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable
17 future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person
18 undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from
19 individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a
20 period of time.

21 *Id.* § 1508.7. A cumulative impacts analysis must be more than perfunctory; it must
22 provide a useful analysis of the cumulative impacts of past, present, and future
23 projects. *Klamath-Siskiyou Wildlands Ctr. v. BLM*, 387 F.3d 989, 993–94 (9th Cir.
2004).

24 The agency is permitted to exercise its discretion and incorporate the
25 expected impact of such a project into the environmental baseline against which
26 the incremental impact of a proposed project is measured. *Cascadia Wildlands v.*
27 *Bureau of Indians Affs.*, 801 F.3d 1105, 1112 (9th Cir. 2015). With respect to past
28 actions specifically, the agency is not required to exhaustively list and analyze all

1 individual past actions or consider the individual effects of those actions to
2 determine the present effects. 36 C.F.R. § 220.4(f). Rather, the agency must
3 determine what information regarding past actions is useful and relevant to the
4 required analysis of cumulative effects. The statutory minima of the NEPA is met
5 where the underlying data base includes approved projects and pending proposals.
6 *Cascadia Wildlands*, 801 F.3d at 1113. The agency is required to provide a clear
7 explanation of its analysis to enable informed public comment on the project. *Id.* at
8 1112.

9 In the EA, the agency purported to provide an analysis and description of the
10 identifiable present effects of past actions, to the extent that they are relevant and
11 useful in analyzing effects. AR 06061. The agency also elected to aggregate past
12 projects into an environmental baseline to assess the Sanpoil Project's impact. The
13 agency catalogued the projects it considered. AR 06061–68 (Appendix A, Tables
14 14 and 15).

15 The agency did not adequately analyze the cumulative impacts of the
16 Sanpoil Project, because it did not discuss past projects' aggregate effects. The
17 NEPA permits the agency's environmental baseline approach and provides that an
18 agency need not list and analyze individual past actions. While the agency claims it
19 established an environmental baseline to analyze effects, the EA did not discuss or
20 demonstrate how it aggregated the cumulative impacts of the noted projects, only
21 citing to its catalogue of projects and ultimate perfunctory conclusions. *Cascadia*
22 *Wildlands*, 801 F.3d at 1111. The agency did not provide a serious analysis on
23 cumulative impacts from the Sanpoil Project.

24 Related to this issue, Plaintiff claims the agency erred when it did not
25 specify the degree to which the Sanpoil Project will permit removal of trees greater
26 than or equal to 21 inches DBH to meet desired conditions. The 2019 Forest Plan
27 states it prioritizes retention of old growth trees but will destroy and remove trees
28 under flexible exceptions. The agency found in the EIS that there was no threat to

1 species viability based on the assumption the new management approach would
2 better protect old-growth trees.

3 This conclusion was contrary to the evidence. The Sanpoil Project EA did
4 not specify the frequency of which the new guideline's exceptions would be
5 invoked, despite the 2019 Forest Plan's stated objective of preserving old-growth
6 trees. The agency is not required to catalogue specific trees that will be removed,
7 but in this case, the agency was required to provide site-specific details at the
8 project planning stage to provide a sufficient picture of the Sanpoil Project's
9 cumulative effects. *See WildEarth Guardians*, 920 F.3d at 1257. Without
10 sufficiently specific information about site impacts, the Sanpoil Project's impact to
11 old-growth trees and their dependent species is speculative.

12 The agency states the following in its internal guidance on compliance with
13 the NEPA: "If the Agency does not know where or when an activity will occur or
14 if it will occur at all[,] then the effects of that action cannot be meaningfully
15 evaluated." *See U.S. FOREST SERVICE, FOREST SERVICE HANDBOOK, FSH*
16 *1909.15.01(1)*. That is the case here. In failing to consider the cumulative and site-
17 specific effects of the Sanpoil Project, the agency did not comply with the NEPA.

18 2. Viability

19 Plaintiff avers the agency failed to ensure that the Sanpoil Project will
20 maintain species viability, as the agency failed to adequately assess the Sanpoil
21 Project's impacts on (1) gray wolves and wolverine, (2) sensitive bat species, and
22 (3) sensitive bird and invertebrate species. The same legal standards noted above
23 regarding effects analyses under the NEPA and species viability under the NFMA
24 apply.

25 a. *Gray Wolves and Wolverine*

26 The agency concluded that the Sanpoil Project "may impact" individual
27 wolves but is not likely to lead to loss of viability. AR 06046. The agency's
28 analysis of the Sanpoil Project's effects on gray wolves is contained in two

1 sentences that relate to impacts on big game. *Id.* Otherwise, the agency referred to
2 its grizzly bear analysis in its assessment of direct and cumulative impacts on the
3 wolf habitat and population. *Id.*; *see also* AR 06308. The agency also found the
4 Sanpoil Project is not likely to jeopardize the existence of wolverines, and
5 therefore, would not lead to loss of species viability. AR 06044; AR 06298. The
6 agency again referred to its grizzly bear analysis for its consideration of the
7 adequacy of wolverine habitat. AR 06297. The EA did not explicitly discuss or
8 examine any negative direct effects to wolverine.

9 In this case, the agency erred when it failed to analyze the Sanpoil Project's
10 effects on the gray wolf population. The agency's cursory reference to its effects
11 analysis on grizzly bears does not constitute an adequate hard look under the
12 NEPA, because the agency did not provide an adequate justification for tying the
13 analyses together. The agency claims that reference to its grizzly bear assessment
14 is appropriate because both species, at least in part, prey on big game. However,
15 the agency did not determine that the species' diets were identical and did not
16 consider or acknowledge any differences between the species that may alter the
17 agency's analyses and conclusions regarding viability.

18 The agency also erred when it failed to meaningfully assess the Sanpoil
19 Project's impact on wolverine. The agency repeated its error by citing the grizzly
20 bear assessment to determine whether there were impacts to wolverine habitat and
21 population. The agency did not acknowledge whether there were any negative
22 direct effects to wolverine from the Sanpoil Project, instead providing only a brief
23 conclusion of viability. By failing to analyze the Sanpoil Project's specific impacts
24 on the gray wolf and wolverine populations, the agency did not comply with the
25 NEPA's hard look requirement and NFMA's related mandate that the agency
26 maintain species viability.

1 b. *Bat Species*

2 The agency concluded the Sanpoil Project was not likely to lead to a loss of
3 viability of sensitive bat species, including the little brown bat, Townsend's big-
4 eared bat, and pallid bat. AR 06046. The agency stated that it was unable to do a
5 viability assessment for the Townsend's big-eared bat or the pallid bat due to a
6 lack of knowledge to adequately map habitat. AR 06259-60 (Table 1). It found the
7 Sanpoil Project could decrease roosting sites for bats. AR 06264. The agency
8 specifically noted that the highest conservation priority for the Townsend's bat is
9 to reduce human disturbance and destruction of roost sites. AR 06264; AR 06310.

10 The agency's analysis on the viability of sensitive bat species was deficient.
11 The agency reasoned that the Sanpoil Project was not likely to lead to a loss of
12 viability of sensitive bat species, because activities would either be far enough
13 removed from known bat roost sites to have no effect on species or would be timed
14 to avoid periods that the sites would be occupied. AR 06046. The agency need not
15 have a complete census of where bats live in the forest; however, it is unclear how
16 the agency can ensure that the Sanpoil Project activities will not affect bat viability
17 by avoiding roosting sites, when it admits it does not have sufficient information
18 about those sites to map the species' habitat. The agency's conclusion that the
19 Sanpoil Project would not lead to a loss of viability for bat species depends on the
20 agency's ability to avoid bat roosting sites, which it admits it is unable to locate.
21 The record indicates the agency did not make a reasoned decision on viability
22 based on the evidence it had. *Earth Island I*, 351 F.3d at 1301. In failing to provide
23 a reasoned explanation of the conclusions it drew from the data available, the
24 agency violated the NEPA and NFMA. *The Lands Council v. McNair*, 537 F.3d
25 981, 994 (9th Cir. 2008).

26 c. *Bird and Invertebrate Species*

27 The agency studied the impacts of the Sanpoil Project on the Northern
28 goshawk, an old-growth-dependent species. The agency noted that the cumulative

1 effects area for the goshawk is the entire Colville National Forest, AR 06305, and
2 that commercial logging has the greatest potential to reduce goshawk nesting and
3 foraging habitat, AR 6304. The agency estimated that the Sanpoil Project will
4 reduce potential goshawk habitat by nearly 5,000 acres, or 17% of the habitat in
5 the Sanpoil Project area. AR 06304. Nonetheless, the agency concluded the
6 Sanpoil Project would not lead to a loss of viability for the species. AR 06305.

7 The agency erred by not including a meaningful discussion of logging
8 projects that, in conjunction with the Sanpoil Project, would impact the Northern
9 goshawk habitat and population. The agency determined that commercial logging
10 has the greatest potential to impact goshawk habitat. The agency found that other
11 vegetation restoration projects would contribute to effects on the goshawk,
12 AR06045 (Table 11), but the agency considered only a handful of approved and
13 proposed projects in its effects assessment. AR 06305; AR 06317–22. The NEPA
14 requires the agency to consider the cumulative environmental effects of past,
15 present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. *See* 40 C.F.R. § 1508.1. The
16 Sanpoil Project itself is estimated to dramatically reduce forest-wide habitat, yet
17 the agency declined to meaningfully consider a number of present and future
18 logging and restoration projects that will have a cumulative impact on the Northern
19 goshawk.

20 As to sensitive invertebrates, the agency also concluded that direct and
21 cumulative impacts of the Sanpoil Project would not lead to a loss of viability. The
22 EA determined that less mobile sensitive invertebrates could be killed, that food
23 plants could be damaged, and the increase in grazing has the potential to remove
24 forage and host plants and alter the integrity of meadows and riparian habitats. AR
25 06046 (Table 11). One noted invertebrate species is the Western bumblebee.

26 The agency further erred by failing to support its conclusions regarding the
27 viability of the Western bumblebee. While the agency concluded the Sanpoil
28 Project would not impact viability, the agency did not consider any specific effects

1 of the Sanpoil Project on the Western bumblebee. The agency’s conclusion lacked
2 adequate explanation and reasoning and is insufficient to meet the mandates of the
3 NEPA and NFMA.

4 3. Development of an EIS

5 The agency concluded the Sanpoil Project would not have significant effects
6 on the quality of the human environment, and therefore, an EIS need not be
7 prepared under the NEPA. AR 06784–95.

8 Before undertaking any major federal action significantly affecting the
9 quality of the human environment, the NEPA requires an agency to prepare a
10 detailed EIS. 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C); 40 C.F.R. § 1508.11. To decide whether an
11 EIS is necessary, an agency must first prepare a shorter, less comprehensive
12 document called an EA. *Id.* § 1508.9. An EA must briefly provide sufficient
13 evidence and analysis for determining whether to prepare an environmental impact
14 statement. *Id.*; *see also Weldon*, 697 F.3d at 1053. If the EA concludes the
15 proposed action will not have a significant effect on the environment, an EIS is not
16 necessary, and the agency may issue a “Finding of No Significant Impact” and
17 proceed with the action. 40 C.F.R. § 1508.13.

18 In determining whether a project has a significant effect on the environment,
19 and thus warrants creation of an EIS, agencies must evaluate both the context and
20 intensity of an action to determine the significance of its impact. 40 C.F.R.
21 § 1508.27(a), (b) (2005). Context refers to the significance of the action with
22 regard to society as a whole, the affected region, the affected interests, and the
23 locality. *Id.* § 1508.27(a). To assess an action’s intensity, the agency should
24 analyze beneficial and adverse factors, unique characteristics of the geographic
25 areas, the degree to which the effects are likely to be highly controversial, highly
26 uncertain or unknown risks, and the degree to which the action may establish a
27 precedent for future actions with significant effects. *Id.* § 1508.27(b)(1)–(7). The
28 agency must also consider whether an action is related to other actions with

1 The agency is empowered by Congress to alter forest management policy,
2 and it is not the role of this Court to select an appropriate action on behalf of the
3 agency. However, any decision of the agency must be within the confines of the
4 substantive and procedural mandates of the NFMA and NEPA. For the reasons
5 expressed above, the agency's actions were arbitrary and capricious under the
6 APA. The relevant portions of the 2019 Forest Plan and Sanpoil Project are
7 vacated and remanded to the agency.

8 Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

9 1. Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File Extra Record Evidence,
10 ECF No. 46, is **GRANTED**. The Eastside Screens Report, ECF No. 47-1, is
11 **ACCEPTED into the record**.

12 2. Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF No. 48, is
13 **GRANTED**, and Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF No. 54, is
14 **DENIED**.

15 3. The parties are directed to meet and confer and notify the Court within
16 **thirty (30) days** regarding what the next steps should be for this case, if any.

17 4. The Clerk of Court is directed to **ENTER JUDGMENT** against
18 Defendants and in favor of Plaintiff.

19 **IT IS SO ORDERED**. The District Court Clerk is hereby directed to enter
20 this Order and provide copies to counsel.

21 **DATED** this 21st day of June 2023.



25
26

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Stanley A. Bastian". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned to the right of the court seal.

27
28

Stanley A. Bastian
Chief United States District Judge