

1 Patrick Gallagher (CA Bar No.146105)
2 Sierra Club
3 85 Second Street
4 San Francisco, CA 94104
5 (415) 977-5709
6 (415) 977-5793 FAX
7 pat.gallagher@sierraclub.org

8 Attorney for Plaintiffs
9 Sierra Club and
10 Tule River Conservancy
11 Additional Counsel listed on next page

12 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
13 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

14 SIERRA CLUB, TULE RIVER)	
15 CONSERVANCY, SIERRA NEVADA)	
16 FOREST PROTECTION CAMPAIGN,)	Case No.:
17 EARTH ISLAND INSTITUTE, SEQUOIA)	
18 FORESTKEEPER, and CENTER FOR)	
19 BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY, non-profit)	
20 organizations,)	COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY
21 Plaintiffs,)	AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF
22 v.)	(Administrative Procedure Act Case)
23 DALE BOSWORTH, in his official capacity)	
24 as Chief of the United States Forest Service,)	
25 JACK BLACKWELL, in his official)	
capacity as Regional Forester, Region 5,)	
United States Forest Service, KENT)	
CONNAUGHTON, in his official capacity)	
as Deputy Regional Forester, Region 5,)	
United States Forest Service, ARTHUR)	
GAFFREY in his official capacity as Forest)	
Supervisor, Sequoia National Forest,)	
UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE, an)	
agency of the U.S. Department of)	
Agriculture, MIKE JOHANNNS, in his)	
official capacity as Secretary of the U.S.)	
Dept. of Agriculture, and UNITED STATES)	
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,)	
Defendants.)	

1 Eric E. Huber, (Colo. Bar No. SC 700024) Pro Hac Vice Application Pending
2 Sierra Club
3 2260 Baseline Road, Suite 105
4 Boulder, CO 80302
5 (303) 449-5595
6 (303) 449-0740 FAX
7 eric.huber@sierraclub.org

8 Attorney for Plaintiffs
9 Sierra Club and
10 Tule River Conservancy

11 Deborah Reames (CA Bar No. 117257)
12 Anne C. Harper (CA Bar No. 176202)
13 Earthjustice
14 426 17th Street, 5th Floor
15 Oakland, CA 94612
16 (510) 550-6725
17 (510) 550-6749 FAX
18 dreames@earthjustice.org
19 aharper@earthjustice.org

20 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
21 Sierra Nevada Forest Protection Campaign and
22 Center for Biological Diversity

23 Rachel M. Fazio (CA Bar No. 187580)
24 John Muir Project
25 P.O. Box 697
Cedar Ridge, CA 95924
(530) 273-9290
(530) 273-9260 FAX
rfazio@nccn.net

Attorney for Plaintiffs
Earth Island Institute and
Sequoia Forestkeeper.

1 **INTRODUCTION**

2 1. Plaintiffs bring this action to protect the magnificent Giant Sequoia National
3 Monument (“Sequoia Monument”) from the unlawful actions of the U.S. Forest Service and
4 Department of Agriculture and their responsible officials. The Sequoia Monument is an
5 exceptionally popular national treasure, containing approximately two-thirds of all of the giant
6 sequoia trees in the world. Most of the world’s remaining giant sequoias are located in the
7 adjacent Sequoia National Park. In stark contrast to the very successful management techniques
8 used for decades by the National Park Service in the Sequoia National Park, Defendants
9 approved a “Giant Sequoia National Monument Management Plan” and associated final
10 environmental impact statement (“FEIS”) that would permit extensive logging and cause the
11 degradation of old forest habitat and irreparable harm to the Sequoia Monument’s wildlife,
12 directly conflicting with the purposes of the Monument. Defendants’ actions also threaten to
13 exacerbate rather than lessen the risk posed by wildland fire to the Monument and nearby
14 communities. In contrast, the National Park Service has been using prescribed fire for decades in
15 the Sequoia National Park to protect communities, reduce fuels, sustain biological diversity and
16 stimulate the growth of young giant sequoia trees. Defendants’ actions violate the National
17 Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321 *et seq.* (“NEPA”), *inter alia*, because they
18 contradict sound science and failed to provide accurate and meaningful information to the public
19 concerning the Management Plan’s scope, purpose, and environmental effects. Plaintiffs seek an
20 order vacating and remanding defendants’ actions to remedy their violations of NEPA.
21
22

23 **JURISDICTION**

24 2. This Court has jurisdiction over this action under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (action arising
25 under the laws of the United States), 5 U.S.C. §§ 701 *et seq.* (Administrative Procedure Act) and

1 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202 (Declaratory Judgment Act). Plaintiffs have exhausted all
2 administrative remedies and the violations of law claimed below are ripe for judicial review.

3 **VENUE AND INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT**

4 3. Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 3-2(c), plaintiffs state that they base venue in this
5 district and assignment to the San Francisco Division on the following: 1) plaintiffs Sierra Club
6 and Earth Island Institute are incorporated in California and reside and maintain their
7 headquarters in San Francisco County in this judicial district; 2) this action seeks relief against
8 federal officials acting in their official capacities; and 3) 28 U.S.C. §§ 1361 and 1391(e) provide
9 for venue in the judicial district of a plaintiff's residence, including the San Francisco Division.
10

11 **PARTIES**

12 4. Plaintiff Sierra Club is a nonprofit corporation organized under California law,
13 with more than 700,000 members nationwide. The Sierra Club is closely identified with the
14 magnificent giant sequoia tree; an image of the giant sequoia forms the organization's official
15 logo. Beginning in 1901, when John Muir lobbied for the expansion of Sequoia National Park to
16 encompass the entire range of the giant sequoia, the Sierra Club has advocated for the protection
17 of giant sequoia ecosystems in their entirety. Members of the Sierra Club's Tehipite and Kern-
18 Kaweah chapters and Sequoia Task Force have participated in numerous legal and regulatory
19 actions to protect the giant sequoia, including: a 1986 administrative appeal to stop first entry
20 logging into the Freeman Creek Grove; a federal lawsuit that secured an injunction on sequoia
21 grove logging in 1988; participation in all phases of planning for the Sequoia National Forest
22 Land and Resource Management Plan (LRMP) in the 1980's; an administrative appeal of the
23 1988 LRMP; negotiation of the 1990 Mediated Settlement Agreement resolving the 1988 LRMP
24 appeal; support and lobbying for Congressman Brown's bill, HR 2153, which was the
25 foundation for the eventual Sequoia Monument Proclamation; support and lobbying for President
Clinton's Proclamation on April 15, 2000 establishing the Sequoia Monument; the submission of

1 detailed recommendations to both the Sequoia National Forest and the Science Advisory Board
2 during the development of the Sequoia Monument Management Plan and FEIS; and an
3 administrative appeal of the Record of Decision approving the Management Plan and FEIS.

4 5. Plaintiff Tule River Conservancy (“TRC”) is a nonprofit corporation organized
5 under California law, with more than 200 members who live, own property, or recreate in the
6 immediate environs of Sequoia National Forest. The Tule River Conservancy was organized
7 specifically to foster responsible, sound management of Sequoia National Forest and to educate
8 the public about how they can help encourage protection of forest resources. Since its
9 establishment, TRC has regularly and routinely submitted comments regarding projects proposed
10 in Sequoia National Forest and Sequoia National Monument. During the 1990’s, TRC provided
11 educational tours for Congressional members of Forest Service logging practices in Giant
12 Sequoia groves. They have analyzed and compiled extensive records documenting logging
13 damages on lands now within the Monument. They provided background information to the
14 administration leading to President Clinton’s Proclamation on April 15, 2000 establishing the
15 Giant Sequoia National Monument. TRC was a member of the coalition of environmental
16 groups that opposed the lawsuit that sought to dismantle the Giant Sequoia National Monument.
17 TRC submitted detailed recommendations to both the Sequoia National Forest and the Science
18 Advisory Board during the development of the Sequoia Monument Management Plan and draft
19 EIS; and filed an administrative appeal of the Record of Decision approving the Management
20 Plan and FEIS.

21 6. Plaintiff Sierra Nevada Forest Protection Campaign is a coalition of over eighty
22 local, regional and national environmental organizations dedicated to protecting and restoring the
23 Sierra Nevada’s forests, including the Sequoia Monument. The Campaign works to protect and
24 restore the ancient forests, wildlands, wildlife and watersheds of the Sierra Nevada through
25 scientific and legal advocacy, public education and outreach, and grassroots forest protection

1 efforts. Among other things, the Campaign has sought to achieve greater protections for the
2 California spotted owl, Pacific fisher, American marten and other old forest-dependent species.
3 Since the late 1980s, the Campaign has been involved in major policy decisions and research
4 initiatives relating to Sierra Nevada national forest management and species conservation,
5 including the California Spotted Owl Sierran Province Interim Guidelines of 1993, the Sierra
6 Nevada Ecosystem Project of 1996, the Herger-Feinstein Quincy Library Group Forest Recovery
7 Act (1998) and pilot project (1999), the 2001 Sierra Nevada Framework, and the 2004
8 Framework revisions. The Campaign actively participated in the planning process for the
9 Sequoia Monument Management Plan, commented on the draft EIS and administratively
10 appealed defendants' approval of the Management Plan.

11 7. Plaintiff Earth Island Institute (EII) is a nonprofit corporation organized under
12 California law. EII is headquartered in San Francisco, California. EII's mission is to develop
13 and support projects that counteract threats to the biological and cultural diversity that sustains
14 the environment. Through education and activism, these projects promote the conservation,
15 preservation and restoration of the Earth. One of these projects is the John Muir Project – whose
16 mission is to protect all federal public forest lands from commercial exploitation. EII a
17 membership organization with over 15,000 members in the U.S., over 3,000 of whom use and
18 enjoy the national forests of California for recreational, educational, aesthetic, spiritual and other
19 purposes. EII has recently appealed numerous timber sales on national forests in the Sierra
20 Nevada. EII through its John Muir Project has a longstanding interest in the protection of
21 national forests. They accomplish this goal through ensuring that the Forest Service relies upon
22 and addresses all scientific evidence in its decision-making process and that its decisions comply
23 with all federal environmental laws. EII's John Muir Project and EII members actively
24 participate in governmental decision-making processes with respect to national forest lands in
25 California and rely on information provided through NEPA processes to increase the

1 effectiveness of their participation. EII's John Muir Project actively participated in the NEPA
2 process associated with the development of the Giant Sequoia National Monument Management
3 Plan and FEIS, including submitting comments on the proposed plan and administratively
4 appealing the decision.

5 8. Plaintiff Sequoia Forestkeeper (SFK) is a non-profit corporation organized under
6 California law. SFK is headquartered in Kernville, California. SFK's mission is to protect and
7 restore the ecosystems of the southern Sierra Nevada including, but not limited to, the Giant
8 Sequoia National Monument, Sequoia National Forest and Mountain Home State Forest through
9 monitoring, enforcement, education, and litigation. Many SFK members have been actively
10 involved in formulating management policies for public lands and preserving local areas,
11 including participating in the establishment and development of the Giant Sequoia National
12 Monument. SFK actively participated in the development and review of the Giant Sequoia
13 National Monument Management Plan and FEIS, attending public meetings, submitting verbal
14 and written comments on the proposed Plan, and administratively appealing the decision.

15 9. Plaintiff Center for Biological Diversity is a non-profit corporation with over
16 5,000 members, and offices in San Diego, Idyllwild and Berkeley, California; Tucson and
17 Phoenix, Arizona; Shaw Island, Washington; and Silver City, New Mexico. The Center for
18 Biological Diversity is dedicated to the preservation, protection, and restoration of biological
19 diversity, native species and ecosystems in the western United States and elsewhere. The Center
20 for Biological Diversity protects endangered species and wild places of western North America
21 and the Pacific through science, policy, education and environmental law. The Center's efforts
22 to protect and preserve national forests include comments, petitions, and administrative appeals
23 to the Forest Service on particular projects, as well as on more programmatic plans. The Center
24 participated in the planning process and administrative appeals concerning the Management
25 Plan.

1 10. The plaintiff organizations described above have members who live or work in
2 communities located near or adjacent to the Sequoia Monument. The plaintiff organizations'
3 members use and enjoy the Sequoia Monument for a variety of purposes including, but not
4 limited to, hiking, backpacking, photography, scientific study, wildlife observation, hunting and
5 fishing. They intend to continue to do so in the future. Plaintiffs' members derive recreational,
6 spiritual, professional, aesthetic, educational and other benefits and enjoyment from these
7 activities.

8 11. Defendants' approval of the Giant Sequoia National Monument Management Plan
9 and FEIS is harming and injuring the interests of plaintiffs and their members by causing or
10 threatening irreversible adverse effects to the Sequoia Monument and to the wildlife and other
11 objects of interest in the Monument. Defendants' actions would deprive plaintiffs and their
12 members of the recreational, spiritual, professional, aesthetic, educational and other benefits they
13 presently derive from the Monument. Additionally, defendants' actions deny plaintiffs'
14 members their right to have the laws implemented and enforced, and the satisfaction and peace
15 of mind associated with witnessing the enforcement of this nation's environmental protection
16 laws.

17 12. Plaintiffs and their members are adversely affected and irreparably injured by the
18 defendants' approval of the Giant Sequoia National Monument Management Plan and FEIS.
19 These injuries are actual and concrete and would be redressed by the relief sought herein.
20 Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law.

21 13. Defendant Dale Bosworth is the Chief of the Forest Service. The Chief is the
22 highest ranking officer in the Forest Service. The Chief has the responsibility to ensure that the
23 Forest Service acts in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. He is sued in his official
24 capacity.
25

1 14. Defendant Jack Blackwell is the Regional Forester for the Forest Service’s Pacific
2 Southwest Region, which encompasses the Sequoia National Forest, and in that capacity has the
3 responsibility to ensure that the Forest Service acts in accordance with applicable laws and
4 regulations. Mr. Blackwell’s office denied the plaintiffs’ administrative appeals of the Record of
5 Decision approving the Giant Sequoia National Monument Management Plan and FEIS. He is
6 sued in his official capacity.

7 15. Defendant Kent Connaughton is the Deputy Regional Forester for the Forest
8 Service’s Pacific Southwest Region and was the Appeal Reviewing Officer who signed the
9 letters denying the plaintiffs’ administrative appeals of the Record of Decision approving the
10 Giant Sequoia National Monument Management Plan and FEIS. In his capacity as the Deputy
11 Regional Forester and Appeal Reviewing Officer, he has the responsibility to ensure that the
12 Forest Service acts in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. He is sued in his official
13 capacity.

14 16. Defendant Arthur Gaffrey is the Forest Supervisor for the Sequoia National Forest
15 and was the official who initially approved the Record of Decision for the Giant Sequoia
16 National Monument Management Plan and FEIS. In his capacity as Forest Supervisor, he has
17 the responsibility to ensure that the Forest Service acts in accordance with applicable laws and
18 regulations. He is sued in his official capacity.

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

1 Sierra Nevada Ecosystem Project (“SNEP”) Report. These studies concluded that old forest
2 habitat and old forest-dependent wildlife in the Sierra Nevada suffer from serious decline, and
3 that special management measures are needed to conserve the Sierra Nevada forests and their
4 wildlife.

5 24. On April 15, 2000, President Clinton issued a Presidential Proclamation creating
6 the Giant Sequoia National Monument (“Sequoia Monument Proclamation”), citing the
7 magnificent resources of the giant sequoia groves and surrounding forest, as well as the rare
8 wildlife and significant cultural and archaeological resources in the area. The Sequoia
9 Monument Proclamation directed the Secretary of Agriculture to prepare a management plan for
10 the Sequoia Monument.

11 25. On January 12, 2001, Regional Foresters Bradley E. Powell (Pacific Southwest
12 Region) and Jack Blackwell (Intermountain Region) signed a Record of Decision adopting a
13 region-wide plan amendment for all of the Sierra Nevada national forests (the “2001
14 Framework”). The 2001 Framework was approved as an amendment to the LRMPs of all eleven
15 national forests in the Sierra Nevada, including the Sequoia National Forest.

16 26. The 2001 Framework established a system of “old forest emphasis areas” which
17 included approximately 40 percent of national forest lands in the Sierra Nevada, within which
18 logging would generally be limited to removal of trees smaller than 12 inches in diameter.
19 Outside of these areas, logging would generally be limited to removal of trees smaller than 20
20 inches in diameter. To protect species associated with old forests, the plan established specially
21 protected habitat zones; required that logging projects should maintain at least 50 percent canopy
22 cover in westside forests outside of a quarter mile defense zone in the urban-wildland interface;
23 and restricted incremental canopy cover reductions to 20 percent.

24 27. In June 2003, the Forest Service issued a draft environmental impact statement
25 (“DEIS”) for the Giant Sequoia National Monument Management Plan. The DEIS was harshly

1 criticized for weakening conservation measures adopted in the 2001 Framework by, *inter alia*,
2 allowing the logging of trees up to 30 inches in diameter and allowing significant reductions in
3 forest canopy. Several wildlife experts criticized the DEIS for failing to evaluate and disclose
4 harmful impacts to wildlife dependent on old forest habitat.

5 28. In July 2003, the Regional Forester approved a stand-alone “Fire Plan” for the
6 Sequoia National Forest without preparing an environmental impact statement or conducting
7 public review under NEPA. The Fire Plan is a major federal action that, *inter alia*, divides the
8 Sequoia National Forest, including the Sequoia Monument, into “fire management zones” and
9 lays out fire management strategies for each zone, such as prescribed fire, logging and fire
10 suppression.

11 29. In December 2003, the Forest Service approved the FEIS and Record of Decision
12 (“ROD”) adopting “Modified Alternative 6” from the FEIS as the final Giant Sequoia National
13 Monument Management Plan (“Sequoia Monument Management Plan” or “Management Plan”).
14 The Sequoia Monument Management Plan was adopted as an amendment to the Sequoia
15 National Forest LRMP. The major flaws in the Management Plan identified by wildlife experts
16 and others were not corrected in the FEIS and ROD. Nor did the Forest Service adequately
17 address why it plans to manage the Sequoia Monument contrary to the scientifically-based,
18 successful management of the nearby Sequoia National Park.

19 30. On January 21, 2004, the Forest Service adopted a record of decision approving
20 substantial revisions to the 2001 Framework (the “2004 Framework Revisions”). Like the 2001
21 Framework, the 2004 Framework Revisions were adopted as an amendment to the LRMPs of all
22 eleven national forests in the Sierra Nevada, including Sequoia National Forest.

23 31. On March 1, 2004, numerous administrative appeals were filed challenging the
24 FEIS and ROD for the Sequoia Monument Management Plan, charging that the Forest Service
25

1 yet again failed to provide adequate conservation measures for the giant sequoia ecosystems and
2 resident wildlife.

3 32. In April 2004, the People of the State of California, through California Attorney
4 General Bill Lockyer, filed suit in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California
5 challenging the Forest Service’s approval of the Sequoia National Forest Fire Plan on the
6 grounds that the Fire Plan underwent no NEPA review prior to approval. That lawsuit is
7 pending.

8 33. On January 11, 2005, the Deputy Regional Forester of the Forest Service’s Pacific
9 Southwest Region, which encompasses Sequoia National Forest, denied all administrative
10 appeals of the FEIS and ROD on the Sequoia Monument Management Plan. In his denial of the
11 appeals, the Deputy Regional Forester asserted, *inter alia*, that the Sequoia Monument
12 Management Plan is unaffected by the 2004 Framework Revisions and continues to be governed
13 by the 2001 Framework.

14
15 **THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT**

16 34. Congress enacted the National Environmental Policy Act EPA “To declare a
17 national policy which will encourage productive and enjoyable harmony between man and his
18 environment; to promote efforts which will prevent or eliminate damage to the environment and
19 biosphere and stimulate the health and welfare of man; [and] to enrich the understanding of the
20 ecological systems and natural resources important to the Nation.” 42 U.S.C. § 4321.

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

1 environmental impact statement (“EIS”). The EIS must describe the adverse environmental
2 effects of the proposed action and alternatives to the proposed action. *Id.*

3 36. The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) has promulgated regulations
4 implementing NEPA, which are binding on all federal agencies. 40 C.F.R. § 1507.1. The CEQ
5 regulations establish additional requirements for environmental impact statements. 40 C.F.R. §
6 1508.9.

7 37. The EIS process is intended “to help public officials make decisions that are
8 based on understanding of environmental consequences, and to take actions that protect, restore,
9 and enhance the environment” and to “insure that environmental information is available to
10 public officials and citizens before decisions are made and before actions are taken.” 40 C.F.R. §
11 1500.1(b)-(c). The EIS must “provide full and fair discussion of significant environmental
12 impacts and shall inform decision-makers and the public of the reasonable alternatives which
13 would avoid or minimize adverse impacts or enhance the quality of the human environment.” 40
14 C.F.R. § 1502.1.

15 38. An EIS must be clear and supported by evidence that the agency has made the
16 necessary environmental analyses. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.1.

17 39. NEPA requires that an EIS properly define the proposed action and describe the
18 existing environment affected by the proposed action. 40 C.F.R. §§ 1502.4, 1502.15.

19 40. An EIS must evaluate the significance of the direct and indirect environmental
20 effects of the proposed action, as well as any conflicts between the proposed action and other
21 federal, state or local laws or policies for the same geographic area. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.16,
22 1506.2.

23 41. NEPA requires that an EIS consider the cumulative impacts of the proposed
24 federal agency action together with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions,
25

1 including all federal and non-federal activities. 40 C.F.R. § 1508.7. Cumulative impact “is the
2 impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added
3 to other past, present or reasonably foreseeable future actions, regardless of what agency
4 (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions.” *Id.* Cumulative impacts “can
5 result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of
6 time.” *Id.*

7 42. The alternatives analysis is considered the “heart” of an EIS. 40 C.F.R. §
8 1502.14. An EIS “should present the environmental impacts of the proposal and the alternatives
9 in comparative form, thus sharply defining the issues and providing a clear choice among options
10 by the decision-maker and the public.” *Id.* The Forest Service is required to “rigorously explore
11 and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives,” 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14(a), and must “devote
12 substantial treatment to each alternative . . . so that reviewers may evaluate their comparative
13 merits.” 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14(b).

14 43. NEPA requires that the agency use the best available data and ensure the
15 scientific integrity of an EIS, disclose opposing scientific viewpoints and follow specified
16 procedures to address gaps in data and scientific uncertainty. 40 C.F.R. §§, 1500.1, 1502.9,
17 1502.22, 1502.24.

18 44. Agencies must circulate an EIS for public comment and must respond
19 meaningfully to comments. 40 C.F.R. Part 1503. An agency that wishes to tier an EIS to a prior
20 document must follow specified procedures. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.20.

21
22 **CLAIM FOR RELIEF**
23 **(Violations of NEPA, NEPA Regulations and the APA)**

24 45. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference here the allegations of the preceding
25 paragraphs of this Complaint.

1 46. The draft environmental impact statement (“DEIS”) and/or final environmental
2 impact statement (“FEIS”) for the Sequoia Monument Management Plan failed to provide
3 sufficient information to decision-makers and the public, in violation of NEPA.

4 47. The DEIS, FEIS and Record of Decision (“ROD”) are vague and unintelligible in
5 many respects, and fail to describe the major federal action consistently or in enough detail to
6 allow meaningful public review, including but not limited to a failure to define management
7 standards and guidelines for the Sequoia Monument in sufficient detail. The incomplete and
8 inaccurate description of the federal action cause the entirety of the DEIS, FEIS and ROD to
9 violate NEPA.

10 48. The DEIS, FEIS and ROD did not properly analyze and address how the proposed
11 action will meet the purpose and need of the Sequoia Monument Proclamation, including but not
12 limited to how the Management Plan’s weakening of conservation measures in old forest areas
13 and sensitive habitat and overbroad definitions of wildland-urban interface zones will promote
14 the Proclamation’s dominant objective of protecting the natural objects and ecological integrity
15 of the Sequoia Monument.

16 49. The DEIS, FEIS and ROD did not properly analyze and address how the proposed
17 action will meet the purpose and need of achieving fire management and restoration objectives,
18 including but not limited to how the logging of large trees and reduction in forest canopy cover
19 will promote these objectives.

20 50. The DEIS, FEIS and ROD did not properly analyze and address the existing
21 environment affected by the Management Plan, including but not limited to the current status of
22 imperiled wildlife such as the Pacific fisher, California spotted owl and American Marten and
23 their habitat; the status and trends of other sensitive species and management indicator species;
24 the zones of ecological influence for giant sequoia groves; and the significance of extensive,
25

1 preexisting disturbances in the Sequoia Monument resulting from past logging and fire
2 management activities.

3 51. The DEIS, FEIS and ROD did not properly analyze and address the direct and
4 indirect environmental effects of the Management Plan, including but not limited to effects on
5 wildlife such as the Pacific fisher, American marten and California spotted owl; the effects of
6 logging on fire behavior; effects on roadless and unroaded wilderness areas within the
7 Monument; effects caused by grazing; and effects caused by extensive road use within the
8 Monument.

9 52. The DEIS, FEIS and ROD did not properly analyze and address the inconsistency
10 of the Management Plan with the Sequoia Monument Proclamation, including but not limited to
11 the conflict between the Plan's projected commercial harvest of timber, removal of large trees
12 and reductions in forest canopy on the one hand, and the Proclamation's strict prohibitions on
13 tree removal and emphasis on the conservation of natural objects such as the Monument's
14 imperiled wildlife.

15 53. The DEIS, FEIS and ROD did not properly analyze and address the inconsistency
16 of the Sequoia Monument Management Plan with the 2001 Framework, including but not limited
17 to the discrepancies between the Plan and the 2001 Framework concerning diameter limits on
18 tree removal, restrictions on forest canopy reduction, and disturbance of specially-designated
19 wildlife habitat zones such as home range core areas.

20 54. The DEIS, FEIS and ROD did not properly analyze and address the inconsistency
21 of the Sequoia Monument Management Plan with the 1990 Mediated Settlement, including but
22 not limited to the Plan's failure to require grove-specific plans prior to any logging in giant
23 sequoia groves.

24 55. The DEIS, FEIS and the ROD did not properly analyze and address the
25

1 cumulative environmental effects of the Management Plan, including but not limited to the
2 cumulative effects on the Pacific fisher and other wildlife from logging proposed in the
3 Management Plan, in conjunction with past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects in the
4 southern Sierra Nevada including projects implementing the 2004 Framework Revisions, logging
5 on private lands, and the Kings River Administrative Study Proposal.

6 56. The DEIS, FEIS and ROD did not properly analyze and address project
7 alternatives, including but not limited to failing to include a rigorous and objective analysis of
8 alternatives to the adopted Management Plan, failing to address why the Sequoia National Park's
9 management practices should not be adopted and approving an action that was significantly
10 different from the alternatives examined in the DEIS.

11 57. The DEIS, FEIS and ROD did not properly analyze and address significant gaps
12 and uncertainty in the scientific data relating to conditions in the Sequoia Monument and the
13 environmental effects of the approved action, including but not limited to modeled effects on
14 wildlife and modeled fuels and fire behavior.

15 58. The DEIS, FEIS and ROD failed to use the best available scientific data,
16 including but not limited to the best population and habitat data for wildlife such as the Pacific
17 fisher, American marten and California spotted owl; data relating to the role of large trees and
18 canopy cover in fire behavior and fuels management; data concerning the relationship between
19 tree size and age; data on sequoia regeneration; and data relating to wildlife behavior and habitat
20 needs following wildfires.

21 59. The DEIS, FEIS and ROD did not properly disclose, address and meaningfully
22 respond to contrary scientific opinion and evidence submitted to the Forest Service on several
23 aspects of the Management Plan, including but not limited to scientific opinions and evidence
24 submitted to the agency: advising against the selected alternative because of its adverse impacts
25

1 2. Defendants' approval of the Sequoia Monument Management Plan and the
2 associated Record of Decision and Final Environmental Impact Statement were arbitrary,
3 capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law, and without
4 observance of procedure required by law, contrary to the APA, 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A)-(F);

5 B. Pursuant to the APA, 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A), set aside and vacate the Sequoia Monument
6 Management Plan and associated Record of Decision and Final Environmental Impact Statement
7 and enjoin implementation of the Management Plan, including any projects approved pursuant to
8 or implementing the Management Plan;

9 C. Award plaintiffs their costs and expenses (including reasonable attorney, expert witness
10 and consultant fees); and

11 D. Award plaintiffs such other relief as the Court deems appropriate.
12

13
14 DATED: January ____, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

15
16 _____
17 PATRICK GALLAGHER
18 ERIC E. HUBER
19 SIERRA CLUB
20 Attorneys for Plaintiffs Sierra Club and Tule River
21 Conservancy.
22
23
24
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

DEBORAH REAMES
ANNE C. HARPER
EARTHJUSTICE
Attorneys for Plaintiffs Sierra Nevada Forest Protection
Campaign and Center for Biological Diversity.

RACHEL M. FAZIO
EARTH ISLAND INSTITUTE
Attorney for Plaintiffs Earth Island Institute and Sequoia
Forestkeeper.

