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Dear Reader

This issue tells the story about how countless people who care about our forests and wildlife stood up to George Bush and his promise to timber companies that he would allow them to liquidate our ancient forests.

It’s a story of a significant victory for citizens who wouldn’t let the President get away with his agenda, even if the end results are nothing better than a temporary reprieve for endangered species such as the northern spotted owl. We must recognize that some future president can pursue the same goals, and possibly with much different results, so we must always be vigilant.

These stories get to the heart of the damage Bush, Julie MacDonald, Mark Rey, Lynn Scarce and many others have been trying to do to the environment and science, and how they were exposed and defeated (though the Bush administration is still working to gut the ESA on the way out the door).

We also specify what the next president, Barack Obama, can do right away to fix the “mangled mess” this administration has left us.

We are grateful for the generous support our many donors have given to this project, which took over a year to complete, including the many months we waited for the administration to provide crucial documents under the Freedom of Information Act. Big thanks go out to the Campbell Foundation, the Brained Foundation, Hilary Abraham, John McCormack, Ken Magolis, John Haines, Bob Amundson, Robert Stull, Molly O’Reilly, Candace France, Charles Simek, Thomas Grizka, John Reynolds, Linda Park, Charles Ray, Jeanne Norton, John Weidman, Jim Baker, Beatrice and Bill Booth, Helen Jones, Bob Phillips, Kevin Shea, William Wessinger, David Chambers, Andrea Olson, Andrea Carlos, Michelle Tappan, Dominick DellaSala, Regna Merritt, Tom Turner, Scott Greacen, Randi Spivak, James Cunningham, Joel Koberstein, Jim Owens and Nick Pimble.


Cascadia Times is not simply about furry animals and remote forests. It’s also about the people who live in this region, their communities and their quality of life. Cascadia Times makes connections across the West, with a broad, bio-regional outlook.
The Owl’s Stunning Reprieve

Citizens stand up to Bush in defense of ancient forests

By Paul Robert

History is certain to judge the Bush years as a disaster for the nation’s — and the planet’s — environment. But as his second term winds down, it’s worth noting that ancient forests in the Pacific Northwest are still standing, despite the administration’s vigorous efforts to help timber companies cut them down, and thanks to countless citizens who stood in the way.

The administration’s approach to nature has been driven by two myths: what’s good for industry is good for the environment, and the extent of our resources is without limit. But there is much work to do. For the last eight years, Bush has been at war with the planet’s complex and fragile life-sustaining systems in his rush to aid industry.

Aside from his last-gasp attempt to gut the house on his way out (see story page 4), Bush has lost his war on the environment. Witness the fact that the ancient forests are still standing, despite almost eight years of concerted efforts to liquidate them. A broad campaign to suppress science and intimidate scientists has been exposed, and administration officials have been forced to reverse several unlawful decisions. Many more decisions are under investigation by Congress, the courts and independent government watchdogs. The clock will soon run out, leaving behind a mangled mess that the next president should be able to fix (see page 18).

However, if the next president wants to avoid lasting damage, he must get on this right way, and he must do more than just dispel myths. He must also weed out Bush’s true believers from the bureaucracy, and identify language now embedded in rules and regulations that would undermine conservation — and delete it.

The next president must also contemplate how to restore wildlife and ecosystems damaged by Bush’s assault and neglect, and avoid the catastrophic climate disruptions that he failed to address.

Bush was stopped by combatants whom the administration considered to be enemies. Citizens, communities, conservationists and scientists all helped to deliver a final, crushing blow.

They ended this onslaught on the hallowed ground of the Pacific Northwest’s ancient forests where he could not produce on a promise to industry: provide old-growth timber without violating the law and angering the public, Congress and the courts.

Many consider a 2003 backroom deal with the timber industry to have been a potential turning point. In that agreement, Bush officials implicitly promised to ignore laws protecting old growth forest habitats and hand over vast amounts of forests for clearcutting.

“It has become abundantly clear that this Administration does not give one whit about the ESA. Its strong-arming of Federal scientists, slow-walking of listing decisions, and stonewalling of new rules have convinced me that every attempt to fix the mismanagement of the endangered species program under this Administration is a lost cause.” — Rep. Nick Rahall III

Congressional committees exposed Bush’s widespread effort to muzzle scientists. Now an administration that had big plans is in full retreat, with environmental groups unraveling the administration’s unlawful schemes.

The most notorious “ninja” among top Bush officials was Julie MacDonald, a non-scientist (she has a degree in engineering) who as Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Department of Interior for fish, wildlife and parks was accused by her underlings of waging a “reign of terror” against scientists with whom she dis
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agreed. An internal investigation alleged that MacDonald interfered with Fish and Wildlife Service decisions by "intimidating" and bullying scientists unless and until they produced findings that were politically acceptable to her.

MacDonald resigned her post under pressure on May 1, 2007, but she was not acting alone. Political appointments throughout the upper reaches of Interior and other agencies were caught tamping with scientific findings, just as she did.

The Fish and Wildlife Service says that eight species have been affected by MacDonald's bad science.

The Union of Concerned Scientists says scientific evaluations of some 80 species, including the northern spotted owl, marbled murrelet, sage grouse and salmon, have been marred by political meddling. The Center for Biological Diversity is using the government for faulty decisions affecting 55 species.

Now top Bush officials are insisting that they have reformed what was the last vestige of the Clinton administration's conservation efforts. Lynn Scarlett, the deputy Interior Secretary, told a congressional committee chaired by Rep. Nick Rahall III in May 2007. "The Fish and Wildlife Service employs rigorous procedures to ensure that the best available science supports (endangered species) determinations. Under no circumstance do we promote, tolerate, or endorse suppression of scientific information."

In July 2007, Dale Hall, director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, told the same committee, "I would like to emphasize my personal commitment to ensuring the scientific rigor, validity, and integrity of the Service's decisions under the ESA."

However, as Dr. Dominic DellaSala, a biologist who

The Fish and Wildlife Service, meanwhile, has admitted the error of some of its ways and has decided to redo a flawed owl plan, wasting almost an entire year's worth of work and a lot of people's time and money.

"At this point, the best hope for endangered species may simply be to cling to life until after January when this President and his cronies, at long last, hit the unemployment line," Rahall said.

Science is the foundation of all our conservation efforts. — Deputy Interior Secretary Lynn Scarlett

The 1980s saw huge amounts of Northwest old-growth timber going to the sawmills, as much as 5.5 billion board feet per year. Katie Durbin reported in The Oregonian in 1990 that Hatfield and AuCoin were legitimizing harvesting levels so high that the Forest Service had trouble finding enough trees to meet the targets. Max Peterson, a Forest Service chief, was fired in 1986 because federal harvests weren't big enough.

AuCoin, an Oregon Democrat, imposed a limit on the role in the firing, allowing however that he was frustrated by the chief's "reluctance to implement the will of Congress," as Durbin reported.

Hatfield, an Oregon Republican, and AuCoin were calling for harvests that clearly were not sustainable, and eventually it became apparent to biologists that the spotted owl's extinction was inevitable unless the harvests slowed down.

Then, in April 1990, the northern spotted owl was listed as a threatened species under the ESA. Acting immediately, the late federal Judge William Dwyer in Seattle shut down the timber sale program, arguing that the government could figure out how to save the owl. Later rulings were designed to assure the viability of all native vertebrates that depend on old-growth habitat, and Judge Dwyer admonished the government to "take an ecosystem approach." Meanwhile, mechanizing of logging mills was already causing damage to the old growth. Thousands of timber workers lost their jobs while the industry rebounded with retooled mills that were able to process smaller, younger logs.

"The smarter timber companies are rejecting the pipeline that the Bush administration will restore the good old days," says Randi Stadler, executive director of the environmental group American Lands Alliance. "These progressive companies see the writing on the wall and are relying on handcrafted individual plans that are removed for legitimate forest restoration purposes."
In short, the timber industry has directed a major rewrite of the rules and has the people in place to continue down its path.

— Patti Goldman, Earthjustice

The Bureau of Land Management plans to allow this western red cedar in the Alsea River watershed to be logged. Photo by Brian Creek Defenders

The industry argued that the owl as a species wasn’t in any danger, didn’t need saving, and that the old growth really wasn’t crucial to its survival. In fact, the Clinton plan never provided the “promised” 1.1 billion board feet of timber it claimed it deserved.

After Bush took office, the industry saw an opportunity to press for favorable resolutions to its four lawsuits. Documents obtained by Earthjustice via the Freedom of Information Act revealed the timber industry’s legal strategy to force the issue. After all, federal agencies were then populated by a number of timber friendly officials who hated the Clinton forest plan and were eager to gut it.

One of them was Mark Rey, a former industry lobbyist, who served as the assistant secretary of Agriculture with responsibility to oversee the Forest Service. If anybody could lead the Forest Service back to the days of Hatfield and AuCoin, it was Rey.

The American Forest Resources Council, a Portland-based group representing more than 100 timber companies, filed two lawsuits; others were filed by the Western Council of Industrial Workers and an association of western Oregon counties. They have long favored collecting timber revenues as a way to pay for public services (in recent years, as revenues have sagged, they have slashed services rather than increase their relatively low tax rates).

The plaintiffs said they would settle their cases if the Bush administration provided the “promised” 1.1 billion board feet — even if it had to disregard a number of environmental regulations the industry didn’t like. The industry demanded the weakening of rules to conserve aquatic species such as salmon, and the administration “break the law, and adulterate science, if you have to, but give us our timber.” The administration was quite happy, if not ecstatic, for a chance to oblige.

“The Bush Administration has not only agreed to all of industry’s demands, it has also proceeded in precisely the way advocated by the industry,” said Earthjustice lawyer Patti Goldman.

Goldman said the administration agreed to make “sweeping changes in forest management in secret settlements of friendly industry lawsuits.” It also made changes in rules that would allow the industry to resume clearcutting, albeit at a much slower and more sustainable rate.

“Old-growth forest near Low Pass, in the Oregon coast range, threatened by the BLM's preferred alternative in the Western Oregon Plan Revision. Photo by Doug Helken.
Old-growth forest near Low Pass, in the Oregon coast range, threatened by the BLM’s preferred alternative in the Western Oregon Plan Revision. Photo by Doug Heiken. Oregon Wild
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They are not up against the Pacific Ocean,” John Osborn, the Spokane environmentalist and Sierra Club leader, once said about the timber industry. Old growth forests are defined as stands composed of a mixture of different sizes, species and ages of trees, scientists say, characteristics that take centuries to develop. Some trees in these stands can be dead snags, while others seemingly touch the sky with their towering canopies. The industry’s seeks to cut down these forests and replace them with profitable tree farms that can be nearly barren of wildlife diversity.

Cutting down ancient forests would certainly consign the owl to extinction, owl biologists say. The owl’s recovery depends on whether the government can protect these forests on federal land. Old growth has almost disappeared from state and privately owned lands. In Oregon, these forests are particularly vulnerable because they are regulated under Oregon’s forest practices code, which is the weakest in the region, as Cascadia Times reported in 2005.

Moreover, the destructive nature of clearcutting old-growth forests poses threats far greater than those felt by the owl. Clearcutting also impairs the marbled murrelet, a robin-sized bird that nests exclusively in ancient trees within 50 miles of the ocean. Clearcutting on the predominantly steep slopes in Northwest forests can also destroy salmon, trout and other aquatic life by burying their habitat in silt. Another purpose of the Northwest Forest Plan was to avoid the need to list any of the 1,100 species that depend on mature or old-growth forests in the Northwest.

In 1990, when the owl joined the endangered species list, James Monteith, then executive director of the organization now known as Oregon Wild, said, “It’s unfortunate that we’re in a position where animals can go extinct on public land. We would hope that industry would accept the scientists’ conclusions and stop dicking the truth.”

But timber industry spokesman Ralph Saperstein said at the time that scientists were finding increasing numbers of owls on younger stands in Northern California, and speculated that maybe owls could adapt to young forests throughout the Northwest, thereby avoiding both extinction and job losses. The industry vowed to fight logging restrictions imposed to protect the owl.

Clinton’s 1994 forest plan created millions of acres of reserves where the owl was protected from effects of chainsaws. The industry, meanwhile, stuck to Superstein’s discredited theory, even though not a single scientific study confirmed his claim that owls north of the California redwoods can survive in younger forests. Instead, studies have confirmed just the opposite: owls will die off without the old forests.

After Bush came into office in 2001, the industry pressured the Superstein theory with fresh administration officials who were quite willing to believe it. The industry talked Bush officials into supporting increased timber production in Northwest forests by decreasing the amount of acreage protected for the owl, murrelet, salmon and other species.

The timber industry, in its 2002 proposed settlement, blatantly urged the government to embrace a lie as though it were an indisputable fact. “The scientific community has significantly changed its assessment of the biological requirements of the northern spotted owl,” the industry said in a memo to the administration, obtained by Earthjustice. “Fragmented habitat is now viewed as preferable to large blocks of old growth.”

Scientists who are expert on the spotted owl’s needs say neither of these claims is true.

The memo noted that any reduction in northern spotted owl habitat “increases the timber production potential of the Northwest Forest Plan.” It argued for a re-examination of critical habitat for the northern spotted owl and the marbled murrelet (another old-growth reliant threatened species), both of which it claimed are “essential to achieving the 1.1 billion board feet timber sale goal.”

The fact that Bush officials were willing to swallow the industry’s lie about the owl became apparent to everyone on April 26, 2001, when the Fish and Wildlife Service unveiled a deeply flawed draft “owl recovery plan” that declared that habitat protection was no longer fundamental to owl conservation. Just as the timber industry wanted. Just as the administration promised back in 2003.

Documents show that in May 2003, shortly after the administration agreed to meet the timber industry’s demands, Julie MacDonald took charge of the administration’s effort to gut protection for the owl and the murrelet.

Her notes indicate the Interior Department would appoint an Owl Recovery Team to complete a draft recovery plan in 2006 and a final plan in 2007.

But the recovery team did not include any of the leading, well-published owl scientists, said DellaSala, a member of the team. “It was stacked against the owl from the get-go.”

Two team members, DellaSala and Tim Cullinan of Audubon Washington, objected when the team submitted its plan in September 2006. So much so that more than a few team members felt that the shortsomings would be exposed during peer review. “In fact, the draft got slammed in peer review,” DellaSala said.

“Neither Tim nor I wanted our names on the documents as scientists, and we even asked to have us removed from the acknowledgments as team members, it was so bad,” he said.

In October 2006 the plan went before a “Washington Oversight Committee,” comprised of 12 top agency officials who developed a major revision of the document (see the full list of these 12 officials on the opposite page). These Bush appointees in the departments of Interior and Agriculture, including Rey, Scarlett and MacDonald, jettisoned the recovery team’s version in favor of a revision backed by timber companies, the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

In the revised draft, the Washington Oversight Committee misinterpreted two studies that showed the owl can survive in certain young, cutover forests the redwood region of Northern California. It made these misrepresentations at the encouragement of a timber industry representative on the recovery team, and ignored warnings from the authors of these studies that they must not extrapolate their findings to other parts of the region.

The author of one study cited by the new draft owl plan, Dr. Alan Franklin, claimed the oversight team had “misinterpreted” his data as well as his modeling approach. Franklin is a research biologist with the National Wildlife Research Center in Colorado.

The author of the other study, Dr. Gail Olson, also claimed that the government misinterpreted her spotted owl's needs say neither of these claims is true.

“It’s unfortunate that we’re in a position where animals can go extinct on public land. We would hope that industry would accept the scientists’ conclusions and stop dicking the truth.” — James Monteith, former executive director, Oregon Wild

Politiicans get it wrong
owl studies. In a letter to the Fish and Wildlife Service, she said, "There are many places in the plan where my research results are not interpreted correctly and used in ways that I not only did not intend for them to be used, but specifically warned against in my published paper."

"I strongly believe this to be at least a misinterpretation of my research results and at worst deliberate misuse," she said in a letter to U.S. Rep. Jay Inslee, a Democrat from Seattle.

Olson, a research scientist with the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, said she was "never asked about the research that was cited extensively in the Plan nor was I requested to provide feedback on the use of that research within the Plan."

The Washington Oversight Committee proposed to allow logging in 823,000 acres that otherwise would be set aside for the owl, and eventually in another 1.6 million acres.

DellaSala said that during a recovery team meeting in Portland on February 7, 2007, Renne Lohse, the Pacific regional director for the Fish and Wildlife Service, "indicated that the recovery team was 'responding to outside influences,' yet he gave no details on who these influences were. Upon further questioning from the recovery team, he indicated that the outside influences were representatives from the timber industry."

"What was supposed to be a science-based plan was derailed by a pattern of political interference," Dr. Dominick DellaSala, spotted owl recovery team.

"What was supposed to be a science-based plan was derailed by a pattern of political interference," Dr. Dominick DellaSala, spotted owl recovery team.

BLM exceeded an appropriate role in the development of the recovery plan," Calvin Joynt, deputy regional forester, said in a letter last year to DellaSala.

Scientists and conservationists led protests against the plan.

"There is no scientific basis ... to conclude that old-growth forests are no longer essential to the owl's survival," according to a February 2008 statement signed by more than 160 concerned scientists."

The scientists said increased threats from barred owls, an invasive species, and climate change, justified the protection of "more habitat — not less," for the owl. At public hearings along the West Coast, members of the public overwhelmingly voiced similar concerns.

Scott Greacen, executive director of the Environmental Policy Information Center in Northern California, said at a Redding, Calif., hearing that the plan is "the product of a corrupt process and a corrupt administration which pursues its political ends with no regard for either the science or the expressed will of the American people."

Diane Beck, of the Redwood Chapter of the Sierra Club, said "this so-called plan appears to weaken protection for the northern spotted owl while pretending the opposite. She asked the administration to redo the plan "...and involve good academic and government biologists and keep special interests out of it. Biology and the endangered species should drive northern spotted owl policy rather than special interests dragging the policy and the science around by the neck."

Lisa Paribello of Audubon Washington said in Lacey, Wash., "Today we have before us a recovery plan that ignores science and substitutes political manipulation, that minimizes the most urgent threats facing the owl in favor of scapegoating. If adopted, this plan would jeopardize not only the spotted owl but the old-growth ecosystem on which they depend, and with them a host other species, clean water and the natural legacy for future generations."

Marianne Nelson, speaking in Portland, said, "Unfortunately, the approach of the recovery plan is similar to the U.S. Government's previous stance on global warming. It denied the science, looking only at political objectives, until so many scientists spoke out the science could no longer be denied. Science should not be manipulated for political objectives."

In Roseburg, Doug Heiken of Oregon Wid said, "I wish the Washington oversight committee was here listening. That's the committee that Lynn Scarlett is chairperson of, but she can't even remember who the other persons on the committee are. They seem to have a strong influence over what's going on, but we don't even know who they are or how to reach them and influence them, and that's pretty frustrating for the public. They'd get quite an earful if they were here."

In late 2007, the Fish and Wildlife Service decided to revise the plan once more, and hired the Portland-based Sustainable Ecosystems Institute, to do the revision.
work. The SEI review was also highly critical, saying, "Acknowledging that the pace of timber harvest in Northern Spotted Owl habitat on federal land has greatly declined 1990-2007, we view the continued conservation of (old growth) forest to be paramount for Northern Spotted Owl recovery. We concur that increasing the harvest of occupied habitat would harm the species at a time when it appears to be in accelerated decline.

Final owl plan still flawed

In May 2008, the Fish and Wildlife Service released a new owl recovery plan that made no mention of the Washington Oversight Committee or its flawed work.

The Fish and Wildlife Service did not call for peer reviews of the final plan, but several experts stepped forward with their opinions. Although an improvement over the draft plan, a consensus of experts gives it a failing grade.

It's still not adequate, but it represents a "major improvement" over the work of the oversight committee, says Dr. Jerry F. Franklin, Professor of Ecosystem Analysis in the College of Forest Resources at the University of Washington.

In testimony last May before the Rahall committee, he said the draft plan "failed all scientific tests."

"It is important that Congress recognize that these improvements are largely a consequence of the oversight provided by extensive public involvement, including comprehensive and independent scientific review during the development of the recovery plan."

Nevertheless, Franklin says the number of conservation areas established for the owl — 133 — is not adequate, and is based on an "old" strategy developed in 1989 and 1990 that is now obsolete.

"I see no scientific reason why the (Fish and Wildlife Service) would have based their approach on this old strategy. The Northwest Forest Plan provided for a much more extensive system of Late Successional Reserves, a system of reserves superior to (the final owl plan)."

The Wildlife Society, a scientific organization which peer-reviewed the draft plan, said no other expert has been studied as extensively as the northern spotted owl.

The final plan, it said in a review published July 31, "does not adequately avail itself of the depth and breadth of this information, resulting in a seriously flawed plan for recovery. The 2008 Plan will not lead to recovery of this species. Indeed, the plan would reverse much of the progress made over the past 20 years to protect this species and the habitat upon which it depends."

The group said the owl's recovery plan should strengthen the provisions of Clinton's Northwest Forest Plan. Instead, the new plan illogically "proposes significant reduction in suitable habitat available to the owl."

In a joint review published in late June, the Society of Conservation Biology and the American Ornithologists' Union said the final plan "is still inadequate as a conservation strategy." It said the plan significantly reduces the amount of habitat protected for the owl.

"Given that the northern spotted owl has been experiencing about a 4 percent annual rate of population decline for the last 15 years, any reductions from current levels of habitat protection cannot be justified. In contrast, a sufficient conservation strategy would continue to protect all lands currently designated for spotted owl recovery under the (Northwest Forest Plan) and consider expansion in the size and number of habitat reserves."

The latest demographic data shows that populations of northern spotted owls in Washington continued to decline through 2007, and those in Oregon are declining at a greater rate than in 2003.

The next demographic study will be conducted after the 2008 field season in January 2009, and it is likely that the news will be even grimmer than it was after the 2003 analysis, said DellaSala. Also, the latest genetic studies by Dr. Susan Haig, of the USGS, shows reduced genetic viability in owl populations due to inbreeding.

"This happens when populations are crashing and not very well connected," DellaSala said. "All of this goes against the Fish and Wildlife Service plan to reduce habitat. As I've said before, the FWS is pulling the habitat rug out from under the owl at a time when population declines are accelerating."

The BLM takes a whopper

To find the biggest and oldest trees in Oregon, you must travel to the remote Crabtree Valley located high in the Cascade Mountains of west-central Oregon. To get there, you follow U.S. 20 east of Albany, turn off just beyond the small town of Sweet Home onto backroads that lead past Foster and Green Peter Reservoirs and into the foothills of stately Mount Jefferson.

You can drive up to the trailhead leading to the Crabtree Valley if the snows have melted, which may not occur before July. Upon entering the Crabtree Valley you will find a hiking trail down to a picturesque lake bordered by trees that took root more than 1,000 years ago.

There you will find towering old-growth forests that the timber industry and its friends in the Bush Administration want to clearcut. This fate has been proposed by the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Land Management.

Environmentalists have saved this extraordinary forest once, and they say they now must save it again.

Andy Kerr, a conservation consultant for environmental groups, was working for Oregon Wild in the early 1980s when Crabtree Valley was owned by the timber company Willamette Industries. One day, he and another Oregon Wild activist, Cameron LaFollette, met with the company's CEO, Bill Swindell Jr., in his office on the top floor of the First Interstate Tower in downtown Portland.

"Cameron and I begged him to do a land exchange with BLM," said Kerr, now CEO of the Larch Company, an environmental consulting firm based in Ashland. "He told of cruising it in his younger days as forester. He kept saying that he didn't think the forest was special."

At the time, Kerr noted that, "Old growth hadn't taken off as an issue yet. Crabtree helped launch the issue."

Crabtree Valley Lake, Salem District Bureau of Land Management. Photo by Chandra LeGue/Oregon Wild
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“The spotted owl needs the BLM’s forests as critical stepping stones of habitat that connect large blocks of suitable habitat in the Coast Range and the Cascades.”
— Doug Heiken, Oregon Wild

Endangered Species Act is valid everywhere in the U.S., except in parts of 16 of Oregon’s 36 counties.

The counties go on to claim that a 2007 U.S. Supreme Court ruling implies that the BLM “may not create reserves ... to avoid jeopardizing a listed species.” The industry says that no conservation purpose—not even to protect salmon by baring clearcutting on landslide-prone soils—can conflict with the BLM’s duty to allow timber production.

But Federal Judge William Dwyer, ruling in 1994, had already rejected the industry’s contention that the Northwest Forest Plan violated the O&C Act, and that on these lands the ESA is null and void. Dwyer has stated that BLM must fulfill its conservation duties under those and other environmental statutes in managing the O&C lands. Dwyer said that BLM must look not only to annual timber production but also to “protecting watersheds, contributing to economic stability, and providing recreational facilities.”

One of the tenets is that some rural communities continue to believe the myths that continued logging of older forests will financially rescue their communities. Spivak said, “History has proven just the opposite. The more older forests are logged, the more public controversy, the more damage to vital drinking water supplies, failed fisheries, and erosion and flooding caused by an overbuilt, eroding road system. The Bush Administration and the timber industry have no interest in the health of rural communities.”

If the BLM and the industry get their way, environmentalists say the future of the northern spotted owl would be put in great jeopardy.

The spotted owl needs the BLM’s forests as critical stepping stones of habitat that connect large blocks of suitable habitat in Coast Range and the Cascades,” says Oregon Wild’s Doug Heiken.

“Congress needs to once and for all protect all mature and old-growth forests,” Spivak said. “There is no scientific or social ambiguity on the need to protect and regrow these older forests. Laws must be created to eliminate this practice or scarce public resources will continue to be wasted.”

The BLM in October 2008 revised its plan, proposing to reduce by one-third the amount of logging it intends to allow in ancient forests. The BLM had hoped to “harmonize” its plan with the flawed draft owl plan offered by the Fish and Wildlife Service, before it revised the draft. As it was written, the clock was running out on Bush and his war on the environment. The old trees and the spotted owl will live for another day, despite the administration’s and timber industry’s best efforts to liquidate them. In times of government duplicity and corporate greed and fraud, that counts as a major victory.

Ponderosa pine forest on the east side of the Cascades in Oregon. Scientists say these fire-prone forests need protection as habitat for numerous species. Photo by Larry Olson

Proposed BLM forest plan ignores global warming

In its proposed plan for forests in Western Oregon, the Bureau of Land Management completely ignored climate change — in apparent violation of Department of the Interior policy.

The plan says it assumes no change in climate conditions, and dismisses any attempt to project climate changes in the region over the next 100 years as speculative.

This means that, if carried out as prescribed, the Whopper would make global warming worse by cutting down huge blocks of forest and releasing massive amounts of carbon dioxide.

By ignoring climate science, the BLM is violating an order issued by then—Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt in 2001. The secretarial order states: “Each areas analysis of the Department will consider and analyze potential climate change impacts when undertaking long-range planning exercises...activities covered by this Order include...programmatic and long-term environmental reviews...activities associated with oil, gas and mineral development on public lands...”

A new report from Oregon Wild suggests that BLM’s failure to address global warming misses a big opportunity for the agency and its plan to be part of the solution to global warming, rather than helping contribute to making climate change even worse.

Oregon Wild has spent over three decades advocating for the protection of old-growth forests. These forests once blanketed the Pacific Northwest, but 100 years of intensive logging has left us with only 10 percent of our original old growth. We have always known that older forests provide us with clean drinking water, fish and wildlife habitat, and some of our favorite places to recreate.

Contrary to previous assumptions about old forests, new research shows that older forests remain effective carbon sinks. Randi Spivak of American Lands Alliance. The older age classes can contain two to 10 times as much living biomass carbon as the youngest age class. Logging and wood processing emits more annual carbon emissions in the U.S. than from forest wildfires.

However, the BLM refused to even consider how its forests could be used to help cushion the impacts of our most pressing environmental problem.
THE FALLEN LIEUTENANT

Disgraced ex-Interior official Julie MacDonald ran broad scheme to suppress science

In Bush's war against the environment, Julie MacDonald, a deputy assistant Interior secretary, cast herself as the loyal lieutenant who led his fierce campaign to blunt efforts to recover imperiled species in favor of more grazing, timber production and fossil fuel extraction across the country.

The manipulation and suppression of science "is rampant" throughout the process of listing and recovering endangered species, said Dr. Francesco T. Grifo, senior scientist with the Union of Concerned Scientists, at a congressional hearing in May 2008.

Bush allowed political appointees "to interfere with individual species decisions and propagandize policies that reduce the role of science in endangered species decision making," Grifo said.

MacDonald worked at Interior from 2002 to 2007, and during that time some 200 listing, delisting and critical habitat rules came across her desk. As a deputy assistant secretary at Interior, she oversaw fish, wildlife and parks, focusing on implementing Endangered Species Act, which requires agencies to base decisions on the "best available science." As we'll see, MacDonald often employed the "worst available policies" as her standard.

She was not the only Bush appointee who allegedly sought to rearrange science to fit the administration's political agenda. According to the Center for Biological Diversity, in addition to violations committed by MacDonald, "Others were committed by Randal Bowman, Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary of Interior, and Craig Manson, the Assistant Secretary of Interior himself. Still others were committed by Ruth Solomon in the White House Office of Management and Budget."

In addition, a study by the General Accounting Office, an arm of the Congress, cited an unnamed Interior official (not MacDonald) who blocked an emergency petition to list the Miami blue butterfly. Fish and Wildlife Service officials "at all levels supported a recommendation for listing the species," the GAO said. But one Interior official, citing a Florida state management plan and the existence of a captive-bred population, determined that emergency listing was not warranted.

Besides colliding with the Bush political agenda, the needs of wildlife in at least one instance conflicted with MacDonald's business interests at her farm near Sacramento, according to an investigation by the Interior Department's Office of the Inspector General.

MacDonald was allowed by her superiors to influence the fate of the northern spotted owl, even though they were well aware of the serious allegations against her. The Inspector General, Earl Devaney, launched his investigation into her activities after receiving an anonymous complaint in April 2006, and it released the first of two scathing reports in March 2007. But she was allowed to keep her job until May 1, 2007 — just days after her work on the owl was finished with the release of the industry-friendly, but scientifically flawed, draft spotted owl recovery plan.

She also played key roles in decisions affecting the existence of the marbled murrelet, bull trout, Gunnison's prairie dog and the greater sage grouse.

Decision-makers at the Fish and Wildlife Service worked directly under MacDonald, who was allowed to wield enormous power over which species are added to, or deleted from, the endangered species list, as an email cited by Grifo in her congressional testimony illustrates. The email said, "Per Julie please make the pt (prairie dog) finding negative."

As the New York Times pointed out, "ranchers, developers and the petroleum industry breathed a sigh of relief" when they overruled a consensus of scientists at the Fish and Wildlife Service who claimed that the best available science showed that the prairie dog belonged on the list.

In another example of MacDonald's middlebrow behavior, she criticized the science showing widespread threats to the sage grouse. As a result, the Fish and Wildlife Service refused to list it. The Western Watershed Project, an environmental group from Hailey, Idaho, sued, and federal Judge Lynn Wimnill ordered the agency to redo its decision.

"The (Fish and Wildlife Service) decision was tainted by the inexcusable conduct of one of its own executives," Wimnill wrote in her December 2007 order. "Julie MacDonald, a Deputy Assistant Secretary who was neither a scientist nor a sage-grouse expert, had a well-documented history of intervening in the listing process to ensure that the 'best science' supported a decision not to list the species. Her tactics included everything from editing scientific conclusions to intimidating FWS staff."

Her extensive involvement in the sage-grouse listing decision process taints the FWS's decision and requires reconsideration without her involvement.

Agency gags its own scientists

Under Bush, when a species is added to the endangered species list, it usually happens after citizens file a petition; the agency rarely initiates its own ESA action.

But a Fish and Wildlife Service policy instituted in May 2005 made it hard for its own scientists to fairly evaluate citizen petitions. The policy imposed a gag order on any scientist who possesses information in support of a citizen petition. This policy "explicitly prevents its scientists from using information they already have within their own files to support a citizen's petition," Grifo says.

The policy, rescinded in November 2006, was in effect at a time when the Fish and Wildlife Service was setting a record for the longest time span in history in which it added no new species to the endangered species list.

From May 2006, when Dirk Kempthorne became secretary of Interior, to May 2008 when the agency belatedly listed the polar bear as threatened, not a single species was added to the protected list, a period of two years and five days, "the longest drought in listing in the history of the ESA," according to Grifo.

During the George W. Bush presidency, the rate of newly listed species dropped to the lowest level since the Endangered Species Act was passed in 1973, far lower than any other administration, according to the Center for Biological Diversity, a conservation group based in Tucson, Ariz., that specializes in endangered species litigation.

Since 2001, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has listed just 50 species, for a rate of eight species per year. By comparison, the Clinton administration listed 512 species for a rate of 62 species per year, and the George H.W. Bush administration listed 234 species for a rate of 56 species per year.

Under the younger Bush, officials may have allowed one species — and possibly more — to die off. The summer-run kokanee used to live in Lake Sammamish near Seattle. The run numbered near 15,000 in the 1980s. After years of delays, in 2007 the Fish and Wildlife Service finally denied petitions to list the species, but by then it was too late. Summer-run Lake

"Julie MacDonald had a well-documented history of intervening in the listing process to ensure that the 'best science' supported a decision not to list the species. Her extensive involvement in the sage-grouse listing decision process taints the FWS's decision and requires reconsideration without her involvement."

Federal Judge Lynn Wimnill
The Sacramento Splittail

The most significant changes were made to the statistical analysis of splittail population data. More than 500 changes were made specifically by MacDonald, most of which successfully made it to the final rule.

— Interior Department Inspector General Earl Devaney
SAVING THE THREATENED NORTHERN SPOTTED OWL

Leasing old-growth forest scientist Dr. Jerry Franklin of the University of Washington, says the final spotted owl recovery plan released in May represents a major improvement in scientific credibility over the draft recovery plan released last year. But he says the plan still falls well short of meeting the needs of threatened species, given the critical status of the bird. Compared to Clinton's 1994 Northwest Forest plan, the draft plan recommended up to 38 percent less protection for the owl, and the final plan provides up to 56 percent less protection for the owl.

The recovery plan adapts a single species approach, which is a step back from the ecosystem approach of the existing Northwest Forest Plan, developed under President Clinton. His plan provided more than 10 million acres of Late Successional Reserves and Riparian Reserves. The Clinton Plan is said to have been successful in providing complementary benefits to both terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems.

The timber industry has argued that the owl doesn't need reserves to survive. The final plan replicates that point of view, which had been accepted by the draft.

In 2007, officials in British Columbia captured the remaining 16 known wild spotted owls. Before then, the population of spotted owls in Canada was declining by as much as 15 percent per year.

The number of owl populations that declined in recent years, and the rate at which they have declined have alarmed biologists, particularly the precipitous declines in the Wenatchee, Cle Elum and Rainier areas in Washington, according to a study conducted from 1985 to 2005. Estimates of population declines in these areas ranged from 40 to 60 percent. There was also evidence that populations in the Olympic area was also decreasing.

In Oregon, the largest habitat declines were in the Umpqua, Rogue and Klamath areas, according to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service data. The annual rate of population change and trends in the rate of adult survival showed clear decreases in all areas of Oregon included in a demographic study by R.G. Anthony and others.

The plan says large trees of other fire-intolerant species (e.g., grand fir and white fir) may be removed outside critical owl habitat to reduce canopy fuels. This is a potential loophole that could allow inappropriate logging of high-elevation mixed-conifer forests that could provide good owl habitat.

The recovery plan listed in the final plan requires clusters of only 15 pairs of owls be maintained in 80 percent of the large reserves (MOCA 1) over a 5-year period. Critics of the plan see two big problems with this: the cluster size is too small, and the large reserves are not well-distributed.

The Bush administration dumped its scientifically flawed draft owl recovery plan, only to replace it with a final plan scientists say is just as flawed.

The final plan recommends elimination of reserves in all ecoregions except the Cascades and the adoption of a landscape-wide program of active management such as logging to reduce fuels in those areas. Fuel treatments could pose a significant risk to the spotted owl given that fuel reduction may degrade owl habitat, particularly if fuel reductions remove large trees and lower canopy closure to less than 60 percent. No one really knows what that means, until some studies are done.

The plan recognizes the dearth of information specific to the Klamath region. The plan also recognizes the need for information about the Klamath region.

The plan also recognizes the need for information about the Klamath region.

The plan gives the agencies lots of discretion in terms of identifying complex old forests to be protected outside of reserves, if fuel reduction and salvage after fires. This is a systemic problem for the land management agencies which are under pressure to provide timber for harvest.

The Klamath Mountains are included in the Cascades ecoregion; however, managers are encouraged to actively manage them to reduce fire hazards. Klamath forests are different than the cascade and coast redwood forests, and scientists caution against the application of science from other regions. The plan also recognizes the dearth of information specific to the Klamath region.

The contiguous range of the spotted owl extends from southeast British Columbia through the Cascade Mountains, coastal ranges, and the Sierra Nevada in Washington, Oregon, and California, as far south as Marin County, California. The actual number of currently occupied spotted owl locations across the range is unknown, because not all areas have been or can be surveyed on an annual basis.

The Recovery Criteria listed in the final plan require clusters of only 15 pairs of owls be maintained in 80 percent of the large reserves (MOCA 1) over a 5-year period. Critics of the plan see two big problems with this: the cluster size is too small, and the large reserves are not well-distributed.

The timber industry has argued that the owl doesn't need reserves to survive. The final plan replicates that point of view, which had been accepted by the draft.

In 2007, officials in British Columbia captured the remaining 16 known wild spotted owls. Before then, the population of spotted owls in Canada was declining by as much as 15 percent per year.

The number of owl populations that declined in recent years, and the rate at which they have declined have alarmed biologists, particularly the precipitous declines in the Wenatchee, Cle Elum and Rainier areas in Washington, according to a study conducted from 1985 to 2005. Estimates of population declines in these areas ranged from 40 to 60 percent. There was also evidence that populations in the Olympic area was also decreasing.

In Oregon, the largest habitat declines were in the Umpqua, Rogue and Klamath areas, according to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service data. The annual rate of population change and trends in the rate of adult survival showed clear decreases in all areas of Oregon included in a demographic study by R.G. Anthony and others.

The plan says large trees of other fire-intolerant species (e.g., grand fir and white fir) may be removed outside critical owl habitat to reduce canopy fuels. This is a potential loophole that could allow inappropriate logging of high-elevation mixed-conifer forests that could provide good owl habitat.

The recovery plan listed in the final plan requires clusters of only 15 pairs of owls be maintained in 80 percent of the large reserves (MOCA 1) over a 5-year period. Critics of the plan see two big problems with this: the cluster size is too small, and the large reserves are not well-distributed.

The Bush administration dumped its scientifically flawed draft owl recovery plan, only to replace it with a final plan scientists say is just as flawed.

The final plan recommends elimination of reserves in all ecoregions except the Cascades and the adoption of a landscape-wide program of active management such as logging to reduce fuels in those areas. Fuel treatments could pose a significant risk to the spotted owl given that fuel reduction may degrade owl habitat, particularly if fuel reductions remove large trees and lower canopy closure to less than 60 percent. No one really knows what that means, until some studies are done.

The plan recognizes the dearth of information specific to the Klamath region. The plan also recognizes the need for information about the Klamath region.

The plan gives the agencies lots of discretion in terms of identifying complex old forests to be protected outside of reserves, if fuel reduction and salvage after fires. This is a systemic problem for the land management agencies which are under pressure to provide timber for harvest.

The Klamath Mountains are included in the Cascades ecoregion; however, managers are encouraged to actively manage them to reduce fire hazards. Klamath forests are different than the cascade and coast redwood forests, and scientists caution against the application of science from other regions. The plan also recognizes the dearth of information specific to the Klamath region.

The contiguous range of the spotted owl extends from southeast British Columbia through the Cascade Mountains, coastal ranges, and the Sierra Nevada in Washington, Oregon, and California, as far south as Marin County, California. The actual number of currently occupied spotted owl locations across the range is unknown, because not all areas have been or can be surveyed on an annual basis.
THE FALLEN LIEUTENANT

(Continued from Page 11)

The Inspector General issued two reports that found MacDonald had violated ethical standards during the spotted owl affair, and another that found that her conduct violated regulations for giving preferential treatment to industry groups. She resigned on May 1, 2007.

The Inspector General found that MacDonald was "heavily involved with editing, commenting on, and reshaping the Endangered Species Program's scientific reports from the field." As for her qualifications to make these kinds of biological judgments, the Inspector General said she had none. "MacDonald admitted that her degree is in civil engineering and that she has no formal educational background in natural sciences, such as biology."

The Inspector General also looked into potential conflicts of interest while MacDonald was looking for a new job in late 2006 and early 2007, a period during which she was potentially involved with several endangered species decisions, but not the northern spotted owl (she had recused herself). Her signature appears on documents related to the polar bear, Canada lynx and 13 other species.

One target of her search was an industry association whose members would be more than a little affected by decisions on the owl: the American Forest & Paper Association. One of the association's members is the American Forest Products Council, the same industry association whose members pushed for massive clearcutting in spotted owl habitat in Oregon.

MacDonald's behavior during her employment at the Interior Department might have seemed familiar to her old neighbors at the farm. An anonymous complaint from a Fish and Wildlife Service employee said MacDonald had persistently harassed, bullied, and insulted FWS employees to change documents and "ignore good science" related to the Endangered Species Program.

Another employee said that MacDonald did not want to list species, but preferred to ensure they were not listed in litigation. A third employee described MacDonald as an "angry woman" who had been abusive to her. She added that MacDonald had demoralized employees around the country, who identified eight decisions that might need to be re-examined to make sure they were legal. Other decisions were not reconsidered because "MacDonald's impact on the decisions was minimal." The agency chose not to reconsider decisions involving the marbled murrelet, bull trout and Sacramento splittail.

The eight decisions (including two involving one species, the Preble's meadow jumping mouse, reconsidered by the Fish and Wildlife Service were:

1. Hawaiian picture-wing flies proposed critical habitat: MacDonald directed in the proposed rule that the critical habitat for each of the 12 federally listed Hawaiian picture-wing flies consist of no more than 1 acre per species.
2. Preble's meadow jumping mouse 12-month finding and proposed delisting: MacDonald was involved in a decision to move forward with a proposal to delist the mouse based on a preliminary genetics report that had not been accepted for publication at the time of the proposal.
3. Preble's meadow jumping mouse, White-tailed prairie dog 90-day petition finding: The field office drafted a positive 90-day finding on a petition to list the white-tailed prairie dog. The finding concluded the information in the petition was substantial and warranted further review of the species' status. MacDonald revised the document to be a "not-substantial" finding.
4. California red-legged frog, final critical habitat: MacDonald's involvement may have affected the extent of the critical habitat designation.
5. Preble's meadow jumping mouse, final critical habitat: MacDonald's involvement may have affected the extent of the critical habitat designation.
6. Canada Lynx, final critical habitat: MacDonald's involvement may have affected the extent of the critical habitat designation.
7. Preble's meadow jumping mouse, final critical habitat: MacDonald's involvement may have affected the extent of the critical habitat designation.
8. The Fish and Wildlife Service chose not to look into northern spotted owl decisions on its recovery plan and on critical habitat. Reps. Nick Rahall and Peter DeFazio asked the GAO to investigate, but it did not.

Over a year ago, Sen. Ron Wyden, Democrat of Oregon, asked the Interior Department's Office of the Inspector General also to investigate the owl decisions. They have yet to issue any findings.

"No one seems to know why," said Dominick DellaSala. The groups said several decisions affected the endangered species list. The Fish and Wildlife Service promised to investigate the incident following the Interior Department investigation. Despite clear evidence of political interference with a scientific determination, the agency still has not announced whether it will revisit the decision to take the spiltail off the endangered species list.

Of the 200 decisions that crossed MacDonald's desk, who knows how many were tainted. The Union of Concerned Scientists questions 80 decisions affecting 78 species. The Center for Biological Diversity in August 2007 filed a notice of intent to file federal lawsuits to require the Fish and Wildlife Service to reconsider the Sacramento spiltail delisting ruling, among 55 decisions it considers to be "wrongful."

"The corruption which promoted the illegal actions goes far deeper than Julie MacDonald," the Center said.

The groups said several decisions affecting old-growth forest species were tainted, including salmon, bull trout, the marbled murrelet and the northern spotted owl.

Most of these decisions are now under investigation by the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Department of Interior, the Government Accountability Office or the courts.

"Julie MacDonald had demoralized employees with her interference with endangered species studies, often reaching "way down the line" to make sure that reports said what she wanted them to say."

— an unnamed Fish and Wildlife Service external affairs employee
**Decisions Tainted with Allegations of Politics**

There may be between 55 and 80 endangered species who have been victims of government officials who relied on their own political agenda instead of the best available science when deciding their fate, according to the Union of Concerned Scientists and the Center for Biological Diversity. Often these and other groups say, the interests of ranchers, developers, fossil fuel producers and timber companies trump the science. Courts, Congress, the Office of the Inspector General in the Department of the Interior and others are conducting investigations.

The groups say politics have tainted six types of decisions under the Endangered Species Act, including: designating critical habitat, the informal 90-day review of a citizen petition to list, the 12-month formal review to decide whether to list or delist a species, five-year status reviews, recovery plans and biological opinions.

---

**Alameda whipsnake**

Development in San Francisco Bay and road construction have fragmented the whipsnake's originally continuous range into five declining populations. Critical Habitat

**Arkansas river shiner**

Disappeared from more than 50 percent of its historical habitat. And less than 50 percent of remaining habitat officially deemed "essential" remains federally protected. Critical Habitat

**Arroyo toad**

Populations have suffered throughout the twentieth century as watersheds in southern California have been dammed and polluted by siltation from development and other activities. 5-Year Status Review

**California least tern**

Inhabit bays and lagoons and forms breeding colonies in the adjacent open sandy beaches, dunes, or disturbed sites. Intense coastal development and increased human activity on beaches have seriously affected populations. Critical Habitat

**Canada Lynx**

Lynx have been eliminated from much of their historic range in the lower 48 states. Today small populations remain only in portions of Maine, the Great Lakes states, the northern Rockies/Cascades region, and Colorado, thanks to a reintroduction program. Critical Habitat

**Hawaiian picture wing flies (12 species)**

The 111 species of picture-wing flies have evolved from a single female that migrated from the mainland 5 million years ago. Hawaiian picture-wing flies represent one of the most remarkable cases of specific adaptation to local conditions that have been found in any group of animals on Earth. Surveys from 1965 to 1999 showed declines of all 11 listed picture-wing species. Critical Habitat

**Gunnison Sage Grouse**

Since 1900 sage grouse populations have been reduced as their sagebrush habitat has been destroyed, degraded, and fragmented by a plethora of human activities. The species no longer occurs in Arizona, British Columbia, Kansas, Nebraska, New Mexico, and Oklahoma. Sage grouse have declined as much as 45-90 percent over the past 20 years. 12-month Formal Decision Not To List

**Montana fluvial Arctic grayling**

The fluvial Arctic grayling, a glacial relic of a much larger Arctic population, has fallen victim to the war for water as river diversions and agricultural dewatering have drastically shrunk its Montana population. Withdrawn from even the list of candidates for Endangered Species Act protection. Montana's graying is now teetering on the brink of extinction. 12 Month Formal Review

**Southwestern Willow Flycatcher**

The southwestern willow flycatcher has suffered more than a century of steady decline. Because of livestock grazing, dams, water withdrawal, and urban and agricultural sprawl, the bird has lost more than 90 percent of the southwestern riparian habitat it needs to survive. The species' 2005 critical habitat designation influenced by Julie MacDonald's political meddling. protect less than half the 376,095 acres originally proposed for designation. Critical Habitat

**Pierson's Milk-Vetch**

Found only in the in the Algodones or Imperial Dunes of Imperial County east of San Diego, an extremely popular area for off-highway vehicles. The Bush administration proposed a management plan that would re-open conservation areas to vehicles. It later issued a biological opinion declaring that the plan wouldn't jeopardize or adversely modify Pierson's milk-vetch habitat. A 2006 federal court ruling upheld protections for the Algodones Dunes, proclaiming that current off-road vehicle closures would remain in effect for the foreseeable future. Critical Habitat

**Southwestern bald eagle**

In 2006, the FWS denied a petition to list the Southwestern bald eagle as a distinct population, contrary to the recommendations of its own scientific panel, which concluded, we do not believe that the Southwest Bald Eagle population is secure, and we question whether even current numbers can be sustained without active management and habitat protection. Critical Habitat

**Vernal pool species**

20 threatened or endangered species of plants and animals occur within seasonal wetlands throughout California and southern Oregon, including include 10 endangered plants, five threatened plants, three endangered animals, and two threatened animals. The pools come to life when winter rains collect in shallow, impermeable basins. Numerous species of animal and plants have adapted to a pattern of winter filling and summer drying. In the spring, most vernal pools are easily identified by concentric circles of beautiful wildflowers. Critical Habitat

---

**Florida Panther**

The Fish and Wildlife Service admitted that it committed scientific fraud in assessing the habitat needs and population of the endangered Florida panther. The FWS fired the biologist, Andrew Eiler, who challenged the fraud. New developments sprawl across panther habitat. The agency used scientific fictitious data. The agency changed no decisions as a result of the fraud. Critical Habitat

**Montana population. Withdrawn from the endangered species list. but because it possesses no population size or trend data. 5-Year Status Review**

**Southwestern willow flycatcher**

The southwestern willow flycatcher has suffered more than a century of steady decline. Because of livestock grazing, water withdrawal, and urban and agricultural sprawl, the bird has lost more than 90 percent of the southwestern riparian habitat it needs to survive. The species' 2005 critical habitat designation influenced by Julie MacDonald's political meddling. protect less than half the 376,095 acres originally proposed for designation. Critical Habitat

**Willowy Monardella**

Willowy Monardella is severely declining in total numbers in San Diego County. The sandy embankments in major canyon riparian systems along the coast, which are the primary microhabitat of Willowy Monardella, are rapidly being developed or degraded. Critical Habitat

---

**Biological Opinion: Critical Habitat**

**Critical Habitat**

**Biological Opinion: Critical Habitat**

**Critical Habitat**

**Critical Habitat**

**Critical Habitat**

---

**12 Month Formal Decision Not To List**

**12-month Formal Decision Not To List**

**5-Year Status Review**

**5-Year Status Review**

**90-Day Finding**

**90-Day Finding**

---

**Recovery Plan**

**Vernal pool species**

20 threatened or endangered species of plants and animals occur within seasonal wetlands throughout California and southern Oregon, including include 10 endangered plants, five threatened plants, three endangered animals, and two threatened animals. The pools come to life when winter rains collect in shallow, impermeable basins. Numerous species of animal and plants have adapted to a pattern of winter filling and summer drying. In the spring, most vernal pools are easily identified by concentric circles of beautiful wildflowers. Critical Habitat

---

**West Virginia Flying Squirrel**

Scientific studies indicate that the species' preferred habitat, mature red spruce forest, is projected to entirely disappear from the United States due to global warming. The Fish and Wildlife Service wants to remove it from the endangered species list, but because it possesses no population size or trend data.

---

**White tailed prairie dog**

A number of animals depend on the prairie dog for their survival, including endangered black-footed ferrets, burrowing owls, mountain plovers, and fer­rugious hawks. Once ranging throughout western Colorado, eastern Utah, Wyoming, and south-central Montana, the prairie dog has declined by more than 92 percent throughout its range. Oil and gas drilling, shooting, poisoning, and disease have taken their toll.

---

**90-Day Finding**

**Critical Habitat**

**Critical Habitat**

**Critical Habitat**

---

**Recovery Plan**

**Critical Habitat**

**Critical Habitat**

---

**Recovery Plan**

**Critical Habitat**

---

**Critical Habitat**

---

**Critical Habitat**

---

**Critical Habitat**
Where political meddling is routine, and scientific integrity is discouraged, how can you tell what to believe?

Julie MacDonald's shocking behavior creates a credibility problem for federal environmental agencies, especially significant to the public. Who would believe anything that's been tainted with MacDonald's fingerprints? Who else has poisoned the science with politics? How can you tell what to believe?

No one understands this credibility gap better than the scientists who work for the government. The Bush administration seems, however, to be in denial. When asked about overwhelmingly negative comments in a recent survey scientists who work for the EPA, agency spokesman Jonathan Shadrar attributed some of the discontent to the "passion" scientists have toward their work, CNN reported. He dismissed the scientists' concern about the EPA's lack of scientific integrity.

More than half of 1,586 EPA staff scientists who responded online to a 44-question online survey reported they had experienced incidents of political interference in their work in the last five years, according to a Union of Concerned Scientists survey released in April 2008. In the last three years, the Union of Concerned Scientists has surveyed three environmental agencies about questions of political influence and scientific integrity, including the EPA, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the National Marine Fisheries Service (part of the Department of Commerce). The others. It has also surveyed federal climate scientists who work for a variety of agencies, including NOAA and NASA. Two other nonprofit groups participated in the survey, the Government Accountability Project and Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility.

By law, the work of all these agencies is supposed to be fueled by science, but under Bush, politicians have interfered to an alarming degree, according to detailed accounts provided to Congress. The disruption of climate may be the most vexing environmental issue affecting our planet, but only about half (58 percent) of 150 climate scientists reported that they had personally experienced one or more incidents of political interference within the past five years, such as editors in their reports that changed the meaning of scientific findings.

Significant numbers of scientists say political interference is a serious concern for endangered species. The AEO survey of Fish and Wildlife Service scientists, nearly half whose work is related to endangered species (44 percent) reported that they "have been directed, for non-scientific reasons, to refrain from making policy or other findings that are protective of species." One in five scientists revealed they had been instructed to compromise their scientific integrity. They said they had been "directed to inappropriately exclude or alter technical information from a Fish and Wildlife Service scientific document," such as a biological opinion.

Interestingly, executives at the Fish and Wildlife Service ordered their employees not to respond to the survey. Yet, of the 1,400 who received the survey, nearly 30 percent defied the order and responded. At the National Marine Fisheries Service (also known as NOAA Fisheries), more than one third of those in a position to make recommendations about protecting endangered species said they had been interfered with. They said they had been "directed, for non-scientific reasons, to refrain from making findings that are protective" of marine life and nearly one in four of those conducting such work reported being "directed to inappropriately exclude or alter technical information from a NOAA Fisheries scientific document."

EPA scientists also reported personally experiencing political interference, ranging from the "explicit to the subtle." The Union of Concerned Scientists surveyed its 191 members and found that 94 scientists (7 percent) had frequently or occasionally been "directed to inappropriately exclude or alter technical information from an EPA scientific document."

It found that 191 scientists (16 percent) had personally experienced federal managers to say things that are incorrect. It's one thing for the Department to dismiss our recommendations, it's quite another to be forced (under veiled threat of removal) to say something that is counter to our best professional judgment.

At a House hearing last year, John Young, a former Fish and Wildlife Service biologist, described pressure he faced while he coordinated the preparation of a bull trout recovery plan, a critical habitat designation for bull trout, and a 5-year review of the bull trout's status. Young said that scientists initially proposed to designate the bull trout's "critical habitat" as the entire range of the endangered species. In the Columbia River basin, that would have included the parts of watersheds that area above the federal projects on the Columbia and Snake rivers. Documents show that Julie MacDonald, the deputy assistant Interior secretary, directed the entire Columbia and Snake basins be deleted from the trout's critical habitat.

"While an argument might be made that exclusion of the mainstream Snake and Columbia River areas directly managed by the agencies operating the (federal hydro system) is appropriate, blanket exclusion of the (entire basin) is completely illogical," Young said.

He said scientists were overruled. Documents obtained by Cascadia Times through the Freedom of Information Act reveal that MacDonald insisted on those blanket exclusions. Moreover, he noted that there are hundreds of large and small reservoirs built for irrigation water storage, flood control, and hydropower generation elsewhere in the Pacific Northwest. Again, documents show that the scientists were overruled by MacDonald, who excluded those man-made lakes from the trout's critical habitat.

"The final critical habitat designation for bull trout was a fraction of that presented to (Fish and Wildlife Service) managers following public comment and peer review, and the result was scattered patches of habitat across the Pacific Northwest not reflective of connected habitat, representing the life history requirements of this species," Young told Rahall's committee.

In the Klamath Basin, critics like Steve Rodgers of Oregon Wild say the agency's "turned biology on its head. It protected only three small streams as critical habitat for the bull trout, which needs to be able to migrate to areas where the water is cold and clear."

The analysis also skewed the costs of imposing the critical habitat designation. According to Young, the costs of fish passage facilities built long ago were included by Interior officials, even...
GOVERNMENT SCIENTISTS SAY: DOES YOUR AGENCY LACK SCIENTIFIC INTEGRITY?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>NMFS</th>
<th>FWS</th>
<th>EPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes 22.5%</td>
<td>Yes 22.4%</td>
<td>Yes 36.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Union of Concerned Scientists and other groups surveyed scientists with NOAA Fisheries, the Fish and Wildlife Service and the EPA about scientific integrity. NOAA Fisheries scientists were asked if the agency routinely makes determinations using its best scientific judgment, even when political pressure is applied. 22.6 percent of them either disagreed or strongly disagreed. Fish and Wildlife Service scientists were asked if, in their experience, scientific documents generally reflect technically rigorous evaluations of impacts to listed species and associated habitats. 22.4 percent disagreed or strongly disagreed. EPA scientists were asked if EPA determinations and actions are consistent with the scientific findings contained in agency documents and reports. 36.7 percent said occasionally, seldom or never.

HAS THERE BEEN POLITICAL MEDDLING?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>NMFS</th>
<th>FWS</th>
<th>EPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes 58%</td>
<td>Yes 73.2%</td>
<td>Yes 34.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Union of Concerned Scientists and other groups surveyed scientists with NOAA Fisheries, the Fish and Wildlife Service and the EPA about political interference. NOAA Fisheries scientists were asked if they agreed that high-level U.S. Department of Commerce administrators or appointees have inappropriately altered NOAA Fisheries determinations. 58.0 percent of them either agreed or strongly agreed. Fish and Wildlife Service scientists were asked if they knew of cases where U.S. Department of Interior appointees have injected themselves into Ecological Services determinations. 73.2 percent agreed or strongly agreed. EPA scientists were asked how many cases did they know of where EPA political appointees have inappropriately involved themselves in scientific decisions. 34.2 percent said they knew of some or many such cases.

Bad Math at NOAA

Critics of NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service's management of salmon and other ocean resources often generates conflicts of interest and confusing policies. The agency's Office of Protected Resources enforces the endangered species act for marine species, while its Sustainable Fisheries division promotes commercial exploitation.

This conflicting duties, according to a survey of NMFS scientists, create a working environment that is rife with political interference. Comments given in the PEER survey included:

- "The scientific integrity of the National Marine Fisheries Service is compromised by getting industry and the Administration out of the Regional Administrators offices. Also, take Protected Resources out of NMFS!! We are the fox watching (and killing) the henhouse."

- "It seems that we are encouraged to think too much about the consequences and how to get around them, rather than just basing our recommendations on the best available data."

- "This Administration is the worst in my life with regard to natural resources protection, and yet somehow the public is generally unaware of this fact. Perhaps if it were addressed by the media or academia it would help improve our scientific integrity, not to mention our natural resources."

NMFS scientists regularly review dam operations in western rivers where conflicts with salmon often lead to tragic consequences. Federal courts have often ruled that the agency has failed to protect salmon from impacts from dams, especially in the Columbia-Snake, Klamath and Sacramento-San Joaquin river systems.

In 2000, NOAA Fisheries biologist Mike Kelly was assigned to analyze federal irrigation hydro projects in the Klamath River basin to ensure that they did not jeopardize listed salmon species. In 2001, in the face of a debilitating drought, a lawsuit filed by Earthjustice on behalf of commercial fishermen and environmentalists prodded the Bureau of Reclamation to dramatically reduce water deliveries to farmers in the basin so that downstream coho salmon had a fighting chance. NOAA had found that water transfers to farms in the Klamath were jeopardizing the coho.

Kelly's job called on him to determine whether 2002 water deliveries might also harm the fish. But that year the Bureau of Reclamation had declared that there was sufficient water for all needs and proceeded to keep most of the water in upstream reservoirs for summer irrigation. This deprived young salmon of the water they needed to make their escape to sea, and jeopardized the coho fry that needed hiding and feeding areas in the streamside vegetation.

A federal judge refused to order the bureau to provide water necessary for the immediate survival of young salmon. As the summer of 2002 wore on, the flows released by the federal Bureau of Reclamation declined as more water was diverted to farmers upstream. The water diversions led to a massive die-off of salmon, steelhead and other fish in the Klamath.

"My immediate supervisor advised me that she had been informed that Vice President Cheney had been briefed," Kelly told a House committee chaired by Rep. Nick Rahall in 2007. "That is the only time that the Vice President was mentioned to me during the consultation process." Kelly told the committee, "I was aware that President Bush had declared that he would do everything he could to get the water for the farms."

Kelly said he realized that political pressure might be applied, but believed that his supervisors would shield him from pressure.

He developed a draft biological opinion, in which he found that removing water from the river would jeopardize the existence of coho salmon. But the Department of Justice under Attorney General John Ashcroft deemed Kelly's work "indefensible."

"I was never told what was indefensible about it, and I think Justice was mistaken in their conclusion," Kelly said.

Jim Lecky, the Assistant Southwest Region Administrator at the time, traveled to Kelly's field office in Arcata, California, to review an analysis that the Justice Department would deem "defensible."" Kelly considered Lecky's analysis to be "much weaker" than his. "I viewed it as a somewhat complicated case of 1-1-1-2. I never suspected that it would be asked to support the conclusion that 1-1-1-3, but I was."

But before Lecky came to Arcata, and before Kelly's original draft analysis had been reviewed by Justice, he sent a letter to Reclamation saying that they had already overdosed the Klamath Project "was not likely to adversely affect" coho salmon if they operated the project as proposed.

"This is when I began to worry," Kelly says.

Then came the fish kill. The Fish and Wildlife Service said low river flows in the Klamath River were a key factor in the deaths of the 64,000 adult salmon and other fish.

Kelly asked to be dismissed from the project because "I would not participate in an illegal action. I never took insubordination lightly, and this was by far the most difficult moment of my professional life. But I was being asked to provide scientific support for a 1-1-1-3 conclusion, which, of course, would be a clear violation of my professional ethics and official federal ethics rules, as well as a possible violation of the law."

Kelly was never reprimanded, and, in fact, received an award for his work. "Clearly it didn't matter if I was a 1-1-3. They had obviously been ordered to push the thing through anyway."

Ultimately, the courts found the flawed analysis — known as a BiOp, or biological opinion — to be illegal under the Endangered Species Act.

He now says there is strong evidence that salmon were killed due to a "blandly illegal decision," and thinks there should be a investigation by the appropriate authorities, including those outside the agencies, such as the Public Integrity Section of the Justice Department, to determine whether any criminal violations of any law may have occurred.

Conflicts in these salmon rivers remain unsolved. Federal Judge James R. Redden has rejected three salmon protection plans in the Columbia; salmon in the Sacramento are now in sharp decline, a direct result of summer irrigation; and the Klamath's salmon are subject to fish-killing dams and irrigation systems that withdraw too much water.

Meanwhile, Jim Lecky, the NMFS official who released the flawed analysis to support the 1-1-1-3 conclusion, and whose role in the咨询 killed millions of fish in the Klamath, has been promoted. He is now head of NMFS' Office of Protected Resources, where he is in charge of promoting endangered fish, marine mammals and all other species that live in all U.S. ocean waters.
Fixing Bush’s Mangled Mess

100 things President Obama can do right away

A trail in the proposed Mount Hood Wilderness. A bill that would establish the wilderness area has been blocked by Oklahoma Sen. Tom Coburn.

Economics

12) Require a full accounting of the economic benefits of protecting and preserving ecosystems. Studies by the Eugene-based Pacific Rivers Council found that the BLM, in its forest plan for Western Oregon, failed to account in any meaningful way for the costs that increased logging and reduced environmental protection would bring to communities.

13) Reimplement the ban on offshore drilling.

14) Institute a cap-and-trade system for carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases.

15) Make massive investments in alternatives to fossil fuels.

23) Expand tax breaks for renewable energy projects.

24) Set a national standard requiring that 40 percent of electricity in this country comes from renewable sources by 2020.

25) Give vigorous support to alternative energy research and development, as it is critical to achieving practical solutions.

26) End subsidies for the fossil fuel and nuclear industries.

27) Focus research on technologies and fuels that can deliver the greatest environmental gains, including hybrid and fuel cell cars, and the cleanest forms of hydrogen production.

28) Protect tribal treaty rights to clean water and to catch and consume fish.

29) Guarantee that low-income communities are not vulnerable to schemes that would privatize or drive up the cost of drinking water.

30) End the government’s incentives for corn-based ethanol production, which have been blamed for contributing to the crisis of rising food prices.

31) Ban genetically modified foods.

32) Strengthen international protection for tropical rainforests. The benefits of forest protection to fighting global warming are not well understood. If the current rates of deforestation in Brazil and Indonesia alone were to remain unchanged through 2012, the emissions from this deforestation would offset nearly 80 percent of the emission reductions gained from the Kyoto Protocol.

33) Protect Pacific Northwest temperate rainforests because they can attain the greatest biomass per acre of any ecosystem on earth. Temperate and boreal forests are very extensive and currently serve as net carbon sinks.

34) Protect forests in the Southeast, which along with Northwest forests could double their storage of carbon if timber managers lengthened the time between harvests and allowed older trees to remain standing.

35) Halve continued destruction of forests by supporting a “compensated reductions” system, whereby a country that committed to reducing deforestation would be issued certificates that it could sell on the open market.

Information

36) Re-open the Environmental Protection Agency’s specialized library for research on the properties and effects of new chemicals. This library, in EPA’s Washington D.C. headquarters, had provided research services to EPA scientists and EPA contractors who review industry requests for the introduction of new chemicals into the market. Without any public announcement or notice to its staff, EPA shut down the library in October 2006. Its holdings were dispersed and many journals “recycled.”

37) In December 2007, after nearly a third of EPA libraries had been closed when Congress intervened and ordered EPA to re-open libraries but not improve the agency’s ability to do research on chemicals. Ensure that the plan guarantees openness and access to information.

Nuclear Waste

38) Ban the development of new nuclear power plants until the issue of nuclear waste is resolved.

39) Reject plans to dispose of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, out of concern for the potential contamination of the groundwater.

40) Continue the prohibition on reprocessing spent nuclear fuel for nonproliferation concerns.

41) Cleanup the massively contaminated former defense nuclear sites such as Hanford.

Oceans

42) Although a few government agencies and private-sector researchers are exploring the possibility of “fertilizing”
our oceans with iron to enhance their natural capacity to absorb carbon, it is unwise to clean up our atmosphere at the expense of our oceans. This approach holds serious risks for marine animals and plants, disrupting the marine web of life.

43) Stop NOAA Fisheries proposals that weaken the nation’s bedrock environmental review and public participation in fisheries management. The proposal opens the door for fishery managers to slip environmental review altogether and severely curtails the public’s right to have a say in how our oceans are managed.

44) End the “cat running the fishhouse” system of ocean management. Generally, only fishery industry insiders are appointed to the eight regional fishery management councils. Very rarely will an environmental advocate receive an appointment. The system was created at a time when the industry believed few outsiders understood much about fisheries. Today, many respected experts work for non-governmental organizations and would make excellent members of these councils, yet their applications are almost always rejected.

45) End overfishing.

46) Ban fishing techniques like long-lining in areas where they pose harm to endangered sea turtles.

47) Encourage an international treaty to protect endangered sea turtles from long-lining.

48) Replace Kitty Simonds, executive director of the Western Pacific Fisheries Management Council for her refusal to implement conservation policies.

Pesticides

49) Require the use of pesticides in water to be subject to National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits. Pesticides can have a significant, harmful effect on salmon, and can damage rivers, lakes and oceans. Bush reversed a policy requiring the permits.

Political Meddling in Science

50) Create explicit policies that reinforce a culture of scientific openness, allow government scientists to do their jobs without political interference, and punish political appointees and others at federal agencies who interfere with science.

Salmon

51) Remove four salmon-killing dams on the Columbia and Snake rivers, recognizing the positive economic benefits that would result.

52) Reopen negotiations for water settlement in the Klamath Basin to strengthen watershed restoration measures and retain more water in the river for fish, in addition to a mandate to remove dams.

Scientific Integrity

53) Engage in a systematic review of all decisions where the science behind decisions may have been altered or distorted.

54) Give government scientists the right to conduct their research without interference, and whistleblower protections to those who report political interference in the work of government agencies.

55) Establish procedures for whistleblowers to challenge scientific misconduct through safe and confidential disclosure channels.

56) Ensure that basic scientific freedoms of federal scientists are respected.

57) Ensure that the public and policy makers have unfettered access to unbiased federal scientific research and analysis.

58) Give agencies the responsibility of addressing concerns of scientific misconduct. According to the Union of Concerned Scientists, those systems either do not exist or lack credibility.

59) Agencies should demand that channels should incorporate anti-retaliation rights. Agencies should demand that channels should incorporate anti-retaliation rights and be grounded in fair procedures free from conflict of interest.

60) Require agencies to make public the scientific rationale for decisions that are based on science, such as the decision to list a species on the endangered species list.

61) Require the public disclosure of the name of each employee who participated in the decision.

62) If scientists have significant concerns about the decision, they should have the opportunity to make their concerns public. The public deserves an explanation about why they concerns of scientists have been ignored if the decision is supposed to be based on science.

63) Those who misuse science for political purposes need to be held accountable for their actions.

64) Ensure that scientists and other staff have the fundamental right to express their personal views, provided they specify that they are not speaking on behalf of, or as a representative of, the agency but rather in their private capacity.

65) Ensure employees have the right to review, approve, and comment publicly on the final version of any proposed publication that significantly relies on their research, identifies them as an author or contributor, or purports to represent their scientific opinion.

66) Create an internal disclosure system to allow for the confidential reporting and meaningful resolution of inappropriate alterations, conduct, or conflicts of interest that arise with regard to media communications.

67) Include provisions to actively train staff and post employee rights to scientific freedom in all workplaces and public areas.

68) Give scientists the right to publish their research in peer-reviewed scientific literature.

69) Do not allow agencies to ask scientists and other experts under consideration for membership on scientific advisory committees about their political or policy positions or voting history, factors the National Academy of Sciences has deemed to be as relevant to a scientist’s ability to serve as a fellow or eye color, according to the Union of Concerned Scientists.

70) Restore funding to the Office of Technology Assessment, which Congress established to help make decisions that rely heavily on science and technology, especially in response to the growing demand for nonpartisan and objective analyses of complex scientific issues, such as nuclear weapons or pesticide use. But in 1995, all funding for the OTA was cut, leaving it effectively abolished.

The Bush administration failed to protect all but a few miles of the endangered bull trout’s habitat in the Northwest. The administration also produced an economic cost-benefit analysis of the critical habitat plan that omitted all mention of benefits. Fish and Wildlife Service photo.

Transportation

71) Require the auto industry to offer consumers more fuel-efficient vehicles by raising the average gas mileage — the Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) — to 40 miles per gallon on their fleets. Bring SUVs up to the same standards as cars.

72) Offer tax credits to consumers who buy advanced technology vehicles such as hybrids (a combination of gasoline and self-charging electric battery engine) and new fuel cell vehicles that will hit the market within the next decade.

73) Increase access to public mass transit by supporting a bill sponsored by Rep. Earl Blumenauer, Democrat from Oregon. The bill would:

74) Expand public transportation to help transit agencies deal with high fuel prices.

75) Encourage pay-as-you-drive auto insurance policies that discourage driving by rewarding low mileage drivers with lower insurance premiums.

76) Reduce commuting costs by providing incentives to employers and employees to take transit, bicycle, carpool, walk, or telecommute to work.

77) Help local governments manage transportation demand, and create walkable, bikeable communities that are well-served by transit.

78) Educate consumers on the environmental, energy, and economic benefits of transportation alternatives versus the single occupancy vehicle.

Watershed Restoration

81) Increase funding for watershed restoration, which suffered under the Bush administration. Money is needed to repair or remove decaying Forest Service roads that contaminate drinking water and habitat for salmon and other fish. The Forest Service estimates that if roadwork begins today, it will take $300 million during the next 10 years to solve the problem.

Wilderness

82) Help the U.S. Senate override Oklahoma Sen. Tom Coburn’s effort to block the creation of the proposed 128,000-acre Mount Hood Wilderness. The president should also back bills to create new wilderness in:

83) Alaska.
84) Arizona.
85) California.
86) Colorado.
87) Georgia.
88) Idaho.
89) Michigan.
90) Montana.
91) Nevada.
92) New Mexico.
93) Northern Rockies.
94) Oregon.
95) Pennsylvania.
96) South Dakota.
97) Utah.
98) Virginia.
100) West Virginia.
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1000 Friends of Oregon
1000 Friends of Oregon works to conserve farm and forest lands, protect natural and scenic resources, and promote livable cities with transportation and housing choices. 1000 Friends is currently working on the three-year Oregon Coastal Futures Project, a collaborative effort to help plan for the future of one of Oregon's great treasures. With your help, we can continue to advocate for protection of Oregon's coastal and natural resources.
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P.O. Box 10559 Anchorage, AK 99510-0599
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Citizens group working to protect the quality of the Columbia River and all life dependent on her.
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PO Box 1254, Hood River OR 97031
(541) 387-3030
721 NW 9th, Suite 300, Portland, OR
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Earthjustice
Earthjustice is a nonprofit public interest law firm dedicated to protecting the magnificent places, natural resources, and wildlife of this earth, and to defending the right of all people to a healthy environment. We bring about far-reaching change by enforcing and strengthening environmental laws on behalf of hundreds of organizations, coalitions and communities.
426 17th Street, 6th Floor
Oakland, CA 94612-2820
(510) 550-6700
(800) 584-4640
Alaska
325 Fourth Street
Juneau, AK 99801
(907) 586-2751
juneauoffice@earthjustice.org; California
426 Seventeenth Street, 5th Floor
Northwest
705 Second Avenue, Suite 203
Seattle, WA 98104
(206) 343-7340
seattleoffice@earthjustice.org

Environmental Defense
Founded in 1967, Environmental Defense links science, economics, and law to create innovative and equitable solutions to society's most urgent environmental problems.
P.O. Box 520
Wilton, WA 98801
426 Seventeenth Street, 5th Floor
Northwest
705 Second Avenue, Suite 203
Seattle, WA 98104
(206) 343-7340
seattleoffice@earthjustice.org
www.ed.org/hawaii

Environmental Protection Information Center (EPIC)
The Environmental Protection Information Center was formed by community activists more than 30 years ago, and works to protect and restore ancient forests, watersheds, coastal estuaries, and native species throughout Northwest California. EPIC uses an integrated, science-based approach, combining public education, citizen advocacy, and strategic litigation.
P.O. Box 397 Galtville, CA 95542
(707) 923-2931
www.wildcalifornia.org

Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs
Established in 1932 for Mutual Service and for the Promotion of the Proper Use, Enjoyment and Protection of America's Scenic Wilderness and Outdoor Recreation Resources. The federation's purposes include to unite its member clubs behind a shared agenda of conservation goals, and to help its member clubs become more effective in their own conservation work.
www.fedwesternoutdoorclubs.org

FLOW (Friends of Living Our Waters)
FLOW's mission is to provide legal oversight, monitoring and public education to help protect Oregon Waters from the impacts of pollution and development. P.O. Box 2478
Grants Pass, OR 97526
www.oregonwaters.org; flow@oregonwaters.org

Green Fire Productions
Green Fire Productions has produced a new documentary, Common Ground: Oregon's Ocean, that examines Oregon's ocean ecosystems and looks for ways to protect their marine biodiversity and enhance fisheries.
P.O. Box 14906, Portland, OR 97293
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citizens accountable. With our sister organization, OLCV Education Fund, we coordinate the Oregon Conservation Network: a coalition of conservation groups that lobbies the Legislature. OLCV’s Scorecard rates legislators’ environmental voting record. OLCV’s PAC endorses candidates and supports those in tough races with money and volunteers.
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Oregon Wild
Oregon Wild (formerly the Oregon Natural Resources Council or ONRC) has been instrumental in securing permanent legislative protection for some of Oregon’s most precious landscapes, including nearly 1.5 million acres of Wilderness, 95,000 acres of forests in Bull Run/Little Sandy watersheds (to safeguard the quality of Portland’s water supply) and almost 1,700 miles of Wild and Scenic Rivers. 5625 North Gresham, Portland, OR 97217-3900 · (503) 283-6343 · info@oregonwild.org · www.oregonwild.org/

Pacific Rivers Council
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Rainbow Video and Film Productions
Producing documentaries on threats to our air, water and forests. Working with citizen groups using videos as activist tools. Teaching production skills to young activists.

Sightline
Sightline is the only daily on-line news service for the Cascadia Rainforest. daily.sightline.org

Union of Concerned Scientists
The Union of Concerned Scientists brings independent, sound science to some of the most critical environmental and global security challenges of our day.

Waterwatch of Oregon
WaterWatch works to keep water in its natural course – thus protecting fish and wildlife.

Western Environmental Law Center
The Western Environmental Law Center (WELC) is a nonprofit public interest law firm that works to protect and restore western wildlands and advocates for a healthy environment on behalf of communities throughout the West.
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