



**Comments on the  
Land Management Plan Revision for the  
Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forests**

Submitted by:

**North American Packgoat Association**

**April 20, 2020**

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. Introduction to Comments .....	2
II. Legal Background for the Comments .....	2
A. NEPA Prohibits Uninformed Agency Action .....	2
B. Review Under the APA .....	3
III. Background on the LMP Revision .....	4
IV. Comments on the DEIS and LMP Revision.....	5
1. There is No Justification for Curtailment of Goatpacking on the Forest. ....	5
2. The DEIS Misrepresents the Science on Disease Transmission from Domestic Goats, Especially Pack Goats. To Ensure the Scientific Integrity of the DEIS and Forest Plan, the Nez Perce-Clearwater Must Correct and/or Remove False or Unsupported Statements Concerning Pack Goats from the DEIS and LMP Revision. ....	6
3. Statements in the DEIS Concerning Effects of the Current Plans Must be Revised to Reflect Current Science on Disease Transmission from Pack Goats. ....	7
4. The Nez Perce-Clearwater Must Consider Dr. Margaret Highland’s Research Concerning the Limited Prevalence of Mycoplasma ovipneumoniae in Pack Goats. ....	7
5. The DEIS Must Specifically Identify and Discuss the Threat of Disease Transmission from Pack Goats to Bighorn Sheep.....	8
6. The Nez Perce-Clearwater Must Consult the Agricultural Research Service, within the United States Department of Agriculture, Before Preparing the Final EIS and Record of Decision. ....	10
7. The Nez Perce-Clearwater Fails to Account for the Important Differences Between Pack Goats and Herd Domestic Goats and Domestic Sheep.....	11
8. The Nez Perce-Clearwater Fails to Adequately Explain and Analyze the Proposed Provisions to Prevent Disease Transmission Between Domestic goats and Bighorn Sheep. ....	13
9. The Nez Perce-Clearwater Must Evaluate Alternatives that Consider Strengthening Bighorn Sheep Immunity to Disease. ....	15

10. Epidemiological Modeling is Needed to Understand How a Range of Factors Affect the Dynamics of Disease Spread Under Various Management Alternatives.....	16
11. The Nez Perce-Clearwater Fails to Consider the Most Important Aspects of the Problem in the DEIS.....	17
12. The DEIS Does Not Properly Address the Relevance of Unavailable or Incomplete Scientific Information.....	18
13. The Nez Perce-Clearwater must Obtain Additional Information for the DEIS.....	19

**VIA ELECTRONIC SUBMITTAL**

**RE: Comments on the Land Management Plan Revision for the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forests**

To: Nez Perce Clearwater National Forests  
Attn: Zach Peterson, Forest Planner  
903 3rd Street  
Kamiah, ID 83536  
Electronic Submittal: <https://cara.ecosystem-management.org/Public/CommentInput?project=44089>


Responsible  
Official: Cheryl F. Probert, Forest Supervisor  
Nez Perce Clearwater National Forests  
903 3rd Street  
Kamiah, ID 83536

From: Andrew A. Irvine  
of Andrew A. Irvine, P.C.  
P.O. Box 3221  
Jackson, WY 83001  
Phone: (307) 690-8383  
Email: [andy@andrewirvinelaw.com](mailto:andy@andrewirvinelaw.com)

On behalf of: North American Packgoat Association  
Curtis King, President  
P.O. Box 170166  
Boise, ID 83717  
Phone: (509) 539-0982  
Email: [curtis.king66@yahoo.com](mailto:curtis.king66@yahoo.com)

On behalf of the North American Packgoat Association, I hereby timely submit these Comments on the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forests (“Nez Perce-Clearwater”) Draft Environmental Impact Statement (“DEIS”) for the Land Management Plan Revision (“LMP Revision”). If you have any questions concerning these comments or need further information, you may contact NAPgA or Andrew Irvine at the emails and phone numbers indicated above.

Date: ~~April 20, 2020~~



---

Andrew A. Irvine  
of Andrew A. Irvine, P.C.

## **I. Introduction to Comments**

The North American Packgoat Association (“NAPgA”) timely submits comments on the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forests (“Nez Perce-Clearwater”) Draft Environmental Impact Statement (“DEIS”) for the Land Management Plan Revision (“LMP Revision”). Notice of the Draft Land Management Plan Revision for the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forests appeared at 84 Fed. Reg. 70,187 (Dec. 20, 2019) and provided a comment deadline of March 19, 2020. The Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forests extended this deadline to April 20, 2020 on their website and in a message from the Forest Supervisor. *See* <https://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/nezperceclearwater/landmanagement/planning/?cid=fseprd682962#DEIS> (providing April 14, 2020 video update concerning comments and stating “FORMAL COMMENT PERIOD RUNS DECEMBER 20, 2019 to APRIL 20, 2020”); *see also* <https://cara.ecosystem-management.org/Public/CommentInput?project=44089> (stating “Your comments are requested by 4/20/2020”).

The North American Packgoat Association, Inc. is an organization established specifically for promoting packing with pack goats. The organization was incorporated in March 2001 as a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization. NAPgA seeks to further the pursuit of goatpacking by sharing the knowledge, ideas and experiences of its members, by promoting the use of pack goats to the public as a means of low impact wilderness transportation and recreation, by serving as an advisory group on local and national land use issues, and by engaging in other activities related to educating the public about goatpacking.

NAPgA appreciates this opportunity to comment on the Nez Perce-Clearwater DEIS for the LMP Revision. NAPgA and its numerous goatpacking-members will be affected by the management direction proposed in the draft LMP Revision. The proposed management direction would result in the curtailment of goatpacking in one of the premier goatpacking areas in the nation, and set a bad precedent for other forests to follow in managing goatpacking as a recreational use. These comments will better inform the DEIS and LMP Revision and further develop the efficacy of the management direction as defined by the LMP Revision.

## **II. Legal Background for the Comments**

### **A. NEPA Prohibits Uninformed Agency Action**

In passing NEPA, Congress “recogniz[ed] the profound impact of man’s activity on the interrelations of all components of the natural environment” and set out “to create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony.” 42 U.S.C. § 4331(a). To bring federal action in line with Congress’ goals and to foster environmentally informed decision-making by federal agencies, NEPA “establishes ‘action-forcing’ procedures that require agencies to take a ‘hard look’ at environmental consequences.” *W. Watersheds Project v. Kraayenbrink*, 632 F.3d 472, 486 (9th Cir. 2011) (citing *Metcalf v. Daley*, 214 F.3d 1135, 1141 (9th Cir. 2000)). Foremost among those procedures is the preparation of an environmental impact statement (“EIS”). *Id.*

Agencies considering “major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment” are required to prepare an EIS. 42 U.S.C. § 4332(C). The EIS “shall

provide full and fair discussion of [the] significant environmental impacts” of the proposed action. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.1. That discussion serves two purposes:

First, it ensures that the agency, in reaching its decision, will have available, and will carefully consider, detailed information concerning significant environmental impacts. Second, it guarantees that the relevant information will be made available to the larger audience that may also play a role in both the decisionmaking process and the implementation of that decision.

*W. Watersheds Project*, 632 F.3d at 487 (quoting *Dep't of Transp. v. Pub. Citizen*, 541 U.S. 752, 768 (2004)). This process does not mandate particular substantive results, but “NEPA . . . prohibits uninformed . . . agency action.” *Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizens Council*, 490 U.S. 332, 351 (1989). By focusing agency and public attention on the environmental effects of proposed action, “NEPA ensures that the agency will not act on incomplete information, only to regret its decision after it is too late to correct.” *Marsh v. ONRC*, 490 U.S. 360, 371 (1989).

## **B. Review Under the APA**

The Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”), 5 U.S.C. §§ 701-706, provides for judicial review of agency actions, such as those at issue here.<sup>1</sup> Under the APA, a reviewing court shall “hold unlawful and set aside agency action, findings, and conclusions found to be . . . arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law; . . . [or] without observance of procedures required by law.” 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A), (D). Although the arbitrary and capricious standard is a “narrow one,” the court is required to “engage in a substantial inquiry” and a “thorough, probing, in-depth review.” *Native Ecosystems Council v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 418 F.3d 953, 960 (9th Cir. 2005) (quoting *Citizens to Preserve Overton Park, Inc. v. Volpe*, 401 U.S. 402, 415-16 (1971)).

Under this standard, an agency decision is to be reversed as arbitrary and capricious if the agency has “. . . entirely failed to consider an important aspect of the problem, [or] offered an explanation that runs counter to the evidence before the agency. . . .” *Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass'n v. State Farm Mutual Auto. Ins. Co.*, 463 U.S. 29, 43 (1983). “The reviewing court should not attempt itself to make up for such deficiencies.” *Id.* (citation omitted). Most fundamentally, the agency must “examine the relevant data and articulate a satisfactory explanation for its action including a ‘rational connection between the facts found and the choice made.’” *Motor Vehicle*, 463 U.S. at 53 (quotation omitted).

Where, as here, there has been a change in policy from allowing goatpacking on the Nez Perce-Clearwater to curtailing goatpacking on the Forest, judicial review starts with the

---

<sup>1</sup> NEPA claims are subject to judicial review under the APA, 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A). See *Dep't of Transp. v. Pub. Citizen*, 541 U.S. at 763; *Marsh*, 490 U.S. at 375–76; *League of Wilderness Defenders-Blue Mtns. Biodiversity Project v. U.S.*, 549 F.3d 1211, 1215 (9th Cir. 2008) (the APA provides authority for the court’s review of decisions under NEPA); *W. Watersheds Project v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 2006 WL 292010, \*2 (D. Idaho) (same).

presumption that the change in policy is *not* justified by the administrative record. *Motor Vehicle*, 463 U.S. at 42. Additionally, the traditional presumption of agency expertise “may be rebutted if the decisions, even though based on scientific expertise, are not reasoned.” *W. Watersheds Project v. Ashe*, No. 11-462, 2013 WL 2433370 at \*5 (D. Idaho June 4, 2013) (citations omitted).

In addition to the requirements of the NEPA and the APA, Forest Service regulations require that “best available science” be taken into account in forest planning. 36 C.F.R. § 219.3. In taking “best available science” into account, the Forest Service must “document how the best available science information was used to inform the assessment, the plan decision, and the monitoring program” and such documentation must “[i]dentify what information was determined to be the best available scientific information, explain the basis for that determination, and explain how the information was applied to the issues considered.” *Id.*

### **III. Background on the LMP Revision**

The LMP Revision makes significant changes to the Nez Perce-Clearwater’s existing management of goatpacking on the Forest. At Standard FW-STD-WL-02, the Forest provides: “In order to prevent disease transmission between wild and domestic sheep, domestic sheep or goat grazing shall not be authorized in or within 16 miles of bighorn sheep occupied core herd home ranges.” *See also* DEIS at 3.5.3-18 (similar). At Guideline FW-GDL-WL-05, the Forest adds: “New authorizations and permit reauthorizations for domestic goat packing should include provisions to prevent disease transmission between domestic goats and bighorn sheep.”

As apparent reasoning for these changes, the LMP Revision in Section 1.1.2.4.1 Wildlife Species, Bighorn Sheep, indicates: “The primary reason the bighorn declined is due to their susceptibility to pneumonia after exposure to bacteria (*Pasteurella* spp.), viruses (Parainfluenza type-3), lungworm, and stress agents. Sources of these diseases are generally domestic sheep and goats. Major reductions or total extirpation of bighorn herds due to pneumonia outbreaks are well documented.” The LMP Revision adds: “Bighorn in the planning area have survived when other regional populations have been reduced or extirpated. This, coupled with the fact that domestic sheep grazing on the Nez Perce-Clearwater has been ongoing for centuries, make these populations of bighorn particularly interesting. In fact, individuals of this population have served as the source for other bighorn re-introductions around the west (Mack, Kasprzak, & Luiz, 2017).” These same statements are echoed verbatim in the DEIS at page 1-15.

With regard to potential impacts to bighorn sheep, the DEIS provides:

The primary limiting factor for Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep in the plan area is disease. Domestic sheep, goats, and other exotic relatives of bighorn sheep carry diseases that are lethal to bighorns and can have lasting effects on population performance. Bighorn sheep in the Salmon River and Hells Canyon population management units experienced high rates of mortality in pneumonia outbreaks in the 1980s and 1990s, likely originating from contact with domestic sheep. Those populations have not recovered, and bighorn populations are currently limited by low lamb survival primarily due to pneumonia caused mortality (Idaho Department of Fish and Game, 2010). Disease transmission to bighorn sheep can

be controlled by maintaining separation between bighorn sheep and domestic sheep and goats.

DEIS at 3.2.3.4-11 – 12. There is no other discussion of potential impacts from goats on bighorn sheep in the plan area. *See* DEIS at 3.2.3.4-11 – 13.

With regard to wildlife management the DEIS adds:

Plan components require provisions to be included for domestic goat packing. This includes goat packing by outfitters and guides and by recreational and subsistence hunters, as well as for general recreation purposes. Goat packing is an activity that occurs on the Nez Perce-Clearwater. Any provisions that limit the ability of goats to be used for packing activities would negatively impact those recreation uses. This guideline may greatly curtail goat packing on the Nez Perce-Clearwater, depending on the provisions assigned.

DEIS at 3.4.2-24. There is no further discussion of potential impacts on goatpacking. *See* DEIS at 3.4-2-24 – 25.

#### **IV. Comments on the DEIS and LMP Revision**

To assist the Nez Perce-Clearwater, NAPgA's comments generally refer to specific pages of the DEIS and LMP Revision that form the basis for each comment; however, some comments may apply more broadly. Comments are intended to apply to all listed pages, or generally, and should be addressed in the context of each of the listed pages or in general.

NAPgA looks forward to the Nez Perce-Clearwater's responses to its comments. In addition to its general obligation to respond to public comments under 40 C.F.R. § 1503.4(a), the Nez Perce-Clearwater must specifically "discuss at appropriate points in the final [EIS] any responsible opposing view which was not adequately discussed in the draft [EIS] and . . . indicate the agency's response to the issues raised." *Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 349 F.3d 1157, 1167 (9th Cir. 2003) (quoting 40 C.F.R. § 1502.9(b)). A failure to do so is itself a NEPA violation. *Id.* at 1168. The Nez Perce-Clearwater must also "insure the professional integrity, including scientific integrity, of the discussions and analyses" included in its DEIS. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.24.

##### **1. There is No Justification for Curtailment of Goatpacking on the Forest.**

The DEIS and LMP Revision both state: "Bighorn in the planning area have survived when other regional populations have been reduced or extirpated. This, coupled with the fact that domestic sheep grazing on the Nez Perce-Clearwater has been ongoing for centuries, make these populations of bighorn particularly interesting. In fact, individuals of this population have served as the source for other bighorn re-introductions around the west (Mack, Kasprzak, & Luiz, 2017)." DEIS at 1-15; LMP Revision § 1.1.2.4.1. In other words, the population of bighorn on the Nez Perce-Clearwater has remained healthy under past management direction. So, why is the Nez Perce-Clearwater now changing management direction? If it ain't broke, don't fix it. There is no justification provided for changing past management direction with regard to management of domestic goats on the Nez Perce-Clearwater. Any change needs to be



explained and justified, as applicable to the population of bighorn sheep on the Nez Perce-Clearwater.

**2. The DEIS Misrepresents the Science on Disease Transmission from Domestic Goats, Especially Pack Goats. To Ensure the Scientific Integrity of the DEIS and Forest Plan, the Nez Perce-Clearwater Must Correct and/or Remove False or Unsupported Statements Concerning Pack Goats from the DEIS and LMP Revision.**

In evaluating the environmental impacts of a proposed action, NEPA requires federal agencies to ensure the scientific integrity of an EIS by considering appropriate studies and data. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.24. The Nez Perce-Clearwater must “insure the professional integrity, including scientific integrity, of the discussions and analyses” included in its DEIS. *Id.* An agency may not rely on conclusory statements unsupported by data, authorities, or explanatory information. *Seattle Audubon Soc’y v. Moseley*, 798 F. Supp. 1473, 1480-83 (W.D. Wash. 1992), *aff’d*, 998 F.2d 699 (9th Cir. 1993). NEPA requires that an agency candidly disclose in its EIS the risks and effects of its proposed actions, and that it respond to adverse opinions held by respected scientists. *Seattle Audubon*, 798 F. Supp. at 1482 (citing *Friends of the Earth v. Hall*, 693 F. Supp. 904, 937 (W.D. Wash. 1988)). Further, under NEPA, courts have held that agency actions based on unexplained assumptions are arbitrary and capricious. *Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. U.S. Dep’t of the Interior*, 623 F.3d 633, 650 (9th Cir. 2010); *see also Dow Agrosciences LLC v. Nat’l Marine Fisheries Serv.*, 707 F.3d 462, 470 (4th Cir. 2013) (agency must explain why lab tests reflect nature).

The Nez Perce-Clearwater has failed to ensure the professional integrity, including scientific integrity, of the discussions and analyses in the DEIS as required under NEPA. The Nez Perce-Clearwater appears to be operating on incomplete information concerning disease transmission from domestic goats, including pack goats, to bighorn sheep, and also appears to be ignoring important aspects of the problem of disease transmission as well as offering explanations in the DEIS that run counter to the evidence before the Nez Perce-Clearwater. Much of the analysis and discussion in the DEIS lacks factual or scientific support.

The DEIS and LMP Revision indicate: “The primary reason the bighorn declined is due to their susceptibility to pneumonia after exposure to bacteria (*Pasteurella* spp.), viruses (Parainfluenza type-3), lungworm, and stress agents. Sources of these diseases are generally domestic sheep and goats. Major reductions or total extirpation of bighorn herds due to pneumonia outbreaks are well documented.” DEIS at 1-15; LMP Revision § 1.1.2.4.1. Where is the scientific justification for these statements as applied to domestic goats, and in particular pack goats? No scientific references are provided. Also, how do these statements apply to bighorn sheep populations on the Nez Perce-Clearwater? The DEIS and LMP Revision both confirm that despite centuries of grazing, the population of bighorn sheep on the Nez Perce-Clearwater have survived, so what decline and/or “major reductions or total extirpation” are referenced above? *See id.* There are no facts or scientific references provided to support the statements in the DEIS and LMP Revision as they apply to domestic goats, especially pack goats, and the population of bighorn sheep on the Nez Perce-Clearwater.

The DEIS further adds:

The primary limiting factor for Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep in the plan area is disease. Domestic sheep, goats, and other exotic relatives of bighorn sheep carry diseases that are lethal to bighorns and can have lasting effects on population performance. Bighorn sheep in the Salmon River and Hells Canyon population management units experienced high rates of mortality in pneumonia outbreaks in the 1980s and 1990s, likely originating from contact with domestic sheep. Those populations have not recovered, and bighorn populations are currently limited by low lamb survival primarily due to pneumonia caused mortality (Idaho Department of Fish and Game, 2010). Disease transmission to bighorn sheep can be controlled by maintaining separation between bighorn sheep and domestic sheep and goats.

DEIS at 3.2.3.4-11 – 12.

Again, there are no facts or scientific references provided to support these statements as they apply to domestic goats, especially pack goats, and the population of bighorn sheep on the Nez Perce-Clearwater. If the population of bighorn sheep on the Nez Perce-Clearwater has survived for centuries, despite disease, how is disease now the limiting factor? Where is the scientific study showing that pack goats “carry diseases that are lethal to bighorns and can have lasting effects on population performance[?]” Please provide such information to the public for review and comment. Concerning pneumonia outbreaks, none of those are stated to have been caused by domestic goats, so who are goats being restricted on the Forest? These questions must be answered and the facts and science indicating that pack goats pose a risk of disease transmission on the Nez Perce-Clearwater must be provided. Moreover, the Forest must show how a previously healthy population of bighorns is now all of a sudden at risk of disease which it has withstood for centuries.

**3. Statements in the DEIS Concerning Effects of the Current Plans Must be Revised to Reflect Current Science on Disease Transmission from Pack Goats.**

The DEIS at 1-15 and LMP Revision § 1.1.2.4.1 insinuate that domestic goats, including pack goats, carry certain diseases that could be transmitted to bighorn sheep on the Nez Perce-Clearwater and result in mortality of bighorns. No cites are provided to justify such conclusion. When has a domestic goat, particularly a pack goat, ever transmitted disease to bighorn sheep in the wild? That has never happened. The conclusion above must be revised to exclude pack goats.

**4. The Nez Perce-Clearwater Must Consider Dr. Margaret Highland’s Research Concerning the Limited Prevalence of *Mycoplasma ovipneumoniae* in Pack Goats.**

The Nez Perce-Clearwater has failed to consider recent scientific research indicating that pack goats do not commonly carry *Mycoplasma ovipneumoniae*. This research by Dr. Margaret Highland, Research Veterinarian with the Animal Disease Research Unit-ARS-USDA is

presented in Exhibit B. Dr. Highland's research indicates that pack goats do not commonly carry the disease-causing organisms associated with bighorn sheep die-offs. The results of the testing performed for Dr. Highland's research are also included in Exhibit B, so that the Nez Perce-Clearwater can consider the results and verify the legitimacy and scientific method in the research. Dr. Highland's research is in the process of being published, but has already been presented, *see, e.g.*, <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/presentation/4bb7/616fa740f42ceda2c55d275f0a8032fc6ca8.pdf>, and has been considered by the Forest Service on numerous other occasions (except on the Nez Perce-Clearwater).

Under the APA and NEPA, the Nez Perce-Clearwater is required to consider the fundamental aspect of the problem of disease transmission, namely, whether pack goats can actually carry and transmit *M. ovi* to bighorn sheep in the wild. *See Motor Vehicle*, 463 U.S. at 43. The Nez Perce-Clearwater is also required to examine relevant data, consider opposing viewpoints, ensure the scientific integrity of its discussions, and articulate a satisfactory explanation for its action. *See id.* at 42-43, 53; *Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 349 F.3d at 1167 (quoting 40 C.F.R. § 1502.9(b)).

Moreover, and in addition to the requirements of the APA and NEPA, Forest Service regulations require that "best available science" be taken into account in forest planning. 36 C.F.R. § 219.3. In taking "best available science" into account, the Forest Service must "document how the best available science information was used to inform the assessment, the plan decision, and the monitoring program" and such documentation must "[i]dentify what information was determined to be the best available scientific information, explain the basis for that determination, and explain how the information was applied to the issues considered." *Id.* The Forest Service Land Management Planning Handbook, FSH 1909.12, directs the Nez Perce-Clearwater's use of the best available scientific information and provides that where research is relevant, accurate and reliable, the Forest Service should include it as the best available scientific information. *See* FSH 1909.12, 42.13.

As a result, this science presented by Dr. Highland must be considered in the DEIS under the APA and NEPA, as well as the implications of pack goats not being carriers of *M. ovi*. If pack goats are not carriers of disease-causing pathogens, then they do not pose a risk of disease transmission to bighorn sheep on the Nez Perce-Clearwater.

In sum, the Nez Perce-Clearwater must review and consider Dr. Highland's research in the DEIS. Such consideration is required by the APA, NEPA and the Forest Service's own planning regulations. Dr. Highland's research indicates that pack goats are rarely carriers of *M. ovi*. As a result, pack goats do not pose a significant risk of disease transmission to bighorn sheep on the Nez Perce-Clearwater. Pack goats cannot transmit disease they do not have. These points must be considered in the DEIS and LMP Revision.

##### **5. The DEIS Must Specifically Identify and Discuss the Threat of Disease Transmission from Pack Goats to Bighorn Sheep.**

The Nez Perce-Clearwater should explain in the DEIS what the risk of disease transmission between pack goats and bighorn sheep actually is. Notably, contact between pack

goats and bighorn sheep has never occurred before on the Forest, so risk does not mean that contact is more likely than not, otherwise such contact would have already occurred. There is no scale of risk to inform the reader about the actual likelihood of contact. The Nez Perce-Clearwater should explain what they mean by “risk,” including the various scales of risk from high to low. Also, the Nez Perce-Clearwater should explain how contact between pack goats and bighorn sheep on the Forest would actually occur. What does the Nez Perce-Clearwater mean by “contact?” Would a bighorn sheep approach a pack goat on a trail, in the presence of the pack goat’s human owner and make “contact?” Would a bighorn sheep enter into a camp in a forested area where there is a pack goat, again in the presence of its human owner, and make contact there? Is this nose-to-nose or sexual contact? When the Nez Perce-Clearwater considers risk and contact in the DEIS it is unclear what the Nez Perce-Clearwater is talking about and how such contact would occur. These things should be explained. Likewise, the Nez Perce-Clearwater should discuss the likelihood of contact in understandable terms and present how such contact would occur based on the behavior of bighorn sheep and use and training of pack goats.

In reality, there is limited use of pack goats on the Nez Perce-Clearwater, so for disease transmission to occur on the Forest, during one of the few goatpacking trips taken each year, a bighorn sheep would have to (1) leave its herd and its summer habitat in the high country, (2) find a human and pack goat camp, (3) sneak into that camp without causing any disturbance in the pack goats and without being detected by the humans, (4) ask the pack goats to not be alarmed, to remain still and to muffle their bells and collars, (5) find a tethered goat that is infected by and shedding strains of *M. ovi*, (6) make physical contact with that goat sufficient for disease transmission, and (7) sneak back out of camp and return to its herd and infect other bighorn sheep. It is a far-fetched scenario that has never happened before.

In reality, there is almost no overlap in time or space between pack goats and bighorn sheep on the Nez Perce-Clearwater; bighorn sheep are not prone to leave their herd/habitat and wander into human and pack goat camps; pack goats react noisily when they are alarmed by other wildlife, including bighorn sheep; the vast majority of pack goats do not carry and shed strains of *M. ovi*; and it is unknown whether bighorn sheep can even be infected with strains of *M. ovi* from pack goats resulting in fatal respiratory disease. The facts do not support the Nez Perce-Clearwater’s assumption that there is a likelihood of disease transmission from pack goats to bighorn sheep on the Forest.

Before undertaking management action concerning the risk of contact and disease transmission between pack goats and bighorn sheep on the Nez Perce-Clearwater, the Forest should provide an analysis of the current risk posed by pack goats. This could be done with a quantitative risk assessment. Regardless, the Nez Perce-Clearwater has not presented any scientific information indicating that pack goats pose a significant risk. Rather, pack goats rarely use the Nez Perce-Clearwater, rarely carry disease and are very unlikely to contact a bighorn sheep, particularly when handled according to established guidelines, so pack goats would appear to pose negligible risk. Why then are they being curtailed on the Nez Perce-Clearwater? The Nez Perce-Clearwater must answer this threshold question. The Nez Perce-Clearwater’s explanation for curtailing pack goat use runs counter to the evidence before the agency. Without establishing significant risk, the Nez Perce-Clearwater’s curtailment of pack goat use is unjustified.

**6. The Nez Perce-Clearwater Must Consult the Agricultural Research Service, within the United States Department of Agriculture, Before Preparing the Final EIS and Record of Decision.**

NEPA imposes on federal agencies conducting environmental review a duty to consult with certain other agencies.” Prior to making any detailed statement, the responsible Federal official shall consult with and obtain the comments of any Federal agency which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved [in the proposed action].” 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C). Further, to promote NEPA’s policies of public participation and informed decisionmaking, copies of the EIS and comments thereon from other agencies “shall accompany the proposal through the existing agency review processes.” *Id.*

The regulations implementing these provisions state that “[a]fter preparing a draft environmental impact statement and before preparing a final environmental impact statement the agency shall . . . [o]btain the comments of any Federal agency which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved . . . .” 40 C.F.R. § 1503.1(a)(1); *see also id.* § 1500.1(b) (“Accurate scientific analysis, expert agency comments, and public scrutiny are essential to implementing NEPA.” (emphasis added)). “Special expertise” is defined as “statutory responsibility, agency mission, or related program experience.” *Id.* § 1508.26. Under the statute and its implementing regulations, the Nez Perce-Clearwater has a duty to consult with the Agriculture Research Service (“ARS”) before issuing the Final EIS. *See Idaho Wool Growers Ass’n v. Vilsack*, 816 F.3d 1095, 1103 (9th Cir. 2016).

ARS has “special expertise” concerning significant aspects of the proposed decision, including the mechanics of pathogen transmission in domestic sheep and goats. For example, 7 C.F.R. § 2.65 delegates to ARS, among other matters, the authority to “[c]onduct research concerning domestic animals and poultry, their protection and use, [and] the causes of contagious, infectious, and communicable diseases.” Also, ARS’s mission statement proclaims: “ARS conducts research to develop and transfer solutions to agricultural problems of high national priority and provide information access and dissemination to . . . enhance the natural resource base and the environment . . . .” U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, ARS: About US, <http://www.ars.usda.gov/aboutus/aboutus.htm>.

Thus, considering the language establishing NEPA’s consultation requirement is expansive, NEPA mandates consultation with any federal agency that has” special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved.” 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C) (emphasis added); *see also* 40 C.F.R. § 1503.1(a)(1) (“[T]he agency shall . . . [o]btain the comments of any Federal agency which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved. . . .” (emphasis added)). And, further considering that *Warm Springs Dam Task Force v. Gribble* suggests that for the consultation requirement to apply, the particular expertise of an agency does not have to encompass the proposed project as a whole or the issue the proposed project was designed to address. Rather, the expertise need relate only to one of the project’s anticipated environmental effects. *See* 621 F.2d 1017, 1020-21 (9th Cir. 1980) (per curiam); *see also Idaho Wool Growers Ass’n*, 816 F.3d at 1103. It is a clear requirement that the Nez Perce-Clearwater MUST consult with ARS on issues of disease transmission, such as those presented in the DEIS and LMP Revision, prior to issuing a Final EIS. As a result, the Nez Perce-Clearwater MUST consult with ARS and should detail such consultation in the Final EIS.

**7. The Nez Perce-Clearwater Fails to Account for the Important Differences Between Pack Goats and Herd Domestic Goats and Domestic Sheep.**

The Nez Perce-Clearwater fails to acknowledge the important differences between pack goats and herd domestic sheep and goats. These differences must be considered in the DEIS and Forest Plan. NEPA prohibits this type of uninformed agency action. *See Robertson*, 490 U.S. at 352 (“NEPA . . . prohibits uninformed . . . agency action.”); *Marsh*, 490 U.S. at 371 (“NEPA ensures that the agency will not act on incomplete information, only to regret its decision after it is too late to correct.”). These differences are critical to the Nez Perce-Clearwater’s analysis of disease transmission from pack goats to bighorn sheep and must be considered by the Forest under NEPA.

Pack goats are very different from other domestic goats (and domestic sheep), both by breed and by use. These differences result in far less risk to bighorn sheep than the risk posed by domestic goats (or domestic sheep) on grazing allotments. The Nez Perce-Clearwater DEIS must account for these differences. To consider pack goats the same as other domestic goats (or domestic sheep) for purposes of analyzing the risk of disease transmission to bighorn sheep on the Nez Perce-Clearwater would be a critical error.

Pack goat owners go to great lengths and expense to find and train particular goats that will not stray from the security of a finite string of pack goats and their owner. Pack goats are inextricably bonded to their owners, which represent the “alpha goat” in their small herd. This is achieved through the processes of imprinting and socialization of pack goats from birth. As a result, pack goats are not prone to straying and remain in very close proximity to the “alpha goat.” Other domestic goats (and domestic sheep), while often included in herds that number in the hundreds or thousands (compared to a string of pack goats ranging from two to ten goats), are not individually trained and, thus, there may be some risk of individual domestic herd goats (or domestic sheep) straying from the herd. The risk associated with domestic sheep or domestic goats transmitting disease to bighorn sheep requires “physical contact” between the domestic animal and the bighorn sheep, therefore, a pack goat that is less likely to stray and thereby come into contact with a bighorn sheep poses a much lower risk of transmission than any number of herd domestic sheep or goats which can wander and stray.

Domestic goat and sheep herds typical to grazing allotments on public land represent larger populations of animals that are more difficult to maintain, and which may not be in immediate proximity of their caretaker at all times. Pack goats, on the other hand, require their owner or “alpha goat” to be present to monitor the herd at all times, and are always in their owner’s immediate presence and control. The small size of a pack goat string and perpetual control of the owner allows pack goats to be tied in unison while on trails, and tethered or high-lined at night (among other best management practices that can be easily implemented) to reduce the risk of contact between a pack goat and a bighorn sheep. Furthermore, if ever in sight of a bighorn sheep, there is always a human present in close proximity to the pack goats, making it extremely unlikely that a bighorn sheep would approach the string. In the presence of wild animals, such as bighorn sheep, pack goats are also on heightened alert and retreat to a position near the “alpha goat,” i.e., their human caretaker. This and the other defining traits of pack goats, and the nature of their use and training, make pack goats far less of a risk of coming into contact with a bighorn sheep than herd domestic goats and/or domestic sheep.

Further, the lifestyle and care of a pack goat differs greatly from that of a typical herd domestic goat or domestic sheep. This difference in care means that pack goats are healthier and less likely to be the carrier of a disease. Pack goats are seen by their owners as a significant investment in time and resources. A pack goat is not viable for packing purposes until at least the age of three or four, and often pack goats do not reach their packing prime until the age of five or six. Thus, a goatpacker will have had to invest a number of years into a pack goat before it is ready to hit the trail. During this time, and throughout a pack goat's life, pack goats see personalized veterinary care in order to keep the goat healthy and prolong their useful life, a luxury that other free ranging herd domestic goats or domestic sheep do not enjoy.

Because of their overall health and stamina, a trained pack goat can bring a sale price of over \$450. This means that a pack goat owner has a large financial interest in each of his or her pack goats. This high financial interest means that the owner of pack goats is likely to see to their care and protection whether that is protection from disease at home, or from contact with other wildlife when on public lands.

Further, typical herd domestic goats and domestic sheep may be sold and intermixed with goats from other herds. In contrast, pack goats—which are treated more like household pets than livestock—are not likely to change owners. The higher frequency that typical herd domestic goats and domestic sheep may be exposed to other domestic stock, would increase the opportunity for disease to spread between individual animals. On the other hand, pack goats are infrequently transferred between owners because of the nature of their function and required bonding. This greatly reduces the risk of exposure of pack goats to various diseases as compared to herd domestic goats and domestic sheep.

Perhaps most critical to the Nez Perce-Clearwater's analysis of disease transmission from pack goats to bighorn sheep is the fact that the overwhelming majority of pack goats are not known to carry *M. ovi*. If a pack goat did not carry *M. ovi* it would be impossible for that goat to transmit disease to a bighorn sheep. Thus, the risk of disease transmission from that pack goat to a bighorn sheep would be zero. Further, even if a pack goat were to carry *M. ovi* and directly contact a bighorn sheep, there is no science indicating that the pack goat would transmit this pathogen to the bighorn sheep and that the bighorn would succumb to pneumonia as a result. The Nez Perce-Clearwater did not consider these important factors in its analysis.

Finally, goatpackers limit their visits to the Nez Perce-Clearwater, as well as their time on the Forest when they do visit. With only a few pack goats per goatpacker and only a few visits by goatpackers per year, for a limited amount of time, the chance that a pack goat would come into contact with a bighorn sheep is extremely unlikely. This factor was not considered by the Nez Perce-Clearwater.

Here, the Nez Perce-Clearwater's analysis in the DEIS is completely silent on the differences between pack goats and herd domestic goats and how those differences affect the risk of disease transmission between pack goats and bighorn sheep. These differences are critical and must be considered by the Nez Perce-Clearwater. An agency decision is to be reversed as arbitrary and capricious if the agency has "entirely failed to consider an important aspect of the problem." *Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass'n v. State Farm Mutual Auto. Ins. Co.*, 463 U.S. 29, 43 (1983). The Nez Perce-Clearwater's silence on the issue will not suffice. The agency's path

must be reasonably discerned. *Id.* A court “cannot infer an agency’s reasoning from mere silence or where the agency failed to address significant objections and alternative proposals.” *Benov. Shalala*, 30 F.3d 1057, 1073 (9th Cir. 1994) (citing *Motor Vehicle*, 463 U.S. at 57); *see also, e.g., SEC v. Chenery Corp.*, 332 U.S. 194, 196-97 (1947) (“[i]t will not do for a court to be compelled to guess at the theory underlying the agency’s action.”).

In conclusion, pack goats are very different than other herd domestic goats or domestic sheep that are grazed on or near the Nez Perce-Clearwater, and the use of pack goats on the Nez Perce-Clearwater is very different than the use of other herd domestic goats and domestic sheep. The Nez Perce-Clearwater DEIS and LMP Revision fail to account for these differences in the analysis of disease transmission from domestic sheep and domestic goats to bighorn sheep on the Nez Perce-Clearwater. As a result, the DEIS must be revised to consider (1) pack goats separate from other herd domestic goats and domestic sheep and (2) the unlikelihood that pack goats carry disease and (3) the unlikelihood that pack goats would ever come in close contact with bighorn sheep on the Nez Perce-Clearwater. Further, the Nez Perce-Clearwater must consider that the nature and use of pack goats on the Forest already achieves the spatial and/or temporal separation recommended by the Nez Perce-Clearwater to minimize potential disease transmission. Thus, there is no justification and no need for the prohibition of pack goats on the Nez Perce-Clearwater.

#### **8. The Nez Perce-Clearwater Fails to Adequately Explain and Analyze the Proposed Provisions to Prevent Disease Transmission Between Domestic goats and Bighorn Sheep.**

At Guideline FW-GDL-WL-05 of the LMP Revision, the Nez Perce-Clearwater provides: “New authorizations and permit reauthorizations for domestic goat packing should include provisions to prevent disease transmission between domestic goats and bighorn sheep.” The DEIS then provides:

Plan components require provisions to be included for domestic goat packing. This includes goat packing by outfitters and guides and by recreational and subsistence hunters, as well as for general recreation purposes. Goat packing is an activity that occurs on the Nez Perce-Clearwater. Any provisions that limit the ability of goats to be used for packing activities would negatively impact those recreation uses. This guideline may greatly curtail goat packing on the Nez Perce-Clearwater, depending on the provisions assigned.

DEIS at 3.4.2-24. There is no further discussion of potential impacts on goatpacking. *See* DEIS at 3.4-2-24 – 25.

With regard to Guideline FW-GDL-WL-05 and statements at DEIS, page 3.4.2-24, there is no information provided on what “provisions to prevent disease transmission between domestic goats and bighorn sheep” the Nez Perce-Clearwater may be contemplating. As a result, there is not enough information for the public to comment on the guideline, nor does there appear to be information adequate for an analysis of impacts to goatpacking on the Forest in the DEIS. What provisions are being considered? These should be specified, so the public can



comment on them and so the Nez Perce-Clearwater and properly analyze the impact of such provisions under NEPA.

Further, and based on the above, it is unclear why “[p]lan components require provisions to be included for domestic goat packing[?]” What is the basis for requiring such provisions? These should be stated and backed up by fact and science in the DEIS.

Under NEPA, the Nez Perce-Clearwater must consider and discuss mitigation measures that would allow the use of pack goats on the Forest. NAPgA has attached a proposed suite of best management practices (“BMPs”) and other minimization and mitigation measures at Exhibit A to prevent contact and possible disease transmission between pack goats and bighorn sheep on the Nez Perce-Clearwater. These, as well as other available practices and measures must be considered by the Nez Perce-Clearwater in the DEIS.

For example, the Nez Perce-Clearwater DEIS fails to consider that separation between pack goats and bighorn sheep is maintained by the presence of a human with pack goats, by nighttime tethering or high-lining of pack goats, and by the nature and training of pack goats. The DEIS also failed to consider the use of GPS tracking collars on pack goats, pathogen testing, permitting for pack goat trips, designation of corridors for pack goats, and a host of other measures. Certainly, if pack goats do not carry disease and do not come into contact with bighorn sheep, there is zero risk of disease transmission from pack goats to bighorn sheep. Neither of these scenarios were considered in the DEIS. Instead of considering any of these measures, in violation of NEPA, the Nez Perce-Clearwater fails to provide any consideration of these best management practices to maintain separation between pack goats and bighorn sheep on the Nez Perce-Clearwater.

BMPs are mitigation measures that can be employed by goatpackers to prevent contact between pack goats and bighorn sheep. 40 C.F.R. § 1508.20 (defining “mitigation measures” to include “[a]voiding the impact” and “[m]inimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation”). For a reasonable range of alternatives, the Nez Perce-Clearwater DEIS must consider implementation of BMPs and mitigation measures, rather than simply concluding that goatpacking on the Nez Perce-Clearwater must be curtailed. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14.

An EIS must discuss “mitigation . . . in sufficient detail to ensure that environmental consequences have been fairly evaluated.” *Robertson*, 490 U.S. at 352. An agency is required to “discuss possible mitigation measures in defining the scope of the EIS, 40 CFR § 1508.25(b), in discussing alternatives to the proposed action, § 1502.14(f), and consequences of that action, § 1502.16(h), and in explaining its ultimate decision, § 1505.2(c).” *Id.*; see also *Okanogan Highlands Alliance v. Williams*, 236 F.3d 468, 473 (9th Cir. 2000) (An EIS must contain a “reasonably complete discussion of possible mitigation measures.” (quoting *Robertson*, 490 U.S. at 352)). To be sure, an agency’s final decision must “[s]tate whether all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from the alternative selected have been adopted, and if not, why they were not.” 40 C.F.R. § 1505.2(c).

Further, NEPA mandates that federal agencies “provide legitimate consideration to alternatives that fall between the obvious extremes.” *Colorado Env'tl. Coalition v. Dombeck*, 185

F.3d 1162, 1175 (10th Cir. 1998). More specifically, NEPA is violated when an agency dismisses the consideration of an alternative “in a conclusory and perfunctory manner that [does] not support a conclusion that it was unreasonable to consider them as viable alternatives.” *Davis v. Mineta*, 302 F.3d 1104, 1122 (10th Cir. 2002). “The existence of reasonable but unexamined alternatives renders an EIS inadequate.” *Ilio’ulaokalani Coalition v. Rumsfeld*, 464 F.3d 1083, 1095, 1101 (9th Cir. 2006).

Without an alternative that describes and analyzes the implementation of mitigation measures to prevent contact between pack goats and bighorn sheep, instead of simply curtailing the use of pack goats on the Nez Perce-Clearwater, the DEIS contains an inadequate range of alternatives. Alternatives considering BMPs and mitigation measures are both reasonable and feasible under the circumstances, and must be analyzed in the DEIS.

In conclusion, the Nez Perce-Clearwater has violated NEPA by failing to discuss and consider mitigation measures that would allow use of pack goats on the Forest while preventing the risk of disease transmission between pack goats and bighorn sheep. As a result, the Nez Perce-Clearwater must revise the DEIS and Forest Plan to discuss and consider appropriate mitigation measures to prevent the risk of disease transmission between pack goats and bighorn sheep. Proper consideration of such measures should include consideration and adoption of an alternative to allow the use of pack goats on the Nez Perce-Clearwater. This alternative should consider maintenance of the separation of pack goats and bighorn sheep on the Forest and, thus, achieve avoidance of any potential for disease transmission between pack goats and bighorn sheep.

## **9. The Nez Perce-Clearwater Must Evaluate Alternatives that Consider Strengthening Bighorn Sheep Immunity to Disease.**

Established epidemiology shows that disease occurs in bighorn sheep populations in the absence of contact with domestic sheep and other animals, including pack goats. These data indicate that infectious agents and other contributing factors involved in the disease process are present within bighorn sheep populations. It appears that most bighorns are getting pneumonia from other bighorns because most of the herds that have outbreaks of pneumonia, are not in contact with domestic sheep or domestic goats. This indicates that the major problem is the lack of a good immune system in the bighorns. As discussed below, there are inherent risks in choosing a management strategy that attempts to isolate bighorn sheep populations from all perceived transmission risks (when complete isolation is not possible); instead the focus should be on managing population immunity.

The critical component of managing infectious diseases is population immunity. A decision to isolate a given population of bighorn sheep from contact with potential sources of infection assumes the ability for that population to maintain isolation. The wisdom of this management scheme (maintaining immunological naivety) in animal populations within the United States, when sources of infection are present in nature, is questionable at best. Two methods which provide population immunity are vaccination and/or exposure of populations through natural exposure (transmission). This latter situation is also referred to as premonition (resistance to a disease due to the existence of its causative agent in a state of physiological

equilibrium in the host and/or by immunity to a particular infection due to previous presence of the causative agent).

A primary risk associated with incomplete immunologic isolation of animal populations is cycles of disease when isolation is broken as opposed to a continuum of managed population immunity through vaccines and/or natural exposure and premonition. When multiple sources of a given pathogen or group of pathogens exist, the prudent long-term health management dictates that population immunity be the primary tool. As an example of population immunity being the most effective management tool, the Lostine River herd of bighorns experienced a die-off in the 1980s, but is now considered the most viable herd in the Hells Canyon area due to successful population immunity. Since bighorn sheep are infecting each other, building up their immune systems could have a beneficial effect on survival from many forms of disease.

Likewise, bighorn sheep face the risk of infection from domestic sheep and other animals on and off the Nez Perce-Clearwater. Consequently, the curtailment of pack goats on the Nez Perce-Clearwater, even if there was evidence that pack goats carried and transmitted disease, would not eliminate the risk of disease transmission to bighorns. This fact is not adequately considered in the DEIS. It will be impossible for the Nez Perce-Clearwater to eliminate the risk of disease transmission to bighorns because of the numerous variables besides pack goats (which are not even a known carrier or transmitter of disease) on the Nez Perce-Clearwater. As a result, the Nez Perce-Clearwater must analyze alternative solutions to maintaining bighorn sheep viability.

The Nez Perce-Clearwater must also analyze the possibility that without interaction between bighorn sheep and other animals, bighorn sheep tolerance to disease may become worse, leading to more widespread die-offs, instead of fewer die-offs. Instead of considering this likelihood, the DEIS only considers one course of action: total separation. Based on the analysis in the DEIS, the most prudent and most logical management action would be to encourage development of immunity in bighorns because total separation is impossible. This action must be considered by the Nez Perce-Clearwater in the DEIS.

**10. Epidemiological Modeling is Needed to Understand How a Range of Factors Affect the Dynamics of Disease Spread Under Various Management Alternatives.**

The very limited disease review in the DEIS is generally based on geographic characteristics of the disease in the context of interaction between domestic sheep and bighorn sheep. While this is a useful component of much needed research, it is not in itself enough to make well-informed recommendations on policy alternatives. There remains limited knowledge of transmission dynamics. Clinical studies have shown bighorn sheep susceptibility to disease from contact with domestic sheep. However, epidemiologic modeling is needed to understand how contacts with domestic sheep, bighorn sheep, and other disease carriers (elk, deer, wild goats, birds, etc.), forage and climatic conditions, and other factors affect the dynamics of the disease spread under various management alternatives. The Nez Perce-Clearwater does not appear to apply any sort of modeling for the risk of disease transmission on the Forest.

NEPA's procedures require the presentation of "complete and accurate information to decision makers and to the public to allow an informed comparison of the alternatives considered in the EIS." *NRDC v. U.S. Forest Service*, 421 F.3d at 813. Here, further modeling and additional study is needed to determine the added probability of disease transmission among bighorns and from other animals. The probability that healthy "carrier" bighorns are infecting "non-carrier" bighorns is likely high, since a large number of the bighorns on the Nez Perce-Clearwater may be disease-carriers. Additionally, more information and study should be undertaken to determine the exact mechanism for developing pneumonia in bighorn sheep following association with domestic sheep or other animals. Further, the Nez Perce-Clearwater must study the development of immunity to disease in bighorn sheep. All of this information should be considered and addressed by the Nez Perce-Clearwater in the DEIS.

#### **11. The Nez Perce-Clearwater Fails to Consider the Most Important Aspects of the Problem in the DEIS.**

Under the APA, agency decisions under NEPA and NFMA will be set aside if they are "arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law." 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A). Under this standard, judicial review of agency action seeks to determine whether an agency "has relied on factors which Congress has not intended it to consider, entirely failed to consider an important aspect of the problem, offered an explanation for its decision that runs counter to the evidence before the agency, or is so implausible that it could not be ascribed to a difference in view or the product of agency expertise." *See Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass'n v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 463 U.S. 29, 43 (1983); *Utah Environmental Congress v. Bosworth*, 443 F.3d 732, 739 (10th Cir. 2006).

In its DEIS, the Nez Perce-Clearwater has failed to consider and acknowledge that the proposed alternative is unlikely to control disease transmission and is implausible. Disease could still be a factor for bighorn sheep populations on the Nez Perce-Clearwater, regardless of the closure of the Forest to pack goats. The DEIS fails to give importance to the fact that bighorn sheep themselves on the Nez Perce-Clearwater in fact already carry the pathogens that lead to disease. Thus, bighorn sheep are at risk of contacting other bighorn sheep that carry the pathogens that can lead to disease.

Because bighorn sheep are carriers of the pathogens that can lead to disease, contact with other bighorn sheep not only puts bighorn sheep populations at risk, but renders irrelevant pack goats as the vector for transmission of the pathogens (assuming that pack goats on the Nez Perce-Clearwater are carriers of the pathogens). This can mislead readers to believe that eliminating risk of contact on the Nez Perce-Clearwater between pack goats and bighorn sheep will eliminate the threat of disease transmission. Under this misleading premise, the DEIS appears to be designed to depict pack goats as a significant cause of disease transmission or even risk of disease transmission, which is not accurate. The alternatives and the discussion in the DEIS must acknowledge more fully the potential futility of alternatives and explain the need for more comprehensive solutions to the problem of disease transmission, such as the development of a vaccine, or the improvement of bighorn sheep immunity, or the improvement of bighorn sheep habitat.

The DEIS also fails to consider that other animals on the Nez Perce-Clearwater, like elk, deer, birds, etc., may carry the pathogens that can lead to diseases. Thus, contact between cattle and other animals, besides pack goats, and bighorn sheep may lead to disease transmission on the Nez Perce-Clearwater. The DEIS does not discuss this possibility. In addition, the DEIS fails to acknowledge that bighorn sheep are at risk of contact with domestic sheep and other animals off the areas controlled by the Nez Perce-Clearwater, and which risk is not mitigated by the alternatives or the ban on pack goat use.

Because the DEIS wholly fails to consider the risks of disease transmission from other bighorns, the risks of disease transmission off the Forest, and risks of disease transmission from other sources, the DEIS is inadequate under NEPA. As a result, the DEIS must be revised to consider risks of disease transfer from other bighorns, off of the forest and from other sources.

## **12. The DEIS Does Not Properly Address the Relevance of Unavailable or Incomplete Scientific Information.**

The Nez Perce-Clearwater DEIS lacks complete information to assess the potential effects of disease transmission between domestic sheep and domestic goats and bighorn sheep, let alone pack goats and bighorn sheep. The DEIS does little to address the lack of information with its subsequent conclusions.

In situations such as this, where the relevant information for assessing impacts is incomplete or unavailable, the agency preparing the EIS must take the following steps: first, if the incomplete information relevant to reasonably foreseeable adverse effects is essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives and the overall costs of obtaining the information is not exorbitant, the agency must include that information in the EIS. Next, if the relevant information cannot be obtained because the overall costs are exorbitant or the means of obtaining the information are not known, then an agency must include in an EIS:

- (1) a statement that such information is incomplete or unavailable;
- (2) a statement of the relevance of the incomplete or unavailable information to evaluating reasonably foreseeable significant impacts on the human environment; (3) a summary of existing credible scientific evidence which is relevant to evaluating the reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts on the human environment; and (4) the agency's evaluation of such impacts based upon theoretical approaches or research methods generally accepted in the scientific community.

40 C.F.R. § 1502.22(b).

Here, the Forest Service fails to take these required steps to address the incomplete or unavailable information relevant to ascertaining the possibility and consequences of disease transmission between domestic sheep/domestic goats and bighorns, and further fails to do so pertaining to the lesser risks of disease transmission from domestic goats in comparison to domestic sheep. The evidence provided in the DEIS suggests the likelihood or risk of disease transfer is largely specific to domestic sheep and not to domestic goats. The DEIS fails here to

include contrasting scientific points of view that have studied the differences in disease transfer risk between domestic sheep and bighorns, and domestic goats and bighorns. Here also, the DEIS fails to distinguish relevant information pertaining to disease transfer between other free ranging animals as comparable to easily managed and controlled animals like pack goats. Likewise, the DEIS fails to contain a clear and direct statement that the required information is incomplete or unavailable. The DEIS also fails to discuss the relevance of incomplete or unavailable information in light of evaluation of a reasonably foreseeable environmental impact. Lastly, the DEIS fails to contain the Forest Service's own evaluation of such impacts "based upon theoretical approaches or research methods generally accepted in the scientific community." *Id.*

Instead of honestly evaluating the range of potential scientific opinion applicable to disease transmission between pack goats and bighorns, the Forest Service impermissibly fails to comply with the requirements of the CEQ regulations to address incomplete or unavailable scientific information. Based on this fundamental flaw in the evaluation of environmental consequences in the DEIS, the DEIS should be revised to provide further analysis.

### **13. The Nez Perce-Clearwater must Obtain Additional Information for the DEIS.**

When particular information "relevant to reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts is essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives," the agency must obtain that information and include it in the EIS, unless the cost is "exorbitant or the means to obtain it are not known." 40 C.F.R. § 1502.22. If obtaining the information is too costly or infeasible, the agency can forego its collection, providing full explanation in the EIS. *Id.* § 1502.22(b). "In that case the agency must include in the EIS: (1) A statement that the information is incomplete or unavailable; (2) a statement of the relevance of the incomplete or unavailable information; (3) a summary of relevant "existing credible scientific evidence;" and (4) the agency's evaluation of impacts based on "theoretical approaches or research methods generally accepted in the scientific community." *Id.*

The Nez Perce-Clearwater has not included the following relevant information in the DEIS:

- Information indicating the differences between pack goats and other domestic goats;
- Information indicating that pack goats carry disease that can be transmitted to bighorn sheep;
- Information indicating that pack goats may come into contact or have come into contact with bighorn sheep on the Nez Perce-Clearwater;
- Information indicating that BMPs and/or mitigation measures are not effective to ensure separation between pack goats and bighorn sheep on the Nez Perce-Clearwater;

- Information indicating that pack goats may transmit or have transmitted disease to bighorn sheep on the Nez Perce-Clearwater;
- Information indicating that bighorn sheep have contracted disease transmitted by pack goats on the Nez Perce-Clearwater;
- Information indicating that bighorn sheep that have contracted disease transmitted by pack goats on the Nez Perce-Clearwater have returned to their herds and infected other bighorn sheep;
- Information indicating that bighorn sheep that have contracted disease transmitted by pack goats on the Nez Perce-Clearwater have returned to their herds and infected other bighorn sheep, which has led to a die-off;
- Information indicating that there is a risk of disease transmission from pack goats to bighorn sheep on the Nez Perce-Clearwater;
- Information indicating the risk of disease transmission from other animals on and off of the Nez Perce-Clearwater to bighorn sheep;
- Information indicating the impacts of wolves, mountain goats, and hunting on bighorn sheep populations on the Nez Perce-Clearwater; and
- Information indicating the recreational, social and economic impacts on goatpackers of a closure of all or part of the Nez Perce-Clearwater to pack goats.