

October 3, 2009
The Honorable Governor Bill Ritter
136 State Capitol
Denver, CO 80203-1792

Re: Colorado Scientists' Comments on July 28, 2009 version of proposed Colorado Roadless Rule
(sent via Roadless.Comments@state.co.us)

As scientists who reside and work in Colorado, we are writing to urge you not to move forward with your state specific roadless area proposal to manage the state's national forest roadless areas. The national forest roadless areas within Colorado are deserving of the full protections currently afforded to them under the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule. The state's current draft rule^{1,2} contains management direction allowing a variety of activities that would be harmful to these forest ecosystems and would collectively undermine the intent of the 2001 rule to provide long lasting protections for watersheds, biological diversity, critical habitat for threatened species, and dispersed recreation in inventoried roadless areas within the National Forest System³. Additionally, we are enclosing a letter signed by scientists from around the nation urging President Obama to apply the 2001 roadless rule consistently and in its entirety as this rule making to address local issues is clearly unwarranted.

Colorado's 363 inventoried roadless areas, totaling some 4.43 million acres², are an essential component to the state's intact ecosystems and the quality of life Coloradoans enjoy. These areas provide a vital supply of drinking water to millions of residents while helping to meet the irrigation demands of farmers and ranchers. With the rapid pace of development putting increased pressure on the national forest system, particularly in the West, and the emergence of global climate change, roadless watersheds take on even greater importance as a source of clean water. Anticipated tripling of state water consumption levels by 2050⁴ underscores the need to fully protect the state's roadless areas for at least this purpose, particularly as climate change potentially triggers more frequent and lasting droughts⁵.

The state's national forest roadless areas also are vital for at-risk species such as large carnivores that depend on large tracts of intact ecosystems⁶, trout that depend on cool water, and big game species that depend on unroaded areas for habitat security⁷. As an example, the Currant Creek portion of the Priest Mountain Roadless Area in the Delta area is important to downstream users as a source of drinking and irrigation water, and is considered by the Colorado Division of Wildlife as providing quality elk, deer, and bear hunting opportunities². Under the state's proposal, a minimum of 29,000 acres of this area would be subject to coal mine methane removal and construction of accompanying infrastructure and methane well pads that would permanently change its unique features while releasing greenhouse gas pollutants.

¹Colorado Roadless Rule – Final Language as of July 28, 2009 16 U.S.C. 472,529, 551, 1608, 1613; 23 U.S.C 201, 205.

²USDA Forest Service. 2008. Rule making for Colorado Roadless Areas Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Washington, D.C.

³USDA Forest Service. 2000. Forest Service Roadless Area Conservation Draft Environmental Impact Statement Volume 1. Washington, D.C.

⁴Colorado Water Conservation Board, 2009. State of Colorado 2050 municipal and industrial use water use projects. June 2009. Draft report.

⁵Udall, B. and G. Bates. 2007. Climatic and hydrological trends in the western U.S.: a review of recent peer-reviewed literature. Feature article from *Intermountain West Climate Summary*, January 2007.

⁶Trombulak, S. and C. Frissell. 2000. Review of ecological effects of roads on terrestrial and aquatic communities. *Conservation Biology* 14:18-30. USDA Forest Service. 2000, *ibid*.

⁷Petersen, D. 2005. Where the wildlands are: Colorado. Trout Unlimited. Durango, CO.

National forest roadless areas under the state's proposal would be subjected to numerous exceptions that either do not appear in the 2001 roadless rule or are weaker than the national rule, thereby providing fewer protections to roadless areas than any state in the nation. In sum, proposed land use activities will fragment roadless areas by greatly expanding logging and road building; allowing roughly 100 new oil and gas leases, many with new roads, pipelines, and other industrial infrastructure to go forward in some of Colorado's best hunting and fishing and undeveloped backcountry areas; coal development in fragile areas; ski area expansions; water conveyance structures; and other developments affecting at least 246,000 acres⁸ of inventoried roadless areas by removing them from the national inventory or degrading them through such cumulative impacts. The proposed rule lacks mandatory requirements to preserve roadless area characteristics in the face of such activities⁹ and circumvents the National Environmental Policy Act.

As noted in the national scientist letter, the presence and human use of roads, even the use of *long-term temporary and temporary roads* as proposed— can impact ecosystems in many ways. For instance, roads may alter the spread, frequency, and intensity of disturbances on the landscape¹⁰, including the probability of human-caused fire ignitions¹¹. In Colorado, road building has been a primary agent of landscape change¹², resulting in declines to elk habitat¹³, water quality¹⁴, and fisheries⁵ among other impacts. Road building in roadless areas is especially risky in Colorado, as the state leads the nation in landslide susceptible roadless areas². Many of these impacts are not effectively remedied, as assumed by the Forest Service², as they are likely to interact with other proposed changes (pipelines, transmission lines, water conveyance and infrastructure, oil and gas platforms, etc.) to compound disturbances affecting large portions of roadless areas and their surroundings. Notably, approximately three-fourths of Colorado roadless areas are within 1 mile of nearest roads¹⁵ where spill over effects from roads and associated developments may impact adjacent roadless areas¹⁶, particularly when combined with the numerous additional impacts proposed by the state.

Some of the changes proposed by the state are due to concerns about the probability of wildland fire and insect damage to forests; however, road building and tree cutting will likely have minimal effects on fire spread and intensity, which in Colorado is primarily driven by weather rather

⁸This difference was arrived at by comparing 4.43 million acres of inventoried roadless areas under the 2001 rule vs. the state's July 28, 2009 proposal of 4.184 million acres but is likely to be conservative due to cumulative impacts.

⁹Roadless characteristics defined in §294.31 are used as guidance and context for decisions about the management of Colorado Roadless Areas. However, road construction and reconstruction as allowed under §293.33, and tree-cutting as allowed under §293.32, shall not be prohibited within Colorado Roadless Areas solely because there may be adverse effects to some roadless characteristics with project implementation (July 28, 2009 proposed rule).

¹⁰ Miller, J.M., L. A. Joyce, R L. Knight and R. M. King. 1996. Forest roads and landscape structure in the southern Rockies. *Landscape Ecology* 1 (2):115-127.

¹¹DellaSala, D.A., and E. Frost. 2001. An ecologically based strategy for fire and fuels management in National Forest roadless areas. *Fire Management Today* 61(2):12-23.

¹²Allen, C.D., J.L. Betancourt, and T. W. Swetnam. 1997. Landscape changes in the southwestern United States: techniques, long-term data sets, and trends (<http://biology.usgs.gov/luhna/chap9.html>). Southern Rockies Ecosystem Project. 2004. State of the Southern Rockies Ecoregion. Colorado Mountain Club: Golden, Colorado.

¹³Lyon, L.J. 1983. Road density models describing habitat effectiveness for elk. *Journal of Forestry* 81: 592-595. Rowland, M. M., M. J. Wisdom, B. K. Johnson, and M. A. Penninger. 2004. Effects of Roads on Elk: Implications for Management in Forested Ecosystems. *Transactions of the North American Wildlife and Natural Resource Conference* 69: in press.

¹⁴Anderson, D.C. 2007. Road impacts on the Baca Wildlife Refuge, Colorado with emphasis on effects to surface- and shallow-ground water hydrology- a literature review. USGS Open-File Rept. 2007-1052.

¹⁵<http://www.roadless.net/maps/roads.htm>

¹⁶Forman, R.T.T. 2000. Estimate of the area affected ecologically by the road system in the United States. *Conservation Biology* 14:31-35.

than fuels¹⁷. This is particularly the case for lodgepole pine and spruce-fir forests, the dominant forest types in the majority of the state's roadless areas, as these forests characteristically burn severely and infrequently^{2,17}. Thinning and post-fire logging¹⁸ are not likely to alter fire extent or severity in these forests under extreme drought conditions, an increasingly likely scenario in Colorado. Further, as noted, road building increases the likelihood of human-caused fire ignitions. For all these reasons, wildfire risks are best dealt with by focusing treatments on homeowner defensible space and already roaded areas¹⁷. Under the state's proposal; however, tree cutting and road building can take place anywhere in a roadless area where the Regional Forester deems there is "substantial risk" to municipal water supply systems from insects, disease, and wildfire hazards. Logging would retain large trees to the "maximum extent practical," which is a significant departure from the 2001 rule that emphasized removal of primarily small trees. Additional tree cutting can take place within a Community Protection Zone, extending up to 1 ½ miles from an affected community, potentially impacting large portions of inventoried roadless areas. The state's proposal therefore would weaken provisions for cutting trees, introduce new measures, including Community Protection Zones, with far reaching effects that in their entirety would impact nearly 10 times more roadless area acreage than under the 2001 rule¹⁹. In addition, there is no requirement, as in the 2001 rule, to maintain roadless area characteristics in the face of such activities, which is considered optional rather than mandatory as in the 2001 rule²⁰. These extreme measures are not necessary, as the 2001 rule already provides sufficient local discretion to address these concerns within the broader context of protecting roadless areas²¹.

The state also expressed concern that outbreaks of bark beetles, which result in dead conifer needles, are increasing the probability of extreme fire behavior and therefore tree cutting is needed to "prevent or suppress an insect or disease epidemic"²¹. However, recent studies indicate that the probability of fire increases only in forest stands where dead needles are still present on the trees; needles drop relatively soon after dying and logging is not likely to minimize this short-lived risk¹⁷. In general, trees in roaded areas are nearly four times more susceptible to attack by insects and pathogens than those in roadless areas³, due primarily to homogenization of stands and landscapes by associated logging that may reduce populations of natural enemies of destructive insects¹¹. As noted, the 2001 rule provides ample measures for addressing such contingencies while safeguarding roadless areas²¹.

In closing, Colorado's roadless areas are a vital part of the state's natural inheritance and outdoor recreation economy that will only become even more important to protect as the state and nation deal increasingly with the social, economic, and ecological disruptions of climate change, as

¹⁷Romme, W.H., J. Clement, J. Hicke, D. Kulakowski, L.H. MacDonald, T.L. Schoennagel, and T.T. Veblen. 2009. Recent forest insect outbreaks and fire risks in Colorado forests: a brief synthesis of relevant research. Available at Colorado State University, Ft. Collins. June 3, 2009 letter from W. Romme to M. King, Colorado Dept. Natural Resources. Also see Bond, M. L., D. E. Lee, C. M. Bradley, and C. T. Hanson. 2009. Influence of pre-fire tree mortality on fire severity in conifer forests of the San Bernardino Mountains, California. *The Open Forest Science Journal* 2:41-47. Black S.H. 2005. Logging to control insects: The science and myths behind managing forest insect "pests." A synthesis of independently reviewed research. The Xerces Society for Invertebrate Conservation. Portland.

¹⁸Kulakowski, D., and T.T. Veblen. 2007. Effect of prior disturbances on the extent and severity of a 2002 wildfire in Colorado subalpine forests. *Ecology* 88:759-69.

¹⁹Stewardship logging can occur on 12,000 acres under the 2001 rule vs. at least 114,000 acres of relatively unrestricted logging in the state's proposal (see USDA Forest Service DEIS 2008 and state proposal noted in footnotes 1 and 2).

²⁰Roadless characteristics defined in §294.31 are used as guidance and context for decisions about the management of Colorado Roadless Areas. However, road construction and reconstruction as allowed under §293.33, and tree-cutting as allowed under §293.32, shall not be prohibited within Colorado Roadless Areas solely because there may be adverse effects to some roadless characteristics with project implementation.

²¹USDA Forest Service. 2000. Roadless Area Conservation Final Environmental Impact Statement Fuel Management and Fire Suppression Specialists' Report. Washington, D.C.

well as the rapid pace of development that is putting increased pressure on the national forest system. The 2001 roadless rule continues much needed protections of Colorado's roadless areas, while allowing sufficient flexibility to address local public health and safety, fire, and undesirable insects. Ironically, by introducing additional and controversial measures less protective than the 2001 roadless rule, the state runs the risk of *reducing* (not increasing) management flexibility that potentially causes irreparable harm to roadless areas. Thus, management direction in the proposed Colorado rule in general runs contrary to best available science and the more protective and robust measures of the 2001 roadless rule that set a national standard for safeguarding the nation's critical lands and waters. When viewed in this context, Colorado's untrammled roadless areas contribute uniquely to the state's ecological and economic well being and the nation as a whole. Implementing and enforcing the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule is the best way to ensure these wild areas continue to sustain the many values and ecosystem services they provide.

Sincerely, *

Sharolyn Anderson, Ph.D.
Geographer
Denver, Colorado

Jesse R. Barber, Ph.D.
Colorado State University
Ft. Collins, Colorado

Phil Cafaro, Ph.D.
Colorado State University
Ft. Collins, Colorado

William H. Clements, Ph.D.
Colorado State University
Ft. Collins, Colorado

Patrick Crist, Ph.D.
Director of Conservation Planning and
Ecosystem Management
Broomfield, Colorado

James Ebersole, Ph.D.
Colorado College
Colorado Springs, Colorado

Kurt Fausch, Ph.D.
Dept. of Fish, Wildlife, & Conservation Biol.
Colorado State University
Ft. Collins, Colorado

Mark Hernandez, Ph.D.
Professor of Environmental Engineering
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado

Richard Knight, Ph.D.
Professor of Wildlife Conservation
Colorado State University
Ft. Collins, Colorado

Julie Korb, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Biology
Fort Lewis College,
Durango, Colorado

John Loomis, Ph.D.
Colorado State University
Ft. Collins, Colorado

Andrew Martin, Ph.D.
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado

Christy McCain, Ph.D.
Professor of Ecology
Boulder, Colorado

Russell Monson, Ph.D.
Professor of Biology
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado

Dhruba Naug, Ph.D.
Ft. Collins, Colorado

Barry Noon, Ph.D.
Dept. of Fish, Wildlife, & Conservation Biol.
Colorado State University
Ft. Collins, Colorado

Charles Olmsted, Ph.D.
Professor Emeritus of Environmental Studies
Greeley, Colorado

Tom Quinn, Ph.D.
Professor of Biology
University of Denver
Denver, Colorado

Chris Ray, Ph.D.
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado

Richard P. Reading, Ph.D.
Director of Conservation Biology
Denver Zoological Foundation
Denver, Colorado

Julie P. Rieder, Ph.D.
Colorado State University
Ft. Collins, Colorado

Robert J. Reinsvold, Ph.D.
Professor of Biology
University of Northern Colorado
Greeley, Colorado

William H. Romme, Ph.D.
Professor of Fire Ecology
Colorado State University
Ft. Collins, Colorado

Robert L. Sanford Jr., Ph.D.
Professor of Biological Sciences
University of Denver
Denver, Colorado

Tania Schoennagel, Ph.D.
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado

Timothy Seastedt, Ph.D.
Professor of Ecology
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado

Anna Sher, Ph.D.
Director of Research and Conservation
Denver Botanic Gardens
Denver, Colorado

Darrel E. Snyder, M.Sc.
Colorado State University
Ft. Collins, Colorado

Michael Soule, Ph.D.
Professor Emeritus
University of California, Santa Cruz
Paonia, Colorado

John D. Stednick, Ph.D.
Professor of Watershed Science
Colorado State University
Ft. Collins, Colorado

Thomas T. Veblen, Ph.D.
Professor of Geography
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado

Diana H. Wall, Ph.D.
Colorado State University
Ft. Collins, Colorado

Richard T. Ward, Ph.D.
Professor of Botany/Ecology
Colorado State University
Ft. Collins, Colorado

***Affiliations listed for identification purposes only. Signatories as of Oct. 2, 2009**

cc: Mike King, Colorado Department of Natural Resources (mike.king@state.co.us)

Attached: Scientists' letter to Pres. Barack Obama supporting the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule

President Barack Obama
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20500

Re: Scientists' Support for the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule

Dear Mr. President:

As scientists working in natural resource-related disciplines, we commend your commitment to uphold and enforce the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule as the best policy to protect the nation's 58.5 million acres of undeveloped national forests. Now, as your administration deliberates next steps to preserve roadless areas, we would like to stress the scientific importance of this landmark environmental policy and our concern about attempts to undermine its protections on the Tongass National Forest in Alaska and national forests in Idaho and Colorado.

Since its promulgation, we have been, and continue to be, supportive of the 2001 Roadless Rule, because it applies a consistent and scientifically based national standard that appropriately safeguards the numerous ecological benefits that roadless areas provide to the nation's citizens and fish and wildlife, while also supplying clean drinking water to millions of Americans²². Ongoing development in concert with human-caused disruptions to the earth's climate now makes the application of a national roadless area policy even more urgent.

The 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule aptly noted the importance of roadless areas for watershed and ecosystem health. For example, over half of the nation's roadless areas supply water to downstream facilities that treat and distribute drinking water to the public¹. There is strong scientific evidence that roadless areas provide high-quality habitat for threatened species, contain important concentrations of old-growth forests and aquatic strongholds, and, the absence of roads and other disturbances, allow these areas to provide a buffer against invasive species²³. Because over half the nation's roadless areas are at elevations above 7,000 feet¹, they are vital for wildlife seeking cool, moist conditions in the face of a warming climate. In contrast, the presence and human use of roads have been linked to increased wildlife mortality and fragmentation of their habitat, changes in the physical and chemical environment, diminished water quality,

²²USFS. 2000. Forest Service Roadless Area Conservation. Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Volume 1. Washington, D.C.

²³Strittholt, J.R., and D.A. DellaSala. 2001. Importance of roadless areas in biodiversity conservation in forested ecosystems: a case study – Klamath-Siskiyou ecoregion, U.S.A. *Conservation Biology* Vol. 15(6):1742-1754. DeVelice, R.L., and J.R. Martin. 2001. Assessing the extent to which roadless areas complement the conservation of biological diversity. *Ecological Applications* 11(4):1008-1018. Loucks, C., N. Brown, A. Loucks, and K. Cesareo. 2003. USDA Forest Service roadless areas: potential biodiversity conservation reserves. *Conservation Ecology* 7(2): 5 Strittholt, J.R., D.A. DellaSala, E. Fernandez, G. Heilman, and P.A. Frost. 2003. Oregon's Legacy Wild Forests. Conservation value of Oregon's inventoried roadless areas (www.consbio.org). Gelbardi, J.L., and S. Harrison. 2005. Invasibility of roadless grasslands: an experimental study of yellow starthistle. *Ecological Applications* 15(5):1570–1580.

introduction of invasive species, wildfire ignitions, and increases in landslide susceptibility²⁴. Such ecological effects are estimated to impact nearly one-quarter of all surface areas in the conterminous United States²⁵. The few remaining roadless areas, which represent only two percent of the nation's total land area, take on even greater significance when viewed in this manner.

We believe the roadless area benefits described herein are best maintained by applying the 2001 Roadless Rule consistently across the nation, as it was originally intended. In fact, one of the primary reasons for invoking the 2001 Roadless Rule was individual national forest plans, coupled with various regulations and other outside factors, were allowing the continued erosion of roadless areas absent a national standard²⁶. The 2001 Roadless Rule imparted U.S. Forest Service officials with the responsibility of considering national interests in the management of the National Forest System, and specifically, inventoried roadless areas²⁷. Reverting to state level exemptions and policies would undermine this important national direction, contributing to the further loss of these national forest system lands and their important ecological functions.

Perhaps there is no better example of the scientific justification for full restoration of the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule than the Tongass National Forest in Alaska. When the 2001 Roadless Rule was being developed, many scientists from across the country noted that to best conserve its wildlife and other ecological values the Tongass should be included in any measure to protect national forest roadless areas²⁸. Because of a temporary exemption promulgated in 2003, the Tongass is the only national forest on the Pacific Coast unprotected by the 2001 Rule. This is unfortunate, as it holds approximately 30% of the planet's largest remaining coastal temperate rainforests. It also represents one of North America's largest carbon sinks and most biologically productive ecosystems²⁹. The Tongass exemption left more than two million acres of roadless areas – including many old-growth forests – open to development, placing at risk high-quality habitat for many valued wildlife species as well as contributing to the release of dangerous greenhouse gas pollutants from logging activities.

We are also concerned about efforts by two other states where rule changes have weakened the 2001 rule (Idaho) or are proposed (Colorado) to bypass many important protections of the 2001 roadless rule. Idaho contains the largest intact national forest ecosystem in the lower 48 states, and a new state roadless policy was developed by the

²⁴Trombulak, S. and C. Frissell. 2000. Review of ecological effects of roads on terrestrial and aquatic communities. *Conservation Biology* 14:18-30.

²⁵Forman, R.T.T. 2000. Estimate of the area affected ecologically by the road system in the United States. *Conservation Biology* 14:31-35.

²⁶USFS. 2000. Roadless Area Conservation Final Environmental Impact Statement. Volume 1:3-12.

²⁷66 Fed Reg. Notice 3246, January 12, 2001.

²⁸December 20, 1999 letter sent to President Clinton

²⁹Schoen, J., and D. Albert. 2007. Southeastern Alaska conservation strategy: a conceptual approach. Chapter 10 in *The Coastal forests and mountain ecoregion of southeastern Alaska and the Tongass National Forest: a conservation assessment and resource synthesis*, eds. J. Schoen and E. Dovichin. Audubon Alaska, and The Nature Conservancy, Anchorage, Alaska.

previous administration that would place many national forest acres at risk, including opening up more than 5,700 acres of roadless areas in the Caribou Targhee National Forest to phosphate mining that poses a significant risk to terrestrial and aquatic species and water quality³⁰, while also being potentially risky to human health and safety. In Colorado, which contains over 4 million acres of inventoried roadless areas, proposed exemptions in their draft rule would impact at least 246,000 acres³¹ of inventoried roadless areas by removing them from the national inventory or degrading them by eliminating many restrictions on logging and road building, allowing approximately 100 oil and gas leases to go forward in prime hunting and fishing areas, additional coal mining and exploration, expansion of ski areas, and many other provisions that could have long-term negative consequences to these vital landscapes. Fossil fuel development in these areas also contributes to the build up of greenhouse gas pollutants.

In closing, we thank you for your pledge to restore scientific integrity to policy development and specifically to decisions impacting the environment – including the conservation of our public lands. As scientists, we believe that the 2001 Roadless Rule remains the most scientifically credible approach for managing and protecting our last undeveloped national forests and we urge your continued support for it.

Thank you for considering our views on this matter of vital importance to the America’s ecological health. Please do not hesitate to contact us for further information or input.

Sincerely, *

Dominick A. DellaSala, Ph. D.
Chief Scientist and President
National Center for Conservation Science & Policy
Ashland, Oregon

David J. Berg, Ph.D.
Professor of Zoology
Miami University
Hamilton, Ohio

Solange Brault, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
University of Massachusetts Boston
Boston, Massachusetts

³⁰Hamilton, S.J., Buhl, K.J. and P.J Lamothe. 2004. Selenium and other trace elements in water, sediment, aquatic plants, aquatic invertebrates, and fish from streams in SE Idaho near phosphate mining. *Life Cycle of the Phosphoria Formation: From Deposition to Post-Mining Environment*, Chapter 18. J. R. Hein, ed.

³¹4.43 million acres of inventoried roadless areas are currently protected by the 2001 rule vs. the state’s July 28, 2009 proposal that includes 4.184 million acres. This difference is likely conservative due to cumulative impacts from multiple activities proposed.

Danielle Busch, Ph.D.
NOAA
Seattle, Washington

Dana E. Dolsen, M.S.
Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
Salt Lake City, Utah

Thomas L. Fleischner, Ph.D.
Professor of Environmental Studies
Prescott College
Prescott, Arizona

Jeffrey Foster, Ph.D.
Northern Arizona University
Flagstaff, Arizona

Jerry Freilich, Ph.D.
Research Coordinator
Olympic National Park
Port Angeles, Washington

Margaret H. Fusari, Ph.D.
University of California Santa Cruz (ret.)
Santa Cruz, California

Richard W. Halsey
Director, California Chaparral Institute
Escondido, California

Jeffery Hill, Ph.D.
Professor of Environmental Studies
Univ. of North Carolina Wilmington
Wilmington, North Carolina

Richard Hutto, Ph.D.
Division of Biological Sciences
University of Montana
Missoula, Montana

Mrill Ingram, Ph.D.
Editor, Ecological Restoration
Univ. of Wisconsin, Madison Arboretum
Madison, Wisconsin

Marni Koopman, Ph.D.
Climate Change Scientist
Nat'l. Center for Conservation Science
and Policy
Ashland, Oregon

Debora L. Mann, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Biology
Millsaps College
Jackson, Mississippi

Reed Noss, Ph.D.
Professor of Conservation Biology
University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Philip J. Nyhus, Ph.D.
Asst. Professor Environmental Studies
Colby College
Waterville, Maine

Dennis Odion, Ph.D.
University of California Santa Barbara
Ashland, Oregon

Thomas Michael Power, Ph.D.
University of Montana
Missoula, Montana

Thomas P. Rooney, Ph.D.
Professor of Biological Sciences
Wright State University
Dayton, Ohio

Matthew Schlesinger, Ph.D.
Chief Zoologist
New York Natural Heritage Program
Albany, New York

Walter H. Smith, Ph.D. Candidate
University of Alabama
Tuscaloosa, Alabama

Vinaya P. Swaminathan, M.S.
Foundations of Success
Washington DC

Vicki Tripoli, Ph.D.
Science Advisory Board
Nat'l. Center for Conservation Science & Policy
Ashland, Oregon

Susan K. Willson, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Conservation Biology
St. Lawrence University
Canton, New York

George Wuerthner
Ecological Projects Director
Foundation for Deep Ecology
Richmond, Vermont

* Affiliations listed for identification purposes only. Signatories as of October 2, 2009