CASCADE-SISKIYOU NATIONAL MONUMENT

WORKING GROUP: STUDY OF LIVESTOCK IMPACTS

Meeting Notes

July 23, 2004

Members Present: Gene Bowling, Romain Cooper, Rose Marie Davis, Cate Hartzell (part), Bob Horton, John Roth, Anita Ward (alternate)

BLM Staff Present: Howard Hunter

Facilitators: Jon Lange & Terry Morton

I. *July 8 Meeting Notes*

Richard Anderson's last name was corrected to read Richard Taylor. Meeting Notes & Agenda approved.

II. *Purpose*

The group discussed Cate's concern regarding the legality of the Working Group, as well as the likelihood of any problems. Howard consulted with two BLM attorneys, and reported the solicitor said that it was "unlikely the PAC Working Group could be held liable," and "likely zero." He has sent a note to the state office asking for a written legal opinion. Based on his experience, Bob Horton believes it is legal. The group agreed to go forward with the present level of certainty, hoping to get more.

Cate joined the meeting later, and expressed her interpretation that it was not legal. She is however willing to go forward with the education process, up to the point of recommendations, but does not wish to go forward from there without a written opinion.

The group also addressed the charge outlined in the Charter. Gene had understood the group would collect data and study the effects of grazing. Bob suggested we can comment on what's needed to ensure the Study is appropriate and adequate. The group went forward with the understanding that it would basically follow the charter.

III. Quorums and Decision-Making Processes

Quorums: A motion passed unanimously that five persons present would constitute a quorum for "operational decisions," and six people would be the minimum number for recommendations to the BLM.

Decision-Making: The group will attempt to reach consensus in all areas. If that fails, for "operational decisions," the group will take a vote and a simple majority will prevail. Recommendations will be proposed at the meeting prior to deciding. If necessary, members will then seek proxy votes for anyone unable to be present for any voting, and 70% of voting members will be required for a recommendation to be adopted. Minority reports will be allowed.

IV. Creating a Process for Following the Charter

Terry & Jon began the discussion of this process with the following matrix:

INFORMATION REQUIRED BY:	*Working Group*	*Public*	*Scientist-Advisors*
BLM Study (incl literature review)	✓	✓	✓
Additional Studies	✓	✓	✓
Peer Review	✓	Make Available	X
Field Trip	✓	X	?
Initial Assessment Report	✓	?	?

This matrix with its check marks and "Xs" made up the issues in front of the group (the "what") as well as the groups of people (the "who") that might consider these issues. The group then proceeded to discuss the "How" and "When."

Field Trip Notes:

1. Paul H., plus one scientist who is conducting an "additional study" if possible;
2. Limited number of participants (8 Working Group, 2 Facilitators, 2 BLM, 2 lessees, 2 trusted by the environmental community, who—to be decided)
3. Purpose of the field trip is Study-oriented:

a. See some study areas (with Paul/other scientist as guides)

b. See the effects of grazing and how they measure them
c. See exclosures
d. See some of the objects of biological interest & ecosystem dynamics
e. General information sharing—not advocacy

4. Ground rules to ensure no grandstanding: maybe questions only, developed in advance by Working Group, with selected participants
5. Limited media coverage (maybe invite Paul Fattig)
6. Public cannot be excluded, must be advertised, but include information about ground rules and that space is limited.
7. Consider Peer Review comments to inform field trip
8. Working Group can suggest areas they would like to see
9. Gene will contact lessees & ask for two representatives
10. Soda Mountain Wilderness Council will be approached to select two
11. May engage the representatives in planning the field trip

Scientist-Advisors:

1. Purpose: What's being done? and What studies do we need? (NOT whether to allow cows on the Monument) – advertise accordingly
2. Who?

a. Paul
b. Peer Review scientist
c. Scientist on additional study
d. Scientist trusted by environmental community
e. Scientist trusted by ranching community

3. Make it all an interactive, public process as the centerpiece of the public participation process
4. Preference: get clear as a Working Group first, then open to the public
5. Scientists not advocates, but trusted by different stakeholder groups
6. This process must be planned at the next meeting.

V. *Timeline*: **Next meeting: August 13**

1. 1. Develop questions for Paul
2. 2. Discuss the Peer Review from OSU

3. 3. Get a presentation on the Additional Studies
4. 4. Discuss & Plan Public Meeting
5. 5. Identify "What's In & What's Out" for Recommendations

a. a. Early September

Field Trip: With Paul + Additional Study person (if possible)

Late September

Tentative Plan for the Public Meeting with Scientist-Advisors

1. 1. Paul's presentation on the Study (90 minutes)
2. 2. Peer Reviewer presentation (include reasons for disagreement)
3. 3. Additional Study scientist
4. 4. Interactive Public Process to be determined

October

Discussion of issues

Decision regarding recommendations to BLM

VI. Meeting Review & Next Steps

- Positives
  - Lunch
  - Frank appreciates opportunity to speak
  - Moving forward—felt good
  - Went smoothly
  - We have a plan!
  - Relieved at the progress!
  - Good points on both sides of the Charter/Forest Plan issue

Next Meeting: Friday, August 13, 9am – 4pm

BLM Office/Lunch will be provided!

Purposes of meeting:

1. Questions for Paul

2. Discuss the Peer Review
3. Presentation of Additional Studies
4. Discuss & Monitor planning
5. Decide "What's In" and "What's Out"of the Recommendations!