

# CASCADE-SISKIYOU NATIONAL MONUMENT

## WORKING GROUP: STUDY OF LIVESTOCK GRAZING IMPACTS

### Meeting Notes

October 20, 2004

Members Present: Ed Kupillas, Gene Bowling, Romain Cooper, Cate Hartzell, Bob Horton, and Frank Lang & Anita Ward (alternates)

BLM Staff Present: Howard Hunter, Kimberly Hackett, Lori List, Kathy Minor

Public: Dave Willis, Randy White

Facilitators: Terry Morton & Jon Lange

Bob Horton called the meeting to order. The notes from the last meeting were approved as written.

### **Topics:**

**New Information:** The group considered how long they would be able to accept new submissions of comments and recommendations, and decided no formal decision needed to be made.

**Information Sources:** The information sources used by the Working Group were identified and agreed to: the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the Monument Proclamation, the Working Group Charter, the identified objects of biological interest, the BLM studies, the additional studies funded by the World Wildlife Fund, the OSU Peer Review, and recommendations from group members and the public.

**Quorum and Decision-Making:** We re-visited the issues of what constituted a quorum and how many votes would be required for recommendations. They were summarized in a document taken from the agreements made on July 23, 2004. (See other document.)

**Format of Recommendations:** It was decided that the format would include the following:

- 1-2 pages
- bullet points
- concise
- say clearly what is meant
- Recs. would go from this group to the SOPAC to the PIEC to the BLM

**Focus:** The focus of the group would include ensuring that

- The studies are fair and balanced and that possible biases be revealed
- A wide array of information be made available to the public
- The studies are adequate and sufficient for a BLM decision on grazing based on impacts

**What is “outside the purview” of the group’s recommendations/charge?**

After much discussion, it was agreed that specific comments about scientific methodology (e.g., size of exclosures, sampling, etc.) would be outside the group’s purview for recommendations. However, comments or recommendations about how others might deal with methodology (e.g., the OSU Review, other peer reviewers) would be considered. A motion passed unanimously that endorsed all of #10 inside the Working Summary. That language reads:

***Outside the Purview of the Working Group***

Directly critiquing scientific methodology for specific studies (John Roth)

Deciding whether Rangeland Health Standards & Guides is an appropriate tool in deciding whether or not current grazing on the Monument is incompatible with the objects of biological interest (John Roth)

Deciding whether each effect from grazing is positive or negative, and whether so many positives might balance out so many negatives or vice versa (John Roth)

Recommending whether or not a buy-out plan is appropriate (John Roth)

Recommending funding levels or duration of research projects designed to shed light on grazing impacts (Romain)

Deciding the standards of adequate peer review for grazing studies (Romain)

Making recommendations for upcoming NEPA processes regarding grazing in the Monument (Romain)

Determining whether the subcommittee’s work (dealing with a CSNM issue) is legally mandated under the Northwest Forest Plan (Romain) (Ed)

It was also stated that the group could revisit this list later if it decided to do so.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The group then turned to the Summary of Recommendation areas, with individual’s differences and overlaps indicated, a “synthesis document” created by Terry Morton. This served as the document from which the group began to make recommendations. It was decided that the exact language would be worked on later. What follows is mainly conceptual, not reflecting exact final wording:

## Recommendation #1

Literature Review: We recommend that the BLM include in its deliberations literature reviews that include pertinent studies on grazing impacts, especially historic studies focusing on the monument itself. A bibliography should be compiled.

## Transparency and Input/Feedback from the Public and Experts

The group spent some time talking about two issues, (1) transparency, and (2) input and/or feedback from the public and experts. It was decided that Terry and Jon would attempt to craft some language that would reflect the group's thinking about these issues. The statements would not appear as formal recommendations, but perhaps in a preface or added on at the end. Here are the statements:

*We encourage openness and transparency on the part of the BLM. We hope they will consider diverse information from multiple sources, including previous public input and the observations of those working or living on or near the Monument. We recognize that they will need to be discerning, weighing the input they receive, and encourage them to respond to the public in a way that lets them know how their input was taken into account. We recommend the BLM publicize the basis of their decision about the grazing studies, so that people are able to understand their rationale.*

## Peer Review

The remaining amount of time was spent discussing a recommendation having to do with peer review. The committee made some progress but did not make a final decision regarding this item. (It will be taken up next meeting.)

The group considered dealing with past studies, the BLM grazing studies, the additional studies, and non-scientific input separately. It was agreed that the "additional studies" should be peer reviewed. While at first it was said that the BLM grazing studies were not peer reviewed at the start, it was pointed out that indeed there was peer review of the design of those studies. It was agreed that the standards of peer review should be "rigorous and comparable" (such as publication in a journal). It was suggested that the group support and endorse the OSU Peer Review.

## **Public Comment**

Dave Willis was the only member of the public to comment. He commented on a number of items. Regarding the recommendation process, he suggested that the literature review be appropriately focused, and that public and expert input be appropriately weighed (given their source), and that all relevant information be made available to the public.

The group adjourned at 12:05.

**Next meeting: Friday, October 29**

**New time frame: 12-4:30 (lunch provided),**

**New location: BLM Office**