

Meeting called to order on July 29, 2014 at 1:00 p.m. by Monument Manager Cindy Staszak, the Designated Federal Official for the GSENM Advisory Committee (MAC); and MAC Chair Steve Burr.

MAC Members in Attendance: Bob Blackett (Geology), Gordon (Boz) Bosworth, Steve Burr, Chair (Social Science), Dirk Clayson (Kane County Commissioner), Link Chynoweth, (Livestock Permittee), Mike Friedman (Outfitter/Guide), Phil Hanceford (Environmental), Kevin Heaton (State), Norm McKee (Wildlife), Leland Pollack (Garfield County Commissioner), Doug Reagan (Systems Ecology), and Keith Watts (Education) (by phone).

MAC Members Excused from Meeting: N/A

MAC Members Not Attending: N/A

Monument Staff In Attendance: Larry Crutchfield, Public Affairs; Katherine Farrell, Environmental Coordinator; Richard Madril, AMM, Resources; Kevin Miller, Science Program Administrator; Sarah Schlanger, Associate Monument Manager; and Carolyn Shelton, AMM, Science and Visitor Services

Non-Monument BLM Personnel in Attendance: None

Other Agency Personnel in Attendance: None

Members of the Public in Attendance: Brian Bremner, Garfield County Engineer; Rich Csenge, Grand Staircase-Escalante Partners (GSEP); Shannon McBride, Kane County; Noel Poe, Executive Director, GSEP; Larry Spanne, President, GSEP; Laura Welp, Western Watersheds Project (WWP).

Agenda

29 July 2014

Welcome: Staszak

Administrative Remarks: Crutchfield

- Turn in Hotel receipts/mileage claims tomorrow before departing.
- MAC Charter & By-laws
- Review 2014 Advisory Committee Contact spreadsheet; submit corrections to Crutchfield
- Status of Appointments
- Introduce proposal to amend MAC by-laws – change quorum from 2/3 (10 members) to simple majority (8 members). This would allow the MAC to continue

conducting business in the event of unforeseen resignations/terminations of MAC members.

MAC Business: Burr (MAC Chairman)

- Review/Discuss/Approve September 2013 MAC Meeting Minutes
 - **Discussion:** Two corrections
 - **Motion to Approve** – Bosworth/Pollock
 - **Motion Approved** – Unanimously
- Election of new chair/vice chair
 - Nominated for Chair – Burr
 - Nominated for Vice Chair -- Chynoweth
 - **Motion to approve nominations for appointment to Chair/Vice Chair:** Pollock/Heaton
 - Passed Unanimously

Recreation Experience Baseline Study: Tim Casey, Colorado Mesa University (via weblink)

- **Recreation Experience Baseline Study**
 - Understand public's interests and demands regarding a landscape
 - Facilitate the articulation of those interests to the GSENM staff, other agencies and other parts of the public thus enhancing on-going communication between agencies and the publics they serve.
 - Create a baseline for on-going dialog between GSENM, their partners and public (visitors and gateway communities)
 - Inform future planning and management of landscape
 - Understand and document the many senses of place connecting humans with a particular landscape
- **Methodology**
 - Mixed methods – Focus Groups
 - Discussion/Discourse – Understand the language participants use to describe their connection to the landscape. Ask open questions first, then organize through audience polling.
 - Audience polling – quantifying those connections and “hearing” from every participant rather than just the vocal or articulate.
 - Photo Elicitation – Use of photos as discussion prompts to articulate public preferences and concerns about certain landscape settings.
 - In-person and digitally – local residents, leaders and business owners (including outfitters and guides) as well as those who can't be physically present on the landscape when focus groups happen.
 - Public process – Putting the public in public lands. On going dialog from focus groups to presentations to reports. Active, anonymous, participation is essential for the research.
- **Demographics**

- 12 on-site focus groups
- 5 digital webinar based digital focus groups
- March –September 2013
- 123 Participants
- 10 states and Canada
- Most from UT
- **Special Places Identified on a Map**
 - Participants were asked to write the names of places particularly special to them on sticky notes and place them on a map of the area on the wall, then asked to explain WHY those places were special to them.
 - All sticky notes were cataloged and mapped based on the location the note was placed on the wall map.
 - 295 mentions (Sticky notes) total
 - 79 unique places identified
 - 183 in GSENM (62%)
 - 114 in GCNRA (38.6%)
- **Conclusions –A Special Place**
 - HITSR Area is a unique landscape that is a very special place to a wide variety of people
 - Part of what makes it special are the wild, remote, rugged and scenic qualities. A sense of discovery and wonder, but also the importance of its history, geology and connections to people’s experiences. It is a dynamic landscape that affords many different experiences and connections.
 - Use of this space has increased in recent years and this has been a mixed blessing. More people to enjoy it and boost local economies, but it can be “loved” to death or at least enough to substantially change the qualities people seek in this remote location.
- **Conclusions – Threats to this place**
 - Threats to the specialness of the landscape include overuse, damage to the resources, and over development. There is also concern that many who come in the future will not have the connection or appreciation of the place. Education is an important tool to address this threat.
 - The current management approach is generally working well on the landscape with some important noted areas of concern where the resource and its specialness are threatened
- **Conclusions – Activities and Expectations**
 - This is an area that is often approached by vehicle, but is more likely encountered on foot. It is prized for its inspiring scenic qualities and the kinds of activities associated with such dramatic scenery such as photography, site-seeing and artwork.
 - People come here to experience the naturalness and tranquil escapes embodied by the landscape.

-
- There is a sense of discovery and self-reliance encouraged by the land itself, but it is also an important place because of the connection people have with the area historically, spiritually, scientifically, recreationally and traditionally.
 - **Conclusions - Development**
 - Although some were interested in developing recreational and transportation facilities such as upgrading the main road and trailheads, most preferred the lack of developments and feared what those would do to the specialness of the place as it is and has been.
 - In the comments of many, the improvements of access and facilities would trade off with the qualities of wildness, ruggedness and discovery/exploration.
 - **Conclusions - Services**
 - Visitors and locals rely on a variety of services from local communities and beyond to support their connection to the HITR area.
 - These include gas and groceries, but also information, guide services and the restaurant/hotel business
 - The interpretive and educational services provided by GSENM-Interagency staff, outfitters/guides, and locals are vitally important to help people develop and nurture a monumental sense of place around the area accessed by the HITR road
 - **Conclusions – Suggested Solutions**
 - There is certainly a role to manage the increase in use (and abuse) of the landscape, but this should be done in cooperation with the public (including public stewardship), and with an effort to minimize the impact of that management on the undeveloped character of the place.
 - Designating certain areas such as Dance Hall, HITR and Devil’s Garden for development to accommodate heavier use might be a great way to maintain the remote character of the rest of the landscape
 - People overwhelmingly love the characteristics of this unique place as it is. Targeted attention to such areas of concern such as Coyote Gulch, or issues such as vandalism, trash, human waste and crowding to maintain the specialness of the place is supported.
 - **Further Research**
 - Summer 2014 – Final Report on Phase 1 (HITR) available to the public
 - 2014 – Phase 2 – Grand Staircase region
 - Started March 2014 in Kanab and Cannonville
 - Additional focus groups in May and September
 - Digital Focus Groups this summer
 - 2015 – Phase 3 – Highway 89 corridor
 - Covers lands in GSENM, BLM Kanab FO, Vermillion Cliffs NM
 - Focus groups from Kanab to Page and digitally
 - 2016 – Phase 4 – TBD: Highway 12 corridor or Burr Trail area or another area of Monument
 - 2017 – Monument-wide analysis

- Data from all four phases
- **Questions?**
 - Pollock: Alluded to the fact that you've interviewed a lot of people along HITR; what you are hearing is quite different from what I hear. HITR is not available to a lot of people because of its condition – only 4-wheel drives can use. People want more access.
 - Casey: Not saying that we didn't hear some of those voices...and I know there are people who feel that way...but that's what we heard.
 - Clayton: I participated in the study...perhaps we're reading too much into this question. People do want access. They don't want the roads to be impassable.
 - Bosworth: Would you find a change in responses if you changed the time of the study.
 - Casey: It would change a bit...local residents probably wouldn't change but certainly the outside visitors would.
 - Bosworth: Where can we find the report.
 - Casey: A link will be on the GSENM website.
 - Heaton: Did you ask participants to define solitude as what it means to them.
 - Casey: Yes.
 - Heaton: Did you have any target objectives to sample a certain percentage of locals?
 - Casey: I can't say 123 people is a statistically viable number...but I can say the people who came are the ones that would probably vocalize their thoughts.

Action: Copy of executive summary to MAC: Completed July 29

Livestock Grazing EIS Update: Farrell

- EIS timeline
- Scoping report/results – available online on the Monument website.
- Newsletter – has been sent out to interested parties/ cooperating agencies/planning contact list; also available online.

Status of GSENM Rangelands: Madril

- Land Health...Is what its all about
- Part of the process of determining land health is by an interdisciplinary team of Professional staff meeting on the ground and following an approved process
 - Over 650 Upland sites
 - Over 150 Lentic sites
 - ~360 Miles of Lotic Reaches
- Thriving vegetation is what protects the soil and maintains the land
- Passive Management and extended non-use of the land brings its own un-intended consequences
- Active management at all levels is what it takes to keep balance

GSENM “Objects and Values”: Schlanger

- Planning must keep aware of Monument Objects & Values...a comprehensive, concrete list of those items listed in the proclamation. Came up with this list as a staff to confirm how we are doing in terms of conserving, protecting and restoring.
- Passed out draft O&V table to MAC members.

Livestock Grazing Public Science Forum on Biological Soil Crust: Schlanger

- To have a discussion by recognized experts and to hear what they say; how should we be responding to the management implications.
- **Comments:**
 - Clayson: When developing alternatives, take a look at what all can be done to improve the ecology...erection of fences, etc. How do we reconcile the objects & values and how they are impacted by grazing when the proclamation says nothing will affect existing livestock grazing and applicable regulations.

Repurpose Grazing Subcommittee to address O&V: Burr/Schlanger

- Subcommittee for Land Health was originally formed for the purpose of compiling information, conducting research in support of the plan amendment and providing scientific oversight of submitted data.
- No data received for subcommittee review.
- GSENM would like MAC to consider repurposing the subcommittee to address Monument objects & values.
 - Hanceford: (Comment) Use exclosures to monitor long-term range health to help drive the science forward. Monitoring for the past 12 years...land health assessments tell you where you're at today (Madril). Those do asset soil but not necessarily crust.
 - (Madril) yes they do. AIM strategy – is that changing the way monitoring is happening. Miller – it will in the long term. AIM is an on-going assessment then regular monitoring of land health.
 - Burr: Range conditions were improving; recovering has been due to changes in management...what changes.
 - Madril – changing of seasons, rotations, protective structures, voluntary non-use.
 - Bosworth: Showed springs that benefitted from change in management. What springs/conditions keep a stream from meeting? Floods, exclosures. NRST in slides – came to help GSENM understand...are they producing any type of document/recommendations? They are working with us to understand how to properly evaluate the conditions. Trying to develop something (study protocols, management strategies, etc) for the entire southwest to understand.

-
- Chynoweth: Objects & Values – to list the impact of grazing on these objects & values...not only impacted by grazing, every use on the Monument impacts objects & values. I think grazing should be listed as a value.
 - Pollock: Grazing is listed as a historic object that should be protected. People are begging to improve the land on the monument – there are areas you don't want to do something on; but there are many other areas that need help – P.J...what can we do to help big horn sheep, mule deer, wildlife, soil erosion. Let's stop pointing fingers & start with improving the range.
 - Burr: What is monument's stand on using fire as a tool?
 - Madril: Let it burn except in some areas – urban interface, powerlines, etc.
 - Reagan: Why are the Resources, objects & values not listed? Grazing is a value as well as an impact. How do you sort that out?
 - Watts: I don't think I'm in the position to make those judgements of what our objects & values. MAC should concentrate on collaborative effort to work out the problems with the EIS. I think we need to agree to agree on some things.
 - Friedman: There is the public NEPA process which is very clear cut & the Objects/Values is very subjective.
 - Burr: MAC will continue discussion of the subject tomorrow morning.

Public Comment

Welp: Use science...get away from emotions & values...use science. You need to read the literature...the papers that are available relating to grazing and grazing management. Assessing rangeland health is very subjective.

Csenge: After listening to today's discussion, I think it might be helpful to reexamine the definitions of the different terms you are discussing. What is a resource, an object and a value. I think that will help.

Motion to Adjourn Meeting: Clayson/Hanceford

- Passed unanimously

1730 - Meeting Adjourned: Chair/DFO

July 30, 2014

MAC Members in Attendance: Bob Blackett (Geology), Gordon Bosworth (Botany), Steve Burr, Chair (Social Science), Link Chynoweth (Livestock Permittee), Dirk Clayson (Kane County Commissioner), Mike Friedman (Outfitter/Guide), Phil Hanceford (Environmental), Kevin Heaton (State), Norm McKee (Wildlife), Leland Pollock (Garfield County Commissioner), and Doug Reagan (Systems Ecologist)

MAC Members Excused from Meeting: Keith Watts (Education)

MAC Members Not Attending: N/A

Monument Staff In Attendance: Larry Crutchfield, Public Affairs; Katherine Farrell, Environmental Coordinator; Richard Madril, AMM, Resources; Kevin Miller, Science Program Administrator; Sarah Schlanger, Associate Monument Manager; and Carolyn Shelton, AMM, Science and Visitor Services

Non-Monument BLM Personnel in Attendance: None

Other Agency Personnel in Attendance: None

Members of the Public in Attendance: Sky Chaney, Kane County Taxpayers Association; Gael Hill, Glen Canyon Natural History Association Tourism Coordinator; Noel Poe, Ex Dir, GSEP; Larry Spanne, Pres, GSEP; Laura Welp, WWP.

8:15 Meeting Called to Order: Chair/DFO

Our Science Mission: 20th Anniversary & Beyond: Shelton

- Update on science activity
 - 2016 20th Anniversary celebration/3rd GSENM Science Symposium – Invitation to MAC to work w/staff for the anniversary events.
 - Introduction of Gael Hill, GCNHA Tourism Coordinator
 - Burr: GSENM tourism council recommendation from AI; are we going to form one?
 - Hill: I hope so.

AIM Presentation: Miller

- **Motion:** The MAC should send a letter to the Monument Manager asking that she continue to solicit grant dollars to help meet Monument restoration objectives; to request the UPCD give priority status to those projects; and to allow dollars to be spent on NEPA in support of the project. Pollock/Chynoweth
 - **Discussion:** Bosworth - We need to include in the letter an explanation of why the MAC feels this is important.
 - Motion passes unanimously.

Land Health Subcommittee: Hanceford

- Hanceford is acting chair
- Subcommittee needs to further discuss ecosystem restoration.

-
- Subcommittee on Land Health should look at MAC II recommendations w/respect to restoration.

GSENM in the News: Various staff members.

- Little Valley Wash Oil Spill – Schlanger
 - Update on the spill & follow-on actions
 - Passed out copies of the Final Report
- Appreciative Inquiry Study – Schlanger
 - Update on the study – many positive actions have resulted, i.e., Big Water Dinosaur Festival, Long Valley (Orderville) Farmers’ Market, Winter rotation of open restaurants in Escalante, grants of \$4,000 each to four community festivals, hiring of tourism coordinator.
- WWP Litigation - Madril
- RS 2477 Litigation - Crutchfield

MAC Review of Objects & Values

Open Discussion

Discussion on change to By-laws requires

- **Motion to reduce quorum to simple majority.** Clayson/Reagan
 - Passed unanimously

Public Comment Period

- **Spanne:** Best science should be used. Partners have active site steward program on the monument. We entertain coordination with the ranchers on the sites. Partners also works with UPCD...willing to help if we can.
- **Poe:** New executive director. Recruiting a development director to build relationships with various people to help us with the projects. ERWP efforts. Lab technician. Education program.
- **Chaney (President of Kane County TPA):** In long run, EIS & policies on grazing may have impact on Kane County. .41% & 17,000 jobs as opposed to recreation.
- **Welp:** Commend the monument for the process employed to get public opinion for EIS; excited to hear the land health subcommittee will look at the former report & help use the data; socioeconomics is important.

Next Meeting: October 28 & 29, 2014; Escalante
Motion to adjourn: Bosworth/Reagan

Meeting Adjourned