

**PAC WORKING GROUP:
GRAZING ON THE CASCADE-SISKIYOU NATIONAL MONUMENT**

**Meeting Notes
June 18, 2004**

Members Present: Gene Bowling, Romaine Cooper, Rose Marie Davis, Mark Grenbemer, Cate Hartzell, Bob Horton, Ed Kupillas, Anita Ward (Alternate)

BLM Staff Present: Kimberly Hackett, Howard Hunter

Facilitators: Jon Lange & Terry Morton

Meeting notes of May 17 were reviewed & corrected to remove Bob Miller from list of PAC Members Present, as Bob was present as a member of the public.

Terry & Jon presented the Draft Initial Assessment, & the Working Group offered the following general responses, questions, and thoughts on future directions of the Group:

- Ed is willing to contact the National Riparian Team and bring more information back to the group, should it become part of the plan;
- The OSU Peer Review report is scheduled to arrive “mid-June,” and should be here any day;
- The Working Group would like a clarification on the relationship between the Standards & Guidelines and the Livestock Study; questioned whether we should even discuss the Standards & Guidelines;
- The Working Group would like a legal opinion on how the Proclamation language will be interpreted (e.g., whether it will be a grazing/no grazing decision, or whether modifying grazing practices can be an option)
- How far are we qualified to extend ourselves toward *scientific* recommendations?
 - Prefer to read information prior to meeting.
 - Good to be able to compare groups’ perceptions & find threads.
 - Regarding the tendency to polarize into groups who think similarly, it’s different for the BLM (who have a hierarchical structure), and also for Working Group members (who have a charge beyond their own interest groups).
 - Recommendations will be made to the full PAC, which will make recommendations to the BLM; District Manager (Tim Reuwsaat) will make the final decision, based on these recommendations and other input; this isn’t an “appealable” decision, although the final decision whether to allow grazing to

continue (scheduled in a few years) will be; the decision-making process will be “protestable” this fall.

- The public may have some of the same confusion that we have; we ought not to be surprised if our work is misunderstood.
- Concern about the group violating the Charter of the PAC, & being part of future appeals & litigation.
- Looking forward to getting on the ground.
- Hope this process won't be subject to protest.
- Concern that recommendations will be “for naught”, because of legal maneuverings.
- We ought to focus the issues.
- What about “the neighbors”? (near the CSNM)

- ***Goals of This Working Group***

- Review the Livestock Study
 - Review the OSU Peer Review Report
 - Engage in a public participation process (provide education & gather input)
 - Make recommendations to the BLM
- May want Jon & Terry to do #3;
 - #3 is the last piece to do – we need to get lined out first;
 - Review the existing Study & the Peer Review, identify gaps, propose additional studies, then involve the public;
 - Large public meetings for input will get us more of what we've already gotten;
 - Find a way to do public participation where input is more focused on the Study;
 - Also educate the public;
 - Get initial Peer Review comments on the original study;

→ ***Howard will provide the names of scientists who commented on the first draft of the Study, & whose comments are included in the packet the Working Group already received.***

- Remember second Peer Reviewers (OSU) are much more informed about the Study, as BLM met with them and communicated many of the details;
- We want to defuse polarization – limiting public comment won't achieve that – look for way to include public regularly in our meetings;
- Expose the public to the same process we've gone through – presentations, questions & answers, feedback;
- Would like the BLM to help us understand the transition from Draft 1 to Draft 2;

- We can model a way through the conflict that stays focused on information (as distinguished from values);
- Field trips with public education;
- How do we make the public aware of what we're doing?
- Field trip for *this* group, & put it in the paper to let the public know; have later field trips for the public;
- Perhaps this group ought not to go to the field; we can't pretend it will get us fully informed on the science of the Study;
- Could convene a panel of scientists (trusted by the stakeholders): 1) field trip; 2) panel discussion;
- Working Group "not the BLM" – can lend credibility & objectivity to the process;
- Scientists can make recommendations to -?- (Working Group, PAC, BLM).

Next meeting Wednesday, July 7, 1:00-4:30pm

Purpose: To draft a process for developing recommendations

Following meeting either Monday, July 19, or Friday, July 23, 8am-5pm

Purpose: Reserve for field trip, in case that's part of the 7/7 process