

**Meeting Minutes for CMR Community Working Group Meeting**  
**Tuesday, June 18, 2013**  
**Multi-Purpose Room, Winnett, MT**

**Attendees:** Damien Austin, Monte Billing, Jason Holt, Destanie Melin, Dean Rogge, Mark Good, Karl Christians, Terry Selph, Kit Fischer, Virginia Murnion, Rick Potts, Ralph Corbett, Dyrck Van Hyning David Allen, John Chase, Heather Richter, Bridget Nielson, Gary Gershmel, Mary Jones, Paul Gies, Daniel Belk, Bill Milton, Rachel Frost, and Carie Hess

10:10 Welcome & Grounding Question –Facilitator Bill Milton. Twenty-four people were in attendance.  
Self-Introductions & Answers to Grounding Question – What does you're county look like now and how much rain have you gotten?

Updates were given from the Eastern Montana Riparian Workshop and it was noted that with the weather there was a low number of attendees. Monte and Dean mentioned that it was more of a classroom type setting than an outdoor training.

Bill Milton opened the floor to Rachel Frost the new Missouri River Conservation District Council coordinator. She stated that she was originally from Texas but has been in Montana working for the Montana State University System in Bozeman in the Animal and Range Sciences Department as a research scientist for the last 7 years. She informed the group that she has a degree in rangeland ecology and management. Dyrck asked how much of the coordinator's time would be spent on the CMR Community Working Group? The answer was that the amount of time will vary some due to workload but that if a percentage had to be stated it would be approximately 10 percent of her time. Terry Selph mentioned that the working group has many players and that there is no one person.

Other council members in attendance mentioned that the council will be revamping their work plan and are focusing on more on-the-ground projects. The council will be working on their new work plan once Rachel is on full time after July 1<sup>st</sup>.

Questions for the break out session

Q1: What do you want to measure that supports the CMRCWG purpose (pick top 3)?

Q2: Regarding an "Atlas Type Project" what are your recommendations for the next steps?

**Group 1**

**Q1: Amenities**

- Economic measures – employment – what sectors
- Income
- Population
- Economic diversity

Identify major qualities

Economic contributors

- Tourism/ recreation
- Agriculture
- State
- Federal
- Transfer payments

- Wildlife trends

Proximity & population to education/healthcare

Landownership

Cost of living/ housing availability

**Q2:** Continue to pursue:

- Bring in economic development groups
- Tourism regions
- Decide the reasons to continue the project

## Group 2

**Q1:**

- Economics of ranching, farming, recreation. (They all support local business)
- Land status – ownership – what is federal, state, private
- Land use – grazed, CRP, farming, wilderness, study areas, non- use areas, both recreation or ag production, access, bison impacts.
- What supports and funds local government
- Demographics

**Q2:**

- Talk with each county to discuss benefits of the Atlas
- Where does the data come from?
- Where does the money come from?
- Any dollar amount equals buy in
- Information brought from reliable sources.

## Group 3

**Q1:**

- Land Use
  - % of land leased for natural resource development, grazing, crops, etc.
- Surrounding real estate \$
  - Residence of landowners
  - Land use – e.g. recreation vs. agriculture
- Reasons for visits to CMR
  - Opportunities for providing services / local community development

**Q2:**

- Find out what information is already available
- Who is generating the available information?
- How have the other counties / groups used similar information?
  - Testimonials for/ against
  - Local buy in

## Group 4

**Q1:**

- Wildlife related economic impacts for 6 counties surrounding CMR.
- Economic impacts to counties of differing land ownership.

- Growth opportunities (economic)?
- Stakeholder satisfaction
- Economics impacts of wild bison population
- Trends of AUM's on CMR, federal, and private
- Trend of sensitive species
- Weed management trends
- Meeting accomplishments of HMP/ goals

**Q2:**

- Bring all 6 counties to the table to discuss
- Hash out priorities of CMRCWG first, and then take to counties.
- Make it a local document

Group 5

**Q1:**

- Education
  - Number of outreach events
  - Number of attendance
  - Number of packets
- Vegetation – Ecosystems
  - Native perennial species diversity
  - Wildlife population
  - Rangeland health
  - Large tracts of wildlands/ unbroken lands
- Community
  - Evaluate letters to editor in papers
  - Survey of CMR operators (opinions/status)
  - Number of farms and ranches – age of ranch community
  - Access of roads to CMR
  - FWP hunting stats
- Communication
  - Attendance numbers
  - Demographics of attendees
  - Interaction between / Human roles with ecosystems
    - Land ethic based of the management of land
  - Local economics
  - Education

**Q2:**

CWG must agree on what we want to measure in the project

Bill then opened the discussion up for “what’s next”

Jason was concerned that the group is too focused on the economics and not the natural resources. He started a discussion on if the group could take the priorities and put them into 4 categories. These were economics, ecological, community and the Triple bottom line. The group came up with the following:

**Economics:**

- Employment/ employment breakdown

- Incomes
- Economic diversity
- Tourism/ recreation/ AG
- Economics of various sectors and contributions to local government
- Cost of living/ housing available
- Land values
- Wildlife related impacts/ values
- Economic impacts of different landownership's

### **Ecological:**

- Land-use/ connectivity
- Trends of sensitive species
- Trends of weed management
- Meeting HMP goals
- Native perennial species diversity
- Wildlife populations
- Rangeland health
- Vegetation cover/ native prairie

### **Community:**

- Population/ demographics
- Landownership/ use
- Unique features
- Distance to hospitals/ education
- Stakeholder satisfaction
- Public opinion/ attitude/ satisfaction
- Quality of life
- Community spirit

### **Triple Bottom Line:**

- What draws people to the CMR?
- Wild Bison
- Growth opportunity
- Trend of AUM's
- Growth threats
- Education/ Public Awareness
- Access
- Hunting/ fishing/ wildlife viewing
- Communication within group
- Value to scientific research

It was noted that with the Triple Bottom Line that social, environmental, and economics play a role.

### **Wrap up**

Mark Good mentioned that meaningful pieces of life should be included.

Dryck mentioned that some of the information is already out there and it was thought that group members could take responsibility and take one item on the list and so some research through various sites.

Bill mentioned that everyone in the group should take the process of how the group came up with the lists to new people. He also mentioned that the group should do some outreach and call and invite people to the meeting. It was noted that these calls should be placed 1-2 weeks before a meeting.

#### Announcements

Next meeting date is August 14<sup>th</sup> in Lewistown

3:00 Adjourn