

**Meeting Minutes for CMR Community Working Group Meeting
Wednesday, August 14, 2013
Sapphire Room A , Yogo Inn, Lewistown , MT**

Attendees: Rick Hartz, Jennifer Boyer, Arnie Dood, Alfred Otto, Doug Powell, Dennis Jorgenson, Stan Benes, Carol Ann Schaeffer, Jason Holt, Destanie Melin, Mark Good, Karl Christians, Terry Selph, Rick Potts, Ralph Corbett, Dyrck Van Hyning, David Allen, John Chase, Bridget Nielson, Mary Jones, Bill Milton, Rachel Frost, and Carie Hess.

Facilitator Bill Milton opened the meeting up at 10:08 am by asking the twenty-four people in attendance to introduce themselves and answer the grounding question – What are your expectations of the meeting?

Bill Milton asked the attendee's to think about "what would we measure to know that we are increasing the vitality of the six county-area and the CMR?" He then gave everyone a 3" X 5" index card and asked them to answer the following questions. For side one "What is your worst possible outcome for this group to create an Atlas?" And on side two "What is your best possible outcome for this group to create an Atlas?"

The group answers are as follows:

Side One - "What is your worst possible outcome for this group to create an Atlas?"

- Rejection of accurate and relevant information because it doesn't conform with
 - A- Your native cultural norm
 - B – Doesn't relate to your desired outcome
- Outcome would be – inability to control our own fate in the economic and social future
- Lose of tax base by loss of ranching and farming
- Group not agreeing on basic data
- Group splitting up because of hard feelings
- When the atlas is completed the partners do no trust and value the information because of the source or funders or it is cast aside, unused with a feeling of failure around the table.
- It fails, misrepresents, and gives the group a bad name from it.
- The communities for the six county area are mistrustful of the information compiled in the final atlas despite the CMR working group's efforts to source the best possible information in a transparent process and it is not adopted by local government as a useful planning tool.
- There is no agreement about valid sources of information.
- The information is used to divide the people instead of making positive progress.
- We rally behind the project, spend capital to bring reluctant members of the community on board, spend limited dollars on its production only for the final document to be seen as biased or propaganda for a special interest agenda causing more bad feelings between various interest groups.
- The group splits, retreating to their respective homes in a state of anger, disagreement, and disillusionment with each other or the process.
- Much effort with nothing
- Definitive highlighted and the end result is a waste of time that generates arguments.
- Discard the idea entirely – unwillingness to agree on anything.
- Division among the group fueled by disagreement on the accuracy of the data presented.
- Threat of one group using the data against another.
- Lost trust and communication between organizations and communities.
- A document prepared by government agencies and environmental groups to support their agendas.
- Individuals continue to hold to preconceived "facts"

- That results/outcome is not accepted by the communities/CD's or County Commissioners and in turn they look down on the CMRCWG.

Side Two - "what is your best possible outcome for this group to create an Atlas?"

- This document is well received and actually used and not set on a shelf to collect dust.
- Legitimate information is discussed and most of the group agrees with the research that is shared.
- See the atlas used as a planning tool by the six surrounding counties, for the benefit of our communities, families, and their lifestyles.
- Combining all community members into long-term trustful and understanding relationships – working relationships
- Built into a long term plan.
- Improved unity among the group and respect for each other because of realized value of all stakeholders.
- Tool to improve communication among stakeholders and counties.
- A reasonable level of initial buy-in from most of the group/counties
- A demonstration that the information as assembled begins to prove useful for a number of interests.
- Document would find some enlightening facts that a collective effort could move forward to the betterment of the area and the Prairie Eco-system, furthering the credibility of the group and their intentions.
- The group arrives at an agreement on at least 80 percent of the issues.
- That the Atlas helps move counties into a place of being proactive instead of reactive on large scale issues.
- Can answer questions about communities easily.
- The diverse stakeholders of the working group come together to complete a project (Atlas) which then serves as a central reference point for facts and data and a symbol of finding areas of agreement.
- Everyone have a better understanding of issues and further work on solutions.
- Consensus about what the information compiled means.
- The resources that are generated from natural amenities and wildlife are recognized as a valuable element of the communities' viability in the atlas project.
- Provide a document that is able to help the six county-area put focus on areas that need help.
- The group takes the information, identifies a common concern/opportunity based on facts – begins problem solving.
- Implementation the CCP successfully to all counties satisfaction.
- Introducing wild bison to CMR.
- More people to live here.
- A conjunction of cultural groups representing people of their region employs data rationally to agree on constructive decisions for the future of our home ground.

Bill then opened the floor to Rick Hartz, County Planner, Beaverhead County – Rick gave a little background on himself and how he got to his position as the County Planner. He stated that the atlas is designed to support land use planning efforts, economic development projects and serve as a community resource for landowners, new residents and others. One immediate application will be supporting the new growth policy for Beaverhead County. He mentioned that the goal is to present natural resource and socio-economic data in a single location, graphically and with some simple analysis and summary. This will provide a snapshot of the resources and attributes in Beaverhead County and could augment grant proposals and community projects. Rick stated that the county commissioners will need to engage in the project due to the fact that they are the ones that have to initiate any program or plan, good or bad. He did mention that printing of the booklets costs about \$22-24 each and that Park County sells them for \$30

each. When he was asked how long the information would be useful he stated that he would say 5 to 10 years as some items are long term such as federal/ state/ private land ratios while other data such as the economics, needs to be looked at about every 5 years. Rick said that Beaverhead County has already used this document for a subdivision review, grant application, and the planning process. He also noted that they make great Christmas presents. It was mentioned that there was a subcommittee of 3 members working on the project for over a year and that they met at least once a month.

Dryck Van Hying shared some data (see attached to the minutes) that he was able to get right off the Headwaters Economic website. He asked where does Headwater’s get their data and can it be trusted. He stated that there are multiple categories and showed what his research over the last 4 months had procured. He put this information up on a projector so that everyone could see the data. He mentioned that he had left off some information to keep from irritating other group members. Rick Potts mentioned that the group would need to start with a whole list and narrow it down. Jason Holt thanked Dryck for his time spent and noted that he felt that Dryck is just trying to show that the data is out there. Ron Moody mentioned that the data is only going to be a snapshot in time and that it will always be changing. It was mentioned that Dryck presented a great sample or example of the data that is out there.

After lunch Bill asked the group “what are the common elements among all of us?” He then asked the group “do you feel that some form of Atlas project can be done?” He went around the room and each person was given an opportunity to answer. The majority of the group felt that some sort of Atlas project is obtainable.

It was stated that there is a need to go door to door to the counties and commissioners to promote the Atlas and to answer any questions that are out there. Bill asked if the group could create an Outreach group or committee to go out to the individual counties to educate people on what an Atlas is what it has to offer each county. It was mentioned that maybe there needs to be another vessel promoting the Atlas, and it was asked if that could be the MRDCDC.

Jason Holt asked if the group could do a hands-on activity with a few laptops at the next meeting to look at the Headwater’s site to gain some more knowledge. It was thought that it would be possible and a few people thought that they could bring laptops.

It was mentioned that the group needs to be promoted in the papers, radio and other avenues.

Wrap up

Bill asked everyone in attendance to tell him what worked and what needs improvement

What worked	Needs Improvement
Presentations	Needs to be more hands on
Dryck’s sample	The feeling to not say something that might offend others
Communication	Distraction
Good thoughts/ideas	
Some progress was made	

Ron Moody stated that he would like to do a wildlife management presentation.

Announcements

A new meeting rotation was introduced which is as follows:

- August - Lewistown
- October – Glasgow
- December – Jordan

February – Malta

April – Winnett

June - Circle

Next meeting is Glasgow on October 10th.

Adjourned at 3:15 p.m.