

August 30, 2010 10:00 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.
CMR Stakeholder Group Meeting (2nd Meeting)
Petroleum County Courthouse Basement, Winnett, MT

10:00 – 12:00 Bill Milton introduced himself as the group facilitator and had everyone in the room gather chairs in a circle and introduce themselves by answering four questions: 1) What is your relationship to the landscape in and around the CMR? 2) What are your expectations for our meeting? 3) How far did you travel to get here? 4) How do feel about being in this circle today?

Meeting attendance breakdown by type of organization.

| Type of Organization, Group, Etc. | Count |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| Conservation Organizations | 6 |
| Conservation Districts/Councils | 10 |
| RC&D | 1 |
| Friends Group | 2 |
| Ranchers | 4 |
| Press | 2 |
| Outfitters | 1 |
| Cabin Assn | 2 |
| Sportsmen's Assn | 2 |
| County Govt | 2 |
| Fed Govt | 4 |
| State Govt | 1 |
| Ranch/Farm Group | 3 |
| Local Business | 2 |
| TOTAL | 42 |

12:00 – 1:00 No host lunch at cost of \$6.00

1:00 – 3:00 Break-out groups. Given 3 questions (one at a time) to answer with full reporting to group after each question.

Question 1 – What are the boundaries of the landscape (including towns and communities) the group wishes to focus its efforts?

Group 1. Alternatives:

1. CMR
2. CMR + Towns
3. 6 County area around CMR

Group 2. Landscape boundaries are proposed to be CMR plus the entirety of the six surrounding counties.

1. Counties may be better able to work with CMR
2. Increased ability to leverage funding and other resources
3. County-based Conservation Districts will be better able to interact with CMR
4. Concerns about economic well-being of surrounding communities
5. Wildlife cross jurisdictional boundaries, not just staying on (or off) CMR
6. Increased buy-in of the public in stakeholder process

Group 3. Map of differing boundaries (from smallest to largest)

1. CMR
2. Bounded by Highways 200 (S), 191 (W), 2 (N), 24 (E)
3. CMR plus 6 surrounding counties
4. Another one – can't identify

Group 4. List of 3 criteria

1. Focus on CMR for boundary
2. Consider biological area
3. Understand effects on human community

- Group 5. Where do you stop?
- Group 6. The focus is on the CMR but consideration should be given to all surrounding communities.
- Group 7. Area/Landscape of interest – CMR and contiguous properties.

Question 2 – In eight words or less, what is the core purpose (reason for existing) for the group?

- Group 1. Provide a forum for diverse stakeholders to better understand opportunities in a changing landscape.
 1. Make policy makers aware of our concerns
 2. Come together and build consensus about CMR
 3. To improve the health of the CMR
 4. ID issues and concerns affecting the defined landscape
- Group 2. Build on common principles for natural resource, agriculture, and community vitality. (need to add “understand”...!!Construction Zone!!).
 1. Building on common principles while solving conflicting values.
 2. Understand different perspectives and, where possible, find common ground.
 3. Build a partnership with the CMR to address public concerns.
 4. Natural resource, agriculture, and community preservation and sustainability partnership.
 5. We collaborate for conservation of natural and human communities of the counties surrounding the CMR.
- Group 3. Purpose is the conservation, economic, social, and political well-being of the area.
- Group 4. Help the CMR while preserving local cultural values.
- Group 5. To ensure that state & federal agencies don’t make land management decisions without including local stakeholders in the planning, decision and implementation process.
- Group 6. Form a consensus to influence management of CMR to benefit all affected parties.
- Group 7. To facilitate communication among stakeholders and achieve mutually beneficial goals.

Question 3 – The vision question: What is one measurable achievement this group can accomplish in the next year?

- Group 1.
 1. Use a variety of management tools to measurably improve habitat for a diversity of prairie wildlife.
 2. To ensure state and federal agencies do not make land management decisions without including local stakeholders
 3. Introduce a healthy, sustainable, and huntable wild bison population on a large landscape in association with prescriptive cattle grazing.
 4. One successful joint project involving all interested stakeholders.
- Group 2.
 1. To see concerned groups still at the table in 5 years.
 2. Resolve grazing conflicts for ranchers and wildlife
 3. Consideration for the recreating public who use Fort Peck Lake through improved all-weather roads throughout the Refuge.
 4. Develop ongoing group to present information and resolve issues.
 5. In 5 years, at least 60% of the stakeholders involved in this group will have achieved at least one goal that they otherwise could not have achieved, demonstrating the power of targeted collaboration.
- Group 3.
 1. Publicize the political issues for a clear understanding of playing field.
 2. All stakeholders have a voice that is heard and respected by each other and CMR staff.
 3. CMR respect local opinions.
 4. Change attitudes of CMR staff toward local input. Add respect not arrogance.
 5. Spread the word of information gatherers from the group concerning CMR.
- Group 4.

1. To see max cap of grazing reinstated in refuge while maintaining wildlife standards and national recreation standards.
2. Start and continue a community conversation toward agreements for sharing the CMR resource by all stakeholders.
3. Set up international internet forum for exchange of information and posting comments on the CMR and interaction with community preservation.
4. To see the CMR managed to full economic benefit of local communities who are affected daily while helping CMR meet their specific required mission.
5. Within 2 years agree on a natural resource project on CMR that can be accomplished in 5 years or less.

Group 5. We might return if...we could trust in CMR enough to know without a doubt that they listen and care about local values and make a serious effort to include our input in their management decisions.

1. Measurement: Did they include our suggestions yes/no?

Group 6. What will keep us coming back:

1. A plan of order command concerning use.
2. CCP comments influencing CMR to be managed for the most sustainable value.
3. If there was a way to return to practical grazing practices.
4. A sense that the group was open, sincere, and working for trust toward a shared goal.
5. Have future changes in CMR policy include local input and consider their voices in those changes. This meeting is a start.

Group 7. Goals:

1. Game carts permitted in wilderness areas.
2. Wilderness designations for CMR.
3. Allow predictable & economically feasible livestock grazing.
4. Increase wildlife habitat quality as a means of increasing public benefit.
5. Agreement on fire management issues between CMR and adjacent landowners.
6. Containment of noxious weeds on the refuge (consensus).

3:00 –3:30 Wrap up and determine next meeting date/location.

All still in attendance stated they would be willing to return to another meeting with the exception of one participant who answered that maybe she would return.

The next meeting will be held on Monday October 4 from 10:00-3:00 in Lewistown. A planning team was formed consisting of:

- 2 representatives from agriculture: Dana Darlington and Linda Poole
- 2 representatives from govt agencies: Bob Nansel and Bill Berg
- 2 representatives from conservation groups: Dennis Jorgensen and Kit Fisher
- 1 representative from recreation: Terry Self;

Terry offered to be the on-site person in Lewistown to handle logistics for next meeting.

Laurie Riley, Missouri River Conservation Districts Council

Bill Milton, meeting facilitator

County Commissioners were invited, but unable to commit time to the planning process.