

Custer-Gallatin National Forest Working Group (CGWG)

Meeting Agenda

September 9, 2015 (1:00 pm)

The Community Room, Gallatin County Courthouse, 311 W. Main, Bozeman, Mt.

Time	Topic	Lead	Outcomes
1:00	Opening and introductions; Meeting materials: Minutes, Membership applications, Skills Matrix, Process and Purpose, CGWG 2015 Action items	Prinkki/Atwood	Welcome, introductions, agenda reviewed
1:10	Consent Agenda: Minutes Financial report/disbursements	Prinkki/Atwood	Vote on consent agenda items: individual items can be segregated for discussion and vote.
1:20	Membership applications Bruce Reiersen , Mt. Trail Vehicle Riders Assoc. (MTVRA)	Prinkki/Atwood	Review, interview and vote on membership applications
1:30	Forest Service: Farm Bill Project Selection 2016	Prinkki/Atwood	Review/Determine Farm Bill Project Proposals for CGWG consideration
2:00	CGWG Project selection process;	Atwood/Prinkki	Form CGWG Sub-committee; Review selected Farm Bill projects. Responsible for evaluating and recommending future CGWG projects
2:15	Strategic and Organizational Planning (2nd of 3 meetings). Skills Matrix Purpose and Process 2015 Action items	Atwood/Prinkki	Increase the capabilities of the Custer Gallatin Working Group (CGWG) to enable them to assist the Custer Gallatin National Forest (CGNF) achieve higher levels of performance.
3:00	Break		
3:20	Strategic and Organizational Planning; cont.	Atwood	Evaluate Purpose and Process statement: Prepare for October adoption
4:45	Public comment	Prinkki	Allow for Public comment/questions
5:00	Adjourn		

Documents to review/bring to meeting: meeting agenda, August minutes, CGWG Action items, Skills Matrix, Purpose and Process Statement

Meeting was brought to order by Chairman Prinkki at 1:00 pm.

Members and guests in attendance introduced themselves and quorum was established with fourteen (14) members present.

Those in attendance:

John Prinkki, Carbon County	Gary Severson, High Point Resources
Jim Hart, Madison County	Mary Erickson, Supv. Custer Gallatin Natl. Forest
Jeff Schmidt, Red Lodge Ski Area	Alex Sienkiewicz, USFS, CGWG Liaison
Mike Christianson, Member at Large	Lisa Stoeffler, USFS
Scott Brennan, The Wilderness Society	Darcie Warden, Greater Yellowstone Coalition
Kevin Germain, Big Sky Chamber	Dan Clark, MSU Local Govt. Center
Jerry Furtney, RY Timber	Blake Christensen, MSU Local Govt. Center
Joe Skinner, Gallatin County	
Joe Josephson, Greater Yellowstone Coalition	
Earl Atwood, Beartooth RC&D	

Chairman Prinkki invited comments from any citizen present, there were none.

The consent list agenda was presented which included the following items for approval:

1. Minutes from the August, 2015 CGWG meeting

Mike Christianson moved approval of the consent agenda items, seconded by Kevin Germain.
APPROVED by unanimous voice vote.

A Membership Application was presented for consideration, from Mr. Bruce Reierson, representing the Montana Trail Vehicle Riders Association (MTVRA). Mr. Reierson introduced himself and provided background on his association and explained his organization's interest in participating in the CGWG. Members present were given the opportunity to ask questions. Following discussion, John Prinkki moved to accept the MTVRA application and receive Mr. Reierson as their representative on the CGWG. Seconded by Jeff Schmidt. APPROVED by unanimous voice vote.

Mary Erickson, Lisa Stoeffler and Alex Sienkiewicz representing the Custer Gallatin National Forest provided an overview of their recent process to identify priority projects for implementation under the Farm Bill. The process utilized by the CGNF was explained, and the short list of candidate projects were presented to the CGWG members with rationale for their priority. The recommended project as first priority for implementation is the Bridger Bangtails landscape.

Ms. Erickson sought input from the CGWG members concerning the project selection process, and the resulting recommendation, as well as the degree of interest on the part of CGWG to collaborate on the execution of the project in the coming year.

Members asked numerous questions concerning the short-listed projects, but ultimately agreed that the recommended project (Bridger Bangtails) has a strong rationale for first priority. Further, members expressed support for direct collaboration on the project. Details will need to be worked out in terms of CGWG action items, but developing the proposal, working through the NEPA process and helping to engage the local constituency would be the general scope of assistance. Members authorized Chairman Prinkki to generate a letter of support for the Forest Service process and recommended project.

Updated draft documents were presented concerning the Member Skills Assessment and the Purpose and Process document that has been drafted to supplant the CGWG Values Statement.

Most of our members expressed that we need to put additional work into simplifying the language.

There was discussion about the spatial scope of the Working Group, i.e. whether the landscape area of eight counties was overreaching the capacity of the Group.

The Group also spent some time on the “triple bottom line”, and it seemed that the reference to “physical...environment” in the first statement was confusing to some, as opposed to “ecological”.

The universal, iterative use of the word “Restore” in all of the desired conditions statements was not comfortable for several members, and seemed to distract from the objective of evaluating whether the rest of the sentence actually stated a desired condition they agreed with.

Reference to fire dependent ecosystems flashed a discussion about whether that was too limiting when the point of the desired condition was achieving resiliency in an ‘all lands’ approach.

The Group had several questions regarding the term Ecological Site Descriptions, in the third section. Chairman Prinkki advocated for having this term embedded as a connector for potential down-line funding. Conceptually, there were reservations about the way the term is situated in the statement.

When the discussion turned to Ops Manual, the key item covered was membership structure. We emphasized that diversity is key to the group’s credibility, and thus the need to consider some additional representation. Commissioner representation for the eight county area was discussed at some length. The Group did not reach consensus about changing the model to a representative approach (fewer commissioners are seated but they represent all counties). Members did seem open to the addition of other categories, however.

A new draft of the document is to be brought back to the September meeting, with suggested revisions to address concerns from the discussion. Gary Severson will be attending in October, and will put additional information on the table at that time for ‘next steps’ in the planning process.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:50 PM.

Next Meeting will be on October 14th at 1:00 pm in the same venue.

Next Meeting: September 9, Bozeman, Montana – location to be determined.