

CITIZENS ADVISORY COUNCIL
Region 7 - Miles City
Meeting Notes
April 22, 2009

CAC ATTENDANCE: Bob Hagedorn, Scott Studiner, Mary Zeiss Stange, Warren Broeder, Julie Jordan, Jim Schaefer, Art Hayes III, Rob Reukauf, Greg Mohr, Fulton Castleberry, and Chris Pileski.

FWP STAFF ATTENDANCE: Brad Schmitz, Dwayne Andrews, Mike Moore, John Little, Ginger Omland, Vic Riggs

Also present were Gary Bertellotti, FWP Acting Field Operations Chief; and the BLM Access team of Dena Lang and Mark Jacobsen.

Brad welcomed everyone and summarized the agenda. He then introduced Gary Bertellotti, Acting Field Operations Chief, of Fish, Wildlife and Parks in Helena.

Legislative Bills – Gary Bertellotti

Gary B. handed out a packet which included a list of Bills that passed, or are expected to pass, affecting FWP programs or management; Bills that passed related to law enforcement; Bills that passed affecting licenses or use opportunities; Bills that died with the issues unresolved and likely to resurface; a list of bills that were introduced later to FWP; and lists of committees with the respective legislators.

Gary spoke about a few bills that were not on the handouts such as the Federal Stimulus money that has come to Montana is being coordinated with two of the main bills in the legislature which are HB 2 and HB 5. House Bill 2 is the general across the board spending bill. Every agency has a budget and that budget is in HB 2 which is their spending operations – maintenance bill. House Bill 5 is the cap of construction, capital improvements, etc. They are trying to coordinate those two bills so that the stimulus money that has come directly to Montana can be implemented in those two areas. House Bill 645 is the bill that is going to do that. Right now, those are the three major bills being discussed on the floor and they have to have legislative authority to spend this stimulus money. If they don't have that, they cannot spend it. These bills affect FWP in that we have operations and maintenance and all our budgets are tied to the authority for us to spend our money.

The following is a list of bills that Gary commented on:

FWP COMMISSION LEGISLATIVE UPDATE
APRIL 16, 2009

Bills that passed, or are expected to pass, affecting FWP programs or management:

- HB 42 Requires FWP to address fire mitigation, beetle kill and wildlife habitat improvement on FWP lands, with priority for lands with greater than 50 forested acres. Establishes a Forest Management Account that is statutorily appropriated to fund forest management projects.
- HB 203 Requires FWP to secure landowner permission before transplanting any wildlife to private land and to notify the public where wolves, bears or lions are released.
- HB 499 Requires FWP to establish a citizen's advisory council and develop a strategic plan for the Upland Game Bird Enhancement Program and eliminates the 15% cap on administrative expenditures of UGBEP funding.
- HB 645 Provides \$180,000 for Traveler's Rest State Park over the biennium.
- HJ 32 Requires a study of the impact of historic preservation and identifies strategies for preservation at sites like Virginia City, Bannack, Pictograph Cave.
- SB 164 Applies the "Good Neighbor Policy" to all FWP lands. Requires FWP to develop a noxious weed management plan prior to purchasing any land and to set aside the equivalent of 20% of the purchase price (excluding Habitat Montana funding) or \$300,000, whichever is less, in a Land Maintenance Account that is statutorily appropriated to fund operations and maintenance on FWP lands.
- SB 228 Requires FWP to place priority on the protection of humans, livestock and pets in managing wolves, lions and bears. Defines and allows removal of problem wolves for livestock depredation and provides that following delisting, kill permits may be issued to landowners or the public.
- SB 343 Creates a Montana invasive species act, an account and defines department responsibility. Provides for the prevention and control of infestation, authorizes inspections of the exterior of vessels for invasive species and prohibits the transport of invasive species. Includes an appropriation to the Department of Agriculture that will be shared with FWP.
- SB404 Revises laws relating to the location of shooting preserves by increasing maximum size to not more than 1,920 contiguous acres and eliminating the 10 mile spacing requirement. Retains FWP authority to restrict preserves as necessary to avoid impact to public hunting.
- SB 425 Revises the laws governing the management and funding of the Ft. Peck hatchery to allow production of up to 750,000 cold water fish and repealing the warm water stamp, effective March 1, 2012.
- SJ 15 Joint resolution supporting the decision to delist the gray wolf and urging FWP to defend delisting against legal challenges.

Bills that passed related to law enforcement:

- HB 218 Clarifies prohibitions on the use of artificial light when hunting, clarifies when an individual commits the offense of wasting a furbearing animal and defines "pelt."
- HB 222 Stipulates that a person whose privileges to hunt, fish or trap have been revoked is not eligible to purchase any license until all terms of the court sentence in which the privilege was revoked have been met, unless the person is making timely payments on a schedule set by the court.
- HB 223 Authorizes the revocation of hunting, fishing and trapping privileges if a person commits criminal mischief or trespass on property owned or administered by FWP or commits criminal trespass while hunting, fishing or trapping on private land.
- HB 296 Allows designating tribal fish and game wardens as ex officio state wardens when a cooperative agreement exists between FWP and the tribe.
- SB 202 Prohibits feeding of ungulates, bears or mountain lions.

Bills that passed affecting licenses or use opportunities:

- HB 74 Authorizes archery-only seasons for mountain lion, wolf and bear.
- HB 137 Allows landowners enrolled in Block Management, or a full-time employee, to receive a free big game combination license and eliminates the requirement that the cost of the free license be deducted from compensation paid.
- HB 172 Allows FWP to issue a provisional Hunter Education Certificate to a mentally disabled person who cannot pass the written test. Anyone hunting with this certification must be accompanied and supervised by a parent or guardian.
- HB 190 Codifies the public's right to access rivers and streams at county bridges and allows landowners to connect fences to county bridge abutments, provided they do not restrict access. Requires FWP to pay for any improvements in fences to facilitate access.
- HB 221 Allows minors who will reach the age of 12 prior to January 16 to hunt for the entire, preceding fall season.
- HB317 Guarantees a member of the armed forces who forfeits a license or permit issued through a drawing as a result of deployment outside the continental U.S. that same license or permit upon application when they return to Montana.
- HB 366 Allows FWP to enter into an agreement with adjoining states for reciprocal fishing privileges in Montana rivers and streams within 10 miles of the boundaries of Montana.
- HB 383 Provides for free hunting licenses to youth with life threatening illness.

- HB 480 Authorizes nonresident youth aged 12 through 15 to hunt upland game birds and migratory birds with the purchase of a class B1 nonresident upland game bird license at the discounted price of \$35.00 vs. \$110.
- HB 585 Creates up to 500 nonresident elk/deer combination and 500 nonresident deer combination licenses that may be used by adult nonresident family members who wish to return to Montana to hunt with a sponsoring, resident family member. Revenue is earmarked for the acquisition of public hunting access to inaccessible public lands.
- SB 32 Provides that a licensed chiropractor may certify a person as disabled for purposes of obtaining a Permit to Hunt from a Vehicle.
- SB 184 Requires that an application for wild bison must be made on the same application and be subject to the same deadline as the special licenses for moose, goat and sheep. Requires that licenses for bears and lions be available at anytime with the stipulation the licenses purchased after April 15 or August 31 must be purchased at an FWP office and may not be used until 5-days after the license is issued.
- SB 185 Creates a nonresident college student combination big game license that can be used by nonresidents attending post-secondary institutions in Montana, or former Montana residents attending post-secondary institutions in another state.
- SB 188 Allows a hunter with an antlerless elk permit to take any elk allowed by the general hunting regulations at any time the general regulations allow the taking of antlerless elk.
- HJ 15 Requests an interim study to evaluate funding sources for an incentive program to encourage and compensate private landowners who grant public access for non-hunting recreation.

Bills that died with the issues unresolved and likely to resurface:

- HB 62 Mandatory trapper safety and education.
- HB 63 Authorize revocation of commercial fur dealer license.
- HB166 Increase Department of Justice prosecutor for FWP law violations to full-time attorney.
- HB167 Appropriate money to FWP for the operation of Travelers' Rest State Park.
- HB 217 Authorize FWP wardens and park rangers to enforce laws related to minors in possession on lands owned or operated by FWP, on state waters and on other state lands pursuant to an agreement with the appropriate land management agency.
- HB 253 Recognize bison as a valued native species, give management authority to FWP and direct FWP to work with the Dept. of Livestock to protect private property.

- HB 275 Provide that the Department of Natural Resources may declare the need for an emergency stream flow and procedures for implementing curtailment of water use when emergency stream flow conditions are met.
- HB 314 Provide methods for FWP to direct the dispersal or removal of concentrations of big game animals that pose a threat to landowners and livestock or the health of wildlife, habitat or the public; provide penalties for concentrating big game animals and create an advisory board.
- HB 330 Revise snowmobile registration and fee distribution. Would reduce FWP's share of revenue.
- HB 382 Create a resident apprentice hunting certificate which allows youngsters of any age to hunt with a mentor that meets certain requirements and exempt those youngsters from the requirement to complete a hunters safety education course provided they are hunting in the presence of a mentor.
- HB 559 Provide for reduced price hunting and fishing licenses for certain members of the armed forces who are participating in a contingency operation.
- HB 605 Provide for the equitable distribution of revenue from the Dingle Johnson and Pitman Robertson federal funding sources between the State and Montana tribes for fish and wildlife management purposes.
- SB 59 Require mountain lion trophy fees be used for the management of mountain lions.
- SB 162 Restrict FWP Commission from limiting hunting permits allocated for certain species from the number issued in 2007 unless certain conditions are met.
- SB 183 Revise the states wolf policy, assert states rights and challenge federal authority, void the Montana wolf conservation and management plan and the state's cooperative wolf management agreement. Establish conditions for future management plans and agreements specific to the wolf. Establish liability and penalties for injury or death of a human because of a wolf attack.
- SB 213 Require FWP to implement a program to manage game animal populations in a manner that prevents the transmission of disease between game animals and domestic livestock or humans.
- SB 217 Require FWP to reimburse livestock producers who are required to test livestock for brucellosis during periods when game animal population objectives are not met.
- SB 337 Prohibit translocation of bison from the FWP/APHIS quarantine study to any site in Montana except the National Bison Range.
- SB 435 Provide for no net gain in state owned land. Would have precluded purchase of land for FAS's, State Parks or WMA's.

Rob asked about the bill that pertained to wolf hybrid dogs which was tabled.

Julie said it was SB344 which would revise laws governing wolf hybrids-reporting and ownership.

Gary said it came down to two issues. What is a hybrid and how do you identify a hybrid. Another issue was who would be liable if that wolf hybrid out there caused damage to livestock or humans. Those two discussions derailed the whole bill.

Julie asked if FWP supported this bill to which Gary answered they did.

Rob said it seems like whenever a sheep is killed it is a hybrid so that there is no compensation.

Jim S wanted to know who is legally authorized to breed wolves?

Gary said it is allowed in Montana and is legal.

Julie said there is a law now that hybrid owners have to be registered with FWP.

Mike said it has to be tattooed and registered. Mike thought this bill was grandfathered into existing ones and was basically cut out.

Brad said that the issue is not going away and although the bill may not have made it through this session, it will more than likely resurface a couple of years from now.

Mary asked what the market is for the breeders. Gary remarked that it must be good.

Gary explained how easy it could be if the wolves are delisted and management control on the ground for those people that live in Montana. For example, if a producer sees a wolf in his cows and shoots it, he won't be prosecuted for a federal offense. Gary said it would just give the landowner more authority to protect themselves and their livelihood.

Jim Schaefer asked about SB 425 regarding the fish hatchery and if it was kicked out of committee again. Gary said SB 425 was the revised bill for Ft Peck Hatchery for funding and for taking the restrictions off of what they could raise. It was killed in the House. The first time, it didn't get out. The second time, it did. It was approved and is on the Governor's desk now. The question was how it was going to be funded because the warm water stamp sunsets in 2012.

Dwayne Andrews – Wolf Delisting Status

Dwayne explained the handouts that he distributed on wolves which included several weeks of Montana Wolf Program Weekly Report which can be obtained from FWP website; an opinion by the Independent Record; and the delisting of wolves which Gary covered. The delisting effort is in place right now by the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and the overall effort is to delist the wolf in Montana, Idaho, the eastern third of Washington and Oregon and a small part of north central Utah. Precluding any legal action that stops this process, the wolf could be officially delisted effective May 4, 2009. What that does is take wolves off the endangered species list and turns over the wolf management to the State of Montana and the other states.

Gary said at the next FWP commission meeting, they are taking up the quota issue on wolves. If it is delisted, FWP has to have the quota in place for any season to take place.

Hatchery Funding

Dwayne also gave a handout that was a copy of the story in the Billings Gazette about the hatchery funding. This bill has been sent to the Governor and hopefully, will be signed.

Jim Schaefer asked if it would help the hatchery short term or would it have to wait until 2012 before any funding is found? Gary said the plan is that there is enough money to operate to 2012. However, if we start raising rainbow trout there for the eastern part of the state, we have the authority right now to use federal aid dollars.

Dwayne said it appears that the warm water stamp would disappear after 2012.

Warren said it appeared that the committee was the hatchery's worst enemy.

Wolves, continued

Mary asked to go back to the wolf issue and wondered what FWP's management plan is for wolves and she assumed the department has given a great deal of thought on this to which Brad replied that FWP had to have a management plan through the commission and reviewed and approved by the Feds. Brad said everything was available on the website and that everything had to be in place before the feds would delist.

Mary asked if hunting and trapping would be an essential piece of that and Brad said it would over time. Hunting would be implemented first and trapping would be implemented at a later date.

Mike said there was a minimum number of breeding pairs that have to be maintained and Brad commented that, currently, we are way over the minimum number.

Gary said the breeding pairs were 13 and they are going to manage at 20 to 25.

Dena Lang and Mark Jacobsen – BLM Access Team

Mark handed out an outline of the BLM's access strategy which was an access plan specific to Miles City Field office. He said the Miles City Field Office covers roughly the eastern third of the state and manages more than 2.7 million surface acres of public land and over 12.4 million acres of subsurface mineral estate.

The access strategy has been sorted into four categories:

1. Land exchanges (Pumpkin Creek land exchange is good example).
2. Travel Management plans (Knowlton and Hay Draw travel management areas).
3. Easements They are in process of trying to put on maps so that locations are identifiable. Mark said they would like to add more on a long-term process and Dena added that a lot of them are only handshake agreements with nothing else in place which she would like to have something more permanent. Rob asked about Terry Badlands and Mark said that was one example where just a handshake agreement created problems. Mark said some resolutions are very simple. Dena said along with that are some other projects that have come about.
4. In house existing opportunities – Dena said an example would be public boundary signing.

Mark said their position right now, in the process, is that they have a list which they have generated based on these four criteria. They have incorporated FWP in the mix and they are helping to prioritize the list and now they are taking this to the public.

Chris P. asked if there is any way that a group like CAC could help in this process since access is one of the main issues of the CAC. Dena commented that one their tasks and one which FWP assisted with was identifying parcels on a map that would be good potential for access and that the CAC members might be able to help with that. Chris asked if there was a step beyond identifying and to help them implement their highest priorities, whatever it might be. Mark said they could get a list of priorities as they come about.

Dena would like to know what landowners to contact to make the connections for easements and thought CAC could assist with that.

Rob commented that as far as block management goes there is already access. Fulton feels that block management is not an issue. Dwayne said all the block management is on GIS and all the sign placement can be on GIS.

Dena asked if trying to get more access around the block management would create problems with the block management program by upsetting the landowners that are in block management. Dwayne said if they are in block management, they are already

expressing a desire to work with the agencies and the public and in certain circumstances, we have blocks of BLM that really don't have any legal access to them. You have landowners with the perspective that they are capable and willing to work with agencies and he didn't think it would cause a problem by approaching them in a professional manner to see what they would think of obtaining an easement across some of the private and maybe some state land to get to BLM.

NWTF/FWP: Public Land Access – Dwayne Andrews

Dwayne has worked with the National Wild Turkey Federation and they have given him permission to develop temporary access agreements with landowners. The NWTF would pay the cost of the temporary access agreements. The idea is to locate blocks of public land which is usually BLM ground that has no legal access to it. However, if private land butts up against it, the idea was to work with that landowner and try to see if there could be a temporary agreement worked out to allow the public to cross the private land (not hunt the private land) on a designated route and access the public land. If the landowners are in block management, hunters already have access to blocked public land that is adjacent to the private land. Dwayne said this is a program that has potential but he hasn't had any results of getting willing landowners to come and visit with him. He asked that the Citizen's Advisory Council help out with identifying landowners and visiting with them and then letting Dwayne know so he can follow-up with the landowners.

Fishing Access Sites – Brad Schmitz and John Little

Brad presented a power-point presentation of some of the FAS that they have worked on the last few years. He gave a brief overview of Terry Bridge and Cook Creek FAS and some of the problems associated with those. Brad asked for help from the committee members to help push those along.

John Little spoke on the Hysham area, Black Bridge and Tongue River Fishing Access Sites. Brad added that these are purchased but there is no funding to move forward.

Stipek FAS appraisal is done, price is agreed, but there are some complications with road access. Brad said access to money is tight. Stipek is very critical for a lot of reasons. One of which would create a 10 mile float from Glendive to Stipek and a 10 mile float from Stipek to Intake which is what we would like to see - an access every 10 to 15 miles to allow public to do day floats and get in and out of the river.

John said there are several issues involved in the Black Bridge FAS. This was purchased from the Glendive Chapter of Walleyes Unlimited. Funding is now available for this FAS and we are hoping to get this project started in August or September of this year. Brad said this is a high priority for FWP.

Tongue River: BLM and Mars – The bottom line on this, Brad said, is that we need to visit with Lonnie on this and get this moving forward. He asked if BLM had anything to add from their perspective.

Dena said the funding actually came from the Spring Creek Coal Mine mitigation fund, so she thought they still had funding in there for this.

Brad said he would visit with BLM in next few weeks.

Scott wanted to know if it was posted and it is not. Art asked about the pieces where the road is right next to the river.

Brad said the bridge access bill would provide some opportunity and even though we would have legal rights to be in there on that easement, he would like to work that out and maintain good relationships with those people.

Open Discussion

Rob R. commented on the letter of last October 8 whereas the \$110,000 that was contributed to the predator program each year is now being used for wolf management. He said the redirection of funds was unheard of and nobody new anything about it.

Gary said the \$110,000 that goes to wolf management is mandated by us in an MOU with US Fish and Wildlife Service and Department of Ag and Wildlife Services for wolf management in the state and has nothing to do with any monies that have ever been used for predator control. The two are separate issues.

Rob asked Gary to address the redirection of funds that was in the letter from Hagener.

Gary said again that right now, FWP gives \$110,000 to Wildlife Services to wolf management. That was the legislative argument this year is that the \$110,000 would go away if the bill passed, the \$110,000 goes away. FWP could not contribute to that.

Rob said he wanted to know what was contributed before that and where it was going before it was redirected in 2007 as stated in that letter and that he would like an answer to that question.

Gary responded that he would do that and give him specifics. Gary also said the redirection was not based on predator control. He said the \$110,000 that is being put into the wolf management is an additional \$110,000.

Rob said he wanted to know how much is still going in the predator control fund.

Mike said Rob's concern is that Western Montana may still be getting their money for wolves but that Eastern Montana is not getting the money they were directed for predators.

Scott asked if wolf management gets back to the state, would they give back the \$110,000?

Gary said they are still obligated to meet the federal regulations under ESA for at least five years and that's why we have to do monitoring and collar wolves with Wildlife Services.

Rob asked who brought the wolves in.

Gary said the Feds and that it is our cost or obligation now.

Scott wanted to know if under FWP's plan, was it a general license with a quota or will it be a permit that you have to try to draw?

Gary said right now, it is an unlimited number of tags but there will be a harvest quota.

Warren wanted to know if the \$110,000 was coming from licenses and Gary said no.

Mike said Wildlife Services will still be the lead even when the state takes over. They will still be doing the trapping, etc.

Bob H. asked if the quota would be by region and Gary said it is set up in three regions and each region will have its quota and then it will be a statewide quota. The first year, there will be no trapping.

Warren B. asked if the whole program would be funded by sportsman dollars. Gary said that has been the issue all along. Brad said there are concerns with that as FWP is trying to work with the Feds because there is a big price tag that goes with wolves and when it becomes FWP's, they don't want to have to incur the whole price tag.

Fulton asked about HB 203 and what the guidelines were. Gary said they still have to inform landowners right now within a five-mile radius of any transplanted wildlife no matter if it is federal, state, or private land.

Scott said they weren't notified on the release of a bear in the Ashland area and wondered how many were released in Carter County.

Mary asked when a nuisance bear is captured, how is it determined where it goes. Mike explained where the two bears in R-7 had gone. Basically, the ones that we deal with are found in an urban area and then transplanted to another area.

Brad Schmitz – R-7 Supervisor

Brad asked how long the CAC had been in existence to which the answer is three years. He then asked the CAC members for discussion on:

1. Where we going?
2. What are we doing?
3. Are we productive?

Brad then read parts of the Citizen's Advisory Council charter one of which was reciting the two main functions which state, "provide the agency with a communication avenue for collecting information, ideas and initiatives from the public, and providing a collaborative environment for FWP to inform and educate key citizens with the expectation that they will in turn inform and educate the broader public. The exchange of information will assist in the identification of issues before they reach conflict levels, inform various constituencies about management of public resources and suggest various management choices in a broad context." He also read an excerpt from the Purpose of the Charter which says, "The CAC will be advisory in nature assisting the region with public outreach and communication. Identification of issues and suggested solutions will assist the region in the decision making process."

Brad opened the floor to any feedback from the CAC members.

Jim S. responded by saying, if you would have asked this question last week after he read the article by Mark Henckel, he would have wondered the same thing. But now that we find out that some idea that started here actually went forward and could do some good, he felt differently. His question has always been "who are we advising?"

Brad asked if any of the other members would like to comment or answer that question.

Rob said he thought CAC's charge is to advise the FWP commission and to try to influence their decisions so that it can go to the governor or legislature.

Jim said the question remains are they hearing us. He would like to think that that is true but no commission members have ever been to any meetings.

Brad answered the question "who are we advising?" that the charter doesn't have as much authority in it as it maybe needs to and sometimes that might be good for FWP and sometimes that may not be good for FWP. Brad said that both of the CAC members that answered were correct. On a local level, he thought their advice is heard fairly well and is not always implemented as mentioned but on some things, they definitely are implemented. So on that level, Brad said we are moving along as a committee. Now as it is stepped up to the Helena level, the same notes get sent to Helena and committee members have been involved on Helena committees.

Brad asked the members "How do we reach who we are trying to advise?"

Fulton said he has always looked at it as two levels - regional and state.

Scott said he would like to think that he goes back and advises the local community. Scott also thinks the CAC committee needs to be more task oriented.

Brad said they want to be able to involve CAC more and we want to produce products from this committee. FWP needs assistance from the CAC members.

Rob said another important part of the CAC committee is that they keep FWP accountable on issues.

Gary commented that the CAC's were developed and the rationale behind that was that FWP was not getting the communication back from the general public, only from various groups. Brad said that he would like to see more products evolve from the CAC.

Brad commended Chris on wanting to get involved in the landowner access issue with BLM and gave some examples of things that could be done by the CAC. In the next few years, we would like to incorporate some ideas to include more landowners in access.

Jim S. said the education goes two ways. He said he has learned a lot about the challenges and obstacles that R-7 faces and with his out-of-state travels, he can now educate some nonresidents as to what FWP has to offer in Montana. He said he has learned a lot from FWP and likewise.

Art would like BLM to return to a CAC meeting and identify where their priorities are with landowner access. Brad thought that would be great for them to sit down and visit with CAC members.

Bob H. asked if anyone thought it might be a good idea to put something in the newspapers regarding the CAC meetings and outcomes. Brad and Dwayne thought it could be arranged to put something in regarding what the CAC charge is and asking for help.

Brad asked the question, "How do we incorporate CAC into the regulations setting process?"

Gary said that CAC's were mentioned multiple times in the Ft. Peck Hatchery issue during the legislative session. He commented that the Citizen Advisory Committees are being heard.

Greg said he, like Chris, would like to have some more hands-on stuff to work on.

Brad asked Gary if CAC's had the ability to stand up in front of the commission with some of the issues and he thought they did.

Mary would like to see more communication between the Citizen Advisory Committees.

Brad would like to go to other CAC meetings to see how they function. He would invite CAC members to do the same thing. Gary said he has looked into getting a statewide CAC form that compares CAC's.

Dwayne informed the members that all the CAC minutes and agendas are posted on the FWP website.

Brad outlined Region 7 CAC issues as follows:

Product

1. Ft Peck Hatchery
2. Information Exchange/Education
3. BLM Access Program
4. NWTF
 - A. Advise local communities – How do we do this better?
 - B. Tasks?
 - C. FWP – accountability
 - D. Visibility of CAC's (how to improve)
 - E. Better communication with other CAC's
 - 1) Legislative
 - 2) Helena Director, etc
 - F. Other CAC's function
 - G. CAC Rep meeting

Brad challenged the members to take some of the issues such as BLM access program and NWTF and turn them into finished products such as the Ft Peck Hatchery.

Brad would like to see a standard agenda for the next meetings with basic introductions and reports of what this person or groups have been doing and reports from FWP and what we are doing, etc. which would bring accountability to all.

Gary offered anyone here to join R4 CAC in mid-May to participate in that meeting and he would be willing to pay the travel.

Brad asked the members for any feedback reducing the amount of time the CAC would meet and would like to go 3 times a year - January, May and September.

Gary didn't think every four months would be enough to cover more of the action items.

Chris P said he would like to identify issues.

Rob suggested a CAC road trip to the FAS that Brad gave a presentation on.

Next Meeting – July 8th at 2:00 P.M.