

The Montana Watershed Coordinating Council

April 12, 2005

AGENDA

- 1:00 pm** **Introductions, Agenda review, Meeting overview**
- 1:15** **Sharing thoughts from those not in attendance**
- 1:20** **What are the commonalities of watershed groups – list & discuss**
- 2:00** **Break**
- 2:15** **What are some of the differences between groups– list & discuss**
- 3:00** **How can differences broaden understanding?**
- 3:30** **Break**
- 3:45–4:30** **Wrap up discussion**

Participants:

Lane Adamson, Tina Bernd-Cohen, Jennifer Boyer, Sarah Carlson, Stan Danielsen, Karen Filipovich, Susan Higgins, Tom Hinz, Laurie Kelley, Warren Kellogg, Roxann Lincoln, Carole Mackin, David Martin, Steve Merritt, Nicole McClain, Mike McLane, Amy Miller, Mike Miller, Bill Milton, Rich Moy, Gerald Mueller, Lynn Owens, Noorjahan Parwana, Glenn Phillips, Robert Ray, Alan Rollo, Jeff Schahczenski, Steve Schmitz, Kathy van Hook, Gary Weiner, Jim Wilbur.

Meeting Overview

Bill Milton gave an overview of the thinking behind scheduling this meeting as well as the operating environment that surround watershed groups.

Participants introduced themselves and talked about what a watershed means to them.

Thoughts from those not in attendance

Jennifer Boyer read from comments that were submitted from interested parties that were not able to attend the meeting (see attached)

What are the commonalities of watershed groups

Participants listed and discussed the following commonalities

Commonalities

1. Solve problems re: local environment
2. Clearly defined region
3. Collaborative – a lot of different tools – with govt., groups, etc.
4. Recognize defining issues
5. Have a set of goals/objectives they work toward
6. Involve the same group of players & not others
7. Funding – need for – to keep running & do the work
8. Locally driven
9. More than one person at the table
10. Born out of common concern/problem/issue
11. Have convictions about resource stewardship
12. Need to be able to frame & understand extent of problem
13. Successful = inclusive
14. Striving toward inclusiveness according to maturity +
15. Local delivery platform for funds regulation

16. Form @ knee-jerk reaction to NR issue
17. Seeking sustainable development of a watershed – economy, way of life, environment
18. Almost always have focus on water resources
19. Grass roots start based on love of the land
20. Most consensus based decision making
21. Tend to respond to govt. initiatives
22. Most have transparent process
23. In a perfect world - success will drive international policy
24. Adaptability & innovation
25. Lack police power - can't compel action
26. Don't seek litigation to solve problem
27. Some attempt to think holistically
28. Good leadership = success
29. Interested in Law-advocate good legal outcomes
30. Have outreach & educational component
31. Look for win-win solutions
32. Build human, social & biological capital
33. More than one person, combine 9, 11 & 19 Passion, work together to make change – that is the power- people who make things happen

DISCUSSION

- Prompted by WSG directory
- Awareness has changed in past few years
- Big Hole River Foundation – 17 years working in watersheds
- What were criteria for inclusion in directory?
 - Not environmental group
 - One per watershed (problem)
 - Less duplication of effort
 - Following a watershed boundary
 - More interest around \$
 - Inclusion in brochures
 - Advocacy not primary effort

Criteria

- Political acceptance
- Dividing the pie
- Collaborative process

Advocacy

- We are all in advocate roles for all levels – all partners
- Stay true to goal of inclusivity
- Language needs clarification
 - “landscapes” – managing
 - solving problems
- Many different forms & functions
- Focus on outcomes

What are some of the differences between groups?

Participants listed several categories of differences including form, function, scale, and other differences.

Differences in form & function

Types

1. Conservation District
2. Foundation as a fiscal agent
3. Sub-committee of CD
4. 501C3
5. Single issue focus
6. Water Quality Districts: sponsors, coop, fiscal agent
7. RC&D
8. Councils
9. Task forces
10. Kitchen table groups- some formal mission goals
11. Some created in statute
12. Committee – not 501C3 – steering committee
13. Fund seekers – Imposters

Scale

- Size of watershed
- Size of budget
- Membership
- Number of issues and programs
- Some try to affect policy
- Inclusive vs. Selective
- Stakeholder/group representative

Other Differences

- Inclusive vs. selective
- Size or range of scope of work
- Governance – How decisions are made
 - E.D.
 - Board
 - Consensus vs. vote
 - Steering committee
- Agricultural vs. high and low population urban based vs. rural
- Codification – by-laws
Loose verbal agreements
- Structural
 - Only the watershed
 - Umbrella group over several watershed groups
 - Public notice of meetings
 - Membership only part.
 - Govt. agency voting members
 - Leadership from an agency
 - Leadership from landowners
 - How partners are brought together
 - Joint management of certain issues
 - Volunteers only; or staff & volunteers

If we were successful – What would that look like?
How do we get to each other and help each other?

- Diversity a must
- Need to learn how each of us operates
- Money is not an outcome – a resource
- More broad-based groups working together to expand pies
- Understanding each other's values and views – coalescing
- Some groups evolve closer together
- How do we deal with who is but isn't – loose definition
- MILLION \$? = Solve problems, not become alternate to local governance – exist to solve problems others cannot/have not
- What is the criteria
- How do we convince a funder we meet their criteria
- What are you going to do with \$ that is effective
- Some \$ not designated for WSG

General criteria for being defined as a watershed group

For directory

Locally driven

Inclusive

A group collaborating on Natural Resource issue(s) within a defined or specified watershed

What makes your watershed Group effective?

character, interaction, decision-making

- **Increase problem solving capacity**
- **Involving the larger community**
- **Forum that encourages participation**
- **Sharing limited resources between groups within a watershed**

NEXT STEPS

- Web forum
- Distribute notes
- MWCC 5/26 award event & results working group
- Facilitate dialog on how program worked – not set

Parking Lot

Criteria

Funding

Revised directory

Govt. sanctioned WSG