2024 Current Fiscal Year Report: Missouri Basin Resource Advisory Council

Report Run Date: 03/29/2024 01:42:22 PM

1. Department or Agency	2. Fiscal Year
Department of the Interior	2024

3. Committee or Subcommittee	3b. GSA Committee No.
Missouri Basin Resource Advisory Council	84608

4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?	5. Current Charter	6. Expected Renewal Date	7. Expected Term Date
No	11/09/2023	11/09/2025	

8a. Was Terminated During FiscalYear?	8b. Specific Termination Authority	8c. Actual Term Date

9. Agency Recommendation for Next FiscalYear	10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?	10b. Legislation Pending?
Continue	No	Not Applicable

11. Establishment Authority Statutory (Congress Created)

12. Specific Establishment Authority	13. Effective Date	14. Commitee Type	14c. Presidential?
Federal Land Policy and Management Act, Sec. 309		Continuing	No

15. Description of Committee Non Scientific Program Advisory Board

16a. Total Number of Reports	No Reports for this FiscalYear

17a. Open 0 **17b. Closed** 0 **17c. Partially Closed** 0 **Other Activities** 0 **17d. Total** 0

Meetings and Dates

No Meetings

	Current FY	Next FY

18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members	$0.00	$0.00
18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members	$0.00	$0.00
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff	$0.00	$0.00
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants	$0.00	$0.00
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members	$0.00	$0.00
18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members	$0.00	$0.00
18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff	$0.00	$0.00
18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants	$0.00	$0.00
18c. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)	$0.00	$0.00
18d. Total	$0.00	$0.00
19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)	0.00	0.00

20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?

The Missouri Basin Resource Advisory Council (RAC) will provide advice and recommendations to the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) on land use planning and management of public lands located within the BLM’s North Central Montana and Eastern Montana/Dakotas districts. The RAC will also make recommendations on recreation fee proposals for the BLM and U.S. Forest Service.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

The Missouri Basin RAC is composed of 15 members distributed in a balanced fashion among the following groups and within those groups. Specific interests include: Category I includes

those holding Federal grazing permits or leases, interests associated with transportation or rights-of-way, developed outdoor recreation, OHV users, or commercial recreation activities, commercial timber industry, or energy and mineral development. Category II includes nationally or regionally recognized environmental organizations, dispersed recreation activities, archaeological and historical interests, or nationally or regionally recognized wild horse and burro interest groups. Category III includes state, county, or locally elected office-holders, employee of a State agency responsible for the management of natural resources, Indian Tribes within or adjacent to the area for which the RAC is organized, are employed as academicians in natural resource management or the natural sciences, or represent the public-at-large.

20c. How frequent and relevant are the Committee Meetings?

The Council will meet 2-4 times per year depending on emerging resource issues.

20d. Why can't the advice or information this committee provides be obtained elsewhere?

The Missouri Basin RAC will play a role in developing consensus and partnership as its members make formal recommendations and communicate with the stakeholder groups that they represent. These formal and informal communications have enabled the RAC to identify and address issues early on, developing more defensible actions with greater local support and buy-in. The BLM would not be able to approve changes to recreation fees or approve any new recreation fee sites without RAC input.

20e. Why is it necessary to close and/or

partially closed committee meetings?

All meetings will be open to the public.

21. Remarks

The RAC met June 20-21, 2023, and September 18-19, 2023.

Designated Federal Officer

Scott Haight District Manager

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
Barta, Stacey	03/08/2023	03/08/2026	Montana State Rangeland Coordinator	Representative Member
Good, Mark	03/08/2023	03/08/2026	Former Field Director, Montana Wilderness Association	Representative Member
Hayes, Aurther	01/15/2021	01/15/2024	Rancher, Permittee	Representative Member
Huemoeller Lewis, Kelly	01/15/2021	01/15/2024	Lawyer	Representative Member
Hutton, Miles	01/15/2021	01/15/2024	Blaine County Commissioner	Representative Member
Jacobs, Perri	03/08/2023	03/08/2026	Rancher	Representative Member
Jagim, Nathan	01/15/2021	01/15/2024	County Weed Specialist	Representative Member
Jergeson, Gregory	03/08/2023	03/08/2026	Blaine County Conservation District Supervisor	Representative Member
Kary, Douglas	01/15/2021	01/15/2024	Montana State Senate	Representative Member
Krings, William	03/08/2023	03/08/2026	Steel Construction	Representative Member
Mason, Jody	03/08/2023	03/08/2026	Rancher – NorthBench Livestock	Representative Member
Merriman, Cliff	03/08/2023	03/08/2026	Farmer/Rancher - 4M Farms	Representative Member
Schafer, Jeffrey	03/08/2023	03/08/2026	Rancher – Coppedge Ranch, Inc.	Representative Member
Tonn, Trisha	03/08/2023	03/08/2026	Account Manager, Flogistix LP	Representative Member
Wagner, Kevin	03/08/2023	03/08/2026	Business Development Director	Representative Member

Number of Committee Members Listed: 15

Narrative Description

What are the most significant program outcomes associated with this committee?

	Checked if Applies
Improvements to health or safety	✓
Trust in government	✓
Major policy changes	✓
Advance in scientific research	
Effective grant making	
Improved service delivery	
Increased customer satisfaction	
Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements	
Other	

Outcome Comments

What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

	Checked if Applies
None	
Unable to Determine	✓
Under $100,000	
$100,000 - $500,000	
$500,001 - $1,000,000	
$1,000,001 - $5,000,000	
$5,000,001 - $10,000,000	
Over $10,000,000	
Cost Savings Other	

Cost Savings Comments

Unable to detemine.

What is the approximate Number of recommendations produced by this committee

for the life of the committee?
20

Number of Recommendations Comments
The RAC made 19 recommendations on the proposed Public Lands Rule during the June 20 meeting. The RAC recommended: 1. The BLM use the rule to foster ecosystem resilience of old and mature forests on BLM lands by taking mitigation measures that a lessee may take should be focused, if not on the exact location of the lease, at least within the planning area. 2. That the use of wise management decisions should include forest thinning projects and controlled burns within old and mature forests. 3. That forest-thinning, controlled burning, and other forest best-management practices be considered on all lands to address encroachment issues of non-desirable species. 4. The BLM should include all entities, be it a private individual or organization or public agency, as eligible to hold a conservation lease. 5. The BLM should use the rule to foster ecosystem resilience of old and mature forests. 6. The BLM should consider using “lease” versus “agreement” when referring to “conservation leases.” 7. The BLM should consider the appropriate default duration for conservation leases to be the length of time necessary to complete the conservation enhancements or preservation improvements or 10 years, whichever is shorter. 8. The BLM should not constrain which lands are available for conservation leasing, but conservation leases should not supersede existing permitted uses unless the existing permittees formally agree to the proposed conservation lease. 9. The rule should not clarify or limit the conservation practices or enhancements to generate carbon offset credits. 10. Conservation leases should not be authorized for carbon sequestration purposes as the sole intent of use. Conservation leases should not be limited to protecting or restoring specific resources. 12. The BLM should use the existing valuation processes or methods to determine fair market value and reevaluate every 5 years. 13. There is not enough information available to formulate an adequate response regarding whether lands with valuable alternative land uses be prohibitively expensive for conservation use. 14. The BLM should incorporate a public benefit component into the rent calculation to account for the benefits of ecosystem services. 15. There should be no waiver of bonding requirements for Conservation Leases. 16. The proposed language requiring expertise of the mitigation bank is warranted given the value of the public resource. 17. Conservation enhancement and preservation agreements should be entered into with BLM, the entity or individual who wants to perform the practice, and the current lessee, in partnership when possible. 18. The rule should clarify that the BLM will be responsible for all of the costs associated with the construction of fences and consider the impacts of building such structures on the travel of livestock and wildlife to other habitat. 19. The BLM should consider if the addition of structures to limit this access by unintended users would do more damage to the resource than the benefits of enhancement of preservation practice

activity. The RAC also voted to write a letter to BLM supporting the Prairie County Commission in obtaining public access related to the Milwaukee Bridge.

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Fully implemented by the agency?
0%

% of Recommendations Fully Implemented Comments
The RACs recommendations will be considered while the final Public Lands Rule is developed.

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Partially implemented by the agency?
0%

% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comments
Unable to determine until the final Public Lands Rule is publishedf.

Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to implement recommendations or advice offered?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Applicable ☑

Agency Feedback Comments

What other actions has the agency taken as a result of the committee's advice or recommendation?

	Checked if Applies
Reorganized Priorities	☐
Reallocated resources	☐
Issued new regulation	☐
Proposed legislation	☐
Approved grants or other payments	☐
Other	☐

Action Comments

Is the Committee engaged in the review of applications for grants?

No

Grant Review Comments

How is access provided to the information for the Committee's documentation?

	Checked if Applies
Contact DFO	✓
Online Agency Web Site	✓
Online Committee Web Site	✓
Online GSA FACA Web Site	✓
Publications	✓
Other	

Access Comments