

Annis Rating

	Senate Policy Committee- Holdover	Senate Policy Committee- General	Probably Yes - Holdover	Probably Yes- General	Probably No- Holdover	Probably No- General	No-Holdover	No-General	Total Senate Seats
	Jackson - '14 TL (60.25) Moore - '14 (58.64) Wittich - '14 (57.77) Lewis - '14 (57.75)	SD 19 Rosendale (64.31) SD 34 Sales (61.98) Barrett - '12 (59.8)			Vincent - '14 (57.49)		Olson - '14 (62.87) Peterson - '14 TL (60.74) Tutvedt - '12 (60.73)		
	Walker - '14 (53.77) Priest - '14 (52.30) Essmann - '14 TL (52.10)	SD 7 Feilder (54.37)			Sonju - '14 (53.87)	Ripley - '12 (55.1)	Lake - '14 (54.68)		
M Y Dee		SD 6 Taylor (51.42) SD 45 Thomas (50.56) SD 2 Brown (48.48) SD 24 Webb (47.40)	Zinke's seat Murphy - '14 TL (47.76)		Murphy - '14 TL (47.76)	SD 18 Brenden - '12 (51.53)		Arthun - '14 (51.85)	
		SD 17 Richman (40.84) SD 26 Long (37.03)	Wendy SD 10 McKamey (45.40)		-Howlett	SD 27 Arntzen (41.53)			
								Brown - '12 (35.3)	
	7	10	1	1	4	3	5	2	33
		17		2		7		7	
Elections									Elections
Best	11	10		1		3		2	5 Best
Realistic	8	6		2		2		2	4 Realistic
Worst	5	4		1		2		1	3 Worst
Holdover	8	7	1		4		5		9 Holdover
Elections + Holdovers									Elections + Holdovers
Total - Best	19								14 Total - Best
Total - Realistic	16								13 Total - Realistic
Total - Worst	13								12 Total - Worst



Eric Moore <fdm7098@gmail.com>

meet

19 messages

Eric Moore <fdm7098@gmail.com>

Fri, Sep 7, 2012 at 4:46 PM

To: "Jason S. Priest" <jason@montanagrowthnetwork.org>, Jeff Essmann <jeff@jeffessmann.com>, Art Wittich <artw@montana.com>, Ed Walker <edward.a.walker@gmail.com>

Gentlemen,

Jason and I were on the phone this afternoon and are both of the opinion that a face to face meeting with the five of us (and maybe a few others) is necessary to advance preparations for the upcoming session. We thought we could meet in Billings in the evening, work through dinner, and then maybe a half day the next morning. A date to start out with would be the evening of September 26th and morning of the 27th. Please let me know how that works for you. Once we get a date set, we'll work out a preliminary agenda and consider whether we need anyone else there.

Thanks!

Eric Moore

artw@montana.com <artw@montana.com>

Fri, Sep 7, 2012 at 5:41 PM

To: Eric Moore <fdm7098@gmail.com>

Cc: "Jason S. Priest" <jason@montanagrowthnetwork.org>, Jeff Essmann <jeff@jeffessmann.com>, Art Wittich <artw@montana.com>, Ed Walker <edward.a.walker@gmail.com>

ERic

those dates work for me
what do we need to bring?

Art

[Quoted text hidden]

Ed Walker <edward.a.walker@gmail.com>

Fri, Sep 7, 2012 at 5:48 PM

To: "artw@montana.com" <artw@montana.com>

Cc: Eric Moore <fdm7098@gmail.com>, "Jason S. Priest" <jason@montanagrowthnetwork.org>, Jeff Essmann <jeff@jeffessmann.com>, Art Wittich <artw@montana.com>

Those days work for me also.

Regards,
Ed Walker

[Quoted text hidden]

Eric Moore <fdm7098@gmail.com>

Fri, Sep 7, 2012 at 5:59 PM

To: artw@montana.com

I think we want to try to reach agreement on an officer slate, and get that out of the way. If time permits, we can start on policy and priorities. Bring your courage and convictions!

[Quoted text hidden]

Jason S. Priest <jason@montanagrowthnetwork.org>

Fri, Sep 7, 2012 at 6:20 PM

To: Ed Walker <edward.a.walker@gmail.com>

I personally am not a very experienced visionary in State Government, or School Boards, or County Government. But I can move people, and convince people, and build consensus behind a goal....IF I know myself what the goal is, and understand clearly myself why it is the right objective. If you deep thinkers will figure out what we need to do, then I am pretty good at articulating the position, and boiling it down to the key bullets that people can digest and support.

Let's write next April's Press Release.

Taylor

Taylor Brown

Northern Broadcasting System, Inc

P.O. Box 1742

Billings, MT 59103

taylor@northernbroadcasting.com

From: Llew Jones [mailto:ljones@mtbus.net]
Sent: Saturday, September 15, 2012 4:25 PM
To: Eric Moore
Cc: Taylor Brown
Subject: Re: Llew

My thought was not to question leadership styles from the past, merely define expectations of leadership going forward. I am OK if we do not go here, but I know from talking to several caucus members that there is very different thoughts as to what the 2013 Leadership should do, and for that matter, what the extent and limits of each elected positions are.

For example, do we envision that our leadership roles will have time to carry and work on complex bills, or are they there to help others carry such bills?

Who is responsible for vision, who is responsible for management?

Obviously there will be differences depending upon the personalities, but I would hope we could at least define, in our own minds, what is appropriate...

I know personally, if I do not understand clearly the expectation of a position, or the metrics that will ultimately define success, how can I ever truly know how I am doing?

Llew

On Fri, Sep 14, 2012 at 5:50 PM, Eric Moore <fdm7098@gmail.com> wrote:

My thoughts:

I think we want to keep this strictly forward looking. As soon as we look backward to previous sessions or elections, the accusations start flying. I'm not sure we need to define the leadership roles. A certain amount of flexibility is needed to let the pres and maj leader define their own roles as well as those of their support staff.

I think we should make it about policy. Where we agree, where we don't. I'm not sure a little healthy debate on areas where there is disagreement would be a bad thing. Let people defend their positions and learn where others are coming from and why.

Finally, it would be beneficial for the moderator to be able to illustrate, with some sort of visual aid, bar chart, whatever, that the caucus probably agrees of 90+% of the issues we will face in the next session.

Thanks for getting the ball rolling on this, Llew,

FDM

Committee Members - Republican

Name:	Standing Class A					Standing Class B				
	Finance & Claims	Judiciary	Taxation	Business & Labor	Education	Local Gov't	Natural Resources	Public Health & Welfare	State Admin	
Ron		X							X	
Deby		X					X			
John	X						X			
Dee			X						X	
Taylor		X					X			
Ed				X			X			
Jeff			X		X					
Jennifer				X		X				
Verdell				X				X		
Llew				X			X			
Bob				X		X				
Dave	X				X					
Eric				X					X	
Terry		X				X				
Alan		X					X			
Jim		X					X			
Jason	X							X		
Don				X		X				
Rick	X					X				
Matt			X		X					
Scott			X		X					
John	X								X	
Janna	X									
Fred			X						X	
Bruce				X		X				
Chas		X					X			
Ed	X								X	
Art			X					X		

28
7 7 7 6 8 4 5 9 3 6

Committee Members - Republican

Name:	Standing Class C						Select Committees			
	Ag	Energy	Fish & Game	Highways	Comm. On Comm.	Rules	Ethics	Leg. Admin		
Ron	Arthun	Incumbent		X						
Debbie	Barrett	Incumbent	X				X			
John	Brenden	Incumbent	X			X				
Dee	Brown	Replacement	X							
Taylor	Brown	Incumbent								
Ed	Buttrey	Incumbent		X						
Jeff	Essmann	Incumbent	X			X				
Jennifer	Fielder	Replacement	X							
Verdell	Jackson	Incumbent	X				X			
Llew	Jones	Incumbent		X						
Bob	Lake	Replacement	X							
Dave	Lewis	Incumbent				X				
Eric	Moore	Incumbent	X			X		X		
Terry	Murphy	Incumbent	X							
Alan	Olson	Incumbent		X						
Jim	Peterson	Incumbent	X			X				
Jason	Priest	Incumbent								
Don	Richman	Replacement		X						
Rick	Ripley	Incumbent	X			X				
Matt	Rosendale	Replacement		X						
Scott	Sales	Replacement	X			X				
John	Sonju	Replacement		X						
Janna	Taylor	Replacement	X			X				
Fred	Thomas	Replacement		X		X				
Bruce	Tutvedt	Incumbent		X						
Chas	Vincent	Incumbent	X					X		
Ed	Walker	Incumbent	X			X		X		
Art	Wittich	Incumbent	X			X				

5 8 6 8 6 9 2 3

	First	Last	Email	Phone
Mes	Elsie	Amtzen	emarntzen@gmail.com	
Mes	Ron	Arthun	ronarthun@gmail.com	
	Debby	Barret	grt3177@smtel.com	
	John	Brenden	senatorbrenden@gmail.com	
Y	Taylor	Brown	Taylor@northernbroadcasting.com	
	Dee	Brown	brownfords2@gmail.com	
	Ed	Buttrey	ebuttrey@senate13.com	
Y	Jeff	Essman	jeff@jeffessmann.com	
	Jennifer	Fielder	GetItRight@montana.com	
	Verdell	Jackson	vjack@centurytel.net	
	Llew	Jones	ljones@mtbus.net	
	Bob	Lake	boblakepsc@gmail.com	
	Dave	Lewis	davelewis@aol.com	
Y	Eric	Moore	fdm7098@gmail.com	
	Terry	Murphy	murphter5@yahoo.com	
	Alan	Olson	aolson@sanjel.com	
N	Jim	Peterson	jimpetersonranch@gmail.com	
Y	Jason	Priest	jpriest@hamiltonventure.com	
	Rick	Ripley	ripleys@3riversdbs.net	
Mes	Matt	Rosendale	mattrosendale@midrivers.com	
Cousins	Scott	Sales	sales.scott@hotmail.com	
	Ron	Sonju	sonjunt@yahoo.com	
	Janna	Taylor	JANNATAYLOR@MONTANA.COM	
	Fred	Thomas	sfredthomas@yahoo.com	
N	Bruce	Tutvedt	tutvedt@montanasky.us	
	Chas	Vincent	Cvvincent@hotmail.com	
Y	Ed	Walker	edward.a.walker@gmail.com	
	Roger	Webb	webb4mt@hotmail.com	
Y	Art	Wittick	artw@montana.com	

recurring for who



Eric Moore <fdm7098@gmail.com>

Agenda Control

4 messages

Jeff Essmann <jeff@jeffessmann.com>

Sat, Sep 15, 2012 at 8:22 PM

To: Eric Moore <sfeeders@midrivers.com>

Cc: Jason Priest - Personal <jpriest@hamiltonventure.com>, Art Wittich <artw@law-advisor.com>, Ed Walker <ewalker@loenbro.com>, Dave Lewis <davelewis@aol.com>

Eric,

I do not know of a single conservative who has threatened to annihilate Rick Hill's policy proposals if a conservative leadership team is not elected. In my meetings with Hill's people, Mendenhall and Baker, I told them that our goal was to advance a limited number of conservative policies early in the session, many of which Rick supports. I know that we would not be in a position to block the moderate proposals if they worked with the D's. That is the political reality. On the other hand, my friend Senator Tutvedt spent the entire convention spewing about vengeance. If they choose that path that will be their responsibility. It is curious to me why anyone would think it would be the fault of conservatives if the moderates pulled the nuclear trigger. If we have a vote and lose, I will support the elected R leadership, but I may not support all their policies. However, if we hold a vote and they lose they are going to support Wanzenreid? And kill Rick's priorities? Really?

I would be happy to forward previous email offers to negotiate with Jim and the moderates. I've sent these to you before back in early April, and I resent them the email in July. In spite of the fact that it was unproductive, I am willing to try one last time.

I propose we follow your offer to lead a negotiating team that consists of the two of us. First, we ask for their support on ten priority bills. Second, we test their sincerity to work with us, and show ours, by proposing a power sharing arrangement. In the latter case, we elect the offices within the caucus guaranteeing Jim the presidency. We take the other positions, including Pres Pro Tem, but we change the rules to require the Pres, Pro Tem, and Majority Leader to agree to Calendar, Staffing, Conference Committee assignments and bill scheduling. Moderates will get fair treatment for their committee assignment requests. One additional rule change is to elect new leadership at the end of the session so the power sharing ends so everyone can take their votes and positions and determine who manages the interim.

Even if we have the protection provided by this power sharing arrangement they will be able to move their stuff with sufficient Dem support, which is what they are threatening us with. Therefore a power sharing agreement will not work to block their policies, so they should have no objections to it.

If they are not willing to work with us now to establish this power sharing arrangement then you could reasonably conclude they will not work with us in the session.

This plan would avert the public dispute that you are trying to deal with and it gives Jim a dignified exit.

I will be in Mexico from the 16 to the 23rd, so I will be out of the loop on negotiations, but you can work out the details with the other people on this email.

Hope you can make some progress.

Jeff

2013 COMMITTEE PLAN

September 27, 2012

This plan outlines the Committee makeup for the 2013 session for purposes of bill planning and personnel placement.

Currently there are thirteen standing committees and four select committees. Within the standing committees there are four Class A committees, five Class B committees, and four Class C Committees as follows:

Standing Class A:

- Finance & Claims
- Judiciary
- Taxation
- Business & Labor

Standing Class B:

- Education
- Local Government
- Natural Resources
- Public Health & Welfare
- State Administration

Standing Class C:

- Agriculture
- Energy
- Fish & Game
- Highways

Select Committees:

- Committee on Committees
- Rules
- Ethics
- Legislative Administration

In suggesting Committee Assignments, I have assumed the following:

1. We must designate key pass/kill committees wherein the most important bills are placed for purposes of moving to the floor or killing in committee.

Pass / Kill Committees:

- Finance & Claims
 - Taxation
 - Education
 - Public Health & Welfare
 - State Administration
2. I have not designated Democrats to committees until the Minority Leader makes recommendations. In addition, if structured properly with Republicans, it should not matter which Democrats sit on which committee.
 3. I have not suggested Chairs and Vice-Chairs until we understand other needs and caucus control.



Eric Moore <fdm7098@gmail.com>

Agenda control12 messages

Jeff Essmann <jeff@jeffessmann.com>

Thu, Sep 13, 2012 at 7:30 AM

To: jpriest@hamiltonventure.com, Art Wittich <artw@law-advisor.com>, Ed Walker <ewalker@loenbro.com>, Eric Moore <sfeeders@middrivers.com>, Dave Lewis <davelewis@aol.com>

Senators,

We are reaching a decision point on what to do to advance conservative policies during the next legislative session. The discussion will be somewhat academic if Steve Bullock is elected Governor as we will be left to our strategy of putting another 4 or 5 referendums on the 2014 ballot.

If Rick Hill is elected Governor, we will find out if he is a Mark Racicot moderate who will expand the size of government and support a new tax to pay for it, or is a Judy Martz conservative who at least signed a bill to reduce tax rates and reduce taxes on capital gains. The good news is that Rick has publicly supported at least a couple of items desired by our backers in the conservative movement, Student Scholarship tax credits and charter schools.

We are now facing the conundrum of how to move conservative policies while conservatives are still a minority of the Senate as a whole. We may be at 18 or 19 in the caucus, with a potential reach to 21 but that is still a minority of the body as a whole. As Llew Jones and Taylor Brown are pointing out in their calls to Eric and I assume others, the moderates are in a position to block the advancement of our policies if they align with the Ds on either the votes on the bills themselves or the votes on the leadership which can operate the levers of power to block the advancement of bills.

So, what do we do to advance conservative policies? Can we negotiate a binding agreement to advance a list of our priorities to show progress for our backers, which is the most critical task we have in order to keep building the movement? Can we trust the other group not to screw us and renege on the deal once there are reinstated in power under such a deal? How do we show progress on advancing conservative policies so that we can engage in the long game strategy that involves changing the face of the Montana Supreme Court so that it does not find a constitutional block to every conservative policy initiative and will give us a better shot at redistricting in 10 years?

Jon Bennion was able to draw a map with 63 Safe Republican seats. If we can implement the long term strategy we will be in a position to actually elect a majority of conservatives in both bodies, adopt conservative legislation and have a court that will uphold it. That is going to be a long struggle, but it is the only way to change the face of policy in Montana on more than a piecemeal basis. By the way, it looks to us like Lamson is going to present a Senate pairing plan that will either put Rosendale and Moore in the same seat, or put Moore in the Miles City house district which would strand him without a race in 2014.

But what do we do now? Is it better to force the moderates to be transparent in their cooperation with the Dems to block our objectives, so that we can use that to raise money and win primaries, or is it better to

negotiate a deal (subject to be broken) to advance conservative policies? Which approach will maintain the support of our backers which is critical for executing the long game? If we decide to negotiate can we negotiate for control of the levers of power (committee on committees, rules committee, assignment of bills, and support on all votes on rules committee decisions) so that we can guarantee that they cannot renege on the deal? We need to find out if they are willing to give up the levers of power that they can use to block our policy advancements in exchange for leaving Jim in place. Otherwise we are in the same place we are now but with a loss of transparency.

The last suggestion would effectively leave Jim in the Pres job, remove Tutvedt from the leadership suite and the Pres Pro Tem job, and transfer the job of assigning bills so we would have operative control along with the critical committees and rules committee votes I mentioned. Previous Senates even had the bill assignment process conducted by the chairman of committee on committees when Jack Galt had the job. There are lots of options if we are creative, but the thing to focus on is whether their suggestion is more about control or saving Jim's ego. My guess is its more about control, they do not have any intention of keeping a deal to move our policies, and their main goal is to keep all the division behind closed doors so they are not forced to take the hard votes in public and have to defend themselves in primaries.

But if we want to flush them out and try to negotiate a deal they can't renege on we can afford to waste a little time doing so. Our power only increases every day we get closer to a vote, as the vote is what they fear. That is why they are trying to avoid it so much and the push is on so hard right now. I, on the other hand, am prepared to lose a leadership vote and then vote my conscience and beliefs and let the chips fall where they may. If you are too, we have nothing to lose, except fleeting promises that they might advance our policies, the ones we know they hate.

So can we trust them?

Jeff

Dave Lewis <davelewis@aol.com>

Thu, Sep 13, 2012 at 8:54 AM

To: Jeff Essmann <jeff@jeffessmann.com>

Cc: "<jpriest@hamiltonventure.com>" <jpriest@hamiltonventure.com>, Art Wittich <artw@law-advisor.com>, Ed Walker <ewalker@loenbro.com>, Eric Moore <sfeeders@midrivers.com>

Jeff: Rick spoke at montax yesterday and announced that he would use the endowment tax credit for school choice. The credit is capped at \$1500 and so no way you could get big contributors to build tuition pools for low income students. It is a nothing burgher that advocates will see through immediately. I would rather put forward a conservative agenda and if not all republicans support it, then that is their problem. I am willing to vote for anything I have to to accomplish agenda, including right to work. That is a big step for me and so do not feel like compromising. I am too old for that. Have a good day.

Dave Lewis

[Quoted text hidden]

artw@montana.com <artw@montana.com>

Thu, Sep 13, 2012 at 9:12 AM

To: Jeff Essmann <jeff@jeffessmann.com>

Cc: jpriest@hamiltonventure.com, Art Wittich <artw@law-advisor.com>, Ed Walker <ewalker@loenbro.com>, Eric Moore <sfeeders@midrivers.com>, Dave Lewis <davelewis@aol.com>

Jeff

No, I do not trust them.

I have nothing to lose.

There are many "lost boys" like me (from Sedan MT instead of Sudan?) that have no real choice in this battle, frankly including you Jeff.

But BJ, Llew and Assoc. have everything to lose.

We are in a great position when the fists start flying.

I probably have a bad district pairing in 2014 also.

So what?

In the long run we are all dead.

The session is a biennial docu drama.

Let's make it a good show, from day 1.

We want the people watching to know there is a legitimate battle of ideas in this country and state, and at least some of us "get it." That will help with logistics, and frankly recruiting reinforcements.

The GOP is becoming irrelevant. It is funding our enemies to make rational choices to further our decline.

I frankly think I can make better deals with Dems, if the old guard persists in desperately hanging on to power.

I do deals for a living. The other side's ability to fight (or refuse a deal) always dictates the outcome. If BJ and crew can't see this, they are bigger chumps than I thought.

This "conflict" is really up to them, not us. But who will be embarrassed by the fight, win or lose? Not me. Not us. And they know that.

I am acquiring the state form for switching parties so we can send it to them.

Any Repub that votes with Dems for a BJ Prez must be called out to switch parties.

Appeasement is not the answer. Just ask Ambassador Stevens.

We must help the purge along.

Hopefully, a new phoenix will rise from the ashes.

We will either win the leadership vote, and accomplish a few things, or we will lose the vote and accomplish a few things.

Art

[Quoted text hidden]

Eric Moore <sfeeders@midrivers.com>

Thu, Sep 13, 2012 at 9:18 AM

To: Jeff Essmann <jeff@jeffessmann.com>

Jeff,

I might be coming through Billings Fri am. Would you have time for a visit?

Eric

[Quoted text hidden]

Jeff Essmann <jeff@jeffessmann.com>
To: Eric Moore <sfeeders@midrivers.com>

Thu, Sep 13, 2012 at 10:20 AM

I will be stuck participating in an interim committee meeting in the am. In Mexico from Sunday to Sunday after that.

Jeff

From: fdm7098@gmail.com [mailto:fdm7098@gmail.com] **On Behalf Of** Eric Moore
Sent: Thursday, September 13, 2012 9:18 AM
To: Jeff Essmann
Subject: Fwd: Re: Agenda control

[Quoted text hidden]

Eric Moore <sfeeders@midrivers.com>
To: Jeff Essmann <jeff@jeffessmann.com>

Thu, Sep 13, 2012 at 10:49 AM

R U in Helena now, or coming tonight? I'm in ELG right now, could stay in Helena tonight.

FDM

[Quoted text hidden]

Art Wittich <artw@montana.com>
To: Dave Lewis <davelewis@aol.com>, Jeff Essmann <jeff@jeffessmann.com>
Cc: "<jpriest@hamiltonventure.com>" <jpriest@hamiltonventure.com>, Ed Walker <ewalker@loenbro.com>, Eric Moore <sfeeders@midrivers.com>

Thu, Sep 13, 2012 at 11:23 AM

Dave
I think your tax credit bill last year was for \$2k?
This seems like a concession to Bruce T.

So if \$500 is not that big of deal, why not reduce public school funding from \$11,500/student to \$11k?

[Quoted text hidden]

Art

Jason Priest - Personal <jpriest@hamiltonventure.com>
To: Art Wittich <artw@montana.com>, Dave Lewis <davelewis@aol.com>, Jeff Essmann <jeff@jeffessmann.com>
Cc: Ed Walker <ewalker@loenbro.com>, Eric Moore <sfeeders@midrivers.com>

Thu, Sep 13, 2012 at 12:06 PM

Lot's of good comments. I think you are all correct to focus on policy.

At first look, we are dealing with people who threaten their friends and negotiate with their enemies. After all, we're in the same party. In reality, they see

conservatives as their enemies and the status quo spenders as their friends. The question is how do we respond to the information they have given us about themselves?

My first business mentor taught me that you learn the most about your partners when you negotiate the deal with them. That lesson has proven to be an immutable truth in business and life. In this particular negotiation these guys have started with the threatening phone calls, they are telling us that they will screw us every time they need to (need defined as protecting government that they like).

I'm not surprised, this is what they have been doing for years. They weren't transparent last session or the session before that. They weren't transparent at the pre-session get together. We created priorities that they used the Presidency to change. They worked with the D's to pass their bills and grow government in previous sessions and will in this one. In this election, more of our members are in jeopardy because of Jim and Llew (HB 198, education funding) than the Democrats. Our own guys added money to the budget after Finance and Claims did its job. How much more data do we need???

I'm baffled by the idea that we can trust them.

I also can't get my mind around how we're going to pre-legislate the legislative session. Jeff, you're a lawyer, how could we have a binding agreement? Who are the parties? Binding on whom? Enforceable how? Enforceable by what court? We don't have the details of very many bills and if the bill changes is the deal off? Only part of the deal? I get how this works in a business but not the legislature.

When it goes wrong, who will answer to the base and advocates? How will we explain we negotiated away our power for nothing? Why should they be there for us in the future? Why did I raise \$200K for legislative races to piss it away? If they screw us in public, the answer is completely different.

That being said, I'm willing to negotiate if only to put the idea to the death it will ultimately meet. I'm even willing to exclude all of my personal bills from consideration to make the negotiation easier. Whoever in our group wants to negotiate should lead the negotiation. I wouldn't wish it on anyone but I'm not going to spend time on that suicide mission either.

I just want to go on record here: With the Presidency and Committee on Committees we can win some important skirmishes while losing this year's battle on our way to winning the ten year war. I feel great about that opportunity. I think this group can do it. I'm proud to be part of it. Republicans are looking for leadership. That's where the party is, that's where the public is, that's what 2010 was about. It's time to channel Churchill and bury Chamberlin. Appeasement has never worked and thinking it can is what Churchill described as the "triumph of hope over experience."

Put me in coach, I'm ready to play.

Jason Priest
Hamilton Venture Holdings, LLC
PO Box 743
Red Lodge, MT 59068

Office
Fax
Mobile

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

suggestion is more about control or saving Jim's ego. My guess is its more about control, they do not have any intention of keeping a deal to move our policies, and their main goal is to keep all the division behind closed doors so they are not forced to take the hard votes in public and have to defend themselves in primaries.

>

>

>

> But if we want to flush them out and try to negotiate a deal they can't renege on we can afford to waste a little time doing so. Our power only increases every day we get closer to a vote, as the vote is what they fear. That is why they are trying to avoid it so much and the push is on so hard right now. I, on the other hand, am prepared to lose a leadership vote and then vote my conscience and beliefs and let the chips fall where they may. If you are too, we have nothing to lose, except fleeting promises that they might advance our policies, the ones we know they hate.

>

>

>

> So can we trust them?

>

>

>

> Jeff

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

Art

Jeff Essmann <jeff@jeffessmann.com>
To: Eric Moore <sfeeders@midrivers.com>

Thu, Sep 13, 2012 at 12:08 PM

No I am phoning it in.

JEff

From: fdm7098@gmail.com [mailto:fdm7098@gmail.com] **On Behalf Of** Eric Moore
Sent: Thursday, September 13, 2012 10:50 AM
To: Jeff Essmann
Subject: RE: Re: Agenda control

[Quoted text hidden]

Eric Moore <sfeeders@midrivers.com>

Thu, Sep 13, 2012 at 2:05 PM

To: Jason Priest - Personal <jpriest@hamiltonventure.com>

Cc: Art Wittich <artw@montana.com>, Dave Lewis <davelewis@aol.com>, Jeff Essmann <jeff@jeffessmann.com>, Ed Walker <ewalker@loenbro.com>

I'll take a contrary point of view, just to keep it interesting. I'm not 100% sold on this, but here's the way I see it now:

1) If any group enjoys shooting at each other more than republicans, its ranchers and farmers. I've spent 20+ years working on the political side of the ag industry, and I have lost far, far more battle than I have won. That's because farmers and ranchers are always hopelessly divided and fighting among themselves. The largest industry in the state has a weaker lobby than the plumber's union. It will eventually be our demise. Had the ag/rural vote been unified, we would not have elected Schweitzer, or Tester, and thereby might not have Obamacare. I have seen firsthand how civil war leads to defeat.

Jason referred to Churchill. Remember that he and Eisenhower, despite the aggravation in dealing with Stalin, DeGaule, Montgomery, Patton, and all the other prima donnas in the allied force, never forgot that Hitler was the true enemy.

2) We've always said we were about policy, not personal position. Here we have the opportunity to negotiate for just that. If negotiations go nowhere, we're no worse off than we are now.

3) Personally, I don't feel my constituents are served by an implosion of the senate republican caucus that paralyzes the 2013 session (especially if Rick pulls it out), and ensures a democratic majority for the next 10 years. As infuriated as I am with positions taken by the moderates, the fact remains indisputable that my constituents are better served by government run by republicans than by dems. As poor as his decisions are, Jim doesn't want to run ranchers off their land and turn it into a Buffalo commons; Wanzenreid does.

4) I'm certainly not suggesting that we give away the presidency without getting handsomely paid for it w policy. And no, I have no idea yet how we'd enforce such an agreement, but I think it irresponsible to not even explore the possibility. If there is any support among us, I'll work on it. If not, I'll keep my mouth shut and watch Armageddon. Should be a good show, if nothing else!

FDM

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

suggestion is more about control or saving Jim's ego. My guess is its more about control, they do not have any intention of keeping a deal to



Eric Moore <fdm7098@gmail.com>

RE: Llew

1 message

Taylor Brown <Taylor@northernbroadcasting.com>

Sun, Sep 16, 2012 at 12:50 PM

To: Llew Jones <ljones@mtbus.net>, Eric Moore <fdm7098@gmail.com>

Llew and Eric:

Thanks for copying me in on your ideas. I think it is important to have this discussion now, and not wait until later. I think you are both right, that we need to focus on the areas where we will find broad agreement, and begin to work on those as soon as possible. Conversely, in areas where we know we will find strong disagreement in our Caucus, let's try to avoid wasting valuable time and political capital.

My thoughts, to build on what you said below are: Let's start with the end in mind. Let's write the Press Release right NOW, that we want to see at the end of next April. What will it say that we accomplished back in 2013?

- ✓ • Did we shrink State Government again? (By an additional 5% beyond the 4% that we accomplished in 2011?) If so, how did we do that?
- Did we lower or simplify Taxes at all? (How and Where?)
- Did we make Government more transparent, and finally put the state's checkbook on line, like some states already are now?
- In Education, did we improve local flexibility, or student measurements, or more balanced funding, or increase competition? (How?)
- Did we make any progress on Tort Reform? (Where did we realistically do that?)
- Did we actually streamline permitting, and make it easier for resource-based businesses to invest in Montana?
- Did we improve how the state manages wildlife or land? Did we rein in wild bison and wolves, and stop increases in state land purchases?
- Did we re-open Work Comp, and Marijuana, or did we leave those lie for a term?
- Did we make serious progress towards a Pension Plan fix, or just kick the can?

If we could get someone started right now on big items like these, and not be waiting to work on them until January, then imagine how far we could get!? But if we let our key good thinkers get bogged down in peripheral issues that we are not even going to include in next April's Press Release anyway, then we may not have much to write about.

So, assuming that we have a Governor who will sign our bills...what are the key issues that we want to brag about next April?

Llew is right, the discussion should be WHO is responsible...for WHAT? Last time, we had the Majority Leader as our point man to spend days and days working on important Marijuana Legislation. Is that the way we want to do it again? Or do we want it more like when we had Rep. Reichner focused on Work Comp, and getting that right for all the caucus....while somebody else ran the floor. Our Pro-Temp, Sen. Tutvedt did the heavy lifting on Business Equipment Tax relief, and still served in leadership, so is the trick to keep our key guys focused on just their paragraph in next April's "Press Release"?

Example. Llew Jones knows more about how to fix education than anyone else on our team. What does that paragraph say next April about what we realistically did about Education tenure, and longitudinal student metrics, and local flexibility? And if possible, a guy like me needs to know that NOW, so I know what to be saying and supporting from the start,...and not trying to guess next February whether the plan includes for my district in Colstrip to go under the bus or not.