



**4FRI Stakeholder Group Meeting
DRAFT Minutes**

Wednesday, September 24th, 2014, 9am-4pm
Coconino National Forest Supervisor's Office
1824 S. Thompson St. Flagstaff, AZ 86001
Teleconference line: (712) 432-1500, code: 892961#

Attendance: David Auty, Bill Baker, Pam Baltimore, Jay Beecroft, Pascal Berlioux, Marta Call, Neil Chapman, Rebecca Davidson, Karen Durant, Dick Fleishman, Annette Fredette, Steve Gatewood, Brenna Goth, Bill Greenwood, Scott Harger, Ron Klawitter, Holly Krake, Ron Lee, Linda Lind, Bill Masters, Joe Miller, Kathy Mitchell, Anne Mottek-Lucas, Tom Olsen, Keith Pajkos, Jim Perkins, Stephen Reidhead, Cathie Schmidlin, Sue Sitko, Greg Smith, Buck Swaney, Diane Vosick, Amy Waltz, Mike Williams, Russell Winn, Tiffany Woods, and Travis Woolley

On the Phone: Sharon Adams, Lori Martinek, Darren Gurner, Margaret VanGilder, Rob Davis, and Todd Schulke

9:00 Introductions

Brief update on administrative functions:

Kathy Mitchell and Tiffany Woods from the Ecological Restoration Institute will assume administrative support responsibilities for 4FRI. They will only provide administrative assistance to 4FRI, the coordinating role that Eli filled will be returned to the co-chairs.

9:10 Approve minutes from Aug 27th SHG meeting – Berlioux

Minutes Approved – No comments were made

SHG meeting locations will now be set for Flagstaff and Snowflake

9:15 Review action items from Aug 27th SHG meeting – Gatewood

Action Item	Lead	Status
Finalize reporting structure for monthly SHG updates from contractors and USFS	Berlioux, Fleishman, Horner, and Martinek	First draft completed
Sitgreaves Fire Field trip details/planning for September-FLG	Vosick, Fleishman, Williams, Waltz	Completed
Confirm USFS Regional Office participation at the Sep meeting	Fleishman	Completed

9:15 Call to the Public

No public comments

9:20 USFS update – Fleishman and Fredette

- NEPA (Fredette) – The NEPA report is currently undergoing the internal review process, it is projected to be completed by the end of October or early November. The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) and Record of Decision (ROD) are also scheduled to be out in the same timeframe, the release date is dependent on the outcome of the internal review and recommendations for changes. The internal review is currently at the local and Regional level, however, it may be reviewed at the National level.

Question (Miller): Is the ROD subject to US Fish and Wildlife review?

The FS has been in consultation with Fish and Wildlife, there is currently a first draft of the Biological Opinion (BO) and the process of consultation should be completed this week.

- **Request for Action (Berlioux):** Will the FS work with Shaula Hedwall from US Fish and Wildlife to provide a presentation on the BO at the following, October, SHG meeting? Fleishman and Fredette will discuss this with Fish and Wildlife.
- GAO Visit (Fleishman) – A draft agenda is available on Basecamp, please RSVP by emailing Dick Fleishman. The visit will take place Oct. 1st and 2nd and is intended to facilitate a conversation between 4FRI and the GAO concerning landscape scale restoration across the U.S. The following sites will be visited during October 2nd:
 1. Existing stand conditions in the 4FRI EIS area
 2. Gus Pearson site – this visit will be organized in coordination with the ERI to discuss the related research that has been conducted in correlation with 4FRI and GTR 310 objectives
 3. Sites reflecting the effectiveness of thinning treatments, in regards to the Slide Fire and San Juan Fire area treatments
 4. Location of the previous SHG monitoring field trip
- CFLR Annual Report (Fleishman) – The projected due date is October 25th as the annual report must be submitted to the Washington office by the first week of November. Each member of the collaborative is responsible for submitting their in-kind and match contributions for the last year (October 1, 2013 to September 30, 2014). The template will be made available to collect the data. Please send completed forms to Tiffany Woods of the Ecological Restoration Institute.
- FS – 4FRI September 2014 update (Fleishman) – Please review Handout #1, posted on Basecamp:
 - Revision: 6th month firm and tentative timber sale offerings outside 4FRI phase 1. Tonto – Colcord Stewardship will be changed from 500 acres to 263 acres
 - More revisions will be in the following update to account for additional projected NEPA acres
 - There will be an increase in prescribed fires in correlation with drier climates
 - 45,000 acres across the 4 forests have been treated with managed fire; this number will also increase within the next few months

Question (Vosick): The public and 4FRI would like information on the current status of timber sales outside 4FRI. Specifically noting who is getting the contract(s)?

Response and Action item (Fleishman): The FS can update the template to include who the contracts have been awarded to because it is public information.

Discussion between Industry (Perkins, seconded by Southwest Forest Products) and FS:

Perkins noted that many loggers are currently anxious to get wood outside the 4FRI contract and is requesting that sales be put up faster than 2015. There is currently only enough wood to maintain business for the following five months and his industry requires these future sales to continue operations. From his perspective there is a huge amount of wood in the 4FRI contract, but nothing is being treated, however, there is not wood outside the 4FRI contract.

Question (Reidhead): Is there a possibility to pull out 4FRI contracts/task orders that are not active?

Response (Fleishman): Not if it has been issued, however, Fulton and Sinkhole were pulled out of 4FRI Phase 1. Currently the FS does not have all of the answers concerning how contracts will be issued outside of the 4FRI contract. This is currently up for discussion and should be touched on in more depth at FS workgroup meetings.

Quick review of the 4FRI Collaborative and what actions the 4FRI collaborative can make (Swaney):

1. To study and develop recommendations for the Forest Service
2. To create a Position Statement to the Forest Service

In summary, 4FRI does not have the ability to make decisions, only recommendations.

9:40 Review of USFS FEIS/ROD Objection process and discussion regarding questions for Cal Joyner – VanGilder

Please review handout #2. The 218 objection process is as follows:

1. Administrative review process
2. Legal notice published
3. Objections filed
4. Meetings will be open to the public

Meetings will be advertised via websites (Basecamp and 4FRI.org) and letters will be sent to Stakeholders, however, it will not be a legal notice. Holly Craig is tasked with uploading all meeting info for the FS. The format of the meetings will be dependent on Cal Joyner. These meetings are intended to clarify objections and can often result in a resolution being reached.

The proposed timeframe for the Forest Service to complete the objection process is as follows: 45 days to file followed by 45 days (plus a possible 30 day extension) to respond.

The timing for the written responses will depend on the number of objections received and the complexity of the issues. If there are limited objections, the review may be completed in 45 days, if not, then the response time may need to be extended for up to 30 days. If there are instructions that must be completed prior to signing the ROD, those will be issued by the Reviewing Officer (the Regional Forester or one of his Deputies).

Action item: Clarify the 4FRI collaborative status concerning our ability to object. Is 4FRI considered a partnership and do we need to be a legal entity in regards to being able to file an objection? VanGilder will provide a proper response to the 4FRI inquiry at the 10/22 SHG meeting.

Cal Joyner response to the 4FRI letter will occur during the Steering Committee Call scheduled for October 21 at 1PM – The conference call-in telephone number will be provided on Basecamp to open the meeting to all interested participants.

10:20 Break

10:35 Stakeholder Disclosures and Accountability – Swaney

- Posting articles on Basecamp even if they are unfavorable – All
The SHG is not in favor of censorship. Additionally, it would be difficult to enforce any rules regarding posts on Basecamp. Concerning the question of copyright, if the article is free it can be posted, if it is not, make note of it, but do not post the article.

When responding to any publications concerning 4FRI refer to the charter, section 7B2C, section 7B3A, and section 9. Essentially, differentiate between yourself and the collaborative and consider the impact of comments made on the SHG as a whole.

- HCN article – All
Noting that there is a direct contradiction between the GEP representation regarding Concord Blue's operations and the representations made by Claudine LoMonaco, Berlioux would like the SHG to provide GEP with an opportunity to refute (or confirm?) the allegations made in the "Lost in the Woods" article.
Refer to above remarks concerning posting on Basecamp and charter rules.

Action Item (Winn/Berlioux): Have Jason Rosamond provide a status update on Concord Blue's operations at the October meeting. GEP was unable to comment on Concord Blue during this meeting.

Disclosures

1. Stewardship Agreement between A-S and ECO – Berlioux

The A-S NF has signed a Stewardship agreement with ECO to complete the Burro Task Order (726 acres) intended to complete a restoration project proposed in the White Mountain Stewardship Contract. The parameters of the agreement are as follows: 1 year, 1 project (the Burro). ECO is responsible for releasing the Request for Proposal (RFP) and field project management. It should not be a subsidy-heavy project, but rather it should break even. However, both the A-S and ECO are contributing funding under the agreement. On a final note the agreement does not pertain to 4FRI NEPA as it concerns a project that has already been approved by WMSC NEPA.

2. ADOT pilot project to increase weight limit - Berlioux

ADOT and ECO are working together to study the impacts of increasing the maximum weight of logging trucks. Three scenarios were presented to ADOT from EACO, they concerned raising the weight to 86,000 lbs., 90,000 lbs. and 110,000 lbs. The pilot will be an ongoing analysis for 2 years. If the weight limit is increased it could reduce transportation cost by 15%-20%. The pilot should be enacted as early as

October. GEP is in favor for the limit to be raised to 90,000 lbs. as it would not require a change or update of current equipment.

11:00 GEPAZ update – Martinek and Gurner

GEP currently has a second contractor on the West Fork TO, cutting up to 60 loads per day. They have more than doubled their production and are looking to increase their capacity in the forest and to expand their sales. A new debarker will be on site tomorrow, 9/25/14, at the Heber mill. It should be installed within the next ten days to increase productivity. They are continuing to invest and move forward with cutting trees.

GEP is actively looking for entities with trucking capabilities, small scale or large scale. Contact Darren Gurner if you are willing to negotiate concerning this request.

Question (Berlioux): Gurner, at the past two SHG meetings, GEP has promised have a major announcement for the following meeting, what is the major announcement?

Response (Gurner): I promise to make no future promises for a major announcement.

11:10 Campbell Global update – Horner

Posted Task Order update to Basecamp. As of last Monday, 9/15/14, Campbell Global has harvested 2,347 acres under the contract. Currently awaiting the road plan for East Clear Creek to start restoration activities on the east side. Focusing on road maintenance to encourage sales and markets to drive more work in the forest. They are also waiting for upgrades to be done at Lumberjack mill to increase productivity. Currently operating at the rate of 40-50 acres per day.

Action Item (Berlioux): Only include current year progress on contractor's template to avoid confusion. This was the result of Rob Davis' inquiry concerning 900 acres completed vs 2,347 acres completed. GEP and Campbell will not list acres as completed until they are signed off by the FS.

The topic of choosing local vs. external loggers was discussed, this is a continuing discussion between local industry and the FS. The main objective of Campbell and GEP is to keep restoration treatments cost effective and they are willing to work with any entity that will help them achieve that goal, whether local or external. Perkins answered that he cannot afford to log for the price offered by Campbell. Currently, the major challenge with their production capabilities concerns biomass, in most cases there is more biomass on site than logs and their contract requires that anything that is cut is to be removed. Worst case scenario can see up to 60% biomass and best case scenario will have 25% - 45% biomass, it is dependent on the TO. They do not currently have small log mill, but they are working to get the production capacity to the area. Berlioux commented that the proportion of biomass is related to mill capacity for use of small diameter logs. Increasing the utilization and processing of smaller diameter logs at appropriate mills decreases the amount of wood considered to be biomass. Limited investment under the contract has been made in this segment of small diameter utilization, however, it remains a key purpose of 4FRI

11:20 Working Group Updates

- **Multi-party monitoring Board – Woolley and Gist**

Travis Woolley is now the primary co-chair of the MPMB with Jessica Gist taking post as the second co-chair.

Update from the 8/27/14 SHG meeting, the MPMB is currently working to address the TO order/sequencing questions concerning monitoring for pre-treatment starting next spring. Aiming to have a more specific update at the 10/22/14 SHG meeting.

The 5 year CFLR report is due in November and will include 5 national indicators with 1 ecological indicator consisting of 4 sub-indicators, based on multi-party monitoring. The report is intended to provide Congress with a report showing the progress that is being made. Dan Kipervaser is currently working extensively with the MPMB to complete the report, once it is completed it will be posted on Basecamp. As the MPMB is a subgroup of the SHG, they would like the SHG to make remarks concerning the report or possibly providing approval for the report. Currently in discussion on who has to approve the CFLR report before it is submitted.

- **Communications Working Group** – Gatewood

With Eli's departure, the CWG is working to fill the leadership role. Once this is determined there will be a better update, hopefully by the 10/22/14 SHG meeting. At the most recent meeting Ann DeMarco and Steve Gatewood were the only members present.

- **Industry/Utilization Working Group** – Gatewood

The first meeting focused on determining short-range (1-2yrs), mid-range (5yrs) and long-range (15+yrs) issues and needs of the industry members. The major purpose of the working group is to gather information regarding industry & utilization for the SHG pertaining to how the FS deals with industry. The Industry/Utilization Working Group will meet the 2nd Monday of each month, however, the October meeting will be held on the 3rd Monday of the month at 3pm due to holiday.

Determined short-range issues:

- Analyzing assistance and provide support for completing the second analysis area EIS and contract; major question involves contract issuance, will it be another large contract or smaller contracts?
- Facilitate contracts outside of 4FRI
- Continue to provide industry updates to determine volume needed and available supply

Long-term concerns are as follows:

- What kind of industry will be created as a result of 4FRI?
- Is the industry sustainable once the 4FRI contract is no longer available?
- Will the restored forest ecosystems be managed by prescribed fire, logging, or both?
- Utilization of the GFFP developed Coordinating Resource Offering Protocol (CROP) to project/identify what the Forest Service will have to offer through their 10-year plans into the future

East Side Industry update (Greenwood):

- Vaagen – Closed, could use 20 loads a day

- Terry Reidhead: Both mills could take 6 loads a day
 - a. Nutrioso Mill – out of wood
 - b. Eager – small log mill – not running, but has one week’s worth of supply
- APC Pallets – Has less than one month’s supply. Currently working to purchase large logs that could not be processed at the Vaagen mill, if they do they would have enough supply to last until November
- Forest Energy – pellet mill. Has two months’ worth of supply and would need 16 loads a day
- AZ Log & Timber – No supply, needs 3 loads per day
- Novo Power – Currently has 20 days’ worth of supply, working at 95% capacity, but would need 40-50 trucks per day
- Sierra Madre pole peeling operation – Moved to Lumberjack mill and can now process small diameter logs. According to Bill Greenwood the NAWPA encouraged the move

Newpac Fibre update – (Durant)

Mid – September, Newpac Fibre began production with its refurbished mill which has a 30,000bft/shift capacity. They have hired 10 new, local, employees and are continuing to build out infrastructure at their main property which will have an annual capacity of 50million bft. As of 9/24/14 they had shipped out 20 loads of product and are currently filling domestic and international orders. Newpac Fibre’s logger is harvesting at a rate of 10,000 tons of fiber per month or 120,000 tons annually, however, with the larger mill they could increase their fiber needs to 500,000 tons of fiber per year. Newpac Fibre has a supply contract with Perkins Timber Harvesting and their biggest concern is if they will have enough fiber to support their main property.

Question (Berlioux): What do you do with your biomass and logs?

Response (Durant): Right now we are creating rough sawn lumber, so we are producing cants and boards – these are our primary products. Concerning residues, whether in the forest or at our plant, we have a lot of experience dealing with landscape & soil amendments, and biofuels.

SRP update – Davidson

SRP will be holding their second annual conference, Healthy Forest Vibrant Economy, on October 16th - 17th at the Scottsdale Hilton. The main focus is to encourage city planners to consider forest health and watershed health when working on long-term community planning. Senators Flake and McCain will be attending this event. For more information please view the SRP website:

<http://www.srpnet.com/water/forest/conference.aspx>

11:45 Meeting Updates/Discussions

Co-Chair rotation: Steve Gatewood (1st) and Diane Vosick (2nd) will be the 4FRI co-chairs starting 10/1/2014 – An official request was made by Vosick for more SHG members to volunteer to be a co-chair

Upcoming SHG meeting schedule – all

October 22nd:
Northland Pioneer College

Silver Creek Campus - Snowflake
 LC101 Symposium

November 19th and/or December 10th:
 Coconino National Forest Supervisor's Office
 1824 S. Thompson St. Flagstaff, AZ 86001

The 10/22/14 date is confirmed, however, the November and December date will be dependent on the release of the EIS.

12:00 Action Items and adjourn

Action Item	Lead	Status
Presentation on the BO and ROD by the FS and Shaula Hedwall from US Fish and Wildlife Review	Fleishman/Fredette/Williams	In Progress
FS will update contractors template to reflect current status of timber sales outside of the 4FRI contract	Fleishman	
Clarification concerning the 4FRI collaborative status in regards to the 218 objection process – Do we need to be a legal entity to file an objection?	VanGilder	
Post conference call-in number to basecamp for 10/21/14 SC meeting – Cal Joyner will be discussing the USFS FEIS Objection process	Mitchell/Woods	
Concord Blue update	Rosamond	
Collection of CFLR match data – send information to Tiffany Woods from the ERI	Fleishman/Woods	
Finalized scheduling of the Nov./Dec. SHG meetings	Dependent on NEPA report	
Update contractor's template to include only 2014 completed acreage, not total acres from past two years.	Horner/Martinek/Gurner	
Summary of discussion with Cal Joyner from the 10/21/14 SC meeting	SC members	

12:45 Depart for Sitgreaves-Complex fire field trip (bring a hard hat, water and lunch)

Key questions and discussion points from the field trip (notes by Amy Waltz):

The small group chairs developed these questions:

1. What were the mix of vegetation types burned, and what were the ranges of fire effects (and severity) observed?
 - a. Desired outcomes by vegetation type?
 - b. What are the differing actions/methods for desired outcomes in different veg types?
2. What was the progression of the fire – and how were lighting/ignition (Rx fire) strategies used to control the managed burn?
3. How was the managed fire controlled – what resources were needed?
 - a. Were only local resources used? If not, how is lack of local knowledge dealt with when implementing to achieve desired outcomes using outside resources?

Social, Economics and Policy questions (not stop dependent)

1. Cost currently for “managed fires” such as Sitgreaves?

2. Cost in the future as these become more common?
3. Costs compared to prescribed burns and wildfire management?
4. Forecasting! What do you think the role of managed natural ignitions vs. prescribed burning will be into the future as more fire is applied to the landscape? Does the USFS see one being more prevalent to cover the needed acres of fire?

The Kaibab staff were prepared to answer these, as well as many others captured during the field trip.

Summarized Discussion Points (not in any particular order):

- Key point: the revised forest plan allows a potential increase in fire use across all vegetation types.
- In the new Kaibab Forest Plan, the Desired Outcomes/Conditions are set for each vegetation type; this created a desired outcome/metric at which forecasted fire outcomes could be compared. When they felt effects would remain within desired conditions, they were able to allow the fire to burn.
- About 11% of the burned area was classified as Mixed Conifer, the rest was a ponderosa and ponderosa/oak forest.
- Both aerial and ground-based lighting strategies were used to “help” the fire back down slopes, eliminating the need to place firefighters in steep terrain or in non-roaded areas.
- Only local resources were used, Incident Commander was local FMO.
- Cost was about \$55/acre; reminder suppression costs highly variable, but can be \$1500-\$2000/acre.
- WFDSS analysis (Wildland Fire Decision Support System) can serve as a mini-ID (inter-disciplinary team) meeting to make the call on Managed Fire. Timeframe is hours, not months/years. Requires the good guidance and desired condition specificity, and specific criteria (triggers) from the Forest Plan.
- Managed fire impacts on proposed actions in EIS. Still working within defined desired conditions. If some parts of fire had effects that moved towards desired condition, great, if effects were limited, change. Still will plan on active management, including thinning, in burned area.
- Does it lower the priority of action? Implementation is reliant on multiple factors, this may reduce risk to adjacent communities for a certain time period.
- Comparison to Eagle Rock fire of 2010. Large patches of tree mortality on north slopes and flats, both mixed conifer and ponderosa pine. Very different weather and moisture conditions. Great to explain how managed fire to achieve desired conditions can be utilized, but also when different conditions warrant full suppression.
- Quote of the trip: “So, you could say, the FS managed the Sitgreaves Complex fire, but the Eagle Rock Fire managed the FS”... 😊

5:00 End of field trip

Process for approving minutes:

1. Note-taker sends draft minutes to Co-Chairs and facilitator < 48 hrs. following meeting
2. Co-Chairs and facilitator respond with edits (if needed) < 48 hrs. of receiving minutes
3. Note-taker incorporates edits & posts draft minutes to BASECAMP < 48 hrs. of receiving edited minutes
4. Draft minutes are approved (with additional edits as necessary) at next Stakeholder Group meeting
5. Note-taker posts Final Minutes to BASECAMP as PDF