



**4FRI Stakeholder Group Meeting Minutes**

Wednesday, October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2014, 9am-12pm

Northland Pioneer College – Learning Symposium

1611 S. Main St. LC101, Snowflake, AZ 85937

Teleconference line: (712) 775-7031, code: 439290611#

**Attendance:** Steve Gatewood, Dick Fleishman, Joe Miller, Sue Sitko, Diane Vosick, Travis Woolley, Annette Fredette, Ron Miller, Buck Swaney, Tiffany Woods, Bill Greenwood, Karen Durant, Bill Masters, Steve Reidhead, Greg Smith, Bob Seidler, Jay Beecroft, Kris Lester, Buzz Ivisek, Bill Baker, Holly Krake, Chirre Keckle, Rebecca Davidson, Ron Klawitter, David Tenney, , Pascal Berlioux, Steve Horner, Vicki Horner, Dan Kipervaser

**On the phone:** Todd Schulke, Paul Summerfelt, Rob Davis, Keith Pajkos

**9:00 Approve minutes from Sep. 24<sup>th</sup> SHG meeting** —Gatewood

The approval of the 9/24/14 SHG minutes has been postponed for a few weeks to match the minutes of the meeting to the recording of the meeting.

**9:05 Review action items from Sep. 24<sup>th</sup> SHG meeting** —Vosick

Action Item	Lead	Status
1. Presentation on the BO and ROD by the FS and Shaula Hedwall from US Fish and Wildlife Review	Fleishman/Fredette/Williams	In Progress
2. 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/Fredette	Complete
3. 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	Complete
4. Concord Blue update	Rosamond	No update will be provided.
5. Collection of CFLR match data – send information to Tiffany Woods from the ERI	Fleishman/Woods	In Progress
6. Finalized scheduling of the Nov./Dec. SHG meetings	Dependent on NEPA report	In Progress
7. Update contractor’s template to include only 2014 completed acreage, not total acres from past two years	Horner/Martinek/Gurner	In Progress
8. Summary of discussion with Cal Joyner from the 10/21/14 SC meeting	SC members	Complete

## 9:10 Call to the Public

No public comments

## 9:10 USFS Update – Fleishman/Fredette

- GAO Visit (Fleishman) – The GAO visit was intended to gather information on landscape scale restoration across the United States, specifically, to understand how it is being done and determine NEPA efficiency. The GAO is currently preparing a report that outlines their findings from the 5 CFLR areas they visited. This report will be presented to Congress in March or April and will list recommendations, if any are provided. The GAO report will also include material obtained from BLM landscape scale restoration projects.

Day one of their visit was conducted in the office and day two was spent in the field. This allowed them to visit several locations that ranged from sites with existing conditions to historical conditions. Many questions were asked and sufficient information was provided, they were able to obtain exactly what they needed. Diane Vosick noted the importance of their visit and how it is happening concurrently with the 5 year CFLR Monitoring. Congress is currently reviewing CFLR projects and how the funding is being implemented on the ground. The GAO visit and 5 year report will help identify if objectives are being met.

- EIS Update (Fredette) – The Forest Service has the final Biological Opinion (BO) and it has an associated monitoring plan. The FS is incorporating the BO monitoring into their monitoring plan for 4FRI, as the BO requires. The FS is currently making last edits to the draft Record of Decision (ROD), while the internal reviews are complete, they still need to set-up executive briefings.
- CFLRP Announcement (Fleishman) – Dick Fleishman and Dan Kipervaser are working on the CFLR annual report. There are 2 reporting requirements, what has been done with match funds for the 4FRI effort and the in-kind time that has been contributed to moving this process forward. Please submit your data to Tiffany Woods by next Wednesday, who will then send the completed form to Dick Fleishman for the annual report. The report wants a picture of all funds contributed to implement this process.

**Action Item:** Dick Fleishman will post information concerning leveraged funds to Basecamp.

## 9:20 Review of SC discussion with Cal Joyner – Gatewood

Gatewood reviewed the questions that were asked and the responses that were provided during the SC call with Cal Joyner, they are as follows:

- 1) Is there an update on the timeline for release of the ROD and Final EIS? The Notice of Availability (NOA) will be published late November or early December. The documents will be available on the web a few weeks before they printed. There will be a signed BO.
- 2) Please provide an overview on how you envision structuring the public process for the objection resolution period? The process will follow the handout that was presented at the 9/24/14 SHG

meeting ([http://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE\\_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb5442116.pdf](http://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb5442116.pdf)), however, Cal Joyner does have some discretion. The number of objections and the complexity of those objections will ultimately determine how they structure their public meetings. All resolution negotiating meetings will be open to the public, however, it has not yet been determined if the public will be able to participate in those meetings. Cal has the discretion to allow the public to comment or to address the particular process.

Clarification from Fleishman: It is not a negotiation process, it provides the objectors an opportunity to present their case and their resolutions. He is not aware of how much negotiating will take place

3) What are the sideboards of what you can & can't do as the deciding officer during this process? As the Reviewing Officer, Cal has the delegated authority and responsibility to:

- Review the eligible objections and then accept, partially accept, or set-aside the objection.
- Determine whether adequate time remains in the review period to make a meeting practical.
- Decide date/duration/location of meeting and the format/mechanism for its conduct.
- Consolidate objections where they are common and likely issue 1 response to multiple objections from different objectors if the comment is the same.

Note: Cal does not need to be physically present at these resolution meetings, he can appoint someone from his Executive Staff to represent him.

4) How will notifications for public engagement be communicated (i.e. Basecamp, e-mail, press releases, etc.). They will have a roll-out plan on how they will notify the public of these meetings, legal notice is not required. Once the information is available on their website, it can be posted on Basecamp. There could be various timeframes for meeting announcements, ranging from a few days to a week, it will normally be a short notice.

5) How would you handle the scenario of a large number of objections that may require numerous independent negotiations (if they aren't combined)? He will combine objections when possible and make use of videoconferencing if and when appropriate.

6) Will video/streaming be an option for those unable to travel to any negotiating meetings? Cal and his staff will consider this option, but are unable to make any guarantees at this time.

During the conversation, the Rosemont mine objection process was often referenced, however, the 4FRI EIS received only 2,000 comments while the Rosemont mine EIS received 50,000 comments. Fleishman notes that Cal intends to include more employees in the process as a result of the compressed timeframe, this is something that will be implemented as a result of the complex process that presented itself concerning Rosemont mine. Fleishman also wanted to note that Cal thanks the SHG and recognizes the value added to the process as a result of our participation.

Update from 9/24/14 SHG meeting: Clarification of 4FRI Status concerning 218 Objection Process – we do not need to be a legal entity to object and we do not need to be an objector to sit at the table. Cal will invite the stakeholders as an entity or as individuals to participate.

## 9:30 Stakeholder Disclosures and Accountability – Swaney/All

- SRP Conference update (Davidson): The “Healthy Forests, Vibrant Economy” Conference was a two day event in Scottsdale, Arizona. The conference focused on bringing in the idea that without restoration Arizona is going face some serious economic impacts in recreation/tourism, water supply, and long-term planning for our communities. Importance was placed on public/private partnerships and innovative opportunities that could be found there while opening a forum for industry to discuss things that are going well and areas that need improvement.

The conference also focused on different policy approaches as a result of the presentations made by Senators Flake and McCain. Restoration is something that requires top-down and bottom-up changes/contributions. Currently SRP, the FS, and the National Forests Foundation are pursuing a bottom-up opportunity by creating the Northern Arizona Forest Fund. Funding has been made available through public/private partnerships targeted at on the ground restoration of pre-approved NEPA projects improve watershed health. There are two projects this year, the Upper Beaver Creek Forest Health project and an Oak Creek sedimentation and erosion control project.

- 4FRI.Org update (Vosick): ERI manages the 4FRI website and has concluded that the public site does not effectively provide meeting information. Changes will be made to simplify the site to allow easy access to the agenda, which will be made available in a timely manner, and upcoming meeting locations. Access to official documents of the collaborative will be made more accessible. To keep the site simple and clear any contract and FS updates will be available through a direct link from the site to the FS site. These changes will start to take place within the next few weeks and the SHG is in favor with the upcoming changes.
- Continued negative publicity concerning the collaborative (Vosick): Business News today published an article indicating that the collaborative has come to a complete standstill, however, had the reporter attended last week’s SRP conference they would have heard a different story from Robert Bonnie discussing the importance of 4FRI. 4FRI is alive and well.
- CFLRP survey (Gatewood): The CFLR coalition has issued a survey related to collaboration for their 5 year report. This survey will be made available on Basecamp and the information obtained will be combined with other CFLR projects and presented to Congress for deliberation on future CFLR projects.
- Trout Unlimited, AZ Game & Fish, and TNC collaboration (Miller/Woolley): Joe Miller from Trout Unlimited, Travis Woolley from The Nature Conservancy, and Jessica Gist from AZ Game & Fish are in discussions about sharing resources for stream temperature monitoring on the Mogollon Rim and in the White Mountains. The first meeting will be in Flagstaff on November 5th.
- Decreased participation of contractors at SHG meetings (Swaney): Two weeks ago, Earl Stewart related to the SC that Campbell Global and GEP will no longer be present at all of the monthly SHG meetings. They are not signatories on the charter and they are not required to report to the group, their monthly updates have been a voluntary service that have been provided as a courtesy. GEP and Campbell Global have both agreed to the following:

1. They remain interested in active collaboration and will continue to participate with the working groups
2. Both organizations will continue to provide the SHG with written reports
3. They will not have time to provide in-person, contractor's updates at each SHG meeting. As a result they will not be listed in upcoming agendas, unless they have relayed that they will have something to present

GEP is currently working to get their business off the ground and need to be efficiently using their time. Both GEP and Campbell Global are looking forward to help from the collaborative to overcome challenges. They will always be open to direct communications with individual stakeholders.

Gatewood recommended that GEP and Campbell come to the stakeholders for help.

Question (Tenney): How does GEP and Campbell Global intend to remain a part of the process when you are not actively participating in the meetings?

Response (Horner): It is our intention to be present or at least on the conference line during most meetings and by continuing to put out the monthly TO updates. We are looking for the most productive process for us. Travis Woolley also mentioned that Ann DeMarco continues to be present at the MPMB meetings. The working groups are a great way for the contractors to remain active in the process.

Berlioux tried to distinguish GEP and Campbell and the perceived (lack of) credibility of GEP. Horner responded by noting that they are who they are and instead of criticizing GEP, he should focus his efforts on restoration in Northern Arizona.

Swaney attempted to read the third ground rule of the Charter, however, Berlioux interrupted him and requested that he instead read the fourth ground rule first.

Ground Rule 4: Participate candidly: Share your views fully and honestly with everyone. Be forthright, avoid creating false expectations, and recognize that disagreement will be part of many deliberations. Be willing to explain the reasoning behind statements, questions, and actions. Openly discuss controversial issues that could undermine the effectiveness of the process if left unspoken. Represent the interests and concerns of your organization and constituents as accurately and thoroughly as possible and inform the group when the limits of your authority are reached.

Ground Rule 3: Treat others with respect: Everyone brings different perspectives to the 4FRI, and others may have viewpoints you had not considered. Allow expression of other ideas, even if you disagree. As the group works to achieve agreement, strive to also develop a deeper understanding. Discussions should focus on interests, not positions.

Berlioux fails to see the disrespect or the lack of respect in asking candid questions to verify the expectations which have been created. It is the right of the stakeholders to question the contractors when promises have been made. Berlioux believes that the disrespect lies in the answers that have been provided from Steve Gurner concerning inquiries made about GEP, not in the questions being asked.

Swaney stopped the conversation and pointed out how it shows why this interaction has not been working and why it needs to change. The SHG has to re-think and re-work this situation to make/reach a solution, but before this can move forward he will review the MOU.

## **9:40 SHG Charter and MOU Review – Swaney**

The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is an agreement between the stakeholder group and the FS, it outlines the following:

- The FS develops and maintains long-term contracts
- Together we can explore and implement mechanisms and processes, such as utilization, contracting, strategies, grants, agreements, and volunteer work.
- The collaborative is to discuss, evaluate, and implement innovative planning, project preparation, implementation, admin, science, monitoring, etc.

In the MOU there is no place where we make it our responsibility, as stakeholders, to deal with where the contract is getting or isn't getting. We want and need that information, however, it is fundamentally between the FS and the contractor.

SHG Charter: Our charter objective is to help design and implement innovative strategies with the FS. We are also encouraged to advocate, participate, and support contracting actions and activities. We should be focused on what we can do to help the contract, however, our energies have been directed at criticizing the contract. Our energies should be focused on collaborating with the contractor, we need to produce a forum where they can approach us with their questions and needs.

The following items were covered in the Stakeholders Accountability and Disclosures agenda item:

- Objective
- Ground Rules
- Contractor Participation Requirements
- Discussion and Approach: Collaborating with the Contractor (a Stakeholder)

## **10:05 MPMB Ecological Indicator presentation and update –Kipervaser**

The purpose of the presentation on the Ecological Indicator is to provide the SHG information about what is required by and will be presented to Congress for the 5 year CFLR report. The report that is being prepared will include data from all of the CFLR projects across the nation and summarize their findings in a single, simplified, statement while keeping in mind that each project differs in their goals, needs, and approaches. Some case studies will be provided, however, the overall objective is to convey to Congress progress towards restoration, across the entire program. The data and the methods and means of creating this report will be saved as they will contribute to the development of the future, required, 10 and 15 year reports. The database closes on October 31<sup>st</sup> and the report is due November 7<sup>th</sup>.

To begin, the Ecological Indicator is one of 5 National Indicators and is separated into four metrics of ecological restoration:

1. Fire Regime Restoration
2. Fish and Wildlife Condition
3. Watershed Condition
4. Invasive Species Severity

A desired outcome statement has been developed for each metric for every CFLR project. Progress will be measured in terms of good, fair, or poor. This will help simplify the national picture of where the country is relative to the act; however, there is one caveat, the report wants to include treatments that

are happening right now. As there is no means to collect this data, we are required to use our understanding of science, the changes being made, and the standard methods of approach to roll-up the figures.

To determine if the desired outcome is good, fair, or poor, an approach was developed:

- A target statement structure is fixed: (blank)% change across (blank)% of the CFLR landscape by the end of FY 2014
- Flexibility in desired conditions and metrics is allowed: Each project can develop how and what questions will be asked that can lead to desired answers
- Emphasis in Outcome vs Output – output would be to list acres treated while outcome measures and describes the magnitude, extent, and types of changes that occurred as the result of treatment
- Calculation:
  - Good > 75% of target
  - Fair 25% - 74% of target
  - Poor < 24% of target

Referring to the 4FRI proposal, a target is produced, the bar by which progress is rated. The target takes into account that treatment effects are not limited to the corresponding footprint, but rather the footprint and a determined surrounding area. This can explain why percentages are higher relative to the actual percentage of acres treated. This helps determine the total progress made towards a target. It should also be mentioned that different questions can be asked at the landscape scale and project scale. In particular, when you do a project the following questions are asked:

1. Are you meeting the desired conditions of that specific project?
2. What percentage of projects were treated as they were supposed to be treated?

These questions help gauge project specific outcomes vs. landscape scale restoration.

Metric by metric limitations:

- The rate by which we calculate the costs of fire have changed since the development of the proposal. It can also be difficult to quantify the loss of life or possessions.
- When considering Fish and Wildlife Habitat conditions you must differentiate between landscape scale restoration and project scale. Also the retention of snags and large diameter trees is relative to the number of trees that had been treated.
- Utilization of the WCATT to report our progress on watershed conditions is not effective as it is not sensitive to changes on our landscape. 4FRI is not going to do anything that will mess up our watersheds.
- The metric for invasive species is dependent on the report-outs for all treatments combined with their effectiveness

Reporting Limitations:

- Loss of acres allowed under NEPA as a result of landscape change, e.g. Wallow Fire
- Delay of the ROD

The larger the landscape the larger chance of landscape changes. The Wallow Fire and the delayed release of the ROD were not taken into consideration for the report and could account for why our scores are fair as opposed to good. It was determined to remain true to the proposal as opposed to changing the target.

Question (Durant): Could funding change as a result of what is reported to Congress, if they were to compare the numbers to the actual number of acres treated?

Response (Kipervaser): This is a balancing act as Congress could determine that funding was provided, but there has been minimal results. Or they could determine that the numbers have been inflated. If the numbers result in questions we will already have the answers prepared.

#### *4FRI – Current Progress (2010-2013)*

Fire Regime:

- Target: 47% change across 37% of the CFLR landscape by the end of FY 2014.
- Progress: 53% change across 24% of the CFLR landscape.
- Assessment: 65% of target area: Fair

Wildlife:

- Target: 64% change across 34% of the CFLR landscape by the end of FY 2014.
- Progress: 74% change across 24% of the CFLR landscape.
- Assessment: 71% of target area: Fair

Watershed:

- Target: 10% change across 100% of the CFLR landscape by the end of FY 2014.
- Progress: 12% change across 100% of the CFLR landscape.
- Assessment: 125% of target area: Good

Invasive Species:

- Target: 5% of the CFLR landscape was restored by reducing invasive species severity to meet desired conditions by the end of FY 2014.
- Progress: 4% of the CFLR landscape.
- Assessment: 72% of target area: Fair

#### **10:35 Working Group Updates**

- **Communications Working Group – Gatewood**

There is no CWG update because there was no meeting. A request was made by both Holly Krake and Steve Gatewood for more members to join the CWG.

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

West Side Update (Gatewood): Rob Davis noted that Eastside industry, which we have invested in, is going out of business. He wants to know why there isn't a louder outcry from the public and politicians. Tying in his comment, the current focus of the UIWG is to determine what it is going to take to support the existing industry and how we can work with GEP and Campbell Global to make wood available in these interim periods until other Task Orders become available. To consider all possibilities there was also discussion on what would it take from a subsidy point of view, over the short term, to get wood to these local industries that are struggling. This subsidy could be applied for transporting wood, over long distances, to mills that are in need of supply, however, an analysis needs to be made concerning the source of the funding and how long the funding would need to be made available, this would help determine if this type of endeavor would be feasible. It should also be mentioned that in some places long distance transport is profitable, in other cases it is not. A final possibility involves current inactive TOs that can be seen from the FS update, however, this would require further discussion between industry and the FS.



East Side Update (Greenwood):

Industry Name	What is your current raw material inventory level?	Number of truckloads needed for your daily operations	Number of loads your facility is currently receiving on a daily basis	What percent of capacity is your facility currently operating?	Comments
Novo Power	30 days	40-50	60	95%	20-25 loads are coming from PJ, the rest are ponderosa
Forest Energy	2 months	17	6-8	100%	Losing speed
AZ log & Timber	0	3	½	5%	Ran only 3 days last month
APC Timber	30 days	5	0	100%	Equipment was down for last two weeks, they will shut down in November
Reidhead – Nutrioso	0	7-8	0	0	Shut down
Reidhead – Eagar	2 weeks	7-8	0	0	Has not been running, but received the bid for the San Juan salvage sell
Vaagen	Closed	20-30			

Vaagen is currently working/talking with Novo Power and Tri-Star to see if it is feasible to move Vaagen next to Novo Power to bring the west side logs because there are about half a year's supply of timber from the Tonto and A-S. Lumberjack cannot currently handle all of the production. There will be a better update at the next SHG meeting.

Newpac Fibre update (Durant): They are currently up to 20,000 bft/shift at their small mill and the first three truck loads have arrived at their new, large mill. The large mill is the old Ash Fork mill, it has been refurbished and developed for ponderosa pine, small diameter wood. Between the two mills they are taking in 7-20 loads of logs/day, producing 5-7 loads of timber and 5-7 loads of byproduct. The main concern, within the next three months leading to opening the large mill, is the long-term fiber supply.

Newpac Fibre does have an agreement with James Perkins to provide us with "x" amount of wood, but we will need more than that established amount. They are always looking for new supplies. The loads per day input will be 20-40 loads.

**11:00 Meeting Updates/Discussions**

- November/December SHG meeting dates (all) – The November/December will be combined. Currently we are determining if December 10<sup>th</sup> or 11<sup>th</sup> will be the next SHG meeting date. The January meeting might also need to be rescheduled as it will be dependent on the posted legal notice.

- Special FEIS meeting (Krake): Once the FEIS is released the FS will organize a meeting specifically for the SHG. More information will be provided by Holly Krake from the FS.

**11:30 Action Items and Adjourn**

<b>Action Item</b>	<b>Lead</b>	<b>Status</b>
1. Approve 9/24/14 SHG Minutes – waiting for recording review	Gatewood	In Progress
2. Add a note to the 4FRI public site indicating that the December meeting is subject to change as a result of the release of the FEIS	Woods	Complete
3. Formalize an outreach plan to increase participation in Working Groups	Swaney	
4. Post information on Leveraged Funds to Basecamp	Fleishman	

The December 11th SHG meeting information:  
 Arizona Game and Fish Department  
 3500 South Lake Mary Road  
 Flagstaff, AZ 86005  
 Teleconference line: (712) 775-7031, code: 439290611#

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