



AGENDA

4FRI Stakeholders Meeting
Wednesday, January 22, 2014
9AM-4PM

Arizona Game and Fish Dept., 2878 E White Mountain Blvd, Pinetop

Teleconference Information: (712) 432-1500, code: 292353#

Attendance: Ethan Aumack, Neil Bosworth, R.H. Davis, David Dorum, Dick Fleishman, Steve Gatewood, Alicyn Gitlin, Bruce Greco, Bill Greenwood, Scott Harger, Steve Horner, Marlin Johnson, Eli Lauren-Bernstein, Tom Mackin, Patrick Rappold, Todd Schulke, Sue Sitko, Earl Stewart, Buck Swaney, Amy Waltz, Mike Williams, Russel Winn, Travis Wooley, Levan Webb, Lynn Krigbaum, Larry Ethelbah, Bill Masters, Tom Has, Tim Kinney, Gage Smith, Greg Smith, Stephen Levesque, Steve North, Dan Kipervaser, Royal Shacky, Dan Holderman, Colette Moore, Rob Marshall, Don Gonsalves, Steve Reidhead

On the phone: Lori Martinek, Paul Summerfelt, Anne Mottek Lucas

9:00 Introductions

Buck briefly introduced the many new participants (mostly E. side industry representatives) at this meeting to the history of the 4FRI Stakeholder Group.

09:10 Approval of 12/11 SHG meeting minutes



09:15 Review and Status of 12/11 Action Items



09:20 Call to the Public

- Levan Webb, whose family business is WW Cattle Guards, left a business card and price sheet (posted on BASECAMP 1/27). They hope to provide cattle guard and fence services/products to the 4FRI effort.

09:25 Updates: USFS – Dick Fleishman

- NEPA: the ID Team timeline for completing the draft ROD will be updated next Tuesday. Dick said the USFS is hoping for an ASAP (May) release of draft ROD, at the latest. Earl Stewart was not able to comment on whether the draft ROD might be posted to the USFS website sooner than the legally required deadline of 4 days following the date when the notice is published.
- Apache Sitgreaves bridge projects timeline: (1) Larson (near Heber-Overgaard)-should see a decision in < 1 year.; this is a “full restoration” prescription (2) East Escadilla (west of NM



state line) <2 years until decision; and (3) Upper Rocky Arroyo (N/NE of Pinetop), < 3 years to decision; some re-treatment

- Operations: prep work is underway for 2015/2016 task orders; timber sales outside of WMSC (undetermined whether a single, final task order will be released/completed before the Aug 9th deadline for completion of the WMSC). Approximately ~22,000 acres of task orders are planned for the current fiscal year (through September). Current ground conditions are hit and miss for the 9 task orders (other than Mercer) currently open...probably late spring before work can get in to those. The USFS projects that existing industry (bridge projects) will thin approximately 15,000+ acres/year, and 30,000+ acres/year will be thinned on the 4FRI 1st analysis area as soon as 2015 (approx. 15,000 acres thinned/year has been the past average for the 4 Forests).

09:40 Updates: Contractor – Steve Horner

- GEPAZ operating on 1 task order (Mercer) since Christmas, working on 75 acre unit. Chipper arrived on 1/21. Good progress thanks to warm/dry weather.
- Office established on S. Plaza Way, Flagstaff. Phones up this week. Hiring staff.
- GEPAZ not ready to provide additional updates on the pellet mill/industry ramp up plans. Lori Martinek said they have plans for an update in late January.
- Mercer saw logs are going to Lumberjack mill in Heber, and chips will be sent to Novo beginning in a few days. Distance between Mercer and Novo Power (Snowflake) is ~ 30 miles one way. 4-5 trips being made each day currently.

10:00 Updates: Report on DC Trip –Earl Stewart/Steve Levesque/Rob Davis

- In early January, 2014 a number of stakeholders took part in a trip to D.C. to lobby for the 4FRI (organizations/entities who took part in the trip: USFS-Earl, GEPAZ-Jason & Maya, TCG-Steve Levesque, ECO-Dave Tenney, TNC-Pat Graham, Gila County-legislative rep, and ERI-Diane). Excellent scheduling by Diane to meet with many important people, including:
 - (1) AZ Delegates targeted (Kirkpatrick, Gosar, Grijalva, Flake) and they were extremely supportive, as well as being keen to see results...including a signed FEIS soon! Commitments made to keep delegates well informed.
 - (2) Also met with House and Senate delegates for Natural Resource and Appropriations committees.
 - (3) USFS Chief Tidwell and USDA deputy undersecretary--Robert Bonnie...desire was to export the 4FRI model to other regions
 - Strong D.C. messaging to supporting the E. Side bridge projects, in order to protect ~\$100M investment in WMSC-power plant and four mills currently running as a result of WMSC...which was surprisingly not in the forefront of the delegates' minds.
- Sue Sitko announced S. 1875, sponsored by Senator Wyden (D-OR), Wildfire Disaster Funding Act. A national effort is being made to solicit support signatures for this Act via an electronic submission or via letter. The 4FRI Collaborative was encouraged to support and sign onto this proposal. A motion was made (and passed) for the collaborative to draft an official resolution of support for S. 1875. No objections were raised from the SHG during the



discussion. Sue and Eli to draft a resolution for SC approval before the January 31th deadline, to be put before the SC by early next week, and on BASECAMP by Friday.

<http://www.energy.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/democratic-news?ID=1b99dca9-f3eb-4ce5-a059-68b1593eeb47>

<https://docs.google.com/forms/d/195Vuy48TaTOC0ylkVRrcwosVY1KNLpPKErE7HEz-No/viewform>

10:15 Stakeholder Disclosures and Accountability

- Steve Horner: TCG currently developing relationship/working closely with many new partners.
- Earl Stewart: a draft DEIS for FWPP will be released in the next 45 days
- Steve Levesque: DC Trip (Dave Tenney was an amazing advocate for 4FRI)
- Steve Gatewood: Ponsse put an ad in the Daily Sun this week looking for Ponsse equipment maintenance support (equipment being used on Mercer task order)
- Sue Sitko: the contracted consultant, Joseph McClure, for the White Mountain Stewardship Project presented draft findings for the 2012 economic monitoring survey. Limited survey response and the impact of the 2011 Wallow fire resulted in somewhat reduced numbers in terms of jobs and other findings; however, follow-up work includes visiting with those businesses who did not respond in the first inquiry, and a 2013 survey will be initiated shortly that is likely to provide results that: 1) are more comparable with past years; and 2) will help provide predictive information on the future of local businesses once the WMSP is completed in summer 2014. In addition, Sue reported that the AZ Game & Fish Department's research biologist, Kirby Bristow, presented the results of a multi-year research project on black bear movements in the WMSP area. Results indicate that while black bears tend to actively favor vegetation/habitats other than ponderosa pine, treatments within pine do see a reduced use by bears. Conclusions were drawn from data collected pre-Wallow fire; post-Wallow data will be analyzed separately over the coming months.
- Greg Smith--Empire Machinery-Show Low/Flagstaff: Empire president owns 30% of Novo Power) Ponsse's closest facility in the U.S. is in Minn. and their interest in coming to the area is a huge ray of hope to Empire.
- Steve Reidhead: is there going to be enough wood to maintain the local industry on the E. Side, post bridge projects? \$3M investment in equipment means TriStar is incurring big risk to take on the 4FRI work estimates. Concerns that Lumberjack Timber can't handle all the wood on the W. Side (although Novo Power could likely handle the biomass). Concerns also about monopolization of timber supply.
 - Jim Zornes: 20,000 acres/year (15,000 PIPPO and 5,000 Juniper) in addition to 4FRI projects should be enough to maintain local industry. But haul distances might be less than ideal in the early years.
 - Rob Davis: currently industry in the area only has work lined up for the next 6 months, which is very hard for operators; that should be ~ 3 years out to make industry comfortable and manage risk.



- Buck Swaney: shared that he will be under contract for the next month with Coconino NF, helping them with their Plan Revisions.

10:45 Evaluating SHG meetings: value, attendance and participation – *Buck Swaney*

- Round-robins (where each Stakeholder has the opportunity to speak) will be implemented more frequently at SHG meetings to help address conversation dominance problems.

Round Robin on the question “how can we improve the SHG meeting process?”

- Meetings are too long on average and should alternate (when possible) between long and short format. We need to accept that not all meeting attendees want/need to stay for the entire meeting. Consider an earlier start time if/when Industry needs to attend.
- The annual SHG planning and prioritization meeting is a good use of time.
- The most important issues and topics (especially those requiring SHG approval) should be placed first on the agenda.
- Historic hostility among the SHG has been a turnoff for other meeting participants—civility at these meetings is very important.
- The SHG should maintain its tradition of approving agenda items in person at monthly meetings.
- The SHG should do a better job of keeping local government informed of its meeting schedule and meeting outcomes.
- The monthly meetings should always provide longer breaks for networking among Stakeholders.
- In larger meetings, cordless microphones (and perhaps other technical tools) are necessary to make the meetings audible for call-in participants.
- Field trips should be more common in 2014, with meetings built around those trips.

11:15 BREAK

11:30 Multi Party Monitoring Board Framework Discussion – *Ethan Aumack*

(Ethan)

- The MPMB small working group (Ethan, Eli, Amy, Todd, Anne, Pascal, & Steve Gatewood), has made stepwise progress towards the formation of a MPMB over the last 2 months..we are halfway through that process. The WG has drafted the current Charter framework, after working through a number of concerns both within the WG and from the SHG.
- Timeline may need to be pushed back by 1 month
- We have a good document with strong direction and necessary SHG involvement in its creation...we want feedback and we are confident that the SHG can approve this today.

Questions/Comments:



- *What will the MPMB's role be in working with subcontractors and RFP's?*
 - It is not clear at this time whether the MPBM will be asked to managed RFP's with independent contractors, separate from USFS' contracting for monitoring. This will be an issue to revisit over the next few months as the MPMB drafts its final Charter and works with the USFS and SHG to determine the administrative in's/out's of multi-party monitoring.
- *Is a separate, formal agreement between the SHG, USFS and MPMB (e.g. an MOU) needed to govern the (see above) administration of monitoring activities?*
- Forest Supervisors agree that some type of agreement will absolutely be called for, but the specifics will need to be worked out over the coming few months. It might need to be multiple instruments, for example to govern exchange of \$ and data handling.
 - Example offered from Apache-Sitgreaves: they have used principal agreements (Master Agreements)/MOU) with a 5 year term, to lay out the broad terms of the agreement; then use Subparts (SPA's) on each of the project components (fiduciary, etc) for more specific, short-term and regularly updated agreements.
- *Data formatting/delivery must bridge the technical cross-walking challenges of using databases within vs. outside of the USFS.*
 - Dan Kipervaser is confident that the majority of indicators the Stakeholder Group wants to monitor can be collected within USFS' FSVeg (Access) database...those indicators that cannot be collected within the USFS' database will require secondary/parallel databases; he suggested it would be relatively easy to export the USFS' database but that importing any parallel databases into the USFS' database would be very difficult. This means that the MPMB and USFS Monitoring Coordinator may need to figure out how to coalesce data from multiple databases.
- *Some stakeholders are concerned about USFS transparency with the process of data collection, analysis, interpretation and delivery, and request specific language on this to be formalized in the formal agreement process.*
- *Include language in the charter on coordination of the WMSC bridge-project monitoring and current 4FRI shelf stock monitoring*
 - Some Stakeholders said they would only be willing to join the MPMB if that Board "picked up where WMSC monitoring left off", specifically asking for the integration of all the WMSC bridge projects and 4FRI shelf stock. MPMB should better understand exactly what that might mean and how it could be achieved. (It is interesting to note that the WMSC has never seen a public request for raw data).
- *CFLRP reporting will cover all projects/actions (whether bridge or 4FRI)*
- *Could contractor timber monitoring data be gathered as well?*
 - TCG is willing to explore if/how this can be accomplished
 - Anne Mottek Lucas has already developed contractor reporting forms (within FWPP) that could be developed for 4FRI.

Motion to approve this document with the following changes:



- Integrate monitoring of WMSC Bridge projects and 4FRI bridge projects
- Revisions (Erik Nielsen & Valerie Stein's suggestions)
 - Monitoring coordinator to serve as ex-officio on MPMB
 - MPMB needs sociopolitical, fundraising and private sector collective expertise
 - MPMB wildlife ecology collective expertise
 - Change duties language on bullet #2 to, "Advocate for the Monitoring Plan (based on SHG monitoring priorities), work to fill scientific knowledge gaps and **ensure that 4FRI monitoring is informed by the best available science.**"

Framework for MPMB was approved unanimously

12:30 LUNCH

1:30 Annual Assessment review and 2014 planning – Buck Swaney

(See Buck's presentation posted on BASECAMP on 1.28.14)

- Twenty nine Stakeholders's took the survey in 2013 (consider that this was in Nov/Dec when the SHG was in a different place-more conflict-than it is now). Thirty one took it in 2012
- Stable, positive and negative trends compared to 2012 progress report, on areas of high agreement, mixed agreement and high disagreement (based on survey scores)

Suggested action items as a result of survey:

- Improve efficiency of meetings and developing SHG products
- Support and advocacy for our collective efforts
- Galvanize a shared vision of success
- Increase TRUST looking outward.
 - ~74% of respondents AGREED that "To achieve the 4FRI project's economic, environmental, or social goals, trade-offs between competing interests are often necessary. Generally, I am willing to make these trade-offs."
 - But ~48% DISAGREED that "Generally, my fellow stakeholders are willing to make these same trade-offs".
- Improving our public voice
 - Question: How can we do effective public outreach with a general public that often lacks sufficient, basic information about the 4FRI?
- Review the discussion in Winslow (Aug, 2013) about shared visions/definitions of success.

2:00 Canopy Cover/Openness Discussion

Amy reviewed LTRS discussions from October/December SHG meetings:



- Stakeholders perceived that the USFS “changed their priorities” in supporting the LTIP over the LTRS, and asked USFS to strengthen the LTIP by incorporating elements of the LTRS that were missing in the LTIP. Those elements were:
 - Removing large trees (and only according to specific criteria) should be an exception to the general rule of leaving all large trees
 - Stakeholders felt that their concerns were overridden by USFS line officers “above” the IDT
 - A pure restoration option is difficult for 4FRI, but that protecting large trees is critically important ecologically
 - Open discussions of LTRS and Openness has allowed misconceptions to be aired and somewhat resolved between the SHG and the USFS

Potential solutions

- SHG wants to see a stronger commitment to the LTRS in the FEIS, and language in the FEIS summary/ROD that the “intent of this project is to thin small diameter trees from the landscape”.
- Concerns that regeneration openings are additive to interspaces, rather than included in interspaces...to be resolved by the following statement:
 - If regeneration openings are incorporated in the prescription, do not exceed the maximum prescribed openness, so that the combination of regeneration openings and interspace doesn’t exceed max openness”
 - A heterogeneous landscape is the goal; mix of opening sizes/interspaces (in implementation plan)
 - Transparency at all levels of USFS decision making
 - Clarify where and how the LTRS was incorporated into the LTIP

Dick passed out two handouts (posted on BASECAMP 1.27.14) and reviewed draft USFS responses to DEIS canopy cover/openness comments from SHG—he asked, “did the USFS understand SHG comments correctly and are responses appropriate...any clarifications needed”?

Dick’s take home items from SHG feedback, referencing DEIS comments:

- 1. We are concerned about how post-treatment openness will be quantified to determine whether desired conditions are being met and that, without a clear operational plan, heterogeneity in groups and openings may be less than desirable, repetitious or lead to homogeneity.**
- 2. Not enough information is presented in a way that readers can visualize post-treatment stands to evaluate heterogeneity of groups and openings and connectivity of forest conditions.**



- USFS needs to standardize language and metrics which characterize pre/post openness/canopy cover
 - Don't use tree density as a measure of openness
 - USFS needs to tie compare openness to openness...not a mixture of openness to tree density to interspace (see Amy's email to USFS in Oct. 2013).
 - It would be good to provide images that convey degree of openness. TNC will provide further support for canopy cover discussion through their preliminary visualization exercise (interspace vs regeneration cut vs closed canopy)
 - Also a measure of pre-treatment openness vs. post-treatment openness (could be done in R-SAC). We don't want to end up with a homogeneous pattern of openings—Dick believes this is an implementation (and trust) issue not an effects analysis issue. Although, aspect does dictate openness size in the DEIS. .
 - SHG/USFS needs a field trip to explain how designation by prescription would work to achieve desired openings and heterogeneity of openings.
 - How can heterogeneity of openings be prescribed and compared to HRV?
 - Stakeholders agreed to work with the prescription to achieve HRV, but did not quantify preferred degrees of openness relative to HRV.
 - USFS said that they are required by contract to conduct test marks (training) on every designation by prescription
 - The TNC tablets might help inform this process, if it were affordable.
 - This (canopy cover/openness) is probably the most difficult issue within the EIS. Today's discussion was a very small step in the right direction...but we need to get on the ground (especially to see the most aggressive treatments) and examine potential effects to canopy-dependent wildlife species. Much of CBD's concerns about wildlife are drawn from the literature...which is pretty limited on the effects of forest thinning treatments to canopy-dependent species. Major issues face us on how to reconcile the polarized concerns of (1) restoration/fire risk/fuels reduction and openness (2) canopy dependent wildlife species and openness with respect to connectivity of habitat
- 3. Depending on the prescription, basal area in groups can be quite high to achieve stand desired condition. This could lead to a dominance of uniform small trees in groups, which may not put those groups on a trajectory toward restoration.**
- “Red Zones” in DEIS table 140 are high basal area categories (SDI) that the USFS will not be managing for...which limits the % of regeneration area that can be included in a treatment.



4. Planned openings on average are smaller than would be optimal for snowpack accumulation and retention, which are important for promoting soil water storage, plant vigor and forest resilience. Few openings of this larger size are planned (also relates to 1)

- Dick says it is not the intent of the project to “maximize” snowpack accumulation with regard to opening sizes/interspaces.

5. The fire behavior analysis was conducted as if all treatments happened simultaneously rather than over time. Hence, at any given time fire desired conditions (less than 10% of landscape with crown fire activity) will not actually be met. (if time).

- Fire analysis: the USFS needs to include a disclosure (or strategy) acknowledging that modelling currently assumes the entire landscape will be treated in the same year...when in fact treatments will sequenced over 20 years.
 - USFS plans to Prioritize: WUI, candidate areas, etc. in the 10 year plan, not FEIS
 - NEPA & sequencing treatments over time are a poor match
 - Wildland fire decision support system

The LAM requested time to review Dick’s 2 handouts before they can effectively comment on these responses.

3:45 Action Items & Adjourn – Buck Swaney

Action Items from 1/22 SHG meeting	Contact	Status
1. Draft resolution of support for WDFA	Eli/Sue	By 1/24
2. Schedule 2014 Planning for Feb Meeting	Buck	
3. Test short meeting agenda this spring	SC	
4. Update MPMB Framework and post to BASECAMP	Eli/Ethan	
5. Make SHG request for MPMB membership	Eli	
6. Post results/trends from 2013 self-assessment to BASECAMP. Include Winslow (Aug.) meeting comments.	Buck	
7. LAM to examine Dick’s Canopy Cover/Openness response to SHG comments and get back with follow up questions/concerns.	LAM	
8. Update BASECAMP all 2014 meeting dates in calendar (and make reservations)	Eli	