

4FRI Stakeholders Meeting, Wednesday, January 25th, 2012, Coconino Supervisor's Office, 1824 S. Thompson Rd, Flagstaff, AZ, Call-In Number: (877) 686-0400 Passcode: 774-7488-215

Introductions-- one goal for 4FRI for 2012:

- Award contract and get record of decision done for NEPA
- See industry on the ground making forest healthier
- Complete ROD
- Picking up hazards
- Implementation on the ground and EIS
- Contact award
- Get going on the ground
- Get EIS done and address issues
- Begin statewide outreach and funding
- Keep moving from us/them to we
- Stay involved
- Same as previous years
- See trust and respect continue to grow within group
- Get help with project success funding with SRP contacts and research
- Continue treating
- Turn monitoring into an actual program
- Seek and maintain a sense of urgency
- Provide help
- American Conservation Experience: attend and one day help implement
- Communicate re: 4FRI match items
- Learn more about the process for NAU
- Considering investment
- Monitoring
- Refine and operationalize the monitoring plan

Approval of 12/7/11 Meeting Minutes and Call to the Public

The 12/7/11 Meeting Minutes were approved with modifications.

Forest Service and Contract Award Updates – Henry Provencio

Updates:

Large Tree Retention Strategy (LTRS): USFS has mapped them. They are not exceptions, they are the rule. They aligned LTRS with desired conditions. They want to review the first draft internally and with technical experts before releasing it.

The process will be for the draft to go to Forest Supervisors (decision makers) and then to the stakeholders.

Annual Evaluation Initial response: Henry provided a handout which is just an initial draft response to questions. USFS will discuss and refine this further internally at its February 9 meeting at the Regional Office.

Facilitator Selection Process – Marcus Selig

Updates:

The Steering Committee is looking at options for facilitation for the time period from April to September. A small group within the Steering Committee developed a scope of work with help of the U.S. Institute that includes the number meetings and duties for a facilitator.

Based on that scope of work, the U.S. Institute provided options and budgets. The Steering Committee also is exploring options outside the U.S. Institute. The USFS available budget for 6 months is not likely adequate to cover facilitation costs. We either need more funding from stakeholders or we need to reduce the tasks to be performed. Any contribution will be tax deductible.

Rough estimates for the three options are:

1. Use a local facilitator (Mike Wood or another) with support from U.S. Institute at an increased level (the U. S. Institute would help the facilitator and interested stakeholders develop facilitation skills)
2. Use a non-local facilitator with the regular level of U.S. Institute support
3. U.S. Institute performs the work and helps interested stakeholders develop facilitation skills

Discussion:

- USFS has paid for facilitation so far. Stakeholders should contribute because facilitation is value added.
- Under federal regulations, USFS cannot say how fast contracting can occur.
- The U.S. Institute can contract quickly.
- On the federal side, we are under more pressure to reduce costs. Effective facilitation is crucial. We should find ways to make it cost effective.
- The Grand Canyon Trust issued a challenge that it would match contributions from others up to \$5,000.
- ERI, TNC, GFPP, and the Elk Society will likely contribute funding to facilitation.

Next Steps:

By the February Stakeholder meeting, the Steering Committee will give a final recommendation. The National Forest Foundation also is compiling a cost estimate for facilitation based on the scope of work.

Building Working Relationships – U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution

1) Introduction to Interest-Based Negotiation

Sample 4FRI Issue exercise:

Positions: *Measure canopy by stand or measure canopy by group*

By stand interests: are understanding, clarity, definition, species viability, compliance, science
By stand criteria: large heterogeneous, ensure forest opening forest plan
By group interests: restoration, ecosystem, consistency, compliance, science/best info
Options: group, stand, comb, individual tree

2) Identifying the goals and intended uses of all products and documents

Reasons for why it is important:

- Define purpose and outcome
- To create accountability among stakeholder group
- Expectations

Decision: Implement a clear, systematic process for both USFS & Stakeholders agreement on goals of product or document (below):

1. Both the USFS and Stakeholder Group will Identify goals & intended uses of all 4FRI products
2. Include key Details
3. Address unanticipated unknowns when they arise
4. Identify next steps
5. Example: expectations Letter for Monitoring/ Reference other key 4FRI documents

Discussion/Key items for consideration:

- Recognize there is difficulty for USFS to identify exact use of products/documents before they see it.
- USFS considers 4FRI products/ documents legally in the same way as other public groups
- Stakeholders group doesn't want to be limited to strict interpretations and can state how they would like products/documents used so that it's clear to the FS.
- There needs to be internal agreement within the collaborative *plus* clarity between the FS and Stakeholder group.
See MOU sideboards

3) Articulation of individual and organizational interests and motives in 4FRI

Some interests and motives were identified in the measurement of canopy cover discussion.

4) Clear and systematic capture and identification of decisions made by the Stakeholder Group

An example of this was the decision made at today's meeting on identifying the goals and intended uses of products and documents (above).

National Forest Foundation's Selection of 4FRI as "Treasured Landscape" – Marcus Selig

Updates:

The National Forest Foundation is non-profit. They have a Treasured Landscapes, Unforgettable Experiences campaign. They have chosen seven treasured landscapes and want to add seven more. NFF is committed to \$1.5 million fundraising campaign and then USFS will match \$1.5 million (so the total will be \$3 million). They will spend on portion of the 4FRI landscape and spread it over 2 to 5 years for implementation.

Where NFF wants to focus efforts:

- Place where integrated restoration can occur.
- On the ground treatments. Ideal if on-the-ground treatments are diverse.
- Site offers opportunities for community activities to experience the landscape.
- Place for NFF to add value.
- Place of high priority for 4FRI.
- Project boundary area appropriately scaled.

Mary Mitsos from NFF will come to our February Stakeholder meeting and give a presentation.

Open to ideas. Don't need to make selection yet. Do we want to set up a Committee?

Discussion:

- The funding the USFS contributes may be able to be included as part of 4FRI. So the USFS may not have to come up with another \$1.5 million. Also NFF wants to emphasize the public aspect. Treasured landscape is for restoration and to promote and advocate for.
- Last fall Game and Fish gave a presentation tied to "Woody Ridge Project" which is shelf stock NEPA. We can share the process we went through with NFF. Woody Ridge area is place we could get work done soon.
- The largest treasured landscape so far is 114,000 acres. We told Mary to consider expanding to 300,000 acres.
- As Vice President of NFF, Mary will approach the Regional Forester.
- Separate from Treasured Landscapes, the NFF sent 4FRI a letter giving 4FRI up to \$10,000 to support CFLR socio-economic and national indicator monitoring. The grant period is anticipated to start on March 1, 2012.

Potential areas of consideration for Treasured Landscapes(some NEPA ready, some not):

- Hart Prairie
 - Potential for funding through Snowbowl tickets
- Peak to Rim(wildlife enhancement)
- Oak Creek Canyon(wildlife enhancement)
- Dry Lakes Hills
 - Priority area for city of Flagstaff, could contribute funding
- East Clear Creek
- Rim Lakes (habitats)
- Shultz Burn area (watershed restoration)

(Need to consider accessibility, 2-5 year implementation period)

Next Steps:

Volunteer group will follow up on this list and prepare for discussion with Mary Mitsos (NFF), including Sarah Reif, Shaula Hedwall, Diane Vosick, Henry Provencio, Marcus Selig, Ed Smith, Taylor McKinnon, Anne Mottek-Lucas

January 4th Arizona-Wide Forest Restoration Meeting Update

Updates:

The January 4 meeting grew out of a 4FRI presentation at a class Larry Fisher teaches at U of A. Larry pulled together:

- 4FRI
- Firescape (TNC and U of A)
- Prescott NF (Strategic planning)

Discussion:

- The Coronado National Forest has not qualified for CFLRP, but has similar challenges for restoration as 4FRI.
- There are future opportunities for all three groups to work together.
- One outcome was considering an outreach campaign statewide. The three collaboratives will develop a statewide strategy. They could help with the Governor's effort and communicate to the public the need for, effects, and benefits of restoration to get public support. Then they could engage in a statewide fundraising effort.
- What about involving Fort Huachuca, Malpai Borderlands also?
- All the groups focused on adaptive management.
- After the meeting, several people raised concerns—is this a new initiative—what is going on? We encourage the effort to be clear and to communicate what it is and how it relates to other efforts. Explain who initiated this, where did it come from, how is 4FRI involved.
- Larry Fisher initiated the meeting. Also Mary Mitsos from NFF wanted to talk to 4FRI. We want to make sure that 4FRI and this group are not at cross purposes but rather are complementary.
- It is good that people are getting excited and wondering about this. We need to be careful how we move forward. Also, when you involve much larger groups, we could lose what we are trying to achieve.
- The goal is to work together. This group may never be more than a network and dialogue to meet once or twice a year.

Next Steps:

- Address how to communicate with the public within the 4FRI Communications Work Group (the three collaboratives and the Governor's Forest Health Council).
- Marcus will send the link for notes from the January 4 meeting to 4FRI.
- Clarify group goals: Diane will work with Larry to generate a bulleted list of what the January 4 meeting was about.

4FRI Project Identification Committee Update – Ed Smith

Updates:

NEPA shelf stock, distinction between 4FRI and other restoration efforts, and CFLRP matching

Objectives:

- Objective: 1. CFLR matching is occurring in a way that is defensible, and meets the CFLR Act
- Objective 2. What is being branded 4FRI is actually collaboratively developed by the 4FRI stakeholder group as determined by the CFLRA and in keeping with what is being “sold” to the public.

Discussion:

- Defining the issue: Some of the shelf stock projects, which are being used as matched for CFLRP, are being considered as non-restoration and were not collaboratively developed, but are being applied under the 4FRI brand
- The “over-match” intensifies the issue
 - Is there flexibility on the over-match?
 - The definition has already been made
- All CFLR projects started with existing shelf stock
- How can we move forward or how do we leave legacy for 4FRI?
 - Can we address treatments now? (Not NEPA)
 - Identify 4Fri (see handout)
 - Can we work collaboratively at the prescription level?
 - Do shelfstock under first contract (but not be CFLRP match)- go forward with contract
 - Match
 - Contract Award
 - Restate the match?
 - Collaborative group says which projects use CFLR funding
 - Assess and “rate” projects

USFS input:

- Break projects by activity is not practical from USFS perspective
- Hesitant to revisit old decisions/risk management aspect

Next Steps:

1. The USFS will ask internally (run up the flagpole) if we can revisit the # of acres for match

2. Communicate to DC & other CFLR, projects, (if common issues, clarify)
3. Look into reducing the amount of match.
4. Communications committee will discuss Objective #2 as far as communicating with the public

December 15th Goshawk Guidelines/Canopy Cover Meeting Update

Updates:

The purpose of the December 15 meeting was to address comments by Center for Biological Diversity, the Grand Canyon Trust, and Sierra Club.

- Clarified issues, underlying interests, and next steps to getting a better picture of the natural range of variability of canopy cover

At a second meeting:

- Maps produced
- Initial process
- Initial results

The presentation today will provide an overview of the remote sensing results from the meetings and mapping process.

Questions on Regional Office Presentation:

1. What are the canopy cover characteristics of sites that were not harvested? Were not grazed since mid-1900s? And have not had multiple fires in the last century? That can and do accommodate natural surface fires today?
2. Will canopy cover be targeted at the stand vs. group scale?
3. What is the measurement at the group level in reference sites?
4. Look at special arrangement piece.
5. Identify why sites were chosen.

**A future deliverable will no longer inform treatment types in the USFS planning process. However, it can inform future treatments and could help inform if the established treatments are or aren't within NRV.

Potential follow up areas from presentation:

- Discuss study results vs. other's experience with info
- Contracting and timing
- Get additional plot data that includes species and size.
- Analyze by tree group size and openings
- Further explore the value of the 5 sites
- Explore level of analysis stand/scale
- Literature analysis and packaging regarding desired conditions

- What is the hypothesis and why are we doing this? What are the deliverables at the end?
- Confirm measurement of *pipo* compared to the dry-mixed conifer on the GCNP Study sites.
- Look at contemporary relic sites statistics.
- Group level measurement in reference sites
- Timeframe
- Remember why sites were chosen
- Clearly identify additional questions to be addressed.

Next Steps:

1. A problem solving meeting needs to be scheduled ASAP.
 - USFS has indicated the time has passed for input on this issue
 - A problem-solving meeting deliverables could inform
 - i. Future Decisions
 - ii. Confirm whether guidelines are/are not within natural range of variability
2. Steering Committee will meet to recommend next steps re: problem solving meeting (who, when, timeframe).
 - Review objectives of December 15th meeting
3. GCT, CBD, Sierra Club and USFS will also meet to clarify and recommend next steps.
4. Need to look at impacts, scenarios, trade-offs (Draft EIS to Final EIS & potential litigation)

4FRI's Long-Term Strategy and Annual Work Plan – Marcus Selig and the Institute

Next steps:

1. Marcus will send the 2012 Workplan spreadsheet to stakeholders
2. The stakeholders will individually fill in the tasks/products columns along with an indication of how they will contribute to those tasks/products and email to Marcus to compile.
3. Marcus will report this back to the group at the February stakeholder meeting.
 - Consider that the NFF project will be time intensive

Working Group Updates

- **Landscape Strategy Working Group** – Amy Waltz / Taylor Mckinnon
 - Monitoring plan: Approved
- **Science and Monitoring Working Group** – Matt Williamson / Ed Smith / Dave Huffman
 - Socioeconomic report is coming online soon
- **Communications Working Group** – Marcus Selig
 - Upcoming meetings will include: Statewide Strategy, Newsletter due the end of this month, Press Release for the contract award, 4FRI labeling solutions
 - SRP is heading up an outreach effort to inform customers about forest restoration

- **Fiscal Working Group** – Marcus Selig

- Bill for economic incentive for industry was recently introduced in State Legislature -- HB 2332
- Payment for Watershed Services: meetings are being held with commissions and cabinets within the city of Flagstaff to explain what this is, the need, and how it could be implemented.
- There has been difficulty in setting up donations online due to Navajo county accounting. On the website, there is now a posting of how to mail in donations.

Evaluation of meeting

+ (Worked well)

- Got a lot covered in this meeting
- Facilitation
- Interest Based Negotiation exercise was helpful

- (Room for improvement)

- Wish there was more time to dig in deeper to issues
- Wish there was more time to dig into the IBN example more