



4FRI Stakeholder Group Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, March 25, 2015, 9AM – 12:30PM

South County Complex Health Building – Frontier Conference Room

600 North 9th Place, Show Low, AZ 85901

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

Attendees: Diane Vosick, Sue Sitko, Lynn Krigbaum (TRACKS), Claire Mendelsohn, Pascal Berlioux, Rebecca Davidson, Tiffany Woods, Bryce Esch, Greg Smith, Billy Masters, Thomas Holl, Gary Moore, Bruce Greco, Sharon Adams, Randy Fuller, Annette Fredette, Brienne Pettit, Joe Miller, Patty Turpin, Mark Nigrelli, Travis Woolley, Steve Horner, Keith Pajkos, David Newlin, Buck Swaney, Linda Lind, Jeff Whitney, Jerry Payne

On the phone: Ethan Aumack, Rob Davis, Jessica Gist, Alicyn Gitlin, Scott Harger, Ron Lee, Tom Mackin, Tommie Martin, Lori Martinek, Todd Schulke, Chris Stephan, Amy Waltz, Russ Winn

9:05 Approve minutes from Feb 25th SHG meeting — No objections; minutes approved

9:10 Review action items from Feb. 25th SHG meeting — Vosick

Action Item	Lead	Status
1. SC Agenda: Further discussion of Legal Actions White Paper and Webinar in April	Vosick	Complete
2. SC Agenda: SHG role in Resolution Process	SC Members	Complete
3. SC Agenda: Update Charter Member List	Swaney/Mitchell	Postponed until 5/27 retreat
4. SC Agenda: Establish planning committee for 4FRI SHG retreat (30min)	Swaney/Vosick/Sitko/Berlioux	In Progress
5. SC Agenda: 4FRI Talking Points Discussion for April D.C. Trip	All	In Progress
6. Rephrase 3 rd paragraph of letter to Cal Joyner to better clarify definition of participation	Summerfelt/Vosick	Complete
7. Post 4FRI 2 nd EIS Project Area to BASECAMP	Fredette/Vosick	Complete
8. Post CFLR summary to BASECAMP	Fleishman	Complete
9. Post announcement on BASECAMP to assemble questions concerning 2 nd EIS project boundary.	All	
10. Develop a map outlining ponderosa pine forest within 4FRI that is not covered in the first and second EIS	USFS 4FRI Team	Complete
11. Send input for Paul to possibly discuss at Smallwood conference	All/Summerfelt	Complete
12. Post SHG Self-Evaluation to BASECAMP	Swaney	Complete
13. Post Opt-in notice on SHG		After Objection Process

9:15 Call to the Public

Lynn Krigbaum – Looking for sponsors for a June 6th fundraising event for both the White Mountain Nature Center and Save Our Park. The sponsorship expense is \$300.00; please contact Lynn for more information.

Agenda Change: USFS Update – Fredette

There is not a lot activity due to wet ground conditions, activity will increase once the ground conditions improve across the 4FRI landscape.

Question (Winn): What happens when a task order (TO) term date passes and the TO is not yet finished? The number of days given to complete a TO refers to the number of work days as opposed to a number of calendar days. To determine the exact length of time given to complete a TO there are two factors; 1) The number of work days in a week, and 2) The length of the logging season, excluding shutdowns during the fire season and winter season. 360 work days often amount to an 18-month timeframe to complete a TO.

Question (Stephan): How many work days are being counted for the slash piles that are located near Garland Prairie Road? Specifically, is there a maximum term for which a slash pile can remain on-site? Slash piles are required to be removed from the logging site after 30 – 60 days, no longer. Current wet conditions and the start of the birding season are holding up the process.

9:20 Objection/Resolution Process Update – All

Resolution meetings were held during the week of March 16 and as a result of those meetings a list modifications, clarifications, and additions were agreed upon that have resolved some of the issues that were brought up in the objections. The FS also agreed to continue working on five proposals with the objectors that concern modifying language in the EIS, FEIS, ROD, implementation plan, and the monitoring plan. These five proposals include MSO monitoring, grazing, incorporating other science, clarifying expected vegetation outcomes, and adaptive management. The desired outcome for these meetings is to reach an agreement of modifications that would encourage objectors to withdraw their objections.

The next meeting that will be held to continue reviewing these five proposals is scheduled to take place after the SHG meeting (*this meeting has already occurred*). The end of the objection review period is April 6th.

Question (Vosick): If there is litigation, are only those items that were brought up in an objection eligible to be litigated or can other issues be introduced? The only requirement to litigate is that the person have standing. Once through the Objection Process, objectors have exhausted their administrative remedies. However, it is up to individual courts/judges to decide whether they will accept a lawsuit from someone who has done so, or accept a lawsuit on a different issue. While the FS desired outcome is for objectors to withdraw their objections, some objectors may decide to keep sections or the entirety of their objection in order to retain legal standing.

Those stakeholders that participated in the resolution meetings only had positive remarks to make on the process. All agreed that that the FS and objectors showed real intent to find a solution and the meetings encouraged an open collaborative approach that allowed progress to be made. Stakeholders also noted that Cal Joyner often referred to the SHG during the meetings, the adaptive management

plan was well received and he even suggested that some of the objections could have been resolved before the objection period began had the objectors joined and participated in the SHG.

Todd Schulke from the Center for Biological Diversity and Alicyn Gitlin from the Sierra Club, both objectors, were in agreement with the general consensus, and they both commented on the quality of the conversations. They were both fairly confident that resolutions could be made, but could not make any guarantees as they are still in the process of completing the resolution meetings.

Agenda Change: Multi-Party Monitoring Board Update – Gist/Woolley

This update is directly related to the objection/resolution review because three monitoring issues were discussed during the meetings that directly affect the MPMB, they are as follows:

1. Increased northern Goshawk occupancy monitoring – Modify the Goshawk pretreatment monitoring plan in the Kaibab Forest Plan to reflect what is in the Coconino Forest Plan. It will not be the same approach, but very similar.
2. Canopy cover monitoring – The MPMB has adopted a remote sensing approach to conduct canopy cover monitoring, but there is a request to conduct on-the-ground monitoring. The FS might be tasked with on-the-ground monitoring.
3. MSO monitoring - increase number of PACs that are to be monitored to include all 18 PACs and consider new science on mixed severity fire on MSO habitat. Conducting research on MSO responses to mixed severity may not be considered because the adaptive management plan separates research from monitoring.

MSO monitoring is a tier 1 monitoring plan item, however, the MPMB was going to wait until the release of the biological opinion (BO) from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to decide what actions to take concerning the monitoring of MSO. While the first two monitoring issues will impact the monitoring budget for 4FRI, increasing the number of monitored PACs could require the full extent of the 10% of the implementation budget that is dedicated to monitoring. Cal Joyner does not want to put the monitoring budget in disarray and has suggested that a higher percentage of implementation funds could be used for monitoring, but this would still put pressure on the 4FRI budget as a whole.

In the past 4 years, 4FRI Landscape, Assessment and Monitoring (LAM) and the MPMB has put a lot of consideration into what is effective monitoring and has prioritized ecological indicators that are to be monitored according to input brought forth by the SHG. They are working with a limited budget and need to be smart and strategic about making additions or modifications to the tier 1 monitoring plan questions.

- **Discussion regarding the probability of legal challenges and 4FRI Stakeholder Group response**

At this time, all parties seem optimistic that litigation will not occur, however, organizations were requested to discuss what steps they would take if this is not the case. Questions concerning the available legal options can be asked and potentially answered at the Upcoming Peer Learning Session (Webinar) on the Administrative and Legal Review Opportunities for Collaborative Groups on Thursday, April 16, 2015. It is recommended that those who are interested in attending register in advance.

Action Item: Repost White Paper Webinar announcement on BASECAMP

- **SHG Press Release regarding the process** – Berlioux

The Stakeholder Group has maintained their position since the release of the DEIS and are optimistic that they will be able to celebrate the end of the objection process. Regardless of the outcome, once the process comes to an end it is recommended that a press release be drafted and approved regarding the SHG position.

Action Item: Sue and Pascal draft an end of objection process press release.

10:00 Stakeholder Disclosures – All

Vosick – On Monday, March 30th, from 1PM-3PM there will be a Workforce Planning Meeting at the ERI/NAU. The meeting is focused on discussing how to provide the necessary training for the increased workforce needs in the harvesting and wood manufacturing sector. They are assessing the resources that will help facilitate training programs that could be held at community colleges and provide on-site specialized equipment training.

Greco – The Natural Resources Working Group (NRWG) will be conducting a review of the Bridge Monitoring Plan in coming weeks. Stakeholders are invited to participate in this review that is intended to validate or change the living document as needed.

Berlioux – Eastern Arizona Counties Organization (ECO) is working with the FS (A-S) and the Regional Office to ensure the continued supply of wood fiber to eastern industries. They are currently planning the availability of 86,000+ acres over the next 3 to 5 years and have been developing several medium term Bridge-the-Gap projects

Action Item: Notify Pascal Berlioux or Bruce Greco if interested in participating on Bridge Monitoring Program discussion.

10:15 4FRI D.C. Trip Talking Points – Vosick

Each year, 4FRI representatives go to Washington D.C. for meetings with the USDA, their Congressional Delegation, and Natural Resources Committees. This year's meetings will be held on April 20th – 22nd and the current list of attendees are as follows: Jeff Whitney, Steve Levesque, Jason Rosamond, Maya Minkova, Ethan Aumack, Mandy Metzger, Diane Vosick, Kevin Kinsall, Earl Stewart, and Pat Graham (*Pending*).

The document is separated into 3 sections; overview and history, 4FRI milestones and updates, and conclusions. The SHG was requested in advance of the meeting to review the points and provide feedback or revisions. The document is still available on BASECAMP and will be further discussed at the 4/7/15 SC Call.

Rob Davis, Pascal Berlioux, and Ethan Aumack all made recommendations for changing some of the content in the document. Rob suggested changes be made to both the milestones and conclusions sections and provided the following rephrasing for the 3rd point listed under conclusions: *It is especially important that adequate acres continue to be offered across the 4FRI landscape in order to not only maintain, but optimize operation for existing and emerging businesses.* Rob will send a list of his revisions to Diane Vosick.

Both Pascal and Ethan recommended that that the document mention the second analysis and the status of implementation of the first contract, specifically pertaining to acceleration of on the ground treatments. They recommend that the group be ready to discuss the challenges of implementation openly and mention where we are at on the 1st analysis, where we are at with the first contract, and where we are at with the second analysis.

A discussion on the inclusion of funding sources for the Bridge Monitoring Program in the document was initiated by Russ Winn. All that participated in the discussion agree that continued funding of the monitoring program is important and that the NRWG is going to have to look for funding sources beyond what the FS is providing. The only issue concerning this request is that Bridge Gap Projects are not covered or included in the CFLRP. This conversation will be continued in the NRWG meetings once the group is ready to address the needs of the project.

Action Items: Update 4FRI D.C. Talking Points and further review at 4/7/15 SC Call.

10:30 Break

10:45 Second EIS Boundaries Map – Fredette

The maps provided during this discussion are available on BASECAMP. The first map is the FS proposal for the second EIS boundary. The second map covers the vegetation types throughout the 4FRI boundary, including both the first and second (proposed) analysis areas. The FS also provided the group with data on the acres that are proposed to be treated by vegetation type in the second EIS project area. The main vegetation type that is to be treated is ponderosa pine and does not include projects on the east side that are outside of 4FRI.

Question (Vosick): How many acres of ponderosa pine will be available for treatment in the 4FRI area once the acres are deducted for the projects outside of 4FRI? This data can be provided by the FS at a future date.

Issues could arise in industry if the number of acres that are going to be available for treatment are overestimated. Aside from having a better estimate of the number of acres that are going to be dedicated to wood supply during the project the stakeholders and industry members are also interested in answering the question of the long-term supply. Will there be mechanical re-entry in these forests or will restoration be possible to maintain with only fire maintenance? Could another wood analysis be done to help answer these questions? These are questions that are being asked concerning 4FRI and its impacts on industry.

The FS wants input from the SHG concerning the second EIS boundary, however, they also want to move the project forward and request an endorsement from the group in the coming months. The NRWG is also reviewing the boundary and the 04/22/15 SHG meeting will provide an opportunity to review the feedback brought forth by the NRWG and provide the FS with a statement.

Some the input and suggestions that were mentioned included moving the eastern boarder more eastward, the inclusion of Payson and Blue Ridge in the analysis area, and continuing dialogue with the Native American Tribes that share the border with the project area. 4FRI is primarily focused on treating contiguous sections of ponderosa pine, to increase the boundary size would require restoration treatments in pinyon juniper and mixed conifer, both wet and dry. The science of restoring ponderosa

pine forests is well known amongst the group, but the group has not dived into the science available on mixed conifer, pinyon juniper, or aspen. Another consideration would be the economic expense of treating these other vegetation types. A goal of 4FRI is to create industry funded restoration, however, another goal is to aid communities with wildfire reduction and protection.

There is the potential of a 3rd EIS when looking eastward and 4FRI is not the only restoration project occurring across Arizona. The second EIS project area is very different from the first and all of the suggestions that are brought forth from the group are being considered by the FS. The discussion on the second EIS boundary will be continued at the next SC Call on 4/7/15. All stakeholders that would like to comment on the boundary are invited to join and the meeting information will be made available on BASECAMP.

The group agreed to make a formal decision at the April 22 meeting and to communicate its position to the USFS regarding the second EIS boundaries.

Action Item: Post announcement to BASECAMP inviting stakeholders to join the SC Call on 4/7/15 to continue the discussion on the second EIS boundary.

11:45 5/27/15 SHG Retreat Planning – Vosick/Sitko/Swaney/Berlioux

The SHG retreat will be May 27-28th at TNC's Hart Prairie Preserve. Suggested topics to discuss include:

1. Lessons learned
2. Opportunities for improvement
3. Increasing stakeholder participation
4. Continued meeting frequency
5. Co-chair arrangements
6. FS post-action review
7. Contract status
8. Facilitator needs and contract
9. Review of the Path Forward document
10. Result of Self-assessment

The draft Advance Planning document is available on BASECAMP. Stakeholders should be prepared to discuss and finalize the retreat agenda at the 4/22/15 SHG meeting. There has also been discussion on having a mini retreat in the fall to further flesh out how the SHG and the NRWG will coordinate efforts.

Action Item: Develop a more finalized retreat agenda at the 4/7/15 SC Call

12:10 Working Group Updates

- Utilization and Industry Working Group – currently inactive
- Communications Working Group – currently inactive

12:15 Announcements

- BASECAMP opt-in – Vosick
- 2015 SHG Self-Evaluation Announcement – Swaney

The 2015 SHG Self-assessment survey has been posted to Basecamp

12:30 Action Items and Adjourn

Action Item	Lead	Status
1. Repost White Paper Webinar announcement on BASECAMP	Woods	
2. Draft end of objection process press release	Sitko/Berlioux	
3. Notify Pascal Berlioux or Bruce Greco if interested in participating on Bridge Monitoring Program discussion	All	
4. Post announcement to BASECAMP inviting stakeholders to join the SC Call on 4/7/15 to continue the discussion on the second EIS boundary		
5. Develop a more finalized retreat agenda at the 4/7/15 SC Call	Vosick/Sitko/Berlioux/Swaneey	

The 04/22/15 SHG meeting information:
Coconino National Forest Supervisor's Office
1824 S. Thompson St., Flagstaff, AZ 86001
Teleconference line: (712) 775-7031, code: 439290611#

Anticipated agenda items for 04/22/15 SHG meeting:

1. Annual Planning

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