



## AGENDA

4FRI Stakeholders Meeting

Wednesday, March 26, 2014, 9AM-2:30PM

**Forest Supervisor's Office, 1824 S. Thompson St., Flagstaff**

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

**ATTENDANCE:** Ethan Aumack, Kevin Boness, Dick Fleischman, Alicyn Gitlin, Bill Greenwood, Scott Harger, Steve Horner, Eli Lauren-Bernstein, Stephen Levesque, Anne Mottek-Lucas, Lori Martinek, Sharon Masek Lopez, Sue Sitko, Sybil Smith, Earl Stewart, Paul Summerfelt, Buck Swaney, Dave Tenney, Amy Waltz, Russ Winn, Travis Woolley, Jim Zornes, George Geisler, Greg Smith, Jay Smith, Todd Owen, Joe Black, Jana Sterling, Lisa Turner, Steve Vandertoorn Sr., Joanne Keene, Mandy Metzger, Billy Masters, Brian Prater, Rebecca Davidson, Marc Wicke, Dan Kipervaser, Darren Gurner, Chuck Denton, Gary Moore, Lynn Krigbaum, Heather Noel, Gabriella Smith, John Grahame, Buzz Ivicak, Steve Pauken, Bill Baker

**ON THE PHONE:** Roberta Buzkirk, Jerry Payne, Dave Dorum, Todd Schulke, Chris Stephen-Good Earth Power AZ, Rob Davis

**9:00**                    **Introductions**

**9:10**                    **Approval of 2/26 SHG meeting minutes**

minutes approved

**9:15**                    **Review 2/26 Action Items**

**9:20**                    **Call to the Public**

- John Graham: There will be a Museum of Northern Arizona session on 4FRI, "Seeing the Forests" on April 29<sup>th</sup> that is open to the public. It will explore the big picture goals, challenges and current developments of the initiative and will be a valuable chance for the SHG to do positive public outreach (could this be video-recorded?)

**9:25**                    **Updates: USFS – Dick Fleishman & Roberta**

- **Large-scale NEPA:** on track for the USFS to produce a draft ROD end of July (USFWS should have the Biological Opinion back to USFS by 7/9/14).
- **1<sup>st</sup> Analysis Area:** All 2014 task orders are basically finished, minus the road package, and should be released shortly. FY15-16 task orders layout is currently in review (to get 2 years ahead on prep). Start increasing task order acreage in 2015.
- **May 5-9<sup>th</sup>** Washington Office CFLR Team review/visit of the 4FRI as it relates to CFLR program. SHG invited to informal BBQ (\$10-15/person) on Monday the 5<sup>th</sup> starting at 5:30 at Ft. Tuthill (RSVP to Dick Fleischman at [dfleishman@fs.fed.us](mailto:dfleishman@fs.fed.us)). A more formal get together with the SHG at the Coconino SO will take place Tuesday the 6<sup>th</sup> from 8-9am. Lastly a meeting venue/dinner in Pinetop will also take place on Tuesday the 6<sup>th</sup>.

- **Bridge:** upcoming task orders: Larson, Upper Rocky Arroyo (30,000 acres), Escadilla East (decision early 2016), Luna (in conjunction with Gila NF, but would be two decisions) ...and other preliminary projects: "Center Fire" (joint project with the tribes near the Black River focused on high priority Watershed Condition Framework areas).
- **Roberta:** Ranch task order is basically done. Mercer working on biomass cleanup until 3/31, then wildlife survey. Starting next on Alder.
  - **Question:** do we expect to see further changes to the GEPAZ/USFS contract (concern since this took 3+ months to complete)
  - **Answer:** neither Roberta nor GEPAZ or TCG believes there is any need for further modifications to the contract.
  - **Question:** was this actually a "re-negotiation" of the contract or just a "modification" of the contract
  - **Answer:** not a full contract "re-negotiation", it was a modification
  - **Question:** does the modification require GEPAZ to locate the mill in Williams?
  - **Answer:** modification allows flexibility for site(s) selection for mill; Pioneer contract required that the mill be located only in Winslow.

#### 9:40                      **Updates: Contractor – TCG and GEPAZ**

- (Steve Horner) TCG has changed its name to Campbell Global. Believes the contract modification is a very positive move and allows much needed flexibility. The 932 acre Ranch task order is essentially complete. TCG has designated a new contractor to complete the Mercer task order (90 of 1000 acres completed), and they will then move to higher ground for spring operations. Notice for Alder (1,307 acres) task order was received this week and the subcontractor is getting ready to start work there. All 2013 task orders have been released, and the USFS is only waiting on notices from the contracting officer for the subcontractors to proceed.
- **Question:** what are the plans for a Williams mill and the effort there?
- **Answer:** Williams is the closest mill location to the upcoming task orders and now that modification has completed, TCG and GEPAZ are working to develop more specific plans for industry development in Williams. Hope to make a further announcement in 60 days.
- **Question:** is the plan to be working on multiple task orders at once, starting with Alder?
- **Answer:** YES! But the ability to forecast how many and which task orders will be simultaneously worked.

#### 9:50                      **Updates, other:**

- LAM: Revisions to 4FRI monitoring plan—Amy  
(see BASECAMP posting of this presentation)

- Working to finalize changes to the 80 page monitoring plan, ensuring proper voice to match the FEIS (USFS & SHG) and incorporating Dan Kipervaser's edits. 4FRI SC will be privy to these edits in the near future and the final document will be presented to the SHG in April. Adaptive Management intent and how to monitor northern goshawk are the two big issues that the LAM working group is currently editing.
- Interim-Multi-party Monitoring Board: Charter development—Eli (see BASECAMP posting of this presentation)
  - The interim MPMB has been very productive in recent weeks, drafting a final charter for SHG approval at the April meeting. They have identified gaps in the Board's collective skill set, begun making invitation to fill those gaps as well as invites to a Technical Advisory Group who would operate as ex-officio board members and advise the MPMB on analytic, statistical, experimental design and spatial analysis issues.
- NRWG: Bridge Projects monitoring plan—Sue
  - (directed by Bruce Greco) the bridge project monitoring plan is attempting to tier directly to the 4FRI monitoring plan so there is consistency in monitoring across the 4FRI. Dan is helping to ensure this. However, it will be highly simplified from the 4FRI plan. Goal is to finalize the small-group's draft prior to the April 15 NRWG meeting, and present it to the NRWG at that time for their ultimate review and approval.

**10:00 Stakeholder Disclosures and Accountability—all**

- (Ethan Aumack) 2 meetings now that have been convened by Kevin Kinsall (Governor's office) to better understand what issues might be controversial in the FEIS. CBD, GCT, USFS, Governor's staff and E. Counties representatives have attended. This is not a decision-making group, but an exploratory/listening session. Encouraging developments. Hoping to come back to SHG and especially the LAM working group (canopy cover/openness) in the next few weeks for a constructive conversation about overlap.
- (Earl) referencing the above: these conversations have been very personally valuable, especially in clarifying specific DEIS comments. The challenges have often been with interpretation of data sets. One data request was for VSS class 4-5-6 (~ >12" dbh), where large trees intersect with NOGO and other key ecological features across the landscape. Goal is to work this back to the SHG. This is not any different for the USFS from working through issues of clarification with any other Stakeholder.

- (Paul Summerfelt) week ago Diane Vosick, Paul and Joanne (Coconino County) met with visiting Germans about the FWPP, which went well. In a few weeks Paul, Earl and Diane will present to Fire Leadership Council in D.C.
- (Sue Sitko) Sen Flake's staff requested a tour of the field operations of the WMSC, which occurred last week, along with SRP and TNC. Was small and very productive. The tour covered each step in the process from tree cutting to mill processing.
- (Amy Waltz) 5 CFLRP's from Region 6 requested a report on 4FRI progress and Amy will be giving that next week.
- (Dave Tenney) has participated in the above-mentioned meetings with the Governor's office. Also participated in a D.C. trip, advocating for 4FRI and specifically the bridge projects.
- (Todd Schulke) reported that the Daily Sun covered the Ombudsman report which analyzed assertions made by CBD about KNAU killing a story about the 4FRI contract process.
- (Amy Waltz) reported that ERI has released corrections on the Ombudsman and Daily Sun stories. Both the report and the rebuttal were posted on Basecamp.

**10:20                    Break**

**10:30                    Progress Report: Canopy Cover/Openness-LAM/USFS**

(see Amy's PowerPoint on BASECAMP)

- The requested clarifications from USFS on SHG openness comments are being effectively addressed by Dick and Dan.
  - The goal has been shared learning, clarity and solutions to the openness concerns.
  - Small group: Steve Rosenstock, Amy Waltz, Russ Winn, Steve Gatewood, Tom Mackin, Eli Lauren-Bernstein, Dan Kipervaser, Sharon Masek Lopez, Pascal Berlioux, Alicyn Gitlin, Travis Wooley
  - Lessons learned: USFS' response to SHG comments also addressed discussion points (not productive) and in the future SHG should keep its comments to recommendations.
  - Specific openness discussions focused on:
    - SHG desires clarity on pre/post changes across the landscape
    - Incorporation of GTR310 report (Restoring Composition and Structure in SW Frequent-Fire Forests)
    - Clarifications on table 139
    - Regeneration openings are included in canopy calculations
    - Better describe the range of opening sizes across the landscape (just as was done between the USFS and the SHG on tree clump sizes)

- 
- Heterogeneity is the goal and needs to be reiterated up front in the FEIS
- Clarify how/where regeneration openings are implemented
- How will openness/canopy remaining post treatment be quantified? How to approach the apparent “two camps” within the SHG; (1) those who believe bridge-habitat species need less openness and (2) those who believe we are not achieving enough openness to achieve real restoration?
- How will range of opening sizes be included in the FEIS and then implemented? (e.g. implementation guide, checklist, and “plan in hand” with signatures blocks for all task orders and prescribed burns)

*Group discussion:* some confusion remained about regeneration treatments and why they are considered canopy (not openings) by the USFS. Regeneration can include both VSS 1 (new) and 2 (advanced). There is an important distinction between “canopy” (existing trees) and “tree’d area” (includes regeneration openings), that has been eluding many in the Stakeholder group. This needs to be captured by USFS in the FEIS.

### **11:30 Preliminary FEIS & Scenario Planning Discussion—Buck**

SHG reviewed Eli’s summary of the FEIS timeline, which included a schedule from this point forward, the various benchmarks or milestones to the final ROD, and the points within the process where SHG can become involved. An open discussion ensued as the SHG explored the ramifications, advantages, and challenges a variety of scenarios for how to respond to the FEIS, generally focusing on five topics:

1. What constituted a “legal entity” for the purposes of potentially objecting to the ROD, or obtaining status as an “intervener” or “petitioner”. How could the SHG get involved at these points?
2. Public statements, according to our Charter, must have 100% consensus. What if there is no full consensus on the FEIS ROD or the potential objections raised? Can we realistically develop a public statement?
3. What if we take no position on the FEIS ROD and therefore do not craft a public statement? What are the social and political ramifications?
4. Does the 100% consensus rule mean that all stakeholders must agree with the actual FEIS decision, or agree with the statement that we put forth, which would/could be a factual summary of disagreements between SHG/Charter members?
5. Is there a need, benefit, or disadvantage to modifying our Charter re: the 100% consensus rule, either permanently or for this one exception

Other points of discussion included the possibility of incorporation in order to obtain legal status; use one or more organizations to lead a collaborative effort of those entities that agree with that organization; and the desire to develop specific means to achieve consensus on communications. No decisions on the above discussion points were made. The SHG supported the need to re-initiate the Communications Working Group, and use this group as the venue for developing a path forward for outreach on the FEIS/ROD. Eli was tasked to pull together the working group to initiate this discussion. Scenario planning will continue at future SHG meetings to ensure whole-group input is received.

**12:30**                    **Light lunch & networking break**

**1:15**                    **2014 Field trips proposal—*Travis & Amy***

(see Amy's spreadsheet)

- Openness
  - **Regeneration:** understanding range of openness in existing treatments
  - **5-15 yrs. post treatment:** How do field perceptions relate to prescriptions or desired conditions
  - How do field perceptions relate to landscape metrics
- Preponderance of large trees
  - **LTRS:** Understand the potential implementation in these stands
  - **Regeneration:** Understand the scope of preponderance-how big are groups of large trees?
- Fire
  - **Fire Operations:** Understand the variability of prescribed fire
  - **Social issues:** smoke, burn windows, etc...
    - **ADEQ** (Sybil) said that they could be very supportive with smoke-related messaging/field trips, and with 1 month notice they could send an ADEQ expert to attend field trips on smoke. (also would be key to involve ADEQ with the Communications Working Group to work on smoke issues)
- **5-15 Years post-treatment**
  - **(nest within openness):** Capturing lessons learned from SHG – developed treatments
  - Understand what treatments look like multiple years post-treatment

SHG discussed the value of using field trips to evaluate the problems and solutions to developing monitoring BMP metrics, thresholds and indicators.

Potential locations:

- Observatory Mesa
- Mountainare
- Flagstaff arboretum
- Flagstaff Well Fields
- For Valley/GFFP-stack
- Taylor Woods
- Saginaw
- White Mountain Stewardship

The SHG is leaning towards having an afternoon field trip at the April meeting in Pinetop, and the SC will discuss and decide on whether or not one of the above objectives could be studied. There was also interest expressed by stakeholders for some future field trips to include sites in the second analysis area and explore “lessons learned” from the development of the first EIS.

**2:00                      Action items and adjourn—Buck**

<b>Action Items from 2/26 SHG meeting</b>	<b>Contact</b>	<b>Status</b>
1. Develop a proposal for next steps on 4FRI communications process (FEIS scenario planning) and develop a solution to issues with decision rules	<b>SC in coord. with Communications WG</b>	
2. Switch meeting dates/locations for Flagstaff and Winslow...now Flagstaff in May and Winslow in June	<b>Eli</b>	
3. Organize Communications Working Group to begin process of refining scenarios for SHG discussion.	<b>Comm WG (eli to organize)</b>	
4. Post 2014 field trip dates, locations, purposes on BASECAMP and have the SC review	<b>Travis &amp; Amy</b>	
5. Set up a meeting between LAM Canopy Cover/Openness working group & Governor’s advisory group	<b>Ethan/Amy</b>	
6. CFLRP funding/re-authorization support letter information request from coalition	<b>Sue</b>	
7. Finalize and post the 2014 scenario planning	<b>Buck</b>	
8. Revise FEIS timeline document	<b>Eli</b>	
9. Sue to contact Pascal re: his ability to step into cold seat chair as scheduled and if not, ask Steve Gatewood to take Pascal’s place beginning April 1	<b>Sue</b>	

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