



4FRI Stakeholder Group Meeting
 Wednesday, 4-25-2012
 Arizona Game and Fish Offices, Pinetop, Arizona

I. Next Steps

| Description | Responsibility | Complete By |
|---|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Distribute electronic version of contract award announcement as soon as it is awarded | Marcus Selig | TBD |
| 2. Send Henry comments on NEPA analysis | Stakeholder Group | ASAP |
| 3. Post final NEPA scoping report on 4FRI website | Henry Provencio | When final |
| 4. Contact Jason (EPA representative) about reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) before it is published | Henry Provencio | May 16, 2012 |
| 5. Send message of invitation to Stakeholder Group members to join a subgroup to discuss CEQ pilot project | Marcus Selig, but now Diane Vosick | May 16, 2012 |
| 6. Discuss Steve Gatewood's proposal to modify Alternative D in the Draft EIS to include some burning in mechanically treated areas | NEPA Project Review Working Group | May 11, 2012 |
| 7. Explore 4FRI use of Flagstaff Payment for Watershed Services (PWS) during next Fiscal Working Group meeting | Fiscal Working Group | TBD |
| 8. Post Statewide Communications and Fundraising Efforts presentation on Basecamp | Marcus Selig | Completed 4/30/12 |
| 9. Review Rim Lakes, Timber Mesa, Upper | NEPA Project Review Working | May 16, 2012 |

| Description | Responsibility | Complete By |
|---|---|--------------|
| Beaver Creek, McKraken and Jones projects; explore concerns and determine if the projects meet 4FRI criteria based on foundational documents; report back at May Stakeholder Group meeting | Group | |
| 10. Include on May 10 Landscape Assessment and Monitoring Working Group May 16 agenda, review of project prescription and descriptions for the EIS (related to monitoring). And some discussions about applying those prescriptions in some tests | Landscape Assessment and Monitoring Working Group | May 10, 2012 |
| 11. Post Rogers Lake Work Dates on 4FRI Website | Ed Smith | ASAP |
| 12. Post “Chutes and Ladders” graphic on Basecamp | Diane Vosick | When final |
| 13. Send invitations to potential 4FRI Stakeholder Group facilitators to attend June Stakeholder Group meeting; members to send Marcus name of potential facilitators (Stakeholder Group members are not eligible) | Marcus Selig and Stakeholder Group members | ASAP |
| 14. Work with U.S. Institute to revise Scope of Work (SOW) for new facilitator(s); include 3 highlighted “actions” identified from 4FRI annual evaluation* | Ed Smith | May 4, 2012 |
| 15. Finalize Scope of Work | USIECR, USFS, Stakeholder Group | June 1, 2012 |
| 16. Revise “Participant’s Feedback on Meeting Effectiveness” evaluation form, item #5, to include: a. Stakeholder Group; and b. Stakeholder Group and the Forest Service; consider removing items #2 and #3; consider | USIECR | May 16, 2012 |

| Description | Responsibility | Complete By |
|--|--------------------|---|
| revising scale (.5 – 4.0) and adding three facilitator “actions”* | | |
| 17. Develop Adaptive Management Monitoring Plan to be included in Draft EIS | Henry Provencio | TBD |
| 18. Seek clarification from Forest Service DC on whether hours spent at Stakeholder Group meetings should be included in the CFLRP Annual Report | Dick Fleishman | TBD |
| 19. Finalize Partner-Match CFLRP reporting survey, incorporating Dick’s research, and share at next Stakeholder Group meeting | Windy Greer | May 16, 2012 |
| 20. Report Steering Committee call agendas, number of calls, and members participating at Stakeholder Group meetings at monthly Stakeholder Group meetings | Steering Committee | May 16, 2012 and each monthly Stakeholder Group meeting |
| 21. Pascal review 4FRI Charter posted on Basecamp for language specifying that only one member from each organization represented on 4FRI can participate in decision-making | Pascal Berlioux | Completed 4/27/2012 |

** 1) The facilitator should directly address conflict, making an attempt to manage and resolve it; 2) the facilitator should mediate and serve as a liaison, and not merely call on people in meetings and adhere to agendas; and 3) the facilitator should hold people accountable for violating the “ground rules” and exhibiting obstructionist behavior.*

II. Key Decisions Made at this Meeting

| |
|--|
| 1. Approved minutes of March 28, 2012 4FRI Stakeholder Group meeting |
|--|

| |
|---|
| 2. Agreed, without reservations, that 139 of the 144 projects listed as 4FRI projects were collaboratively-identified by 4FRI Stakeholder Group |
| 3. Agreed to refer five (5) projects (Rim Lakes, Timber Mesa, Upper Beaver Creek, McKraken and Jones) to NEPA Project Review Working Group for discussion at May 11 meeting. Goal: identify concerns and look at 4FRI project criteria based on foundational documents; share outcomes at May 16 Stakeholder Group meeting; show where projects are consistent or inconsistent and language for the annual report |
| 4. Agreed by consent of the Stakeholder Group that the social-economic monitoring plan submitted by Ann Mottek Lucas is final |
| 5. Agreed to complete CFLRP Survey quarterly |
| 6. Agreed that facilitator will facilitate “+ / Δ” discussion and restate decisions made and next steps agreed to at the end of each meeting |

III. Introductions, Welcome and Ground Rules

Debra Drecksell, meeting facilitator, reviewed the ground rules. Marcus Selig, welcomed the meeting participants and reminded members to sign the meeting registration form and to sign the Charter if members had not previously signed it. Members introduced themselves. Four members joined by phone (Rob Davis, Dorothy, Todd Schulke, Paul Summerfelt).

U.S. Forest Service Updates – *Henry Provencio*

- **Contract Award:** Henry had no new information on the contract award; he has been assured it is eminent
 - Marcus reported that a communication strategy and talking points have been developed, which will be used when the contract award is announced. A press release has also been prepared.
 - Marcus will distribute an electronic version of the contract once it is awarded
- **NEPA analysis**
 - Henry is seeking feedback on the NEPA analysis
 - Public meeting is scheduled May 14 from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. at the Coconino County Supervisor’s office. A call-in number will be provided and has been included on the announcement letter; it is also available on the Forest Service website
 - Seven specialists have submitted draft reports for Chapter 3 of the DEIS.

- The Forest Service is working on amending language in the DEIS and will share the changes with the public as soon as they are finalized.
 - The Forest Service will be analyzing four (4) alternatives: A) No action; B) Proposed action as scoped in August; C) addressing comments received on grassland treatments; and D) responds to comments regarding effects of smoke (e.g., heavy metals, radioactive isotopes, etc.) by keeping the “burn only” box as burn only on 200K acres. It removes prescribed fire in areas treated mechanically. Alternatives are being reviewed by the Forest Supervisors; no significant changes are anticipated
 - Amendments to language will delay release of DEIS; anticipate sending it to the publisher by July 2012
 - The NEPA scoping report is being produced simultaneously with the DEIS; Henry will post the final scoping report on the 4FRI website (anticipated two weeks before May 14 public meeting)
 - Diane Vosick met with Jim Smalls of CEQ the week of April 16. He recommended that the Forest Service share the DEIS with the EPA before it is published. Henry agreed to contact his EPA representative about this.
- **Scales of Analysis:** The Forest Service is looking at four scales of analysis for the critical habitat component. Coconino has to sign a letter documenting that the Forest Supervisor’s analysis was different from that defined for Ecosystem Management Areas (Coconino’s EMAs are synonymous with 10,000 acre lots).
 - **Second NEPA Analysis:** The Forest Supervisors are coordinating on preparing data for the next EIS; The ID Team is talking with the FS Supervisors to develop a strategy for establishing the next EIS area.
 - Neil Bosworth will be new Forest Supervisor on the Tonto. There is uncertainty about what will be done on the Tonto.
 - It will be essential to have a coordinator for this EIS

A member expressed concerns about Alternative D in the DEIS, saying that it would not align with the DEIS Purpose and Need. Henry responded that it is the Forest Service’s job to analyze the effects of the proposed action; if an alternative does not align with the Purpose and Need statement, it will be reflected in the analysis. Henry also explained that this alternative was recommended by the Forest Supervisors to ensure there was an alternative to analyze that was between burning nothing and burning everything. After further discussion the Stakeholder Group agreed to refer discussion about modifying Alternative D to the NEPA Project Review Working Group.

IV. Call to the Public

There were no comments from members of the public.

V. Stakeholder update

- National Forest Foundation (NFF): Diane provided a brief update on 4FRI at the NFF reception in Phoenix. 4FRI was mentioned as important leadership endeavor. ERI developed a landscape-scale video that featured many Stakeholder Group members. The NFF is a private organization authorized by the federal government to work with the U.S. Forest Service on providing additional resources to improve forest management. The organization is a preferred partner with the Forest Service. Chief Tidwell, Harris Sherman, and Corbin Newman were present and acknowledged 4FRI as a highly recognized effort.
- **CEQ Discussion:** CEQ discussed conducting a peer review after the DEIS is published and agreed to talk with Horst Greczmiel, Associate Director for NEPA Oversight at CEQ, about this proposal. Note: this is a very preliminary discussion that came out of brainstorming ways that CEQ could support 4FRI; there is no commitment on CEQ's part. Diane explained that there are no formal lines of communication between 4FRI and CEQ.
 - Members agreed to form a subgroup to discuss a CEQ pilot project. Marcus will send an invitation to members to join the subgroup.
- **National Indicators Group:** Amy Waltz and Matt Williamson are in Washington, DC, with the National Indicators group for CFLRP to develop ecological and socio-economic indicators that will be required by all CFLRP projects. They are taking the lead nationally. They hosted webinar on ecological monitoring.
- **White Mountain Stewardship (WMS):** A concern was raised whether the White Mountain Stewardship contract continues even after the EIS is complete.
 - Christine reported that the Forest Service is finishing a 10-year plan that will identify all existing NEPA decisions, commitments to White Mountain Stewardship, and the current 4FRI contract. There are uncertainties beyond 5 years. The plan will be shared with the public sometime this year.
 - There are no commitments to WMS beyond the current contract.

VI. Presentation on Statewide Communications and Fundraising Efforts – *Marcus Selig*

The presentation focused on the Fiscal Committee's fundraising strategy which is deemed necessary due to the following factors:

- Need for additional funding
- Complementary restoration activities (not covered under the contract)
- Ecological and socio-economic monitoring (and research, if possible)
- Long-term maintenance of treatments

The Fiscal Working Group will discuss further options on how to respond to engagement between the City and SRP on Flagstaff Payment for Watershed Services (PWS). We have the option to support and participate in a more active role, or we can issue an endorsement of support recognizing that this is not a 4FRI effort, nor is it a 4FRI decision.

Marcus will upload this presentation to Basecamp for stakeholder review.

Next steps:

1. Conduct statewide survey to determine public knowledge gaps and willingness to pay (complete)
2. Build relationships with utilities and other key partners (in progress)

Marcus will set up regular Fiscal Working Group meetings and see if participation builds. The following indicated interest in participating: Tim Scrupa (SRP), Ed Smith, Mark from ERI, and Pasqual Berlioux.

VII. CFLRP Match and Project Nomenclature

USFS Decision 1: USFS is not willing to keep two sets of books for what is reported in the CFLR Annual Report. What we do and what we report will be the same. Any project in the 2.4 million acre footprint will be in the CFLRP Annual Report.

USFS Decision 2: The USFS is not willing to make a decision on how projects will be funded until the full Stakeholder Group has an open and honest discussion about what the subset of stakeholders has expressed as concerns and developed a statement from the full Stakeholder Group they can submit to the USFS.

USFS wants the Stakeholder Group to establish criteria to evaluate projects, apply it equally across all projects, and then submit the results to the USFS. The stakeholder group could make a recommendation on what category the projects fall within and what projects would be funded.

Stakeholder response:

- This full stakeholder discussion has been initiated with the USFS present but a lack of information on specific project details precluded the ability to reach decision points. More information is needed from the USFS so stakeholders can come to a decision.
- Decision 1 seems to negate for any further discussion in Decision 2.
- The assumption that any project within the 2.4 million acres is eligible for CFLR funding opens this for litigation from many fronts.
- The 4FRI label is not a rubber stamp to be used where convenient and rejected where not convenient.
- We expressed that funding projects that are not collaboratively identified is not in line with legislation. This could be fixed by changing the funding or identifying the project as 4FRI if it meets the muster.
- Will all 2.4 million acres be subject to 4FRI foundational documents in regards to projects identified under CFLR Report?
- The legislative language clearly states that the USFS shall not spend funds on projects that are not collaboratively identified. The responsibility falls to the USFS and DOA to ensure this. It is not the Stakeholder Group's responsibility.
 - The USFS feels this responsibility has been met.

STAKEHOLDER GROUP DECISION: 139 of 144 projects (all but the subset's 5 projects of concern) are agreed upon by the Stakeholder Group as being collaboratively identified. This agreement is at the highest level, Agreement without Reservations. On the 5 remaining projects, the subset's general concerns are:

- There is uncertainty on the Timber Mesa and Rim Lakes projects because neither has a Record of Decision.
 - Timber Mesa: Was collaboratively developed by an alternative collaborative through the NRWG. Timber Mesa would count as a match, but NFRP money would be the funding. FONSI by June or July.
- McKraken: Not collaborative, not in line with the Large Tree Retention Strategy, not in line with the Goshawk Guidelines, and big trees might be affected.
- Jones and Upper Beaver Creek: owls and habitat.

Action Item: The Stakeholder Group agreed to refer five (5) projects (Rim Lakes, Timber Mesa, Upper Beaver Creek, McKraken and Jones) to the NEPA Project Review Working Group for discussion at the May 11 meeting. They will identify concerns and look at 4FRI project criteria based on foundational documents. They will report on the outcome at the May 16 Stakeholder Group meeting, showing where projects are consistent or inconsistent. Then it will be decided how to disclose this in the annual report.

At the May 16 Stakeholder Group meeting, if “Agreement without Reservations” cannot be reached on these 5 projects, then 4FRI Decision Rules will be used on each of the 5 projects to bring this to closure.

VIII. Working Group Updates

- **Landscape Assessment and Monitoring Working Group – Amy Waltz**
 - The LSWG & S&M WG have combined. Amy Waltz, Taylor McKinnon and Ed Smith will be co-leading this group. Matt Williamson and Dave Huffman will be assisting. The first meeting will be May 10th, 9a.m- noon to discuss the first EIS area, project implementation and monitoring strategies.
 - They will be planning for the next EIS area, using lessons learned from the USFS and other stakeholder input. This will be a facilitated meeting by the Institute.
 - Many of these meetings will be held on the east side to get more engagement from those members.
 - Work days will be posted soon.
- **Communications Working Group – Marcus Selig**
 - Contract outreach strategy has been developed. There is a press release ready to be sent.
 - Newsletters are roughly quarterly. May 4 is the next date for release.
 - Earth day festival in Flagstaff and in the Grand Canyon Park. The Grand Canyon Trust and USFS had a combined booth.
 - Marcus, Wally Covington, and Charlie Ester will be on a panel for the Healthy Headwaters meeting.
 - Marcus and Mary Lata are presenting to an international group regarding watersheds and range management.
 - Valley Forward presentation at the Sheraton downtown by Marcus, Wally, and Henry on May 2: There’s a \$60 entrance fee.
 - May 3: Diane and Dick are giving a presentation at the Smallwood Conference.
 - May 20: Ed Smith and Matt are giving separate presentations on 4FRI at the Udall Foundation’s U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution Conference.

- **Fiscal Working Group – Marcus Selig**
 - There a student group at NAU who works with the Climate Science program. Marcus has worked with them on a Carbon Accounting project for which they have just been selected as finalist for the Barrett Award. If they win, they receive \$50K; second and third place wins \$10K. They need a letter from the USFS supporting the work they are doing.
- **NEPA Project Review Working Group – Marcus Selig**
 - The next meeting will be Friday May 11 at 1pm at the Grand Canyon Trust in Flagstaff.
 - From a triage approach the 5 projects identified will be addressed first then subsequent projects will be discussed.
- **Socio Economic Report** has been posted to Basecamp. If there are no comments or revisions by Friday it will be submitted to the USFS.

Discussion of Challenges to Working at Landscape Scales– Diane Vosick

This discussion is born through a series of presentations being given by stakeholder members on challenges collaborating at landscape scale. Diane has established a “Chutes and Ladders” model. We will scan this and post to Basecamp. Stakeholder input is welcome.

Facilitation – U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution

Marcus told the group that on the Steering Committee call they developed a strategy to work towards transitioning to a new facilitator in October. We want to start looking at facilitators immediately. Will be going from this meeting forward – picking a facilitator – invite them to meeting – at end talk about what they witnessed and how they can help us as a group.

ACTION ITEM: Marcus will send invitations to facilitators to invite them to the meeting. If anyone has a facilitator they would like to invite, let him know. We are not interested in any facilitators within your organizations or anyone who is a 4FRI stakeholder. Send references and we will invite them to a meeting.

Marcus said that the Steering Committee will work with U.S. Institute to determine how to get potential facilitators involved and to work out details.

Participants discussed the following related to facilitation needs:

- Address conflict
- Make an attempt to manage and resolve conflict
 - On the Steering Committee call yesterday, the decision was to move forward with interviewing and selecting a potential new facilitator immediately. Three potential facilitators have been identified and will be invited to visit with the 4FRI stakeholder group at monthly meetings. The Steering Committee will work with the U.S. Institute to work out the details.
- Informal mediation is a function we need on an ongoing basis more than meeting management.
- Teach us how to self-regulate or self-enforce the ground rules while protecting the trust we are trying to rebuild.

- Establish a schedule for a selection process: Ed Smith will revise the current Scope of Work and draft a new one to share with the Steering Committee on the next call.

ACTION ITEMS:

- U.S. Institute will work with Steering Committee to develop Scope of Work (SOW) for new facilitator. U.S. Institute will send Request for Proposals; U.S. Institute and the Steering Committee will review proposals and bring candidates in to meetings. We need to get going immediately.
- By June 1, have SOW done.
- By June meeting – have a guest facilitator visit.
- By May 4, Ed Smith take existing SOW and create revised draft. Add that if they have a video, provide it. Share the draft SOW with Steering Committee on their next call and with the U.S. Institute.

U.S. Institute revise the draft meeting evaluation form:

- Expand a, b, c, on facilitation
- Team : Stakeholder Group, and then Stakeholder Group and USFS
- Plus/ Delta at end of meeting
- Meeting agenda: Yes/No with Comments
- Meeting Content: yes/no with Comments
- At the end of each meeting, the facilitator gathers, compiles and summarizes the evaluations and includes the summary with the meeting notes.

Partner-Match Reporting for CFLRP Annual Report – Windy Greer

Dick will follow-up to determine what type of stakeholder activities are reportable (e.g., monitoring, implementation, planning).

After receiving Dick’s input, Windy will reformat the Survey Monkey sheet and present it at the next Stakeholder Group Meeting.

Next Stakeholder Group Meeting

The May Stakeholder Meeting will be held on the May 16.