



4FRI Stakeholder Group Meeting
May 16, 2012
Flagstaff, Arizona

I. Key Decisions Made at this Meeting

1. Approved minutes of April 25, 2012 4FRI Stakeholder Group meeting—Marcus will amend April notes to reflect that there will not be full 4FRI engagement on fiscal.)

2. DECISIONS regarding Charter:

- Add language for one vote per organization now.
- Discuss whether grammatical and hierarchical revisions constitute substantive changes on the next Steering Committee call.
- Open the Charter to substantive amendments in October (as provided in the Charter).

3. Decisions regarding CFLRP:

The group used the Decision Rules from its Charter to reach the following:

1. 143 of the 144 projects are “Collaboratively identified as a CFLRP project (plus some language from CFLRP Act)”
2. Timber Mesa: All highest level of agreement: “Agreement without Reservations”
3. Upper Beaver Creek: All highest of agreement: “Agreement without Reservations”
4. Jones: All highest level of agreement: “Agreement without Reservations”
5. McKraken: All highest level of agreement: “Agreement without Reservations” EXCEPT GCT, CBD, AZFRP, & ERI:
 - a. Agreement with Reservations:
 - ERI (Amy: sanitation cuts)
 - AZFRP (Pascal: sanitation logging)
 - b. No Clear Agreement:
 - GCT (Marcus: Sanitation logging, large trees, mistletoe, extent project removes large trees to create regeneration; we have flexibility to not include
 - CBD (Todd: regular list of reasons)
6. Rim Lakes
 - Do NOT include in CFLRP Report: All highest level of agreement: “Agreement without Reservations”
 - Stakeholder Group desires collaboration with USFS on this project: All highest level of agreement: “Agreement without Reservations”
 - Steering Committee will develop a letter in collaboration with the Stakeholder Group that will go to Forest Service (perhaps the Regional Office and the Forests).

II. Introductions, Welcome and Ground Rules

Debra Drechsel, meeting Facilitator, reviewed the ground rules. Marcus Selig, Steering Committee Co-Chair, 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. Five members joined by phone (Sue Sitko, Rod Davis, Billie Hewes, Ross, Marlin Johnson).

III. Approval of 4/25/2012 Minutes

Participants approved the April 25, 2012 minutes with an amendment to be added by Marcus that there will not be full 4FRI engagement on the fiscal.

IV. Call to the Public

V. Review of Decisions made from 4/25/2012 Meeting and Identified Next Steps, *Debra Drechsel*

A few highlights include:

- When the contract comes out a communication strategy is in place.
- Send Henry comments on NEPA analysis (ongoing).
- Scoping report will be on Basecamp when finalized.
- CEQ Pilot is being taken on by Diane Vosick who will communicate with Stakeholders about meetings.
- Kaibab National Forest has an adaptive management and monitoring framework in their plan. To see how it has been incorporated in an existing land management plan, that is a good place to look.

VI. Forest Service Updates-- *Henry Provencio & Dick Fleischman*

- Update on RFP for contract:
 - The contract will be awarded very soon.
- DEIS Update
 - They are still cross checking numbers.
 - All specialists' reports except fisheries (waiting for soils report) and archeology have been developed.
 - They need to incorporate Alternatives C & D, which are still just drafts. They are getting amendment language edited. They went over the amendment language for Alternatives C and D at the May 14 NEPA Update Meeting.
 - They had a meeting yesterday on closed/higher sites (sites where areas will occur for canopy dependent species). That meeting went very well.
 - USFS will get the Large tree implementation plan to the Stakeholder Group early next week so we can start talking about issues.
 - The Implementation plan is a work in progress. We will talk about it at next public meeting.

- We are continuing to work on the monitoring plan.
- Amy mentioned that the second EIS is on the LAM Work Group agenda. We want to have a lessons learned session from the first analysis area. We could make recommendations on geography for the second analysis area and let know folks where we are at and how to move forward.
- Another role for Monitoring Coordinator will be data.
- As a result of being selected for CEQ pilot, the first webinar will be July 18 at 11:00 MST (2:00 p.m. EDT). Stakeholders are invited to participate on the public end. EPA, Game & Fish, Fish & Wildlife, and the 4FRI Steering Committee will participate. The webinar will include a 90 minute presentation, a 30 minute presentation by another project, and then 30 minutes for Q &A.
- We need to work through an iterative process in advance of the DEIS on the Monitoring Plan (and incorporate adaptive management).
- CFLRP Partner Match Reporting Requirements, *Windy Greer*
 - Lauren Marshall in the Washington Office and she confirmed that match is only implementation and monitoring that is reported in the CFLRP report.
 - That does not mean that other planning/meeting time should not be tracked, but we should have three columns in your online data tracking forms, as well as the excel spreadsheet.
 - For CFLR reporting, Dick said we can only report stakeholder implementation hours. Henry clarified that time spent on preparation for field work can be reported. Time spent on Stakeholder Group meetings and Work Group meetings cannot be reported. There are two categories: total hours put into 4FRI and implementation hours.

VII. 4FRI Stakeholder Updates

- Ed Smith reported that tomorrow he is meeting with Mary Mitsos from the National Forest Foundation (NFF). She wants more information on Heart Prairie (tour of sites and types of restoration occurring). Marcus added that NFF still has not made decision on what will be Treasured Landscape. It probably will be Heart Prairie.
- Tom reported on the Woody Ridge Wildlife Corridor, saying that they put together a group for funding. Last Saturday was their last field exercise and 16 volunteers participated. They identified fences in poor shape and brought some of them up to standard. The group put in 120 hours of service. Now they are making plans for the next date which they will post on Basecamp. Sarah added that they want to keep building on this with other small grants on restoration work (grassroots community efforts).
- Amy Waltz reported that she is part of the team working on national level CFLRP indicators. She went to Washington DC a couple of months ago related to this effort. This effort is different from annual reporting. This effort is looking at ecological outcomes (not outputs), such as did we reduce fire behavior, did we improve wildlife habitat, etc.? The national CFLRP indicators are a suite of 5. Henry added that we do not want to duplicate efforts.

VIII. Update on Canopy Cover Meeting Outcomes, *Debra Drecksel and participants*

Two sessions, a morning session and an afternoon session, were held on May 4 to discuss canopy cover related issues.

- May 4 morning session:
 - The group discussed that, simplistically, the more open the space is, the more likely you will have very little threat of destructive fire and the more closed the canopy is, the better it will be for those species dependent on high tree density.
 - The Implementation Plan: a lot of the specifics people are concerned about in the Amendment language will actually be included in the Implementation Plan.
- Afternoon session:
 - Adaptive management and monitoring plan was a main focus of this session.
- May 15 Meeting:
 - One goal was to understand “High Sites” areas (areas conducive to closed canopy species because dense state—includes low intensity treatments, etc.).
 - Determining High Sites: Taylor, Marcus, and Todd met to discuss the characteristics of “high site” areas. They identified 5 criteria including, low intensity treatment, wilderness areas, PACS, pfas, and 45 % slope. They then went through areas with the USFS GIS specialist and developed a map to identify areas that met those criteria to get more clarity on how much refuge canopy cover dependent species would have after treatment. They made a map with 3 categories: low, medium, and high densities. PAFs are disbursed across the landscape. On that map, open treatments are purple (high intensity treatments), teal blue is medium, and dark green is low. Very roughly this translates to 20% high; medium 20% to 25% and low under 20%.
 - Henry reported that they went over the Proposed Action and Amendments B & D (Mexican Spotted Owl and cleaning up 16 inch). They just went over Coconino. The Amendments specific to burning were not covered because that is in Amendment C. Regarding interspaces, Henry continued, we took your advice and provided more background information, such as where are we at, why are we doing this, why is it important. For each Amendment there are significance criteria.
- May 16 group discussion:
 - Marcus noted that they previously understood that the USFS is planning to measure at groups of trees, but disclose at stand level. Now additionally, the understanding is that there will be a minimum stocking requirement in a basal area target at the large scale. The basal area is 54 to 55 square feet per acre, so if one did transects with a prism at a larger level than the group, on average would have 55 acres of basal area.
 - Participants explored how to get more clarity on how canopy cover will be measured. When you look in the southeast portion of the analysis area, there are more dense areas for PACs. One might expect a similar pattern as you move farther east. The least intense treatment is 10 to 20%.
 - The intent of this from Marcus’s standpoint is to have a complete understanding of what the Proposed Action will do so we can discuss it with others.
 - A question was raised: If exclude PACs and slopes from specific acreage, what would be left for treatment? Answer: All those acres are getting treated. The map shows levels of treatment intensity. This is Alternative C.

- Shaula clarified that these are levels of “denser” (rather than dense versus not). In her view, we are not leaving dense levels of the REMAINING TREE DENSITY MAP.
- In response to input, the USFS will revise the map and remove the wilderness areas.
- Canopy cover will be measured at the group level and additionally stocking levels at the group 4, 5, and 6 and basal area at larger scale of 54-55 sq. ft. per acre at a minimum.
- Constituent elements that are important to Goshawk survival and canopy cover at different levels are assessed related to this. How the percent change on the different structural parameters; there will be a specialist report.
- Still unknown are how large trees will be handled and design features of the Implementation Plan.
- Next steps that will bring this set of issues to final closure:
 - a. Revise the map to change color of wilderness areas.
 - b. Rename map to “Post treatment Forest Openness.”
 - c. Clarify regarding large trees.
 - d. Revise the amendment language.
 - e. Amy will take a look at post treatment fire behavior and follow up with stakeholders.
 - f. Toggle this map with current conditions.
- To date this is significant progress on this issue toward reaching closure.
- Henry highlighted that the 4FRI ID Team produces a better product through this type of collaboration.

IX. Work Group Updates

1. Steering Committee, *Ed Smith*
 - a. Discussions from the last meeting included agenda items for today, upcoming facilitation, charter revisions, canopy cover discussion update, and Monitoring Coordinator discussion (proposal from ERI and Arizona Game & Fish for a jointly-funded position).
 - b. The next Steering Committee call is next Tuesday May 22.
2. Communications, *Marcus Selig*
 - a. Carpe Diem West Healthy Headwaters meeting presentation was given by Marcus Selig, Wally Covington, and Charlie Ester.
 - b. Panel discussion with Valley Forward (a gathering of Phoenix area business leaders), consisted of Marcus Selig, Wally Covington, Henry Provencio, and a representative from SRP. There were great discussions and follow up conversations. The Executive Director sent a positive letter to editor to Arizona Republic about 4FRI. Valley Forward wants to help with fundraising.
 - c. Coming up is a panel discussion regarding implementation of 4FRI and what people can expect to see: Marcus, Sarah, Diane, Sick and hopefully a contractor will participate on the panel. Erik Nielsen will moderate that discussion on June 5 at the Cline Library.

- d. Mormon Lake Outdoor Festival will be held on June 9. Stakeholder participation is welcome.
 - e. On June 15, Arizona Game & Fish will sponsor an event with an outdoor lunch speaker. The speaker is still to be identified.
 - f. The timing of publishing the newsletter is slipping to less than quarterly because we are waiting for the contract announcement.
 - g. A jointly developed press release by the stakeholder group and the USFS is approved and ready to go once the contract announcement is made.
 - h. Steering Committee approved talking points for the contract award have been developed for stakeholders. Please follow these talking points as closely as possible.
3. Fiscal, *Marcus Selig*
- a. We are working with SRP to take steps to help with marketing for fundraising to put materials together.
 - b. Soliciting funds for a project that has not begun to be implemented yet has been a cause for concern by some.
 - c. NFF would be interested in managing an account for the 4FRI as they have the capacity to do so.
 - d. Caution that when we are speaking to media we need to be careful about putting potential partners into the spotlight when they are possibly not ready yet.
 - e. Mary Mitsos and Marcus are meeting with APS representatives to discuss a possible partnership with 4FRI in fundraising efforts.
 - f. The City of Flagstaff is interested in PWS. A group is discussing to determine the feasibility, budgetary possibility, etc. This is not an official 4FRI effort.
4. Statewide effort:
- a. This is a collection of collaborative groups working on developing an RFP for a statewide collection of funds that would go toward forest restoration. We have representatives from 4FRI, Firescapes, Prescott National Forest, Sky Island Alliance, ASU, etc.
 - b. This effort is working on a foundational document addressing the types of projects that can be supported with this money.
 - c. A statewide survey regarding Arizonans' views regarding forest restoration showed that over 80% supported mechanical treatments for fire.
 - d. The next meeting is June 12 in Tucson.
 - e. The Statewide survey of public perception on forest restoration populated strong support for mechanical thinning of small trees and willingness to pay. This data is not currently on Basecamp but this information will be shared soon.
5. Landscape Assessment & Monitoring (LAM), *Amy Waltz*
- a. Socio-economic plan: Prioritization is now being developed and we are working with the 4FRI ID team on incorporation of that plan.
 - b. NFF awarded 4FRI \$10K to implement the social-economic plan. The 4FRI Steering Committee will develop the process for issuing that award.

- c. A Monitoring Coordinator has been in discussion in the USFS and the stakeholders. The LAM would like to talk with the Forest Supervisors to combine efforts on this discussion.
- d. Dick Fleischman is working on a ten year plan that will be rolled into the implementation plan. Where are the priority areas? What are the access points to the priority areas? As the USFS moves to implementation, the stakeholder group would like to be prepared to show where our priorities fit. The Forest Supervisors have a list of priorities that lined up very closely with the stakeholder list of priorities.
- e. A missions and goals statement was developed for this group and will be posted to Basecamp for wordsmith.
- f. LAM next steps to address the desire to move east include documenting USFS needs and expectations, documenting stakeholder expectations for the USFS, reviewing the White Mountain Stewardship (WMS) to date, reviewing past assessments, reviewing the eastside needs in coordinating and creating new infrastructure, and retaining old infrastructure from the WMS.
- g. There is a real desire to have a facilitated lessons-learned meeting from the first EIS.
 - i. CEQ is seeking lessons learned so this could help structure the timeline and subject areas.
 - ii. The Forest Health Council meeting will present Lessons learned and would reduce the task for LAM.
 - iii. Windy will update Basecamp for the LAM membership.
 - iv. Coordinate meetings with stakeholder group meetings so people can fully participate without driving back and forth across the rim.

X. Charter Revision Update, *Marcus Selig*

- As requested at the last Stakeholder Group meeting, Pascal reviewed Charter. The Charter did not state one representative per organization as originally intended, so the group agreed to amend the Charter to add this now.
- While reviewing the Charter, Marcus noticed grammatical errors and outlining hierarchy inconsistencies. On the Steering Committee call, some expressed concern that correcting these might have made substantive changes.
- DECISIONS regarding Charter:
 - Add language for one vote per organization now.
 - Discuss whether grammatical and hierarchical revisions constitute substantive changes on the next Steering Committee call.
 - Open the Charter to substantive amendments in October (as provided in the Charter).

XI. 5 Remaining CFLRP Projects

- 5 Remaining Projects:
 - Timber Mesa: Proposed Action acceptable (relevant acreage = 5,000)
 - Upper Beaver Creek & Jones: Injunction lifted; no remaining concerns (relevant acreage = 2,000 on Upper Beaver Creek and 600 on Jones)
 - McKraken: remaining concerns (relevant acreage = 3,550)

- Rim Lakes:
 - Remaining concerns (relevant acreage = 5,000)
 - No Proposed Action yet
 - Currently slated: Match & Funded with CFLRP \$
 - Indicators not being collaboratively identified
- DECISIONS: The group used the Decision Rules from its Charter to reach the following:
 1. 143 of the 144 projects are “Collaboratively identified as a CFLRP project (plus some language from CFLRP Act)”
 2. Timber Mesa: All highest level of agreement: “Agreement without Reservations”
 3. Upper Beaver Creek: All highest of agreement: “Agreement without Reservations”
 4. Jones: All highest level of agreement: “Agreement without Reservations”
 5. McKraken: All highest level of agreement: “Agreement without Reservations” EXCEPT GCT, CBD, AZFRP, & ERI:
 - c. Agreement with Reservations:
 - ERI (Amy: sanitation cuts)
 - AZFRP (Pascal: sanitation logging)
 - d. No Clear Agreement:
 - GCT (Marcus: Sanitation logging, large trees, mistletoe, extent project removes large trees to create regeneration; we have flexibility to not include
 - CBD (Todd: regular list of reasons)
 6. Rim Lakes
 - Do NOT include in CFLRP Report: All highest level of agreement: “Agreement without Reservations”
 - Stakeholder Group desires collaboration with USFS on this project: All highest level of agreement: “Agreement without Reservations”
 - Steering Committee will develop a letter in collaboration with the Stakeholder Group that will go to Forest Service (perhaps the Regional Office and the Forests).

XII. Next Steps

- Marcus, Amy, Todd, and Pascal will send Debra their reservation language on McKraken
- Add CFLRP Act language to Decisions on projects
- Amy & Debra work on designing lessons learned sessions on eastside and westside for first analysis area
- Steering Committee
 - Rim Lakes (first draft of letter to USFS) for review by Stakeholder Group
 - Facilitator Scope of Work & invitations to facilitators
 - Charter discussion regarding grammatical
 - Update letter to USFS on CFLRP
- LAM
 - Amy work with Debra to set up a meeting on lessons learned
 - WMS Monitoring Board
 - Natural Resources Work Group
 - Send to Steering Committee regarding fiscal award
 - Socioeconomic
- Map / Canopy Cover Issues next steps
 - Revise map by changing the color of the wilderness areas.

- Rename map “Post-Treatment Forest Openness.”
- Address large tree issues.
- Address design features (Implementation Plan).
- Complete Forest Plan Amendment language.
- Amy perform crosswalk with post-treatment fire behavior.
- Toggle this map with current (existing conditions).
- Show/tell why we are doing this. (Henry says this is already mapped).
- Henry work with Forest Supervisors to display the foregoing in late June (prior to publishing the DEIS).

Per Todd: This is a huge step forward. We are not there yet, but we are coming together and getting there.

Per Sharon (ERI): The map will look even more heterogeneous at a smaller scale.

XIII. Plus / Delta

Participants generated the following pluses and deltas for today’s meeting:

- Plus:
 - Used decision making process (Decision Rules)
 - Good reports
 - People came prepared
 - More open and honest
- Delta
 - Develop decision questions prior to meeting