



**4FRI Stakeholder Group Meeting**  
Wednesday, May 24<sup>th</sup>, 2017 9am-12:05pm  
Coconino National Forest Supervisor's Office  
1824 South Thompson Street  
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

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

## 9:00 Introductions

Diane Vosick, Melanie Colavito, Pascal Berlioux, Travis Bruner, Tom Mackin, Steve Rosenstock, Arron Green, Jay Smith, Greg Smith, Dick Fleishman, Brienne Petit, Art Babbott, Annette Fredette, Patrick Moore, Bruce Greco, Patrick Rappold, Matt Cole, Nate Rees, Joe Miller, Sue Sitko, Neil Chapman, Ann Mottek, Jim Parks, Allison Jourden, Ken Ribelin, Brad Worsley, Steve Reidhead

Bob Seidler, Steve Best, Todd Schulke, Scott Russell, Steven Flora, Buck Sanchez, Henry Provencio

**9:05 Approve minutes from the April 26<sup>th</sup> SHG meeting** — Travis Bruner – Approved with edit from D. Vosick regarding SHG meeting policy on providing presentation materials to support a motion on the Friday prior to a SHG meeting at which a vote will take place (page 3). It's agreed that people who want action at an upcoming SHG meeting make available all supporting documents and materials on Basecamp by the Friday prior to the meeting at which an action will take place. No substantive changes can be made to these materials after the Monday prior to the meeting.

**9:10 Review action items from the April 26<sup>th</sup> SHG meeting** — Travis Bruner

Action Item	Lead	Status
1. Send out agenda for May 16 <sup>th</sup> meeting in Williams	FS	Complete
2. Annette send potential date for earlier field trip to the planning WG	Annette Fredette	Complete
3. FS present date for Vision 17 presentation	Henry Provencio	Complete
4. Co-Chairs sign and send Dwarf Mistletoe position letter to USFS	Co-chairs	Complete

**9:15 Call to the Public** - None

**9:20 USFS Update** – 4FRI Board, Coordinators

- **Vision 17 - Strategic Plan Framework** – Scott Russell & Brienne Pettit

The strategic plan is being put together for 4FRI and is part of the structuring that they're doing associated with the program. The strategic plan is composed of the ideas from Vision 17 in a different container/format. The Forest Service hopes the strategic plan to become the 4FRI plan

collectively. The plan provided on Basecamp on the Friday prior to this meeting is primarily relevant to the Forest Service, so it definitely still requires work to incorporate the SHG. The plan needs review by the group to determine who might be best suited to handle each different task outlined in the plan, whether that be the Forest Service or the various Stakeholders in the group. Some tasks may be for the Forest Service, the SHG, or both. The intention at this meeting is to do a high-level review of the plan and to save the detailed work divvying up tasks for the strategic plan meeting that will be discussed later.

This strategic plan includes action items to be taken, but there is a level of detail below this document that outlines the plans of some of the components, like implementation of DxP and the plan associated with the RFP. The strategic plan is a generalized plan arching over the entirety of the work planned by the FS.

This plan functions as a form of strategic umbrella and it has program components with more detail. The plan is made of three parts: operating norms to articulate how work will be done, goal statements, and strategic objectives to determine what will be focused on.

The program components functions as a form of table of contents. It shows program areas and components associated with each area. Each box in the program components break down into an objective and strategies associated with accomplishing each objective, and identified action items. This is the portion the group needs to review heavily to determine who will take responsibility for which action item, in order to make this a collective plan.

The Forest Service's next step is to propose a meeting for the group to flesh out the rest of the strategic plan. The intention is to do a broad overview of the plan and to then break into sub groups to work on individual components. The meeting would be forest services facilitated but the break out groups are planned to be stakeholder facilitated. Those who volunteer to facilitate will plan to be less involved in the content of the session and more involved with managing the flow of the meeting and discussions. Those with deep rooted interest and concerns for the issues should not volunteer to facilitate.

Questions?

Bruner – What is the FS is thinking concerning biomass and its mandatory removal, with regards to this plan? As discussions for an open RFP take place, the FS is thinking that they may do it similarly to the first RFP in that biomass removal will be highly rated in terms of the rating of proposals that are received on this bid, but will not be a requirement for all proposals coming in. The RFP will be open and inclusive of proposal but biomass removal will score a proposal a higher rating.

Worsley – Was biomass removal not mandatory on the first EIS? Was the requirement to remove biomass contractual? Is there a FS document that requires the removal of biomass? Why is mechanical thinning bottlenecked by biomass removal if biomass removal isn't mandatory? Biomass removal was not mandatory on the first EIS. The FS doesn't want to be in a position where they feel that any action taken that doesn't result in full desired conditions doesn't count towards ultimate restoration objectives. They've accepted that some steps towards desired conditions may not involve the removal of biomass but they should still be taken in efforts toward restoring the forests. The FS doesn't want to close themselves off to

restoration possibilities simply because a plan for biomass removal is not in place with each contract acquired. In some cases they can only take partial steps towards restoration.

Berlioux – The first RFP didn't call for mandatory biomass removal but it allowed bidder to propose a biomass removal plan. The biomass plans were indeed highly scored, so many bidders submitted complete and extensive biomass plans. The biomass proposal made by Pioneer was ultimately adopted into the contract and made biomass removal mandatory. The entire Pioneer contract and the 6<sup>th</sup> amendment of the RFP is posted on the 4FRI.org website. Pascal brings up a correction to the website that it states the contract and its amendments are posted while it's actually the RFP's amendments that are available on the site.

Berlioux – As long as we continue not to mandate the removal of biomass, there is no incentive to do so. Pascal suggests that if the FS starts mandating biomass removal they will inspire the conditions for a biomass facility to arise and exist.

Vosick – In terms of this becoming a collaborative document, there may be things that the SHG would want to include that would be against FS policy, like policy options for maintaining funding for 4FRI and looking at policy remedies like the environment portfolio standard. So there are some policy supply chain issues that the SHG might have more power to promote than the Forest Service. When this planning meeting occurs, the group should figure out how they'll handle those things that the FS can't promote but that the SHG has power to promote to help the initiative.

The FS presents potential dates for the Strategic Plan Meeting and the group decides on Monday, June 19<sup>th</sup> as a date for the strategic plan meeting and anything that comes out of that meeting will be brought to and discussed at the following SHG meeting on the 28<sup>th</sup>. The meeting will be located in Flagstaff and times are TBD, consider blocking the entire day. A first draft of the plan should be done by July. Volunteers to help coordinate the meeting are Brienne Petit, Pascal Berlioux, Allison Jourden, Ann Mottek, and Travis Bruner. Those interested in facilitating the subgroups are Melanie Colavito, Ann Mottek...

- **RFP Next Steps** – Scott Russell & Dick Fleishman

Right now the FS is reviewing the previous RFP to determine what can be learned and what can be used for the 2<sup>nd</sup> RFP. At this point the FS is not planning to collect public comment or recommendations on that, but they will be accepted if people have thoughts on the first RFP. They're also evaluating the effectiveness of issuing an RFI prior to the RFP. The RFI would be a focus on questions needed to improve the quality and success of the RFP, like how many acres people would want to look at and where they will be located. The decision on issuing an RFI hasn't been made yet, but this shouldn't change the schedule for issuing the RFP in the fall.

Berlioux – Pascal points out that one of the challenges faced by the first RFP was that the numbers and locations of acres to be treated weren't yet specified when the RFP went out because the NEPA was not complete. He suggests that the issue of characterization of these acres is important to everyone in the industry and recommends that when the RFP goes out, the acres are clearly specified for bidders.

Berlioux – Are the FS and SHG still planning on tapping the expertise of the Industry Working Group while developing the RFP? If the IWG were to invite the FS to an informational session

about the RFP, would the FS be interested in attending? Russell says that they are not planning to request recommendations from the stakeholders specific to the RFP. If the SHG decides to do some work and provide recommendations, the FS would be more than willing to accept them.

Worsley – On May 15<sup>th</sup>, Arizona Commissioner Dunn is opening a docket to explore the unique role that forest bioenergy play in Arizona and the impact on the state. The Arizona Corporate Commission has opened a docket to explore forest biomass potential as a renewable energy credit. This provides a mechanism for the state to build a biomass facility.

Vosick – Diane is concerned at the potential to have our industry folks disqualified from the bidding if conflict of interest laws between industry and the FS are violated.

Berlioux – These interactions taking place in public settings essentially protects the FS and industry from conflict of interest, according to legalities defined during the first RFP discussions.

Worsley – The difference between a docket and a PPA

- **USFS Updates**

Operations – Fleishman

We're currently transitioning from prescribed to wildfire season. Seven harvesting sales are underway currently. There is a lot of activity going on.

Planning – Fredette

There was great turnout for the first dwarf mistletoe field trip with 32 attendees. They're working on the itinerary for the 3rd trip which will take place on June 8<sup>th</sup> in the A-S NF. Right now planning is developing alternatives and setting up analyses.

Provencio – TNC agreement is moving along. They're hoping to be in the woods by the end of June. The agreement is 20,000 acres between 8 projects which are planned to be completed in 5 years. They're moving forward on a jointly funded position between the FS, the Wild Turkey Foundation, and Game and Fish. They're hoping to have that position in place by the end of August 2017. That grant agreement process is still in the works. Will be working on comprehensive implementation projects across the 4 forests.

**10:40 Water Field Trip June 9– Joe Miller**

Joe distributes a flyer for the aquatics field trip. This field trip was put together by the planning working group and is a collaboration between AZG&F and the FS. Contact Jamie Clark at [jclark@azgfd.gov](mailto:jclark@azgfd.gov) for questions. Stephanie Coleman and Annette will be involved in the presentations. To Sign up, call Jamie or Joe Miller. Representation from the tribes will be in attendance.

**10:45 Break**

**11:00 Working Group Updates – All**

- Planning WG (10 min) – Pascal Berlioux

The last activity of the PWG was the first leg of the dwarf mistletoe field trip that took place with the regional team. The idea was to go and see the outcome of treatments that were already performed so they visited locations on the Kaibab National Forest. The second leg of the process is a field trip taking place on the 8<sup>th</sup> of June. This time they will visit infested stands in the footprint of the first EIS. Much of what they saw on the Kaibab was generally well-received in terms of treatment and effectiveness. They were looking at fairly traditional treatments involving some over-story and canopy cover. They're interested in looking at a new generation type of treatment, that they can call isolation treatment, to create "donuts" around infested stands that are downwind, to start the propagation of the disease. The SHG is invited to the field trip on June 8<sup>th</sup> and they hope to see as many people as possible. Posting Logistics on BC.

The aquatics/water resource field trip is taking place on June 9<sup>th</sup>. Trying to adopt the idea of comprehensive restoration on the 2<sup>nd</sup> EIS. This is a field trip purposed to take a look at water and riparian restoration possibilities.

- Industry WG (10 min) – Brad Worsley

IWG is not meeting actively, currently. They're focusing efforts on attending and supporting the various field trips occurring right now. They're preparing for the RFP and potential efforts needed there. They are meeting and supporting the FS as needed.

- Communications WG (10 min) – Sue Sitko

A full communications WG is now functioning with members including Sue Sitko, Tayloe Dubay (ERI), Ann Anderson, Pascal Berlioux, Kelly Wolf-Krauter, Jay Smith, and Brienne Petit. The group had a call recently to reassess group priorities. After reviewing the charter and the CWG, they started discussing what is happening now and what the SHG needs from them. They've identified a few emerging issues that they believe they can help with, including improving social understanding of smoke and managed fire, as there is a role to play in improving public understanding of this. An increase in treatments are going on and effects to communities are happening including forest access, truck traffic, treatment appearances, impacts on forest floor and other aspects of restoration treatments. Most of these issues are socially driven. The CWG is working to prepare message points to respond to complaints on these issues. The FS is developing signs to be placed in treatment areas to respond to frequently occurring concerns regarding treatments.

The CWG will initiate working monthly meetings to try and hammer out some draft language on these issues and they hope to have a draft of something at the June meeting.

Berlioux – Pascal compliments the CWG as it's transitioned from a reactive group to a proactive group, under Sue's leadership.

Newsletter ideas for July newsletter to be distributed at July meeting: Outcomes of DMT field trips, the Aquatics field trip, Mexican spotted owl article, an article about the aquatics flexible toolbox, GFFP fire wise landscaping contest, information about wildfire managed for resource benefits, SHG Volunteer field trip. The CWG should have a draft newsletter at the June meeting.

- MPMB WG (10 min) – Steven Flora

The last MPMB meeting talked about the scope of work for 4FRI economics monitoring. Some funding issues on the budget have arisen that the group is waiting for finalizations on. Some of the other projects on the budget for this upcoming year are songbird analysis, a 4FRI monitoring storyboard by TNC, LCI ground plots, and the SSI that wasn't in the monitoring board budget but spring surveys through the FS will be conducted on the Rim Country on about 80 springs. There are talks of two Americorps positions to do some monitoring on these ground plots next year.

- Comprehensive Implementation WG (10 min) – Travis Bruner

The group is on schedule for T-Six spring restoration project happening late summer/early fall. Tom Mackin is leading a field trip to restore some sheep fence with pronghorn friendly fence. Dick is working with Noah Bard at the forest service to develop a database of potential restoration projects. At the group's last meeting, Rebecca Davidson and Spencer Plumb from NAFF joined and are interested in coordinating projects with the group and have some funding available for spring restoration projects. July 13<sup>th</sup> is the group's next meeting and they're hoping for that to be a meeting in the field to see potential restoration sites. In August they're meeting at The Nature Conservancy's Hart Prairie Preserve.

**11:50 Stakeholder Disclosures – All**

Berlioux – A field trip on 5/25 on the Black River organized by ECO, AZGFD, ASNF, and the east side industry. They're looking at potential treatment areas and the bottom line is to assess economic viability of the project. They're meeting at 9am at the alpine district and should be back by 3-4 pm.

Reidhead – Tristar is working full-blown right now and pushing 70-75 loads per day and they're hoping to get to 80+ loads per day soon.

Mottek – GFFP is conducting economic monitoring but Ann will be looking for some external funding, about \$10k, because they are trying to separate the analysis from the survey portion. They're considering community initiative grant.

**12:00 Review Action Items**

<b>Action Item</b>	<b>Lead</b>	<b>Status</b>
1. Post 2 <sup>nd</sup> DMT Field Trip Logistics on Basecamp	Pascal Berlioux	
2. Coordinate strategic plan meeting on June 19 <sup>th</sup>	Travis, Ann, Brienne, Allison, Pascal	
3.		
4.		

**12:05 Adjourn**

**1:05 Fence Replacement Field Trip led by Tom Mackin (if you volunteered)**

**06/28/17 SHG meeting information:**

Wednesday, June 28<sup>th</sup>, 2017, 9am-TBD

Arizona Game & Fish Region 1 Office (Pinetop)

2878 E. White Mountain Blvd., Pinetop, AZ 85935

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

**Future Agenda Items:**

1. Industry Economics around Restoration USFS & AZSF
2. Rim Country Alternatives