



4FRI Stakeholders Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, July 28, 2011, 9 AM - 3:45 PM

Call-in number: 1-877-686-0400, passcode 7747488210

Arizona Game & Fish Department Office, 2878 E White Mountain Blvd, Pinetop, AZ

Approval of 6/22/11 Minutes: No changes/ Minutes Approved

NAU's Case History of 4FRI - *Windy Greer and Erik Nielsen:*

Objectives

1. Provide opportunity for all 4-Fri participants to contribute to history from multiple perspectives
2. Identify critical antecedents and precedents (conditions, events and processes) that have led to the formation, structure and organizational development of 4-Fri
3. Establish the birth date of 4Fri (the coining of the term and the coming together of the 4-forests)
4. Identify linkages between critical events or factors
5. Rank those antecedent conditions and precedents most critical in contributing to the formation of the 4FRI

Participatory Activity

Using definitions provided for the categories, stakeholders reviewed the timeline and added antecedents, precedents, and critical elements that contributed to the formation of the 4FRI. Stakeholders drew lines on the timeline posters to demonstrate how items related to or influenced one another.

Five categories of events relevant to the history of this collaborative effort are defined as:

1. Key Decisions: Significant decisions made within the 4FRI Stakeholder group, with the USFS, and within the USFS.
2. 4FRI Products: Key 4FRI related products
3. Ecological Events: Significant ecological events effecting forest resources, management and policy.
4. Policy/Legal: National, regional and local forest management policies and conflicts
5. Constituency Events: Collaborative processes where stakeholders, ecological issues, and assessment activities came together
6. Science Assessments: Evolving science, evidence and joint knowledge building
7. Wrap up and ranking

Please continue to email Windy (windy.greer@nau.edu) additions, edits, revisions, etc. to the timeline and case history.

4FRI Team Progress & Proposed Action

- Earl Stewart will be Acting Deputy Regional Forester in Albuquerque, NM starting August 8 for the next three months. Kristen Bale will take over as Coconino Forest Supervisor. Earl will remain involved 4FRI.
- Budget meetings are scheduled for August 29th, 30th and September 1st.
- The RPA, is in internal review right now and by tomorrow there will be results from the review.
- There will another week to incorporate comments. On August 11th the Notice of Intent will come out.
- The two week public comment period will be the 11th through the 26th.
- Public meetings are scheduled for Thursday 18th, Williams Ranger District, 4:30-7:30 PM, Saturday 20th, Coconino SO from 10-2 PM.

- Proposal offered by Earl Stewart: By end of Friday, 5th the information from regional office will be included in the revised proposed action. A working draft of the revised proposed action will be posted on the web for review from Friday through Wed. Comments can be given to Earl by COB Wednesday. **Proposal accepted.**
- **Decision:** Steering Committee will post comments on the revised proposed action by end of the day Tuesday 2nd and post it to Basecamp for Stakeholder review with 24 hour deadline to comment. Comments will be forwarded to FS by close of business on Wednesday.

Individual Outreach efforts:

- Fox 10 news Sunday a.m. with Rob Davis and Pat Graham discussing need for industry in 4FRI
- Marcus Selig is pulling together all the media efforts that have been put forward by individuals
- The resolution for full funding for the CFLR was forwarded to the staff of Congressman Gossar to support the amendment he was bringing to the floor of congress calling for full funding. His staff responded by saying that if the amendment passes a press release will be issued acknowledging the 4FRI Resolution. CoChairs will be sending a letter to each member of our congressional delegation with a copy of the resolution urging for full funding.
- The Dorris Foundation has contacted ERI and the GCT to discuss how they may provide funding to 4FRI.

Wallow Fire Q&A development for the field trip–

- Effects of fire in different treated areas
- Owl PAC habitat condition
- Fire effect mitigation related to tree condition
- Effects of direct fire vs. heat intensity
- Limited ability to treat slopes
- Accommodate “places at risk”
- Strategic placement and strategic sequencing
- Does shelf stock need to be included
- Can large fires be ended?
- How did prevention (WUI) work?
- Impact of previous fires on fire effects
- What was status of treatment areas (slash, etc.)?
- Think about “What if” (e.g. WMSC). What could have happened if that information has been translated into treatments? Review historical decisions.
- Look for sites where forest structure was restored by the fire.

Dialogue on Important Issues: Salvage Logging – Dennis

Stakeholder discussion developed some questions and considerations for the Wallow Fire Field Trip:

- What resulted in areas treated with (X)" caps in place? Particularly canopy survival and fire patterns? What fire behaviors were there at the site?
- Did slopes left untreated owing to difficulty of access have any apparent impact on adjacent/surrounding areas?
- Was there any difference in outcomes in Owl PACs compared with other areas, in terms of overall impact?
- Was there any discernible difference in treated areas between active fire entry versus direct heat exposure?

- Did the size of any given observed treatment area seem to have any impact on results post-fire, both in the area, and in areas adjacent?
- At comparable forest type sites, what differences were observed under different fire behaviors? (day/night; wind/calm; fire line/no line, etc.)
- What can we learn about the impacts of sequencing and distribution of types of treatment within that sequence?
- What differences in ground conditions (especially slash) seemed to make a difference (or no difference) in impact in comparable areas?
- Is there a need to designate critical habitat areas, watersheds, etc., in a similar manner as Wildland Urban Interface areas are now delineated?

US Institute – Annual Evaluation of 4FRI – Dennis Bowker, Larry Fisher, Debra Drechsel, Patricia Lewis:

Suggestions for methodology: anonymous, efficiency, follow through, required?

Volunteers will assist Dennis in developing a self-evaluation that will be administered by a second party in the first year.

Annual Evaluation Development Working Group: Anne Mottek Lucas, Windy Greer, Erik Nielsen, Marcus Selig, Amy Waltz, Ed Smith, FS member (Henry, Dick)

Each 4FRI working group will contribute questions to Annual Evaluation Development Working Group.

Methodology suggestions included from the discussion:

- The survey should be anonymous.
- It should be efficient.
- Follow through from the group will be necessary for the survey to be effective.
- Should the survey be required or voluntary?
 - Suggestion that at least one representative from each stakeholder organization must complete the survey.
 - Is making the evaluation mandatory premature? What Impact might that have?

Value:

- Outcome-oriented (process important, but should take a backseat)
- Continuous improvement
- What does “success” mean for 4FRI
- Identify stumbling blocks
- Use minimum data set necessary
- Address timeliness, completeness, and effectiveness
- Incorporate working relationship with the Forest Service

Suggestion: Generate quantitative measures outside the survey

Suggestion: Look at national survey for ideas

Annual Evaluation Work Group:

- Will be facilitated by Dennis
- Participants: Ed, Ann, Windy, Erik, Marcus, Amy, Matt, and Forest Service (Henry, Dick, or Neil)
- Will take the proposed evaluation structure, revise it as needed, generate questions (indicators) under each category of the structure, and define the evaluation methodology
- Each of the other Working Groups should feed questions to the Annual Evaluation Working Group

Discussion:

- Two perspectives: (1) If this is a self-evaluation, the Forest Service shouldn't fill out the Annual Evaluation survey; rather the collaborative should evaluate itself. (2) We are looking for ways to bring the collaborative and the Forest Service closer together; therefore we should evaluate ourselves together.
- How do the following fit together: Collaborative, Forest Service, Regional Office; Stakeholder Group?
- What is 4FRI?

Timeline:

- August 14: Annual Evaluation Working Group will send a draft survey to the stakeholder group
- August 24 Stakeholder Meeting: Stakeholders discuss draft survey
- August 31: 4FRI (Dennis or Ed?) send final survey to U.S. Institute
- September: U.S. Institute administers evaluation
- Prior to October 26: (If stakeholder group agrees) U.S. Institute will send Annual Evaluation results to BaseCamp for posting.
- October 26 Stakeholder meeting: U.S. Institute will present Annual Evaluation survey results, facilitate a discussion of the results, and facilitate the generation of action items and priorities; U.S. Institute also will facilitate a discussion regarding facilitation for the coming year

Identifying social, economic, and political indicators for monitoring progress toward desired conditions –

Anne Mottek Lucas

- Adaptive Management, the group should “ruthlessly embrace uncertainty”.
- Need to develop a structured processes to test hypotheses
- Emphasis needs to be equally balanced between economic vs. other attributes.
- Economics may be second to Ecological?
- New adapted DFC's require revisiting documents.
- Articulate whether questions are new DFC's.
- Need to understand public outlooks/desires/needs

Work Group Updates

Science and Monitoring, *Matt Williams*

- Effects of big fires information has been uploaded to Basecamp. Amy Waltz and David Huffman are pulling together information from the ERI. Please post additional information on Basecamp or email Matt Williamson at mwilliamson@grandcanyontrust.org.

Landscape Strategy, *Mark Sensibaugh*

- The group is currently focused on the prioritization and strategic placement of treatments.

Fiscal, *Matt Williams for Marcus Selig*

- Fiscal Working Group meeting on August 9- how to raise funds around Monitoring; anyone interested in that discussion should attend.

NAU's Case History of 4FRI - Windy Greer and Erik Nielsen:

Prioritization exercise: This was a group participatory exercise. Individuals placed stickers on the “Before 4FRI” timelines to identify a prioritization of events that were critical to the development of 4FRI.

August meeting is scheduled for 8/24/11 at the Coconino Supervisor Office in Flagstaff.