



Minutes  
4FRI Stakeholders Meeting  
Wednesday  
September 25, 2013  
9AM-1PM

**Flagstaff: Supervisor's Office, 1824 S. Thompson St. (928) 527-3600**

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

Attendance: Buck Swaney, Katherine Sanchez-Meador, Steve Gatewood, Paul Summerfelt, Ethan Aumack, Ann Mottek Lucas, Yvonne Reinink, Wally Covington, Tommie Martin, Diane Vosick, Dave Tenney, Hunter Moore, Earl Stewart, Dick Fleishman, Dave Dorum, Gary Moore, Amy Waltz, Eli Lauren-Bernstein, Pascal Berlioux, Kevin Boness, Don Berry, Tom Olsen, Tom Mackin, Ron Lee,

On the phone: Jerry Payne, Russ Winn, Billy Hughes, Henry Provencio, Todd Schulke, Rob Davis,

9:00            **Introductions**

9:05            **Approval of 8.28 SHG meeting minutes**

9:10            **Approval of 8.28 Action Items**

9:15            **Call to the Public**

9:20            **USFS Updates**

- The response to DEIS comments are ~ 1 month from being completed, and new alternatives may be considered as a result of analyzing comments.
- New task orders have been release (15K acres) for FY2013, and another 24K acres expected for 2014. (Fiscal Year = Oct-Sep) [see photo, and Dick will try to make this map & data available to the SHG soon]
- Monitoring coordinator position is still in process.
- FY 2013 (OCT 1, 2012-SEP 30, 2013) CFLRP annual report due end of November-Stakeholders need to provide match/leveraged funds estimates to Eli by Oct 24<sup>th</sup>. Examples: city projects, Apache County projects, mills (Vagaan bros), GFFP cost share on West Route 66, Perkins work, NFF grant, AZGF grant.... Eli and Dick to work on this.

- Silviculture position (detail to replace Neil) is in process with forest supervisors...no idea when this will be filled.

#### Question and Answer with USFS:

Q: what are the duration and acreage of the new task orders?

A: They vary from 18 months-3 years—Dick to try and send these details to Eli for BASECAMP posting

Q: Is there a spatial and temporal plan for the sequencing of task orders. Can you share this, with the proper disclaimers?

A: Yes, and they are in a very draft form. Will be shared (see above).

Q: When will NEPA be finished?

A: Definitely will require > 1 month. ROD in early-mid 2014.

Q: What more can you share about additional alternatives?

A: Not much, but they are related to the expected issues. Not likely that the SHG will be directly involved in the details, as supervisors work through the alternatives.

Q: What is the next NEPA product to be released?

A: The draft ROD in 2014. Will be on the USFS site.

#### 9:25 **Contractor updates**

No update today from Marlin.

Pascal provided brief review of Good Earth Power (GEP). GEP is preparing to make a substantial presentation at October meeting.

Tommie and Dave are both optimistic and encouraged by what they see in GEP.

Oct 2, 9:30 donuts and coffee and 10-12 at the Payson library meet 'n greet with GEP and local dignitaries. Stakeholders are welcomed. Call in number will be an option (877-820-7831, 691102#). Apache county meeting with GEP on Oct 7<sup>th</sup>.

9:35

## **Stakeholder Disclosures and Accountability**

Paul: The City of Flagstaff will have a meeting with Payson on OCT 1 to discuss the Flagstaff Watershed Protection Project. He also asked Todd about the accuracy of the AP story in which Robin Silver was quoted regarding “some Stakeholders” being doubtful of GEP’s credentials and concerns about GEP logging large trees. Todd responded by suggesting Paul ask the reporter about her references to “some stakeholders” as well as encouraged Paul to talk to Robin directly for the full story.

Henry: A reminder that the USFS recently issued a Press Release on the corporate profile of GEP and a short piece on new 4FRI task orders.

Diane: Claudine LoMonaco is planning to do a story [for HCN?] on “ERI’s role in the 4FRI”. Windy Selig was called for an interview.

ERI has had recent discussions with Kirkpatrick and Gosar’s office about the white paper.

Pascal: from the ECO side, there are 2 upcoming meetings planned with GEP with Apache and Navajo counties.

Steve: GFFP has been talking with Kirkpatrick staff about the Vilsack letter/White Paper.

GFFP will also be releasing an editorial to Daily Sun about novation outcome...“4FRI back on track”.

Pascal: had meeting with Jerry Brownlow (Kirkpatrick’s office) about the white paper.

Also, FATCO reopened last week and Joe Waters contacted Pascal, asking PB to be a business plan advisor for FATCO. PB has not met with JW yet, but conversation has been started and will continue for a number of months. PB to represent ECO on this.

Dave Tenney: He recently had lunch with Clint Chanler & Buchanan Davis (Flake’s office). Also recently discussed removal of biomass, and biofuels with Jason Rosamond.

10:15

## **White Paper discussion – GFFP (Steve Gatewood)**

***“What happened on this issue w/in Stakeholder Group up to this point, and what are we trying to achieve?” (Buck)***

GFFP, believing that the Vilsack letter/white paper (wp) misrepresented and could potentially negatively affect the 4FRI, decided to respond directly to congressional staff. During that time they made an unconventional request to the 4FRI SHG to “vote” (agree/disagree) on 4 issues in the wp (see below), the results of which they planned to include in their response to delegates.

1. “It appears that the Forest Service has ignored the stakeholders painstakingly formulated solutions to long-standing problems in the planning process so far.”
  2. “...the Forest Service planners must incorporate key collaboratively developed documents, including the *Large Tree Retention Strategy, as written*, into the first project EIS.”
  3. “Also, the effort has not received the kind of scientific scrutiny needed to assure credibility for a project of this scale” and “To ensure that the project is based on the strongest science, the Secretary of Agriculture should commission a high-level science review of the first project plan, led by unbiased, independent science experts that have not participated in the stakeholder group itself.”
  4. “This will require that a strong and scientifically rigorous adaptive management plan be developed and funding directed from the federal government to implement the plan.”
- The SHG feels strongly that GFFP’s process of polling stakeholders was unacceptable and clearly outside the guidance of the 4FRI Charter. As a result, the “vote” was dropped and a general discussion of if/how the SHG itself might respond to the wp commenced.

In that discussion the following points were raised:

**i. What’s the status of the wp?**

1. Ron Lee (Kirkpatrick staffer) was at the SHG meeting and shared that 4FRI is a top priority for Kirkpatrick, particularly with respect to jobs and forest health. They recognized that the Vilsack letter was meant to target the old contract (Pioneer) and is now basically a moot point. The letter did not go public...it only went to Vilsack. Kirkpatrick’s office now wants to work closely with 4FRI moving towards a successful EIS. Ron committed to

2. contacting the Stakeholder Group in the future when they take action on behalf of the group.

**ii. What's bad about the wp?**

1. The issue of calling 4FRI scientific credibility (i.e. request for a Blue Ribbon Panel) into question at this level has not occurred to date. What "science" is the wp calling to be reviewed; 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> analysis area? The LTRS is a social science issue not a natural science issue. Do we believe the USFS has ignored SH concerns as the wp suggests?
2. When policymaker's opinions with actionable implications to SHG come into play, we have to respond. But if that's the case then why didn't the SHG weigh in on the McCain letter? We need to also consider that the SHG's role in responding to political delegations is a sensitive matter and needs to be treated seriously...we don't want to insinuate that delegates have acted inappropriately by drafting this letter, but we need them to respectfully respond and be accountable on actions/documents that they are associated with.
3. The SHG's Accountability & Disclosure process has been ignored with respect to the unannounced release of this white paper. In their defense, the reason why there was no disclosure by ECO at last SH meeting was that ECO felt the need to protect trust with its political affiliations (such as Kirkpatrick's office) by not leaking information before it is delivered to those delegates.
4. Further delays to the 4FRI. The Sierra Nevada framework has been mentioned as the exemplar for stronger scientific oversight of the 4FRI, but that scientific oversight took 10 years and 25 million dollars...and was never implemented.

**iii. How should the SHG respond to the white paper and/or similar future issues?**

1. Many felt that responding to these types of issues was a waste of time. Others felt that the SHG should develop a clear, Charter-driven process for responding to issues/actions that are (a) outside actions by federal agencies or Congress that can "directly affect" the agreed upon 4FRI process or (b) "mis-represent the 4FRI SHG" on positions that we have already taken (DEIS, etc), and/or that (c) negatively affect the potential funding of 4FRI? An

2. alternative: we could use our Decision Rules to append comments by organization on these WP points...characterizing our opinions in a responsible way.
3. The bickering/in-fighting between SHs has been grueling over the years and needs to be addressed at the root to get it to stop. What really, is the work of 4FRI anymore?

iv. **What are the bigger issues that the wp brings up for the SHG?**

1. The EIS could become a dangerous platform for these types of issues if we don't get clear about what our positions are and make room for agreeing/disagreeing before the FEIS. The SHG has multiple worldviews and strategies. Some SHs are relatively pleased with quality/timeline/risks with the current release of a ROD; others think we are heading towards a litigation cliff. We have 2 issues: trust and conflicting worldviews. We should move beyond the smaller issues of the Vilsack letter and the wp to identify the deep divide w/in the group ("precipice" issues) and how that promises to pull the group even further apart in the near future. Let's click through the science issues to ask what would need to be done to avoid litigation! To start, let's get a feel for where individuals stand on the "precipice" issues; without attaching outcomes or expectations.
  - a. LTRS & other SHG DEIS comments
  - b. Blue ribbon panel
  - c. Etc...

12:30      **Multi-party Monitoring Board presentation - Eli**

USFS announced that they plan to include the Monitoring and Adaptive Management Plan verbatim as an appendix in the FEIS.

Eli presented on the CFLRA requirements for multi-party monitoring. Multi-party monitoring is required, but unlike the pilot Stewardship Contracting Authority which covered the White Mountain Stewardship Contract a Multi-party monitoring board is not specifically required. The GEP contract does not require a Monitoring Board. He also presented on the 4FRI Proposal expectations, and potential monitoring board scenarios (3). The goal of the presentation was identify an appropriate structure to seek SH approval by the Oct. meeting.

- Add job descriptions and/or expectations for participation in a monitoring board/ committee.

- Also need to identify key knowledge needs within the committee (e.g., wildlife bio, landscape ecologist, etc) and solicit participation from these – either inside or outside of the SHG.
- Request to limit size for functionality.
- (All comments above could be addressed through a charter process – this would be a much more specific charter than the other working groups).
- Recommend a separate committee, because of awareness that if the LAM absorbed the role of monitoring board there is still a LAM need for east-side assessments. Suggest a Monitoring Board Committee, and the LAM (east side focused).
- The thought that all 3 options had some good components and that we should present a “Frankenstein” version as the preferred option for SHG to approve.
- A few comments that seem to conflict:
  - a. Not a working group, but still within SHG – higher level “board” (a new designation).
  - b. Working group with a very specific charter (as in point 4 above) that maintains neutrality.
  - c. Recommendations go to SHG for final approval.

**Amy’s synopsis:** There was high support and even the mandate from the Act to hold the monitoring group within the SHG. Although there is a desire for neutrality, any group within the SHG could be perceived as not neutral. While I understand the sentiment behind this discussion point and desired membership, I’d recommend that a Neutral Process is all that is needed. Where we’ve been successful is when we have utilized a clear process.

NEXT STEP: Eli and Amy to work on an alternative version incorporating SHG comments and email to LAM committee for feedback.

1:00      **4FRI 2013 Self-Assessment** – Buck  
 Survey monkey self-assessment will be sent out in October, then SHG given 2-3 weeks to complete, and then reported on at the Dec 11 meeting.

1:15      **Upcoming Co-chair rotation**  
 Pascal now stepping off as primary co-chair...who will fill? Diane volunteered again only if no one else is willing to step up...perhaps Sue (we will invite her)? Only have 3 potential co-chairs currently (Steve G., Pascal and Diane), which might require us to extend the co-chair terms.

1:20

## Action items & adjourn

### Action Items from 8.28 Meeting

1.	Assemble 2013 CFLR report on leveraged and matching funding October 24-- Dick and Eli
2.	Develop a formal revision to the Charter to decide the threshold for when/how we want to address (recommendations) outside press/documents/positions...as we currently have no mechanism for that. -- SC
3.	Begin a regular discussion of substantive issues that are leading towards the "precipice" (litigation) and have those conversations allow the USFS develop the best FEIS possible – SC (LTRS, Blue Ribbon panel, monitoring commitment)...develop additional
4.	Self-assessment work group (Buck, Steve, Ann and Russ) will finalize the self-assessment over the next 1-2 weeks, send to SHG via BASECAMP, and announce at Oct SHG meeting.
5.	MPMB presentation to be posted on BASECAMP with 4 <sup>th</sup> option and SHG feedback--Eli
6.	USFS get 2013 task order information-- Dick & Henry (Supervisors)
7.	USFS to explore release of 10 year task order plan-- Dick & Henry (Supervisors)
8.	Can USFS include the LTRS as an appendix?—Dick & Henry (Supervisors)
9.	BASECAMP posting of Tommie's invite to meet with GEP in Payson--Eli

**Next Meetings: 10/23 – Twin Arrows (GEP); 12/11 – Winslow; 1/29 – Flagstaff**

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