



**4FRI Stakeholders' Meeting Minutes, Wednesday, October 24, 2012,**  
Arizona Game & Fish Department Office, 2878 E. White Mtn. Blvd. Pinetop, AZ 85935,  
Call-in Number: 877-686-0400 ~ Passcode: 774-7488-215

**Next Steps and Key Decisions Made at this Meeting**

<p><b>1. Approval of 9/26/12 Minutes:</b> 1. Move Tenney KNAU from disclosure section to Ed's discussion on KNAU. 2. Ed will send revisions to Windy regarding the Industry Resolution discussion and discussion over Pioneer. <b>APPROVED AS AMENDED</b></p>
<p><b>2. Action item from the USFS update:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Dick Fleischman will post the presentation to Basecamp.</li></ul>
<p><b>3. Decision on the Annual Self Evaluation process</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Subgroup will conduct a full analysis including areas of agreement, disagreement, and cross references to 2011 results and will identify action items for collaborative adaptive management.</li><li>• The next presentation for these results will be determined by the Steering Committee.</li></ul>
<p><b>4. Decision on the Charter Revisions and Decision Making process</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The next Stakeholder group meeting will include two agenda topics: the Decision Making process and the Charter revisions. This discussion will occur for as long as it takes to finalize and reach a decision.</li></ul>

**Call to the Public:** None

**Update From the Forest Service – Henry Provencio & Dick Fleishman**

- 1) DEIS Status/NEPA – collaborative review of released draft documents
  - a) The DEIS was sent to the regional office for internal review. There will be an internal meeting on November 5<sup>th</sup> to discuss issues. The DEIS will be sent to publisher in the coming month. Several changes to document based on feedback from fieldtrips, implementation based on questions about clarity. What was offered out to the public was not technically for comments but for information. When it is sent to publisher, it will begin the formal comment period. A projected date will be forthcoming to help inform stakeholders for scheduling meetings to discuss stakeholder input.
- 2) Monitoring Coordinators: There will be a group led by Amy Waltz to define the vision of the MC, where that person will be housed, and how that person would be funded. The programs of work for that position will need to be fully developed. The key challenge is how to make sure this is a multiparty position but with access to USFS database. If people would like to engage in that conversation, please contact Amy Waltz or Sarah Reif.
- 3) Operations Update: Initial 10 year plan focuses for the first 1-3 years on existing NEPA. Other NEPA will fill the end of the 10-year contract. CLFRP Annual Report: Presented detailed PowerPoint on the report.
  - a) 10-year plan: Coordinate surveys, layout mark, ad plan for TOs; coordinate prescribed burning locations and timing; gain input into decisions, accomplish budgeting and monitoring details.
  - b) Prioritization: Discussed how restoration project prioritization occurs on stakeholder candidate areas. Social concerns are first (WUI, Watersheds, Economics), and natural resources came after. High fire risk was also a major criterion. 41,000 acres are programmed for the next two years. This is subject to some NEPA being completed.

- i) Interest expressed in getting started on the next areas. One landscape area has been addressed (the first third), no timetable is currently available for the next contracting process, NEPA process, and prioritization processes.
- c) Finance: Annual report and leveraged funds discussion. Specific concern to ensure that funds aren't double- or triple-counted in the reporting.
- d) Summary of Accomplishments – no time to review. Collaborative encouraged to review on their own.

**Updates from Stakeholders**

- 1) Mike Cooley (Pioneer): It has been 5 months since award of contract. Challenging finance environment has slowed the start of the sawmill. There have been two finance partners and Pioneer is working with two partners still. Activity on specific projects and forestry coordination taking place, Lockheed-Martin meetings/discussions on biofuels aspect of operation (Concorde-Blue). Viewed video of a Romanian production facility that shares many similarities to the facility that will be constructed to support the 4FRI contracts. No pellets or briquette program designed yet.
- 2) Marcus Selig (Grand Canyon Trust): Flagstaff bond issue report – \$10 million bond to support some 4FRI efforts and watershed treatments has made it to the ballot. If it succeeds in the vote, similar efforts may be undertaken in other places after.
- 3) Dick Fleischman and Ed Smith: Gave an update to Flagstaff city council and reported on the resolution in support of industry.

**Annual Evaluation Discussion- Windy Greer**

- 1) The results came in late and have not been carefully analyzed. The Annual Evaluation subcommittee would like to analyze and report carefully over the coming months to prepare for a discussion on the “adaptive management” of the collaborative process as the group did with results from last year in an effort to move forward and update our overall program.
- 2) Action Steps and Timeline: Subgroup needs to conduct a full analysis including areas of agreement, disagreement, and cross references to 2011 results to identify areas that show improvement over the last year and areas that show a need for adaptive management. We will then need to identify action items for collaborative adaptive management. There is a suggestion to change the timeline for revising the overall process for evaluation and charter updating. Request for facilitator to be involved in revisions that result from the evaluation process. All members who are interested are invited to the subgroup meetings. It is suggested to use demographics to ensure representation on the subgroup.

**CFLRP National Monitoring – Collaborative Evaluation Tool responses – Ed Smith**

- 1) Conducted a group survey using a national CFLRP Evaluation Tool Regarding Collaboration. Stakeholders went through each statement and were able to offer a unanimous “vote” for each statement . See below.
  - a) Statement 1: No specific questions. Group quickly moved to consensus on “4 – Agree”.
  - b) Statement 2: Strong division emerged quickly. The collaborative asked whether only one organizational vote standard was in place and the FS players moved back from the table to allow the collaborative to function independently. Group discussed and revised voting and it moved toward “4 – Agree”. This 4 is because one person who maintained a “disagree” acquiesced to the larger group, which was otherwise unanimous.
  - c) Statement 3: No questions or comments. Group voted a 4.
  - d) Statement 4: No questions or comments. Group voted a 4.

- e) Statement 5: There was a specific question about what “implementation” means. Implementation of NEPA analysis or actual restoration. The group defined this as implementation of actual restoration projects on the forest. The group decided to vote 4.
- f) Statement 6: Group clarified that “alignment” was the key word. Most simply didn’t know. Do we not know what the objectives are, do we lack information about where implementation is, or have we simply not thought about the alignment of these two? Group reviewed the successes of 143 accepted/implemented projects and the group settled into a 4 – Agree.
- g) Statement 7: Question reframed to emphasize the word “moving”, and moved to a 5-Strongly Agree.
- h) Statement 8: Specific question about whether the collaboration is speeding the process, or if it was going to happen at anyway. Moreover, are we talking about CFLRP or 4FRI as “the collaborative”. Agreed that this is a question about the 4FRI collaborative’s efforts. Moved to a 5 – Strongly Agree.
- i) Statement 9: Question asked if this is just for 2011. Group agreed that it is since CLFRP funding began. Long discussion on “the path forward” and its renegotiation over and over. So the question emerged whether there was ever formal “agreement” on that. Group agreed to not answer the question based on the thought that our group could not reach agreement on the question as it is posed. Otherwise, it is a “3” to open the comment box with a specific comment that the answer is NOT that “we don’t know”, but that we instead could not agree upon an answer to the question.
- j) Statement 10: No specific comments or questions. Group reported a 4 – Agree.
- k) Statement 11: Based on assumption that it is and will in the future, the Group quickly reports a 4 – Agree.
- l) Statement 12: Yes.

### **Charter Amendment Process**

- 1) The FS prefers to have recommendations that include discussion about reservations or issues.
- 2) There is “angst” about the decision-making, because of confusion about agreement, hostages, progress, public perceptions, and the USFS use of information.
- 3) A workgroup has undertaken a process to attempt to change or update the charter. Reviewed the report, reviewed feedback, argued, and ran scenarios. Revisited objectives of the collaborative and its ability to make decisions. How do we reach agreement generally, and agreement on how to communicate?
  - a) Communication: who is audience, what are objectives, what should the outcomes be?
    - i) Public (state position)
    - ii) FS (make recommendation or state position)
    - iii) Collaborative: Make a decision, assign tasks, and delegate authority.
- 4) Discussion of decision matrix.
  - a) Discussed the prime function being the group ALWAYS striving to achieve the highest level of agreement.
  - b) Discussed the table and the term “Objection”. The group discussed using an alternative word such as “Disagreement” or “In Discussion”. Noted that Acquiescence is in fact “agreement with reservations”.
  - c) Discussed Table 2 and how communication to public and FS partners would occur. There is some concern regarding the approach to recording “majority” vs. “minority” positions. The question is about the use of divisive words that are value-laden. Conversation stalled at the discussion on unanimity.
- 5) McCracken decision-matrix test case update – *Amy Waltz*
  - a) McCracken Discussion: Amy Waltz (NAU). A subgroup applied the new decision framework to the McCracken project as a test case. This involved detailed discussion about the decision matrix, whether it should be a unanimity-, consensus-, or majority-based decision-making process. Debate centered around whether we would “marginalize” the group, losing those who have different perspectives. Some opined that this group should

deliver and report consensus, and that there could be repercussions for delivering reports that lack consensus, document dissention/division, or marginalize participation of some.

- 6) Other Charter amendments – Because of the length of the Decision Matrix discussion, a preview of suggested Charter amendments was not made. This discussion will be **wrapped up in November**.

**Commenting on the Draft EIS – developing a strategy for delivering timely comments**

- 1) Discussed the Collaborative’s desire to have commenting opportunities that are adequate. Collaborative has asked for 90 days and FS has agreed to get them the DEIS as soon as it goes to the publisher, which will in effect allow for a 75-90 day comment period. Collaborative is hoping to see the DEIS released in January. FS indicated it doesn’t yet know the timeline and stated it is possible that it could go to the publisher earlier. Buck noted that 45 days is typical for an EIS and 90 days is more typical of a Land Management Plan comment period.
- 2) Discussed putting together 2-3 LAM meetings (once every 2 weeks), and 2 hours on each stakeholder meeting.

**Upcoming Stakeholder Meetings:**

Stakeholder Meetings in November and December: In November we will be focusing the discussion on negotiating and adopting the new decision rules. After that is complete, we will finalize Charter revisions, and if time remains, we will move to the Survey results. In December, we would potentially meet in Winslow and do a revisioning, re-focusing process with the group. It should be fun and party-like.