

4FRI Stakeholder Meeting, Wednesday, December 7, 2011
Arizona Game & Fish Office, 2878 E. White Mountain Blvd, Pinetop, AZ 85935
Meeting Minutes

Action Items

Description	Responsibility	Complete By
Develop a spreadsheet and narrative that clearly identifies/labels Four Forest projects as, for example, CLFRP matching projects, 4FRI Collaborative projects; ongoing projects under the White Mountain Stewardship program, etc.	4FRI “labeling” subgroup: Coconino Forest Supervisor’s Office staff member, Ed Smith, Pasqual Berlioux, Mark Sensibaugh, Marcus Selig	January 2012 SG Meeting
Share again the USFS’s timeline and decision points; report on any progress made in clarifying legal sideboards	Forest Service (USFS)	January 2012 SG Meeting
Develop a Stakeholder Group work plan to be shared and discussed with the group at the January meeting	Steering Committee	January 2012 SG Meeting

Decisions

- Annual Evaluation Topics and Tasks
 - Postpone the USFS’s clarifications on its legal sideboards/purview and transparency issues regarding collaborative efforts, to the February 2012 Stakeholder Group (SG) meeting to give the USFS time to review internally and with its Office of General Counsel
- Schedule the facilitator presentation about interest-based negotiation and collaboration and other prioritized tasks associated with the overarching theme *Relationship Building/Trust* for the January 2012 SG meeting
- 4FRI November 2, 2011, minutes approved
- Establish a 4FRI SG “labeling” subgroup to clearly label, using a spreadsheet, 4FRI Collaborative projects, distinguishing them from ongoing and CFLRP match projects (or identifying where projects cross categories) and draft a narrative that will explain the differentiations

Welcome and Introductions

Participants introduced themselves and identified their affiliations.

Call to the Public

Not applicable – no members of the public commented at this time on the agenda.

USFS Updates – Henry Provencio and Earl Stewart

- **4FRI Labeling:** Henry distributed copies of the USFS shelf-stock inventory and explained the challenges inherent in distinguishing 4FRI Collaborative projects from CFLRP-grant matching projects. He explained that matching dollars for “4FRI” projects can emanate from projects outside of the 4FRI Collaborative’s purview. There are currently three major simultaneous undertakings: ongoing projects that may be

part of the White Mountain Stewardship contract; 4FRI NEPA and the 4FRI Collaboration. Several participants voiced concerns that the public could mistakenly attribute some of the shelf-stock projects as 4FRI Collaborative projects, which could be especially problematic if the projects do not align with recommendations from the Collaborative. Participants agreed to establish a 4FRI subgroup whose task will be to develop a spreadsheet that clearly labels 4FRI Collaborative projects. The 4FRI labeling subgroup members will also develop a narrative to accompany the spreadsheet. Its research will include review of the 4FRI Annual Report and the Schedule of Proposed Actions (SOPA). Members of the subgroup will include staff from the Coconino Forest Supervisor's Office, Ed Smith (The Nature Conservancy), Mark Sensibaugh (Ecological Restoration Institute), Marcus Selig (Grand Canyon Trust) and Pasqual Berlioux, (Arizona Forest Restoration Products).

- **Disclosure of meetings relevant to 4FRI:** The USFS 4FRI team is meeting the week of December 12 with representatives of the Center for Biological Diversity and the Sierra Club to explore the canopy cover issue. The issues identified at that meeting will be shared with the Stakeholder Group at the January 2012 meeting where options for moving forward will be explored.
- **RFP Progress:** The Request for Proposal process is a high priority for the USFS. It is receiving attention at the highest levels of the agency to ensure the contracting process goes well. The 4FRI team is intentionally not associated with the contracting process and so cannot provide definitive information on when exactly the contract will be awarded. It will likely be awarded sometime this winter.
- **DRAFT EIS Progress:** Good progress is being made, and once the Large Tree Retention Strategy (LTRS) and once canopy cover issues are addressed, it should be in good shape. The USFS has received assistance from Arizona Game and Fish who provided write-ups for the Management Indicator Species (MIS) analysis for several game species. The Forest Service is working with the Fish and Wildlife Service to develop the analysis for the Mexican spotted owl.
- **Treasured Landscape Discussion with the National Forest Foundation (NFF):** A representative of the NFF has agreed to meet with the 4FRI Steering Committee sometime the first two weeks of January 2012 to discuss what it means to be a "treasured landscape." Dennis reminded the group that any Stakeholder Group members are welcome to call into the Steering Committee meetings.
- **Annual Report:** The work on the Annual Report is nearing completion.
- **CEQ:** No update.
- **Forest Education Initiative:** Anne Mottek Lucas, Mottek Consulting and GFFP, is working on a project related to the socio-economic monitoring of 4FRI. Henry has been approached by a publisher to create a book and hand-puppet for forest education targeted at elementary students. Anne needs in-kind support to initiate the project. The project match should be between \$10,000 and \$15,000. Anyone interested in learning more about the project should visit the link on Basecamp; a DVD is also available.

Stakeholder Updates

- Henry Provencio, Steve Gatewood, Marcus Selig, and Diane Vosick held a joint meeting with the Flagstaff City Council and Coconino County Board of Supervisors. The primary focus of the meeting with on job development.
- Ethan Aumack, Rob Davis, Tommie Martin, Henry Provencio, Ed Smith, and Diane Vosick have been invited to serve on a panel to share information on the Four Forest Restoration Initiative at the University of Arizona on Friday, December 9. Panelists will also be visiting areas impacted by the Monument Fire and the Las Ciénegas Adaptive Management project (collaboration between the BLM and The Nature Conservancy). Members of the public are invited to the panel discussion.
- The 4FRI Stakeholder Group will send a representative to serve on a panel at the SmallWood Industry Conference in May 2012. This is an opportunity to share information about the Collaborative with a large audience.
- Many forest communities (e.g., Green Peak's Highway and White Mountains Summer Homes) are taking note of what the Collaborative and the USFS are doing on a landscape basis.
- Molly reported that Russell Jones of the Arizona State Legislature is willing to introduce legislation on healthy forest incentives.
- Kevin Boness reported he would be meeting with Dick Fleishman to discuss the Collaborative's relationship with State Trust Lands.
- The USFS and some members of the Stakeholder Group have been meeting with the City Councils that may have areas impacted by the Four Forests Initiative. City Councils they have met with or will meet with include: Cottonwood, Sedona, Camp Verde, Williams, and Flagstaff. The city of Sedona's primary concern is smoke; Flagstaff's main interest is in job development.
- Cam Hunter, Deputy State Forester, Arizona State Forestry, retired on Friday, December 2. Scott Hunt will be advertising for a replacement.
- Representatives of 4FRI will be attending the Association for Fire Ecology Conference session that will focus on multi-party landscape monitoring February 28.

USFS Staff Updates

- Chris Knopp, former Forest Supervisor Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest has retired
- Gene Blankenbaker has taken a position with the regional office
- Christine Dawes will be filling in as deputy at Apache-Sitgreaves beginning January 2012

Cattle Growers Association Recruitment

- The Cattle Growers Association has decided not to approach Greenlee, Graham, Gila and Navajo counties about their SAFE program; however they are keeping tabs on 4FRI through Marcus's monthly update.

Mexican Spotted Owl Presentation – Shaula Hedwall

(Note: Presentation will be posted on Basecamp)

Shaula explained that the purpose of the presentation was to provide an overview of the Mexican Spotted Owl and that she would be answering questions throughout the presentation. Topics covered in the presentation included:

- Status and threats
- What we know
- What we wish we knew
- Recovery Plan Revisions (where we are)
- Discussion

The Mexican Spotted Owl is one of three species of spotted owl. They are territorial and primarily nocturnal. The species occurs in forests and canyons in the Southwest United States and Mexico. They typically use uneven-aged, multi-storied, high canopy cover forests.

Presentation Discussion:

A stakeholder member suggested that 4FRI set aside funding for spotted owl monitoring to monitor how owls react in the treatment areas long-term. Henry commented that the owl monitoring issue provides an opportunity and catalyst for 4FRI collaboration. Shaula suggested that the Rocky Mountain and Desert Landscape Conservation Cooperatives could be potential sources of funding for owl monitoring.

Actions to Address Prioritized Overarching Themes from 4FRI 2011 Annual Evaluation – U.S. Institute

(Note: Presentation will be posted on Basecamp)

Pat Lewis of the U.S. Institute explained that the intent of the presentation was to share with the Collaborative the Steering Committee's recommendation for an approach and timeline for addressing the prioritized overarching themes from the 4FRI 2011 Annual Evaluation and associated action items. The presentation was structured as follows:

- Background (how we got here)
- Reiteration and confirmation of the prioritized Annual Evaluation Overarching Themes identified at the November 2 4FRI meeting
- Sharing the action items brainstormed at the November 2 meeting and the results of the prioritization survey conducted by Marcus
- Sharing the Steering Committee's recommended approach and timeline for carrying out the prioritized tasks
- Questions and Discussion

The Steering Committee recommended the following timeline for addressing the prioritized Overarching Themes from the 2011 Annual Report:

January 2012 SG Meeting: Differing Views of the Relationship Between the USFS and the Collaborative

February 2012 SG Meeting: Building Relationships/Trust among members of the SG

March 2012 SG Meeting: Facilitation

April 2012: Resources

May 2012: Outreach to the Public

June 2012: Other Common Recommendations from the Annual Evaluation (e.g., shared vision; clarifying the meaning of adaptive management; etc.)

Earl Stewart, Coconino National Forest Supervisor, expressed concern about the USFS's ability to complete the prioritized tasks 1 & 2 associated with addressing the Differing Views of the Relationship Between the USFS and the Collaborative in time for the January SG meeting. Tasks 1 & 2 are:

- 1) The USFS should clarify those decisions that are within the legal purview of the USFS and that are the USFS's sole responsibility
- 2) The USFS should increase transparency regarding its internal workings and its decision-making processes

Forest Supervisor Earl Stewart explained that since the Collaborative is now into the NEPA process, defining and clarifying the decision space and legal sideboards could involve review and input at higher levels of the agency, including the Office of the General Counsel, and that would take significant time. He asked that the USFS be given more time to work with its staff to identify a more realistic timeline for delivering on these tasks. Dennis Bowker, facilitator, suggested that the USFS may want to bring the U.S. Institute's legal counsel into the discussion as well. Pat explained that the proposed budget for its work with 4FRI in the coming year includes up to three meetings with the USFS Regional Office, the 4FRI Team and the Forest Supervisors, to support them with internal alignment around these tasks. When asked if the U.S. Institute could be prepared to work with the Stakeholder Group on its internal relationship building and trust in January 2012, instead of February, Pat responded that it could. Participants agreed to change the timeline as follows:

January 2012 SG Meeting: Building Relationships/Trust among members of the SG

February 2012 SG Meeting: Differing Views of the Relationship Between the USFS and the Collaborative

The USFS agreed to share again (at the January 2012 SG meeting) its previous presentation to the SG group that outlined the agency's timeline and decision points. Diane Vosick commented that at the last Stakeholder Group meeting, members submitted a letter to the USFS stating the Stakeholder Group's desire to provide input to the USFS through implementation (beyond the NEPA process). Forest Supervisor Stewart asked the Stakeholder Group if there were specific questions members had about the USFS's or the Stakeholder Group's legal purview or transparency issues. A member responded that the Stakeholder Group needs to know from the USFS what it wants and expects from the Stakeholder Group to move forward. They also asked if the Stakeholder Group could be given cooperating agency status relative to the NEPA process and the USFS explained that only governmental agencies can be cooperating agencies in NEPA.

Dennis reminded the group that it had previously discussed the possibility of scheduling a two-day meeting in March or April that could include substantive discussions (e.g., the draft EIS), a field trip and social event on the first evening. Diane Vosick responded that it might be best to schedule the two-day SG meeting in April or May if a field trip was planned. A critical issue that should be included on the January Stakeholder Group meeting agenda: prioritizing and sequencing treatments.

Participants discussed the need for a work plan that would include the agenda items mentioned above; the follow-on to the 2011 Annual Evaluation Report prioritized overarching themes, and more discussion about the canopy cover and Large-Tree Retention Strategy issues. It was suggested that an hour of every Stakeholder Group agenda be devoted to information sharing/learning sessions. The Steering Committee agreed to pull together a list of agenda items and develop a draft work plan to be shared with the Stakeholder Group at its January 25 meeting.

Work Group Report-Outs

Communications Work Group: No report

Finance Work Group: No report

Science and Monitoring and Landscape Strategy Work Group – Joint Report / Presentation by Amy Waltz

Amy's presentation on behalf of the two Work Groups titled *4FRI Biophysical Monitoring Indicators: Assigning Metrics of Success (or Failure)* focused on the following:

- Needs of the USFS/Expectations of Stakeholders
- Review of 4FRI Biophysical Monitoring Plan
- Joint work of the Science and Monitoring Work Group (SMWG) and Landscape Strategy Work Group (LSWG) on indicators: Prioritization and *Paramaterization*

The presentation reinforced that monitoring is critical because:

- It identifies and considers effectiveness versus implementation
- It is the foundation of much of what we know
- It is the cornerstone of adaptive management

The presentation outlined USFS and Stakeholder expectations as follows (note: these are excerpts from the draft letter):

USFS

- To incorporate into the draft EIS a stakeholder-developed Monitoring and Adaptive Management Plan by January 16, 2012
- To align USFS Plan required monitoring with Stakeholder desired monitoring
- The agency can commit financially to minimum monitoring, but would like for Stakeholders to contribute as well.

Stakeholders

- The Landscape Strategy Work Group recognizes and acknowledges that there won't be verbatim adoption of the monitoring plan in NEPA, but that collaboration will ensure that integration occurs in a way that is functionally similar
- USFS leadership will work to increase budget priority for monitoring

- USFS will monitor what is legally required. All parties will strive to maximize the economic efficiency of monitoring and data collection

Amy shared that the draft letter will come back to the SG in conjunction with the monitoring plan. Forest Supervisor Stewart noted that many USFS staff will be involved in responding to the Stakeholder Group monitoring plan. He is asking line officers to seek and support additional funding for monitoring.

The Science and Monitoring Work Group looked at:

- Monitoring indicators (social and economic; biophysical)
- Biophysical Indicators (short-term only)
 - Structure, composition, process attributes

The S&M Work Group considered the above and the Desired Future Conditions (DFC) in the Proposed Action and is working hard to determine what metric can be used to quantify the DFC. The S&M Work Group is also setting benchmarks and thresholds or triggers. There is science-based information to be shared with the SG.

Two issues:

- 1) Complete prioritization exercise to indicate when Adaptive Management is needed.
- 2) How to *parameterize* the indicators based on a) most desirable conditions; or b) based on most undesirable conditions.

The S&M Work Group wants to ensure indicators meet USFS planned monitoring.

The SMWG and LSWG are collaborating because its members want to establish a science baseline and incorporate stakeholder values. They are trying to develop those objectives, quantify them, and develop thresholds to see if this looks good or assess “what happened here?” Amy reminded participants that membership on the Work Groups is open to anyone.

A participant asked whether it is appropriate to address some of the first task orders on the shelf-stock list (distributed by Henry) or should more effort be spent on pre-monitoring later task orders? Amy responded that while there should be some level of monitoring on the shelf stock, it will be important to have a discussion about where funding can best be applied .

Forest Supervisor Stewart suggested that, rather than the Work Groups getting too focused on what is developed between January and February 2012 and what needs to get into the draft EIS, a broader perspective might be better given the short time frame. He commented that it is more important to work on implementation monitoring.

4FRI Updates

- This meeting was Ed Smith’s last meeting as co-chair
- Jim Devos is the new co-chair
- This meeting was Dennis Bowker’s last meeting as facilitator. The Stakeholder Group thanked him for his facilitation and commitment to the Stakeholder Group over the last year.

Next Steering Committee conference call: Tuesday, December 13.

Next SG meeting: Wednesday, January 25 at the Forest Supervisor's Office in Flagstaff