



**AGENDA**

4FRI Stakeholders Meeting

Wednesday

December 11, 2013

9:00AM-4:00PM

**Twin Arrows Navajo Casino - 20 miles east of Flagstaff on I-40**

Teleconference Information: **712/432-1500, code 292353#**

**ATTENDANCE:** Stasia Begley, Pascal Berlioux, Kevin Boness, Neil Chapman, Jerry Drury, Paul Ferris, Dick Fleischman, Sharon Gallbreath, Steve Gatewood, Bruce Greco, Bill Greenwood, Shaula Hedwall, Billie Hughes, Marlin Johnson, Anne M Lucas, Tom Mackin, Sharon M Lopez, Hunter Moore, David Newlin, Jerry Payne, Henry Provencio, Steve Rosenstock, Katherine Sánchez Meador, Todd Schulke, Sue Sitko, Sybil Smith, Bob Taylor, Buck Swaney, Rich VanDemark, Diane Vosick, Amy Waltz, Lori Martinek, Jeremy Raisar, Rob Marshall, Celia Barotz, Travis Woolley, Bob Schlesinger, Nick Worth, Stephen Reidhead, Melanie Colarito, Don Walters, Gary Moore, Bill Masters, George Geisler, Greg Smith, Nick Hecker, Amy Hedspeth, Jerry Brodie, John Pavison, Park Watson, Tom Poscharsky, Gus Lundberg, Buchanan Davis, Chris Stephan, Karen Durant, Harold Soehner, Joe Stringer, Michele Ralston, Rory Steinke, Buzz Ivicsek, Terry Burns, G Gumbel, Kathy Hemenway, Art Babbott, Deborah Tosline, Mark Woodson, Ron Lee, Shawn Hau, Stephen Levesque, Darren Gurner, Karen Modesto, Rebecca Davison, Mandy Metzger, Joanne Keen, Mark Brehl, Stephen Horner

**ON PHONE:** Russ Winn, Tommie Martin, Mary Breesee, Jerry Nicholls

Action Items	Contact
1. Approve MPMB framework at January 2014 SHG meeting	S.C.
2. Collect reservations on Adaptive Monitoring (AM) Plan (CBD & _) to Amy by 12-18-2013	Amy
3. Create forum to review comments and responses before the RTC is issued – January 2014 meeting?	S.C.
4. LAM begins collecting high-level items for LTRS/openness/other issues	LAM
5. Compile Basecamp contact information	Eli
6. Prepare and post self-assessment analysis like 2012 analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. What will benefit us next year?</li> <li>b. Make action items</li> </ul>	Buck
7. Henry Farewell	

**9:00**

**Introductions**

Henry introduced Dan Kipervaser as new USFS contact that will be focusing on Monitoring

9:05

**Multi Party Monitoring Board Framework Discussion**

1. Steve Gatewood presented the framework for a multi-party monitoring board.
2. The SHG was asked to express concern about the conceptual framework.
3. Concern: Have we adequately addressed stakeholder involvement with the MPMB? CBD would like clarification about the number of individuals that can be on the Board. Representation is unclear as is total number. This should be addressed in charter development for the MPMB
4. Comment: We should define membership representation on the group
5. Decide upon structure of monitoring board to create a charter to define how the work going forward
6. Stakeholders in good standing have the ability to vote; the highest level of agreement is “agree w/o reservations”: none
7. Steve: approval to move the proposed framework forward to then create a charter and define its membership
8. Pascal: “The situation here is it is inappropriate to make a final decision with the representation issue, and the capping issue. This is not a no, but not a yes until these are decided.”
9. Buck: Move forward with reservations? Is that appropriate?
10. Resolution is not in the process; Define what is needed for update or modification: figure out how to nail down Neil’s comments to know where to put it in the document
11. Sue proposed adding in the composition box: desired \_ to be determined in the charter process
12. Defer MPMB Approval until January SHG meeting
13. Amy: comments were received and recorded and will be addressed. Todd has valid concerns on membership; we could remove the comment on cap. See this as a Draft document, a framework. In the chartering process, these details will be addressed
14. Henry: look at the document before January’s meeting

**Monitoring & Adaptive Management Plan Approval – Amy Waltz**

1. Presentation at SHG mtg 10.23.13 which integrated comments on today’s plan to be voted on
2. Levels of agreement – described by Buck
3. Section 18 is review process to determine if \_ is necessary (Henry)
4. Sharon Galbreath pointed out that the “scale” issue is what the WG spent a lot of time on
5. Key changes:
6. Fixing scale (difficult to understand)

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

7. Prioritize 3 indicators and triggers for those – key for SHG discussions over past few years
8. Estimate of initial cost is important to assess.
9. Monitoring Board will continue to discuss/look at prioritization, cost and budgets, and oversight
10. Verification - crosswalks done
11. All info posted on Basecamp
12. Buck: AM Plan WG has done tremendous work over years of working together – we want full adoption today of the proposed plan
13. Amy: Full copy on Basecamp; biophysical monitoring plan part of AM process
14. Amy went through what was new/addressed by the Working Group
15. Biophysical Plan WG:
  - a. Sharon G: CBD has reservations, but issues reflect that big-picture issues are difficult to address
  - b. Pascal: recognize Amy’s incredible work in this process! Issue of triggers – not possible to have all triggers lined up right now. Adaptive Mgt. Plan needs to adapt as necessary. Recommend that SHG approves the plan
  - c. Travis: level of discussion to figure out triggers and thresholds
  - d. Henry: This monitoring plan is what trust is based on, after treatments get going. It addresses the question “Are we meeting desired conditions?”
  - e. Ann M-L: Success of this project is dependent on monitoring
  - f. Sue S: WM Multi-party monitoring board was first natl learned power of monitoring and collaboration of agency, contractors and SHs. Science-based expertise was really important, including Russ on phone
16. Buck: NEPA clearance to do restoration treatments on the ground. USFS is in process of making Final EIS. AM framework is not necessarily strong, integrated into a NEPA document. Decision before us: vote for this document to go into the FEIS.
17. Open for discussion: none
18. Reservations? None
19. Agree w/ reservations: minor issues w/ triggers e.g. 0 activity of road decommissioning is a low bar
  - Set expectations for success
  - Recognize this is an adaptive plan
  - As long as reservations are on record, Sharon will deliver; Steve gives one week for reservations stated “on paper”
20. Pascal: Eastern Counties agrees without reservation, but with hope – trigger issues as imperfect at this time will be addressed as we move forward

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

21. Jerry: is it implementable on-the-ground?
22. Henry: Aspirational in some respects; tier levels - effectiveness?; monitoring board will be tasked w/ limited funds. AM Plan has been approved to be included in FEIS "as written" as an appendix
23. Collect Reservations

**10:35      BREAK**

**10:45      Joint Presentation by Good Earth Power and The Campbell Group**

*-Steven Levesque*

Updates by Jerry Brodie

1. Recent announcements concerning biofuels and partnership w/ Lansitech to develop a biofuels facility in GA as pre-cursors to be built in AZ to integrate technologies; will be a large-scale work in AZ
2. General announcement will be part of a full team
3. Offices set up in Flagstaff, including more people
4. Introducing new Management Director – Darren Gerner in pulp and paper industry to help getting bio-slash and making into biofuels
5. Steve Levesque will present what is done on ground currently:
6. "Excited to be a part of this project, bringing value to it"
7. .ppt on Basecamp

Steve G: open for questions

Q: What do you think is the biggest challenge in the coming year?

A: until NEPA in place, it's difficult to know and coordinate work for the business

Q: What experience with stewardship contracts (SCs) vs. timber sales?

A: Zero exp. Engages in activities similar to SCs. Sometimes past projects have happened on state or fed lands. Give us time to demonstrate that we're capable

Q: Are you able to speculate when new markets will be available in AZ?

A: Plans will be formerly announced the end of January 2014. Conversations are currently happening with USFS

Comment: task orders will be at different elevations, but USFS operations normally start in April

Q: Where would wood go? What is plan going forward?

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

A: Mercer product will be processed in Heber, AZ. Further projects will be announced later. Agreements are made between Campbell Group and other companies, but needing USFS approval first before announcing

## 12:15 LUNCH

### 1:00 **LTRS Discussion Part II** – Sharon Galbreath, Amy Waltz & USFS

#### 1. Amy proposes **Next Steps**:

- A. Collect these statements (Amy/ LAM – See **Potential Solutions** below)
- B. Invite FS to present “Response to Comments” on the LTRS and Openness Issues.

#### 2. **Potential Solutions**:

- C. And overall stronger commitment to large tree retention in the document. Included in the executive summary, chapters 1 and 2 in the Record of Decision.
- D. With regard to openings; currently regeneration openings are treated as additive (because within tree clumps) to the overall openness. There is a concern: interspace and regeneration openings could potentially be too much space.
- E. Dick suggested the following language could be added to Implementation Plan: “If regeneration openings are incorporated in the prescription, do not exceed the maximum prescribed openness, so that the combination of regeneration openings and interspace doesn’t exceed max openness.”
- F. Shaula Headwall and Steve Rosenstock stated that there could be reasons to go to the maximum and that limiting openness to just the desired openness, and not including regeneration openings, could lead to a more homogenous condition. Dick noted that perhaps the issue is not openness per se, but creating a condition that is heterogeneous. Perhaps we need to look at language in the implementation plan that creates a heterogeneous set of groups and interspaces.

#### 3. Notes:

- Can the LTIP document be strengthened with regard to incorporating the LTRS? Was something missing or added? Are there potential solutions to address?
- LTRS and LTIP integration of LTRS is closely tied to other stakeholder issues with openings, and forest plan amendments. (Sharon G) The timing of discussing this issue makes this a theoretical topic b/c there has not been a response from USFS on the stakeholder comments.
- More specifically, with regard to the translation of LTRS to LTIP and possible mis-interpretation of the LTRS:

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

- The stakeholders observed a “flip” in statements to focus on how and when to cut large trees. The stakeholder intent of the LTRS was to place the large tree removals as exceptions in the context of a restoration project. Stakeholder expectations of the 1<sup>st</sup> analysis are that large abundance of small trees will be the primary focus of tree thinning across the 4FRI landscape that. The stakeholders acknowledge that exceptions exist in multiple categories where large trees will also be removed.
- SHG would like to have the EIS evaluate the LTRS the way the SHs intended, instead of from a silviculture standpoint.
- Stakeholders felt shut down on LTRS inclusion and other items from higher up in the Forest Service.
- Talking about Openness and LTRS is good at high levels in the SH Group, can let LAM work out the details. Let’s keep talking each meeting so that we can strengthen the language to reinforce topics important to all stakeholders.
- Overall goal of 4FRI is restoration which includes heterogeneity; the more variability that can be integrated is good, but how do we get variability?
- Common theme: restoration w/in a regulated forest paradigm is new and a challenge. There is a need to recognize that we want to retain large trees (paradigm shift) as a part of forest health.
- Let’s keep having conversations based on the response to comments

**2:15**      **Approval of 10/23 SHG meeting minutes** - approved

**2:20**      **Approval of 10/23 Action Items** (*included at the end of this Agenda*)

Action items from 10.23.13 mtg

1. Take Dick’s name off the MPMB Working Group
2. Follow through to get on Basecamp
3. It’s up, but will change (per Dick)
4. (assessment is longer this year as a result of new process - Buck?)

**2:30**      **Call to the Public** - none

**2:35**      **USFS Updates** – *Henry Provencio/Dick Fleishman*

1. This is Henry’s last meeting: “there’s a lot of good going on; people are more cordial; don’t forget about AWIF; keep congressionals up-to-speed”
2. NEPA update: going to add action alt for no Forest Plan amendments
3. Analysis will come up
4. Draft ROD (Objection period) in 2014

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

5. May or June 2014 for the draft FEIS and draft ROD
6. After the 45-day period objection period (can be extended another 45 days by the objection reviewing official if needed) is worked through the final FEIS and final ROD decision would be issued in July 2014.
7. Campbell Group will want to get on with 8 task orders; is it logical to have 2,000 acres out in 2014 or should more be kicked out to 2015 and 2016? Coordination is necessary. What is displayed on website for Fy 15 will most likely be changed
8. Orion offered in January as a timber sale; if not sold, will be pulled in as 4FRI task order
9. Saginaw 2 is going to be held onto and offered as a timber; may be a task order if it does not sell
10. Sales on South of Coconino NF (Tulle and Mr. Jones) are going through financial assessments-if these do not pass muster, these will be added to 4FRI as task orders if these do not pass financial assessments
11. On Coconino/Kaibab NF
12. Anything that is not selling, will most likely be rolled into 4FRI
13. Some will be considered for eliminated: LTRS Alternative as Written, treating just priority areas,
14. Alternatives: Katherine Sanchez Meador explained the possible alternatives that came up during the comment analysis and how these would be handled:
  - No New Amendments
    - Develop as an alternative and analyze in detail
  - Prioritize Areas
    - Respond to as a comment
  - Full Restoration
    - Considered but eliminated an alternative analyzed in detail
  - Original LTRS (as written)
    - Considered but eliminated as an alternative analyzed in detail because the LTRS components were woven into the desired conditions and help create the LTIP
  - Smaller Treatment Areas
    - Respond to as a comment
15. Wing Mountain has an Intent to sue by Conservation Congress (Denise Boggs?)
  - a. Is a task order and is splitting into 2: east and west to spread out signed NEPA with the 4FRI task order
  - b. ESA term that after 60 days, a group can sue

16. Forest supervisor:

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

17. Landscape strategy: identified priorities (prioritization in a NEPA doc)
18. From CFLRP in Colorado, Dan Kipervaser will join in January as a Zone Monitoring Coordinator
  - a. With Forest Service for 13 years, and have also worked with Fish & Wildlife, and a small environmental consulting firm
  - b. His job is to figure what monitoring is going on
  - c. To figure if reporting has been done properly in 5 databases
    - i. Reporting is seen by Congress as a gauge to see if the FS is doing as needed
19. Annual Report has been sent
20. \$230,238 in 4FRI Stakeholder contributions; leverage funds \$2,692,661 for leveraged funds (expect to increase)
21. Staffing: fill silviculture position
22. Richard Gonzales (acting silviculturist) – from Kaibab ~10 years
  - a. Filling NEPA position
  - b. Paula Cote would be wonderful to have back to make it seamless

**2:45**

### **Stakeholder Disclosures and Accountability**

The Stakeholder Group has reached its goal of raising \$11,000 for facilitation. Contributions include: \$1,000 GCT, \$500 GFFP; \$500 Flagstaff Fire, \$2,000 TNC, \$3,000 ERI, \$2,000 Coconino County, \$2,000 SRP.

Diane Vosick mentioned that the ERI has two new working papers. One covers treatment longevity (how long treatments last after implementation depending on what is done) and the second on Mixed Conifer reference conditions.

She also disclosed that during a recent trip to DC on ERI business there was broad interest among staff of the Congressional delegation about 4FRI and Good Earth Power/Campbell Group. She said that the trip in January is well timed given the level of interest.

Amy & Shaula: Feb 24-26, 2014 Conference in Tucson; \$29 registration fee  
At same time, AZ Rx Fire Council

Flagstaff City Fire: Summerfelt met with Roundup

Diane: AZ Republic doing a 4-part series

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



Rebecca: SRP integrated post-conference on website to include comments  
Strategies and summaries on website and asking for input to conceptualize funding initiatives forward

Hold a working group wksp in Feb or March for business strategy based on what they've learned

Steve: ... Arizona Forward made a recommendation to create a forest Restoration Board, but declined b/c it would be too controversial

**3:00**

**BREAK**

**3:10**

**Stakeholder Group annual Self-Assessment – Buck Swaney**

Results will be posted on Basecamp

1. Survey shows that there is a discrepancy between Q1 & 2: Respondents feel the charter provides good collaboration guidance, but less sure that it provides adequate guidance for group and interpersonal accountability.
2. Sense of Co-Chair system effectiveness is very neutral and undecided.
3. Working groups achieve adequate participation – Agree, but there is definitely room for improvement.
4. Strong agreement on the group's progress over the past year, with particular success in terms of collaborators' comfort speaking openly and communicating generally. Also a strong sense of success in the specific products produced by the collaborative.
5. Trust and advocacy are connected. Our lowest marks continue to come in areas related to trust. Most collaborators indicate they are being trustworthy, but not as many are sure of the motives and actions of others. Buck pointed out the possible connections between weakness in our external communication and advocacy efforts, and the lack of trust we continue to experience.
6. SHs feel the FS has heard them. The FS gets pretty high marks for collaborating, listening, and addressing SH needs/wants/concerns.
7. Comments say that SHs like how facilitation has led to more clear approach in getting tasks done; some felt that on occasion the facilitation hadn't been completely neutral.
8. Diane: make longitudinal analysis? Any comments to benefit productivity next year? > Action Items
9. Amy: Ensure next year's questions are based on this year's
10. Buck: If we increase trust enough to engender advocacy, this group may be able to self-facilitate within a year.

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

3:25

**Discuss and Refine DC Trip Talking Points – Diane Vosick**

1. Expect that focus will be on learning more about the contractor(s)
2. DC-TPs document: Comments received from a few
3. 4FRI to deliver on what is promised: keeping visibility
4. FS needs professional capacity to keep us moving
- 5.
6. Call for continued funding of 4FRI and innovative approaches to NEPA
7. Need to support new and existing businesses in AZ (?)
8. Extension in Farm Bill that has not (yet?) passed
9. Prediction that 2014 will be another drought
- 10.
11. Tommie Martin and Dave Tenney have been invited as reps of Eastern Counties to go to DC
- 12.
13. Any objections?
14. There is a difference between temperature and \_ (precip?)
- 15.
16. Next two co-chairs will be listed on bottom
- 17.
18. Delegates going forward
19. Funding for CFLRP is needed
20. In DC, talking to AZ delegations and 2 approp comm and 2 \_ comms of House and Senate
- 21.
22. Similar type of delegation of FS
- 23.
24. FWP funding is an example of the public recognition of \$ for this
- 25.
26. 4FRI is related, but the
- 27.
28. Dick: Region would be a good visit b/c there's consideration of reducing to 80% of current levels
29. Diane: Region 3 is at Ground Zero for Climate Change and Wildfire threat
30. R3 is highest performing this year for \_ (Dick)
- 31.
32. Sequestration is that each region will reduce by 5% (a lot of \$ in the 4 forests)
- 33.
34. Full representation of SHs is necessary and get to massive capacity of outputs, or else 2015 will be nothing

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

- 35.
36. CFLRP Coalition (Cheryl Lumbard is primary) – advocating at natl levels
- 37.
38. 4FRI has always had full allocation
- 39.
40. Talking points approved

**3:40 Action Items & Adjourn**  
– Buck Swaney

Action Items from 10.23 Meeting	Contact	Comments
1. Post web link for SRP's (Restoration Investment Strategies) conference on BASECAMP	Eli	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. New Working Group (Ethan, Amy, Eli, Steve, Pascal, Todd/Sharon, Dick) will draft a framework for the Multi-party Monitoring Board Charter, including a timeline for finalization, based on the SHG approved concept for the MPMB that was Unanimously Approved today—by Dec 11 SHG meeting	WG	Take Dick's name off Working Group
3. Compile and post on BASECAMP the contact information for the 4FRI for the following groups: GEP <input type="checkbox"/> USFS <input type="checkbox"/> Campbell Group <input type="checkbox"/> Subcontractors <input type="checkbox"/> SHG	Eli	Follow through to get them posted
4. Post USFS maps (LTRS-related & task order roll-out through 2015) on BASECAMP	Eli	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> It's up, but will change (per Dick)
5. Self-assessment work group (Buck, Steve, Ann and Russ) will finalize the self-assessment and roll-out at Dec SHG meeting	Buck	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Next Meetings:**

**1/22 – Pinetop; 2/26 – Winslow; 3/26 – 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