



**4FRI Stakeholder Group Meeting  
Minutes**

Wednesday, January 24<sup>th</sup>, 2018 9am-12:50pm  
Arizona Game & Fish Region 1 Office (Pinetop)  
2878 E. White Mountain Blvd., Pinetop, AZ 85935

Teleconference line: (712) 775-7031, code: 439290611#

**Attendance:** Diane Vosick, Amy Waltz, Jeff Halbrook, Han-Sup Han, Henry Provencio, Brienne Petit, Sue Sitko, Scott Russell, Annette Fredette, Matt Millar, Art Babbott, Pascal Berlioux, Travis Bruner, Steve Gatewood, Andrew Volkmer, Steven Flora, Greg Smith, Jenny Norton, Peter Norton, Lynn Krigbaum, Steve Best, Wendy Jo Haskins, Kenneth Cox (Northern Arizona Procurement Company), Shae Peterson, Steve Horner, Adam Cooley, Jason Whiting

**PHONE:** Wade Ward, Steve Rosenstock, Shaula Hedwell, Aaron Green, Todd Schulke, Chip Davis, Joe Miller, Steve Reider, Mark Burell, Travis Woolley, Ann Mottek, Jim Parks, Tom Mackin, Kelly Wolf-Krauter, Dorothy Holasek, Mark Nigrelli, Floyd Hardin

**9:00 Introductions**

**9:05 Approve minutes from the November 15<sup>th</sup> SHG meeting** — Berlioux - Approved

**9:10 Review action items from the November 15<sup>th</sup> SHG meeting** — Berlioux

<b>Action Item</b>	<b>Lead</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>1.</b> Discuss the possibility of producing comments on the CFLRP FS report	SC	Pending – Agenda Item to close it out on next SC call
<b>2.</b> Provide Stephanie Coleman with comments/suggestions on the decision matrix for the revised Aquatics and Watershed Flexible Toolbox	PWG	Complete
<b>3.</b> Provide feedback to Sue Sitko on the recent draft of the communications public information brochure	SHG	Complete
<b>4.</b> Consider organizing a field trip with industry where interested parties and the public can tour an active logging site. Consider adding a media focused field trip?	CWG	

**9:15 Logistics: Review Meeting Calendar & Co-Chair Rotation** – Vosick

The SHG meeting schedule throughout the next year has been posted on Basecamp. The SHG meetings are held on the 4<sup>th</sup> Wednesday of each month and the SC meeting occurs on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Tuesday of each month.

Co-Chair Rotation – This is Vosick’s final SHG meeting as hot chair. Starting in February, Berlioux will serve as hot chair with assistance from Greg Smith as cold chair. A fair number of people have served as co-chair and the option always remains open for those who are interested in participating. If anyone is interested in being a co-chair, don’t hesitate to contact the current co-chairs.

If you’re inclined to serve as co-chair, you must understand that there is work involved which includes attending the meetings and participating with the Steering Committee. It becomes co-chair responsibility to steer the steering committee.

### **9:25 Call to the Public**

Holasek - Holasek spoke to Berlioux with the Eastern Arizona Counties on the phone a few months ago. During the conversation Berlioux stated that one reason we need to find a place to take the low-grade biomass that is being burned on the forest floor is because it burns so intensely that it’s sterilizing the forest soils and is causing tremendous soil erosion which can result in sediment draining into water reservoirs. We have to find some marketable way to deal with slash piles. There was an article in the paper calling for public ideas on what can be done to deal with dangerous slash piles. The Forest Service produced a pamphlet saying that it’s impossible for these fires to volatilize Cesium 137 which Holasek believes is a mistake.

Berlioux – The conversation was focused on the negative effects of fire on the forest. Berlioux confirms that he said that as restoration is ramped-up to landscape scale there will be between 1 and 1.5 million tons of logging slash in the woods. Some of these piles grow so large, that if we attempt to burn them, they will burn so hot that they damage the soil. We’ve had some concern from constituents about the amount of smoke associated but also with the release of radioactive nucleoids to the air and water reservoirs. Berlioux discussed this with Holasek in response to her request for a comprehensive explanation of the potential impacts of these restoration activities.

Holasek asked the representatives from SRP in attendance at the meeting to make an official comment on their knowledge of the issue concerning these radioactive materials. Steven Flora with SRP had no comment on the issue.

### **9:30 USFS Update - 4FRI Coordinators**

Scott Russell will be taking a three-month detail as acting Forest Supervisor on the Rogue River Siskiyou National Forest in Oregon, which will go into effect within the next three weeks. The plan will be for the three deputy forest supervisors at the 4FRI Forests to fill in. Robert Sanchez on the Coconino will be filling Russell’s position for the first half of the detail and Tom Torres off the Tonto will take it for the second half. Wendy Jo Haskins will take control of Rim Country Planning and 4FRI Coordination.

The FS is continuing conversations with the state group around partnerships and how they can help in terms of restoration implementation. There is a meeting on February 1<sup>st</sup> to continue those conversations and once they’ve developed a specific proposal, the FS will plan to bring that to 4FRI for stakeholder input. From that there’s an effort to do a Good Neighbor

agreement with the Arizona Department of Forest and Fire Management to enlist their help in planning and layout.

There is a lot of work going on around efficiencies in terms of how to modernize forestry practices. All levels of the Forest Services are working on this, including those on the national level. The ERI has helped facilitate this project.

The FS has proposed some changes to alternative 2 on the Rim Country EIS. They have 50,000 acres on which they're proposing some higher intensity treatments. They want to move as quickly as possible on Rim Country and this rework of the alternative needs to be done before an analysis of the alternative can begin. The planning working group feels that the FS is either pushing too hard or blaming the SHG when things aren't going at an efficient pace.

- Request For Information (RFI) Response Update – Provencio

Provencio – Mechanical Thinning Update – December's mechanical thinning update was released.

The RFI was a seven question request for information released by the Forest Service on August 3<sup>rd</sup>. It asked industry and the public to provide information that would be used to develop a request for proposals.. Provencio provided a written summary of the feedback on the RFI. One of response pertained to services they could provide to assist restoration. There has been a FoIA (Freedom of Information Act) filed for information about the RFI by the AZ Daily Sun (Emery Cowan).

The next steps, after analyzing the results of the RFI, are to develop an RFP. The USFS is now developing the desired details for the RFP.

**Action Item – SHG to get feedback from FS on the RFI discussion at the next meeting.**

Berlioux – When the FS and the SHG decided to develop this joint strategy which came from Vision 17, the group was shooting for an RFP by the end of 2017. It got pushed back to the first quarter of 2018. Does the FS have any idea on a timeline for when an RFP can be expected?

- The FS is going to continue to evaluate the situation and release a RFP when the time is right. The FS is not committing to a timeframe. It takes time to develop the resources to release the RFP and also to prepare the acres that would go along with it. They won't be in a position to offer more acres until the capacity to do that has been identified.

Berlioux – Wants to be clear that when we started Vision 17 in December 2016, the objective at that time was to accelerate implementation from 4FRI. It seems like we're back to business as usual which involves evaluation and waiting. Berlioux wants to point out that it's been over a year and aside from an RFI, nothing has been done. This is a huge concern for the counties.

- WO CFLRP Team / Future Participation – Fredette

The FS was asked to request that the national CFLR team attend a future SHG meeting in order to increase engagement. Annette requested that the SHG identify the topics of the conversation

for the CFLR group. The CFLR group needs these topics so that they can send the appropriate personnel to the SHG meeting.

Vosick – Does the SHG still want the National CFLRP team to attend a SHG meeting? Topics for a meeting could include: What is the FS planning for the CFLR program given that the CFLRP is scheduled to expire soon? What happens to the CFLR projects after the end of its term? Berlioux wants to know what the CFLRP group can do for us.

Provencio - There was testimony presented to the Senate committee by the USFS to extend the CFLRP.

Haskins – If the SHG wants the FS to move forward with NEPA, then we have to come together on the proposed action first.

Action Item – SHG is to provide topics to Annette on which topics they would like the CFLR to discuss at a SHG meeting.

### **9:50 SHG NEPA Public Comment- Action Item – Bruner**

Bruner – One Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, the FS published in the federal register that they are seeking comments on how they could improve efficiencies during NEPA assessments. The deadline to submit comments is February 2<sup>nd</sup>. Travis volunteered to draft some initial comments on behalf of the 4FRI SHG to potentially submit on the issue. Travis posted these comments on Monday which was too late to justify a decision being made today. Travis does believe being able to submit comments to the FS is important enough to warrant making an exception regarding SHG policy. The SHG agreed to make an exception to SHG policy and then to move forward with submitting comments. Bruner requested comments on the draft letter he developed so that he can put together a final draft before submitting.

Babbott – In relation to changes in NEPA processes and requirements specifically around categorical exclusions, was there any discussion on acreage? Some of the legislative bills have specific acreages that have a good probability of moving forward.

Bruner – The Steering Committee did not have that discussion for the draft posted to Basecamp. Included in the current letter is that we are in support of categorical exclusions that are for small spring restoration projects because they can help move those forward, but that we do not support expanding the acreage allowed by categorical exclusions for thinning projects. This generated conversation about whether or not the letter should even mention categorical exclusions because stakeholders have varying ideas and opinions on the issue and there is no consensus.

Miller- Thinks a 30-day comment period is too short for something of this significance. Thinks this point should be made in the comments that are submitted.

Berlioux – Regardless of how long the comment period is, the first thing that's asked for is an extension. As a consequence we will systematically cause the comment periods themselves to last over a year. The eastern counties don't believe there should be an extension because they believe it's up to the individual involved to get their comments together on time.

Vosick –The most challenging question in the letter is whether or not this group supports the question of categorical exclusions and the details surrounding that. The group appears to want to submit a letter and one way to do that is to give people 48 hours to provide comment to Travis on the letter he posted on Basecamp so that he can revise a new draft before submission. The issue on categorical exclusions and the group’s inconsistent views on the matter requires attention.

Schulke – The SHG will have a pretty wide perspective on many of these issues and he believes our input on those issues won’t make much difference. Instead, we as stakeholders should be focusing on the experience we have with large-scale landscape planning and try to offer our input and expertise on that, while staying away from the controversial issues (Categorical Exclusions) of which we won’t have much say anyway.

Bruner – It’s likely that a lot of groups within the SHG are submitting comments independently so believes many of those controversial issues will be touched on there. Bruner supports leaving the controversial issues out of the letter and suggests stakeholders send Travis any comments they have by Friday 1/26, and then Travis and his team will process those comments and will post an updated draft to Basecamp by 1/30 for approval.

If stakeholders have comments on the letter, they should send them to Travis by midnight on Friday 1/26. Vosick, Berlioux and Babbott volunteered to assist Travis to organize and incorporate the comments into a final draft of the letter which will then be posted on Basecamp by the 30<sup>th</sup> for approval. SHG will then have 24hrs to post any comments or criticisms and if none are received, the letter will be sent in by February 2<sup>nd</sup>.

### **10:10 Rim Country Alternatives – Berlioux, Fredette, USFS & Planning WG**

This item is merged with the PWG update.

The discussion on alternatives goes back approx. 6-mos. There were a number of discussions regarding the need to have an additional alternative analyzed. Instead of analyzing a third alternative, the FS is proposing more intense treatments on about 60,000 acres within the framework of alternative 2. The rationale for the discussion is that an argument is being made that more intense treatments will help us reach desired conditions more quickly.

Last Friday at the planning work group meeting, the FS presented 23 different projects where approximately 60k acres in which the mechanical treatments would be intensified. Russell essentially asked for a decision on this proposal at the PWG meeting but Berlioux reminded him that the PWG does not have authority to make decisions on behalf of the 4FRI stakeholder group. The only authority the PWG has is to make a recommendation to the SHG for final approval.

The presentation triggered a discussion about what the desired future condition for the Rim Country is. Some believe desired conditions are clearly identified in the FS document GTR 310 and others believe that definition of desired conditions does not relate closely enough to the Rim Country.

Another discussion was whether or not higher intensity treatments will result in less burnable fuels or whether it will have the opposite effect and cause higher rates of regeneration and therefore higher amounts of burnable fuels.

Some in the PWG aren't sure whether this should be a discussion on intensity or acre prioritization.

During the recent SPLYT field trips, the PWG went to a number of Rim stands that had received intense treatments. Some members of the group thought these areas had already been treated sufficiently and are unsure which additional treatments are appropriate in those areas because they're already pretty open.

Waltz – Working groups do not provide recommendations to the FS. This data/proposal was delivered to the PWG on Jan 7<sup>th</sup> and the meeting to discuss it was on January 9<sup>th</sup>. There was a level of expectation imposed on the PWG for them to provide a recommendation/position on the FS's proposal which was not realistic. Process wise, they will never be able to turn a recommendation around that quickly. During the process of analyzing SPLYT, the collaborative group with the ID team spent 12 months identifying areas where less intensive treatments might be desired. The ERI has seen a shift in the collaborative process for the second EIS. The CFLRP is a collaborative project and an opportunity to work with partners to produce a document that is jointly owned, so that when someone like a regional forester asks them to participate in the objection process similar to what occurred during the first EIS they actually do because they have buy-in to the document. This process over the last 3 months was not done in that spirit. With respect to the proposal itself, Amy admires it and states that it contains criteria taken from past collaborative analyses that she would like to see tested in this new area for validity. She wants to know what is stopping the FS from analyzing it at this time.

Fredette – Annette clarified that the 60k acres identified in this proposal are areas they want to *consider* implementing higher intensity treatments. They are **not** areas where these higher intensity treatments will *definitely* occur. The FS is referring to these areas as "project areas." The FS will look at these project areas and determine whether or not they meet the criteria with in the proposal before determining if they will receive these higher intensity treatments.

Miller – Complimented Berlioux on the nature and the accuracy of the summary of the considerations brought up at the PWG meeting and seconds Amy Waltz's comments.

Berlioux – One of the discussions in the PWG meeting was that two people in leadership positions from the FS had two different perspectives on whether the 60k acres were merely candidates for higher intensity treatments or whether they were guaranteed higher intensity treatments. There are genuine discussions taking place and Berlioux's recommendation is that if we want consensus and robust agreement on the alternative, and if the FS wants SHG support for the ROD, we need to get to a place where the PWG develops its product and that product has an opportunity to get support from the SHG. They are going to try and do that as quickly as possible.

Action Item – PWG to provide review of field trip for February SHG meeting. PWG to provide photographs that come from the field trip to provide visuals.

### **10:50 Coconino County Restoration Coordinator Position – Babbott**

Art Babbott presented a Coconino County Forest Restoration Coordinator position from the county. There is a unique set of skills and assets that county and local governments can bring to the task of moving restoration activities forward. The county is very experienced in writing and managing contracts, they have large equipment, and they build and decommission roads – all activities relevant to successful implementation of forest restoration activities. Their attendance at SHG meetings is to help accelerate the pace and bring innovation to forest restoration efforts. They would like to bring these assets to the table in order to provide better assistance to their partners on this effort, and the county believes this position will accomplish that. The county is looking to bring this person on as soon as possible.

### **11:00 ERI Efficiencies Workshop update – Vosick**

There is massive interest in accelerating various outdated FS policies and procedures. Recognizing this interest and need, the ERI in their work plan volunteered to facilitate a workshop with the FS to home in on some efficiencies that can be achieved from the Record of Decision to the gate. To do this the ERI pulled information done by the industry working group, the Washington Office's Modernization group, and information the Nature Conservancy has compiled while trying to establish its stewardship agreement. There were approximately 15 tactical items identified from the workshop that could be done in order to improve process and accelerate projects on the ground. Along with these 15 items, the workshop identified responsible parties per item and the specific actions for which they're responsible. The FS recognizes that careful follow-through on these items will be key in accomplishing these stronger efficiencies. Next steps will be in setting up a systematic avenue for tracking and experimenting with implementing some of these innovations (things like increased use of tablet technology, DxP, virtual boundary marking, and better use of other already-available technologies). **A final report on the workshop will be released by the end of January and it will be broadly shared.**

Berlioux – Was the workshop a public event? The focus of the workshop was specifically on the ERI helping the FS improve these processes so the workshop was by invite only. Berlioux expressed the point that various industry members would have appreciated an invite.

Provencio – workshop attendance was not intended to exclude anyone and Henry seconds Vosick's point that this was not a one-and-done event – that there will be opportunity for stronger industry involvement on the issue during future iterations of the efficiencies effort. The effort was to try and get various Forest Service employees together from multiple levels of the agency so that the workshop could focus on their specific practices, policies, and potentially out-dated procedures.

### **11:10 Industry Update – Vosick**

The Nature Conservancy / Campbell Global - Horner - On behalf of TNC and the work Campbell Global is assisting them do on their Stewardship Agreement, over the past few months they've focused on SPA areas (Chimney Springs and Clover). They've had 3 logging contractors working continuously up until the snowfall in mid-January. Between those two SPAs they've treated between 400-500 acres. One of the issues they've faced is

dealing with small diameter wood. Without processing capacity they've hit a wall and are working on solutions. Overall the process of the stewardship agreement and SPAs has been working well. It's encouraging that contractors and cooperators can come in and take some of the workload off of the FS hands by using the route of this stewardship agreement. This process has provided valuable learning opportunities.

Northern Arizona Procurement Company (NAPCo) – Cox – At the present time they have entered into a contract to provide logging services to New Life Forest Products. There is no active harvesting going on right now and they haven't cut since Nov. 19<sup>th</sup>. They're in a suspension phase right now because New Life has limited activity at their mill. NAPCO is looking to move operations across the state. They have a lot of capacity in forestry, road building, construction, equipment support and transportation so they're looking to move into other parts of the state to attempt to put their eggs in more baskets. There is a lot of industry that has approached them with interest. Time is of the essence otherwise these industries will go somewhere else. Several things have caused them to stop cutting: Not enough mill capacity to take the cut product. They have a lot of loads that are sitting in the woods waiting to be taken. They have knowledge on what it takes to get to the number of acres this group envisions.

Berlioux – The only way to attract new industry investors is by putting out new RFPs. The concern is that if we don't make this a priority and work in a timely manner, industry guys will leave the state because they can't make money if they're not cutting.

Cooley – Appreciates the work NAPCo has been doing on the forests. They've exceeded expectations based on past experiences with other loggers. There is not enough capacity to process what NAPCo has been able to cut. At the Heber Sawmill, a second kiln is operational. Their air quality permit was approved this month. So things are moving forward with Heber. They've just signed the lease for their second facility and they will start building operations in the next month. A new sawmill has already been purchased and is awaiting relocation. They're planning to install the mill in Williams, AZ. They have another mill coming from Georgia.

Bruner – Is there an estimate on when those mills in Williams will be up and running? They're hoping to have the first sawmill (smaller diameter) running by late summer 2018 and the dry kilns and planters will go in the first part of 2019. The next saw mill would be ready by the spring of 2019. These estimates are subject to change if they decide not to go with the 2-mill plan.

Action Item- Berlioux – Proposes having a standing industry update item on all agendas from here on out, separate from the IWG update. There are no objections.

Coolley – What is the purpose of the IWG if they never meet and no correspondence has been occurring? Berlioux – the IWG made the decision that the group would not meet on a regular basis but will only meet when there is a need. It just happens that the group has not met in the last 6 months but they will probably convene in March to discuss and plan the 2018 industry round table.

### **11:40 Working Group Updates**

- Planning WG (10 min) – Berlioux



\*See above "Rim Country alternatives" Discussion

- Industry WG (10 min) – Berlioux

The IWG has started discussion with FS about the need/usefulness of a 2018 round table. Everyone agrees it is a good thing to do. There was a desire to hold one on the west side and one on the east side but this idea wasn't accepted and there will only be one. They are looking at the beginning of March for a date. There is an idea to push the round table to April so that Dick Fleishman can participate. Last year's round table brought about approximately 25 action items. The first part of this year's meeting will be for the FS to update on the progress of those initial 25 items and the second part of the meeting will be dedicated to developing new action items.

- Communications WG (10 min) – Sitko

The January Newsletter is complete and will be posted on BC this afternoon. The next edition will be released in April so Sue will be collecting ideas for that newsletter in February. This newsletter is a combination of contributions from a variety of stakeholders.

- 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft Brochure Review

Members of the public have questions about what's going on in the woods now that the FS has been ramping up their treatments and this brochure was developed as a way to provide information that would answer those questions. The brochure is fairly generic with the 4FRI logo on the back. These are for elected officials to hand out to constituents, for loggers and operators to give to public members that approach them with questions. This is the 2<sup>nd</sup> draft. There is one panel on goals of forest treatment, two panels on what forest restoration includes, and a panel on being safe, prepared, and involved in forest restoration. The back side is a blank image of a sticky note for anyone to use to pass along any information they need to distribute. This could be helpful for operators in the woods wanting to provide specialized specific information on what's going on at the particular site they are working on. Tayloe Dubay from the ERI helped nudge this process through with the graphic designer in order to develop these brochures to be durable for use in the woods. They're on a special paper to ensure durability.

They're hoping to have this printed in time to have 10,000 copies to bring to the Feb SHG meeting.

Miller – Trout Unlimited contributes \$250.00 to the printing of the CWGs brochures.

The CWG met in January to determine what their priorities are for 2018. The number one priority is completing the brochure but they've identified other priorities which include reviewing the Strategic Plan to determine which action items within it can be knocked out by the CWG in 2018. One item is revamping the 4FRI website to make it a bit more dynamic. They will continue to look at other communication products like talking cards on specific topics, in order to continue to provide information to the public. They're also contemplating trying to figure out a multi-partnered campaign for smoke information to come out. There was a workshop on the smoke issue in Albuquerque about a year ago and the CWG is hoping to reconvene that group in order to host a public workshop in the near future that will include various partners. They're last priority is to do more coordination with the MPMB to start coming up with stories about pre/post treatment information out there and to maybe start initiating a the development of a story board showing pre and post treatments.

- MPMB WG (10 min) – MPMB Representative

Mottek – They're currently working on prioritizing projects for FY18 funding and their next steps will be developing agreements with the FS. Further details on the projects that will be funded for next year will be provided by the February SHG meeting.

- Comprehensive Implementation WG (10 min) – Bruner

The pilot project at T-six springs is complete thanks to Game and Fish and Natural Channel Design who contributed a lot of resources to getting that work done. They will have a more complete report on this project to share at either the Feb. or Mar. meeting as well as an update on other upcoming projects. The CIWG has lined up at least 3 sites (Rosilda Spring, Mineral Spring, and Barber Shop Spring) where they plan to have work on the ground in the next year. There's the potential for an additional 3-5 spring restoration projects to happen in the next year if they can get the resources surveys done in time and if they're able to compile the resources needed to get the work done on the ground.

- Fiesta Working Group (10 min) – Vosick

The FWG is planning a spring event and they will be closing in on figuring out a celebration date.

#### **12:40 Stakeholder Disclosures – All**

Krigbaum - Regional Science Fair – Looking for volunteers to participate as judges.

Waltz – The PWG does not want the FS to wait for a PWG recommendation before starting their proposed Rim Country analysis.

Berlioux – Jason Whiting has been elected the new chair of ECO. On behalf of Novo Power, they are scheduling to relight their burner on Saturday. Hopefully the burner starts which will mean that NOVO power will resume for production in the next 7-10 days which will allow them to begin disposing of biomass once more.

Gatewood – This is Steve's last attendance at 4FRI SHG meetings. Steve states the forest is in good hands with 4FRI.

Petit – The FS expects the FY19 budget sometime this year; Senator Flake is on the Energy and Natural Resources committee who will be meeting to review the FY19 budget so the 4FRI board will ensure he is well-briefed on 4FRI prior. Dick promises a monthly operations update by this Friday. They've started including a few maps on mechanical thinning within the update to provide some visuals on which operations are occurring on the group and in what quantity. They've had a lot of media interest lately. Melissa Sevigny with KNAU is doing a series of stories on the broad picture of 4FRI and restoration in northern Arizona, so members of the SHG may be receiving inquiries from her in the future. The Coconino National Forest is looking to do a news release that the Elden base contract was terminated.

Provencio – FYI - SHs might hear folks say we're running out of acres and to put that in context, what's happening is the FS is prepping and selling acres in many different forms and they're also prepping and burning acres. The difficulty right now is balancing those two

restoration items. Until industry is fully ramped up the FS will keep running into this issue. Another issue is that the type of industry available today limits the areas the FS can offer as projects. If they had stronger demand for biomass, that would increase available acres.

Sitko – Reminds that there are about 10 copies of the brochure floating around and only take one if you're actually interested in reviewing the content.

Mottek – Evan Hjerpe from Conservation Economic Institute is conducting a regional economic analysis of 4FRI and he is collecting primary economic data from contractors from FY17 and there's a forestry graduate student named Jamie who has been assisting Evan and calling contractors for this information. If anyone receives inquiries from Evan or Jamie, Ann strongly encourages them to return their survey because this report will establish a baseline of data for economic contribution of 4FRI, and it will also illustrate the impacts from forest products industries on rural communities in Arizona.

Vosick – A RFP has been put out by Camp Navajo. The RFP is for the completion of a Biomass Feasibility Study. Also, Vosick received an advertisement in the mail for the Little Colorado River Plateau Northeast Economic Development Summit, and they're looking for people to both register and present. The event is taking place Feb. 21<sup>st</sup> - Feb. 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Provencio – For FY18 the FS is planning to put out approx. 45,000 acres in contracts and their burning target is over 100,000 acres.

**12:45 Review Action Items**

<b>Action Item</b>	<b>Lead</b>	<b>Status</b>
1. SHG to get feedback from the FS on the RFI discussion.	FS	
2. Provide topics to Annette on what the SHG would like the CFLR national team to discuss during the 4FRI stakeholder group meeting attendance	SHG	Pending SC call action
3. Send comments on to Travis on the NEPA process letter he posted on BC by Friday, 1/26	SHG	Complete
4. Incorporate comments on Travis' NEPA letter into the document and post another iteration on BC by Tuesday, 1/30	Bruner, Vosick, Babbott, Berlioux	Complete
5. Review of field trip for February SHG meeting. PWG to provide photographs of the field trip to the SHG as visuals	PWG, Jourden	Pending
6. Incorporate standing Industry Update on all future SHG Agendas	Jourden	Done
7. Send comments on second draft of the CWG brochure to Sue by February 2 <sup>nd</sup> .	SHG	Done
8. Provide Stephanie Coleman with comments/suggestions on the decision	PWG	PENDING

matrix for the revised Aquatics and Watershed Flexible Toolbox		
--	--	--

**12:50 Adjourn**

**02/28/18 SHG meeting information:**

Wednesday, February 28<sup>th</sup> 2018, 9am-TBD  
Coconino National Forest Supervisor's Office  
1824 South Thompson St., Flagstaff, AZ 86001  
Teleconference line: (712) 775-7031, code: 439290611#

Future Meetings

- MPMB Season Review
- Comprehensive Implementation Working Group presentation on T-6 Springs Restoration and 2018 Restoration Activities
- APS- The role of APS forestry and mitigation in the 4FRI footprint. Wade Ward –Tentatively April