



4FRI Stakeholder Group Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, February 25, 2015, 9am-1:00pm
Coconino National Forest Supervisor's Office
1824 S. Thompson St., Flagstaff, AZ 86001

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

Attendance: Mike Atkin, Ethan Aumack, Pascal Berlioux, Jerolyn Byrne, Vern Cawker, Danel Conley, Rebecca Davidson, Rob Davis, Bryce Esch, Dick Fleishman, Annette Fredette, Jesse Gatewood, Steve Gatewood, Jessica Gist, Alicyn Gitlin, Scott Harger, Steve Horner, Dan Kipervaser, Lynn Krigbaum, Mary Lata, Tom Mackin, Rob Marshall, Claire Mendelsohn, Anne Mottek-Lucas, Bill Noble, Tom Osen, Keith Pajkos, Sue Sitko, Greg Smith, Robin Stinnett, Paul Summerfelt, Buck Swaney, Diane Vosick, Amy Waltz, Mike Williams, Tiffany Woods (recorder), Travis Woolley

On the phone: Sharon Adams, Lori Martinek, Joe Miller, Hunter Moore, Todd Schulke, Bob Seidler

9:00 Introductions

9:05 Approve minutes from Jan. 14th SHG meeting — Vosick

No objections – 01/14/15 minutes were approved

9:10 Review action items from Jan. 14th SHG meeting — Vosick

Action Item	Lead	Status
1. Update Charter Member List – SC create recommendation for new Charter sign in.	SC/Swaney/Mitchell/Woods	IN PROGRESS Agenda Item SC Call
2. Continue CLFR breakdown – all projects with approved funding (include monitoring expenses) includes CFLN funds.	Fleishman	Complete
3. Completion of rephrasing the second paragraph of the FEIS recommendation letter – Post to BASECAMP. Sent to Forest Supervisors	Berlioux/Schulke/Woods	Complete
4. SHG responses to finalized letter – Due COB Friday	ALL	Complete
5. Post hospital provided email address for Gatewood to BASECAMP	Summerfelt	Complete
6. Add agenda item to 02/25/15 SHG agenda – USFS presentation on new EIS boundary	Woods	Complete

9:15 Call to the Public

No public comments

9:20 Presentation to ID Team - Aumack

To formally recognize the 4FRI Forest Service ID Team, Ethan Aumack, on behalf of the Stakeholder Group (SHG), presented them with a photo displaying the magnificence of northern Arizona's ponderosa

pine forest. The ID Team has worked with enthusiasm and diligence since the beginning stages of the Four Forest Restoration Initiative and without their vision and hard work the project would not be where it is today.

The Forest Service, in turn, commended the SHG and noted that collaboration was also an important component of the project.

9:25 USFS Update – Fleishman

The updates that are made available on BASECAMP can also be accessed through the USFS website. Since October 1st, GEP has been making accelerated progress on work related to the contact. They have already completed as many acres as they had in the previous year.

Aside from the 4FRI EIS, other NEPA projects are expected to be available that will support other restoration work across the landscape. NEPA should be online for the Apache-Sitgreaves NF by the end of the fiscal year as well as the Flagstaff Watershed Protection Plan (FWPP) and the Bill Williams Project.

Prescribed burning for this past month only accounted for 250 acres. More prescribed burning is expected to take place when the opportunity arises.

- CFLR breakdown of all projects

Dick presented a summary of all planned projects (4FRI 2010 -2014), however, it is not possible to track the total cost per approved project because the costs are difficult to array by project because of the IRR budgeting process. The Forest Service (FS) accomplishment rate is within 95% of the planned cost.

The summary is broken down by forest, fiscal year, and then project. It does not include FY15 funding and the FS was unable to flag restoration work in 2010 because an identifier had not yet been created. Since 2011 they have been better able to track restoration projects as there is now an identifier.

Notify Dick Fleishman if there is a need to present the data in a different format. The information will be available on BASECAMP.

Question (Berlioux): Is there a 2015-2020 projection? Not by a project to project basis, but they expect it to fall within the 19-20 million dollars of restoration funding. The FS is unable to forecast with any level of specificity at this time because they receive their appropriations annually.

Question (Sitko): What do implementation and preparation include and would planning be included in preparation? Planning is separate because it is not available for match funding. Preparation includes surveys while implementation would include prescribed burning, paying for task orders (TO), and possible on the ground expenses.

Action Item: Post to CFLR summary to BASECAMP.

9:35 Stakeholder Disclosures – All

- Smallwood Conference - Summerfelt

Summerfelt will represent himself, as a member of the SHG, at the Smallwood Conference on March 25-26. He is a panel member and plans to discuss where the project is today and the success and challenges of the collaborative.

Action Item: Send recommendations for information to be covered by Paul Summerfelt at the conference.

- 4FRI D.C. Trip in April – Vosick

Representatives from the SHG, including the FS and the 4FRI contractor, will be in Washington D.C. on April 20th for their annual trip to report on progress of the CFLRP. It is positioned at a time when they are considering appropriations and provides an opportunity for members of the collaborative to present highlights of the project. Confirmed attendees are: Steve Levesque, Earl Stewart, Diane Vosick, Jason Rosamond, Maya Minkova, Mandy Metzger, and Rob Davis.

Action Item: In anticipation of the annual trip, the SHG will be requested to review and provide input on the talking points. Amy Waltz recommends mentioning the CFLRP 5 year report as the trip coincides with the deadline.

- City of Flagstaff D.C. Trip – Summerfelt

The SHG contributed to the development of the talking points presented by the City of Flagstaff delegation. These same talking points can serve as the foundational talking points for the upcoming trip in April.

- National Association of Counties Meeting in D.C. - Berlioux

Pascal was requested to provide talking points, on behalf of several Eastern Arizona Counties, for this meeting. It included 4FRI among other topics.

- ERI Meeting with Jeff Whitney, Arizona's state forester - Vosick

Dr. Covington and Diane Vosick met with Arizona's new state forester, Jeff Whitney. They invited him to attend a future SHG meeting. He wants to meet the stakeholders and is excited to work with the collaboration.

Disclosures provide individuals of the SHG with an opportunity to discuss items that they are working on outside of the group that could impact the collaborative.

9:55 Review of Objections/Objectors & Presentation on R3 Resolution Process – Fredette

The FS received 9 objections on the FEIS from both individuals and conservation groups. Only one objection, from William Baker, did not have standing. The objections covered the issues including the effects of prescribed burning on public health, use of best available science, effects of grazing and aspen decline, a monitoring plan for the Mexican spotted owl (MSO), the inclusion of a full restoration alternative, the large tree retention strategy, and addressing sensitive species habitat. All submitted objections can be access with the following link: <http://www.fs.usda.gov/main/4fri/planning>

Regarding the objection process, the objection review team has reviewed the objections and is preparing responses. The responses will be reviewed and then it will be determined if and where meaningful discussions can be held. It is expected that the resolution meetings will occur during the weeks of March 9th and March 16th. A strategy meeting is scheduled for March 9th to develop meeting formats and the formal objection dialogue.

The review period was extended by 30 days. The FS is required to send a formal response to the objectors by April 6th and it is expected that the final ROD will be release by April 20th.

The FS does not currently have information on the review and responses that are being worked on by the objection review team. Once the review is finalized the information will be made available. All current documents can be accessed through the 4FRI USFS website.

Question (Mackin): Does the objection on grazing involve too much or too little grazing? The objection was submitted by the Sierra Club because the effects of grazing where not covered in the FEIS. Historical grazing has brought us to an unhealthy forest and acknowledgment of the need for better studies on the effects of grazing is requested:

Question (Mackin): What does the objection on aspen decline include? This was also submitted by the Sierra Club and the issue concerns the changed language in the FEIS. Aspens were originally included in the large tree retention dialogue.

Question (Sitko): Is there a litigation timeframe once the final ROD is released? Implementation begins the day after the release of the final ROD and litigation can occur within a year of the release.

10:25 Discussion on SHG Letter to Cal Joyner – Summerfelt/Vosick

A letter was presented to the SHG that is intended for Cal Joyner voicing the groups appreciation and continued interest to participate in the resolution process as he had discussed in the 10/21/14 Steering Committee Call.

A discussion ensued concerning participation as there could be a difference in interpretation of the word. For example, participation in the resolution process would not be the same if participating as a member of the public (passive) versus participating as a member of the process (active). If invited to actively participate in the resolution process, what would the SHG strategy be to prepare for the meetings, if it is determined there is a need for a strategy? Another concern that was voiced included the potential need for developing positions on issues that had not yet been discussed in-depth by the group. Further discussion on potential strategy development and the need for positions on each issue will be discussed in the next SC call.

Resolution meeting formats are left to the discretion of Cal Joyner, the letter requests clarification on the role of the SHG in the upcoming meetings. The main objective is to ensure that the SHG remain a positive aspect of the process and continue to stay in alignment with the letter that was sent to the Forest Supervisors which stated the group's support of the FEIS.

Action Item: Rephrase 3rd paragraph to better request clarification on SHG participation/role in resolution meetings. Continue participation discussion at next SC Call

10:45 Break

11:00 Presentation on Legal Options White Paper – Vosick

The *Administrative and Legal Review Opportunities for Collaborative Groups. ERI White Paper – Issues in Forest Restoration* is intended to provide information to collaborative groups should there be litigation and legal action after the release of the final ROD. Objectors have the option, if they plan to litigate, to file a legal action or ask for an injunction. While it is unclear if any objectors plan to litigate, the SHG should begin to think about what they will elect to do if the FEIS is challenged. It should be noted that if an injunction is granted all work on the project will be stopped. The two roles in which the SHG can engage in the judicial process are intervention or amicus curiae, however, both would require time and an attorney. There would need to be a discussion on being able to provide the means to stay involved in the suit if the group decides to engage in the process.

Susan Jane Brown from the Western Environmental Law Center (WELC) is the author of the White Paper and she has worked extensively with collaborative groups. The publication is available on BASECAMP and through the following

link: <http://library.eri.nau.edu/gsd/collect/erilibra/index/assoc/D2015006.dir/doc.pdf>

Should anyone have questions concerning this topic, the ERI, in collaboration with the National Forest Foundation and WELC, will be hosting a webinar with Susan in April.

Question (Berlioux): The work that is currently being done is done in the NEPA shelf stock acres, not the FEIS acres. If an injunction is granted against the ROD would it affect the shelf stock? The Office of General Counsel (OGC) would be the more suited to provide a response for this question as it is unclear what projects would be impacted by an injunction.

Action Item: SC Agenda Item – WELC webinar follow-up.

11:15 Second EIS Boundaries – Fredette

The presentation covered is only a draft concerning the second EIS boundary and is being presented to provide the SHG as an opportunity to provide feedback. The boundary is within the 4FRI initiative area not already covered in the first EIS, it is intended to surround contiguous ponderosa pine forest, will include where additional restoration is needed in current and future NEPA projects and where more vegetation analysis is needed within these projects, and excludes portions of the landscape where restoration treatments have already occurred or that have been effected by wildfire.

On the west side boundary of the A-S there is already project work taking place including the Larson project and the Upper Rocky Arroyo project. As 4FRI moves east across the landscape there are a lot more complexities, including aquatic issues and mixed-conifer stands. Moving further east are the Escudilla East project and the Black River project. The FS is working on projects outside of the boundary to leverage outside interest and funds and considered these current projects when drafting the second EIS boundary.

Question (Davis): Will the no analysis needed sections, within the second EIS boundary, be affected if there is an injunction? There is no way of knowing what areas would be affected if there is an injunction.

Question (Berlioux): Is there a date for the release of a draft EIS for the second analysis? At this point, FS anticipates to start working on the proposed action and existing conditions for the next EIS in late spring/early summer of 2015. It is expected that the second EIS will take less time than the first. Berlioux mentioned how the timeline is important from an investment standpoint because it involves the second 4FRI contract/contracts and the extension of the first contract.

Question (Woolley): Is there a potential for a third EIS as a result of the complexities faced on the east side? There could be a third EIS or it could be divided separately.

Question: Is there a map of the ponderosa pine forest within 4FRI that isn't covered by the first and second EIS? There is not currently a map, but one can be developed.

Question (Mackin): Will there be an effort to work with Arizona Indian Tribes to conduct restoration projects that are adjacent to the second EIS boundary? Discussions have been had in the past and the FS is looking to have the discussions again, but engagement with tribal governments would be required.

Action Item: Develop a map outlining ponderosa pine forest within 4FRI that is not covered in the first and second EIS.

Action Item: Post a request for feedback from stakeholders concerning the second EIS boundary so that questions can be assembled and presented at the March SHG meeting (1hr). Questions can be posted directly to BASECAMP or sent to Sue and Diane.

AGENDA CHANGE: Multi-Party Monitoring Board Update – Gist

The MPMB is preparing to conduct on the ground monitoring and the following presentation provides a review of their approach and objectives on how they will obtain their first year of pre-treatment data. They are working to develop and refine top tier monitoring questions while also focusing on the costs of monitoring to remain within the CFLR budget. Use of existing protocols can help streamline the process and improve efficiency if they can be repurposed to answer the top tier questions. Monitoring will begin on 2-4 shelf stock NEPA projects that are within the 4FRI landscape where they best reflect 4FRI desired conditions.

Challenges include creating a sampling design of this scale while remaining within the constraints of the budget, determining how the analyses are going to look and how to manage this information in databases so that they can be shared appropriately. The board has separated into small groups to focus on the following categories:

- Plot based forest structure and composition variables
- Bird Surveys
- Remote Sensing analyses
- Invasive plants landings/roads
- Social perceptions and economic impacts

Each group is responsible for developing a presentation on their assigned category which will be later presented to the SHG for approval. There will also be a need to determine the frequency of monitoring and how to remain with CFLR funding, but the board is open to more partnerships and SHG contributions.

Question (Berlioux): Has the MPMB organized a formal outreach to NAU graduate students in search of thesis projects? This has been a topic of discussion and could be potentially done in the future depending on established priorities. There is a difference between opportunistic research and academic research and often the requests to do research also include a request for funding, which is not possible through CFLR funds. The funding would already have to be made available.

Joe Miller mentioned a potential partnership with Trout Unlimited because they are currently in the planning stages of establishing a large-scale monitoring program in the southwest focused on stream temperatures. The MPMB will discuss adding this to a future agenda.

Question (Fleishman): Could a summary be provided concerning the crossover between the MPMB and the Natural Resources Working Group (NRWG)? The NRWG worked with the MPMB to develop a separate monitoring plan that was based on the monitoring plan of the first EIS analysis area. There is a reasonable amount of overlap, but they also have questions that are specific to their area. As both groups move forward they plan to remain consistent, but also remain aware of differences between the landscapes. This will be a living document that can be changed depending on environmental concerns.

11:30 SHG Retreat Discussion/Planning – Vosick/Swaney

With the anticipated release of the final ROD and a shift in focus to the second EIS, it is recommended that the SHG consider scheduling a retreat intended to reflect on the history of the project and look to the future and discuss how the collaborative can improve. It could provide a forum on how to encourage a unified project culture as opposed to maintaining the current east vs. west outlook. Suggested dates are May 27-28 and it is recommended to outsource a different facilitator to allow Buck Swaney to participate.

Action Item: Dedicate 30 minutes on the next SC Call agenda to retreat planning.

11:45 Workforce Training Outcomes Update – Vosick/Sitko

Representatives from local community colleges and industry attended a preliminary meeting to discuss future workforce needs to complete the work outlined in 4FRI and the means of training the needed workforce. Employers are facing a lack of qualified personnel with computerized math based skills and are facing high turn-over rates. The participating community colleges and industry members are discussing the development of training that could address issues of specialized training and workforce readiness. Potential workforce resources could include previously employed Walgreens employees and returning veterans.

Request (Berlioux): Notify the SHG of future meeting of this type.

12:25 Working Group Updates

- Utilization and Industry Working Group – currently inactive
- Communications Working Group – currently inactive

12:35 Announcements

- BASECAMP opt-in – Vosick

An opt-in post will be coming in the future requesting all BASECAMP members to confirm that they want to remain active on the site.

- 2015 SHG Self-Evaluation Announcement – Swaney

Buck is currently in the process of recreating the 2015 SHG Self-Evaluation survey, it will be available on BASECAMP in the near future.

- 3rd Annual Forest Health Conference – SRP

SRP has tentatively scheduled the next Forest Health Conference for Oct 7th and 8th. Please notify Rebecca Davidson should there be any schedule conflicts or with presentation recommendations.

- Proper EIS terminology – Fredette

The FS wants to move away from referring to the project in phases. The second EIS is not phase II. IT should be referred to as the second EIS.

12:45 Action Items and Adjourn

Action Item	Lead	Status
1. SC Agenda: Further discussion of Legal Actions White Paper and Webinar in April	Vosick/Woods/Mitchell	
2. SC Agenda: SHG role in Resolution Process/develop recommendations for SHG and plan depending on active/passive participation	Mitchell/SC Members	
3. SC Agenda: Update Charter Member List – SC create recommendation for new Charter sign in	SC/Swaney/Mitchell/Woods	IN PROGRESS Agenda Item SC Call
4. SC Agenda: Establish planning committee for 4FRI SHG retreat (30min)	Woods/Mitchell	
5. SC Agenda: 4FRI Talking Points Discussion for April D.C. Trip	All	
6. Rephrase 3 rd paragraph of letter to Cal Joyner to better clarify definition of participation	Summerfelt/Vosick	Complete
7. Post 4FRI 2 nd EIS Project Area to BASECAMP	Fredette, Woods	
8. Post CFLR summary to BASECAMP	Fleishman	
9. Post announcement on BASECAMP to assemble questions concerning 2 nd EIS project boundary.	All	
10. Develop a map outlining ponderosa pine forest within 4FRI that is not covered in the first and second EIS	USFS 4FRI Team	
11. Send input for Paul to possibly discuss at Smallwood conference	All/Summerfelt	
12. Post SHG Self-Evaluation to BASECAMP	Swaney	
13. Post Opt-in notice on SHG		

The 03/25/15 SHG meeting information:
South County Complex Health Building – Frontier Conference Room
600 North 9th Place, Show Low, AZ 85901
Teleconference line: (712) 775-7031, code: 439290611#

Anticipated agenda items for 03/25/15 SHG meeting:

1. 4FRI Self Evaluation
2. Factsheet update for 4FRI D.C. Trip
3. Annual Planning

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

