



### 4FRI Stakeholder Group Meeting

Wednesday, May 25<sup>th</sup>, 2018 9am-1:20pm

Arizona Game & Fish Region 1 Office (Pinetop)

2878 E. White Mountain Blvd., Pinetop, AZ 85935

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

Attendance: Paul Summerfelt, Amy Waltz, Mark Nigrelli, John Souther, Justin Schofer, Patrick Moore, Jay Smith, Kenneth Cox, Tim White, Kelly Wolff, Tom Torres, Dick Fleishman, Randy Fuller, Josh Miller, Brienne Petit, Henry Provencio, Brad Cooper, Annette Fredette, Floyd Hardin, Lynn Krigbaum, Kurt Schneider, Aaron Green, Jeff Whitney, Shay Peterson, Steve Rosenstock, Travis Bruner, Bryce Esch, Allison Jourden, Steven Flora, Andrew Vaulkmer, Paul Watson, Greg Smith, Pascal Berlioux, Michelle Ralston, Joe Miller, Todd Schulke, Steve Horner, Bruce Hallin, Adam Cooley, Emery Cohen, Brad Worsley, Alicin Gitlin, Ann Anderson

#### 9:00 Introductions

**9:05 Approve minutes from the April 25<sup>th</sup> SHG meeting** — Berlioux – Approved with Berlioux edits

**9:10 Review action items from the April 25<sup>th</sup> SHG meeting** — Berlioux

Action Item	Lead	Status
1. When the FS receives interpretation language from Dep. of Agriculture on the Omnibus Bill they will then report the interpretations to the SHG on what the new language enables them to do	Fleishman	Pending – Language will come out in the form of Manual Guidance which is in process
2. Email Chip Davis / Keith Brekhus regarding letter to the Secretary of Agriculture from Congressman O'Halleran on efficient implementation of provisions in the Omnibus Bill	Berlioux	Pending - Email was sent out. No response yet.
3. Post update on Omnibus interpretations on BC when received from the CFLR Washington Office	Fleishman	Pending - Fleishman will post when available
4. Assemble a group of folks to draft a 'Thank you'/review letter to our Congressional delegation (DRAFT by June SHG meeting)	Sitko	Pending - Sue produced draft which was reviewed by group. Further development of letter in process to ask for reauthorization of funding.
5. Determine when the MPMB will give an update presentation	Jourden	Complete
6. Crockett to send WO developed potential funding scenarios to Fleishman who will then present them to the SHG	Crockett / Fleishman	Complete – Fleishman to post a call for volunteers to work on development of funding scenarios
7. IWG to develop a 1-page industry statement on what is important to 4FRI Industry regarding the implementation of provisions in the 20 Year	Berlioux, Worsley, Smith,	Complete

Stewardship Contracts. Will circulate on BC for a 48-hour review by stakeholders.	Horner, Cooley	
8. Berlioux will ask Hunter Moore that he attend an upcoming SHG meeting to report on current meetings happening in the Governor's Office involving 4FRI	Berlioux	Complete – will be addressed in today's presentation by Torres
9. Ward to send Jourden APS presentation of post on BC	Ward/Jourden	Complete

**9:15 Call to the Public**

Krigbaum – Informs the group of events happening in Pinetop:

1. The Nature Center – Walk for the Woods happening on June 2<sup>nd</sup> which is a fundraiser to help the town purchase a park. Krigbaum has registration forms available.
2. Hot-Air Balloon Festival in Pinetop on June 16<sup>th</sup>
3. The Nature center is presenting their annual report about 4FRI to the public on June 9<sup>th</sup> about 4FRI – this event will include a hike and a video. Randy Fuller will be in attendance talking about the trees and there will also be a fire-wise presentation.

Presents maps from the Nature Center showing motorized and non-motorized trails in the Lakeside District.

Krigbaum to send Pinetop upcoming event information to Jourden. Jourden to post event materials on BC.

**9:20 USFS Update - 4FRI Coordinators**

Fleishman presents copies of a press release stating that two senators have introduced a CFLRP reauthorization action. Activity in support of reauthorization of CFLRP funding is occurring nationally.

Operations – Fire restrictions and closures are in effect and are slowing operations. Only 500 acres of mechanical harvest occurred last month. No future prescribed fire is scheduled until we receive some moisture. CC Cragin NEPA is in an objection period at the moment.

Public Affairs – Links to 4FRI first EIS information on FS website have been giving folks issues. This was determined to be a server issue which has now been resolved. May monthly update is now on Basecamp.

Innovations and Efficiencies – There may be the potential for synergy in work with the collaborative in Eastern Oregon. Provencio states that the Forest Service as intentions to look at what they're doing there to see if any processes can be applied to work in Arizona. The FS is discussing possibilities and logistics to meet with this group. Provencio invites participation from the SHG.

- Future CFLR Funding Update – Fleishman

WO did not develop individual funding scenarios but actually tasked the individual CFLRP groups to do so themselves, and to include these in their annual reports. Fleishman hopes for the SHG collaborative to work on this effort together. Fleishman to post press release regarding CFLRP reauthorization and funding scenario template on BC.

Fleishman will post a call for volunteers on Basecamp. Berlioux, Smith, Bruner, and Waltz volunteer.

### **9:50 RFP Prep / Characterization Prep – Torres**

Torres discusses the work being done toward the issuance of a FS RFP for Rim Country. The situation can be summed up by 3 numbers: 50,000 acres being what FS wants to be able to treat on an annual basis; 29 being the average number of acres offered to various contractors to work in the 4FRI footprint; and 13 acres being what they've treated on average in the forest between 2013 and 2017. This depicts a necessary urgency to ramp up the rate and scale of restoration.

To respond to this urgency, the FS has established a collective of specific partners with which they're working to most effectively move forward with issuing a large-scale RFP. The effort to entice and sustain well-capitalized industry needs a variety of perspectives and innovations. Those that have been involved in this partnership are the FS, SRP, BLM, ACC DFFM... Time is of the essence and the FS feels that those within this group are the right ones to help move this process forward quickly because this group has existing straightforward authorities that are beneficial to the process of issuing an RFP. The FS is not saying that they're not interested in advice and assistance from others, but time is an urgent matter.

There were a number of responses to the RFI and the FS is working to develop a Memorandum of Understanding to define roles, responsibilities and levels of confidentiality that will be required from this group. There are some questions that need to be answered before the MOU can be finalized and Torres is hopeful they will receive these answers soon so that the MOU can be shared with the public and other interested parties.

It is envisioned that the new RFP will have the ability to use the new 20-year stewardship authority. The FS will need assistance with efficiencies and implementation.

Bruce Hallin – This MOU is focused on increasing the scale and pace of restoration. SRP is a reclamation project and have long worked with BLM to protect their watershed assets. SRP has been actively been involved in this forest space for longer than the FS has existed. Preventing catastrophic wildfire is critical in protecting these watersheds. SRPs responsibility in maintaining the watersheds is important when and is the reason they believe this collaboration with the FS, BLM, and the state will be beneficial in protecting those watersheds. SRP holds unique authorities and an agency relationship with the federal government. Their interest in partnering in the development in an large-scale RFP comes from the belief that Arizona needs to develop new and existing forest industry in order to make large scale restoration goals a reality. Hallin on behalf of BLM, a federal agency with the capacity to bring assistance to the development of

a large-scale RFP, reiterates their support for this partnership. This type of partnership is not unique as the CWPP project is of a similar structure.

Whitney – Whitney is the State Forester who was appointed by the governor and approved by the senate. He manages a suite of programs that encompasses the land management activities of 9.2 million acres of state trust land and 12 million acres of unincorporated privately owned land. By statute they are required to prevent and suppress all unwanted wildfire, and that includes the management of mitigation measures. They do approx. 13 million acres a year of survey/mitigation work. As the state forester, he is a fiscal agent to accept and disperse funding and has authority to enter into contracts on behalf of AZDFFM.

Vicki Christensen is currently the interim chief for the FS and she observed that we have a 100-year history of collaboration between the federal forestry departments and the states. There are a lot of different land ownership patterns across the western states. AZDFFM mission currently is an opportunity to continue supporting existing industry and to also collaborate with the FS to increase the pace and scale of restoration. We need a dramatic uptick in the supply chain.

The governor supports this collaborative work. The governor's chief of staff has engaged with the Trump Administration early on regarding this.

Torres – Torres will post briefing of this information on BC. Wants to ensure there is consistent information sharing within the collaborative.

Bruner – Is there any information on a timeline for an RFP?

Torres has been working on a draft timeline but there are some questions that require answers before a timeline is finalized. Hallin hopes to have an answer regarding a timeline for an RFP soon as it needs to happen ASAP.

Cowen – How is this process different from the Vision 17 RFP plan and what makes this more likely to succeed?

This effort is consistent with the Strategic Plan. In terms of success, that's what they're most interested in which is why the FS doesn't want to go at this alone – they want a diverse set of expertise at the table.

Worsley – Is concerned. NOVO Power has worked extensively on a solution to biomass and has assumed tremendous debt and sacrifice to make sure they're in place to respond to an RFP once it's available. They have until August 17<sup>th</sup> to bid on the APS 60 mw RFP and they cannot do that until the FS releases their RFP to provide supply. After August 17<sup>th</sup>, they will have missed their chance. The biggest issue forest restoration faces is a solution to biomass and there is a solution available right now, if the FS works fast enough. Industry expected to see the RFP a year ago. In order to get enough financing through APS, proof supply is necessary which is what the FS RFP will provide.

Cooley – Wants to know if Worsley's main concern is supply, because there is supply.

Worsley – SRP confirmed that a 5-year guarantee of supply is not sufficient to obtain the financing necessary to build these needed facilities. In order to get 100,000,000 of financing, assured of supply is required. Worsley has been pressing SRP for information

on what they want to do for months and also waiting on confirmation from the FS on supply.

Berlioux – We've been working 6 years on implementation and we are all in agreement that biomass needs to leave the woods. The only current viable solution is in bio-energy. To remove the biomass we need a market to buy the electricity, investors to bring funds to build biomass facilities, and the woods supply. These are three different things but they need to progress at the same speed – you can't have one without the other. You cannot get an investor interested with no market so they worked with ACC to create a market. Now APS is putting out an RFP but how can anyone answer the RFP without a confirmation of where the fuel will come from? The APS RFP needs answered by August 17<sup>th</sup>. It is impossible for someone to answer the RFP without an answer to the fuel questions. Without the FS providing the guarantee of supply, no one will be able to make the investment in the biomass processing facilities. How will the FS make sure all three of these needs progress together which will ensure 4FRI success?

Torres – The FS is committed to moving forward as quickly as possible. They will take what was shared today and incorporate it into their work.

Worsley – This group has known the ACC was engaging in the biomass issue since last May and that an RFP would be coming. NOVO Power has the opportunity right now to decide if they take their coal plant and retrofit it to a 30, 45, or 60 megawatt facility. They cannot move forward with a decision on the size of the facility without information on how much supply will be available to feed the plant.

White – ClimaTech wants to bring in industry to support Novo Power they as an industry investor are not comfortable with the current guaranteed feed stock and off-take. If they don't have a 20 year commitment of feedstock, they will not invest money into the project. The current issue appears to be a lack of understanding from each agency involved on what's needed to make this happen.

Hallin – SRP is also frustrated with the process and would like to see things move more quickly. They are hoping that through their new partnership with the FS, they can get this RFP out as soon as possible. Accomplishing 4FRI is a biomass in industry issue. The last thing they want is a 60 mw plant competing for wood supply from a new large contract investor in AZ.

Provencio – How much additional biomass confirmation is needed for supply and by when? 250,000 annual bone dry tons and feed which translates to 15,000 acres of ponderosa pine restoration activities. Legally binding commitment is required for the financing. The physical need for the fuel will come two years after the RFP is rewarded.

Whitney – Commits to the coordination and communication with APS to see to what extent the processes can be sped up. Each agency has specific processes they need to abide by and it will be beneficial for all involved to have a clear understanding of each.

Cooley – There will be some overlap between the 1<sup>st</sup> contract's activities and the second RFP. What happens in a scenario that both of those contracts and other industry out there demands more than those 50,000 acres?

Torres – The FS wants to release an RFP that is flexible enough to entice a variety of proposals.

Berlioux – Wonders if it might make sense for the FS to determine its flexibility in choosing two different bidders on one RFP: one to deal specifically with biomass and one to deal specifically with round wood.

Hallin – The design of this RFP is critical and any ideas for effective innovation is welcomed.

### **10:50 MPMB Update – Anderson**

Ann Anderson started with the MPMB in 2014 and is the current chair. The last presentation the MPMB gave to update the SHG was in 2015.

The plan is focused around adaptive management and can be found on BaseCamp. The MPMB has identified a large variety of restoration success indicators however it is well understood that there are insufficient funds to monitor them all over the entire treatment area.

Review of Monitoring Plan Objectives:

One, clarify process for monitoring and adaptive management, clarify requirements for monitoring, to collaboratively develop monitoring plan ... What they are able to monitor is dependent on funding and capacity.

Monitoring Indicators include: biophysical indicators (diversity, forest health, fuel/fire, invasive plants, soils, structure/composition, T&E or sensitive species, watershed function) and socio-economic indicators (social systems framework and economic systems framework)

For effective monitoring, tasks within the plan are tiered as either tier one or tier two.

Past Monitoring:

They've done ground-based forest plots data pre-treatment collection to answer various questions. They've developed protocols for sampling these data sets. They done some watershed function monitoring and wildlife monitoring.

Goals for 2018:

They wish to accomplish pre-treatment monitoring for as many tier-1 indicators as possible. They have the potential to do some post-treatment monitoring this year as well to analyze forest structure and composition indicators. They also hope to finalize water monitoring questions via stakeholder review and the second EIS monitoring plan.

This year they plan to do data analysis for pre-treatment plot data analysis. TNC wrote a grant to add capacity for surveys on invasive plants for pre- and post- treatment data.

Remote sensing monitoring is used to analyze forest structure and composition and to determine post-treatment task orders. They will use UAV and LiDAR to accomplish this. This summer they will fly LiDAR to get a pre-treatment data set for most of the phase one 4FRI footprint.

The economic monitoring survey that took place last year is coming to a close. This was done in support of socio-economic monitoring. They will have some preliminary results this year.

Regarding water, they will go to Rosilda Springs to conduct some effectiveness monitoring. They will work with SSI to develop a study design to measure spring and ground water response to 4FRI treatments. They are developing a protocol to measure spring/water response to 4FRI treatments.

Wildlife – MSO takes priority over other monitoring activities. They are measuring changes in species reproduction and quantities. Regarding breeding birds, they are measuring changes in species abundance and diversity. Pre-treatment surveys are underway. They're also developing a model for pre-treatment landscape permeability based on collar data of pronghorns.

Budget Review:

Andersons hares budget spreadsheet which is on Basecamp. A large portion of the 2018 budget is going toward remote sensing activities, followed by wildlife monitoring and wat monitoring activities.

2<sup>nd</sup> EIS Water Questions:

The board has developed 6 new water questions. The board is proposing deleting one of the old questions and replacing it with two new ones. Questions:

1. **(From previous monitoring plan)** How are springs and watersheds being affected by forest restoration treatments (Spring flow, aquatic and emergent vegetation, stream channel meanders)?
2. **(Delete – from old monitoring plan)** No monitoring questions but desired condition indicators focused on water balance, which was determined to be infeasible.
3. **New** – How do treatments affect surface water flow regimes over time?
4. **New** – How do treatments affect subsurface hydrologic response over time?
5. **New** – How do treatments affect aquatic habitat sustainability?
6. **New** – How do treatments affect the morphology of springs and stream channels?
7. **New** – How do treatments affect the structure and composition of native obligate and facultative riparian vegetation over time?
8. **New** – How do treatments affect the abundance and diversity of native aquatic, riparian, and upland wildlife species over time?
9. **New** – How do treatments affect the condition and function of riparian soils over time?

SHG to review first EIS monitoring plan and the new MPMB water questions to provide feedback to the MPMB at the June Meeting to approve using the First EIS monitoring plan with the new water questions included for the 2nd EIS. Partners they plan to involve are TU, G&F, SSI, and Citizen Scientists. Right now they are trying to finalize the questions before determining who will conduct the specific water studies.

SHG Meeting Item – 2<sup>nd</sup> EIS Monitoring plan acceptance.

Berlioux - Are we biting off more than we can chew?

Esch - The monitoring plan from the first EIS contained large questions as well. One of the roles of the MPMB is trying to set up good science-based questions that capture the desired conditions and outcomes that stakeholders are interested in and to then develop specific indicators and measuring tools that will make these questions easier to grasp.

Bruner – The monitoring plan is ambitious – it is disclosed that they will not be able to fully measure every single questions but they want to make sure that at this point they are at least capturing everything stakeholders identify as important measures in these projects. They recently met with other monitors to gauge what forms of monitoring is already out there and what information is already available.

Dick – How many of these align with existing monitoring efforts happening in other places? Anderson doesn't have an answer to this but will take it back to the board.

2019: The MPMB plans to maximize post-treatment surveys and analyses.

Provencio – Regarding remote sensing training plots, does the work going on right now with TNC contain overlap with information they're hoping to collect for monitoring purposes? As long as they are trying to capture data within the phase one footprint, then yes, they are interested.

Esch – The LiDAR training details are an ongoing questions. The question is whether or not the plots they use for monitoring and data collection are suitable to use for LiDAR training data. It is an ongoing conversation.

### **11:00 Industry Update – Attending Industry Members**

Cox – NAPCo is still removing material from the woods but there are currently not cutting.

Cooley – They continue to remove material from the woods. The Heber Sawmill is averaging about 4ft a shift and some additional improvements as they continue to increase capacity. The Williams facility they're submitting their operating plan to the city to begin construction for that site. Currently they're running one shift but they plan to go back to running two shifts shortly.

The Coconino NF is closed in certain areas but logs are still being removed. There is a map showing forest closures online.

### **11:20 Industry Response to John Crockett – IWG – Horner**



Members of the IWG put together a response to Crockett's request for a statement of industry perspective on the implementation of the 20-year stewardship authority. The IWG posted this response on BC and got some responses. They haven't met yet to incorporate those edits. Summerfelt commented about who that letter should come from, whether the IWG or the SHG and Horner thinks it would be most effective coming from the SHG. The SHG agrees.

Berlioux poses the questions on whether or not the SHG approves that the co-chairs send the letter to Crockett on behalf of the SHG once they are done with the incorporation of the comments already received, as well as any that are received today? There are no objections.

Cooley – The point regarding 5-10 year renewal terms raises the concern that contracts can be pulled out from under contractors if it's found that they're not meeting specific objectives. It's a risk a financier would hold back on. SRP has experienced with their 10-year contracts that changes that have been allowed by others in the industry have not been allowed by them. The objective is to thin the forest and not dictate how their thinned.

Berlioux – Is not in agreement. The financial community is used to monitoring performance as a necessity for continuation. Berlioux does not interpret the idea of performance checks as a threat to the financiers or the contractors; it is necessary for the FS to have measures of performance success in place and the ability to terminate contracts in the case of non-performance.

Cooley – Agrees that the FS should have the ability to cancel agreements when necessary but in SRP experience, specific renewal terms have caused concern with financiers.

Fleishman – For clarification on this item, Dick suggests changing the wording in the bullet from "Could be a maximum of 20 years" to "Would be a maximum of 20 years" and that the example of 5-10 years isn't really necessary in the letter. Berlioux agrees and also suggests changing the word "renewal" with "performance measures."

Smith (Jay) – Do we as a SHG want to guide the FS on what items we want industries to provide to demonstrate that they have the funding necessary to meet their objectives? What avenues will the FS use to ensure industries can successfully fund the projects they say they can fund? There are lessons to be learned from past contracts where industry provided information about funding and then fell through. How will the FS avoid this in the future? Should this letter to John Crockett go into those specifics?

Berlioux – There are many ways these projects can be funded; if the letter goes into detail regarding specific ways to fund the projects, the document will either be very long or incomplete. The letter focuses on capturing the end goal of what the group hopes to accomplish instead of capturing the specifics on how they will get there which may or may not be relevant to a varied selection of projects.

Provencio – Contractors were asked if they could fund the projects in the past but specific avenues for funding were not requested by the FS. Provencio agrees with Smith

that acquiring specifics from contractors will be beneficial in proving that contractors will not fail on their contracts.

White – Just because a company is well-funded doesn't mean they can meet established goals, so proof of funding might not be a great indicator for success.

Torres – In general the items included in the letter can help the FS operationalize. When it comes to financial due diligence, the FS should hire the expertise to evaluate funding potential and Berlioux asks if that can be added to the letter. Worsley and Horner approve adding that to the letter. Horner suggests adding language to the letter saying that the SHG is open to requests for increased specificity if requested by the WO. Provencio says that if there are things they need to do differently, then the Industry should tell them so. It would be useful to include a bullet in the letter that supports FS measures to include partners in the development of the RFP.

**Edits for the letter:** replace notion of “renewal” with “performance measures”, add the suggestion to hire relevant expertise to aid in confirming industry ability to meet financial obligations of contracts, recruitment of technical partner support by FS with the development of an RFP, include the possibility for public comment on an RFP.

Smith (Greg) and Berlioux to finalized and sign the Industry Perspective letter and send to John Crockett.

### **11:35 PWG Brief on Fieldtrip/Workshop – PWG**

The FS developed the agenda and will provide the minutes. Berlioux's perspective is that the field trip was useful in helping distill the issues facing the PWG. An outcome from the field trip is a unanimous consensus among the PWG that they support the implementation of up to 70% of thinning treatments in the WUIs. The group expressed its interest in further prioritization of treatment of the WUI areas.

Rosenstock – The field trip saw good visualizations of the different treatment intensities. They discussed the wildlife objectives and concerns. He thinks the PWG is on the same page regarding the WUI. Fish and Wildlife was able to provide some context on how some of the higher intensity treatment might interface with MSO PACs and there is some expected follow-up information on this. They had a chance to see an area with more intensive treatment which hit a lot of things that they were looking for from a wildlife standpoint. The workshop the next day contained some good discussions about the sciences available and there were some conflicting ideas on which sciences were best.

Bruner – The consensus regarding the high intensity treatments on the WUI is significant progress and the FS will get back to them on how to define WUI in that context. The PWG will continue conversations on measuring treatments by interspace as the question came up on how are they accounting for the regeneration within those calculations.

Waltz – It was a productive event. Waltz appreciated the honest conversation about regeneration openings and the FS openness to being adaptive to some of those stipulations that

were in the first EIS. Waltz looks forward to seeing the notes. She feels that they met a comfortable consensus.

Miller – Saw folks integrating things they saw on the field trip and converting that to a meaningful approach to roll out cooperation with the FS.

Gitlin – Thought the field trip was very helpful to visualize the treatments. She observed a number of issues emerge, one being the question around interspace measurements vs. regeneration. Another issue to emerge was that trees are clumped into groups based on arbitrary metrics and the metric of interspace and openness is not being clearly and logically computed. She also observed a difference between the ecological goals of these treatments and the Silviculture goals of growing straight trees as well as the fire protection goals; Gitlin would like to see stronger emphasis on the fire protection and ecological goals.

Torres –The FS is appreciative of the feedback from the field trip. There is still a fair amount of confusion around the rationale and expected outcomes from the EDR framework and there needs to be more clarity and detail around the use of the FTA. The FTA is used to account for those unexpected field conditions within the stands.

The FS will bring back more information on the EDR rationale and criteria that's used and how that can be displayed spatially – the FS is working on some maps to illustrate this. They will bring forward more specific answers to the questions posed at the event. When the draft EIS is released it needs to make sense, it needs to clearly describe the rationale for each alternative and how they tie to the issues. It also needs to describe how they incorporate the comments from the SHG and the public on each of the issues. The board was walked through the alternatives and how they related to the issues and a lot of the questions they posed were the same questions already posed by the PWG. This is the time for the Forest Supervisors to be engaged. The 4FRI team will continue to be engaged with the PWG and will also make sure to get clarity on specific issues from members of the work group. Communication is always a challenge, so the 4FRI team will continue to reach out to stakeholders to understand the feedback they are getting and which influencers are impacting various agency needs.

Fredette – Felt the field trip was useful in honing in on the key concerns for EDR and FTA. The FS is hoping the notes will be done by the end of this week and then they can be posted on BC.

Provencio – Was the question on interspace more clearly defined at Mountainair because of the apparent regeneration there? This is a question for the SHG that was in attendance at the field trip.

Rosenstock – Mountainair has had a chance to regenerate post-treatment and showed a nice arrangement of key features that wildlife folks like to see. Regarding the interspace question, there is a sense that people want an accounting of how open a space will be following treatment for transparency reasons.

Rosenstock – Is the FS still working out the finer points of how the alternatives will look or are they finalized.

Torres – Believes there is still some room to have a discussion around taking some things out of the EDR framework and getting consensus between FS, PWG, and the SHG.

Berlioux – Answers Provencio saying, yes Mountainair looked much better than Chimney Springs.

### **12:05 Working Group Updates**

- Planning WG (10 min) – Berlioux

Next meeting is June 6th.

- Industry WG (10 min) – Worsley

The IWG is working on the letter to Crockett on the 20-year contracting. They also received feedback from the Industry Round table and the IWG has reviewed them. Once finalized they will be posted on BC.

- Communications WG (10 min) – Wolf

Sue is retiring so Wolf is now the new active chair of the CWG. They need to solicit ideas for the next newsletter. They're discussing having a rotational chair system and no timing on that has been established but is being discussed. They're discussing switching the newsletters to quarterly and perhaps making them shorter. The website will come out in the July meeting. SHG to send newsletter ideas to Kelly within the next 2 weeks. Miller suggests making Sue the main story of the next newsletter.

- MPMB WG (10 min) – Anderson

None.

- Comprehensive Implementation WG (10 min) – Bruner

Meeting scheduled next week. Rosilda spring restoration is happening this summer. Upcoming meeting will discuss potential projects on the Apache Sitgreaves. Coleman will attend to offer potential projects for the east side.

- Fiesta Working Group (10 min) – Esch

We would like to celebrate Sue's retirement. We would like to do something around the date of the next SHG meeting:

Happy hour night before the next SHG meeting – 6 votes

Event immediately following the next SHG meeting in Flagstaff – 14 votes

Event in the evening after the next SHG meeting – 5 votes

FWG will send out information regarding the celebration once solidified.

### **1:05 Stakeholder Disclosures – All**

Worsley – Spent last week in DC meeting with delegates and made the purpose to acknowledge their effort in recent changes. There was a congressional member who was frank about his dissatisfaction with 4FRI and his desire to take it down.

Smith – With Coconino County he has been directed to engage with industry on the west side so they are developing a Coconino County Industry Partners group to look at how the county can take input from industry to help them perform more efficiently. That meeting is on June 4<sup>th</sup> at the Grand Canyon hotel in Williams.

Miller – First, Trout Unlimited met with Rep. Gosar and part of their discussion was about the involvement with and progress of 4FRI. Gosar expressed dissatisfaction with the collaborative. Second, on May 2<sup>nd</sup>, the Tonto management planning team conducted a field trip for stream restoration with help from Kelly Wolff. It was well-conducted and had a lot of good exchange. Third, Trout Unlimited and AZ G&F held the 9<sup>th</sup> Annual Native and Wild Trout Conference in mid-April and there were a lot of good discussions that occurred. They have a campaign going on in Payson relative to their immediate forest closure situation in that one of their writers has discovered that there is very active selling of fire wood occurring despite fire restrictions. Businesses are continuing to sell firewood in lieu of forest restrictions so the campaign aims to remedy that.

There is a new forest service strategy document called Rise to the Future, which is a national fish and aquatics strategy. Trout Unlimited national leaders got a briefing on this from FS folks who developed it just recently. It is supportive of a 4FRI approach to having a water sub-group within the MPMB WG. There were a number of NGOs that were a part of this update. It has been broadened from fish to aquatic resources.

### 1:15 Review Action Items

Action Item	Lead	Status
1. Krigbaum to send Pinetop event information to Allison who will then post it on BC	Krigbaum, Jourden	
2. Finalize and sign Industry Perspective letter and send it to John Crockett	Berlioux, Smith	
3. Post letter regarding CFLRP reauthorization and funding scenario template on BC	Fleishman	
4. Post call for volunteers for future funding scenario development group	Fleishman	
5. Review 1st EIS monitoring plan and new water questions from the MPMB to provide feedback to the MPMB at the June SHG meeting regarding monitoring plan for 2 <sup>nd</sup> EIS	SHG	
6. Send ideas to newsletter to Wolff within the next 2 weeks	SHG	
7. Send out information regarding Fiesta Celebration / Sitko retirement party	Fiesta Working Group	

### 1:20 Adjourn

**06/27/18 SHG meeting information:**

Wednesday, June 26<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#

DRAFT