



4FRI Stakeholder Group Meeting

Wednesday, October 25th, 2023 9 am – Noon

Arizona Game and Fish Department - Conference Room
2878 E White Mountain Blvd, Pinetop-Lakeside, AZ 85935

MEETING RECORDING

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1DSGprRvA1CV-Qs9ZVoYDNmnkzdltw6hG/view?usp=sharing>

Participants:

Peter Wolf, Lisa Bolton, Jay Smith, Pascal Berlioux, Aaron Mayville, Rob Lever, Melanie Colavito, Amy Waltz, Brad Worsley, Tabi Bolton, Scot Rogers, Elizabeth Johnston, Jared Smeenk, TJ Paskach, Ernie Estacio, Preston Raban, Greg Smith, Gary Moore, Brian Nowicki, Chris Pasterz, Devon Suarez, Joel Jurgens, Bob Buckingham, James Perkins, Adam Cooley, Chris Jones, Travis Wooley, Nicole Cannon, Cecilia Clavet, Cerissa Hoglander, Tracy Bazelman, Alicyn Gitlin, Dick Fleischmann, Brett Crary, Lynn Krigbaum

Facilitation Team: Carrie Eberly and Jessica Archibald (Southwest Decision Resources)

9:00 Welcome and Agenda Review - Southwest Decision Resources (SDR)

- Stakeholder Group (SHG) and Steering Committee meeting dates are set for 2024, please put these on your calendar (see bottom of notes for dates).
- The SHG will meet on November 29 in Flagstaff regardless of any potential government shutdown.

9:05 Approve August 23rd Stakeholder Group Meeting minutes and Review Action Items (SDR)

- Minutes approved.
- Brett C.: Started reporting volume last month. It is more difficult than previously thought to report tonnage due to different conversion factors per species. Working with the Regional Conversion Specialist for each sale to report tonnage.
- Email Melanie if you need to get on Basecamp.
- Jay S.: Regarding the industry meeting, talked with some folks at the Greater Flagstaff Forest Partnership meeting. One thing that needs to be discussed is different contracting methods that are coming forward. Jay will get with James Dahlin and Pascal Berlioux about preferred meeting methods.
 - Aaron M.: Coconino National Forest is supportive of this meeting, but if industry does not feel that is useful, please let them know. No need to waste time.
- Brett C.: Added roads table to the monthly reporting - this will be static. It includes more information from engineering to include current status.

- Scot R.: Scot in charge of Prioritization-Optimization, not Nicole. Scot has met with Prioritization-Optimization about staff options.
- Brad W.: Met with Elvy and others about an implementers meeting. Industry meetings haven't been effective. Prefer to consolidate into implementers meeting and consolidate voices. This topic is addressed later in the agenda.
- Brett C.: Don't have aquatic and watershed updates right now but hoping that the new monitoring coordinator can help with this.

9:10 Review Action Items

Action Item	Lead	Status
Create/add a tonnage table for contracts (to best show activity activity and inactivity).	Brett - by next month	Ongoing
Add Amanda Webb and Jason to basecamp	Melanie	Done
Discuss additional Industry meeting	Jay, Joel, James, Pascal	Ongoing
Explore getting roads reports monthly	Aaron, Brett	Done
Provide clarity on keystone partners and relationship to 4FRI	Nicole	Ongoing
Identify staff for prioritization-optimization	Nicole, Scot	Done
Follow up on idea about implementers meeting	Elvy, SDR	Done
Convene charter working group	Melanie, Todd, Dick, Lisa, Scot	Done
Aquatic/watershed restoration monthly updates	Brett, Monitoring Coordinator	Ongoing

9:20 Call to the Public

- Brad W.: Heard about EPA ruling pending about non-attainable PM emissions. AZ is already a high pm emission state. Biomass is worried about this impact. Brad was asked to meet with Senator Sinema about this topic.
- Chris J.: I have a small biochar kiln and I am available for educational demonstrations. Brush pits are ideal. Please email me at ckjones@arizona.edu to discuss and set a date for an event.

9:21 USFS updates – Scot Rogers, Aaron Mayville, Cecilia Clavet

- Scot R.: Budget FY 24 - 4FRI landscape largely funded by BII and IRA. Still waiting for full year allocation out of the Washington Office. Submitted request and are optimistic. Can't release larger contracts until that money is in hand. Haven't been impacted on timeline so far, but the longer the money waits the more impact that there might be. Have some remaining funding from FY23, using this funding to move some things forward where possible. They were hoping to have that budget by October 1.
- Scot R.: Filling John Souther's old position in monitoring - this is a big win! This is important for monitoring group and also for implementation monitoring. Haven't done a great job at being

responsive for requests of data and want to have more communication. New hire will be digging into monitoring requirements.

- Scot R.: Forest Service and 4FRI received letter from Senator Kelly's and Sinema's offices with concerns about why 4FRI hasn't met the pace and scale that they set out to. USFS is working on response. Looking forward to increasing pace and scale.
- Aaron M.: Probably going to see some pushing of internal messaging about successes for the 4FRI footprint (maybe some press releases too). 4FRI used to be the only game in town, but with WCS that changed things. 20 other projects competing for funding now. The Board is looking to push the successes of 4FRI.
 - May ask some in this group to also share successes. Successes can be large or small
 - Be on the lookout for more, if you have ideas please share them with the FS.
- Aaron M.: The potential government shutdown is November 17th. Went through this dry run a few weeks ago, but still here. It very well might happen. USFS is preparing for this but trying not to prepare too much and waste time.
 - Greg S.: In the past 10 years we've made the 4FRI meeting be Nov 15 to avoid shutdown - why not now?
 - It is still undetermined who is essential vs not. Could be that Forest Supervisors are still able to meet.
 - The Steering Committee was worried about changing the date and it not being on people's calendars earlier. There was also a conflict with the Greater Flagstaff Forest Partnership meeting.
 - There is good work to be done for the stakeholders that doesn't require the USFS participation necessarily if they are unable to attend.
- Cecilia C.
 - Pre-solicitation went out a few weeks ago, raised a lot of concerns with community. Intent of pre-solicitation, especially transportation component
 - The transportation pilot was initiative funding by BIL to look at challenge of moving material on the ground where there is a need.
 - Opportunity was seen on 4FRI to use stewardship contracting where it was needed. Looked at this opportunity where there was no existing bid.
 - This is open to all partners for transportation support, meant for variety of transportation modes. Considered optional for types of transportation and use by local industry.
 - This was pre-solicitation, not advertisement. Expectation is to ensure have field visits before, looking for more Q&A before advertising.
 - Intent is to be competitive, transparent, and fair.
 - More information to come.

9:33 Industry Updates – All

- Canyon Creek Logging: Not a lot of change for them. Pushing to try and get as much material as possible ahead of winter months. Has included them expanding with two grinding sites. Pushing hard to get second logging site going.

- Big challenge is trying to hire people. Doing all that they can to get folks into the position where can get the most people out of them.
 - Not getting material into Brad W. fast enough - trying to increase.
- Adam C.: Going to have 12 operating kilns on site, planar line coming on first part of November, back end of sawmill put in (stacking, etc.). Things are flowing smoothly. Lot more components coming - should be done in January (e.g., edgers, etc.). By end of February/March will be at capacity with 80 truckloads of logs a day. Will supply Brad W. and others with biomass.
- TJ P. - Frontline Bioenergy
 - Plan to be a large consumer of biomass - circling up funding for development of a project, \$12 mill development budget, \$2 mill available for local investment - if folks have interest, that will be open.
 - Company based in Iowa, another project in Central Valley, and will develop in Northern Arizona - identified 10 different sites - looking at sites with good access to transport (pipeline, road, rail, electric power resource)
 - Probably will develop closer to Flagstaff - there is a need there, and this will stay away from Brad's shop.
 - Have connected with the Biomass Coalition.
- Tabi B.: Wrapped up project with TNC - Parks West - good stats - wrapped up end of September.
 - Joel V.: 4500 thinned acres, 3500 acres TSI, 1700 meadow restoration, tested by b+, tare weight, etc.
 - Really interesting project - influencing many activities happening now and in future both in operations and USFS sides, TNC will send out more information about this project to the group.
 - Involved in 300 road. That work is happening. West side of 300 Road - DFFM is conducting work - widening, more visibility, and hopefully helping transportation network in the future.
- James P.:
 - Set up new sawmill. It's an older mill that is refurbished, got it going and online. Purchased it end of August, now producing lumber.
 - Shut down Maple Mill. Getting new mill into same building.
 - Finished Munds Timber Sale. Been on books for eight years. 150 loads of logs on yard, lots for winter.
 - Back in Holden - doing thinning around Williams. With two mills now, looking at doubling to 4000 acres a year. They have mill capacity, just need the timber.
 - Will have grand opening in November and will invite the group. Purchased mill with grant from the Forest USFS.
- Greg S.: To Aaron M.'s point - mentioned we are competing with other landscapes. How many of those other landscapes have biomass like Nova Power - this is huge success for 4FRI.
- Devon S.:
 - Been working on Roosevelt with DFFM.
 - In September/October - 550 acres.
 - Invested \$1.4 million into new machinery.

- New buncher feller delivered in September.
- Looking to double pace and scale - 1000 acres every two months. Looking forward to working with USFS to learn where those acres will be.

9:48 Working Group Updates – All

- Industry – no update.
- Prioritization-Optimization -Amy Waltz, Brian Nowicki, Travis Wooley
 - Had great meeting with Scot, wanted to prioritize getting in front of the 4FRI executive board, will be on agenda for early November.
 - Mandate from Chief with WCS was to prioritize landscapes to reduce fire crisis - stakeholders have long been interested in this for 4FRI.
 - WCS is investing in top-down tools, 4FRI has bottom-up values at risk. Will meet with executive board to talk about how to balance these for prioritization.
 - Long planned a workshop for rechecking and identifying stakeholder values at risk.
 - Capacity shifts on the team has slowed this group down a little bit, but have good next steps outlined.
 - Amy W. needs to step back a little bit from this effort - taking on more work at ERI. Means that rest of team needs to step up.
 - Overarching and fundamental questions in letter of intent - from that there are some fundamental questions about how the FS plans and schedules its projects outside of the 5-year plan - how are these getting implemented?
 - How do we make sure most effectively feeding into that process and responding to it (e.g., forest projects happening every year that we need to account for)?
 - Next meeting - report back on conversation with executive board.
 - Carrie E.: continued conversations happening relevant to Prioritization-Optimization and Implementation. Different working groups and conversations, but lots of overlap in how work gets done.
- Multi-Party Monitoring Board - Cerissa H.
 - Excited for monitoring coordinator, thanks to USFS for making this a priority.
 - Wrapped up 2023 field season work including songbird and ground plot data collection.
 - Working on navigating priorities for 2024 - waiting on budget conversations to clarify agreements and move work forward.
- Comprehensive Implementation Working Group -Cerissa H.
 - In September, Grand Canyon Trust volunteers built some rock erosion control structures at Buck Springs on Mogollon Rim. This is a perennial wet meadow system, historically had beaver and willow and other diverse native riparian species. Has been affected by long list of things -overgrazing, etc.
 - AZ Elk Society and Friends of Northern Arizona forests working on updating and maintaining elk exclosures for grazing. As soon as updates are completed, the FS has funding to reintroduce some native Bebb Willow into the sites.
 - This is a pilot site for moving important restoration work forward.
 - Working on planning 2024 work and a long list of priorities.

- Working group is still waiting on a formal response from 4FRI EB / Forest Service to the letter sent by CIWG to them earlier this year about elevating the importance of restoration work and associated capacity.
- Communications - no update.
 - Amy W.: Is 4FRI hiring PIO/PAO?
 - Aaron M.: Unsure if hiring new or pooling resources from existing staff across forests.

10:07 Charter Review and Update - Melanie

- Melanie Colavito gave a presentation about the history of the existing charter, and proposed changes ([link here](#)).
 - In January, per recommendation of Stakeholder Engagement Working Group, there was a workshop in January to revisit 4FRI during implementation. Key results included:
 - Bringing in additional capacity for 4FRI (the reason SDR was brought in as facilitators)
 - Need to review governance documents including memorandum of understanding, the path forward (vision of 4FRI), strategic plan (strategic objectives, action items for 4FRI), and charter (how we engage with each other, administrative needs)
 - Small team has been meeting to review the charter and has proposed changes that were discussed during the meeting.
 - Original charter [link](#)
 - Proposed changes charter [link](#) (see proposed changes in highlighted text)
- Additional discussion and feedback from the Stakeholder Group included:
 - Was there a reason fire was omitted previously?
 - Back then, may not have been as critical. More focused on mechanical.
 - Captured in Path Forward, the barrier was NEPA and getting thinning on the ground
 - Across country, the 4FRI landscape - has accomplished 72% of prescribed burn output across the nation
 - Tracy B.: Like addition of G for fire, been talking about three metrics (thinning, burning, and aquatic restoration to be measuring). There is an opportunity to add to G “aquatic restoration”.
 - Melanie C.: This is built into mission of 4FRI already.
 - Tracy B.: Was looking at this too, may be an opportunity to put in watershed health there. Or something that gives a nod that watershed health is part and parcel of 4FRI. Might be opportunity to add to the mission and specifically actions - something we could measure (e.g., linear feet).
 - Tracy B.: Path Forward referenced in A - can we add a link? In addition or in lieu of Path Forward- could add 4FRI restoration strategy prepared in 2021?

- Amy W.: Restoration strategy document was for the Forest Service, not collaboratively developed by SHG- if link it, definitely need to be clear that it wasn't developed by SHG.
 - Travis W.: Thinking about watershed health, maybe it is adding this as an example of comprehensive restoration (e.g., watershed health, etc.). 4FRI NEPA is all the comprehensive restoration. If going to make amendments now, define this more comprehensively and holistically to cover it.
 - Melanie C.: Feel that the mission covers this already. Recommend all read path forward as it articulates vision for 4FRI.
 - Send Melanie an email if you feel that mission doesn't cover comprehensive restoration.
 - What constitutes member in good standing? How important is it for organizations to meet these good standing requirements?
 - Melanie C.: May be important for decision rules. These haven't been employed in a long time.
 - How do we maintain list of who is in good standing?
 - Facilitator maintains a list of good standing; future decisions will be made if go back to self-facilitation.
 - Greg S.: 1/3 attendance is weak, if not 1/2 meeting feels like someone is not engaged.
 - Brad W.: No evidence or need to make a change, it hasn't come up as an issue.
 - James P.: Does it say that meetings will be alternated from east and west side?
 - Melanie C.: Never said that - it is up to the Steering Committee.
 - Amy W.: Legacy behavior shouldn't influence where we go from now, so take this with grain of salt - like that kept in decision rules, because in section 4 we talk about advocating. Can't say that we are representing SHG without employing decision rules. If can't be 100% consensus as SHG advocacy, we don't speak.
- Next steps
 - Melanie C. will post final version of charter on Basecamp with a review period. Then there will be final approval.
 - There is still discussion needed about the Steering Committee's role. They can discuss at their next meeting.
 - How much do people want to participate in collaborative implementation?
 - Who? How does this change the long-standing collaborative group?
 - Lynn K.: "If it ain't broke, don't fix it"
 - Melanie C.: Agree - but need to address capacity needs across the group (e.g., SC, hot/cold chairs, etc.).
 - Another capacity issue - annual meeting.
 - Communications - need more capacity here!

- Annual evaluation - need capacity here. Consider changes of charter/gov docs and to check back on the goals that we set annually (can also inform successes and highlighting them).
- Tabi B.: I just asked James if he signed the charter - James is now semi-retired, so doesn't know what is going on. Was here in 2013 when this started - what asking is - need to be some way to explain how it works to beginners. There is a need for onboarding.
 - Only need to sign charter if want to be part of decision rules.
- Amy W.: There is a sticky widget - when we talk about roles and responsibilities in implementation - there is already a turnover in participation. Over the last 10 years the people at the table are paid by the organization to participate - but in implementation in industry, what I hear is that people are losing money to be here. How do we acknowledge the turnover and change. We need to know industry perspective.
- James P.: Need to be inclusive of all industry - want more discussion of what is being cut/etc. Want to be part of this to know what future of logging in AZ.
- Brad W.: I have been here a long time, my position on 4FRI has shifted in last year. This group doesn't have a lot of teeth and the purpose of this group is transitioning. Industry has been imposter - can we diminish whining and increase prioritization and optimization?
- Brad W.: Couple of groups been consistently involved. What doesn't yield results - "STP - same ten people". To ask people that don't perceive value to do more is not going to work. What does a 4FRI monthly communication actually do? If doesn't happen, evidence that people don't care. Things that aren't being done aren't being done because no one cares - why ask them to do it if they don't care or it doesn't have impact. You hear me but you don't listen.
- Carrie E.: It may not be that they do not care, maybe its capacity challenge.
- Brad W.: If monthly newsletter made a difference - big organizations can do that.
- There is a lack of clarity about what is 4FRI.
 - Is it FS, SHG, geography - we don't even know what we are.
 - These are really big topics and nuts to crack.
 - Dusting this off is just the initial step that can be taken - doesn't mean we have figured out larger concerns.
- Carrie E.: Is there a will to have first meeting of 2024 to be a look back at 2023 and do revision?
 - Brad W.: Not to be focused on what the 4FRI SHG is, instead focus on acres, Pri-Opt.
 - Amy W.: Let's not do a survey, we just did one.
 - Melanie C.: We can continue to level set.
- Adam C.: To further the point, this is not the only avenue to accomplish something. Bang on FS door - this is another tool.

11:06 BREAK

10:55 Implementation Moving Forward

- Aaron M.: Want to share a reflection on the dialogue. There is a lot of aspirational language in MOU and SHG charter - this may not impact your day to day industry, but hopeful that all members take ownership of this aspiration -restore acres while supporting all other benefits associated with restoration including industry. There is valuable of information sharing, coordinating, etc. Would hope that when we do report acres treated, this group should take ownership. The FS needs the social license to do all these industry/restoration projects -without the legacy and social license we couldn't do these things.
- Frontline: Newsletters very useful for informing our work. Saw that in this area, USFS is serious about restoration. While aspirations may be higher than what was achieved, this informed decision for new industry to move in. The documentation was super helpful and will likely continue to be.
- Carrie E.: We heard Brad's point, and we are trying to listen to him - what does implementation look like moving forward. Is this an expansion of industry WG to address topics that matter to them?
- Jay S.: On the implementation side - which we all agree we are moving on - there was separation on implementation in mind of some and implementation in mind of operators. BIL and IRA brought more dollars to 4FRI than we've ever seen, things moved quicker, and groups like SRP and TNC that bring additional dollars to try and get work done that they find as critical/priority based on their needs. There has been separation between those who do the work and those who fund the work and the USFS who manages that work on the federal lands.
- Jay S.: Couple of meetings ago Elvy brought up idea of implementation WG – Jay hasn't talked with her specifically - but in these discussions also heard things from industry about issues with roads, not being listened to.
- Jay S.: There are issues and things that the industry would like to see done differently - just in last GFFP meeting and NRWG meeting - questions about how IRSCs vs IRTCS and the different mechanisms. Does FS understand the impacts? Local forest wants to understand the impacts to make sure that they know to do things best.
- Jay S.: Things are moving in more positive direction - as we were talking about this in the roads - does this need to be molded together as the Implementation WG - what is the best way forward to make positive solutions so that industry/implementer/funders are heard and so that we move the needle in the right direction? Things are changing, need not just complaining, more accountability. How do we get to the follow through?
- Jay S.: One of things Jay is doing - going to WO to continue funding 4FRI - there is concern from Washington Office that 4FRI isn't doing thing - need to tell story and keep funding in AZ.
- Jay S.: When started talking about roads - closures, etc. We know the issues, but now how do we implement solutions and understand engineering perspectives. How do we move the needle to bring engineering standards in line with updates to technology? Need to improve how industry works and succeeds going forward.
- Carrie E.: Do we put this into the industry WG, implementer WG, or meld the two together? What is the mechanism that everyone feels comfortable with moving forward on these ideas and making

concrete solutions that increases production and other solution? Does it make sense to create WG to focus on these issues?

- James P.: I want to go talk to the politicians with Jay! They control the money. Is there such a thing that does this?
- Jay S.: Industry needs to step up and write letters so that 4FRI hears industry. When the people that do the work show up - write letters, have voices heard, - when James Perkins show up listen way more than Jay Smith. There is a potential opportunity to coordinate lobbying, especially on the west side. Jay can get information about of who to talk to and where to send letters.
- Pascal B.: It's a complex subject which need to be looked at from different succession of facets, trying to click through some different perspectives.
 - 1. Let's go back to what Brad was saying about not being heard. This has been discussed for long time, industry has this feeling where they come to meetings, explain problem, being listened to, move on to next subject and nothing happens. In most cases, this is reality. Have an issue of value provided by these settings to actual industry execution. When aquatic issue comes in, fire issue, etc. it is fairly common for that to result in 4FRI letter to support an issue. When is the last time this group produced a letter addressing or supporting very specific ask from industry targeted to USFS? Where is 4FRI letter to support industry requests to support execution of annual program of work? This has never been done.
 - 2. What is this group now, what's its purpose? Went from planning (very successful here) and mightily struggling with shift to implementation. Planning requires collaboration, implementation requires execution, and this group is mostly incapable at doing it. This type of group does not have authority to get things done. This type of work now is very technical - need to be known and understood first. Specialized discussion which is not necessarily all inclusive of anyone who wants to be in the room. Need to understand technical - then it is somewhat limited between industry and USFS. Can you do it, when, how much, - it's not really a collaborative issue it's an execution issue. Nature of work that needs to be done in implementation is different than planning. Different set of people, different work. Trying to force putting the shoe on (execution/implementation) with collaboration may not be best idea. Are we going the right path trying to have big collaborative process when it comes to implementation? Role of collaborative group is not to be cook in kitchen, but instead support asks and providing political momentum and collaborative momentum.
 - The very last thing we need is yet another 4FRI group - already have another industry group - very fact that this group is dormant is that this group has identified that it is irrelevant. Real question in Pascal's mind is decision between industry player and the people that work with them. Should there be considered any more work done in framework of collaboration, or should we try to work with industry roundtable? Pascal suggests that work happen offline.
- Carrie E.: Sense of the group - Pascal thinks this is not needed, what does the rest of group think?

- Brad W.: Another WG doesn't need to be made. Father of 8 children - when ask what everyone wants to eat, each child needs specific thing. Ask as a kind gesture, not really asking. Concern today with industry WG, everyone has their own specific needs. For the industry WG, what would be more effective is whoever has the greatest sway (e.g., DFFM, SRP) that can bring dollars and power to say, "we've heard where you all want to eat, here is where we are going to eat" and make the decision for the greater good. It needs to be restructured as such so that the someone hears all the needs and can prioritize to meet the greatest number of needs.
- Adam C.: No need to create a new WG but modify the existing. The industry WG is not doing anything - dormant for a reason because haven't been successful/listened to. We have been heard in many aspects, but there is room to grow. There are lots of successes to celebrate. Do agree that can modify or rebrand/revamp the existing WG.
- Tabi B.: One thing we can do – hey people are hungry, we can say we need to stop soon. There are some common things we can advocate for. We are still considering what does the SHG do now, definitely sensitive that here are folks that can't show up here - but that doesn't mean that what they say isn't important. This needs to trickle out somehow.
- Greg S.: Pascal met industry group that meets yearly to talk about changes needed. That is all impacted by FS. To Rob and Aaron - do you have the power to listen and make changes?
 - Rob L.: Yes, to some things. We don't have power to lobby, but we did have some power to make changes (e.g., respond to NRWG requests). From implementation standpoint, Rob also works with Brian Nowicki to make sure not being litigated and still have social license. Huge deals have to go above Forest Supervisors (e.g., paving 300). Still, more acres offered - can try hard for that. Some changes don't happen as fast as needed because of FS capacity but working with keystone partners to build that capacity up. Changes don't happen overnight - must plan a year out to get funding. While might seem not listened to, there is a lag time of reaction. But there are simple things too (e.g., sending archaeology out ASAP when needed, getting juniper acres)
 - Rob L.: Can respond to industry, but we need rest of group too. If step outside social license, get hammered (e.g., Little Timber Sale). Rob needs to hear from both!
 - Aaron M.: Agree with Rob. Without some kind of organization, it's just kids screaming in back of car.
 - Brad W.: If going to baseball game for son, might prioritize his needs - not all demands are equal - all have different impacts. Need to prioritize overarching needs vs individual needs.
 - James P.: A logger in woods can complain to timber sales administrator. It won't do any good at all since they are low on the totem pole. Hearing what Forest Supervisor said, gives some hope that if joining industry meetings, would be different than what has happened in the past. Talking here is better than to a forest administrator.
 - Rob L.: Lot of functions this group can still play and that are important. People in the group can lobby. Information sharing is valuable - capitalize on skills of group (e.g., lobbying).

- Rob L.: There is no such thing as instant acres, 2 years of survey for owls required no matter what. Only a few contractors can do this. People need to advocate for 4FRI's funding so we can ramp up. USFS will holding back in many cases, often for following laws.
- Carrie E.: Industry has been dormant but need a revamp in some way to better communicate and coordinate, to better understand needs and the greater good. Lots of prioritization coming up in this conversation, need to loop this in with industry needs.
- Pascal B.: Thank you Rob for making the point, absolutely critical indeed that collaboration continues to be involved in concept of implementation. Didn't mean to imply that other collaboration that other stakeholders are not needed in implementation - really wanted to focus on execution. Think that industry folks - Jay, Pascal, etc. can organize themselves to work with USFS on these issues.
- Pascal B.: No need for new group, don't think that industry WG should be exclusionary of this group. This is very specific job to be done for very specific people, don't need half of room in the discussion. Industry group folks will coordinate and report to SHG and ask for SHG report when needed - but also with recognition that this is different type of engagement and work with the USFS - probably done differently than other meetings.
- Jay S.: His ask - better understanding of what works best for USFS - that we meet by forest to come up with industry by forest - or is it 4FRI executive board? What we have been doing has gotten some progress, but just so that there is no question of what is needed on Kaibab or Coconino - when do we do that? What is the time space and decision space to operate in? Who do we have the right people in the room to plan accordingly and make impact?
- Brett C.:
 - Could be 4FRI as a whole or east-side/west-side.
 - What he is curious about from an operational standpoint:
 - Annual plan, 5-year plan - do these make sense, right scope of work, right contract size, etc.?
 - Other part is, struggled to meet program of work and meet goals.
 - Working with industry is something Brett would like to do - would district rangers be there too and district staff?
 - Aaron M.: To Jay's question - can absolutely commit 4FRI team - then pull in district staff where appropriate. Start with 4FRI team. Duration - not sure - would refer to Brett and Scot.
 - James P.: Think twice a year.
 - Tabi B.: Part of it is follow up (here was the ask, what is the result, what are next steps).
 - Rob L.: East side and west side is starting to blend more, may not need to be separate as they think - maybe solutions not to separate them.

Action Item	Lead	Status
Discuss additional Industry meeting	Jay, Joel, James, Pascal	Ongoing
Create/add a tonnage table for contracts (to best show activity and inactivity).	Brett	Ongoing
Provide clarity on keystone partners and relationship to 4FRI	Nicole	Ongoing
Aquatic/watershed restoration monthly updates	Brett, Monitoring Coordinator	Ongoing
Post information about Parks West Project to Basecamp	Tabi, Joel	
Discuss adding a watershed health action or comprehensive restoration action in the charter	Charter Team	
Email Melanie if you feel that mission does not sufficiently address comprehensive restoration	All	
Set up tracking for “good standing”	SDR	
Review final version of charter on basecamp for final approval of proposed changes	All	
Coordinate meeting with 4FRI team	Industry Group, 4FRI Team	

12:00 Adjourn

Steering Committee Meetings (second Tuesday of each month)

- **2023:** 1/10/2023, 2/14/2023, 3/14/2023, 4/11/2023, 5/9/2023, 6/13/2023, 7/11/2023, 8/8/2023, 9/12/2023, 10/10/2023, 11/14/2023, December no meeting

- **2024:** 1/9/2024, 2/13/2024, 3/12/2024, 4/9/2024, 5/14/2024, 6/1/2024, 7/9/2024, 8/13/2024, 9/10/2024, 10/8/2024, 11/12/2024, December no meeting

Stakeholder Group Meetings (fourth Wednesday of the month, except November)

- **2023:** 1/25/2023, 2/22/2023, 3/22/2023, 4/26/2023, 5/24/2023, 6/28/2023, 8/23/2023, 10/25/2023, 11/29/2023, December no meeting

-**2024:** 1/24/2024, 3/27/2024, 5/22/2024, 7/24/2024, 9/25/2024, 11/20/2024 (third Wednesday)