

4FRI Stakeholders Meeting notes, Wednesday, February 22nd, 9AM-3:00PM
Arizona Game and Fish Department Office, 2878 East White Mountain Boulevard, Pinetop, AZ

Attending via phone: Jackie Banks, Sarah Reif, Anne Motek Lucas, and Henry Provencio

Approval of 1.25.12 Minutes: APPROVED

Forest Service Updates and Presentations – Dick Fleischman

- 4FRI Team Progress: Effects analysis EIS expected late spring, early summer
- Update on RFP for contract: awarded this winter; before March 21st
- Discussion of nomination for an award by the U.S. Institute for Conflict Resolution
<http://www.ecr.gov/AnnouncementsEvents/AnnouncementsEvents.aspx?Item=107>
 - The deadline is Feb. 27th for submitting this proposal.
 - The FS would like to highlight the MOU contract and DEIS as one of the main accomplishments to date.
 - The award for this is recognition (no monetary value).
 - DECISION: The stakeholder group will offer support to the FS for the award to recognize some of the accomplishments to date. The FS will couch this proposal in terms of where success has occurred to date, recognizing that there is still work to do.
- CEQ selection: There is tentative anticipation that 4FRI will host a webinar and lesson learned and a workshop after implementation. Communication will come through the FS to the Stakeholders when more information is available.

NEXT STEPS:

- Dick Fleischman will have the draft application sent to Windy so it can be posted on basecamp
- Stakeholder group will review Thursday and give comments by Friday the 24th

Presentation and discussion about the National Forest Foundation Treasured Landscapes Program- Mary Mitsos, NFF

- Program Overview: 4FRI has been selected as one of the Treasured Landscapes, which brings matching funds.
 - Work with agency and stakeholders to put together an implementation plan
 - NFF provides fund raising on the private side, agency provides fund match on the public side.
 - The actual plan writing is completed by the NFF, not the USFS.

Results of 4FRI Subcommittee discussion

- The rationale for focusing on the western portion of the landscape is that it is being treated first and that NEPA shelf-stock exists. While we would like to get work in the Eastern part, you have to have NEPA already completed in order to ensure the FS is ready to go in that area. There were no identifiable areas in the East that have NEPA completed and fit into the treatment sequence.
- This area was selected for the variety of elements that could be restored: Aspen, springs, ephemeral channels, meadows, etc., along with public accessibility.
- *Clarification*: the project is within the 4FRI landscape but this is not going to be labeled a 4FRI project. This is an NFF project and it will be labeled so. Any involvement of the 4FRI name will be at the discretion of the 4FRI Stakeholders.
- Total budget for project will be \$3M = \$1.5M from NFF private fundraising and \$1.5M match from USFS.
- Clarify where thinning fits
- NFF is not required to consult with 4FRI but has done so out of consideration of the 4FRI collaborators. By March 9th, we need to offer a recommendation of support for restoration in a specific area.

NEXT STEPS:

- Working group will continue to discuss (2 more calls prior to March 9th);
- Input on proposal is desired from stakeholders; this continues to be an inclusive discussion if anyone wants to submit suggestions for other areas.
- Mary and Earl and his staff will meet this week and provide a timeline

- Clarify where thinning activities fits within other restoration activities
- Need a decision by the stakeholder group by March 9th “we support work done in *this* area”

4FRI Stakeholder Updates, Marcus Selig

- Next co-chair
 - Diane is scheduled to move out the co-chair role in March and a new co-chair is needed to step into the lead co-chair role. There is an issue of supply in applicants. The current supply of co-chairs include Diane, Marcus, Ed, and Steve.
 - There’s a concern about individuals not stepping up to participate in co-chairing. There’s also concern that individuals can self-select in without truly having the available time to commit to the role, and a true understanding of the issues.
 - Over the next several months, there are significant hurdles and milestones that will require commitment, time, and consistency in involvement of the co-chairs.
 - This will be an agenda item on the next Steering committee call, to look at possibilities of expanding the existing pool of rotating co-chairs and the existing structure and timing of co-chair rotations.
 - Suggestions and issues: time commitment, mentoring, distribution, an east side representative would be desired.

NEXT STEPS:

- Determine if Marcus will serve as the lead co-chair for another 3 months.
- The Steering Committee will discuss the Co-chair structure
 - Terms and co-chair vs. vice chair
 - Value in distribution
 - Supply of available committee members
- Navajo county will explore the idea of coming up with a co-chair.
- The steering committee will explore asking/nominating someone they think can fill the commitment for the next position

2012 Work Plan Review

- There is concern that only one entity submitted input when this is intended to be a document that expresses a unified vision from the group.
- The difference between this work plan and the smaller historic work plans is that those were intended to track actions. The goal of this work plan is to be proactive in “goal setting” to develop a unified vision of the products we want to develop over the year.
- CFLRP: this could help to ensure links to national indicators over the next year.
- 501c3 establishment would not include the entire collaborative group. Third party/multi monitoring board is tied in.
- Annual evaluation: Is this something the group would like to do again next year?
 - One of the national indicators includes the effectiveness of your collaborative process, so we need to consider conducting an annual evaluation whether it’s through facilitation or not.
 - This is established in our charter as a required process.
 - Do we have the capacity to conduct this ourselves?
 - Whether we do this ourselves or have outside facilitation, we need a neutral party to administer this process.
- Fundraising
- Landscape Strategy on 2nd analysis area:
 - The LSWG will meet with the FSID team; what does the FS want from the stakeholders, what are the needs, priorities regarding the landscape strategy. Then the stakeholders can use that discussion to develop the work plan.

- The group thought that before the 2nd analysis area can be planned, they need a “Lessons learned” session on the 1st analysis area, to discuss:
 - Was the first landscape strategy useful?
 - If so, what items within the landscape strategy were most useful?
 - Data Assembly/Capacity FS Crosswalk review
 - The stakeholder group and Forest Service different tracks and how they can be better integrated
- Sequencing strategy: FS is going to take a stab at this but they aren’t sure how to stakeholder input will be incorporated.
 - This will be an agenda item for the LSWG.
- Commitment to these products is necessary.
- We need to clarify if these products will contribute to the FS DEIS development.

DECISION: This Work Plan now reflects the products we are going to work on this year (2012).

NEXT STEPS:

- The group will address commitment to this work plan in a future stakeholder meeting
- Marcus will work with the individual working groups to flesh out the activities
- Steering Committee will discuss further who should administer the annual evaluation
- The Landscape Strategy WG will meet with USFS on the landscape strategy
- The stakeholder group will schedule the Lessons Learned meeting after the Draft is released
- The Forest Service will meet to discuss the stakeholder group’s involvement on demonstrating the range of alternatives/NEPA discussions/role of the public
 - Yellow Belly Ponderosa
 - Letter of support from 4FRI was mailed earlier this week. Set forward by the regional office and now we’re just waiting on a decision. If it receives funding it will expand our outreach efforts into schools.

Socio-economic monitoring, Amy Waltz or Anne Mottek-Lucas

- People who have skills in contracting, economics and social science are encouraged to attend these meetings or provide feedback in any way possible.
- Contact Patrick Rappold.
- There is a recommendation to wait for the contract announcement before finalizing, in order to determine prioritization of items on the economic report.
- **NEXT STEPS:** Team will meet soon – include Pascal Berliox, Sue Sitko, and Dick Fleischman on invitation to the meeting
 - Request for call-in capacity for this meeting
- Get baseline survey data early
- Outreach to others with additional skills
- Network with existing manufacturers
- Contact rural development folks
- Coordinate scheduling for out of town
- Written comments should be submitted to Anne and/or Amy within two weeks. Once the initial round of revisions has been made, this will be resent to Stakeholder group for final review.
- Consider finalizing after DEIS.
- Target Date: April 15th submittal date to the FS.

Discussion about CFLR Annual Report and acres used as 4FRI match

- The timeframe for producing the white paper is Friday of this week; the FS will forward this to the Washington office, which will hopefully provide a response within 2-3 weeks. Dick will follow up.

- The timeframe for evaluating the list of projects is 2- 3 weeks.
- Mary Mitsos reported that other stakeholder groups are concerned over a similar issue. The Washington Office is pending a response to those groups.
- The project list will be posted on Basecamp under a non-“4FRI” name. Marcus will schedule follow up meetings to evaluate this list and produce a list the group could endorse under 4FRI labeling.
- Clarification with Todd; relabeling these without reducing our match would be very weak success; what actual Success would be is unclear, but the stakeholder group will explore together how to achieve it.

NEXT STEPS:

- Marcus will draft and post to basecamp the white paper tomorrow with 10 a.m. deadline for comments.
- The project list will be posted to basecamp, and people will individually review the list and determine which projects there is agreement/disagreement on the project being included under the “4Fri” name
- Marcus will schedule a follow up meeting for interested stakeholder group members to discuss the list
- This group will provide a recommendation to the Stakeholder Group for final approval at the next meeting.
- Dick will follow up with WO on nomenclature issues/”base program” language
 - At the March meeting we will be able to determine what action to take on the final project list based on FS feedback.

Follow up from Annual 4FRI Review: Forest Service Relationship with the Stakeholder Group

- USFS interest: legal compliance, to meet interests of agency mission
- SG interest: Deeper and broader engagement (to meet a host of stakeholder interests)
- The stakeholder group requests more engagement and at earlier stages
 - Example: There could have been more joint work and problem solving during the PA and the Alternative Development.
- Some participants want to feel more ownership in 4FRI products so they can defend them
- Done a stellar job on getting input (enhanced NEPA process). Trying to dig at what’s the most functional way to get things done and problem solve. There are people threatening litigation on 4FRI on the listserve. There are real costs for not having the level of engagement desired (by some members)
- Suggest more alignment of FS proactively engaging with the SG (like the Proposed Action)
- Question: could there be more participation with or two-way engagement with the ID team?
- Question: Small decisions vs. the ROD. The group knows the decision authority for the ROD lies with the Forest Service, but does the group have influence on the small decisions being made along the way?
- Question: Should there be a process put in place on where the SG goes when we are stuck and Henry is not available?
- Within the constraints that have been identified, Henry and team have done a good job trying to reach out and their availability is appreciated
- Several members of the I.D. team used to attend meetings and interact; recently only Henry comes. One example where interaction did occur was at a meeting where Henry included stakeholders in a session where his staff was working and stakeholders were able to sit down with the staff and work together.
- Science and monitoring work group is struggling on how FS makes decisions on what money goes to what monitoring projects. It’s a transparency issue —and maybe staff can attend science and monitoring work group.

NEXT STEPS:

- FS will hold public bi-weekly core team meetings where the following can be discussed . Marcus and Henry will coordinate scheduling.
 - Updates
 - USFS information needs
 - Stakeholder group engagement
 - Emphasis on joint problem solving
 - Refer to CEQ handbook
 - Create conditions for ownership of products

- Keep focus on NEPA planning
- Consider continuing the meetings after the first ROD
- The Forest Supervisors will check to see when the ID team can attend a stakeholder meeting to discuss alternatives and response to comments
- Amy will work with the work groups to find better ways to communicate and be explicit about the work that is being done with the Forest Service within the work groups
- Change the standing agenda item of Forest Service update for SG meetings to include updates regarding the ID team's work
- Check back in on this issue (UFSF and SG relationship) again in October for the annual evaluation

Work Group Updates

- Communications, *Marcus Selig*
 - Had an update recently at Gila county
 - Recent editorial in the Arizona Republic about contract award...and HCN article about payment for watershed services
 - Small wood conference in May,
 - June 5th Roundtable discussion at NAU—GCT is going to host
 - Later in the year, Fall-Festival of science-want to put together some field trips to visit restoration sites
 - Yellow Belly Ponderosa was nominated for additional funding
 - Making progress on 4FRI slide show
 - Larger statewide communication strategy: still going through some refinement and there will be a small group work meeting in March to work on the strategy. Bigger state-wide level meeting in April/May
 - Forest health council –New policy recommendations will be rolled out in April with likely media attention
 - Healthy Forest Enterprise Bill in AZ legislature -- 12-0 unanimous support looks like bill will come, so far smooth sailing. Indications it will pass—maybe will schedule a 5 minute presentation on what is in the bill.
 - Quarterly newsletter-please look at it and distribute it
- Science and Monitoring and Landscape Working Group, *Amy Waltz*
 - *Group has been on a break*
- Fiscal Work Group, *Marcus Selig*
 - State wide fundraising strategy-will tie into the larger state-wide plan the communications Work Group is working on. Hope it generates enough funding for 4FRI. (besides other small projects)

NEXT MEETING – MARCH 28TH, FOREST SUPERVISOR'S OFFICE, FLAGSTAFF