



4FRI Stakeholder Group Meeting DRAFT Minutes

Wednesday, March 23, 2016, 9AM – 12:30PM

South County Complex Health Building – Frontier Conference Room

600 North 9th Place, Show Low, AZ 85901

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

Attendance: Greg Smith, Steve Reidhead, Joe Miller, Sue Sitko, Erick Walker, Vickie Horner, Steve Horner, Jana Sterling, Jay Smith, Rob Davis, Keith Pajkos, Lynn Krigbaum, Tiffany Woods, Steve Gatewood, Travis Woolley, Bryce Esch, Scott Russell, Annette Fredette, Randy Fuller, Bruce Greco, Dick Fleishman, Brienne Pettit, Scott Le Rich, Karin Warnick, Henry Provincio, Stephen Flora, Bruce Greco, Heather Provincio, Art Gonzales, Pascal Berlioux, Steve Best, Wendy Jo Watkins, Paul Watson, Gary Moore, Sharon Adams, Don Berry, Dave Bhakta, Buchanan Davis, Dan Kipervaser,

One the phone: Laura Jo West, Bob Seidler, David Dorum, Audrey Owens, Anne Mottek, Tommie Martin, Wade Warren, Alycin Gitlin, Neil Chapman, Rebecca Davidson, Michelle Ralston, Ethan Aumack, Todd Schulke

9:05 Approve minutes from February 24th SHG meeting — Smith

Approved

9:10 Review action items from February 24th SHG meeting — Smith

Action Item	Lead	Status
1. Post FS pre-work list on BASECAMP	Woods	Completed
2. Email 5 year plan questions to co-chairs (Paul Summerfelt and Greg Smith)	All	Completed
3. Overview of 5 year plan development	FS	Completed
4. FS provide responses to additional SHG 5 year plan questions	FS	Completed
5. Post PWG meeting information on BASECAMP and send out invitation to join the PYLT conversation	PWG	Completed
6. Determine dates for SHG Open House (April or May)	SC	Completed
7. Schedule TNC Tablet Technology presentation for future SHG meeting	SC	In Progress

9:15 Call to the Public – No Call to the Public

9:20 Multi-Party Monitoring Board Presentation – Woolley

The Multi-Party Monitoring Board presentation is available for view on BASECAMP. More in-depth information on the indicators is included in the online presentation.

The presentation reviewed the work group's overall goals, indicators, how and what they monitored over the last year, the budget and where they are planning to go in the next year(s). The main goal of the MPMB is to accomplish tier 1 indicators that the stakeholders had developed and this year they focused on pre-treatment monitoring, which was completed on shelf-stock NEPA projects that were already approved. This allowed them to test their protocols. The Center for Biological Diversity helped them vet the task orders (TOs) that were best related to 4FRI desired conditions.

The group had to develop questions to narrow the scope and allow them to collect data on the established tier 1 indicators. In review, the indicators that were monitored are as follows: Mexican spotted owl (completed by the USFWS), songbird occupancy, Northern goshawk occupancy, forest structure vegetation, landscape metrics, socio-economic, and invasives. Please refer to the presentation posted on BASECAMP for more information on all of the indicators, questions, methods, metrics, review of where data was collected and the budget that was allocated for each indicator. It should also be noted that while they did not complete MSO monitoring, they did organize an MSO workshop that was well attended and many of the participants noted they would be willing to pay a small fee to attend similar workshops in the future. They plan to have similar monitoring related events in the future.

*If you are interested in the Coconino County Board of Supervisors Community Grant that was awarded to GFFP or would like to participate in the socio-economic project please contact Anne Mottek.

Concerning the future activities of the MPMB: In 2015, they received \$300,000.00 and this is approximately what they will be awarded each year, unless there are changes in the CFLR budget. They will also only be funded for the next three years so they are starting the discussion on how they will be able to monitor long-term. They will have to work more aggressively to obtain funding and they will need to be more efficient with the funds they receive.

Questions:

Sue Sitko: For the vegetation monitoring are you planning on revisiting the same plots, post-treatment? Yes, they recorded the plots with a GPS and want to revisit them to have robust data.

Dan Davis: When doing sampling are you doing what is already completed in NEPA? Some are similar and some are different. For example, they are trying understand population dynamics as opposed to locations of nests, NEPA wants a much more general look. Dan Kipervaser is helping to ensure they are not doubling their efforts.

Gatewood: What happens after the three years, will you prioritize? When will we be notified of what you prioritize? They have already prioritized and they will need to do this again. When this time comes, they will have a discussion with the SHG and, hopefully, by then they will have good data and they will have been able to obtain more leveraged funding.

Lynn Krigbaum recommended Tracks as a source of completing citizen science. The Grand Canyon Trust will be heading the volunteer/citizen science effort and Tracks has already been named as an organization that should be contacted because of their knowledge and volunteers.

Joe Miller noted that Trout unlimited has also been in contact with the MPMB and FS to discuss stream monitoring and incorporate the stream monitoring efforts that are already taking place in the White Mountains into the Rim Country monitoring. At this time the MPMB is focused on the first EIS monitoring, however, the Rim Country EIS monitoring efforts are being discussed.

Dick Fleishman: The Washington office is considering to expand funding to 2026 from CFLR, Dick recommends reaching out to representatives in D.C. to provide input on funding needs. Also, when does the MPMB plan to expand their efforts to the Tonto and Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests? They should

be starting this discussion soon, but are still focused on the 2016 monitoring plan that included the Kaibab and Coconino National Forests.

Berlioux: Monitoring is an important component that will feed into the adaptive management. What are we accomplishing with the monitoring that we are doing? This group does not deal with implementation, but they are trying to find those connections. The folks at the districts are primarily responsible for implementation and once the MPMB has started to complete analyses (not just pre-treatment data collections) they can feed that information into the districts and the adaptive management plan.

9:50 Working Group Updates

- Industry Work Group – Berlioux
 - Dashboard Update

The IWG Is still working on the implementation dashboard, which is about 90-95% complete. They are currently fine tweaking of the gauges based on the data that has been provided by Arizona State Forestry and industry members. They are taking into consideration logging, trucking and milling capacity and hope to develop a forward looking view of capacity. They hope to present a draft dashboard at the next April meeting.

Action Item: Dashboard presentation at April Meeting

The group has also decided to modify the socio-economic desired conditions that they have been trying to develop and will now only focus on the economic aspect because the social component is beyond their ability to gauge. They are also trying to determine how they could use an economic desired condition and where it would fit in the NEPA process all while remaining in compliance with NEPA laws. If they are going to rely on industry to fund ecological restoration, they need to be able to sustain/support the industry that will implement the treatment. This is why it is important to have an economic desired condition.

Scott Russell: The FS does recognize the importance of those conversations around what they are planning to offer. It would be nice for the FS to have those detailed conversations with the collaborative group. Would the IWG could host a semi-annual get together. Did host an industry forum under NRWG. They plan to continue to do this.

More detailed information on the draft economic desired conditions can be accessed in the IWG meeting minutes. They will be posted on BASECAMP

Action Item: Post (approved) IWG meeting minutes to BASECAMP

Scott Russell: The FS does recognize the importance of these conversations and what they can offer. It would be nice for the FS to be a part of those detailed conversations with the collaborative group. Would the IWG could host a semi-annual get together? The NRWG did host a get-together similar to what the FS is requesting and they plan to have similar events in the future.

- Communications Working Group – Davidson/Sitko
 - Newsletter Review

The CWG distributed a draft newsletter to attending stakeholders for review. There will be a final review of the newsletter at the next Steering Committee call. The CWG requested Pascal Berlioux' s assistance with the Industry insider section and while they have already expanded the newsletter to three pages, they will work with Travis Woolley to develop a monitoring update for the fourth page. In the future they hope the dashboard can be reflected on the fourth page. The only recommendation was that the first article be modified to reflect the collective voice of all the forest supervisors, not just that of Scott Russell because he is speaking on the boards behalf.

- Planning Work Group – Berlioux
 - PLYT and socioeconomic update

The PWG discussed the preponderance of large young trees (PLYT) at their March meeting. PLYT is the component of the first EIS that was seriously objected and it continues to be an area of heightened interest to the conservationist groups that are involved with the project. The PWG is looking into how the issue was resolved and the discussions that were had during the Governor's group to resolve the objections. They are also looking into what PLYT will look like in the second EIS. They have determined that the group has reached solid consensus for VSS 5 and 6, but the VSS 4 stands that are characterized by the PLYT are the primary areas of disagreement.

The main objective of reaching consensus on PLYT is to have an EIS that is not heavily litigated. One issue in the first EIS was that the GIS was not reliable, however, the FS has been working to provide better GIS data for the second analysis. Pascal also noted that the development of canopy specific treatments was a process that worked in the first EIS, if the same reasoning is applied to the second analysis they could reach the main objective. If applied, the group estimates that approximately 83,000 acres (less than 10% of the project area) would be designated for treatment that is developed to retain canopy dependent habitat. However, they are also still addressing the differences in landscape as the first analysis area primarily dealt with ponderosa pine, whereas the second has a higher preponderance of mixed conifer.

At this time the PWG only has a simulation, not a decision.

The minutes of the PWG has the more in-depth conversation on the PLYT, they will be posted to BASECAMP once they have been approved.

Action Item: Post (approved) PWG meeting minutes to BASECAMP

11:00 USFS 5 Year Plan Development – Fleishman/Smith

- Review of questions

Scott Russell is the 4FRI Chief Executive. They are still working out the specifics of this position, but he essentially implements the strategy of the forest supervisors and works on their behalf and helps improve efficiency in the project. Other organizational changes include a new position, the innovations and efficiencies coordinator filled by Henry Provincio, and expanding Dan Kipervaser's monitoring position across the four forests. An organization chart has been posted to BASECAMP.

The NEPA Planner position is still vacant, on the core team, but the FS is finalizing a work order to provide additional NEP support. Katherina Sanchez Meador will be filling this role for the time being.

Update on the additional funding. They prepared a plan that detailed their potential to accelerate restoration and because it was well received, they were awarded a funding increase. However, at the national level, funding is tight so they will modify their five year plan to a steady state program based on where they are in 2016, in case they do not see all of the additional funds.

East side strategy: Situation with east side industry is dire, there is a lack of supply and they are critical to getting the work done. The FS is going to develop a strategy to address how they are going approach the issues presented in the letter by ECO supervisors. Specifically, they will look for opportunities where they can do something immediately and plan for what they can do long term. They are going to look at business practices, efficiencies, and better methods of awarding agreements and they will work with industry directly. Current opportunities in discussion include work similar to that of the C.C. Cragin, but at a broader-scale, and continued work on the good neighbor authority master agreement with Arizona State Forestry. The innovations and efficiencies coordinator will lead the group tasked with drafting the strategy.

Question: When do you expect to get back to this group to give us an update on the strategy? Potentially the May meeting.

Action Item: Post ECO Supervisors' letter to Chief Tidwell on BASECAMP

Action Item: Future presentation by AZSF and FS on Industry Economics

The following presentation covers what drives the five year plan and where do these components come from. The three components of the plan are mechanical, prescribed, and other restoration, but the prescribed burning component includes non-commercial fuel treatments and they are considering splitting this element creating four components. Currently, the first two pieces have been drafted and they are working on the third, the plan serves as a planning tool. The presentation is available for view on BASECAMP.

The priorities of the forest supervisors' and the stakeholders are very similar. For mechanical thinning, they broke it down by forest and project area. For the A-S, they have NEPA in the Rim Lakes, Larson, and Upper Rocky Arroyo, but are not as NEPA rich in the Apache NF. They will do treatments in the NEPA completed areas and will focus on priority areas while factoring in recreation use, MSO habitat, and industry needs. For the Tonto they will also focus on NEPA completed projects and the same goes for the Coconino and Kaibab, but these forests have an increased focus on high priority watersheds.

Prescribed fire is a different than mechanical thinning because once when you start marking on the ground you start limiting where you can have prescribed fire on the ground. You also have to think about different considerations such as the air shed, grazing schedules, and types and amounts of fuels.

For the other restoration work, they provided a list of how they will be prioritizing the work and they are directly related to what is in the NEPA decision. In 2017, they won't list exact acreage amounts rather what they can complete based on funding, but this could change.

At the previous meeting, stakeholders wanted to know where the ramp up work would be directed. The presentation provides a spreadsheet listing planned work in FY16 and the status of the work.

Question (Steve Reidhead): Only a limited number of acres have been released on the Tonto, but there is more potential there, is this NEPA related? They are not currently aware of the status of NEPA on the Tonto, but this is something they will be checking on. Pascal noted that two issues have been identified on the Tonto: 1) they need to verify the validity of NEPA; 2) it does not have the in-house capacity to manage the sales.

Question (Bruce Greco): For the Rim Country analysis is stand exam completed? Yes.

12:00 Stakeholder Disclosures – All

- Sue Sitko (TNC) – There will be an open house on May 10th in Payson to discuss the proposed action. This is not a part of the formal scoping period, but an opportunity for the public to provide feedback on the draft proposed action. Joe Miller is heading this effort and will provide more information once the details have been solidified. The facility is Messingers Payson Funeral Home and with a round table set-up it will be able to accommodate 70 attendees. There will only be one meeting for the draft proposed action because they will have multiple meetings when they publish the proposed action.

Action Item: CWP prepare press release for the open house

- Sue Sitko (TNC) – The April Arizona Highways published an article that was written on ponderosa pine restoration efforts. The article is titled “Cutting it Down to Size”

Action Item: Post Arizona Highways article on BASECAMP

- Joe Miller (Trout Unlimited): They will have the 7th Annual Native and Wild Trout Conference on Thursday, April 21st at the Arizona Game and Fish headquarters.
- Multiple stakeholders: Senators McCain and Flake will be visit the Forest Energy mill on March 24th. A luncheon has been scheduled with McCain and anyone is able to attend, but you must register through the Show Low Chamber of Commerce. They are also scheduled to meet with Steve Best, Scott Russel and Wendy Jo Haskins during their visit to the White Mountains.
- Heather Provincio (FS): They will be hosting a hiring event in Phoenix, Arizona on April 5th and April 6th to hire 50 permanent positions across the four forests.
- Pascal Berlioux and Tommie Martin (ECO) Washington D.C. Trip Review: ECO identified that they were running out of the wood supply needed to sustain industry, that the issue could not be addressed by the A-S alone, and additional issues would arise if everything that was completed under the White Mountain Stewardship and the Bridge-the-Gap was counted as 4FRI. As a result they identified four objectives:
 1. Bring visibility to the issue
 2. Bring money to the issue
 3. Bring human resources to the issue
 4. Bring accountability to the issue

After have discussions amongst themselves, with the FS, and with industry, they wrote a letter to Chief Tidwell that proposed 16 ideas to address the issues that they had identified. They will now be reporting on a monthly basis to the congressional delegation what is being done. Hopefully, they will be able resolve this issue for industry short, mid, and long-term. The overall perception is that the chief was committed to helping 4FRI succeed and knew about the situation.

12:15 Review Action Items/Adjourn

Action Item	Lead	Status
1. Post (approved) IWG and PWG meeting minutes to BASECAMP	IWG and PWG	
2. Post ECO Supervisors' letter to Chief Tidwell on BASECAMP	Berlioux	
3. Future presentation by AZSF and FS on Industry Economics	USFS/AZSF	
4. CWP prepare press release for the open house	CWG	
5. Post Arizona Highways article on BASECAMP	Sitko	Complete