



4FRI Stakeholder Group Meeting

Wednesday, April 26, 2017, 9AM-12:30pm

Arizona Game and Fish Dept. – Pinetop

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

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

9:00 Introductions

Bob Bailey, Travis Bruner, Melanie Colavito, Allison Jourden, Sue Sitko, Steve Reidhead, Jason Whiting, Annette Fredette, Dick Fleishman, Paul Watson, Pascal Berlioux, Steve Best, Wendy Jo Haskins, Greg Smith, Lynn Krigbaum, Bob Vahle, Dave Dorum, Adam Cooley, Art Babbott, Brad Cooper, Patrick Moore, Henry Provencio, Patrick Rappold, Brad Worsley, Steve Horner

Rob Nelson, Neil Chapman, Jim Parks, Travis Woolley, Ann Mottek, Buck Sanchez, Jay Smith, Aaron Green, Diane Vosick, Travis Woolley, Amy Waltz, Jami Clark

9:05 Approve minutes from the March 22nd SHG meeting — Whiting - Approved

9:10 Review action items from the March 22nd SHG meeting — Whiting

Action Item	Lead	Status
1. Update Workshop Flyer with a Project Area Map	Sitko	Complete
2. The co-Chairs, in connection with the steering committee, are tasked by the Stakeholder Group with drafting a letter of endorsement and support for Vision 17 and conveying it to state, regional and national recipients in an expedited way	Co-Chairs / SC	Complete

9:10 May Field Trip – Co-chairs

- Show of hands

Travis with the CIWG proposes the idea for the Stakeholders to do a mini-restoration project as a group after one of the SHG meetings. Tom Mackin is putting together a group event for this to take place after the May 24th SHG meeting and it will consist of replacing woven sheep fence on Forest Service land with smooth wire fence that will be more pronghorn friendly. This will take place north of the San Francisco Peaks on the Coconino NF. They're looking for 6-12 volunteers who will need to dress accordingly for fence removal. This is a good opportunity for stakeholders to get out on the ground and the new fence will help researchers studying the animals in this area better gauge species movement patterns.

9:20 USFS Update – 4FRI Board, Coordinators

- Operations Update

Fleishman – April has been a busy and successful first month with prescribed fire and mechanical treatments. Currently, eight different sales are active. A volunteer event planting willow trees occurred on the Apache-Sitgreaves forest. The FS annual report was turned into

the Washington office in December that was returned the week of April 23rd. Much of the info in the report was from a Q&A that took place at the October SHG meeting in Show Low, where stakeholders stated what they wanted to see in the report.

- **Public Workshop Take-away (28:34)**

There was really good turn-out at both public workshops: 22 people participated in Payson and 38 in Show Low, not including FS representatives. In response to their guiding questions, the FS heard general support from the public for the preliminary alternatives. They heard a lot about water and streams and were told that it should be an issue for which they establish litigation measures for rim country. Currently the FS is looking at this feedback from the workshops and trying to see how the information can be incorporated into the alternatives. The FS is moving on to address their alternatives and start their analysis of Rim Country.

Krigbaum – Suggests more FS contract supervision of placement of landings with regards to trails to avoid trail destruction as much as possible.

Provencio – They've almost finished the first supplemental project agreement of the TNC stewardship agreement, it is currently out for internal review. Logging restoration operations should begin early this summer for that project. The stewardship agreement is a 20,000 acre agreement and it should go for the next 5 years. Most of the sites are located on the Kaibab while other are located on the Coconino NF.

The FS would like to take Vision 17 and transform it into a strategic plan for the FS that would be updated annually with action items to address each year. Under that strategic plan they've taken Vision 17's 20 points and categorized them into program and strategic components. These components are aimed to be transformed into action items and therefore strategic goals for the FS each year. They would like this to be inclusive of everybody and as collaborative of a process as possible. First they would like to build 50% of the strategic plan before they will share it with the SHG for input and feedback. The idea behind this process is that they're outlining each step necessary to accomplish their established goals. Provencio estimates that they will be able to share 50% of the plan with the Stakeholder Group after two weeks.

9:50 Dwarf Mistletoe Recommendation – PWG

- **Decision Requested of SHG**

The Planning Work Group has posted a recommendation on BaseCamp proposing the final Stakeholder stance on the Dwarf Mistletoe issue. The PWG hopes to take a vote today regarding whether or not the SHG will adopt this stance as their own, at this meeting.

The PWG aimed to assess accurately how pressing of an issue the Dwarf mistletoe presents regarding the survival and health of large and young trees. Many believed a major infestation issue existed. The GIS study conducted came back stating that approximately 35,000 acres of infestation of dwarf mistletoe exists on the first EIS. Only 4,000 acres were identified as both infested and treatable. This proposal was drafted by Scott Rosenstock and relied heavily on a paper that was produced by Amy Waltz with the ERI.

PWG Recommendations:

1. Because only 35,000 acres out of a 1.2 million acre EIS were identified as infested, this does not constitute an epidemic.

2. Because there isn't an epidemic present here, the PWG rules out the need for intensive treatment, particularly sanitation treatment. They recommend that the SHG pass on to the forest that there is no need for mistletoe sanitation
3. They believe mitigation of the mistletoe is necessary, so there is no need for a Forest Service plan revision. The restoration activities already detailed in the plan will suffice for the any mistletoe restoration that is necessary.
4. Recommends the SHG endorses working with the FS to design isolation treatments that will focus on thinning the downwind regions to avoid the transportation of the species so that they can avoid harming old trees with valuable canopies.
5. Recommends that the discussions with the FS continues when it comes to the design of these treatments and the assessment monitoring of how effective ecological restoration is in mitigating mistletoe infestations.

The words "hand-thinning" will be added to the beginning of the 5th paragraph of the proposal so as to avoid the implication that hand-thinning has been excluded from potential treatment possibilities.

A comment was made on the issue that the last part of the letter essentially states that a traditional silviculture approach is inconsistent with an ecological restoration approach, and is not supported by best available science. It is also mentioned that this traditional silviculture approach may be inconsistent with CFLRP.

Annette – They feel that it's okay to have the CFLR in there. There are things at odds with their more intensive mitigation treatments with the CFLR, but as far as the planning rule goes, it is not inconsistent.

Woolley – Some treatments have potentially exasperated the mistletoe issue, for example, shelter wood treatments. This is why some believe proceeding with these same forms of treatments might be ill-advised. Pascal assures the group that once this issue gets to the point of discussing type and distribution of treatment possibilities, they'll ensure they're in-line with Stakeholder concerns for treatments.

Pascal calls for a decision by the SHG to have this letter signed and sent to the FS as this group's official position on the DMT issue. If there is no opposition, the motion is adopted.

Oppositions? - None

Motion – Passed – The letter will be signed and passed on to the Forest Service as this group's official stance on the Dwarf Mistletoe issue.

10:50 Vision 17 – IWG

Whiting addresses some comments that arose regarding the Vision 17 adoption process: It has been decided that any groups that wish to request a consensus decision from the group must alert the SHG by the Friday leading up to the meeting that will house the motion. After the initial motion is presented by Friday, the group presenting it has until close of business the following Monday to make any alterations to the motion. This allows the group to review the motion beforehand to gauge their stance on the issue. After this is done, a vote can be made at the following SHG meeting.

- Next Steps

Pascal – The IWG has delivered a recommendation that the SHG has adopted. At this point, the questions on the table consist of who is going to do what, moving forward with the Vision. The FS is running the show. The IWG will act as a repository of expertise that will hopefully be used by both the Forest Service and the SHG. The IWG leadership has had a couple of brainstorming sessions concerning how we can put out an RFP and doing a due diligence process that will include the industry's best practices. The IWG is comfortable providing the expertise and will continue to report to the SHG, and the FS will continue to do their processes. When it comes to making recommendations to the FS, decisions will continue to come down to the SHG. There's the idea for the FS to open their contracting processes to outside input. Pascal supports Henry in saying their product still needs 2-3 weeks of technical development before it's ready for presentation to the SHG, but that that product will clearly reflect the input of both the FS and the IWG.

Diane – It's her understanding that the reason Vision 17 was put on the agenda was that they were going to try to provide more opportunities for people to dig into the Vision and develop a strategic plan for moving forward on many of the plan's fronts. She doesn't get the sense that what they're talking about at this point is next steps for Vision 17 but is instead next steps for the RFP. With Scott Russell and Travis Bruner, Diane kicked around the idea of setting a one-day event to address and discuss Vision 17, to potentially take it one step further and develop a strategy. Diane remains interested in taking the vision and developing a strategic plan from it. Diane suggests that bringing a neutral facilitator on for this meeting would be a good idea because of the importance of this development. It would allow even the co-chairs to have a voice in the discussion. Diane volunteers the ERI pay for the facilitator for this meeting. Diane proposes this meeting be used as a way to bring the SHG in line with what the FS is working on so that it's a fully collaborative idea moving forward.

Bruner – He is concerned that if an outside facilitator is brought in, it's suggesting that the SHG is incapable of coming to consensus on their own. If SHs are to present a unified SHG perspective to folks in DC, SHs need to demonstrate an ability to work towards a common aim without an outside facilitator.

Steve Horner – He believes the fact that a nerve has been obviously struck concerning this issue in itself dictates the need for a facilitator.

Povencio – From the FS perspective, the purpose of the meeting will be for the development of action items based on the Vision 17 points. The idea is that they will lay their action items out and determine if there is support for them.

Babbott – He sees the Vision 17 as an incredibly important road map and a path to move forward. Art stresses the importance of urgency concerning this issue. From his perspective, urgency needs to be given as equal importance as the narrative receives, because he doesn't feel anything will get done otherwise. He doesn't believe the focus on a need for a facilitator promotes expediency or urgency.

Amy Waltz – Disagrees that a facilitator means there are assumed feelings regarding the purpose and connotations of the meeting. 4FRI used to use a facilitator and it promoted productivity at SHG meetings.

Provencio – States that this discourse on a facilitator is unproductive and decides that the FS will have a facilitator at their meeting for the sake of efficiency.

Recap: The FS will hold a meeting to address the Vision 17 points, and how they can be turned into action items, with a facilitator, and will let the SHG know of a date and time, once established.

11:20 Break

11:30 Working Group Updates – All

- Planning WG (10 min) – Berlioux

They have an upcoming event on May 16th that will be a joint field trip with the FS regional team, individuals from all the 4 forests, and the NRWG. The purpose will be to view some Mistletoe stands. The FS will organize the trip. Cal Joiner wants to see some progressive treatments that have been done in the past regarding mistletoe. The field trip will show outcomes of some treatments on pretty severe mistletoe infestation situations. This trip will be in Williams. The FS will send out an agenda once established.

Adam Cooley would like to look at some heavily infested pre-treatment sites that already exist, and suggests another field trip for this purpose. Annette will send out a potential date for the earlier field trip to look at pre-treatment sites.

- Industry WG (10 min) – Worsley

A successful round-table with the FS occurred on April 11th that lasted about 5 hours. They discussed contracting and offering details and this meeting epitomized the purpose for which the IWG is here. Notes on this meeting are to come. Brad wants to highlight from an industry perspective concerns that industry has regarding the Vision 17. It has generated energy and momentum seen from many different sources. Brad stresses that if we do not act urgently, this will not happen. The more we talk about the issue, the less time industry has to actually get the work done.

- Communications WG (10 min) – Sitko

Copies of the April newsletter are available on Base Camp. Kelly Wolf-Krauter has volunteered to join the CWG and Jay Smith has become an active member. Today the CWG consists of Sue Pascal, Tayloe Dubay, Jay Smith, Kelly Wolf-Krauter, Ann Anderson, and Brie Pettit. A conference call for the group is scheduled for May 19th where the CWG will meet and establish their upcoming goals.

- MPMB WG (10 min) – Mottek

At the last meeting they focused on finalizing agreements for the next fiscal year. One of those focuses is an economic monitoring project to assess regional economic contributions of 4FRI related projects. They're also finalizing agreements with LCI on ground plots and are currently working on doing some plots in Chinle Springs. They're also looking into pronghorn connectivity

analyses and understory power analyses. The water subgroup has been discussing overarching aquatic questions. Lastly, the group's last meeting saw a presentation by Adam Salamonte, a PhD student with the NAU remote sensing lab who is looking at treatment pattern impacts on snow retention and soil moisture, but is also open to suggestions to further his dissertation research.

- Comprehensive Implementation WG (10 min) – Bruner

They're moving forward with T-Six spring project. That should be occurring this summer. They're also working on the post-shg meeting fieldtrip as discussed earlier in the meeting. Dick will be involved with the CIWG to help prioritize and identify other restoration projects.

12:20 Stakeholder Disclosures – All

Lynn Krigbaum – On June 10th from 10am-2pm at the White Mountain Nature Center, a Forest Fair is being held.

Reidhead – Tristar Update: They're fully loaded and are currently working on multiple timber sales.

Worsley – Brad highlights that 2,200 acres have been done according to the FS update. Novo power just got through with their turbine overhaul and their plant is up and running after a short outage. Evidence is rising that shows that the vision is prompting successful responses regarding industry. Brad has received word that another PPA might be in the future and he attributes this to Vision 17.

Ann Mottek – Reminder: on May 6th the Harvesting Methods and Wildfire Preparedness Open House is taking place from 10-1 at the aquaplex and a flyer is available on the GFFP website.

12:25 Review Action Items

Action Item	Lead	Status
1. Send out agenda for May 16 th meeting in Williams	FS	
2. Annette send potential date for earlier field trip to the planning WG	Annette	
3. FS present date for Vision 17 presentation	Henry Provencio	
4. Co-Chairs sign and send Dwarf Mistletoe position letter to USFS	Co-chairs	

12:30 Adjourn

05/24/17 SHG meeting information:

Coconino National Forest Supervisor's Office
 1824 South Thompson Street
 Flagstaff, AZ 86001
 Teleconference line: (712) 775-7031, code: 439290611#

Future Agenda Items:

1. Industry Economics around Restoration USFS & AZSF