



4FRI Stakeholder Group Meeting

Wednesday, July 26th, 2017 9am-12:35pm
Coconino National Forest Supervisor's Office
1824 South Thompson Street
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

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

9:00 Attendance: Travis Bruner, Sue Sitko, Steve Reidhead, Tom Mackin, Scott Russell, Adam Coolley, Art Babbott, Brad Worsley, Ann Mottek, Steve Gatewood, John Souther, Paul Brown, Cecilia Overbee, Steve Horner, Paul Summerfelt, Henry Provencio, Dan Kippervaser, Sharon Boe, Mary Lata, Patrick Rappold, Diane Vosick, Dick Fleishman, Karen Bradshaw, Patrick Moore, Melanie Colavito, Amy Waltz, Neil Chapman, Steve Rosenstock, Mark Nigrelli, Brienne Petit, Nate Rees, Allison Jourden, Travis Wooley, Steve Fugate, Andrew Valkmer, Steven Flora, Jim Parks, Joe Miller, Laura Jo West, Wendy Jo Haskins

Phone: Mike Kirby, Jamie Clark, Todd Schulke, Paul Watson, Sharalyn Peterson, Aaron Green, Esther Morgan, Jason Whiting, Bernadette Barthelenghi,

Steve Reidhead resigned as hot chair turning the responsibility over to Sue Sitko, who will be the new hot chair starting in August. Diane Vosick will be the new cold chair.

9:05 Approve minutes from the June 28th SHG meeting — Bruner - Approved

9:10 Review action items from the June 28th SHG meeting — Bruner

Action Item	Lead	Status
1. Contact Diane if anyone would like to participate in the Party Working Group	Vosick	Complete
2.		
3.		

9:15 Call to the Public

Karen Bradshaw – Professor and Researcher at ASU College of Law– Karen is preparing a report on stakeholder collaboration projects. Karen is an academic consultant to ACUS (Administrative Conference of the United States) which is a federal agency that studies other federal agencies to help develop best-practices. She's preparing an Office of the Chairman report on stakeholder collaborations for public lands and natural resources.

9:20 USFS Update – 4FRI Board, Coordinators

Scott Russell – Distributed a draft of the Request for Information (RFI) the FS has been working on for the 4FRI 2nd Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). They are not asking for public

comments but if they receive recommendations, they will accept them. The Forest Service (FS) is planning to release the RFI soon.

Dick Fleishman – The monthly update went out on Tuesday, July 25th. There is at least a week's worth of work that was completed but not reflected on the update. The ops team has put together a DXP (Description by Prescription) Implementation plan for 4FRI on the FS side and there are also some industry components that Dick would like industry input on, so he will be sending this plan to industry folks.

Henry Provencio – They're moving forward on the TNC agreements and trying to get SPAs signed as soon as possible. Information on this agreement is being communicated to various interests on an ongoing basis.

9:35 RIM Country EIS Alternatives Discussion – Russell & 4FRI Team

- **Key\Big Picture Differences**

This topic came out of the last meeting when confusion arose around the alternatives discussion. The presentation outlined the context around the alternatives and discussed why one of the alternatives was dropped.

Russell presented a graph depicting the extent (acres) of each alternative vs. the intensities of each alternative. Alternative 4 has less acres than Alt. 2, but operates at the same intensity.

*SEE PowerPoint Presentation of Prelim Rim Country (RC) Alternatives on BASECAMP.

The FS dropped Alternative 3 with hopes that reducing the number of alternatives would save time and get Rim Country done as efficiently as possible. They also hoped that dropping Alternative 3 would help them avoid proposing restoration treatments that require discussion and possible consternation that might damage social consensus.

Travis Bruner - When the board decided to drop Alternative 3, was there discussion of removing the Dwarf Mistletoe(DMT) aspect of the alternative, but keeping the rest of it intact, in order to solve the potential issue of damaging social consensus? The DMT discussion was the most contentious aspect of Alt. 3 but the decision to drop the alternative was mainly driven as a time-saving move.

Joe Miller – Is there any differentiation between the alternatives regarding aquatics restoration activities? No, Aquatics Restorations remains the same across all alternatives.

Amy Waltz – Early documentation on Alt. 3 discussed climate change specifically. It is correct that climate change isn't directly discussed in the alternative 2 modified proposed action.

Diane Vosick – The executive order limiting discussion on climate change conflicts with other FS directives to use best available science. We have a regional forester that has said repeatedly that we only have one swing of the ax on this, so if we go at a minimum level using Alternative 2, we're going to lose the opportunity to address what is a predicted change in national forests. There's another argument which is that if we do it right, more trees will ultimately go to industry.

Laura Jo West – The intent of the board was to honor the consensus work that's happened over the decade with this group. It's not that they thought Alt. 3 was bad, they just didn't think it was different enough from Alt. 2 to warrant two separate alternatives. They aimed to save time and discussion in order to start performing treatments as fast as possible. She stated that if the group could come to a consensus around the dropped alternative in the next hour, it could potentially result in bringing back the alternative for consideration. The board is concerned with moving forward and meeting their timelines. She wants the Stakeholder Group (SHG) to keep that in mind.

Amy Waltz – Amy described the Planning Work Group (PWG) concerns regarding dropping the draft alternative, one of which being that the group doesn't believe a wide range of intensities is represented in the current available alternatives. The alternative that was dropped provided a higher intensity treatment. The planning group was concerned about the tradeoffs of each alternative.

Joe Miller –Amy gave an excellent summary of the PWG session. The topic they were discussing at that meeting was to give a position statement on Stands with a Preponderance of Large Young Trees (SPLYT) but they had difficulty composing this statement when many of the group had difficulty understanding and following the alternatives.

Todd Schulke – Todd stated that there wasn't a consensus from the PWG stating that they wanted this alternative to move forward. There was a consensus that stated this conversation needed to take place.

Patrick Moore – Acronyms: MSO-Mexican Spotted Owl, NOGO-Northern Goshawk, SPLYT-Stands with a Preponderance of Large Young Trees.

Treatments by Alternative:

*SEE PowerPoint Presentation of Prelim RC Alternatives on BASECAMP

Bruner –He suggested the FS keep in mind that folks not with the SHG will look at these alternatives closely and will potentially have a hard time recognizing a range between the three.

Diane Vosick – Diane argued that the alts. available wouldn't earn group consensus. She makes an argument in retaining alternative 3. The final decision often ends up being a mix and match and our current alternatives don't provide that option. This group has always had the goal of managing more with fire and Alt. 3 facilitates more fire in the landscape in a safer way.

Sue Sitko – Sue agrees that the ID team will need to know as soon as possible as to what the SHG is requesting on this issue. She comments that the NEPA would be lacking if the alternatives didn't stretch the goal to full restoration activities that were represented in the dropped alternative 3. The current alternatives seem to lack substance.

Brad Worsley –As an industry member, he can recall lecturing the FS two years ago on efficiency in getting the EIS completed. He felt he couldn't sit there in good conscience and not support the FS in their effort to move quickly.

Henry Provencio – Henry recommended that the group key-in on important items within alternatives, opposed to the alternatives themselves, to focus on addressing desired conditions collectively. He proposed giving SHs one month to work with the FS to develop and decide what the key items of focus should be.

Todd Schulke – States that the SHs as a collaborative are not in agreement concerning what desired conditions or best available science are.

Amy Waltz –Desired conditions within 4FRI do already exist. They were quantified in the first monitoring plan and included in the first EIS and Record of Decision. Alternative 4 came from the public and not from stakeholders and Amy doubts it will happen because it only analyzes treatments around communities. It doesn't meet the CFLRP Landscape requirements. Why wouldn't we just drop Alt. 4?

Wendy Jo Haskins – Alternatives should be driven by issues but she doesn't believe these alternatives are tied to specifically identified issues. The conversation should go back to what are our desired conditions. Wendy urges the PWG and the SHG to come to consensus on a recommendation to the FS regarding alternatives.

Laura Jo West – The board would be open to accepting a cohesive SHG recommendation on the alternatives issue. Laura commented that though she wants the group to move forward, she doesn't want that to happen at the expense of valuable discourse and conversation.

Steve Gatewood – Steve was concerned with the emphasis on speeding this analysis up since it has taken decades to get to the point that we're at. He commented that dropping Alternative 3, which was a truly ecological restoration focused alternative, was totally unacceptable.

Paul Summerfelt - Drop alternative 4 - it's dumb. It puts communities at much higher risk long-term.

Diane Vosick – This will be an interesting conversation among the PWG but a letter of consensus shouldn't necessarily be expected.

Next Steps: The PWG will develop a paper for the SHG position on this issue for approval by the SHG and delivery to the USFS at the August 2017 meeting.

10:35 Strategic Plan Discussion – Russell, Souther, Bruner

The Strategic Plan discussion is a follow-up to the June 19th Strategic Planning meeting, at which many of the SHG met to go over the strategic plan and provide input on the major and minor components of the document. Travis suggested that perhaps an alternative version of the document is necessary in order to properly communicate its contents to the public or other interested parties.

One thing that came up right away is that a table of contents was a helpful inclusion into the document. Stakeholders were given a week and a half to review the document and return comments to John Souther (jsouther@fs.fed.us) by August 4th, so that he and his team will

have time to work through those edits and address any concerns that arise. The goal is to present the next version for approval by the SHG at the August SHG meeting on 8/23/17.

The strategic goals and outcomes will be for the lifetime of 4FRI. The objectives and strategies beneath each goal would have about a 5 year lifespan before they would be revisited.

Melanie Colavito – Who would be responsible for the yearly, and subsequent updates? The FS and the SHG would be responsible for updating those items which they own.

Vosick – Suggested an annual meeting to review the document as a collaboratively to assess work done on the action items.

Ann Mottek – Seconded the idea to review the document's action items annually and to urge stakeholders to participate in the annual 4FRI SHG survey that goes out.

Todd Schulke – Commended the team for the work done on the Strategic Plan document as it's coming together very well. Todd agreed with Diane and Ann.

Tom Mackin – There were several references within the document on tribal involvement, and Tom was curious whether there is something that needs to be included in the document regarding this. Also, when he looked at the ramp-up to 50,000 ac/year for mechanical thinning, and knows that we've never been able to achieve more than 15,000 ac/year, he wasn't sure how this is going to work going forward.

Russell – The increased tribal engagement component is a great place for the group to think about what else can be done. In terms of the 50,000 acres, it plays out as the three large forests achieve 15,000 acres each and the Tonto achieves 5,000 acres in a year. Tom suggested these numbers be included in the document to better substantiate the plan.

11:35 Working Group Updates – All

- Planning WG (5 min) – PWG Representative

The group is still working on SPLYT Language and they should have this ready for the August meeting

- Industry WG (5 min) – Worsley

IWG is working on a potential response to the FS RFI document.

- Communications WG (20 min) – Sitko

- Draft brochure review and Stakeholder DECISION to support moving forward

Sue distributed the summer newsletter and will post it on Basecamp. The CWG will begin generating topics for the next newsletter in August which will be due in October or November.

The CWG distributed their draft brochure intended to provide information to interested and concerned members of the public on forest restoration activities in their areas. Concerned public are seeing treatments happening and are seeing equipment going through neighborhoods and the FS and implementers have been getting a lot of questions on these activities. This brochure is designed to help answer those questions. This document is meant to be as useable as possible for a wide range of audiences.

Steve Gatewood – Thinks the CWG should focus on making this understandable to the public and not necessarily focusing on established jargon. Steve suggested providing a place or website the public can go to see which operations are currently underway, and where, so as to avoid on-site surprises.

This isn't a document intended to describe 4FRI or CFLRP – It's merely a document to describe to the public what is going on in their own neighborhoods regarding forest restoration activities.

Motion: Does the SHG support the CWGs effort to continue working on this project? All in support.

- MPMB WG (5 min) – Steve Flora

The project agreements the Monitoring Board has been working on have gone through with the exception of the storyboard. Due to this, the group is discussing how they would like to share some of the information they're gathering on monitoring. They're discussing developing a short one page summary. Bird surveys are underway, 16 are finished. Scattered ground plots have been completed. They're working on developing a tracking spreadsheet for these projects on the tools being used, questions being answered, progress, anticipated outcomes, etc.

The group is doing economic monitoring this year and is collecting data. It will help to ground truth the TREAT model the FS uses and it will also give them a baseline on economic impacts. Ann encouraged participation from industry members as the more feedback they receive, the better this data will be.

- Comprehensive Implementation WG (5 min) – Bruner

The pilot project is moving forward as scheduled. Hannah at Game & Fish has taken the lead on getting that organized. On July 13th they took a field trip to Rosilda Spring, Mineral Spring, and Spitz Spring. At Rosilda, the FS and the Grand Canyon Trust (GCT) have submitted an application to the Northern Arizona Forest Fund (NAFF) for some funding to do a project that would include an exclosure that would still allow spring access for livestock and wildlife, and a channel leading down to the pond. They're hopeful this project will start late fall or next spring. At mineral spring they discussed an exclosure to protect some of the streams running there from a spring. At Spitz Spring, the main idea is that there will be some thinning that occurs and they would like to monitor the effects of the thinning. Spitz springs is in the Moonset SPA. They want to measure ground water changes related to water.

- Fiesta Working Group (10 min) – Vosick

Members of the Fiesta WG are Diane Vosick, Brienne Petit, Travis Bruner, Neil Chapman, and Melanie Colavito. The group has begun to plan a celebration on the first thinning project based on the first EIS. The first cuts are planned to take place this fall. The idea is to have a party in late September at Ft. Valley, at the site of the thinning. There will be a small informal ceremony with toasts as well as a small 4FRI brand there to brand individual tree cookies. This is intended to be fun for 4FRI, and no media or external party invites will be incorporated. They're anticipating 30-50 people with families invited. The group is also asking whether we should do a potluck or maybe rent a taco truck. The SHG shows little support for a potluck, showing support for a Taco truck. Depending on cabin availability, TNC presented the option of folks using their cabins at Hart Prairie. This will take place either late September or early October.

12:25 Stakeholder Disclosures – All

Steve Rosenstock – Game & Fish has started the process of putting an MOU in place with the National Forest Foundation so that they can be more direct participants in the Northern Arizona Forest funds and work more collaboratively on projects through that entity and others.

12:30 Review Action Items

Action Item	Lead	Status
1. PWG to meet and compile a recommendation regarding alternatives with approval from the SHG, to deliver to the FS in a month	PWG	
2. Review the Strategic Plan Document and send any edits or comments to John by August 4th	SHG	
3. Send comments on the CWG Forest Restoration brochure to Sue Sitko	SHG	
4.		

12:35 Adjourn

08/23/17 SHG meeting information:

Wednesday, August 23rd, 2017, 9am-TBD
4FRI Stakeholder Group Meeting
Arizona Game & Fish Region 1 Office (Pinetop)
2878 E. White Mountain Blvd., Pinetop, AZ 85935
Teleconference line: (712) 775-7031, code: 439290611#

Future Agenda Items:

1. Industry Economics around Restoration USFS & AZSF
2. October- Annual Review of Strategic Plan accomplishments