



4FRI Stakeholder Group Meeting

Wednesday, August 23rd, 2017 9am-1:15pm

Arizona Game & Fish Region 1 Office (Pinetop)

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

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

9:00 Attendance: Melanie Colavito, Diane Vosick, Sue Sitko, Steve Rosenstock, John Souther, Travis Bruner, Scott Russell, Steve Flora, Dick Fleishman, Stephanie Coleman, Pascal Berlioux, Paul Watson, Greg Smith, Todd Richardson, Wade Ward, Bruce Greco, Brad Worsley, Allen Reidhead, Bob Vahle, Lynn Krigbaum, Sharalyn Peterson, Andrew Volkmer, David Newlin, Scott Lerich, Mary Lata, Dan Kipervaser, Adam Coolley

Phone: Aaron Green, Todd Podesta, Art Babbitt, Neil Chapman, Jamie Clark, Steve Horner, Anne Mottek, Mark Nigrelli, Ron Nelson, Todd Schulke, Kelly Wolff-Krauter, Patrick Moore, David Old

9:05 Approve minutes from the July 26th SHG meeting — Sitko - Approved

9:10 Review action items from the July 26th SHG meeting — Sitko

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	Complete
2. Review the Strategic Plan Document and send any edits or comments to John Souther by August 4th	SHG	Complete
3. Send comments on the CWG Forest Restoration brochure to Sue Sitko	SHG	Complete

9:15 Call to the Public – N/A

9:20 SPLYT Retention Language Recommendation – PWG

- Berlioux – PWG worked with interested stakeholders and FS to address SPLYT. Multiple field trips to identify 2 issues: 1) how GIS could be used to reliably identify SPLYTs; and 2) to discuss what type of treatments would be recommended for implementation in SPLYT. PWG had good attendance, successful field trips. Process identified to find SPLYTs using GIS thanks to Mark, Randy, and Patrick from FS. There was discussion on rationale for including “Site Class 1” and after defining Site Class 1 and explaining why it was included as a filter for SPLYT stands, SHG agreed to maintain that filter. In addition, Steve Rosenstock indicated AZ Game & Fish were analyzing SPLYT footprint for areas of interest. SHG and FS agreed that should there be areas of concern, plans would be developed collaboratively. Language proposed by FS to describe treatment philosophy for SPLYT, which evolved with input from SHG, led to presentation of a statement on SPLYT management by the PWG to the SHG.

SHG unanimously supported statement. FS indicated desire for a formal record of this statement. SHG directed current co-chairs to develop dated, signed document with SPLYT language to submit to FS as soon as possible.

9:35 USFS Update – 4FRI Board, Coordinators

Scott Russell – 6 TNC SPA's to sign in the next couple of weeks. Update on efficiencies work: 1) TNC SPA's have stated focus on efficiencies work on prep side and enabling conditions for industry, includes hiring of Michael Kirby; 2) FS has put a national modernization team in place to look at forestry practices and build a set of business practices to fit the low value material in the SW, 4FRI looking to be national pilot for developing agency practices for low value material; 3) ERI is helping FS find efficiencies and hosting a workshop on efficiencies. There are also exploratory conversations with the State, SRP, and counties about how those groups can step into a bigger implementation role and how to attract industry capacity to the west side.

Fleishman – In August, there was a conversation that not many acres were provided by New Life, but there is movement with the signing of subcontractor NAPCO that is bringing 3 procurement sites.

Brad Worsley - Expressed concern about the low acreage, will there be backlash? Yes, that will be discussed during the WO CFLR field visit, good for the stakeholders to bring up, as well. Need to acknowledge the issue and demonstrate where there is success (e.g. east side).

- Russell – There will be a New Life update in Sept. There is good work to create the set of necessary conditions, but it hasn't had a result yet, so more work needs to be done. There is patience and support from the WO.
- Adam Cooley – Not much to add, but several crews are being added in the next few weeks.
- Fleishman – Several members of WO were here in July and very supportive. There may be unrealistic expectations.
- Berlioux – Where are we from an AQM perspective? Who is the legal contractor with FS and controlling interest? Is there a requirement for novation, has that been undertaken if so?
- Scott – New Life is the legal holder of contract. The New Life Board composition has changed, but this does not trigger need for novation.

Fleishman – Request for updates for 4FRI reports. Draft agenda for WO Field Review – October 4-6, 2017. Agenda aligned with Strategic Plan, provided to SHG. Probably best to have stakeholders meet at stops rather than have everyone travel as a group, SHG to decide who is doing what and where. Stakeholder roundtable on Friday, October 6 may need to be longer.

Souther – Planning team is continuing to flesh out alternatives. The timeline has been extended by 2 months in recognition of planning requirements. With respect to tribal involvement, there is an ongoing effort to get tribes more involved and involve tribal youth. FS signed agreement for 4FRI Tribal Crews, which will expand work with youth on spring and watershed restoration. Trying to align FS work with tribal interests. Also trying to bring tribes to areas before RX burns to collect traditionally used plants. Early work with NAU researcher to create a map and reference guide for traditionally used plants.

- David Old – Has used non-native species for businesses, and is interested in picking up non-native species from the watershed restoration work.

9:50 Strategic Plan Update – Souther, Russell, Stakeholder Representatives Sitko, Bruner, Colavito

Souther – Would like to have a finalized document by the September meeting.

- Russell – Lots of great work, need to think about how to wrap up. Need to consider how to update annually. Proposing to do a little more work, get this to a point where it is good enough for now, and engage again in the next round at the annual meeting.

John – Will be a nested document with 3 parts: 1) first 7 pages that can be used as a standalone document; 2) then add in pages 8-20 in current draft that outline Program Components with more detail; 3) then 3rd level is the included appendices, especially Appendix C with action and ownership. Did best to incorporate comments and questions while keeping in mind the necessary level of detail for a Strategic Plan. Big changes that occurred: 1) identifying the collaborative nature of the plan; 2) refining Strategic Goals & Outcomes; 3) reorganizing formatting to make document easier to follow. In current draft, first 2 Program Components are proposed final style, rest need to be reworked. Appendix C describes actions and accountability. By Sept. would like to have graphic design for 1st 7 pages, finish reformatting, and finalize appendices. Asking SHG to get agreement on content of first 7 pages, not necessarily design. By COB Friday, August 25, please send content issue comments.

Old – Asked for honorable mention in the Strategic Plan. Will contact John Souther to determine the most appropriate venue for that. Will also talk with Sue Sitko for more information on how 4FRI SHG works.

Souther – Next big issue is determining ownership of action items. Strategic Plan team will identify ownership, ask for feedback through Basecamp, and make changes as necessary.

Bruner – Clarification that Souther is asking for a motion from SHG to approve first 7-pages by Friday.

- Vosick – Have until Friday to provide changes, then the document will be revised and sent out on Basecamp with the 48-hour rule, with silence meaning agreement.
- Souther – Goal to have first few pages finalized so they can be handed to graphic designer.
- Sitko – That meets process format to have the Basecamp interaction. Send comments by Friday, and then it will be available once again with a 48-hour window. Remaining part of plan will be revisited as Committee continues work.

10:20 Break

10:30 Fire Treatments in MSO PACs Presentation/Discussion – Richardson, Thompson

*SEE PowerPoint Presentation of 4FRI RX Fire Changes in MSO Habitat

Bruce Greco – What constitutes burn plan parameters? What is a successful burn beyond just getting fire on the landscape? What is acceptable in terms of basal area, etc.?

- Thompson – Mostly identified in the EIS desired conditions. In mixed conifer, desired condition is the same, but may take more re-entry, maybe more single tree torching. Trying to maintain similar level of dead and downed, but generally same conditions as those in EIS.

Scott Lerich – Noticed 6 PAC's identified, but how many are in the whole area?

- Fleishman – 72 analyzed and 99 in project area.
- Thompson – Close to 100 on the forest.

Thompson – Very excited about this project and would like to get this burned this fall, as long as they can get through the Section 18 review. Working with Shaula from Fish and Wildlife who is in support of project. Exciting to be able to learn from these treatments.

Todd Schulke – Appreciated the approach that was taken on this project.

Sitko – If this was implemented this fall, when would the owls be monitored and when would there be findings?

- Thompson – Doing habitat monitoring, so there is pre-treatment data. The PACs have also been monitored for several years. There will be 1, 3, and 5 year post-treatment monitoring.
- Sitko – Would be great to get pictures, as well as information for a newsletter article when treatments are underway, as well as a follow-up later.

Richardson – Question for the group, moving forward, how would you like to be engaged? What is the best way to engage the SHG? Additionally, please send any comments, questions, and concerns so they can ensure they are including all of the information.

Berlioux – This topic came to PWG as a recommendation from the FS, with the desired outcome for the SHG to take an official position on these proposed treatments. PWG unanimously makes recommendation that SHG endorse proposed treatment and continue to be involved during implementation and monitoring. Mechanism will be for SHG to continue to work with PWG. Presentation was posted in advance on Basecamp. PWG made a motion for SHG to endorse proposed treatment as presented.

- Sitko – Decision - reservations or objections? None. Unanimous consensus that SHG endorses the proposed fire treatments in MSO PACs. Further discussion on recording decision determined these minutes would be sufficient.

Fleishman – Learned from Rim Country, doing the analysis across the landscape rather than leaving holes. This was determined through after-action review and learning.

- Thompson – Really narrowed this project down to just MSO PAC's where there will be treatments and monitoring. There are other areas where there are holes, so may come back later with a bigger picture. This is just the area that will be done this fall.

11:30 Rim Country Alternatives Recommendation – PWG

Berlioux – Extensive discussion about NEPA Alternatives from Rim Country and whether original Alternative 3 should or should not be dropped from analysis at last SGH Meeting in July. Discussion pushed to PWG to make a decision about whether PWG would make a recommendation to SHG to ask for reinstatement of Original Alternative 3. PWG met and discussed issue, there was good representation at discussion. PWG was not able to reach consensus. PWG is not making the recommendation to the SHG that original Alternative 3 should be reinstated.

Sitko – In summary, no SHG statement to be delivered to FS?

Berlioux – SHG will need to make decision about what to do. PWG is not making a recommendation to SHG.

Sitko – With respect to process, discussion opened up to SHG with understanding of PWG outcome.

Berlioux – Might be best to first ask any questions for the PWG. Then stakeholders may want to comment on the situation.

Vosick – Has there been any further discussion by the 4FRI ID Team or Executive Board that is relevant to this discussion?

- Russell – Yes, but not to be disclosed at this point.
- Vosick – Will there be a future update?
- Russell – Yes, put it on the agenda for the next meeting.

Berlioux – There is no consensus being presented from the SHG to the FS. The lack of consensus from PWG would suggest there will be no consensus from the SHG.

Vosick – We do defer to working groups, but the SHG is the decision-making body, and many people in room have not been involved in the discussion. Would likely be no consensus on any of the alternatives presented at this time, so unfair to suggest there should be consensus on the original Alt 3. The point of this discussion is not about taking positions, it's about getting all the information on the table so that the FS and SHG can make an intelligent decision. We all know that this often results in a mash-up. We want the best available science in these decisions, these decisions will have long-term and far-reaching implications, will affect how this forest is positioned for climate change. Should not cut the analysis short because we are afraid of the information, time requirements (2 months). We should be learning from what we have been doing, not doing the same thing. ERI wants an analysis that looks at full spectrum of treatments and multi-resource responses. ERI is discussing doing an analysis that would be external to FS to provide information about what variation in intensities would yield to encourage discussion about tradeoffs. May wait to see what the FS update is next month.

- Schulke – The concern is not about being afraid of the science, but the concern is about casting the first ROD as a failure. It's about being afraid of getting bogged down in the same arguments that happened for years on the first EIS. It is about reaching the type of agreement that everyone can sign off on. If we want to look at full spectrum, we should look at other alternatives such as optimization or more fire, as well.
- Sitko – Is there an alternative suggestion for the SHG?
- Schulke – Not as this point.
- Vosick – We would all welcome an analysis at both ends of the spectrum. We are getting better at coming to agreements. Having all the information doesn't open a can of worms, but allows the group to make a conscious decision. We had a lot of success in the first EIS. Need full 360 on the science to have an intelligent discussion.

Old – Complimented group on accomplishments.

Berlioux – From Eastern AZ Counties perspective, the assessment that we are afraid of science or the implication that was made that science was not represented in the first EIS is not shared. Feels that they tried to incorporate science in all aspects of this discussion.

- Sitko – Didn't feel that the previous discussion meant the previous EIS didn't have science.
- Vosick – Not the case at all that ERI felt the first EIS didn't have science, it was a huge success. But we should always be thinking about adaptive management. There is a robust MPMB working hard, showing a firm commitment to learning. The point is to keep learning, do a robust analysis, and work together to come to an agreement, which is something this group can accomplish.
- Berlioux – Accepts the correction with regard to science in the first EIS.
- Sitko – Discussion is reflecting the lack of consensus. It does it appear that the FS is still deliberating the issue.
- Russell – FS is not still puzzling about the original Alternative, they are moving ahead with current Alternative. FS discussion is more about long-term, holistic discussion about Rim Country and meeting timeframes, but not focused on alternatives.
- Sitko – Suggestion from Diane still stands to wait as SHG to hear final outcome that will be presented by FS at next meeting. Any objections?
- Worsley – FS is moving forward, SHG has not come to consensus. All that matters is that FS is moving forward.
- Russell – Moving forward, but want to make sure that what is in place is a good plan.

12:30 Working Group Updates – All

- Planning WG (5 min) – Berlioux – Captured through the agenda: discussions on SPYLT, fire treatment in MSO PAC's, and alternatives. Nothing additional to share.
- Industry WG (5 min) – Worsley – Have not assembled as a core but continued work through co-chairs. Continued work on biomass bottleneck. AZ Corporation Commission ordered APS to do research on increasing amount of biomass in portfolio, this is moving forward.

Berlioux – Eastern AZ Counties has been working with AZ Corporation Commission, who gave a presentation at the last NACOG meeting and invited SRP to make a presentation, which triggered a discussion among NACOG members about the biomass bottleneck through electricity generation. AZ Corporation Commission made announcement that there will be an Oct. 17 workshop for bioenergy in AZ, agenda is under development. There will be a statewide discussion about the biomass bottleneck with the necessary partners.

Russell – Some preliminary work on Rim Country processing sites, will be brought to SHG.

Fleishman – Would like more follow-up on DXP implementation strategy and load accounting with respect to efficiencies and would like to have a meeting at some point.

Worsley – This effort is being driven for a solution that could be provided by anyone. Just hosted 3 SRP engineers at their facility, actively trying to find someone to do this work.

- Communications WG (10 min) – Sitko
 - Distribution of next iteration draft brochure

Sitko – MPMB will work with Communication WG to develop a user-friendly format for sharing monitoring results with the public. It is also time to get ideas for the October newsletter, will likely include the MSO Fire Treatment projects, Strategic Plan work, work with AZ Corporation Commission on biomass, update from New Life. Other ideas? Maybe CFLRP WO Field Visit.

Brochure provided at last SHG Meeting, stakeholders provided comments, and edits made (changed language on fire and smoke, added paragraph about purpose of brochure, added success story with photos, revised and condensed language throughout). Send additional comments to Sue prior to 2nd Monday of Sept. (Communication WG meeting). Approx. \$800 for 10,000 brochures. Graphic design estimate for same designer as ERI Restoration for Homeowners Guide about \$400. Approx. \$1500 for the entire production and printing. Would like to do this brochure through the SHG, future copies could be done through FS process.

- MPMB WG (5 min) – MPMB Representative

Steve Flora – No major updates. Projects are moving forward, and they are looking at solutions for how to share the information and working with Communication Group. Also working on a tracking spreadsheet for projects.

Dan Kipervaser – In a transition period from field season wrap up to planning for the next field season. Slower time, but also critical for looking at next year's needs and coordinating where monitoring is done with treatments. Monitoring Plan being reviewed with respect to differences on Rim Country aquatic areas, will be brought to SHG for review and approval. Also work being done to develop formats for delivering monitoring information to the public.

- Comprehensive Implementation WG (5 min) – Bruner

Bruner – Pilot Project at T6 Spring on track. 3 field trips last week to look at different sites and methods where restoration work can hit the ground in 2018, assuming they meet compliance. 2 out of 3 were not analyzed in the first EIS but are in the footprint. There was another field trip to Hart Prairie but no one at the meeting attended who could provide an update.

- Fiesta Working Group (5 min) – Vosick

Vosick – Haven't made much progress, waiting for agreements to be put in place between FS and TNC regarding Ft. Valley site where we would like to have the event. Melanie Colavito called about food trucks, but they are expensive, so we will have to find an alternative for food. As soon as there is information about when trees will be cut, it will start getting planned more.

1:05 Stakeholder Disclosures – All

Lynn Krigbaum – Next Saturday at the Nature Center from 10 – 3 there will be a Woodland Wildlife Festival.

Diane Vosick – As a result of the Comprehensive Implementation WG, went to Rosilda Spring, just downstream there is an inholding parcel with a lot of water. Exploring options for conservation. It is for sale for 2.5 million. If anyone has ideas, let Diane know.

Vahle – Encouraged to see MSO testing occurring on the Coconino.

Schulke – CBD did a short one-page objection to the West Escudilla Project asking for clarifying comments on large tree protection and asked that SPLYT language get incorporated into decision to be in line with CFLRP/ 4FRI approach. Also asked them to acknowledge and incorporate ongoing discussion in SHG related to mistletoe, and agreed to similar approach to Rim Country where there is mistletoe to do experimental approaches. CBD will work with Apache-Sitgreaves on this and welcomes engagement from others.

1:10 Review Action Items

Action Item	Lead	Status
1. Formal language/ document on SPLYT from SHG to FS	Sitko/ Vosick	
2. Send data to Dick for leverage match info for 4FRI reports by end of Oct.	SHG/ Fleishman	
3. Help with stop logistics for stakeholder meetings during WO Field Visit/ map and information on stops and times	Steering Committee/ Fleishman	
4. Provide edits to first 7-pages of Strategic Plan by Friday, August 25 to get decision on the front end of the document	SHG/ Souther	
5. Update will be made on the Rim Country schedule at the next SHG meeting	Russell	
6. Send ideas for October newsletter to Sue Sitko	SHG/ Sitko	
7. Edits on communication brochure to Sue Sitko by next Communication WG meeting	SHG/ Sitko	

1:15 Adjourn

***Call for Steering Committee members to briefly discuss SC call time –** Tom Mackin made a request to change the time of the call of the SC Meeting. SC Members will gather after meeting to discuss if the time/ day can be changed.

09/27/17 SHG meeting information:
 Wednesday, Sept. 27th, 2017, 9am-TBD
 Coconino National Forest Supervisor’s Office
 1824 South Thompson Street
 Flagstaff, AZ 86001
 Teleconference line: (712) 775-7031, code: 439290611#