



4FRI Stakeholder Meeting Minutes, Wednesday, August 24, 2011, Coconino National Forest Supervisor's Office

Stakeholder Outreach Efforts & Forest Service Updates

- The Proposed Action is now available; the comment period closes on September 2nd, open period closes September 6th with the intention of awarding by October.
- Public meetings are scheduled Thursday at Williams District Office from 4p.m.-7:30 and Saturday at Supervisors Office in Flagstaff from 10a.m.-2p.m.
- Participation is needed in Communications Working group for Outreach efforts in public meetings
- 4FRI made the cover of the Elk Society magazine. Jim DeVos will send the article to Marcus Selig so it can be scanned and posted to the 4FRI website.
- CFLR Coalition is requesting a fact sheet on the 4FRI landscape to continue efforts in expanding funding for the CFLRP. A template has been provided.

DECISION: Cover letters regarding CFLR may go out with the support resolution without further review.

- At the hearing of the Ad Hoc commission of the Forest Restoration Mgmt., Ethan Aumack from GCT gave a presentation and spoke about the work of 4FRI.
- The contract for tornado damage has been awarded for 900 acres at \$950 per acre for complete removal. Removal will begin next week.
- ERI did some filming in Greer regarding Wallow Fire which has been sent out to various news media. ERI will post it to Basecamp.

Refined Proposed Action Discussion (Diane Vosick)

Process: After the discussion today, there is an opportunity to provide input by Friday. Comments should be sent to Diane and posted on Basecamp. It will be compiled and reviewed by the Steering Committee on Tuesday. The SC will develop a letter from the comments and post to basecamp for review prior to sending it to the FS. Steering Committee calls are open to everyone.

The 8 Issues of concern offered by Stakeholders to FS on the original Proposed Action were compared against the current Proposed Action.

- **Level of Detail:** More detail was requested. The RFP does offer increased detail including Desired Condition, proposed actions.
- **Strategic Placement of Treatments:** Stakeholders requested more clarity on how the treatments will be placed in respect to planned and unplanned ignitions.
 - Stakeholder group should go on record in response to Revised Proposed Action.
 - For areas where agreement may be difficult, individual organizations could send in their own letters.
 - The letter should acknowledge where the FS did address Stakeholders' issues.



- Interface areas are priority for treatment for the FS by the Supervisors in terms of sequencing. What is proposed in the PA is just one of the sequencing options the FS can consider.
- The FS did incorporate the elements of the Landscape Strategy.
- The Landscape Strategy working group is tasked with producing some language on this particular issue.
- **Old-growth trees:** Every effort will be made to conserve old large trees. FS states the removal of old trees would be rare.
 - LTR is not part of the proposed action. The FS plans on incorporating it in the DEIS as an implementation strategy. This does not have the force of law that some stakeholders are looking for.
 - An example of logging old growth for purposes of habitat was included in Revised Proposed Action to help clarify. An oversight has occurred excluding this paragraph in which the FS will correct.
 - The stakeholders should reemphasize the importance of not removing old growth.
 - The FS could provide more specificity of when Old Growth should be removed.
 - Suggestion of deleting the statement that Old Growth will be removed where environmental risks are involved. This statement is too subjective and open to loose interpretation.
 - If exceptions are not defined, the exception statement should be removed.
 - Alternatives should be offered before a decision is made. It will be difficult to tabulate every single circumstance in which a tree would need to be removed. Trusting the FS will be necessary at some point.
 - Keep the aggregate separate from the individual responses.
 - Proposal to have a subgroup work on the language resulted in several volunteers who will work together to define suggested language.
 - Recognize this is a technical problem. The language must fit into NEPA.
 - The explicit exclusion of the LTRS in the Revised PA is contentious for some, who requested an explanation of why the LTRS was not explicitly included in the PA, as it seemed to have been accepted in earlier steps.
 - Suggestion to recommend including the LTRS in the DEIS was widely supported.
 - The LTRS was included in the first PA and the FS Team should be acknowledged for that.
 - It is critical to stick to the model of success which is collaboratively resolving issues and arriving at decisions.

DECISION: The Stakeholders will recommend striking the second sentence so the statement will read “Old trees would not be targeted. Removal of old trees would be rare. However, exceptions would be



necessary. Some examples are....”. Removal of the second sentence: “exceptions include removing trees that pose a greater negative effect on the environment if not removed. “

- **Fire Ignitions:** No discussion right now but comments will be accepted until Friday.
- **Ecological Restoration:** No discussion right now but comments will be accepted until Friday.
- **Economics and Utilization:** The Revised PA is silent on economics and utilization. A paragraph will be provided by the stakeholders stating the importance of these factors.
 - Clarification: There are no further revisions to the PA but the DEIS can receive statements.
 - Anne Mottek Lucas, Larry Stephenson and Taylor McKinnon are going to add language for the DEIS on this topic. Language should be adopted from previous work completed by the 4FRI Stakeholders.
- **Adaptive Management:** The Science and Monitoring group are taking a look at the language and will have comments ready by Friday.
 - Anne Mottek Lucas will work with Matt Williams to include Socioeconomics.

Please post on Basecamp any sections you are working on so others can review prior to Friday. If someone has an issue, the Steering Committee will collect stated issues and use the Decision Matrix to incorporate them.

The Steering Committee understands and cares about the issues and will represent the best interest of the group.

Formalizing 4FRI (Marcus Selig, Fiscal group)

Foundations can often donate only to 501C3, which will not work with Navajo County. The contract with Navajo County will expire after 18 mos.

Options for Fiscal Management:

1. Find a New sponsor
2. Individual members sponsor
3. Become 501C3, which would include:
 - Accounting system
 - Staff, board, members,
 - Mission & Vision statements
 - \$400-\$800 for setup in just filing fees
4. National Forest Foundation
 - Charge a %15 overhead fee but manage all accounting for 4FRI

Discussion:

- There is currently no urgency in establishing a sponsor until successful conclusion of the 4FRI work plan has occurred.
- The primary value of 501C3 is the ability to solicit and receive additional funds.
 - Overhead still needs to be paid and resources are costly.



- Question: What are our priorities for spending additional funds other than hiring staff and securing resources and establishing initial infrastructure? Are there sufficient priorities right now that require additional funding?
- Fiscal Committee developed potential needs for funding:
 - Monitoring Adaptive Management and establishing a baseline for monitoring
 - Ancillary restoration efforts
 - Outreach efforts
 - Administration
 - Implementation subsidies
- Potential sources of revenue include:
 - Grants
 - Utilities op out donations
 - Direct Donations through website,
 - AZ Indian Game assoc.
 - Forest Restoration license plates
- This is the initial discussion without need for decision making right now.
- Continuing the conversation will prepare 4FRI for when an urgent need arises.
- From Science & Monitoring perspective this discussion arises at each meeting regarding the limitations of implementing a monitoring plan without funds.
- NFF may be a foundation to start while 4FRI becomes more established.
- The structure here currently does not support the cost/benefit for becoming a 501C3.
- What is the level of the commitment of the stakeholder group with or without CFLR funding? When CLFR goes away, 4FRI could continue its mission with the proper funding in place.
- Suggestion to develop out a work plan including what funding needs are and potential available funds.
- Henry Provencio will supply NFF contact information to the Fiscal Working Group.
- Is this a group that wants to continue to lobby, which would be a 501-C4?
- Another potential is to establish a 501(c)4, with a separate 501(c)3 foundation to accept funds.

Stakeholders Interest in Continuing Participation with USFS during Implementation

- Adaptive Management is a pioneering process and will need further discussion.
- GFFP has done partner marks with the FS.
- Qualitative assessments of marks revealed how it worked, what went right/wrong, how do we learn from this?
- Encourage authors of the letter on Implementation to look at language of the implementation section of the Revised Proposed Action.
- Would we be in step with the contractual process?
- Economics is a critical tool. Other tools will need to be identified for strategic utilization of 4FRI involvement.
- We'll concentrate on what we can do and then focus on what is hard but not impossible.



US Institute- Annual Evaluation

- Individual input, not necessarily organization positions, will be requested.
- The current evaluation outline is very different from the evaluation proposed at the Pinetop meeting so please review it carefully.
- 100% response rate is needed.
- It does not have to be taken online. There will be other methods available, including direct email or US mail.
- There will be a full discussion at the October meeting to determine if this is an effective evaluation process.
- Define if the collaborative is being effective to satisfy and support the national CFLR survey.
- This will be distributed to the 4FRI List with limitation to a particular email address so that repetition cannot occur.
- This is an evolving self-evaluation tool the group will be able to use with or without third party facilitation.
- Are the categories complete and well-constructed?
- Windy Greer and Anne Mottek Lucas will draft an introductory paragraph prior to publishing on basecamp tomorrow afternoon.

Work Group Updates

Communications:

- The end of September is the timeline for the next newsletter. Please submit ideas or topics to Marcus Selig. You may also draft a section.
- The Sedona City Council is requesting a 4FRI presentation.

Science & Monitoring

- The Science & Monitoring document is posted on Basecamp and feedback would be appreciated
- Feedback on objectives and monitoring questions is needed to populate the document.
- The goal is to get the S&M document into the DEIS.

Fiscal

- Approval is needed for potentially using opt out donations for Utilities with SRP, APS, and Tucson.
- This would need to be approved by the Corporation commission.
- Monetary need and accompanying work plan would need to be developed beforehand.
- Steps will be taken to develop presentation and budget, and then present to stakeholders.



Landscape

- SPOTS: where the treatments are placed is good. The sequence in which the treatments are implemented is what the group has been evaluating.
- Economic and operational barriers are also being analyzed.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, September 28th, at AZ Game & Fish, Pinetop.