

Large Group Collaborative Stakeholder Meeting

Facilitator: Bruce Greco, ERI

Introductions: (see attached list for attendees)– *Advisory! Parking will no longer be available at Target or the Hastings-Bookmans parking lots. You will need to request a permit from NAU, or find other parking locations.* Proceeded with group introductions and an attendance sheet was circulated. A working group sign-up was also passed around.

Housekeeping Items:

- 1) **Second Facilitator training** – a sign up for facilitation training was circulated. There is a need for self-facilitation in small groups and for the large group in some instances. Bruce stated that he expects to manage the discussion time during meeting. He asked participants to provide feedback, questions, concerns, and agenda items on the cards provided. These will be summarized and addressed at the next meeting, or adjustments made based on them.
- 2) **Selecting a regular meeting day of the week** - The group selected a regular meeting day and week of the month for stakeholder meetings – it is the fourth Wednesday of each month. **October 28 will be the next regularly scheduled large group meeting.** The meeting will begin at 9 am.
 - Concern was voiced as to whether the ARD conference room was large enough for the number of participants. The facilitators will make sure that a large enough room is found, and information about the location will be sent out in advance of the next meeting. One suggestion was that the Business School has some large rooms available.
 - Concern was also voiced that some adjustments are needed for meetings near Thanksgiving and Christmas. Per the fourth Wednesday schedule, these would be November 25 (day before Thanksgiving) and December 23 (two days before Christmas). This will be addressed at the Oct. meeting.
- 3) **Agenda items next meeting** – Anne Mottek Lucas
If you have agenda items, please record these on a card, and hand them in before closeout. Be thinking about the outcomes you want to see, and decision points that need to be made. This helps everyone prepare for these and be ready to discuss and consider them. Suggestions for the agenda can also be made via the “Basecamp” website as soon as it is available. Meeting information will be posted on the website and emails sent out.

Abbreviations used in text:

CG	Large stakeholder collaborative group (meeting today)
WG	Working Group, subsets of the collaborative group
4-FRI	Four Forest Restoration Initiative
FS	Forest Service
FSup	Forest Supervisor
Core Team	Forest Service Specialists assigned to work on the Four Forest Restoration Initiative
RO	Forest Service Southwestern Regional Office
WO	Forest Service Washington Office
PEIS	Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement
NEPA	National Environmental Planning Act
LA	Landscape Assessment
EA	Environmental Assessment

Coordination of Working Groups – Sarah Reif

Sarah said she has been feeling overwhelmed by the number of working group meetings and there is inadequate information and communication between the CG and WG's. In an effort to be efficient and not overwhelm everyone, the coordination-working group proposes the following actions:

- 1) Create a website that will act as a repository so that the information is available to all participants.
- 2) Develop Working Group descriptions that document tasks, responsibilities, and guidelines for the WG.
- 3) Try to coordinate a mid-point date between CG monthly meetings, so that participants can attend several working group meetings in one day.

On-line tool – “Basecamp” - Ethan Aumack/Ed Smith

As we starting working on this, we were concerned there is too much information to absorb and too many conversations going on. As a possible solution, we looked into using on-line tools that will help to facilitate discussion, set up meetings, and provide a place to post documents and so on, in a simultaneous fashion. These tools have different utilities from more passive or sporadic engagement, to active and frequent use. The intent is to simplify the group's meeting processes. We are currently setting up an on-line tool called “Basecamp.”

Before the next meeting, the tool should be up and running. You will receive an invitation to join the site. Once you are into the site, you can navigate around in it. This product has been successfully used in the Western Governor's Working Group. It doesn't take the place of in-person discussions or phone calls. It acts as a central repository where documents are kept, meeting information is posted, document review can take place, etc. For example, a document can be placed in Basecamp and edits can be made directly on a “write board.” The edits can then be compiled and a new revision of the document displayed. All revisions can be tracked, and the most recent appears at the top.

In Basecamp, the tabs on left side are the important ones to use. All of the 4-FRI working groups are listed, and information or documents related to their work is found in their area. Each working group is called a “group” so look for this tab to find them. This program provides the ability to track time spent working in it and in each of the different functions. In the “general” tab, there is information about all working groups, milestones, etc. One can navigate to the site and find general information to get meeting times and dates, documents available and, the mailing list.

Remember this is open access and unfiltered information will be developing in the working groups areas. It will become difficult if a working group receives lots of outside feedback. Please participate in the working group to provide detailed feedback. Please limit feedback to write boards versus changes in the files themselves.

The Coordination WG will **need feedback** once the website is up and folks receive the invitation and login information. We want be sure that it meets the intent. **Tutorials for the website and how to use it are available.** The Coordination WG could arrange some informal training for the website before or after the next large group meeting if there is interest.

Steve Gatewood – The “Go to Meeting” webpage can be used as well. It allows remote access and phone-in participation. It does cost about \$400 for access. It allows for on-line edits during the meeting. Folks who can’t participate in-person can still get on-line to follow work on a document and participate by conference call in the meeting.

Forest Supervisors Update – Joe Stringer (Coconino NF), Mike Williams (Kaibab NF), and Chris Knopp (Apache-Sitgreaves NF)

Joe Stringer: The FSup’s intend to come to all meetings, but may occasionally have conflicts. Gene Blankenbaker had one today, and was not able to attend. He then thanked Linda Wadleigh, for her work as the acting FS team leader for the 4-FRI core team. Linda has finished her assignment and Mike Chaveas, Deputy District Ranger at Peaks and Mormon Lake RD, will be acting team leader until the new team leader is selected.

Forest Supervisors have been talking with WO and RO, and together to try to come up with a vision for how we would like to see the group proceed. We have secured some funding for the effort, and see it as a long-term effort. We believe that without your support, we wouldn’t have succeeded in having the project funded and supported in the FS. There is an urgent need to get acres treated, need for a collaborative approach, appropriately scaled industry, and use of the best avail science to support the effort. In addition, we need to have monitoring and use adaptive management to adjust the project in order to achieve our objectives.

The FSup’s are responsible for use of national forest lands, restoration of ecological conditions, and wise use of taxpayer dollars. With these in mind, we have agreed upon four steps that need to occur. In addition we need to be able to provide the core team some direction to get moving.

- 1) Need a Landscape Assessment – (left side analysis in NEPA terms) that will translate the Wood Supply Study into an assessment of 2.4 million acres. We expect this to be completed in 6-9 months.
- 2) Need the proper level of NEPA analysis for a smaller piece of the landscape for the first project.
- 3) Need to establish the proper contracting mechanisms so that the “request for proposals” will be ready to go when the NEPA decision is made.
- 4) Need for our FS decisions to be informed by the collaborative process.

Mike Williams: We have established a core team, and will have a new team leader soon. We met yesterday to review the permanent team hires, and will soon have a perm silviculturalist, biologist, fire ecologist, and NEPA specialist. There is currently an acting team in place and we will have a more permanent team soon. We feel an urgency to get rolling. We want to get the large-scale LA going. We expect to use the core team and forest resources in order to complete it. We have agreed that the first project will take place on the Kaibab and Coconino NF, and that we will expand to other forests with subsequent projects. The landscape strategy (assessment) is needed in order to move on, as is the contracting mechanism that is critical to our ability to start treatments, and getting NEPA completed prior to implementation.

Chris Knopp: We have heard some frustration about the lack of direction, and inability to make progress. The intent is to break the deadlock with these decisions. We have a lot of work in front of us. Translation of the Wood Supply Study into a landscape assessment gets to the core of what we were formed to do. Without it, we don't have a basis to move forward. We have many interests represented here that don't necessarily coincide; we believe that professional facilitation will help us move forward. Creation of the LA and the bounds of it will be tricky and is the first priority.

Q: Don Berry – Are we going by the boundaries/maps we were shown at the last meeting for the first project?

A: FSup's – first Coconino-Kaibab project. The location is not set in stone. If it will be a 10-yr stewardship project, we need to figure out what it will look like. Next priority is to identify the strategy we will use. It could be a combination of existing NEPA and new NEPA. If we expect to treat about 30,000 acres per year, we need a strategy to determine where these will be located.

Q: Ethan Aumack – There has been discussion about NEPA planning programmatically or at the project level in working groups. The WG is at mid-stream about assessment, NEPA, timing, and scale. It seems like there has been a void between the work that the WG has been doing and discussions between Supervisors. The WG has developed some discussion topics to help the process move forward. Now I'm unclear about the FSup decisions and WG. It seems like there's a disconnect. How do we resolve it?

A: FSup's – The FSup's have come to the opinion that we don't think a PEIS will work. To get a timely project going, the PEIS won't work. The landscape strategy (assessment) will put us in a better position in order to do a large-scale project. The FSup's are willing to have further discussion, but feel like they want to move forward. There are a couple of

issues that FSup's can't resolve, these are sticky points: financial commitment, predictable wood supply, diameter caps, and appropriate NEPA document (EIS or Environmental Assessment). It is critical to have more discussion about these, and we need to have a different mechanism to discuss these in a facilitated discussion. If we did a programmatic EIS, it would be a 3-year process. We would spend \$1 mil per year to fund this. It would delay a project-level NEPA analysis because it would come after the programmatic EIS. It could be 4-5 years out before we'd see a project-level decision. We don't have the funding to support this before we have results.

Q: Ethan Aumack– It seems like there are questions about collaboration and the way we make agreements.

A: FSup's – We agree. We haven't established common expectations or agreements about how we will work.

Q: Ed Smith– I realize that we needed to identify key items, and working groups have identified these. It seems like there is a lack of information about the relative values of these approaches (PEIS versus LA). Some of the information seems not really knowable and is opinion. The problem is the 2.4 mil acres is huge, and there aren't good examples that we can look to. I think we have enough collaborative experience to move forward, and I think we can proceed with an analysis if that will help us move forward. My personal experience is that it took us 3 years working with Coronado to develop programmatic EIS for introduction of fire across the landscape. I think it makes sense to get ball rolling and get the LA done. I do think we need help with developing the mechanics and with facilitation. I am interested in getting us moving on the analysis.

A: FSup's - The FS has conducted 6-8 different kinds of large-scale assessments and we refer to these.

Q: Steve Sesnie– The WG has been looking at questions, objectives, etc. I think we can continue to work through these. It sounds like the start of information gathering can continue whether it is PEIS or EA. If there is a reason for a programmatic EIS, we can present this. I think the EIS will take more time. If we can convince ourselves of this in the WG, then we can move forward.

Q: - Bonny Stevens-If the NEPA was started, would we have something in a year?

A: FSup's - We don't know. Our objective is to get there as quickly as we can. If the assessment work is done, we should be able to move forward with NEPA.

Q: Taylor McKinnon – I think we need to clarify the relationship with FS and working group/collaborative process. Can we clarify our expectations so that we can all have a reasonable understanding of the timing, means and process?

A: FSup's - We feel that the US Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (Institute) can help us clarify this. It is awkward to discuss six months into this process. The FS needs to clarify the limits in terms of NEPA, land management decisions, and collaboration with the group. We decided not to create a Federal Advisory Committee

Act (FACA) group for this process, and need to be clear that decisions cannot be made about NEPA analysis in this group. The group can make recommendations.

Chris Knopp: My experience is that you have to separate the collaborative group from NEPA group. The working group recommendations are important to informing the process.

Bruce Greco: It is clear that there needs to be more discussion about this. I'd like to move on to the next WG report. Please identify how you would like to see this go forward on the cards provided.

Collaborative Structure and Process Working Group – Ed Smith

Our primary role has been to collect the necessary information to start the hiring process for a third party facilitator. The FS allocated funding for the Institute to assist with this. We worked together to develop a Scope of Work in August. When this was advertised, we received six responses. In early September, we had reviewed these and held conference calls that enabled us to narrow the list to three contenders. They are: Mike Hughes (The Keystone Center), Lucy Moore (Lucy Moore and Associates) and, Gina Bartlett (Center for Collaborative Process). All have impressive track records. The WG went through a voting process and decided to conduct personal interviews with Mike Hughes and Gina Bartlett. The interviews are scheduled early in Oct. We hope to have a facilitator available for our next meeting and start the LA process.

Larry Fisher from the Institute helped us to initiate an information poll through Survey Monkey that many of you participated in. The Institute will work on helping us develop a process for our CG to use and will work with the third party facilitator. Larry suggested having a facilitator training to build skills in our CG, twelve people attended the first session. We got a good sense of how to improve our facilitation styles. I believe that we need help initially to be able to discuss contentious issues. A third party facilitator will take us through the LA. We think that by building capacity now, we may be able to self-facilitate in future. I forgot to mention that Steve Rosenstock helped with questions for the interviews.

Next items we will be working with the Institute on are:

- an organizational assessment
- decision rules
- governance
- roles and responsibilities
- internal communication, etc.

Q: What is the timeline for organizational assessment?

A: Ed Smith - Initial questions will be developed in October and November.

Comment: I think we may need to revisit FACA discussion.

A: Ed Smith - This is something that I anticipate coming up.

Ed Smith then passed around information on the Collaborative Structure and Process WG and participants (to be posted on Basecamp). The WG has drafted purpose, objectives, and strategies statements. The group recommends that the CG work with Institute and third party facilitator to develop an organizational charter.

4FRI Intake Survey Results – Larry Fisher

Thanks for your participation in the survey. To give a little background, we started with what we thought was a quick format to get an initial idea of what was going on with the CG. We used an on-line tool, Survey Monkey, that we have found helps to improve meeting efficiency as well as things like for scheduling meetings, input on topics, and evaluation of sessions. We have used this tool quite a bit for large collaborative groups. I like to keep surveys simple and brief. In this case, it got pretty long and detailed. Please comment on utility of this survey.

(Survey results will be posted to Basecamp)

The following is an excerpt of the results:

1. The questionnaire was developed with the Collaborative WG, it frames perspectives and issues, but it is not a research tool. We can use the results for relevance, but it does not have the degree of rigor needed for research.
2. Overall comments included the sense that by participating in the CG, it is part of a large and important milestone; the project requires efficiency; there is a desire to create an enduring group. Concerns were expressed about the ability of some groups to compromise; and uneasiness about upcoming decisions.
3. Overall patterns show that landscape scale restoration is the group's highest priority. Forest management also ranked very high. There was less concern about process issues, economics, and approaches used (adaptive management or modeling).
4. Issues include: the need to accelerate treatment; speed up the process; restore the natural fire regime; about the ability of forest industry to take on work. There were also comments about the uniqueness of process.
5. Tasks identified include: use of a science-informed process; ecological goals; type of NEPA needed; and LA versus PEIS.
6. Needs: public support; a strategic plan; an enduring group.
7. Strengths: science to support the project; commitment of group; diversity of membership. Note that the coordination and process structure ranked lower. There were questions about the level of commitment of some members.
8. Other strengths were: Resources provided by FS; and desire to make the effort.
9. Regarding skill sets and capacity: good information about forest science and forest management and collaboration. Concerns were expressed about process communication, adaptive management, facilitation, and leadership.
10. Other skill sets and capacities: Ecological Restoration Institute (ERI), Forest Ecological Restoration Analysis (ForestERA). Broad concerns were expressed about leadership, and need for a unified social perspective.
11. Challenges: process issues integrating agendas and goals; clarity on goals; timing/phasing; and funding and laws.

12. Other challenges: Trust and accountability; organizational agendas; adequate supply of wood for industry; and project versus landscape scales.
13. There were questions about how to address: non-negotiable issues; need for training on collaboration; trust; communication; timelines; coming to agreement.
14. Personal questions: different issues; group dynamics; assessment of planning issues; monitoring and adaptive management; NEPA policies; prescriptions and treatments; cost effectiveness.
15. CG questions: facilitation; key negotiation; need for professional facilitation; clear structure and decision making rules; process design; roles of working group versus large group; strategic plans; need to define Phase I; how to bring in stakeholders not represented.
16. Under-represented interests: ranching, hunters, recreation, tribes, USFWS, ADEQ, energy, Tonto NF, community groups, general public.
17. Other items: Need for action; scientific guidance; some groups trying to dominate the process; diameter caps; need to clarify roles and responsibilities; commitment.

I really appreciate your comments. My feeling is that the real work will start when third party arrives and can delve into these issues with you. The Institute is trying to keep momentum going.

Q: Steve Sesnie - Will surveys be used down the road, possibly repeating the same questions?

A: Larry Fisher - Yes, it is very helpful to reassess in order to track the benchmarks of the group. It is objective and anonymous. We need to question if this level of detail is needed? I often use 2-3 questions to assess specific items versus longer surveys.

Q: Ed Smith – Can we have access to your PowerPoint presentation so that we can look at data?

A: Larry Fisher – Yes. [It will be posted on Basecamp.]

Q: Were there things that surprised you? Or things that stand out?

A: Larry Fisher - I have some advantage since I have talked too many of you outside of survey. I am sensing tension between this opportunity for a revolutionary process and serious conflict. There is concern about how to address these. Communication issues are surfacing. Some of these are easily dealt with, such as decision-making; others are more difficult such as communication. Timing is always difficult. Some mistakes will be made because of the speed at which people are trying to move at. Technical capacity is strong. NEPA and laws/policies are there and need to be dealt with. There is a need to clarify CG and WG structure.

Q: Todd Schulke: I have a concern about the landscape assessment and structural pieces. There will be important decision points, including today. We need to get the third party on board as soon as possible.

A: Larry Fisher - Confusion about the decision process is obvious. This needs to be clarified for group. There are issues between how WG and CG function, and CG and FS.

There is a need to clarify these and neutral 3rd party can help with this. There is a need for expertise with large-scale projects and a review of case studies. The 3rd party and the Institute can help with that role. I have the sense that this group is well connected but still very inward looking. We can draw on the expertise in the CG and across country. Key work is to look at WG structure, CG structure and find pathways to govern a structure that will work.

Anne Mottek-Lucas: I have a comment on tasks before us. It seems to me that if we frame the process within the next six months, it will help us get farther. The survey results can be used to help us. We can fine-tune the results to determine what to address first.

A: Larry Fisher – It appears the survey will be helpful.

Q Todd Schulke: I felt some of the questions were ambiguous. Having lots of questions may have led to less precision. I like this as a tracking tool. We need to take the results and tighten them up, then do the survey again. This one helped establish a baseline. The time required to take survey wasn't a problem.

A: Larry Fisher – Resurveying can be very helpful. You can see issues ebb and flow, and you can see that the process is growing as these disappear. It is a good monitoring tool to keep on process.

Commitment Mechanism – Sarah Reif/Ethan Aumack

Ethan Aumack: There is a need for collective commitment of the group to this process and development of a mechanism for demonstrating this. Our WG discussions first didn't know amount of detail to go into, specificity needed in a commitment document versus in a different document. The Strategic Plan is a product of ECR process that defines ground rules, expectations, process expectations. The declaration document is simpler; it clarifies the commitment to this CG. So we see two products to be developed with two different uses. Our sense is that the commitment document (declaration) would be fairly easy to develop. The expectation is to go broader for signature on to the declaration to include all stakeholders and the FS. It provides a formal sign-on and commitment. We drafted the declaration using wording derived from *Accelerating Landscape-Scale Forest Restoration of Ponderosa Pine Forests across Northern Arizona: A Path Forward* (will be referred to as Path Forward) and the Small Diameter Wood Supply Study documents so that we wouldn't have to reinvent wording that the group could agree to. Ethan then summarized the declaration (see posting on Basecamp).

Sarah Reif: This version came out in the second email and is the August 31 draft. We purposefully restructured the declaration to get away from a memorandum of understanding (MOU). It is a declaration of commitment document. We would like each organization to assign a signatory. We feel it is fairly comprehensive and complete especially the mission statement and 5 action items. Is there a need for input to the content? Is the timing right, or do we need to wait for other products before signing? Are you getting what you want out of document?

Q: Mike Chaveas: It says “Enrichment of recreation opportunities? This seems like it was thrown in and we haven’t discussed this.

A: Sarah Reif – It came as input from working group members.

Shaula Hedwall: This was a tie back to how communities were benefiting. I don’t disagree that it hasn’t been a focus of this discussion. **Let’s tag this for further discussion.** Perhaps that path morphed a little. I do think it is important to keep other interest groups in mind.

Anne Mottek Lucas: I remember reading that aesthetic value was included in the *Paths Forward document*.

Shaula Hedwall: agreed

Sarah Reif: There was inclusion of a statement about the imp to communities in terms of access, aesthetics, and property value.

Q: You indicated that the Strategic Plan is not complete – when do you think it will be ready, and is it necessary for commitment and signing?

A: Ethan Aumack - We have been trying to sequence our WG discussions. Where in sequence does the commitment declaration fit? Are we at a real enough place that folks can commit in a substantial way as reflected in the document? Are we at that place now? Will the commitment be meaningful and real?

Ed Smith: I agree with what is put forward. I still have questions about the strategic plan and what the outcome will be. I can give verbal commitment now. As far as signing something, I can’t commit to something that is in process. This may get to most of what you are looking for in terms of committing time, resources, and personnel. I just know what our lawyers would say about where we are in the process. I can’t sign until I know what I’m committing to.

Q: Steve Sesnie - Would it be okay to reach a level of consensus from the group at this time and then sign on later?

A: Ethan Aumack - My sense is that we need signatures as soon as possible. It is a benchmark to formally recognize the commitment. If this is the nature of the commitment to be made, then we can sign on.

Pascal Berlioux - This is a good example of what I think this group will need to come to grips with: first was LA versus PEIS. Ultimately, we will need to be in a position that we have as few loose ends as possible, we need to commit together to pool resources and to deal with as many certainties as possible. Verbal expressions won’t be sufficient, at some point; we must have signatures so that we can work together as a group. We seem to want to choose open-handed paths versus accountability. I don’t see that path as conducive to achieving what we need to do. I am afraid we will not have the commitment to rebuild the infrastructure needed to achieve this. I think the gray areas will shrink in the future.

Ed Smith: I think signatures are fine, if the need is a signed document, then I'd pull out the strategic plan ("Action #5: Implement those strategies contained within the Four Forests Restoration Initiative Strategic Plan") as the path forward. The rest could then be vetted with groups.

Q: Scott Harger – There seems to be an eagerness to sign onto a collaboration declaration. I have two questions: What are the recommendations of Path4 document? What do you mean by carrying forward these documents?

Q: Steve Campbell: This is similar to the difference between the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. One is a declaration of intent; the other is the detail of it.

Steve Rosenstock: I think our department would have similar concerns about the document.

Q: Anne Mottek-Lucas - What if #5 was eliminated?

A: Steve Rosenstock – There would be more chance.

Ethan Aumack: One option is to remove #5 and try to move forward. I am hearing concern about interpreting Action #1 regarding the *Path Forward* document as well. Doesn't appear we have concurrence with this document as it is drafted. We also haven't had formal engagement from FS in this discussion. Need FS engagement. I hope that we can resolve these concerns as soon as we can and come back at the next meeting. Until Scott's question, I was hearing that the content was sufficient, and I expect there will be continued discussion this afternoon about #5.

Communications Strategy – Bonnie Stevens

Bonnie circulated copies of the Comm Strategy. The WG sees this strategy as being geared internally and externally. This group will be the place to refer media inquiries and other inquiries. We understand that there are agencies and groups who have separate organizational media that will be independent of the CG.

Q: Ed Smith: Are you working on development of a logo?

A: Yes, we are working on branding; development of information, and getting information out as soon as possible. Our next meeting is planned for 9 am, September 22 at the Grand Canyon Trust in Flagstaff.

Anne Mottek-Lucas: I want to thank Bonnie and let you know that she took over lead of the WG just a week ago.

Bruce Greco: If you have comments or questions, please write them on the cards and we'll get them to Bonnie.

One more item of business, we are missing phone numbers for some of the new participants. Lunch Break - Please be back by 2 pm.

Industry Engagement – Don Bright

We held a “Contracting 101” at the RO; it was basic and very good. We went through timber sale contracts and permits, service contracts, integrated sale-service contracts, and stewardship agreements. There were presentations, then an extensive question and answer period. The notes and questions were sent out to the mailing list. We also discussed some details such as bonding. The next steps are:

1. Answer questions that were put together from the Contracting 101 meeting.
2. We have requested from Industry Engagement Group (as opposed to FS Industry Group) that we are given pure input. The FS should back out, and the FS Industry Group gives us information to make recommendations from. We will need as much detail as possible, in writing to try to determine the best mechanism to use to move forward. Things like: will slash be left out versus biomass removed, how to scale, location of manufacturing plants, water needs for new industry are what we will need so that we have all the factors needed for development of new industry. If anyone is interested, sign up to participate in the group.
3. Internally, will meet with Forest Supervisors to layout contracting options. We haven’t determined what the best route will be, but want to be able to lay out options. We will also ask a series of questions of the Supervisors.
4. When we have all of these pieces, we can narrow down to a recommendation of one/two mechanisms to use. A month to two months is the timeline we expect. We don’t want to be the hold up to the group.

Q: Sam Oliver - Is there any discussion of using an Engineering and Procurement Company (EPC) to act as a broker?

A: Don Bright - This is where a company would come in as a broker of many companies to work easier on a large-scale project. It could be done in any type of traditional stewardship project. They could bid on it and would need to be able to prove that they could get the product out. We have also asked what about smaller companies, should we rule them out? We said no because a consortium of small groups could come to us and bid. We have had a very broad discussion of the needs, size and location of projects. The final determination could go through a process of several months, doing some cuts, then get into specific discussions of best value, etc.

Q: Ethan Aumack - Have you defined sideboards in terms of scale for the contract? You said you haven’t defined a limit, but is there an upper limit? Have you discussed the relationship between planning and contracting?

A: Don Bright - We are waiting for the CG and Forest Supervisors to dictate the contract. Ultimately the regular program for forests needs to be melded into the additional 4FRI projects. We were thinking of about 3 contracts of 300,000 acres each or it could be one big contract. We don’t know answers to these now. For planning and contracting, we are waiting for the CG. This WG is about how to get industry engaged, not vice versa. I keep reminding the Forest Supervisors, it is a risk assessment when you put out a contract

proposal, and how much information do you want to have that is firm? You could put out something without any information today, with no NEPA, or you could have the whole thing marked for no risk. This decision will need to be decided by the Forest Supervisors and CG.

Industry Engagement Group, the WG, will bring information back to the FS Industry Involvement Group. We are interested in getting new industry to get involved as well.

Q: Ed Smith - The information from Contracting 101 was sent out yesterday, is that right?

A: Don Bright – Yes. It got us through a legal hurdle so that we could discuss this openly.

Q: A lot of information in the presentation was based on experience, and we are trying to get new industry in with no experience. An experienced company is already a proven company, but this is one criteria. Should it be the most important criteria? Are they proven? There are other issues about where will they locate. Where will they get the workforce?

Conceptual Project Areas – Harmony Hall (CNF)

We were asked to develop a conceptual approach for identifying a potential project area. In summary: we started with the map that was presented at the last meeting showing both the Coconino and Kaibab NF. It includes the forested area from Western Mogollon Plateau Adaptive Landscape Assessment (WMPALA). We removed wilderness, steep slopes, and canyons. This leaves about 800,000 acres.

Q: Are you are making a guess about the boundary areas and sideboards?

A: Harmony Hall - We are narrowing the treatment area to obvious things like wilderness, steep slopes, etc.

Next looked at fire danger and prevailing winds and needs to protect Flagstaff area. With these criteria, we removed Kaibab NF acres, and limited it to just Coconino NF. We looked at the area west of Interstate 17. This area is 154,000 acres. We made the assumption that we would probably prepare an EIS for this, about a 2-year process. Tried to include a boundary that would supply 2 years of projects (of about 30,000 acres each).

Q: Bruce Greco - This is just a concept for an area?

A: Harmony Hall - It is a theoretical process that we went through. Obviously there will be many more considerations when we actually identify a boundary.

From the 154,000 acres, we then removed non-FS lands, wilderness, steep slopes (>40% slopes), Mexican spotted owl (MSO) pacs, and treated areas within last 10 years. For the previously treated areas, we may need to include these since the desired conditions probably have changed. We chose to remove them first since they may not have the same amount of biomass as other untreated acres.

When we finished with these filters, we decided that we would need to look at a larger area to start. So we expanded the area to east of I-17 then went through the same process of removing some areas. We came up with about 221,000 acres in the two combined conceptual areas defined with constraints.

Q: Did you use Path Forward process?

A: Harmony Hall - No, we didn't use the Path Forward process, we just used the data that we had available to use in a short amount of time. Just wanted to be able to illustrate a concept of how much land was needed to get a treatable area. We also realize that the area often shrinks after delineation due to rocky areas or other site-specific constraints.

Mike Elson (District Ranger for Peaks-Mormon Lake): We chose areas that we had data for. There will be other constraints when we get out on the ground. Two years is cutting it close for developing a typical EIS; this would give us time for adaptive management. By making the area larger, we were trying to maintain flexibility and allow for constraints. We didn't consider things like the urban interface.

Q: Pascal Berlioux: Essentially we have confirmation of work that has been previously done, and some of the typical constraints. What is the resounding point of the exercise?

A: Mike Elson - What this tells me is if the EIS is completed for less than 50,000 acres, it is not worth your time. It shows the complexity of the EIS and selecting the area carefully. In the first acreage, the constraint was non-FS land, the second was MSO pacs. These are things to think about.

Q: Pascal Berlioux - Should we read in this that your thinking is toward larger acres?

A: Mike Elson - Based on the limited discussion, this would be a reasonable acreage for the EIS.

Steve Gatewood: I am concerned about the discussion about constraints and treatable acres. We should not be considering MSO pacs and slopes. If we are really trying to look at restoration at the landscape scale, we need to step back and look at what is the source of the wood supply. I contend that you need to include wilderness in these because you need to treat these as well. We keep getting hung up on mechanical treatment, not everything will be treated mechanically. We can use fire only. We continue to design projects around production of wood, and not ecosystem restoration (using fire as a tool). We are hearing only mechanical treatment, and constraints.

A: Mike Elson - I agree, but the point of this was to show the need to think about scale and economic production. I think we would want to treat in MSO and in areas already treated. Your point is well taken, perhaps with exception of wilderness. We can't do mechanical treatment in wilderness and other legal constraints.

Steve Gatewood: In a true landscape restoration, you will need to look at Forest Plan amendments to do fire for resource benefit in wilderness. It is focused on sideboards and mechanical treatment, not restoration.

Q: Todd Schulke: Another important aspect is strategic placement of treatments. In the Small Diameter Wood Supply, we identified 20% of places that should be removed. The upshot of that is there is a large landscape out there and how can you determine where strategically placed treatments should go? This example seems very traditional. We have to look at the whole landscape, in the case of this, I think we can't extract ourselves from industry, but you think about the percentage of strategically placed treatments. Look at the landscape that you want to do mechanical treatment on all, then where to place things.

A: Mike Elson - This concept does provide you with some of the challenges of strategically placed treatments because of the reality of what is on the ground. This is a quick concept to get some discussion. We would analyze the whole area identified, but with the GIS layers we have, we have looked at some of the constraints. Some areas may have industrial value. We just don't have the information on-hand right now.

I think this discussion demonstrates the importance of the landscape assessment. We think we are all on the same page, but it demonstrates that what we will actually do on a piece of the ground will change.

Steve Sesnie: I am hoping that there might be some inter-agency collaboration so that the treatment opportunities of adjacent lands can be taken advantage of.

Ed Paul: As I look at the area that was selected, I think that when we do the landscape assessment, it will probably shake out as a high priority. I think the area is very good. When we start looking at restoration treatments, if we look at every acre treated, it should be one of herringbone design so that we meet both silvicultural and fire objectives.

Ethan Aumack: What is the timeline and when would the decision be made on the area?

A: Joe Stringer - We need to have discussions with Kaibab NF because there may be opportunities to expand west. We need to get more clarity on the gaps in data available. Right now, I don't know what additional information is needed. We also need to look at program of work for District. We purposefully identified time for the District to look at this analysis. I would guess that we could start with NEPA in January or February of next year.

Mike Elson: I think we are about ready to go when it is determined.

Mike W. - The LA will help with strategy of where strategically placed acres will be. The process will need to look at where and a rough timeline.

Ethan Aumack: This would be a product of the LA. I think it would be a process like this so that we could integrate the Small Diameter Wood Supply Study.

Mike Williams - The LA would be over the project area.

Joe Stringer - The landscape strategy is over 2.4 million acres, and LA over the first project area.

Bruce Greco: Before lunch we had discussion about the written declaration. Should we take it up now?

Pascal Berlioux: I think we have heard LA and PEIS used interchangeably. My perception of this morning's discussion was the LA would cover the 2.4 mil acres. The EIS would be for the project area. Is this the case? Or what is the plan?

Joe Stringer - We are looking at the LA on the 2.4 mil acres. The prioritized areas for treatments would be the EIS. I don't think we have worked at this scale for an EIS. We will have to evaluate it in conjunction with existing Forest Plans, needs for area, and what the treatments would be.

Pascal Berlioux: Would there be several layers of assessment before getting to NEPA?

Joe Stringer: We would need to look at the project landscape to determine what the proposed action would be for the NEPA.

Pascal Berlioux: I don't have a clue where we are going at this point.

Steve Gatewood: I think this gets at the crux of the discussion. We don't know how large a landscape you need to get the size project you need. Landscape restoration is the key to the discussion, because there would be mechanical, fire and combined. If it is true that we have constraints that the Small Diameter Wood Products Study removed already, it is different than the traditional NEPA that this seems to be leaning toward.

Mike Elson: The definitions of the task we were given were a landscape scale assessment at 2.4 mil acres, and a project at 300-500,000 acres.

Pascal Berlioux: Are we dealing with a process that will yield one small contract or several large contracts? I think the impacts will be different with these two paths. I think that several small contracts would not deliver the industry investment as one large contract.

Joe Stringer: I think we can have a contract for so many acres over several years with several different NEPA decisions.

Ethan Aumack: Where will that conversation take place? We haven't had the conversation about a contract that out sizes the NEPA. Isn't this risky?

Mike Williams – That is what the White Mountain Stewardship contract is.

Ethan Aumack: This is a significant risk when a low percentage of the area is covered by NEPA. Where is this being considered? We need to get to clarity to that soon.

Harmony Hall: I think one NEPA project for such a large area (2.4 million acres) is difficult if not impossible to analyze. Breaking it into smaller areas to analyze NEPA is more possible.

Ethan Aumack: If we are getting an industry strategy versus a planning exercise, this is a different process.

Bruce Greco: Please record these concerns on cards.

Taylor McKinnon: I can give a 10 min. presentation that will provide a context for this discussion.

Q: Don Berry: I think Ethan did an excellent job of understanding and laying out the industry part of the discussion. What are the tradeoffs? What is the size of industry coming in? We are trying to get to these specifics.

Rob Davis: A large part of this is the product that will be manufactured. The location of the industry is also important piece of the discussion. You are looking at multiple locations at the same time and multiple locations for industry. When you define the first area, if you don't look at the landscape and working across the landscape, you can't do anything else. You have defined that all the material will go to one large plant, and the small stuff, who knows what will happen.

Mike Williams – That is a good point, we need to spread the treatment across four forests.

Pascal Berlioux – you can easily overwhelm the biomass for one facility, whereas the other can spread the treatment over several facilities.

Landscape Assessment – Taylor McKinnon

Our group was charged with looking at several scenarios for taking on the landscape assessment. We have some drafted recommendations and scenarios. We realized in a meeting a few weeks ago that we needed to clarify what we think a first tier 2.4 mil acre assessment would achieve. Then we could move on to what the best planning mechanisms would be. The result is in the first document (handout). The second handout is NEPA at the scales contemplated (PEIS? A subset landscape assessment? Or what?). We had lots of discussion and identified key legal questions about costs and benefits of the different approaches to NEPA.

I'm not sure of the value of diving into this is now, since decisions have been made about the LA. Our group has engaged in some work to identify potential treatment areas as well. We do have two concurrent processes going on, and this renders lots of work that the WG has done meaningless. I think we need to clarify how we are working together. As stakes get higher the consequences get more fatal. I think we need to determine how the two processes will continue.

Comment: There was a comment made earlier that we've had open-ended discussion, and that we should write down concerns, and other things on the cards. If we can't get to it today, we need to determine how the WG and FS will work together. Both have put in a lot of effort, and it comes to negative outcomes. This should be a major item for the agenda in October so that WG can work together collaboratively and inform the FS. We have to determine the process for coming to recommendations and FS decision points. If these are identified as key points, we can deal with them.

Bruce Greco: I have recorded: "Analysis area and where it fits on landscape" and "Collaborative relationship."

Todd Schulke: There are lots of details to talk about. There is a fundamental decision making process in front of us. We need to recognize this and deal with it. There are some questions that the FS isn't as concerned about or aren't your responsibility. My observation is that we have some legal questions to deal with, especially FACA. From what I see happening in the WG, we aren't anywhere near FACA and we have room to move about these legal questions, i.e. landscape assessment or PEIS? We missed the fact that we are both meeting separately and haven't established a good communication process. Now we have things on the line that are uncomfortable. We need to deal with these differently and understand the issues. In a presentation this morning, it was said we should have had the conversation about this, but it hasn't happened. I encourage us to elevate this in priority, I believe the process works, and that it is important to get this set up. I think we need to run the question of LA through the process that emerges.

Bruce: Is there a format that you have in mind? Do we need the facilitator to engage in this or WG? Or CG? I think the WG process failed us in this case. I don't think we should wait so that we can have the discussion. I think this will affect the written declaration and process.

Chris Knopp: I agree with Todd. I think we need to determine when WGs are appropriate. I think big questions need to be vetted with entire group. I think the CG is evolving, and processes from the past aren't working. We are hiring a facilitator to help us. That person will have a big job; we need to help the facilitator to help us achieve the desired outcomes. I don't think many of us understand why this is a critical issue.

Mike Williams – I don't want the same outcomes either. The FS is going to meet with the core team about LA and the work that needs to be accomplished. Let's move on that immediately.

Taylor McKinnon: I think we need to rethink structure. WG, FS are both venues. Where does ForestERA fit in?

Ethan Aumack: We need to be careful about making decisions without discussion because they affect the possible success of the project. Let's complete the conversation. There is foundational work in collecting information to be used in the process. It is directionally independent from the discussion of LA or PEIS. I don't think we've had enough discussion about this. It is the most important decision.

Angela Parker: I'd like to compliment the WG. I think an important piece of this understands what a LA is. I have had experience working with the Quincy Library Group and there is other expertise that can help provide the background. I am impressed with work that has been done, but I think we need to establish trust. In doing a PEIS there are a lot of different variables. The LA will help provide a lot of the information needed to do the NEPA analysis.

Steve Gatewood: There has been a lot of discussion about PEIS and LA. We need to improve communication and it appears we have two people with lots of exp in dealing with these kinds of issues.

Bruce: After break, let us discuss approach of how to tackle these issues.

Pascal Berlioux: What we are having is discussion about wanting a specific tool to be used and no discussion about why. These both serve a purpose that we are trying to achieve. What strikes me is that we haven't had any discussion about what we are trying to achieve when we promote these two approaches. We need to have the integrity to say what we are trying to achieve, then we will be able to move forward. This is an example of I want what I want, but I won't tell you why. Engagement in this won't get us anywhere. Let's have the fundamental discussion about what we are trying to accomplish and the best tool to get there.

Break

Bruce Greco: We have two items to left on the agenda. We have the strategic plan to discuss and we need to set topics for the next meeting. After we complete these, then let's move back into the discussion and let's try to identify issues to tackle, timeframes, outcomes, etc.

Strategic Plan – Ethan Aumack and Sarah Reif

Ethan Aumack: It is my sense that this product is a few steps beyond where we are now as a group. I don't think we should spend time discussing it today. I propose that we table the discussion. **Agreed.**

Bruce Greco: Let's work on what are we trying to tackle and get done, who, timeframe? It will be 3 weeks before a facilitator will join us. What are the questions?

Ethan Aumack: I propose something more fundamental; we need a different model for the discussions that is centered on use of the facilitator and a process to use. We need to have discussion about PEIS and LA. We need to interface with FS, and identify the outcomes. Do we have the right people in the room? I propose that we work with the facilitator to give us the structure that we need.

Bruce Greco: Are you proposing that we wait for the facilitator to move forward?

Ethan Aumack: Yes, I don't think we have the process in place for this discussion.

Todd Schulke: We need to figure out what our structure is. First issue to deal with is conversation about relationships and how they play out. Any facilitator should be able to do this.

1. As soon as facilitator is available, discuss relationships and decision-making.

Courtney Schultz: I think that we are looking at roles and expectations. Then we can determine if the structure is functioning or not. There are fundamental differences between participation and collaboration.

Steve Gatewood: What are the lines of communication? (Between FS and CG)

Larry Fisher: I don't think this is a structure question. This is a breakdown in communication and decision-making process. If we can solve this, we can model a good decision-making process.

Rob Davis: I think the group is trying to put too many tasks on the facilitator. There will be a lot of crisis and changes. We need an Executive Director that coordinates the overall process who keeps the corporate knowledge.

Taylor McKinnon: It is important that we need to explore this with a facilitator. These are tough issues, and emotional issues.

Ed Smith: At the LA WG meeting in August we had a number of questions and a lack of information about the two options that we have in front of us (PEIS and LA). Could the Institute help us inform the weighting of these decisions? Can we more formally address these questions so that we can move along? Comparison of the approaches would help with the discussion.

Mike Williams: I'm not sure I'm clear about what you are asking.

Ed Smith: Angela Parker has direct experience with Quincy Library Group, Chris Knopp has with other large assessments, as well as others. What are pro's and con's of the two different roads so that we can resolve the issue?

Mike Williams: The decision has been made, and we are looking at a LA. I'm concerned if you are asking us to revisit the decision.

Ed Smith: I think it is about process versus the actual decision -so that we could better understand the decision.

Mike Chaveas: We had a working group looking at the best way to move forward. At a certain point, the decision was made to do a LA versus a PEIS. The WG is feeling stung. People will be investing time looking at these issues, but the FS has to make the call. We want to avoid having people thinking that they have wasted their time.

Pascal Berlioux: All of these points we are discussing is process related. Is the question "will the tool selected get us to the outcome we desire?" I have lots of questions about how a LA will work and if it will meet our needs. The outcome is more important than the tool. Are we meeting the expectations? I would like to see a meeting between the FS and CG to answer questions.

Taylor McKinnon: This discussion underscores the need to clarify expectations.

Courtney Schultz: A lot of people have raised the question if other expertise is being utilized to make the decisions? Ed Smith is saying there is expertise that we could use. If not this time, there may be others. We might want to use experts for a large scale monitoring process.

Taylor McKinnon: Should we engage CEQ to help us answer legal questions?

Ethan Aumack: I wonder if we aren't listening to each other. Perhaps we need to explore the broader context for how we see this process more forward. If we could hear an articulation of people's expectation for the design of ecological-economic-socially viable project, then maybe we need a listening session. There are different worldviews here.

What is the framework that people see this playing out within? It would help me to understand how my assumptions fit in.

Todd Schulke: I'm convinced that the comment you made about the decision has been made, and it is off the table. It is a critical point and I urge that you better explain the decision. The outcome may be the same, but I think there are critical concerns that haven't been discussed. We are all anxious to get things done and the clock is ticking, but with more understanding we may get there together.

Scott Harger: What is missing from the decision making process?

Todd: Agreement and concurrence.

Steve Gatewood.: We are proceeding with the Decision that the For Sups made, and I think the CG needs to work forward to investigate the tool used. If the WG wants to make a recommendation about the tool to use, we should do this. I can't go with the PEIS because of the timeframes, resources, etc. I think you are looking for a particular outcome. We are approaching this in the wrong way. If the assessment answers the questions, go forward. If it doesn't, then we need to identify these.

Comment: The CG needs to make a recommendation one-way or the other as well. It may lead to further discussion.

Pascal Berlioux: I think the clarification from Don was important. The FS can put out a contract with five different decisions. What matters is the decision. The thing we are trying to determine is the risk. Is it from several different decisions or one? Ultimately I don't care about the tool, the outcome is important. Ten-year time period – decision - execution. Let's make a decision that we can implement over 10 years. If we have to reset the decision every 2 years, then it is hard to go forward.

Todd Schulke: Why do we have to make a decision at this point? I think it is perpetuating the idea that we are separate and there are ongoing needs to make decisions beyond the CG; I don't want to play that game. I understand FACA and final decisions the FS has to make. I don't see the driving need to make the decision now. I disagree that the agency has to act.

Steve Gatewood: I asked Joe Stringer if there has been a decision, is it PEIS or LA? The FS has found the PEIS untenable. I think that they want to move forward with collection of data.

Rob Davis: I think I am hearing without PEIS we won't have predictability. Others say PEIS won't work because of the size and analysis. We seem to be deciding without knowledge of what will work.

Taylor McKinnon: There are PEIS going on for energy development right now. There are a lot of questions outstanding about this issue. I think there is value in making decisions together.

Ethan Aumack: We need to address issues of sufficiency, what is sufficient to meet our needs? I think we have been wrestling in a tight spot for several months. I don't know that the discussion of the planning mechanism has indicated whether the LA will meet our needs. I don't want a 3-year PEIS. We need to remember that there is significant agreement about many issues. I don't think the FS can figure this out, the environ community can't, and industry can't. The question is, how can we work together to work this out? Can we take advantage of our collective knowledge to work this out?

Bruce Greco: What do we do? How do we address what we have heard here?

Mike Williams – I want to acknowledge Todd's statement. The options seem to be: 1) to stay course, or 2) try a listening session. If the outcome of the listening session was the same objection, I would not be interested in this.

Joe Stringer – I knew that we were throwing a wet blanket on the discussion. I anticipated the discussion and reaction. I have felt good about this discussion. I think we can continue it. Let's give the core team guidance to collect and prepare data for the 2.4 mil acres. We are getting internal pressure because of previous experiences with PEIS within agency, and reluctance to go down that path. I am willing to re-evaluate, but we need to put a timeframe on discussion and resolution. A PEIS will also lead to staged decision making. We can't solve the problem for the agency until the cards are on the table. I wish I had a design that would lead us to the outcome we want. We all have to throw out our pieces of the puzzle.

Chris Knopp: The scale and magnitude of the task is beyond our experience. Even talking about energy transmission corridors, these are nowhere near as complicated as the number of resources we are looking at. This is groundbreaking, and beyond any of us to do it. So we need to approach this collaboratively. It is a difficult world to understand when you come from an agency where authorities and regiments are clear. We come to this process where everyone has a say. We have some internal discussions that need to continue, so that we can go down the path the way we want to. I see no harm in the data collection. We can continue to push the NEPA team and others within agency, so that we can clarify the rules for the collaborative process and get to the outcomes that we want.

Sarah Reif – Looking at the CG is structured could take the entire October meeting. We need to discuss this as a first step.

Q: Have we vetted the legal questions? What is the sequence of the first project EIS relative to the LA? How does it fit into the timing and scale of the project?

Todd Schulke—I have a comment on the proposal – I think discussion has been good and open. I recommend that we have this discussion when the facilitator arrives, and as soon as we can. We need to make more progress on this part. Can we attempt to have an initial meeting with facilitator? To outline discussion and make some progress on the issues. I'd like to devote a large part of the next meeting to the planning discussion. The large group needs to engage in the planning discussion. If we could have some pre-CG sessions, I think it would help. We may want to bring some folks in for the discussion.

Bruce Greco – the facilitator will be on-board in October and the person will need to get up to speed. FS needs to have discussions. The WG needs to discuss what work can go on. There needs to be interchange in next couple of weeks to stay connected. We need to articulate to the facilitator what we need to move through in terms of a listening session and issues.

Shaula Hedwall - I need some clarification to help the WG understand its' tasks. What should WG bring back? For LA WG, we need to get the questions answered.

Sarah Reif– I am proposing an interim work session to discuss tradeoffs between the processes.

Taylor McKinnon: I would like to see CEQ come.

Larry Fisher: The Institute has already put in a call to identify a resource person at CEQ. I am curious if the WG will format some questions so that FS can respond so the CG can make decisions together. I am wondering how we get there?

Bruce: Let's ask Collaborative WG to be the point people to brief facilitator, bring questions forward, and have the discussion about how to have the processes discussion.

Ethan Aumack: I think we need to get to clarity on the questions. I want to thank Bruce for facilitating.

Bruce Greco: Who needs to pull this together? Facilitator? WG leaders?

Todd Schulke: WG leaders are acting in this capacity.

Courtney Schultz: Is there a FS person involved?

Joe Stringer: I support the session. We need to have FS rep to help.

Mike Williams – I agree, but if it can't happen before Oct CG meeting, then it needs to be on the agenda.

Bruce Greco: The Ad-Hoc WG leaders will have discussions about an interim session, assimilate the information, and will confirm if Collaborative WG will work with facilitator. There will be FS representation in conference calls.

Bruce Greco: When will the meeting notes be available?

Charlotte Minor: Notes will be sent to Bruce and Anne by end of week.

Bruce Greco: Per the agenda items, it appears this will depend upon how much pre-work is done between now and next meeting. We'll need to determine where we are and what we'll discuss on the agenda at the next meeting. Meeting closed.

Bin Notes:

1. Need a listening session
2. Articulate relationships of the collaborative group as soon as possible
3. What are the roles, expectations and decision-making process
4. Define communication lines between FS and CG
5. Need an executive director who will be the keeper of corporate knowledge for the group.
6. Need professional facilitation
7. Landscape Assessment WG will continue with work, in the modified process
8. Need FS-Group discussion via WG leaders
9. Explore experience of other processes

Comment Cards:

- a. Agenda Items – The facilitator helps the group to develop roles, expectations, and decision-making process.
- b. We need follow-up discussion about the planning question. Including the critical issues, content, tradeoffs, sequencing, and sufficiency.
- c. Need an FS update/presentation at each stakeholder meeting about what FS decisions have been made and what analysis and data gathering the FS Core Team has been working on.
- d. Agenda Item – Consider development of a (Forest Landscape Restoration Act) project within the 4FRI context for the first phase area of CNF-KNF. (Steve Gatewood)
- e. Nametags are needed with affiliation.
- f. Need a summary of the number of personnel involved from specific agencies and groups (e.g. Tonto NF – 3, USFWS – 2, etc and the number of meetings each person has participated in).
- g. Need more detailed feedback to the CG from the WG. Allow the CG to comment, provide guidance to the WG, and make sure the WG are representing the CG's intentions.
- h. Are other landowners besides FS lands being considered for restoration?
- i. Try recording and transcribing the meetings, plus a note taker.
- j. Vickie Christiansen, AZ State Forester, would like to address the October Stakeholder meeting as a representative of Governor Jan Brewer.