



4FRI Stakeholder Group Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, November 18, 2015, 9AM – 1:00PM

Coconino National Forest Supervisor's Office

1824 South Thompson Street, Flagstaff, AZ 86001

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

In Attendance: Paul Summerfelt, Greg Smith, Sue Sitko, Dick Fleishman, Annette Fredette, Tom Mackin, Jessica Gist, Joe Miller, Steve La Falce, Pascal Berlioux, Bruce Greco, Jack Williams, Mike Anderson, Dan Kipervaser, Brad Worsley, Jay Smith, Steve Horner, Jill Grams, Steve Gatewood, Paula Cote, Bruce Greco, Alicyn Gitlin, Brie Pettit, Bill Noble, Stephen Flora, Randy Fuller, Laura Jo West, Tiffany Woods, Samantha Chu, Svetlana Gevorgyam, Sybil Smith, Emery Cohen

On the phone: Roberta Buskirk, Kelly Wolff Krauter, Buck Swaney

Agenda Change: Contracting Update – Roberta Buskirk

Roberta Buskirk was invited to give a contracting update to the SHG as a result of last month's call to the public announcement concerning GEPs non-payment to sub-contractors. *Note: There was limited time for Q&A, please send any additional questions to Paul Summerfelt or Greg Smith as Roberta has offered to answer them through email or at the next SHG meeting.*

The contract is between the US Forest Service (FS) and Good Earth Power Arizona (GEPAZ), any subcontracts are between GEPAZ the vendor. Government agencies do not become involved with issues concerning subcontracts, but as the FS has been contacted by vendors who have not received payment they have notified GEPAZ that payments need to be made in a prompt manner. Jason Rosamond has confirmed that all outstanding payments will be made and up-to-date by December 1st, subcontractors have confirmed that GEPAZ has followed through with current payment plan.

Stakeholders inquired about the breadth of the delinquency, as this is not the first occurrence of non-payment, and if any of the outstanding invoices included those of Campbell Global. Buskirk confirmed that no new subcontractors have contacted the FS concerning lack of payment, only those that have previously identified themselves. GEP understands the severity of non or slow payments and that the FS does not want this pattern to continue, the FS is hopeful that the situation will normalize. This discussion does not pertain to the disagreement between Campbell Global and GEPAZ, only the current sub-contractors GEPAZ is working with.

Brad Worsley also brought up the potential use of bonds, which are held against the owner of the contract, to ensure payments to subcontractors. Buskirk confirmed that the FS does collect payment and performance bonds. However, GEP only has performance bonds, they do not currently have payment bonds because they paid the government directly and it was determined that there was no need for a payment bond. Subcontractors can go against payment bonds for payment, not performance bonds.

In regards to the contract, GEPAZ's progress has been slow, but they are in compliance with the terms and conditions of the contract and they are within the performance period per each task order (TO). If the period of performance is coming to an end, GEPAZ must supply the contracting officer with

justification as to why they need an extension or delay. There is no guarantee that the request to extend or delay the performance period will be approved.

The final question concerned the steps that the FS is taking to help retain the existing industry, as 400,000 acres were cleared with the first EIS and there was already an additional 100,000 acres of shelf stock. The first contract only allots 300,000 acres to GEP, leaving an additional 200,000 acres that could be treated. This is something the 4FRI team is working on, there are no GEPAZ offerings on the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest (A-S) and they are looking into what they can do on the Coconino NF.

Agenda Change: Connecting Forests and their Streams: Forest and Watershed Management Necessary to Support Desired Stream Conditions for Native Southwestern Trout

Dr. Jack Williams and Mike Anderson

Joe Miller introduced Jack Williams, Senior Scientist with Trout Unlimited, and Mike Anderson from the Arizona Game and Fish Department. This presentation was organized because trout and their habitats (streams) are an important component of the Rim Country EIS. There is a direct connection between trout and forest health. They are concerned with the whole ecosystem, not just one aspect of the ecosystem.

Objectives of the presentation are to discuss native trout conditions in Arizona, some of the threats, some of the desired conditions for trout and their habitats, connections between forest management and streams, current management issues, and trout related projects that are being done in the region.

Trout of Arizona: **Gila trout**, they are a high priority for Trout Unlimited as they historically occupied 620 miles of stream habitat and by 2014 there were only 8 populations present in 30 miles of stream. Gila trout are listed as threatened. **Apache Trout**, are in better shape than the Gila trout as they still occupy 25% of their historical range.

Trends in trout populations: As the habitat has been fragmented, small populations have formed that are vulnerable to disturbances. Another problem is non-native aquatic species. Habitat fragmentation, increased vulnerability to wildfire and drought, and the movement of non-native species upstream create what is termed as the "big squeeze." *Wildfire impacts are covered in detail in the PowerPoint presentation.*

Connections between forest management and stream systems is outlined in the following handout **Forest_&_Watershed_Management_for_Southwestern_Trout.pdf** available on BASECAMP.

One focus of the presentation concerned restoring forest wet meadows. While trout may not be found in these systems restoration of these meadows have importance for the lower downstream systems that provide habitat to trout species. The slide discussing these areas show an unhealthy system in the top left corner in contrast to a healthy meadow in the bottom right. Moving onto riparian areas, in general and in Arizona, Dr. Williams points out that most streams lack sufficient large woody material. This material is the dominate pool forming mechanism in our area. Restoration priorities for both trout and their habitats were provided.

The section of the presentation that was led by Mike Williams focused on the activities taking place within the Rim Country EIS boundary. Page 18 (slide 18) provided a map of streams located within the boundary (red indicates a perennial stream). Arizona Game and Fish manages these streams for native

trout, sport fish, and native non-game species. It is important to manage all of these fish as a community to conserve native species while providing diverse angling opportunities. This is because angling is an important economic component for both Coconino and Gila Counties, as indicated from 2013 findings. Regulation changes, habitat restoration, and regular monitoring are all important components of native and wild trout management, essentially they want to be able to stabilize these systems that have been impacted by disturbances, such as wildfires.

Dude Creek provides an example of a current native trout restoration project. It was relatively fishless from the 1990s to 2000s, was restocked in the early 2000s, but then many of the fish were extirpated as a result of high water flows and another wildfire. They restocked the creek in 2015 and will restock again in 2016 and 2017, a common standard for these projects. Yearly monitoring will follow with heavy monitoring starting in 2018 or 2019, depending on these result they might be able to open the area to angling. Mike Anderson pointed out that while the Gila trout is listed as threatened the 4d rule does allow them to manage for recreation.

Other completed projects include Tonto Creek and Canyon Creek. Pictures are included in the PowerPoint presentation that provide examples of habitat structures that were established. Mike also provided a list of upcoming projects including: Canyon Creek (Phase II), Haigler Creek, Christopher Creek, East Verde River, and Dude Creek.

Please refer to the **November_4FRI_Presentation_TU.pdf** on BASECAMP for the complete PowerPoint presentation. Also, Trout Unlimited conducted a nationwide study on trout for 2015, there is a section specific to Southwest and can be accessed through the following website:

<http://www.tu.org/stateofthetrout>

Questions:

Summerfelt: What were the impacts of the slide fire on the upper watershed and downstream systems, if there were any? There was a reduction in population, but with the ash flow that they saw they felt confident putting fish in there this year. It is likely that there are events that could happen, but they don't know if they will push fish out. Putting fish in there will be a good indicator for the stability of the stream health.

Fleishman: Do you have identified restoration needs within the second EIS area that could be rolled into the purposed action? Do not currently have specific needs, but they might in the future. Getting willow (re-veg) planting in there could be helpful. Increasing complexity of these streams that would slow down water is a good goal for restoration of these areas. What about solutions to crayfish and their impacts? This will be a major push from AZGF in coming years. Are there recovery plans for all of the smaller fisheries that are within the next EIS area? Will have to double check on this. Is West Clear Creek a potential site for Gila trout? It would be most likely a stream for recreation.

Berlioux: FWS published a request on the listing on the humpback chub. Do you have any information on the impacts of the listing of this species with the footprint of the second EIS? Not at this time, but the AZGF is trying to keep it from being listed. What about restoration of head meadows and the listing of the New Mexico meadow jumping mouse? Not sure how this will specifically impact timber. Pascal Berlioux is asking these questions to point out that there is a lot of uncertainty on how the listing of these species will impact the second EIS. Protection of their habitats could end up benefiting other species, but it does add complexity.

Greco: Could you please discuss desired conditions in association with managed and prescribed wildfire. Anything that is going to stabilize these systems long term, these systems can live with pulses and small/short disturbances so they are interested in fire as a means to restore the landscape.

Gitlin: Are these restored areas protected from ungulate disturbances? They do often construct enclosures. Impacts are noticeable, but they are probably elk not cattle.

Action Item: Post revised T&E Presentation

9:05 Approve minutes from October 28th SHG meeting — Summerfelt

Minutes Approved

9:10 Review action items from October 28th SHG meeting — Smith

Action Item	Lead	Status
1. Post FWS and AZGFD presentations on BASECAMP	Woods	Complete
2. Post link to SRP video on BASECAMP	Woods	Complete
3. Post future work group meeting (location, time, etc.) information on BASECAMP	All Workgroups	Ongoing
4. Continue BASECAMP cleanup discussion at SC Call	Steering Committee	Complete
5. Post revised 4FRI 2nd EIS Desired Future Conditions Recommendation to SHG on BASECAMP	Planning Workgroup	Complete
6. Post minutes from Planning Work Group that reflect the SHG recommendation concerning draft amendments	Planning Workgroup	Complete
7. Post revised Industry Workgroup charter to BASECAMP	Industry Workgroup	Complete
8. Discuss an official statement from the Stakeholder Group concerning the Phase 1 contractor issues at next SC call	Steering Committee	Complete
9. Review and potential approval of updated 4FRI Charter at November SHG meeting	All	In Progress

9:20 Call to the Public

Agenda Change: Recommendation Regarding Biological DCs – Planning Workgroup (Berlioux)

The Planning Group has separated the analysis of the desired conditions (DCs) in three sections: biological, socioeconomic, and methods in which they can integrate what they learned from the first EIS into the second EIS (mainly referring to the objection/resolution process).

The FS originally provided the workgroup with forested desired conditions from the A-S and revisions from the Tonto, they then provided the group with a more comprehensive list of DCs. The workgroups position and recommendation have not changed since the last meeting. The same concerns are still prevalent in regards to scale, metrics and definitions. As previously determined, the crosswalk supplies a baseline and includes a number of action items that the group would like to be enacted as they believe they will aid the process.

Concerning socioeconomic desired conditions, they would like some focus to be given to the logging industry as they are the enablers of the treatment. There is a need, in the mind of the group members, to inject in the DCs an analysis of the economic impact potential of how we implement landscape scale restoration. Industry expertise and experience could be provided concerning the different types of implementation and the best methods that should be used. It was noted that the EIS does not state how implementation will happen. As this is in the preliminary stages of discussion, Pascal invited anyone interested in this discussion to join the EIS Workgroup or the Industry Workgroup.

Carrying over what was learned from the first EIS to the second EIS. Objection/resolution language that is site specific or site specific data for the first EIS will not be carried into the second EIS, however, the fundamental issues that were presented in the objection process and are relevant to the second EIS will be carried over.

In summary the workgroup does not have a different recommendation as they are still in agreement from the previous meeting. The group was asked if they had any objections to posting the updated table of recommendations, all were in favor of the recommendations presented.

Action Item: Post updated recommendation table to BASECAMP, including draft strategy for carrying forward 1st EIS objection/resolution agreements.

11:00 Rim Country EIS: Incorporating First EIS Objection Resolution Agreements – Fredette/Côte

Paula Côte discussed the handout Draft Strategy for Carrying Forward 4FRI 1st EIS Objection Resolution Agreements. Concerning the issue presented by Chad Hanson, they will conduct additional literature review, however, they expect Chad to submit specific written comments with any science he would like the FS to review. Also heterogeneity will be nested in the purpose and need. While the data that was used in the second EIS cannot be carried over, it does not mean the philosophy will not.

Concerning the objection brought forth by the Sierra Club, the earlier they can provide specific literature on how grazing has affected forest structure and fire to the FS the better. The FS wants to start the discussion now as opposed to waiting for the formal comment period. Design features were created and proved that there needs to be collaboration between silviculture, fire, and range and they want to move this forward. It was added by Pascal Berlioux that the SHG needs to make a decision on grazing. Alicyn Gitlin from the Sierra Club added that they aren't trying to establish desired conditions for grazing, they are trying to emphasize that grazing affects our desired conditions. If grazing is impacting the desired conditions, it should be modified. She also requested that current conditions on grazing be provided, including the number of cattle on the landscape.

Objector Stephen Dewhurst's comments were directly related to the NEPA process. This is an ideal example of what will not be carried over as it is specific to the first EIS, however, they want to ensure that for the second EIS they provide an adequate range of alternatives, etc.

Objector CBD, issues 2-3: This is going to be the heart of the January presentation on the preponderance of large young trees. They are deferring this topic to the next meeting. Issue 4, wildlife corridors, one the FS has the data in hand they are going to view the opportunities for creating wildlife corridors and having design features that address the concerns and issues associated with how and where to place these corridors. Issue 5, MSO treatments and monitoring, they have acknowledged that the monitoring plan from the first EIS is the starting point, but they will have a new BO that will determine the monitoring plan. It was added that they haven't started the analysis of the potential treatments on MSO habitat, if they will do treatments in these PACs.

The last objection was brought forth by Wild Earth Guardians and the recommendations are the same that were provided for Chad Hanson's objection.

The handout/table will be included in the recommendation table presented by the EIS workgroup.

Action Item: Discussion on potential SHG position on Grazing

10:45 USFS Update – Fredette/Fleishman

Since the last meeting, the FS has modified the boundary of the second analysis area, they are very close to being finished with boundary modifications. Once the boundary is finalized they will present it to SHG. They also wanted to remind stakeholders that they will be presenting on the preponderance of large young trees at the next SHG meeting in January.

Operations update: The November monthly update (available on BASECAMP) incorporates FY15 accomplishments. They have completed the FY15 CFLRP Annual Report and sent it to the Washington Office. It will be available online shortly, pending any edits. In regards to implementation, moisture is impacting all TOs and prescribed burning has slowed, however, they have been burning a lot of piles.

Brad Worsley (Comment): The Biomass facility is currently sitting on less than a week's worth of inventory and they do not have the ability to temporarily stop operations as a result of their contractual obligations. There needs to be flexibility on when and how they can work otherwise they will be in default of their contracts and this won't be a result of their inability to work, rather a result of FS restrictions. There needs to be immediate responsiveness to get them from one sale to the next. Dick Fleishman stated that this will be relayed at the next 4FRI call.

- **Facilitation Update**

The facilitation contract is out and closes on Monday the 23rd, all bids need to be in by then. It is anticipated that they will have selected a facilitator by the January meeting, but it will take a few weeks after the close date before a selection is made.

11:30 Charter Revision Update – Swaney

While that charter revision process has been slower going than planned, a revision draft was distributed to the revision charter group last week. Certain language has been simplified and repetitive content was eliminated. The mission and structure is more user friendly, it is now broken down into four objectives. Other changes included moving certain content to appendices, membership information can now be found under Appendix A and Steering Committee information is now located under Appendix B.

Sue Sitko, a charter workgroup member, recommended that language be added before the section concerning good standing and stakeholder removal, essentially stating that exclusion is not the preferred option as they want to support a diverse group and diverse interests. A potential option would be to add a probationary period before going straight to removal.

At this time a formal work group meeting has not been scheduled, but there are two potential steps forward. Scenario 1: Buck is successful in securing the facilitation contract, a workgroup meeting is scheduled for late November or early December and consideration and adoption of the new charter is completed at the January meeting. Scenario 2: Another facilitator receives the contract, in which case Buck would provide in-kind support as needed.

Once the new charter is adopted, the stakeholders discussed the possibility of reengaging stakeholders by having a new charter signing event. No decision was made concerning this possibility as some stakeholders were in favor of this and other were not, it will be considered in a future discussion.

11:50 Working Group Updates

- Industry Work Group – Worsley
 - Draft Dashboard Update

The charter was revised as discussed and the previous meeting and posted on BASECAMP. They hope to have a final Dashboard to present at the January meeting and they plan on further discussing the development of socioeconomic desired conditions at the next workgroup meeting.

- Communications Work Group – Davidson
 - Review Draft January Newsletter

A draft newsletter was distributed to attending stakeholders. Before the final is released there will be one more review at the January SC call. Today's version was populated as a result of the feedback received at the October meeting, does it reflect the intent of the group, particularly the front page article? Please send any feedback to Sue Sitko or Rebecca Davidson, they will also need a list of upcoming events to add to the Coming Attractions section.

- Multi-Party Monitoring Board – Flora

The Multi-Party Monitoring Board (MPMB) had an after action review last Friday, 11/13. The majority of the meeting covered what activities were completed and how they met their monitoring questions for FY15. The meeting also focused on developing and planning for FY16 monitoring and they reviewed their 5 year plan. They are also developing an MSO workshop for January and will notify the SHG once a date has been set.

Bruce Greco from ERI wanted to know the area the group was reviewing and if they had considered the Bridge the Gap monitoring plan. Specifically, if they plan to integrate the monitoring that has been completed under the Bridge the Gap monitoring plan with that of 4FRI monitoring. The group has only reviewed the monitoring completed in the first analysis area. It was also suggested that group provide data for the CFLRP economic model called TREAT, as the model doesn't currently have a lot of hard socioeconomic data.

Action Item: Post MSO workshop information on BASECAMP

12:30 Stakeholder Disclosures and Announcements – All

Brad Worsley (Novo BioPower) – They are very concerned about the coming winter months as they are sitting on minimal inventory. They have reached out to every conceivable supplier for material as they are expecting that they will be unable to access the forest for a combined period of a month or more.

Bruce Greco (ERI) – Dr. Wally Covington testified in front of the Committee on Energy & Natural Resources Committee on the topic of wildfire funding. He will also be meeting with various contacts while in D.C. and it is expected that 4FRI will come up.

12:45 Review Action Items/Adjourn

Action Item	Lead	Status
10. Post revised T&E Presentation	Woods	Complete
11. Post updated recommendation table , including draft strategy for carrying forward 1 st EIS Objection/Resolution agreement	Berlioux	Complete
12. Post future work group meeting (location, time, etc.) information on BASECAMP	All Workgroups	
13. Charter Review Discussion at next SC Call	Steering Committee	Complete
14. Discussion on potential SHG position on Grazing	Steering Committee	February SC Call

Potential Observatory Mesa Field Trip: An Opportunity to View FWPP Treatments

This is an informal field trip pending weather conditions and stakeholder interest. Please dress appropriately (in warm field going clothes) if you are interested in going.

01/27/16 SHG meeting information:

Wednesday, January 27, 2015
 South County Complex Health Building – Frontier Conference Room
 600 North 9th Place, Show Low, AZ 85901
 Teleconference line: (712) 775-7031, code: 439290611#

January Agenda Items:

1. GEP Presentation
2. FS Presentation on Preponderance of Large Young Trees
3. Dashboard Presentation