

July 9, 2012 4FRI Coconino and Kaibab NF NEPA Update Public Meeting

Present: Steve Gatewood, Amy Waltz, Ed Smith, Sharon Galbreath, Sybil Smith, Earl Stewart, Neil McCusker, Leah Schofield, Henry Provencio, Paula Cote, Sarah Reif

Earl – no flexibility left in terms of not getting the document out – if significant roadblocks come up that would affect getting the document to the RO or out to the public, he needs to be involved

Monitoring/Adaptive Management Plan

- Amy/Henry – will work together on Wed 7/11/12 to go through the monitoring/AM plan to make progress on this before the full landscape working group meeting and review with stakeholders
- Larger landscape working group meeting – Matt W, Sarah not available, Ed Smith -meeting can probably occur the week of 7/16/12
- Week of 7/23 – sending Chapter 1 and 2 with appendices to RO – will send the summary of the Monitoring/AM Plan to the RO as a placeholder
- Even after DEIS is out for comment, as a group we will continue working through towards the final monitoring plan that would go in the FEIS/ROD
- Needs to be clear what the action could be if implementation is not providing the desired outcome
- Implementation plan review is on an annual basis
- Effectiveness monitoring is usually on a 5-year timeline
- Sharon will read 500 page reports – make sure the key information is accessible – will give a presentation on what SC looks for when they review reports, documents, analyses
- There are vested stakeholders for each group – WMS has a different group than 4FRI – the multi-party monitoring board will have to consider scope – perhaps a zoning concept would work – need to make sure local specialists are involved in monitoring their landscape

Sarah gone the 2nd ½ of July 15th through 8/3/2012, Henry gone week of 7/23/12

Dick – BMP monitoring contract being developed for soil and water resources – was a recommendation from soil and water specialists

RO meeting with contractors to determine what would be the first 2 years of implementation on the contract

City of Flagstaff may ask for bond for Lake Mary watershed and Dry Lake Hills – 4FRI and state lands planned for 7/10/12 meeting – vote is likely 7/24/2012

FYI – land acquisition and transfer in the Airport area is outside the scope of the 4FRI process

Sybil Smith – ADEQ would be happy to come to future meetings to discuss topics

Part 2: Group reviewed the draft Implementation Plan and Neil went over the Silvicultural Design and Implementation Guide that is part of the larger Implementation Plan

Action items and/or recommendations are underlined

3 sections of the Silvicultural Design Guide

A – Management direction (forest plan direction), desired conditions (forest plan, BAS), and treatment design

B – Decision matrix for designing tree groups, openings, regeneration openings

C – Old Tree Implementation Plan

Purpose – take design criteria from this and develop the silvicultural prescriptions

Need to make it more clear when there management direction is from the MSO Recovery Plan

Why do we have regeneration openings in MSO habitat? To get to an uneven-aged forest structure – may appear to be from the goshawk guidelines (10-10-20-20-20) but there is no real overlap –it’s the DC to get to an uneven-aged structure

Make sure its clear that “conifer” is not MC

Still not clear that we could have larger openings

Density would vary within what ranges – confusing to say there is a range without showing a range – make it clear in the MSO restricted other - p. 108

Neil was specifically using the term overall average to allow for variation in group size, interspace, etc to allow for treatment to meet the on-ground condition – add examples – the average is coming from a much broader range – a subset

Not enough statements that would allow for tree groups to be larger and not always get to the minimum group size (1/3 acre)

Clarify gambel oak treatments in the restricted other habitat treatment criteria

Clarify groups and clumps – using clumps as a group – should be groups only?

In uneven aged management – concept of stand goes away – relevancy is then the group
3 factors in DC: (1) amount of open-ness, (2) tree group density (3) overall averaged density

Put draft implementation plan on the web –

Amy has a line drawing pdf from Van Pelt for old growth characteristics – will provide to Neil

Clarify Implementation Plan or Implementation Strategy and Retention Strategy or implementation Strategy

Section B – issue with regeneration openings – but implementation guide should help guide the discussion

“Tree groups would rarely be larger than 1 acre” – UEA 10-40 – why can it be here but not in the other MSO tree group features? P. 117 – for dPFA and PFA mechanical thin and burn – comes from reference conditions

Clarify that managing younger tree groups to develop into VSS 4-6 – closed canopy – see wording in dPFA and PFA – last bullet p. 117

Put PFA before dPFA

Reformat so that it is clear when you are in MSO and when you are in goshawk

There is no regeneration openings in dPFA/PFA pine sage – some regeneration will occur –

Why not do an amendment to get rid of regeneration openings and just use interspace? Per ERI and AGFD and CBD recommendations - cant way we may not cut young, large trees to create variability in the age classes

Under grassland section - What is a large tree with long lived characteristics? Clarify – see p. 126

Arizona Radiation Regulatory Agency - Arizona statewide radiation – Palo Verde to xray machines to nuclides - Sybil will contact ARRA and USGS and provide Henry with a contact

Set up 3 way call with ARRA – EPA – 4FRI-ADEQ (Trevor, Eric)

Next NEPA Update meeting is August 13, 2012 – 0900-1200