CFLR Project (Name/Number): ___Tapash_____

National Forest(s): _____Okanogan-Wenatchee_____

Responses to the prompts on this annual report should be typed directly into this template, including narratives and tables.

1. Match and Leverage funds:

a. FY14 Matching Funds Documentation

Fund Source – (CFLR Funds Expended[1])	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2014($)
1,352,441. (FY13) + 358,047. (FY14)	$1,710,487.8

Fund Source – (Carryover funds expended (Carryover to in addition to CFLR/CFLN)[2] (please include a new row for each BLI))	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2014($)
	0

Fund Source – (FS Matching Funds (please include a new row for each BLI)[3])	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2014($)
Total	**$865,364.41.**
CWFS	**93,279.24.**
CMEX	**426,089.85**
CWKV	**6,551.82**
NFEX	**85,065.74**
NFNF	**44,427.14**
SFSF	**46,985.96**
SRS2	**150,073.2**
WFWF	**12,891.46**

Fund Source – (Funds contributed through agreements[4])	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2014($)
	0

Fund Source – (Partner In-Kind Contributions[5])	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2014($)
	0

[1] This amount should match the amount of CFLR/CFLN dollars obligated in the PAS report titled CFLR Job Code Listing and Expenditure Report – Detailed Analysis by Fiscal Year.

[2] This value should reflect the amount of carryover funds allocated to a project as indicated in the program direction, but does not necessarily need to be in the same BLIs as indicated in the program direction. These funds should total the matching funds obligated in the PAS report.

[3] This amount should match the amount of matching funds obligated in the PAS report.

[4] Please document any partner contributions to implementation and monitoring of the CFLR project through an agreement (this should only include funds that weren't already captured through the PAS job code structure for CFLR matching funds). Please list the partner organizations involved in the agreement.

[5] Total partner in-kind contributions for implementation and monitoring of a CFLR project. Please list the partner organizations that provided in-kind contributions. See "Annual Report instructions" for instructions on how to document in-kind contributions.

Fund Source – (Service work accomplishment through goods-for services funding within a stewardship contract[6])	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2014($)
	0

b. Please provide a narrative or table describing leveraged funds in your landscape in FY2014 (one page maximum)

There was a total of $3,378,152. in leveraged funds invested into the Tapash landscape in FY14.

The Washington State Department of Natural Resources contributed significantly ($1,895,050.) to this investment through their efforts associated with commercial and non-commercial thinning, reforestation, fuels reduction treatments, road improvement, and removal of barriers to fish passage.

The Yakama Nation contributed $770,000. of investment to the Tapash landscape via timber sale implementation, pre-commercial thinning, site-preparation, reforestation and fuel treatment.

The Washington Department of Wildlife and The Nature Conservancy also contributed to this investment ($12,500. and $96,000, respectively) through their efforts in planning and implementation of restoration treatments on adjacent State administered lands within the landscape. These contributions included the costs associated with planning, ESA consultation, prescription preparation, layout, marking, and project implementation. Investments continue to be made by the Washington Department of Wildlife and The Nature Conservancy toward land acquisition within the Tapash landscape (Manastash and Teanaway). Acquisition of at-risk lands continues to be a high priority for the Tapash Sustainable Forest Collaborative.

The Okanogan Wenatchee N.F. invested approximately $604,602 into the planning of CFLRP restoration projects. These funds paid for the costs associated with completing the NEPA process, completing ESA consultation, prescription preparation, and project design.

Investments through active participation in meetings related to restoration project prioritization, program of work validation, and monitoring plan development represent a large proportion of the investment. As well, the participation by Task Force members, members of the wood products industry, and members of the environmental community in field reviews intended to identify potential issues and develop solutions were also significant. Our Tapash partners also contributed valuable time responding to various information gathering and reporting efforts associated with the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program.

Approved by (Forest Supervisor): Michael K Ballon

[6] This should be the amount in the "stewardship credits charged" column at the end of the fiscal year in the TSA report TSA90R-01.

2. **Discuss how the CLFR project contributes to accomplishment of the wildland fire goals in the *10-Year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan*, dated December 2006**. In a narrative format, describe the progress to date on restoring a more fire-adapted ecosystem, as identified in the project's desired conditions. This may also include a description of the current fire year (fire activity that occurred in the project area) as a backdrop to your response (please limit answer to one page).

Our project contributes to the performance measures identified in the 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy by implementing treatments designed to restore and maintain sustainable environmental, social, and economic benefits. High priority acres have been identified in watershed assessments, LSR and MLSA assessments, the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest Restoration Strategy, and Ecosystem Management Decision Support modeling. Collaboratively designed desired conditions for priority acres continue to be validated and further articulated through on-going engagement in the CWPP planning process and via regular communication between the Tapash Collaborative partners and project-specific collaborative teams. Early and frequent public involvement has resulted in public input and cooperation throughout the planning process. Tribal leaders, industry representatives, environmental groups, regulatory agencies, and the public at large have greatly increased their early participation in project identification and design.

We utilized CFLRP funds to implement projects that treat departed forest vegetation and hazardous fuels by using mechanical methods and prescribed fire to reduce the risk of high severity wildfire around communities and in the dry forest environment. These projects moved communities toward the identified desired conditions and maintained desirable conditions where they already exist. Refer to Item 6 for specific acres of accomplishment in WUI and non-WUI. In addition to the improvements made through the treatment of high priority vegetation and hazardous fuels; contributions that promote community assistance are being derived through the development of Memorandas of Understanding, Participating Agreements, the award of contracts, stewardship and other agreements, and permits. Working partnerships have been or are being formed with the local Clean Air Agency, Yakama Nation, The Nature Conservancy, and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife which has greatly increased local acceptance of implementing prescribed fire and mechanical fuel treatments on the landscape.

The 10 year average of wildfires controlled at initial attack is 97%. Those wildfires that escaped initial attack were lightning caused, limited access areas or lower priority response during storm passage (meaning resources were allocated to protecting WUI). The number of human caused wildfires is 40% of the total. All of these fires were suppressed at initial attack. It will be difficult to realize savings on fire suppression costs without a fundamental shift in suppression policy. While restoration and hazardous fuels treatments are and have been successfully implemented on a number of landscapes, suppression strategy within these landscapes continues to be immediate full suppression with 100% mop-up, several days of patrol, and equipment refurbishing, repair and replacement. Encouragement by management to take full advantage of "P-code savings" discourages potential reductions in suppression costs intended by CFLR funded projects.

The Forest did spend more dollars suppressing the wildfires that escaped initial attack. In FY14, increased costs were associated with fires that either the Forest Service was responding to partner agencies requests to take aggressive action; or were located in inaccessible terrain with limited availability of adequate hand-crews (Type 1 and 2 IA crews).

Not all cooperating agencies share the Forest Service's vision of fire as a natural process in the ecosystem, where appropriate. Managers within these agencies strongly advise that Forest Service Line Officers and on-the-ground

Incident Commanders implement aggressive, often more expensive, suppression tactics on fires adjacent to their jurisdiction, even when viable containment/confinement options are available.

3. **What assumptions were used in generating the numbers and/or percentages you plugged into the TREAT tool**?

FY 2014 Jobs Created/Maintained (FY14 CFLR/CFLN/ Carryover funding only):

Type of projects	Direct part and full-time jobs	Total part and full-time jobs	Direct Labor Income	Total Labor Income[6]
Commercial Forest Product Activities	**66.9**	**144.6**	**4,938,546.**	**9,300,766.**
Other Project Activities	**3.4**	**4.6**	**145,902.**	**192,343.**
TOTALS:	**70.4**	**149.2**	**5,048,447.**	**9,493,109.**

FY 2014 Jobs Created/Maintained (FY14 CFLR/CFLN/ Carryover and matching funding):

Type of projects	Direct part and full-time jobs	Total part and full-time jobs	Direct Labor Income	Total Labor Income[7]
Commercial Forest Product Activities	**62.5**	**134.9**	**4,657,722.**	**8,710,557.**
Other Project Activities	**4.8**	**6.3**	**200,460.**	**262,778.**
TOTALS:	**67.2**	**141.3**	**4,858,182.**	**8,973,335.**

4. **Describe other community benefits achieved and the methods used to gather information about these benefits** (Please limit answer to two pages).

As described in more detail in Question # 5 below, the Tapash CFLRP multi-party monitoring working group is continuing to work on development and implementation of a site-specific monitoring plan. In our efforts to assess and monitor overall community benefit, the group has identified *social values* (recreational amenities, infra-structure, access, aesthetics, and air quality), *economics* (to supply existing and attract new forest product infrastructure that facilitates ecologically based restoration and creates sustainable local employment and community well-being), and *cultural resource values* (historic and prehistoric heritage resources (archeological properties)) defined as physical evidence of past human activity expressed as artifacts and or features on the modern landscape; and treaty rights (the right of access to usual and accustomed fishing stations and the privilege to hunt, gather and graze animals) as key monitoring categories. These categories are intended to give emphasis to the social/community-related aspects of the project. Specific monitoring questions have now been framed under each of these key categories. At this time, the group is working on identifying the methodologies that are most effective and efficient in capturing the desired information.

To date, much of the information gleaned on other community benefits is anecdotal in nature and derived from discussions at formal and informal meetings, field trips, and forums with individuals from local businesses and others who provide services within the local community and surrounding areas. Members of the Tapash CFLRP/Monitoring Task Group, the Terrestrial Restoration Task Group, and the Economically Sustainable Forest Products Utilization Task Force continue to participate on field trips with members of forest products industry to identify barriers and find solutions to

[6] *Values obtained from Treatment for Restoration Economic Analysis Tool (TREAT) spreadsheet, "Impacts-Jobs and Income" tab. Spreadsheet and directions available at http://www.fs.fed.us/restoration/CFLR/submittingproposals.shtml#tools.*

[7] *Values obtained from Treatment for Restoration Economic Analysis Tool (TREAT) spreadsheet, "Impacts-Jobs and Income" tab. Spreadsheet and directions available at http://www.fs.fed.us/restoration/CFLR/submittingproposals.shtml#tools.*

challenges associated with the economic feasibility of restoration projects, stewardship contracting, and providing more opportunities for purchasers, operators, and local mills.

As a means toward building stronger community relationships between the Forest Service and the Yakama Nation given our common interests in resource stewardship, restoration of fire-prone ecosystems, and sustainable economies; we continue to actively engage with our Tribal partners on the Anchor Forest Project. The on-going Anchor Forest Project, sponsored by the Intertribal Timber Council with funding through the USDA Forest Service, is a multi-ownership, land based area which supports long-term wood and biomass production levels backed by local infrastructure and technical expertise and endorsed politically and publicly to produce desired land management objectives for working forests.

Another example of our efforts toward benefitting the local community is our continued persistence relative to exploring opportunities associated with biomass utilization. Although we have been successful in making biomass available, we have been unsuccessful in moving this small diameter, low-value material off of the landscape. As a means to identify solutions to this situation, we are continuing in our attempts to engage directly with our local community members to utilize local resources for local benefit. We continue to explore ideas such as fuels for schools, non-traditional forest product development, and innovative ways to accomplish forest restoration while maintaining local jobs and a sustainable economy. We intend to continue communication with the USDA Renewable Energy Business Advisor and USDA Rural Development Business Program Specialist to find solutions.

Youth employment and training opportunities continue to be realized through employment of Washington Conservation Crews to implement a variety of projects including: thinning and hand-piling of fuels, invasive species treatment, sediment monitoring, and range restoration projects. Additionally, tangible benefits derived from the WCC program include providing mentoring and leadership skills to youth and young adults who are/will be entering the workforce. Benefits relative to education continue to come through collaboration with faculty and students at the University of Washington in the arena of prescription development, monitoring, socio-economics, and collaboration. Additionally, CFLRP funding provided the opportunity to hire force account crews from the local community and extend the work tours of current seasonal Forest Service employees (many local residents), providing skilled labor where needed and reducing Forest Service unemployment costs.

5. **Describe the multiparty monitoring, evaluation, and accountability process** (please limit answer to two pages).

The Tapash CFLRP monitoring working group continues their efforts toward development and implementation of a monitoring plan that identifies common goals and objectives, develops a process for identifying and prioritizing monitoring questions, identifies a learning method for addressing each question (where, when, and who), and constructs an outreach and communication framework outlining information transfer between project stakeholders. An additional objective of this effort is to build and implement an adaptive protocol that is scale-able and applicable to various landscapes and can serve several monitoring objectives and eliminate redundant work efforts (e.g., CFLRP monitoring, Forest Plan Revision monitoring, Regional monitoring). The group continues to engage the Regional Office CFLRP interdisciplinary team and other CFLRP projects to develop a regional adaptive management framework that is driven by a set of monitoring questions developed through a collaborative, multi-party process.

To date, a suite of key monitoring categories have been developed, under which, specific questions have been framed. Each question has been evaluated using a set of previously agreed upon criteria. The criteria are intended to act as a screen or filter when assessing which monitoring questions to ask and to provide a basis for prioritizing each question.

The group is currently working on identifying methodologies that are most effective and efficient in capturing the desired information to answer each monitoring question, development of a formal prioritization process that further engages our stakeholders and decision makers, and continued stakeholder communication and outreach.

Consistent with the Tapash CFLRP proposal, monitoring will be implemented as part of an adaptive management approach as summarized in the Okanogan-Wenatchee Forest Restoration Strategy. Information gained through monitoring will be used to validate the appropriateness of restoration prescriptions and provide insight into necessary adjustments should they be indicated. In each case, monitoring will address the question whether the strategy was fully implemented and if implementation of the prescribed treatment resulted in the intended outcome. Annual and multi-year synthesis and interpretation with stakeholders and decision makers will provide feedback and inform future decisions. This process could potentially provide for assessment of landscapes across multiple CFLRP projects.

The Forest Service, in partnership with the Yakima Nation, continues to move forward with sediment monitoring in key watersheds within the CFLRP landscape. As well, our partnership with the Yakama Nation to monitor white-headed woodpecker use of managed-stands and the impact of forest treatments on demographic parameters such as density, survivorship, and productivity continues. The objective of the monitoring is to identify the specific features of managed stands that are used for foraging, roosting, and nesting, especially, in areas where large diameter trees are unavailable, and how woodpeckers respond to thinning and burning within these areas. The most recent data collection and synthesis indicates that our treatments are positively affecting the white-headed woodpecker populations consistent with our expectation.

Tapash continues to move forward in the collection of base-line data through the completion of stand exam exams for use in modeling the ecological departure within the landscape; and the subsequent preparation of restoration strategy objectives and prescriptions for restoration treatments.

6. **FY 2014 accomplishments**

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished [8]	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)[9]
Acres treated annually to sustain or restore watershed function and resilience WTRSHD-RSTR-ANN	Acres			
Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres			
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	631	Integrated	NFTM WFHF
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	1,968.6	66,883	NFVW CWKV CFLN
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC	Acres			
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions. S&W-RSRC-IMP	Acres			
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-LAK	Acres			
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	10.01	Integrated	SRS2 CMRD CFLN
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	12,490	Integrated	NFTM CFLN SSSS WFHF
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved RG-VEG-IMP	Acres	6,936.4	Integrated	NFTM CFLN SSSS WFHF
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance RD-HC-MAIN	Miles	20.5	10,250.	SRS2 CMRD
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance RD-PC-MAINT	Miles	213	127,800.	SRSR CMRD

[8] Units accomplished should match the accomplishments recorded in the Databases of Record.

[9] Please use a new line for each BLI or type of fund used. For example, you may have three lines with the same performance measure, but the type of funding might be two different BLIs and CFLR/CFLN.

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished [8]	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)[9]
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	3.81	74,295.	CFLN CMEX NFWF NFEX
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles			
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles			
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage STRM-CROS-MTG-STD	Number			
Miles of system trail maintained to standard TL-MAINT-STD	Miles			
Miles of system trail improved to standard TL-IMP-STD	Miles			
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard LND-BL-MRK-MAINT	Miles			
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC	Acres	674	Integrated below	NFTM, SSSS, CFLN
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF	4,195.7	230,763.	NFTM, SSSS, CFLN
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	20,946.4	Integrated above	NFTM, SSSS, CFLN
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons	Pull number from PAS report		
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	3,039.5	404,254.	WFHF, CFLN, BDBD
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	2,893	578,600.	WFHF, CFLN, BDBD

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished [8]	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)[9]
Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands SP-INVSPE-FED-AC	Acres			
Number of priority acres treated annually for native pests on Federal lands SP-NATIVE-FED-AC	Acres			

Key FY14 accomplishments not captured in the above table include the preparation 2,980 acres for restoration treatment (layout, posting, and marking) and 1,509 acres covered by stewardship agreements. Additionally, 11,746 acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced, and 2 miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced does were not captured in the PAS report despite their occurrence in the appropriate databases of record. We continue to experience discrepancies between the numbers displayed in the PAS reports/databases of record (primarily FACTS and WIT) and the actual accomplishments. We will continue to work to correct these issues.

7. **FY 2014 accomplishment narrative** – Summarize key accomplishments and evaluate project progress. (Please limit answer to three pages.)

The Tapash Collaborative was chartered in 2007 to facilitate the common goals of landscape restoration and conservation of working forests in Central Washington. This area supports an overabundance of dense mid-seral stands prone to fire, coupled with high unemployment and a struggling rural economy. Having become keenly aware of the existing situation; the Yakama Nation, The Nature Conservancy, the Washington State Department of Natural Resources, and the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife recognized the need to collaborate across ownership boundaries to address these issues. The ultimate goal of the Tapash CFLRP project proposal remains to increase our combined restoration footprint on the landscape by implementing restoration treatments which increase overall forest resiliency and aquatic health. The desired outcome is a vegetative landscape that is more resilient to changing climates, fire, and insects, and that responds in a manner that maintains and restores natural processes, patterns, and functions. The reestablishment of natural vegetative processes, such as insect and disease and fire regimes, is also intended to reduce the risk of uncharacteristic wildfire and associated management costs. As well, there is an additional focus to reduce adverse effects on stream flows, sediment regimes, and flood plain function caused by high road densities and/or poor road location.

Accomplishments to date include: 2,393 acres of forest vegetation improved; 14,765 acres of hazardous fuels treated; 43,870 acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced; 16 miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced; 3,965 acres managed for noxious weeds and invasive plants; 8,723 acres of rangeland vegetation improved; 1,806 acres of forestlands treated with timber sales; 41,805 ccf of timber volume harvested; and 64,601 ccf of timber volume sold. CFLRP funding has also enabled the Forest to develop projects that include the full complement of restoration activities, ultimately allowing the vegetation projects to move forward when otherwise they would not. The Oak Creek Restoration Project continues to be an example of a project where improvement in road-related aquatic and fisheries conditions and reconstruction of crossings for aquatic organism passage provided for access to implement a timber sale and subsequent fuels treatment.

Continued application of the Okanogan Wenatchee Forest Restoration Strategy early in the planning process continues to allow us to efficiently prepare for larger landscape treatments by informing the NEPA process and facilitating Section 7 Consultation. The Strategy provides the basis for implementation of large-scale landscape treatment, while at the same time providing for the development of a relatively narrow restoration purpose and need. This supports a proposed action that reflects the specific purposes of the CFLR Act to reduce the risk of uncharacteristic wildfire activity and the cost of wildfire suppression while encouraging economic and social sustainability. Because the strategy identifies multiple potential landscape treatment areas, we are able to prioritize and treat individual portions of the landscape as specific conditions and funding permit; a more efficient process than treating vegetation and fuels with a stand-by-stand approach. With the combined Dry Orr, Little Naches, Upper Yakima, and Upper Swauk sub-watersheds, we will have completed landscape analysis on approximately 400,000 acres. We are now beginning to realize significant NEPA efficiencies and subsequent accelerated implementation of restoration treatments.

The Tapash Collaborative remains united in our dedication to accomplish the meaningful work of implementation of the CFLRP 10-year program of work, increase our restoration footprint, and contribute to a sustained restoration economy. Strategically located and integrated restoration treatments are being implemented to get maximum benefits for a given fixed cost while minimizing unintended adverse effects. With careful placement of treatments, a larger impact of fire behavior and ecology across the landscape is being achieved. The Tapash Collaborative partners are focusing treatments in high priority landscapes while integrating aquatic, terrestrial, and socio-economic considerations to increase the probability of success of restoration while reducing wildfire cost. With implementation of these treatments, land managers are being provided the latitude to take a less aggressive suppression response over the treated landscape, ultimately, lowering fire suppression costs and reducing investments necessary for maintenance of vegetation and capital improvements in support of aquatic health.

The efforts described above contribute directly to meeting a key purpose of the CFLRA, to facilitate the reduction of wildfire management costs, reestablish natural fire regimes, and reduce the risk of uncharacteristic wildfire. The partners are focusing their efforts on areas within the landscape where restoration projects can be edge-matched across ownership boundaries to increase the overall restoration footprint through a multi-jurisdictional approach. Although implementation of an ownership blind, cross-boundary project presents a myriad of challenges yet to overcome (e.g., policy and contracting), we have already shown achievement in regard to edge-matching projects in the Oak Creek watershed where we have worked within a 3-partner checkerboard to implement vegetative and aquatic restoration treatments. As well, the Teanaway Community Forest and Manastash-Taneum areas are currently moving forward in this regard.

Our TNC partners continue to take an active role in initiating and participating in new Tapash cross-boundary landscape projects that includes landscape evaluation across multiple ownerships, planning, and project implementation. They also continue to add capacity in further development of the Okanogan Wenatchee Forest Restoration Strategy economic and aquatic modules. Additionally, through their work with the Yakama Nation/Inter-Tribal Timber Council around Anchor Forests and the Economically Sustainable Forest Products Utilization Task Force, TNC has completed a forest restoration/timber supply assessment across all ownerships that will be used as the basis for a collaborative dialogue around a realistic mechanical treatment footprint and a sustainable wood supply. This effort will also help form the basis for a meaningful discussion related to infrastructure potential, right-sizing, use of the Tribal Forest Protection Act authority and tribal stewardship contracting with the goal of creating opportunities.

8. **Describe the total acres treated in the course of the CFLR project** (cumulative footprint acres; not a cumulative total of performance accomplishments). What was the total number of acres treated?[10]

To date, the project has implemented a diverse array of treatments including mechanical treatments through pre-commercial and commercial activities, prescribed fire of natural and activity fuels, road and trail restoration activities and riparian enhancement treatments. Mechanical treatments include: commercial and pre-commercial thinning, hand piling, and machine piling of activity fuels, mastication of activity fuels, and biomass removal. These treatments occur alone or in combination with prescribed burning of natural and activity fuels. The timing of the treatments varies over the project area but ultimately will encompass all or part of a cycle of commercial thinning, pre-commercial thinning and prescribed fire beginning in FY10 and continuing over the next decade.

Road and trail management restoration treatments include: road decommissioning, road relocation, road stabilization, bridging of motorized fords, fish passage barrier removal and replacement, trail relocation, and trail improvement (drainage, hardening stream crossings). Road and trail related restoration treatments are underway, with implementation of new and on-going treatments continuing annually over the next decade. Similarly, aquatic-related restoration treatments including stream channel stabilization, LWD augmentation, and riparian planting to further contribute to the reduction of adverse impacts on sediment regimes, stream flow, and flood plain function are underway and will continue over the remaining 5 years of the project.

Fiscal Year	**Total number of acres treated (treatment footprint)**
FY14	7,304
FY10, FY11, FY12, FY13 and FY14 (as applicable- projects selected in FY2012 may will not have data for FY10 and FY11; projects that were HPRP projects in FY12, please include one number for FY12 and one number for FY13 (same as above))	24,607

9**. In no more than two pages (large landscapes or very active fire seasons may need more space), describe other relevant fire management activities within the project area** (hazardous fuel treatments are already documented in Question #6):

There was $1,165,792 in wildfire preparedness (WFPR), invested directly to the Tapash landscape in FY14. Expenses included base salaries, training, and resource costs. In addition, we indirectly supported $790,904 in wildfire preparedness. With respect to emergency fire suppression and BAER within the project landscape, we spent approximately $98,376 for the 51 initial attack fires that were contained at small acreages. One additional fire was not contained at small acres. The 51 initial attack fires contained were contained at 16 acres burned; the one additional fire was not contained (485 acres burned). All ignitions were prioritized and suppressed as resources were made available. There were no other hazardous fuels expenses incurred that are not captured elsewhere in this report.

As in FY12 and FY13, there was an attempt to accomplish a large-scale, summer prescribed fire in the Tapash landscape. Ignition began on June 10, 2014. Due to Regional preparedness levels, Forest fire activity and the lack of qualified overhead, the Region asked that we stand down with respect to continued ignition, and as a result, we were able to only accomplish 700 acres rather than the projected 7,000 acres.

[10] This metric is separate from the annual performance measurement reporting as recorded in the databases of record. Please see the instructions document for further clarification.

10. **Describe any reasons that the FY 2014 annual report does not reflect your project proposal, previously reported planned accomplishments, or work plan.** Did you face any unexpected challenges this year that caused you to change what was outlined in your proposal? (please limit answer to two pages)

The spotted owl recovery plan and Critical Habitat Rule continue to add complexity to our vegetation treatments in owl habitat. With increasing pressure to address our road system, the issues around roads and the fisheries and aquatics resource have resulted in increased planning timelines and costs associated with mitigation design. We continue to work directly with our state and federal partners to develop and integrate an aquatics module into the Okanogan-Wenatchee Restoration Strategy. Full implementation of the Restoration Strategy, which includes an aquatic element, will ultimately serve to streamline planning and reduce the time associated with the Endangered Species Act and Section 7 Consultation. The Forest has been working closely with the Regional Office to reach out to State Agencies to ensure personnel at all levels of both agencies support management and are effectively and efficiently completing required consultation. This was a primary discussion topic at the 2014 Okanogan - Wenatchee National Forest NEPA / ESA Activity Review.

Because of the continued concerns related to air quality and the potential for smoke intrusion into the nearby city of Yakima, the Washington State Department of Natural Resources remains reluctant to issue permission to perform prescribed fire at the scale or frequency anticipated and needed; despite the recent signing of a Memorandum of Understanding by the Yakima Clean Air Authority and the Okanogan-Wenatchee N.F. which emphasizes the mutual interest in providing and maintaining clean air to the citizens of Washington State and Yakima County on both a short-term and long-term basis. The Tapash partners continue to work aggressively with state and local agencies to resolve this

The recession and bad timber market were not kind to our initial IRSC contract offering and the Forest was forced to repackage that offering. The stewardship offering has since been awarded and implementation started. We will continue to work closely with the Regional Office to identify opportunities and efficiencies in this area. Because economics is so important to these vegetation management activities, the Forest would also like to begin working with the Regional Office to incorporate an economics package into the Restoration Strategy. As well, the Tapash Collaborative Economic Sustainability Task Force will continue working with individual Interdisciplinary Teams to identify ways to reduce costs, shorten timelines, and increase the outputs of CFLRP projects.

11. **Planned FY 2016 Accomplishments**

Performance Measure Code[11]	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment	Amount ($)
Acres treated annually to sustain or restore watershed function and resilience WTRSHD-RSTR-ANN	Acres		
Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres		
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres		
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre		
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC	Acres		
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions. S&W-RSRC-IMP	Acres		
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-LAK	Acres		
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles		
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres		
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved RG-VEG-IMP	Acres		
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance RD-HC-MAIN	Miles		
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance RD-PC-MAINT	Miles		
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles		
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles		

[11] Please include all relevant planned accomplishments, assuming that funding specified in the CFLRP project proposal for FY 2016 is available. Use actual planned funding if quantity is less than specified in CFLRP project work plan, and justify deviation from project work plan in question 13 of this template.

Performance Measure Code[11]	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment	Amount ($)
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles		
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage STRM-CROS-MTG-STD	Number		
Miles of system trail maintained to standard TL-MAINT-STD	Miles		
Miles of system trail improved to standard TL-IMP-STD	Miles		
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard LND-BL-MRK-MAINT	Miles		
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC	Acres	2,762	483,350. ($175/acre)
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF	40,000	Included above
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF		
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons		
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre		
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	2,800	420,000 ($150/acre).
Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands SP-INVSPE-FED-AC	Acres		
Number of priority acres treated annually for native pests on Federal lands SP-NATIVE-FED-AC	Acres		

12. **Planned FY 2016 accomplishment narrative** (no more than 1 page)

The FY2016 outputs emphasize two things – acres treated with prescribed fire and mechanical harvest to reduce fuels and commercial timber harvest and the associated timber sale volume. Integrated accomplishments in Forest Vegetation Improved, Range Vegetation Improved, and Terrestrial Habitat Improved would also be realized as a result of vegetation and fuel treatments.

Prescribed fire treatments are the highest priority, followed by non-commercial mechanical treatments. The Forest and Regional Office would coordinate closely in an effort to maximize burning windows. Given all the constraints on prescribed burning in this landscape, it is essential to have the RO's informed support as we enter periods of higher preparedness levels Nationally/Regionally each summer and yet locally we have favorable conditions for a landscape-scale prescribed fire.

Full implementation of the prescribed fire program would be the best possible outcome; however if found necessary, the "contingency" scenario would redirect the unspent prescribed burning funds based on a priority ranking where non-commercial mechanical treatments rank as the highest priority followed by road-related aquatic and fisheries improvements (road improvement and road decommissioning) providing for aquatic organism passage. Integrated accomplishments in Water or Soil Resources Protected, Maintained, or Improved to Achieve Desired Watershed Conditions and Miles of Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced have/would be realized as a result of the roads/aquatics treatments.

13. **Describe and provide narrative justification if planned FY 2015/16 accomplishments and/or funding differs from CFLRP project work plan** (no more than 1 page):

The project is submitting a proposal in FY15 to focus on the activities outlined above in FY16 for implementation.