CFLR Project(Name/Number): Colorado Front Range Project/CFLR004

National Forest(s): **Arapaho & Roosevelt and Pike & San Isabel National Forests**

Responses to the prompts in this annual report should be typed directly into the template. Example information is included in red below. Please delete red text before submitting the final version.

1. Match and leveraged funds:

a. FY15 Matching Funds Documentation

Fund Source – (CFLN/CFLR Funds Expended[1])	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2015($)
CFLN14	$290,143
CFLN15	$1,338,424

Fund Source – (Funds expended from Washington Office funds (in addition to CFLR/CFLN)[2] (please include a new row for each BLI))	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2015($)
NFVW13	$660,869

Fund Source – (FS Matching Funds (please include a new row for each BLI)[3])	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2015($)
CMRD15	$53,833
RTRT15	$17,310
NFVW15	$131,350
NFWF15	$186,939
NFTM15	$173,863
WFHF15	$646,162

Fund Source – (Funds contributed through agreements[4])	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2015($)
NFXN15-Arbor Day Foundation (FY15)	$85,600
NFXN13-Denver Water ARP (FY13)	$16,288
NFXN14-Denver Water ARP (FY14)	$51,463
WFXN15-Denver Water PSICC (FY15)	$2,135,174
CWFS15-Colorado Springs Utilities (FY15)	$202,337
CWFS14-Colorado Springs Utilities (FY14)	$124,097

[1] This amount should match the amount of CFLR/CFLN dollars obligated in the PAS expenditure report. Include prior year CFLN dollars expended in this Fiscal Year.

[2] This value (aka carryover funds or WO unobligated funds) should reflect the amount expended of the allocated funds as indicated in the FY15 program direction, but does not necessarily need to be in the same BLIs or budget fiscal year as indicated in the program direction.

[3] This amount should match the amount of matching funds obligated in the PAS expenditure report. These funds plus the Washington Office funds (unobligated funds) listed above should total the matching funds obligated in the PAS report.

[4] Please document any partner contributions to implementation and monitoring of the CFLR project through an income funds 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.

Fund Source – (Partner In-Kind Contributions[5])	**Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2015($)**
Colorado Forest Restoration Institute	$23,500
Front Range Roundtable (CFLR monitoring team and UMC)	$27,940

Service work accomplishment through goods-for services funding within a stewardship contract (*For Contracts Awarded in FY15)*	**Totals**
Total amount of stewardship credits charged for contracts awarded in FY15[6]	$0
Total revised credit limit for contracts awarded in in FY15[7]	$0

Service work accomplishment through goods-for services funding within a stewardship contract (For Contracts Awarded Prior to FY15)	**Totals**
Total amount of stewardship credits charged in FY15[8]	$23,412
Total revised credit limit for open and closed contracts awarded and previously reported prior to FY15[9]	$176,002

[5] Total partner in-kind contributions for implementation and monitoring of a CFLR project. Partner contributions for Fish, Wildlife, Watershed work can be found in WIT database. Please list the partner organizations that provided in-kind contributions.
[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.
[7] This should be the amount in contract's "Progress Report for Stewardship Contracts, Integrated Resources Contracts or Agreements" in cell J46, the "Revised Credit Limit," *as of September 30*. Additional information on the Progress Reports is available in CFLR Annual Report Instructions document.
[8] This should be the amount in the "stewardship credits charged" column at the end of the fiscal year in the TSA report TSA90R-01.
[9] This should be the amount in each contract's "Progress Report for Stewardship Contracts, Integrated Resources Contracts or Agreements" in cell J46, the "Revised Credit Limit." *For open contracts*, this should be as of September 30. *For closed contracts*, this should be at the time of contract closure.

b. Please provide a narrative or table describing leveraged funds in your landscape in FY2015 (one page maximum).

The following table provides information on funds that were used by partners to accomplish hazardous fuels reduction and restoration activities on non-National Forest System lands (private land, State and local government land) within the Colorado Front Range CFLR project area. These treatments are an important component of accomplishing goals of the landscape level changes envisioned with this CFLR project. The funds and treatment acres presented in the table are not the total treatments, but only represent the large efforts where data is available for this annual report

Organization	**Location**	**Type of Treatment**	**Acres Treated**	**External Dollars Used**	**USDA/FS Grant Dollars**
Coalition for the Upper South Platte	Non USFS within CFLRA Boundary	Restoration/Haz Fuels Reduction	792	$852k	$299k
Denver Water	Non USFS within CFLRA Boundary	Restoration/Haz Fuels Reduction	3,710	$30k	$0
Colorado State Forest Service	Non USFS within CFLRA Boundary	Restoration/Haz Fuels Reduction	6,381	$7.4M	$3.63M
Colorado Springs Utilities – Forest Restoration	Non USFS within CFLRA Boundary	Restoration/Haz Fuels Reduction	672	$340k	$0
USDA- NRCS	Non USFS within CFLRA Boundary	Restoration/Haz Fuels Reduction	1,400	$0	$1.1m (NRCS Funds)
Jefferson Conservation District	Non USFS within CFLRA Boundary	Restoration/Haz Fuels Reduction	600	$500k	$0
Waldo Fire Recovery Group	Non USFS within CFLRA Boundary	Post Fire Restoration	See Waldo Canyon Wildfire Update in Section 2	$14.4M	$85k

2a. Discuss how the CLFR project contributes to accomplishment of the wildland fire goals in the *10-Year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan* and **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).

In the 2006 *Living With Fire* report, the Front Range Roundtable identified some 1.5 million acres of lower montane forests along Colorado's Front Range as in need of treatment to mitigate fire hazard, protect communities, improve forest health, and advance ecological restoration objectives. Within this 1.5 million acre landscape, approximately 800,000 acres were deemed suitable for ecological restoration, with the overall goal of reducing forest densities, restoring spatial heterogeneity at multiple scales, and restoring a fire regime more characteristic of historical conditions. Of these priority acres, 400,000 acres are located on federally managed lands. Restoration efforts on these lands accelerated in 2010 with the awarding a Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program (CFLRP) project to the Front Range Roundtable. Approximately 32,000 acres were identified for treatment under the CFLRP throughout the Front Range, from the Pike-San Isabel National Forest (PSICC) in the southern Front Range to the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest (ARP) in the northern Front Range. The formation of the Landscape Restoration (LR) team of the Roundtable followed the CFLRP award, with a charge of describing desired conditions for Front Range forests and developing an ecological monitoring plan to assess progress in achieving these conditions.

In 2011, the LR team published its multi-party monitoring plan, which provides a framework for determining whether restoration treatments are having desired effects. Desired trends agreed to by the LR Team include:

- Tree density – Are we decreasing basal area and trees per acre through restoration treatments?
- Tree sizes – Are we increasing quadratic mean tree diameters?
- Tree ages – Are we increasing the ratio of old trees (>200 years old) to transitional and young trees?
- Stand-scale spatial heterogeneity – Are we increasing the number of tree clumps and openings?
- Tree species – Are we increasing the proportion of basal area in ponderosa pine relative to other conifer species?
- Surface fuels – Are we decreasing litter, duff, and coarse woody debris?
- Fire behavior – Are we reducing crown fire potential at 90% weather conditions?
- Understory vegetation – Are we increasing grass, forb, and shrub cover?
- Wildlife – Are we increasing the occurrence of wildlife species expected in a restored landscape?

The CO Front Range Restoration Initiative (CO Front Range CFLRP) aims to restore lower montane forest structure and function by reducing forest densities, creating diverse patterns of forest structure at stand and landscape-scales, and reducing the potential for uncharacteristically severe wildfire. Common Stand Exam (CSE) data analyzed through 2013 suggest that many of the stand structural and fire hazard metrics identified in the CO Front Range CFLRP monitoring plan are moving in desired directions as a result of treatments. Treatments have been effective in reducing forest densities, bringing basal areas within a desired range of 40-80 ft2/acre. Smaller-diameter trees have been the focus of removals, thus improving the balance of tree size class distributions and increasing stand quadratic mean diameters. The change in stand structure brought about by treatments has resulted in favorable changes in modeled fire behavior as well. The increase in crowning index brought about by treatments is encouraging as it means that higher winds speeds would be necessary to sustain an active crown fire in treated stands currently compared to before treatment. This change in crowning index is likely due to the decrease in canopy bulk density. Overall, results presented here corroborate several independent studies in CO Front Range CFLRP treatment sites that found a 30% reduction in basal area, a 50% reduction in trees per acre, and an increase in canopy openness and opening sizes as a result of treatments.

Despite the reduced potential for crown fire, however, treatments have generally increased surface fuel loads as material (especially coarse woody debris) is redistributed to the forest floor. While opportunities for the use of prescribed fire are limited along the Front Range, the Landscape Restoration team will continue to recommend it as a necessary tool for achieving a wider range of treatment benefits and will consider incorporating the use of fire more explicitly as a desired condition. Restoration of a more characteristic fire regime (i.e. low to mixed-severity) is a primary goal of the CO Front Range CFLRP, yet is difficult to achieve without the use of prescribed fire.

The Landscape Restoration Team continues to make significant strides in formalizing an approach to Adaptive Management (AM) for CFLRP projects. Our AM model poses several direct questions that guide the collaborative in interpreting monitoring outcomes and using monitoring results to inform future treatment design and implementation: Are we treating the right areas? Are treatments contributing to desired conditions? Are we monitoring the right things? In April 2015, the LR team held its annual monitoring review session whereby LR team members gathered to review Common Stand Exam data and ask the question of whether treatments are contributing to desired conditions. The review sessions are an important step in implementing adaptive management and making a collective determination about whether treatments are contributing to desired conditions. Review sessions are held annually to provide an opportunity for LR team members to evaluate data as well as to review the monitoring program itself.

Lastly, in addition to depicting change and informing adaptive management, our monitoring has highlight information gaps and pointed to uncertainties that can be addressed by additional research. Specific questions have arisen from the CO Front Range CFLRP monitoring program, especially concerning post-treatment tree regeneration and opening sizes. Will openings become quickly colonized by tree regeneration? How much regeneration is too much? What is the appropriate range of opening sizes based on site conditions? These unknowns may provide opportunities for more targeted monitoring, as well research opportunities that the LR team will continue to explore.

2b. 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 will be documented in Question #6):

The 2015 wildfire season was unusually quiet along the Colorado Front Range. The Front Range experienced an extremely wet and snowy spring to make up for a drier than normal fall and winter that closed out 2014. Both forests had above-normal precipitation during the summer months and monsoon season, and both Forests had a lower than normal frequency of wildfires in 2015.The PSICC had 26 human-caused and 22 natural ignition wildfires for a total of 48 wildfires, burning a total of 103 acres. This is an average number of wildfires for the PSICC but the fire size was smaller than average. The PSICC was able to concentrate on the national fire emergencies and responded to all the fires in the Northwest, California and Idaho. Given the conditions, the PSICC was also able to complete more than 6,000 acres of prescribe burns on the forest.

Reported fires on the Arapaho and Roosevelt NF totaled less than half of an average season with only 47 fires totaling only 4.7 acres. In 2015, human caused fires made up the bulk of the activity with 45 fires, all less than 0.1 acres in size. The remaining 6 fires were lightening caused. None of these fire required initial attack beyond the first operational period. All were contained by the end of the next shift. There was no opportunity to contribute to the wildland fire restoration goals during the 2015 fire season. A closer to normal season for both forests would produce about 120 wildfires each or an average total of 240 wildfires.

In 2015, wildfires along Colorado's Front Range did not demonstrate large fire growth potential. The development of a neutral to weak La Nina pattern led to numerous Pacific hurricanes off Mexico pushing moisture into the Southwest and Colorado, contributing to fewer and less intense fire season. The weather pattern for late-2015 into 2016 is predicted to

be a "super" El Nino with higher than normal winter precipitation in the southwest portions of the state. It is too early to know what changes may occur in the 2016 fire season. This cycle of extreme dry conditions followed by extreme wet conditions has occurred along Colorado's Front Range for decades as demonstrated by 2012 through 2015 fire seasons.

As a reminder, Colorado's Front Range has had six significant wildfires during the last three years:

Year	Wildfire Name	Wildfire Statistics
2012	High Park Fire	Acreage Burned: 87,284 Homes Destroyed: 259 Deaths: 1 Total Suppression Cost: $39.2M
2012	Waldo Canyon Fire	Acreage Burned: 18,247 Homes Destroyed: 347 Deaths: 2 Total Suppression Cost: $125M+
2012	Hewlett Fire	Acreage Burned: 7,685 Homes Destroyed: 0 Deaths: 0 Total Suppression Cost: $2.9M
2012	Lower North Fork Fir	Acreage Burned: 4,140 Homes Destroyed: 27 Deaths: 3 Total Suppression Cost: $11M
2013	Black Forest Fire	Acreage Burned: 14,280 Homes Destroyed: 486 Deaths: 2 Total Suppression Cost: $9.3M
2014	Royal Gorge Fire	Acreage Burned: 3,218 Homes Destroyed: 0 (but Structures were destroyed and a portion of the Royal Gorge Bridge) Deaths: 0 Total Suppression Cost: $?

High Park and Hewlett Wildfire Updates

You may recall from previous reports that the record-setting drought and historically low snowpack in 2012 set the stage for the Hewlett and High Park Fires on the Canyon Lakes Ranger District of the ARP. The High Park Fire was ignited by lightning on private land June 9, 2012, and burned 87,284 acres (over 42,000 of National Forest System lands (NFS)) destroying 264 homes and killing one person. The fire was contained June 30 of that year. The High Park Fire burned into and around the Hewlett Fire, which burned 7,685 acres in May 2012. Both fires were in the area of the Cache la Poudre River and with both impacting watersheds for the Colorado Front Range.

Since the fires, restoration work has been occurring on both private and public lands. Larimer County, Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS), and water providers have been working closely with private landowners to implement much needed restoration work adjacent to NFS lands. To summarize past work that has occurred on NFS land, almost 6,600 acres of aerial applied mulch, 16 miles of trail stabilization and 8 miles of road stabilization. Hazardous tree removal has also occurred along trails. Noxious weed treatment has begun under a Participating Agreement with

Larimer County. Extensive restoration work with partners such as the High Park Restoration Coalition, the City of Greeley, the City of Fort Collins and the Arapaho Roosevelt Pawnee Foundation has occurred within both burn areas. Multiple research projects are on-going within the burn areas looking at: Soils (carbon movement, sediment transport), Mulching Effectiveness, Water Quality, Mountain Pine Beetle Effects, and Vegetation/Fire Effects. In 2015, stream channel restoration work was completed along Skin Gulch in the burn area, and analysis was started for stream channel restoration for an unnamed creek that flows in to Seaman Reservoir, a municipal water supply for the City of Fort Collins and Northern Colorado.

The Forest also authorized expenditure of High Park BAER funds in 2014 for some Level 3 monitoring being conducted by Rocky Mountain Research Station. This monitoring effort was concluded in 2015. No other High Park BAER work occurred in 2015.

Waldo Canyon Wildfire Update

The Waldo Canyon burn scar continued to receive above normal 30 year rainfall average events during the fall of 2014 and spring of 2015. The completed work in and around the burn scar continue to dissipate the energy, capture the debris flows and minimize the flooding impact to adjacent communities. The Waldo Recovery Group consists of more than 35 partners from Federal, State, and local governments, local and national non-profits and private landowners. To date, the Waldo Recovery Group partners have spent more than $46 million on restoration of public and private lands within and adjacent to the burn scar.

Of note, for FY15:

- CDOT completed $12.9 M of treatments including restoration and rehabilitation treatments on within their right of way on public and private lands to reduce the sediment loads coming from the burn scar.
    - Installation of a large box culvert on Highway 24 to keep debris flow off the highway,
    - Installation of 8 sediment detention basins installed to capture sediment and restore the natural floodplain within the drainage bottom,
    - Channel stabilization (5,400 feet or 4.3 acres), and
    - Hillslope treatments (131 acres) designed to stop headcuts in side drainages and capture sediment from steep hillsides.
- Additionally, the Glen Eyrie, a large private inholding, completed projects totaling 4.2 million including stream channel realignment on private land and completion of bridge replacement and road realignment to avoid the new stream channel.
- The Forest and partners and volunteers continued to play a significant role National Forest System and private land restoration work within and adjacent to the burn scar:
    - Rocky Mountain Field Institute's FY 2015 completed $86,810 worth of stabilization work and included the use of conservation crews that stabilized 8 acres of the burn scar.
    - Coalition for the Upper South Platte (CUSP) completed $1,368,292 dollars of restoration work including channel stabilization, flood mitigation, seeding, planting and installing erosion control barriers.
- The photo below shows before & after example of a volunteer headcut stabilization project in the Waldo Canyon.

Other Related Fire Management Activities

The ARP began hosting an Exclusive Use (EU) helitack program in 2014 that continued in 2015. The aircraft and crew service on the ARF from mid-June to mid-September each year, based at the Hotshot Base/Engine Station in Fort Collins, Colorado. We have re-configured our firefighting capacity by converting an IA module and Engine module to the helitack crew. The program will be administered and led by the ARF under the Canyon Lakes Ranger District FMO, with additional Crewmembers from Colorado Division of Fire Prevention & Control, Boulder County and local Fire agencies. The Manager, Assistant Manager and Squad Leader positions were filled permanently before the 2015 fire season.

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

The expenditure amounts were based upon Forest Service financial records, agreement documents, partner reports and estimates of in kind contribution based upon attendance records. The percentage used on contracts was based upon contract costs. The monitoring percentages were based upon agreements, contracts or workplan amounts. The contract funding distributions was based upon contract records. The volume estimates were based upon contracted volume estimates. The products distribution was based upon comparison of saw log and biomass estimates in contract estimates.

FY 2015Jobs Created/Maintained (FY15 CFLR/CFLN/WO carryover funding):

Type of projects	Direct part and full-time jobs	Total part and full-time jobs	Direct Labor Income	Total Labor Income[10]
Commercial Forest Product Activities	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Other Project Activities	**18**	**18**	**$154,937**	**$188,626**
TOTALS:	**18**	**18**	**$154,937**	**$188,626**

[10] *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.*

FY2015Jobs Created/Maintained (FY15 CFLR/CFLN/WO 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[11]
Commercial Forest Product Activities	**45**	**77**	**$1,627,047**	**$2,671,066**
Other Project Activities	**52**	**61**	**$1,766,532**	**$2,121,785**
TOTALS:	**97**	**138**	**$3,393,579**	**$4,792,851**

4. Describe other community benefits achieved and the methods used to gather information about these benefits. **How has CFLR and related activities benefitted your community from a social and/or economic standpoint?** (Please limit answer to two pages).

The social and economic monitoring assessment for the Colorado Front Range Project is being generated through an agreement with the Colorado Forest Restoration Institute (CFRI). The current analysis for the 2015 Annual Report is in progress and will not be available until June of 2016. Results of this analysis will be presented in the 2016 Annual Report. The economic and utilization statistics are calculated from implementation information 2 to 3 years prior to the current annual report. This delay is the result of contract implementation schedules. The most current information was displayed in last year's 2014 Annual Report and was based on the 2013 Social and Economic Monitoring Assessment completed by the CFRI. The 2014 assessment results will be displayed in the 2016 Annual Report. No additional information is available at this time.

5. Based on your project monitoring plan, describe the multiparty monitoring process. What parties (who) are involved in monitoring, and how? What is being monitored? Please briefly share key broad monitoring results and how results received to date are informing subsequent management activities (e.g. adaptive management), if at all. What are the current weaknesses or shortcomings of the monitoring process? (Please limit answer to two pages. Include a link to your monitoring plan if it is available).

Multi-Party Monitoring Process

A subgroup of the Front Range Roundtable (FRR), the Landscape Restoration Team (LR Team) was tasked with the creation of a CFLRP monitoring plan. The Monitoring Plan was successfully developed in June 2011. The CFLRP Monitoring Plan was the result of intense multiple stakeholder learning and deliberations by the LR Team. The multiple stakeholder group consisted of members of both the Pike and San Isabel and Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forests, USFS R2-Regional Office, Colorado State Forest Service, US Geological Survey, Colorado Parks and Wildlife, Natural Resource Conservation Service, The Nature Conservancy, The Wilderness Society, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Colorado Forest Restoration Institute, and the Tree Ring Laboratory at Colorado State University.

[11] *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.*


Ecological Monitoring Program

The monitoring plan outlines a comprehensive ecological monitoring program to assess success of CFLRP treatments after project implementation, and guides future treatments through an adaptive management framework. Monitoring results are being used both to evaluate the rate and extent of achievement of individual project goals, and to incorporate data into analyses of cumulative effects at the landscape level. The monitoring protocols are designed to address specific Desired Conditions. Desired Conditions are expressed in broad, general terms, with achievement occurring at the end of the 10-year period. The group established Desired Ecological Conditions, based on the original CFLRP proposal, and which determined the group's choice of variables to measure and protocols to use. They are: establish a complex mosaic of forest density, size and age (at stand scales); establish a more favorable species composition favoring ponderosa pine over other conifers; establish a more characteristic fire regime; increase coverage of native understory plant communities; increase the occurrence of wildlife species that would be expected in a restored lower montane forest; establish a complex mosaic of forest density, size and age, all at the landscape scale.

Key Monitoring Results

Accomplishments and ecological monitoring results for the forest restoration treatments described below were collected through 2015. These results draw on previous monitoring reports produced by the Landscape Restoration Team to provide a cumulative view of treatment effects through the life of the CO Front Range Project to date. Forest structural metrics such as tree density and fuels are the focus of the ecological monitoring, and are based on data available as part of the Forest Service's Common Stand Exam. Primary accomplishments include:

- Approximately 14,753 acres have been treated across the Pike-San Isabel and Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forests through 2015.
- Treatments have consistently reduced forest density (basal areas and trees per acre) through mechanical and manual thinning.
- Tree removals have focused primarily on conifers, thus increasing the ratio of aspen to conifers within treated areas.
- Tree removals have also focused on smaller-diameter trees. Quadratic mean tree diameters have increased within treated areas as a result.
- While total live tree biomass has decreased within treatments as a result of tree removals, surface fuels have generally increased as material is redistributed to the forest floor.
- The potential for active crown fire has been reduced through treatments. Crowning indices based on operational fire behavior models have increased due to treatments, meaning that higher wind speeds are necessary to sustain active crown fire now as a result of more open stand conditions created by treatments.

- The Collaborative has made significant strides in outlining an adaptive management process and describing key steps that should be undertaken in order to incorporate monitoring results and lessons learned into future management.

Wildlife Monitoring Program

Wildlife monitoring on the Colorado Front Range Project began in 2011 with a preliminary assessment of possible monitoring options for wildlife species that might be affected by the treatments done in the CFLR Project Area. Representatives from the US Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW), US Geological Survey (USGS) and the US Forest Service (FS) discussed the list of species known to occur in Front Range lower-montane ponderosa pine forests. Based on their professional opinions, experience, and searches of the relevant scientific literature, the group made informal predictions of the potential effects of the restoration treatments on each species (or "guild" of species with similar habitat requirements) and discussed the possible costs, benefits, feasibility, and rationale for monitoring each species.

In the summers of 2011-13, funding from the Southern Rockies Landscape Conservation Cooperative (SRLCC) was granted to a sub-team of the SM Team to implement a more general wildlife use survey protocol on a subset of the Common Stand Exam plots being established pre- and post-treatment on CFLR units to monitor changes in over-story and fuels. These wildlife sign surveys included: nests, burrows, scat, and feeding sign from five "guilds" or groups of species with similar habitat requirements (birds, tree squirrels, small mammals, large mammals, and ungulates). Pitfall traps were also used to monitor occurrence of ground-dwelling insects. Preliminary analyses indicate that 90-100% of all plots had wildlife sign (from at least one guild) pre-treatment, but a year after the treatments, this value dropped to 75% for treated plots and remained at 90+% for untreated plots. Sign left by individual guilds did not show significant changes in abundance post-treatment, but the timeframe may still be too short for trends to become apparent. Future surveys in years five, seven, and 10, as well as correlation of wildlife use data with data from other monitoring efforts, are needed to discern detectable trends over time and evaluate progress toward desired conditions for wildlife habitat at this project-level scale. Analysis is in progress for the data from the SRLCC study, and a final report and manuscript are being developed.

In November of 2012, a second effort at developing a broader-scale wildlife monitoring plan was launched and the Wildlife Working Team (WWT) was formed as a sub-team of the LR Team. The WWT is made up of biologists and ecologists from the US Forest Service, Colorado Parks and Wildlife (formally CDOW), and US Geological Survey (USGS). Several members of the WWT are also members of the LR team so communication between teams is frequent and updates are provided to ensure transparency and solicit feedback.

The team started their work by assessing the approximately 300 species that could occur within the lower montane CFLRP landscape-level footprint and would meet the needs of the Forest Service and CFLR monitoring programs. Through discussions about likelihood of occurrence and influence of CFLR projects on each species, the list was filtered to 145 species of potential interest. The team then assigned "scores" to each species within the categories of "Ecologically Important" "Politically Prudent" and "Socially and/or Economically Important" and applied specific criteria to further refine the list to 64 species which had high scores in one or more of these categories. From those 64 species, we considered stressors, life histories, sampling approaches, standard monitoring protocols, and other factors to evaluate which species (or groups of similar species) could be monitored to generate the most useful information about the effects of the CFLRP on wildlife habitat. The final result was a list of 12 candidate species/ groups including bats, songbirds/woodpeckers, selected raptors and owls, tree squirrels, and carabid beetles.

The team then determined and defined Tier 1 and Tier 2 species monitoring. Tier 1 species include songbirds/woodpeckers, tree squirrels, and the Northern Goshawk. For these species, monitoring will be accomplished using CFLR funds and will likely occur on a rotational basis (not every species every year) based on priority and funding. For the Tier 2 species/groups - bats and carabid beetles - monitoring will be conducted based on the availability of interested partners and supplemental funding opportunities.

In 2014, the WWT initiated monitoring of select Tier 1 species (songbirds and tree squirrels) by procuring a 5 year agreement between the Forest Service and Rocky Mountain Bird Observatory (RMBO) and developing a spatially balanced sampling approach to estimate density and occupancy rates across the CFLR landscape (defined to include both CFLR treatment projects and untreated areas). In May 2014, the first field season was implemented and songbirds and pine squirrels were monitored by RMBO using protocols from the Integrated Monitoring of Bird Conservation Regions (IMBCR). A total of 120 sample units (1800+ avian points) were surveyed across the CFLRP landscape in treated and untreated areas and data analysis will occur in the Winter/Spring of 2015. The WWT began monitoring Abert's squirrels using remote camera stations at approximately 40 locations across the CFLRP landscape (see above photo). They developed a draft protocol for conducting Abert's squirrel feeding sign surveys and field tested it for future use by RMBO; the goal is to incorporate feeding sign surveys into the IMBCR point surveys.

2015 Progress for Wildlife Working Team (WWT):

Year 2 of the Agreement with Bird Conservancy of the Rockies (formally Rocky Mountain Bird Observatory) was implemented for sampling of Tier 1 avian species and pine squirrels under the IMBCR.

A protocol for integrating Abert's squirrel feeding sign surveys into the IMBCR was finalized and piloted in the field by BCR (RMBO).

The Team continued monitoring Abert's squirrels using remote camera stations at approximately 40 locations across the CFLRP landscape; data analysis will occur in the winter/spring of 2016.

Quarterly WWT meetings are held to discuss on-going and future monitoring and data management needs as well as WWT role in the FRCFLP and associated teams.

Understory Monitoring Program

In early 2014, key members of the Landscape Restoration Team formed the Understory Monitoring Team to identify important monitoring questions and to develop an Understory Monitoring Plan to address the questions. The team identified the following questions as being critical to the understory restoration monitoring efforts:

- Have restoration treatments increased or maintained total native plant cover and diversity?
- Have treatments increased or maintained the cover and diversity of native graminoids, forbs, and shrubs?
- Have treatments increased the cover and diversity of native early successional species?
- How have treatments increased or maintained the cover of key native plants (to be defined by ARNF/PSINF personnel)?
- Have treatments minimized increases in total exotic plant cover or diversity?
- Have treatments minimized increases in the cover of exotic species of concern (e.g., noxious weeds)?

Understory Monitoring Process

Understory monitoring for the Colorado Front Range Project is focused on five landscape-scale treatment areas that are slated for treatment in late 2015 or early 2016. The areas contain one or more units that will be treated using techniques such as mechanical thinning, hand thinning, and prescribed fire. While the treatment prescriptions that were developed are consistent within the units, they are variable within and across the landscape. The understory monitoring process was developed in collaboration with the Rocky Mountain Research Station and the Colorado Forest Restoration Institute at CSU.

Inventory plots have been established within most or all of the units (treatment plots) and plots within surrounding comparable stands that are not slated for treatment in the next decade (control plots). Stand cover type was defined as either ponderosa pine and dry mixed conifer (i.e., dominated by ponderosa pine and/or Douglas-fir), or wet mixed conifer (i.e., mixed stands of ponderosa pine, Douglas-fir, lodgepole pine, blue spruce, Engelmann spruce, aspen, and/or subalpine fir). The monitoring target is 200 to 250 plots for thefirst phase of the process.

For treatment plots, we will leverage existing Common Stand Exam (CSE) plots to the maximal extent possible. The CSE plots to be leveraged for a unit will be randomly selected from the available pool. New plots within the treatment unit will be added if needed to obtain an adequate spatial distribution across the unit and across forest cover types. For all control plots, we will randomly establish new plots.

The presence of all understory species will be noted and the percent cover of understory species (i.e., graminoids, forbs, shrubs) and forest floor substrates will be measured. The number of occurrences of each species and substrate type will be tallied to determine the percent cover for each species and substrate. Furthermore, if key native plants or exotic species of concern are encountered during this search, estimated cover will be noted. Surface fuels will be measured using the Brown's transects protocol. Downed woody fuels will be inventoried. These data will be gathered 1-2 years pre-treatment, 1-2 years post-treatment, 4-5 years post-treatment, and 8-9 years post-treatment. Monitoring results will be presented in the 2016 and beyond annual reports.

6. FY 2015 accomplishments

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished [12]	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)[13]
Acres treated annually to sustain or restore watershed function and resilience WTRSHD-RSTR-ANN	Acres	0		
Acrs of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres	996	17,310	RTRT15
			85,600	NFXN15-Arbor Day
			151,710	WFXN15-Denver Water PSICC
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	3,095	911,997	CFLN15
			162,480	CFLN14
			28,819	NFXN14-Denver Water ARP
			9,122	NFXN13-Denver Water ARP
			1,110,740	WFXN15-Denver Water PSICC
			3,643	NFVW15
			660,869	NFVW13
			186,939	NFWF15
			323,081	WFHF15
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	529	124,844	NFVW15
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC	Acres	0		
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions. S&W-RSRC-IMP	Acres	0		
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-LAK	Acres	0		
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	0		
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	4,539		See FOR-VEG-IMP
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved RG-VEG-IMP	Acres	0		

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

[13] 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 [12]	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)[13]
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance RD-HC-MAIN	Miles	0		
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance RD-PC-MAINT	Miles	0		
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	0		
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles	0		
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles	0		
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage STRM-CROS-MTG-STD	Number	0		
Miles of system trail maintained to standard TL-MAINT-STD	Miles	0		
Miles of system trail improved to standard TL-IMP-STD	Miles	0		
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard LND-BL-MRK-MAINT	Miles	0		
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC	Acres	0		
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF	4,660		See TMBR-VOL-SLD
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	8,108	$173,863	NFTM15
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons	0		
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	609	64,616	WFHF15

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished [12]	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)[13]
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	2,438	716,570	CFLN15
			127,663	CFLN14
			258,465	WFHF15
			2,863	NFVW15
			872,724	WFXN15-Denver Water PSICC
			22,644	NFXN14-Denver Water ARP
			7,166	NFXN13-Denver Water ARP
			202,337	CWFS15-Colorado Springs Utilities
			124,097	CWFS14-Colorado Springs Utilities
Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands SP-INVSPE-FED-AC	Acres	0		
Number of priority acres treated annually for native pests on Federal lands SP-NATIVE-FED-AC	Acres	0		

7. FY 2015 accomplishment narrative – Summarize key accomplishments and evaluate project progress. (Please limit answer to three pages.)

FRONT RANGE LONG TERM STEWARDSHIP CONTRACT

In 2015, the principal contractor of the Front Range Long Term Stewardship Contract (LTSC), West Range Reclamation LLC (WRR), filed for bankruptcy and entered court proceedings in an effort to reorganize and keep the company solvent. This situation has negatively affected the ability of the Arapaho-Roosevelt NF and Pike-San Isabel NF to acquire services to complete activities within the CFLRP area. Uncertainty around this contract led to no Long Term Stewardship Task Orders being awarded to WRR in FY15, and resulted in both Forests seeking other contracts to complete work in the CFLRP area in FY15. Unfortunately, WRR's status did not become evident until the spring of 2015 reducing the Forests' time to award stand-alone contract packages. A portion of the CO Front Range funding was transferred within the region to support additional restoration work on the Uncompahgre CFLRP project. Other funds were transferred out of the region to supplement national forest products output. Because of this, CO Front Range CFLRP accomplishments in FY15 were lower than planned. The uncertainty of the LTSC persists. We do not anticipate utilizing this contract as we have in the past.

FIRE TRANSFER OF FUNDS

In late FY15, there was a WO transfer of funds for nationwide fires suppression. This transfer directly affected the ability of both Forests to be able to contract services for planned activities within the CFLRP program area. CFLN funds were transferred resulting in some contracts not moving forward. Also, some appropriated matching funds were transferred, leaving less funding for matching contracts. This transfer coupled with the LTSC uncertainty resulted in accomplishing about 2,000 acres less than planned within the CFLRP area in FY15.

PIKE AND SAN ISABEL NATIONAL FORESTS

Despite the inability to use the LTSC, and with the effect of fire transfer, both Forests were able to contract out thousands of acres of restoration and fuels treatments. A little over 3,000 acres are contracted to restore ponderosa pine stands, and over 2,400 of WUI are to be thinned and hazardous fuels reduced. Timber volume was sold in the form of additional volume for existing contract within the CFLRP area. The restoration efforts on the Pike and San Isabel were recognized by the Arbor Day Foundation with a National Award for all the restoration activities that have been occurring within the CFLRP area.

Partnerships continue to contribute significantly to matching treatments within the CFLRP area and consistent with Colorado Front Range CFLRP goals for FY15. With nearly 1,000 acres of reforestation being funded by partnership funds, and over 2,400 of fuels reduction, partnership contributions are increasingly important in being able to fund activities within the area. The combined contribution of partnership funds in FY15 to fund treatments on NFS lands is a little over $2.6 million. Partners provided approximately 50 percent of the total matching funds.

The Pike National Forest implemented the 717 project, where the primary objective was to increase fine scale heterogeneity by emphasizing natural group openings among conifers while breaking up the canopy continuity to lessen the active crown fire potential. An additional objective was to create growing space for ponderosa pine and aspen to maintain and enhance these species within the project area.

UPPER MONUMENT CREEK

In Fiscal Year 2012,the 67,000-acre Upper Monument Creek landscape, within the Pike National Forest was identified as a CFLRP area of concern by the Forest Service and in because of its location in a high fire risk area in close proximity to previously analyzed and treated project areas, including the Trout West and Catamount Projects. In 2012, the Nature Conservancy convened the Upper Monument Creek (UMC) Landscape Restoration Initiative and collaborative group which is a diverse suite of agencies, organizations and individuals in the effort to accelerate the pace of urgently needed forest restoration recommendations that are science-based and collaboratively agreed to. The UMC Initiative builds on the work of the Front Range Roundtable, which has been working together since 2004 to dramatically increase forest management that reduces wildfire risks to communities and restores resilient ecological conditions in Front Range forests.

The Landscape Restoration team continues to work collaboratively within the Upper Monument project area, identifying treatment types and locations, defining Desired Conditions for the vegetation types encountered within

the project area, recommending design criteria, and provide other management recommendations. Public involvement and scoping was initiated in April 2014. In 2015, The Forest Service Interdisciplinary Team continued its field work and analysis for the proposed activities, and held a field trip for the Landscape Restoration team, and the larger Front Range Roundtable. The objective of the field was to discuss the proposed silviculture prescriptions in an interactive way and discuss their outcome within the larger group. The rest of the summer and fall of 2015 was spent by the Forest Service ID team completing field work, completing specialist reports, and responding to public input, in anticipation of a Draft EIS for public comment in the spring of 2016.

Photos by Paige Lewis. Taken from: The Nature Conservancy, Upper Monument Creek Landscape Initiative Summary Report

ARAPAHO AND ROOSEVELT NATIONAL FORESTS

The Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forests attempted to award and implement CFLR projects in 2015 preparing over 1700 acres of restoration focused treatments within the CFLR project area. However, the contractor failed to accept any of the task orders at this time. Implementation of existing task orders suffered as well. The Forest attempted to procure a portion of the work through another contractor, but was unsuccessful due to impacts of fire transfer.

The primary accomplishment on the ARP this year was in fuel reduction by pile burning on nearly 500 acres. This accomplishment was supported by matching and partner funds. Progress was made in on-the-ground project preparation for 2016 implementation. We expect to have additional contract tools available for the next operating season. We anticipate awarding and implementing CFLR Projects to catch up on project goals.

The Forest is still challenged with applying restoration treatments in the complex stand conditions of the lower montane Front Range forest. Using designation by prescription or description has increased the time needed for contract preparation and administration. There is still significant public controversy over any kind of treatment in portions of the project area. Many of the neighbors to NFS lands hold considerable ownership in the view from their backyard. Many feel that restoration isn't needed or that it occurs naturally without management, except for fire suppression. A considerable amount of time has been spent in several of the project areas to work with and educate the public on CFLR project goals, objectives, and techniques. Work on this challenge continues.

During our annual monitoring field trip in July, 2015, the collaborative and monitoring team visited several implemented project areas on the Forest to gain a better understanding of how treated stands respond over time. The monitoring field trip to the ARP focused on visiting previously treated stands that emphasized restoring historic stand conditions by creating openings, thinning between residual trees, and retaining uncut clumps of trees. Feedback from the field trip participants included the need to remove more trees, increase opening sizes, include the use of prescribed fire to treat surface fuels, and that specific wildlife goals should be emphasized in many of the stands. This kind of feedback proves valuable in developing out-year projects. At the last field trip stop the team spent time discussing the balance of restoration science, implementation economics, and social influence as a driver for project design. It was a lively discussion in the pouring rain.


Before Treatment Stand Conditions


After Treatment Stand Conditions

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?

Fiscal Year	**Total number of acres treated (treatment footprint)**
Total in FY15	14,753 acres
FY10, FY11, FY12, FY13, FY14, and FY15 {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)}	FY10 – 988 acres FY11 – 4,081 acres FY12 – 3,284 acres FY13 – 2,978 acres FY14 – 2,638 acres FY15 – 784 acres

Please briefly describe how you arrived at the total number of footprint acres: what approach did you use to calculate the footprint?

The total number of footprint acres funded by CFLN and In Lieu of Funds was gathered through the review of contract and force account treatment acres for each given year. The contract and force account treatments were generated through GPS data collected prior to treatment. The table above does not include any matching acres from this or previous fiscal years.

Our low acres this year are related to issues with the Front Range Long Term Stewardship Contract (see Section 7). Given that we had issues with our contracting mechanisms, the Regional Forester made a decision to transfer almost $1M of our CFLN In Lieu of Funds to the GUMG CFLRP and out of Region 2 and $650k of our CFLN was provided to Fire Transfer.

9. Describe any reasons that the FY 2015 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).

See Response to Number 7 and 8 for the description of FRLTSC issues, transfer of CFLN In Lieu of Funds and Fire Transfer of CFLN funds.

10. Planned FY 2017 Accomplishments

Performance Measure Code14	**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	1,000	500,000
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	2,200	3,200,000
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	1,500	300,000
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		

Please include all relevant planned accomplishments, assuming that funding specified in the CFLRP project proposal for FY 2017 is available. Use actual planned funding if quantity is less than specified in CFLRP project work plan.

Performance Measure Code14	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment	Amount ($)
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		
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		
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF		
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	5,000	
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons		

Performance Measure Code14	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment	Amount ($)
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	3,400	4,000,000
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		

11. Planned FY 2017 accomplishment narrative (no more than 1 page).

The planned FY 2017 accomplishments are based upon full proposal funding. Our ability to implement the planned acres is dependent upon the currently unknown capacity of the FRLTSC and other contracting opportunities which we will continue to assess. FY 2017 accomplishment will continue to emphasize restoration treatments in the ponderosa pine ecosystem and hazardous fuels reduction in WUI. Partners have agreed to fund noxious weed treatments associated with their projects so both forests will continue to accomplish noxious weed treatments within the CFLR project. In addition, Waldo Restoration activities will slow down in 2017 as a result of reduced federal funding.

12. Describe and provide narrative justification if planned FY 2016/17accomplishments and/or funding differs from CFLRP project work plan (no more than 1 page):

The FY 2016/17estimated accomplishments generally do not differ from the project proposal. The accomplishments include noxious weed treatment, watershed improvement and wildlife habitat improvement that were addressed but not specified in the proposal.

As stated in previous annual reports, it is likely that partner contributions to matching funds are not sustainable over the long term. This may result in challenges in the future.

Accomplishments may be less than originally planned as a result of the issues with the FRLTSC if we are unable to use the FRLTSC, find contractors able to complete the restoration activities, or if contract costs are higher, then few acres may be accomplished.

13. **Please include an up to date list of the members of your collaborative** (name and affiliation, if there is one). If the information is available online, you can simply include the hyperlink here. If you have engaged new collaborative members this year, please provide a brief description of their engagement.

The primary collaborative group for the Colorado Front Range CFLR Project is the Front Range Roundtable. The Roundtable is a coalition of individuals from state and federal agencies, local governments, environmental and conservation organizations, the academic and scientific communities, and industry and user groups, all with a commitment to forest health and fire risk mitigation along Colorado's Front Range. The Roundtable's focus area encompasses 10 Front Range counties: **Boulder, Clear Creek, Douglas, El Paso, Gilpin, Grand, Jefferson, Larimer, Park and Teller.** There are over 300 members of the original collaborative with a core participating group of over 100 individuals. See Attachment A.

Below is a list of the Landscape Restoration Team and their affiliation. This team is responsible for CFLR Project monitoring.

Landscape Restoration Team	Affiliation
Rob Addington	The Nature Conservancy
Greg Aplet	The Wilderness Society
Mike Battaglia	USFS, RMRS
Hannah Bergmann	Colorado State University, CFRI
Jenny Briggs	US Geological Survey
Peter Brown	Rocky Mtn Tree-Ring Research
Tony Cheng	Colorado State University
Casey Cooley	Colorado Parks and Wildlife
Yvette Dickinsen	Michigan Tech University
Lynne Deibel	USFS, ARP
Dick Edwards	USFS, ARP
Jonas Fienstein	USDA NRCS

Landscape Restoration Team	Affiliation
Paula Fornwalt	USFS, RMRS
Jim Gerleman	USFS, PSICC
Hal Gibbs	Private Citizen, Retired USFS
Chad Julian	CFRI, WUI Center
Paige Lewis	The Nature Conservancy
Mark Martin	USFS, ARP
Sara Mayben	USFS, PSICC
Kristin Pelz	Colorado State University, CFRI
Rick Truex	USFS, R2
Jeff Underhill	USFS, R2
Brett Wolk	Colorado State University, CFRI
Kevin Zimlinghaus	USFS, ARP

14. **How has your project increased support from partners in terms of in-kind contributions and funding?** (no more than one page):

- CFLR Project Area overlaps with critical municipal watershed for the City of Denver. The CFLR Project allows us to match partner contributions.
- Treatment objectives are in-line with partner goals.
- CFLR Project has enhanced our relationship with Colorado State University and the Colorado Forest Restoration Institute.
- An ARP forest position has included a partnership coordinator role to promote program activities and to support CFLR project and monitoring coordination.

Partner Investments Overview: Since 2009, the water & energy partners have contributed $28 million across the landscape and plan to invest approximately $8 million more by 2018 for a total investment of $36 million for treatments on NFS and non-NFS lands.

Partner Funds have completed the following work on NFS Lands within the landscape:

- ✓ 30,500 acres treated (hazardous fuel removal, prescribed burns, wetland and riparian restoration, and invasive species treatments);

- ✓ 800,000 trees planted in burned areas;
- ✓ 80 miles of trails and roads restored, constructed or decommissioned;
- ✓ 4 miles of stream channels reconstructed; and
- ✓ 2,700 volunteers engaged

We anticipate our partnerships in this landscape to continue at this level, or higher over the next five years.

15. **Media recap**. Please share with us any hyperlinks to videos, newspaper articles, press releases, scholarly works, and photos of your project in the media that you have available.

Below is the link to our Collaborative, the Front Range Roundtable. There you will find recent publications, videos, newspaper articles, etc…

http://frontrangeroundtable.org/

ARP Signatures:

Recommended by (Project Coordinator(s)): _____

Approved by (ARP Forest Supervisor(s)): for _____

(OPTIONAL) Reviewed by (collaborative chair or representative): _____

PSICC Signatures:

Recommended by (Project Coordinator(s)): _____

Approved by (PSICC Forest Supervisor(s)): _____

(OPTIONAL) Reviewed by (collaborative chair or representative): _____

Appendix A: Complete list of Front Range Round Table collaborative group member.

Name	Organization
Rob Addington	The Nature Conservancy
Jill Alexander	Douglas County
Kelsey Alexander	Colorado Timber Industry Association
Richard Alper	Private citizen
Steve Alton	US Forest Service, RMRS
Sue Anderson	ARP Foundation
Kathy Andrew	El Paso County
Greg Aplet	The Wilderness Society
Ron Archuleta	US Forest Service, ARP
Darla Arians	Boulder County
Denise Arthur	Habitat Management Inc.
Kevin Atchley	US Forest Service, ARP
Steve Aulerich	Forest Engineering
Mike Babler	Private citizen
Eric Bader	Sunshine Fire Protection District
Roger Baker	Gilpin County
Gary Barber	City of Greeley
John Barnett	City of Greeley
Pete Barry	Colorado State University
Mike Battaglia	US Forest Service, RMRS
Mary Bauer	Private citizen
Gali Beh	Beh Management Consulting, Inc.
Geof Bell	US Forest Service
Maria Beltran	US Forest Service, PSICC
Ben Ben-Horin	University of Colorado at Denver
Barry Bennett	Indian Peaks Forest Alliance (IPFA)
John Bennett	For the Forest
Jim Bensberg	El Paso County
Heather Bergman	Peak Facilitation Group
Hannah Bergmann	CFRI
Karen Berry	Conservation Districts and Colorado Geological Survey
Daniel Beveridge	Colorado Division of Fire Prevention and Control
Rosalie Bianco	Environmental Energy Partners
Ben Blaugrund	Gold Hill Fire Protection District
Mark Boche	The Colorado Mountain Club
Scott Braden	US Geological Survey
Jenny Briggs	US Geological Survey
Donna Brosemer	Greeley Water
Peter Brown	Rocky Mountain Tree-Ring Research
Jonathan Bruno	Coalition for the Upper South Platte
Gary Bumgarner	Blue Knight Group
John Burke	Blue Knight Group

Evan Burks	USDS Natural Resources Conservation Service
Jeremy Buss	Natural Resources Conservation Service
Mike Caggiano	Colorado State University
Coleen Campbell	Colorado Air Pollution Control Division
Glenn Casamassa	US Forest Service, ARP
Patty Champ	US Forest Service, RMRS
John Chapman	Southern Rockies Conservation Alliance
Tony Cheng	Colorado State University
Jeanna Childers	US Forest Service, R2
Sallie Clark	El Paso County
Sylvia Clark	US Forest Service, ARP
Connor Coleman	Aspen Valley Land Trust
Erin Connelly	Pike San Isabel National Forest
Casey Cooley	Colorado Parks & Wildlife
Barb Crawford	Crystal Lakes HOA
Shawna Crocker	Colorado State Forest Service
Gary Cure	County Sheriffs of Colorado
Michael Czaja	Colorado State University
Rob Davis	Forest Energy Colorado
Megan Davis	Boulder County
Sam Dearstyne	CFRI
Lynne Deibel	US Forest Service, ARP
Chuck Dennis	West Range Reclamation, LLC
Philip DeSenze	USFS
Steve Dietemeyer	ARP Foundation
Marc Dettenrieder	Teller County
Yvette Dickinson	Michigan Tech University
Kathy Dillon Durica	Crystal Lakes HOA
Amanda Dixon	Larimer County
Dave Dombach	Dombach Trail Project Management
Cindy Domenico	Boulder County
Terri Donelly	Red Feather Lakes HOA
Tom Donnelly	Larimer County
Mary Douglas	Red Feather Lakes HOA
Marla Downing	US Forest Service
Joseph (Joe) Duda	Colorado State Forest Service
Richard Dziomba	Blue Knight Group
Rich Edwards	Colorado State Forest Service
Gloria Edwards	Colorado State University
Richard (Dick) Edwards	US Forest Service, Canyon Lakes
Tom Eisenman	Park County
Carol Ekarius	Coalition for the Upper South Platte
Leslie Ellwood	US Fish & Wildlife Service
Laura Emerson	Big Thompson River Coalition

Seth Ex	Colorado State University
Brian Faith	The Nature Conservancy
Jonas Feinstein	Natural Resources Conservation Service
Cheri Ford	US Forest Service, R2
Susan Ford	US Forest Service, R2
Susan Ford	
Paula Fornwalt	US Forest Service, RMRS
Daniel Fosha	Private citizen
Randy Frank	Jefferson County
Pam Froemke	US Forest Service, RMRS
Tom Fry	American Forest Foundation
Marilyn Gally	Colorado Division of Emergency Management
Meredith Gartner	
Pat Gayner	Markit! Forest Management
Jim Gerleman	PSICC
Hal Gibbs	Private citizen
Kris Gibson	Gold Hill Fire Protection District
Daniel Godwin	
Scott Golden	Boulder County
Tim Gordon	Forestech, LLC
Gabriel Grelle	
Travis Griffin	Jefferson County Sheriff's Office
Faye Griffin	Jefferson County
Summer Grimes	Colorado State University
Chelsea Gunsalus	US Forest Service, ARP
Brett Haberstick	Sunshine Fire Protection District
Howard Hallman	Our Future Summit
Joseph Hansen	Jefferson Conservation District
Craig Hansen	US Fish & Wildlife Service
Claire Harper	US Forest Service, R2
Bob Harris	The Colorado Mountain Club
Kathy Hartman	Jefferson County
Polly Hays	US Forest Service
Jay Heeter	Colorado Mountain Club
Michael Henderson	Blue Knight Group
Mark Herndon	Markit! Forest Management
Dennis Hisey	El Paso County
Rich Homann	Colorado State Forest Service
Andy Hough	Douglas County
Eric Howell	Colorado Springs Utilities
Laurie Huckaby	US Forest Service, RMRS
Eddie Hurt	Mountain Shadows Community Association
Charles Hutton	Colorado State Forest Service
Amber Jack	El Paso County

Flo Jacobson	Colorado Renewable Resource Cooperative
Jeff Jahnke	Colorado State Forest Service
Jon Johnson	Colorado Renewable Resource Cooperative
Randal Johnson	Larkspur Fire Protection District
Craig Jones	CDJ Consulting
Chad Julian	Private citizen
Dale Karlin	Peterson Design
Merrill Kaufmann	US Forest Service, RMRS
Brian Keating	
Don Kennedy	Denver Water
Dan Kipervaser	US Forest Service
Matt Knott	Seedmasters
Dayton Knutson	Colorado State University
Noah Koerper	Office of U.S. Senator Michael Bennet
Jennifer Kovecses	Coalition for the Poudre River Watershed
Kathleen Krebs	Clear Creek County
Sioux Kuglitsch	American Panel Media
David Lasky	Sugarloaf Fire Protection District
Lyle Laverty	Society of American Foresters
Jason Lawhon	Colorado State University
Russell Leadingham	Lefthand Fire Protection District
Boyd Lebeda	Colorado State Forest Service
Lisa Leben	Clear Creek County
Victoria Lee	Beh Management Consulting, Inc.
Michael Lefsky	Colorado State University
Dan Len	US Forest Service, ARP
Terra Lenihan	Beh Management Consulting, Inc.
Mike Lester	Colorado State Forest Service
Paige Lewis	The Nature Conservancy
Patricia Limerick	Center of the American West
Patricia-Calendar Limerick	Center of the American West
Peggy Littleton	El Paso County
Ryan Ludlow	Boulder County
Torsten Lund Snee	USFS
Scott MacDonald	Black Forest Together, Inc.
Suzanne Maki	Jefferson County Board of Commissioners
Steve Malers	Confluence Energy
Mark Martin	US Forest Service, ARP
Bryan Martin	Colorado Mountain Club
Deborah Martin	US Geological Survey
Lisa Mason	Colorado State Forest Service
Mark Mathis	Confluence Energy
Kathie Mattor	Colorado State University
Sara Mayben	US Forest Service, PSICC

Patrick McCusker	Bureau of Reclamation
Jim McGannon	Association of Consulting Foresters
Don McGoron	Private citizen
Mike McHugh	City of Aurora
Kathleen McIntyre	
Connie McLain	Gilpin County
Patrick McLaughlin	Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment
James Meldrum	American Planning Association
Zac Miller	
Mary Mitsos	National Forest Foundation
Don Moore	American Planning Association/ Jefferson County Conservation District
Irene Mora	US Forest Service, ARP
Ken Morgan	Colorado Parks & Wildlife
Deborah Napier	Golden Mean Consulting
Connie Neff	Clear Path Writers
Ken Neubecker	Western Rivers Institute
Jeanne Nicholson	Colorado State Senate
Annie Oatman-Gardner	Office of U.S. Senator Michael Bennet
Robert O'Donnell	Colorado State University
Daniel Olson	Natural Resources Conservation Service
Kevin O'Malley	Colorado State Forest Service
Steve Orr	West Metro Fire
Aaron Ortega	US Forest Service, PSICC
Patti Orth	Colorado State University
Allen Owen	Colorado State Forest Service
George Panek	US Forest Service
Erin Parks	El Paso County
Ben Pearlman	Boulder County
Kristen Pelz	Colorado State University
Andrew Perri	Denver Mountain Parks
John Peterson	US Forest Service, PSICC
Jan Peterson	Peterson Design
Shirley Pfankuch	Slash Solutions LLC
Brad Piehl	JW Associates
Mark Platten	Colorado State University
Dan Predovich	Critical MAS
Laura Quattrini	Rocky Mountain Bird Observatory
Michael Racette	El Paso County
Tammy Randal-Parker	US Forest Service-Ouray
Tim Reader	Colorado State Forest Service
Ken Reed	Bureau of Land Management
Claudia Regan	US Forest Service, R2
Jim Reid	El Paso County
Robin Reid	Colorado State University

Stefan Reinold	Colorado Forest Management, LLC
Alisha Reis	Town of Nederland
Kathay Rennels	Larimer County
Allison Rener	Colorado State University
John Ring	Bureau of Land Management
Kyle Rodman	University of Colorado, Boulder
Bret Roller	Conifer Biomass Collection LLC
Tim Rooney	Antares Group
GayLene Rossiter	Colorado State Forest Service
Kathy Russell	ARPNF
Kyla Sabo	Boulder County
Jon Sams	US Forest Service
Jody Sandquist	Crystal Lakes HOA
Todd Sanford	Union of Concerned Scientists
Trey Schille	US Forest Service, R2
Tania Schoennagel	University of Colorado at Boulder
Jeanne Scholl	Environmental Energy Partners
James Schriever	Mason Bruce and Girard
Courtney Schultz	Colorado State University
Matt Schulz	Colorado Parks & Wildlife
Jennifer Scott	Grand County
Kim Scott	City of Boulder
Marcus Selig	National Forest Foundation
Peggy Shell	
Rosemary Sherriff	
Irene Shonle	Colorado State University
Foss Smith	Park County
Mike Smith	Colorado Renewable Resource Cooperative
RC Smith	El Paso County
Rocky Smith	Private citizen
Rocco Snart	Colorado Department of Public Safety
Val Snider	City of Colorado Springs
Rick Snow	Glacier View Meadows HOA
Jo Ann Sorensen	Clear Creek County
Carl Spaulding	Colorado Timber Industry Association
Mike Spisak	
Jeff Stark	High Country Forestry Solutions, LLC
Garrett Stephens	Jefferson Conservation District
Diane Strohm	US Fish & Wildlife Service
Jeremy Sueltenfuss	Colorado State University
Tim Sullivan	Colorado State Forest Service
Bonnie Sumner	Private citizen
Jim Thinnes	US Forest Service
John Tighe	Park County

Katherine Timm	Colorado State Forest Service
Greg Toll	Boulder Fire Department
Will Toor	Boulder County
Glenda Torres	Bureau of Land Management
Diana Trettin	ERIA Consultants, LLC
Austin Troy	University of Colorado at Denver
Richard (Rick) Truex	US Forest Service, R2
Matt Trummer	New Range Power
Michael Tuffly	ERIA Consultants, LLC
Joe Turner	Private citizen
Jeff Underhill	US Forest Service, PSICC
Kathryn Valdez	Xcel Energy
Janelle Valladares	US Forest Service, PSICC
Tom Veblen	University of Colorado at Boulder
Tim Vogel	Clear Creek County
Judy von Ahlefeldt	Black Forest Conservation Forestry Association
Carole Walker	Rocky Mountain Insurance Information Association
Chris Wanner	City of Boulder
Gail Watson	Gilpin County
Jeff Webb	City of Colorado Springs
Jeff Webb	Boulder Rural Police Department
Ty Webb	Bureau of Land Management
Paul Weissmann	Colorado General Assembly
Bill West	NRE
Lisa White	Colorado Municipal League
Dennis Will	City of Colorado Springs
Tammy Williams	US Forest Service, ARP
Jeanette Williams	CL FIRES
Rick Wilson	National Park Service
Jesse Wittry	Higher Ground Forestry and Land Management
Leigh Ann Wolfe	USFS
Brett Wolk	Colorado State University
Scott Woods	Colorado State Forest Service
Keith Worley	Pikes Peak Wildfire Prevention Partners
Marshall Worthey	Terra Incognita
Penny Wu	USFS
Wade Yates	Jefferson County
Patty Ybright-Jessop	US Forest Service, ARP
Benjamin Yellin	
Kevin Zimlinghaus	US Forest Service, Boulder
Damien Zona	US Forest Service, PSICC