CFLR Project Name/Number: Deschutes Collaborative Forest Project/CFLR09

National Forest(s): Deschutes National Forest

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($)
CFLN13	$-7,731
CFLN14	$116,719
CFLN15	$635,577
CFTM0913	$534,490
Fund Source - (Funds expended from Washington Office funds in addition to CFLR/CFLN)[2] (please include a new row for each BLI)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2015($)

Fund Source – (FS Matching Funds) (please Include a new row for each BLI)[3]	Total Funds Expended In Fiscal Year 2015($)
CMRD	$3,804
CMTL	$19,370
NFTM	$491,592
NFVW	$ 59,667
RTRT	$508,098
WFHF	$350,295
SSCC	$10,142

* 89,667. Recent updates to spending based on WO correspondence. Job code update to CF nomenclature for CFRLA project.

[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 FY l5 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.

Fund Source - (Funds contributed through agreements)[4]	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2015($)
NFXN	$255,024
Fund Source - (Partner In-Kind Contributions)[5]	**Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2015($)**
CFLRA Collaborative Committee Volunteers:	
Participant Time (Restoration Planning Subcommittee):	$11,040
Participant Time (Outreach Subcommittee):	$1,700
Participant Time (Steering Subcommittee):	$690
Participant Time (Monitoring Subcommittee):	$7,800
Field Trip Participation:	$4,000
Meeting Supplies and equipment (COIC):	$900
Meeting Venues (COIC and Deschutes County):	$900
Forest Volunteer Program	$209,522

For Contracts Awarded in FY15:

Service work accomplishment through goods-for services funding within a stewardship contract	Totals
Total amount of stewardship credits <u>charged</u> for contracts awarded in FY15[6]	0
Total revised credit limit for contracts awarded in FY15[7]	1,474,195.96

For Contracts Awarded Prior to FY15:

Service work accomplishment through goods-for services funding within a stewardship contract	Totals
Total amount of stewardship credits charged in FY15[8]	137,310

[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.

[5] Total partner in-kind contributions for implementation and monitoring of a CFLR project. Partner contributions for Fish, Wildlife, and 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-OI.

[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-OI.

Service work accomplishment through goods-for services funding within a stewardship contract	Totals
Total revised credit limit for open and closed contracts awarded and previously reported prior to FY15[9]	**1,791,214.70**

b. Please provide a narrative or table describing leveraged funds in your landscape in FY2015 (one page maximum). Leveraged funds refer to funds or in-kind services that help the project achieve proposed objectives but do not meet match qualifications. Examples include but are not limited to: investments within landscape on non-NFS lands, investments in restoration equipment, worker training for implementation and monitoring, and purchase of equipment for wood processing that will use restoration by-products from CFLR projects. See "Instructions" document for additional information.

No leveraged funds for this year's work.

(Optional) Additional narrative about leverage on the landscape if needed:

2a. Discuss how the CFLR 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).

The goal of the Deschutes Collaborative Forest Project (DCFP) is to restore forest ecosystems to be resilient to natural processes like fire and insects, and to protect natural resource values identified by the Deschutes LRMP, the Northwest
Forest Plan, Community Wildfire Protection Plans ({CWPP) and local efforts to assess multiple stakeholder values. The outcome will be a restored landscape within a natural range of variability and a diversity of habitats while protecting surrounding communities from the risk of wildfire.

This year's number of wild fires ({47 count) is down 23% from the 10 year average (61 count) within the CFLRA ~~boundary.~~
~~Twelve~~boundary. Twelve acres burned in wildfire events within the CFLR landscape, which is much less than the 10 year average of 3431 acres (still less than the 775 acre 10 year average minus Pole Creek of 2012).

One hundred percent of fuel treatments (6179 acres thinning/mowing/under-burning) occurred in areas identified within CWPPs or other collaboratively developed plans. Sixteen percent of acres treated ({984 acres) were acres treated by prescribed fire. The remaining acres ({5195 acres, 84%) were acres treated by non-commercial thinning or mowing/mastication. All treatments (100%) in high priority acres achieved fire management objectives as identified in applicable management plans or strategies. All treatments applied ({100%) where the objective was to restore fire adapted ecosystems

[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.

moved the landscape toward desired conditions. There was 2625 ccf of woody biomass made available for utilization through permits, contracts, grants, agreements or equivalent.

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):

Deschutes National Forest expenses in wildfire preparedness (WFPR) for the area within the CFLR boundary were approximately $375,660. This approximation is based on an 18% project landscape ({257,850 acre CFLR landscape of a
1,458,706 acre total landscape of the Bend/Fort Rock and Sisters Ranger Districts), where a total of $2,087,000 was spent. Expenses in wildfire suppression for fires within the CFLR boundary were $197,029. One hundred percent of the
36 fires that occurred within the CFLR boundary were contained at initial attack for a total acreage of 6 acres.
Hazardous fuels expenses (CFLN, CFHF, CFCC) within the CFLR boundary ({where 6179 acres of fuels treatments occurred) were $514,350. There were no known wildfires that occurred in previous treatments.

3. What assumptions were used in generating the numbers and/or percentages you plugged into the TREAT tool? Information about Treatment for Restoration Economic Analysis Tool inputs and assumptions available here – http://www.fs.fed.us/restoration/documents/cflrp/R-CAT/TREATUserGuidel0l2011.pdf.

Tracking reports do not provide project by project spending and so it is difficult to track and report detail expenditures requested for TREAT and Table 6. Assumptions are therefore made to account for funds using planned expenditures in workplan and WO reports. These are 'ballpark' estimates as an accurate accounting would require individual job codes by project and activity.

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

Type of projects	Direct part and full- time	Total part and full-time	Direct Labor Income	Total Labor Income[10]
Commercial Forest Product	10	23	644,160	1,118,138
Other Project Activities	28	31	704,733	806,659
TOTALS:	38	54	1,348,893	1,924,797

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

Type of projects	Direct part and full- time	Total part and full-time	Direct Labor Income	Total Labor Income11
Commercial Forest Product	14	32	884,212	1,492,041
Other Project Activities	45	50	1,279,146	1,475,192

[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.

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

Type of projects	Direct part and full- time	Total part and full-time	Direct Labor Income	Total Labor Income11
TOTALS:	**59**	**82**	**2,163,358**	**2,967,233**

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 CFLR has inspired a broad array of community benefits, resulting in part from disparate stakeholders developing trust-based relationships that encourage ongoing conversations. Through these discussions, stakeholders share information, coordinate activities, and develop new partnership opportunities.

TREX: For example, members of the Deschutes Collaborative Forest Project (DCFP) supported the Central Oregon
Prescribed Fire Training Exchange (TREX) this spring (May 2015). TREX, a program under the Fire Learning Network, advances understanding of fire and fire adapted landscapes and provides an experiential learning opportunity that engages experienced fire fighters in implementing prescribed fire. The Central Oregon TREX was unique in its incorporation of community engagement and communications in addition to traditional fire operations and fire monitoring curriculum. This program involved DCFP Steering Committee members, community members, policy-makers, and the media in a dialogue about the need for and benefits of prescribed fire use in dry forest restoration. DCFP members developed radio spots on the importance of prescribed fire, invited DCFP stakeholders to attend a prescribed fire event, and engaged in educating the community about the role of fire in the ecosystem. Participants included representatives from The Nature Conservancy, U.S. Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, Oregon Department of
Forestry, Grayback Forestry, University of Idaho, Region 6 Ecology, Oregon State University; a wide array of different organizations from around the state of Oregon and the nation.

International Workshops: Forestry practitioners from around the globe spent several days in Central Oregon, learning from the Deschutes Collaborative Forest Project and touring collaborative projects in the West Bend area. DCFP members and other community members engaged in community forestry and wild fire risk reduction efforts benefited from a learning exchange that included sharing successes and challenges related to collaborative forestry efforts ongoing around the globe. Additionally, fire fighters from the United Kingdom visited Central Oregon and toured projects in the West Bend area. They discussed challenges and best practices related to cross-jurisdictional firefighting.

Community Outreach: The Deschutes Collaborative Forest Project (DCFP) has made significant strides toward increasing public understanding of and support for active forest restoration work. This has been essential, since most of DCFPs projects are adjacent to population centers such as the communities of Bend, Sisters, Sunriver and Black Butte Ranch.
DCFP has developed a new logo and launched a webpage (http://deschutescollabroativeforest.org, Deschutes Collaborative Forest Project home page) that includes blog posts from DCFP members and forest restoration practitioners. This webpage provides content that explains the interconnections between forest restoration activities, public safety, ecological resilience and the local economy. DCFP has also worked with the FS to support public understanding and support during the implementation of prescribed fire within the CFLR landscape and implementation of activities such as mowing and

thinning. This effort has led to public support for restoration activities, even within high visibility and high use recreation areas.

Presentations and Education: Members of DCFP receive a multitude of invitations to speak individually or as panelists at a myriad of local venues that include college and high school classes, pub talks and natural history lecture series. They have held presentations at the High Desert Museum, Environmental Center, Tower Theater, and Central Oregon Community College (COCC) and led field trips for the public.

Monitoring Workshop: DCFP engaged an expert in multiparty monitoring to organize a one-day workshop in which those engaged in implementing the CFLR ecological monitoring plan (link to DCFP Ecological Monitoring Plan) shared their monitoring findings and discussed the implications of these preliminary data for adaptive management and Collaborative decision-making. Participants included conservation groups, industry representatives, Extension, watershed councils, Forest Service specialists, among others.

Research: DCFP engaged researchers from Oregon State University, the Pacific Northwest Research Station and The Nature Conservancy to conduct primary research within the CFLR landscape to assist Collaborative members in understanding fire regime and forest development dynamics of mixed-conifer forests in support of shared learning and social agreement on restoration in mixed-conifer forest types. The value of primary research within the CFLR landscape cannot be overstated. This research design was innovative and engaged the Collaborative in field work and in reviewing and incorporating research results presented by researchers (link to Kew Study summary results). This model of Collaborative engagement in primary research was the focus of several social science papers.

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).

Multiparty Monitoring Field Trips: DCFP undertakes multiparty monitoring field reviews in which collaborative members visit project areas pre-, mid- and post-implementation. Field trips are led by a facilitator engaged by DCFP and conducted in partnership with FS specialists who assist with identifying field trip stops and providing key information about the project. Prior to these field trips, key information about the project is synthesized from the NEPA document to provide an overview of the purpose and need, objectives and intended outcomes. The collaborative then views the area and completes a simple survey designed to solicit information about the degree to which they believe implementation meets the desired objectives. This creates opportunities for adaptive learning, especially pre- and mid-treatment then the group can provide "in the moment" feedback to the FS. It also enhances trust, as the Collaborative engages with the FS throughout the implementation process and can talk through implementation challenges as they arise. Viewing the results of the prescriptions on the ground also leads to opportunities for Collaborative members to grow and change in their thinking, often becoming more comfortable with agreements they have reached through science-based consensus processes. DCFP is planning a more intensive series of monitoring field trips in 2016, and plans to contract with an expert in adaptive

management to assist in developing formal mechanisms for linking findings in the field with our recommendations.

CLFR Ecological Monitoring Plan: In partnership, DCFP and the FS have developed and implemented a landscape and project-scale ecological monitoring protocol that addresses content areas including fuels reduction and fire regime conditions, wildlife habitat, watershed conditions and invasive species. For a detailed description of this monitoring plan, please see (link to DCFP Ecological Monitoring Plan). This year, DCFP worked in concert with the FS to complete the 5 year ecological monitoring report (link to CFLR Ecological Indicator 5-year Report), and contracted a monitoring specialist to organize and implement a 1-day workshop for the purpose of sharing monitoring results that may inform adaptive management and collaborative decision-making. This effort was arduous and rewarding. Many results provide a baseline for which future years will provide a comparison. A report from the workshop will be finalized in mid-December. Next year, the Monitoring Subcommittee and Steering Committee will review this report and, as appropriate, recommend adjustments.

Collaborative Well-being: The healthy functioning of the Collaborative group is essential to its effectiveness and ability to accomplish results on the ground. In the recent past, DCFP surveyed members on key issues related to collaborative health so they decided not to use a survey this year. However, prompted by a letter circulated by a number of environmentalist groups challenging collaborative processes, the DCFP Steering Committee formally discussed the content of this letter and invited members from all stakeholder constituencies to share any concerns they harbored regarding the equity and effectiveness of DCFPs processes. Members were also invited to share concerns via one-on-one conversations with the Collaborative Chair. This discussion process provided grounding in DCFP's norms and collaborative processes. No concerns were surfaced and members affirmed their commitment to the group.

Development of Recommendations: DCFP engaged researcher Andrew Merschel as they worked through recommendations for dry and moist mixed-conifer types. This involved extensive work in the field and ongoing dialogue between the Collaborative and Merschel throughout the development of these recommendations. This provided a clear mechanism for adaptive learning on the part of the group. Additionally, this year the group has engaged in two field trips within the Melvin Butte project area where they have assisted the silviculturist in translating dwarf mistletoe recommendations on the ground. They have begun the process of refining and clarifying these recommendations, an important element of adaptive management.

6. FY 2015 accomplishments

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished12	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			
Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres	2018	498,604 37,000 37,000	RTRT NFXF NFVW
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	2960.2	25,000 5,000 136,310	CFLN RTRT STEW Credits charged for integrated TSI/Fuels
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	953.6	10,142 14,858 20,000	SSCC NFVW CFLN
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial	Acres			

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

[13] Please include the type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match) if you have accurate information that is readily available. Please report each BLI on a separate line within a given performance measures' "Type of Funds" box. .

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished12	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)13
and aquatic species on NFS lands INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC				
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions. S&W-RSRC-IMP	Acres	812.5	11,095	CFLN Integrated accomplishment with HBT-ENH-STRM
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-LAK	Acres			
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	12.3	218,024 48,500 7,809	NFXN CFLN NFVW
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	4264.31		Integrated accomplishment with HBT-ENH-STRM and TMBR-SALES-TRT-ACRES and FUELS
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved RG-VEG-IMP	Acres	40		Integrated accomplishment with HBT-ENH-STRM and TMBR-SALES-TRT-ACRES and FUELS
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving	Miles	3.5	3,804	CMRD

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished12	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)13
maintenance RD-HC-MAIN				
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance RD-PC-MAINT	**Miles**	**20.1**	**25,000**	**CFLN**
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**	**18.4**	**19,370** **24,961**	**CFTL** **CFLN**
Miles of system trail improved to standard TL-IMP-STD	**Miles**			

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished12	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)13
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**	**874**	**804,322 570,404**	**NFTM CFLN**
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	**CCF**	**8006.6 reported; actual is 6655.94* See below**	**221,760 74,252**	**NFTM CFLN**
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	**CCF**	**72116.2**		**Same as TMBR-SALES above**
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	**Green tons**	**15057**		**Same as TMBR-VOL-HVST above**
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic	**Acre**	**1719**	**138,367 33,004**	**WFHF CFLN**

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished12	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)13
wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI				
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	**Acres**	**11991.4**	**207,550 5,000**	**WFHF RTRT Also integrated with Stewardship Credits charged for service work as shown above with FOR-VEG-IMP**
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**			

* Harvest Volume differs from WO report due to Bull Salvage TS being mistakenly identified as a CFLR project. The above number reflects this correction.

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

Our unique collaboration with researchers throughout the development of our moist and wet mixed conifer recommendations was very rewarding and engaging. This process stretched our collaborative members and assisted them in learning more about the challenges and limitations of primary field research, as well as the time required to undertake such research. This effort has contributed to our understanding of the fire regime history on the Deschutes

National Forest and brought the attention of foresters and ecologists from around the world to Central Oregon. It has also provided a rigorous process for engaging Collaborative members in reaching agreements about an ecologically and socially complex forest type at a time when this social agreement is helpful to the NEPA planning process.

We developed successful outreach efforts that have generated and sustained a broad level of community support for forest restoration work such as mowing, thinning and prescribed fire in high visibility, high use and high population areas. Our efforts at outreach through social media, webpage development, public presentations and one-on-one conversations have shifted the tone and tenor of public dialogue about forest restoration.

We are very proud of the diversity and engagement of our membership. The DCFP steering committee is comprised of
19 individuals across a diverse spectrum of stakeholder constituencies that include the traditional collaborative voices of environmental organizations and the forest products industry, as well as watershed, local government, recreation and tourism, Tribal, researchers and community fire protection. This broad representation and engagement strengthens our Collaborative and ensures that a more inclusive suite of social values is reflected in our work.

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?[14]

Fiscal Year	**Total number of acres treated (treatment**
Total	**81,000 Estimated Total 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 - 22,757 acres** **FY11 - 12,988 acres** **FY12 - 13,236 acres** **FY13 - 11,955 acres** **FY14 - 10,137 acres** **FY15 - est. 10,000 acres**

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

This has always been a tough figure to generate as the way GIS reporting due dates have lagged by several months for project accomplishment reporting. Technical GIS processes pull project spatial data while pulling only unique acres.
Initial estimates are given for this report and later updated as spatial reporting occurs and is reviewed. Our current estimates for this fiscal year and cumulative total assume there may be small overlap of treatments through the years that further GIS analysis will refine. Updates for FY15 accomplishments will be in next year's CFLR annual report.

9. Describe any reasons that the FY 2015 annual report does not reflect your project proposal,

[14] 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.

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 program of work was completed as planned.

10. Planned FY 2017 Accomplishments

Performance Measure Code[15]	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**	**200**	
Acres of forest vegetation improved	**Acres**	**1350**	
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	**Acre**	**1000**	
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-	**Acres**	**1100**	
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced	**Acres**		

[15] 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 Code[15]	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment	
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	5	
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-	Acres	1100	
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved	Acres		
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance	Miles	10	
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance	Miles	15	
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	4	
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	Number		
Miles of system trail maintained to standard TL-MAINT-STD	Miles	750	
Miles of system trail improved to standard	Miles		
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard LND-BL-	Miles		

Performance Measure Code[15]	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment	Amount ($)
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales	Acres	1000	
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF	18000	
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	60000	
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for	Green tons	3	
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	1000	
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic	Acres	9000	
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 1page).

Table 10 above lists the program of work for FY17 for the Deschutes Skyline Project and reflects the 10 year workplan.
Since we do not expect significant deviations from our planned work at this time, the CFLRP funds being requested for the above program of work match the FY17 CFLR request for funding for Deschutes Skyline.

12. Describe and provide narrative justification if planned FY 2016/17 accomplishments and/or funding differs from CFLRP project work plan (no more than 1 page): The Forest does not anticipate deviating from the program of work identified for the Deschutes Collaborative Forest Project.

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.

Please refer to this site for membership information: Deschutes collaborative Forest Project home page.

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

The Deschutes Collaborative has been able to bring in additional funding to improve their ability to engage with the community and the Forest. Examples:
Directly to the Collaborative FOR CFLRA Support:

Bella Vista Foundation: $20,500
Oregon Forest Resource Institute: $35,000
OWEB Federal Forest Health Collaborative Assistance: $46,000
Title II RAC: $23, 600

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.

Deschutes Collaborative Forest Project: Media, Websites, Social Media from October 2014 to October 2015

Websites:
Deschutes collaborative forest home page
Deschutes National Forest West Bend
Deschutes NF home page

Facebook:
Facebook Deschutes Collaborative Forest
Facebook Deschutes National Forest

Media:
2015/10/07 Trail closure today in West Bend
West Bend project starting up again

KTVZ. news Deschutes National Forest to begin prescribed burning
KTVZ news reminder prescribed burns today west of bend
KTVZ news highly visible burn planned Thursday
Bend bulletin opinion letter to the editor letter give federal land managers
Critique of Forest-Collaborative may lead to lawsuits
My central Oregon prescribed burns planned in central Oregon 2
KTVZ news more burns planned on Deschutes National Forest 3
Bend bulletin opinion/3477211-151/editorial-forest near bend gets what it needs
You tube Deschutes Collaborative Forest Project
Bend Bulletin Forest Collaboratives do find success
Letter thinning and fuel reduction do work to Bend
Bend bulletin local state forest thinning project continues west of Bend
KTVZ news U.S.F.S. to close West Bend trail for thinning project
KTVZ news volunteers help build a trail/35542688
Gallery/Deschutes collaborative forest index
2014/03/ forest restoration program west Bend
Pacific North West news 2014/03 forest restoration program west
Bend source Deschutes collaborative forest project Profile
Oregon forests news reducing fire risk top concern
Oregon 2 sierra club juniper group action Deschutes
Instagram
Vimeo 142187361
High desert museum pub panel collaborative forest restoration
Library Oregon state edu 1957 56559

Signatures:

Recommended by (Project Coordinator(s)): 

Kristen McBride

Approved by (Forest Supervisor(s))[16] 

John Allen

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

[16] If your project includes more than one National Forest, please include an additional line for each Forest Supervisor signature.