CFLR Project (Name/Number): Dinkey Landscape Restoration Project/CFLN07

National Forest(s): Sierra 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($)**
CFLN0714	$58,272
CFLN0715	$620,079

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($)**
NFWF = CFWF07	$746,491

Fund Source – (FS Matching Funds (please include a new row for each BLI)[3])	**Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2015($)**
NFTM = CFTM07	$336,345
WFHF = CFHF07	$665,765
WFPR = CFPR07	$72,477

Fund Source – (FS Unofficial Matching Funds– matching job code was not used)	**Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2015($)**
SPFH	$79,980
PSW Owl Monitoring	$250,000
PSW Kings River fisher project	$600,000
Air Regulatory fees for RX burning (WFHF)	$6,638

Fund Source – (Funds contributed through agreements[4])	**Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2015($)**
Sierra Nevada Conservancy	$300,494
The Wilderness Society	$20,000

Fund Source – (Partner In-Kind Contributions[5])	**Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2015($)**
Dinkey Collaborative Members (time)	$56,916

[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.
[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.

For Contracts Awarded in FY15

Service work accomplishment through goods-for services funding within a stewardship contract	Totals
Total amount of stewardship credits charged for contracts awarded in FY15	$0
Total revised credit limit for contracts awarded in FY15	$0

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	$0
Total revised credit limit for open and closed contracts awarded and previously reported prior to FY15	$1,162,190

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.

Leveraged funds in landscape for FY2015

Description of item	Where activity/item is located or impacted area	Estimated total amount	Forest Service or Partner Funds?	Source of funds
Southern California Edison (SCE) work on SCE lands w/in DFLRP boundary	2,213 acres of thinning; 305 acres Veg treatment; 120 burning acres; 120 acres tree planting	$575,150	Partner Funds	**Southern California Edison**

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).

The Dinkey Landscape Restoration Project has contributed significantly to the goals laid out in the 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan, which specifically addresses our goals of restoring a more fire-adapted ecosystem. Opportunities for implementing prescribed fire were somewhat limited this past year due to the extraordinary drought and extreme fire season on the Sierra. Though several attempts were made to conduct underburning, dry conditions and extreme fire behavior prohibited continuation of those activities. FY2015 accomplishments were achieved via pile burning and mechanical treatments. Ongoing significant beetle mortality is resulting in a need to reassess fire resiliency treatments, given potential challenges in meeting desired conditions.

Goal 3, Part A, of the Implementation Plan is the restoration of fire-adapted ecosystems, and the implementation outcome is the restoration and maintenance of these ecosystems, using appropriate tools, in a manner that will provide sustainable environmental, social, and economic benefits. In FY2015, 4,379 acres were moved toward desired conditions through collaboration consistent with the Implementation Plan. The opportunity to manage wildfire for ecological benefit did not present itself with the project boundary.

Goal 3, Part A, of the Implementation Plan is the restoration and post-fire recovery of fire-adapted ecosystems, and the

implementation outcome is the recovery of lands damaged by wildfire to desired conditions. The project boundary does not include areas damaged by recent wildfire.

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 Dinkey Landscape Restoration Project has contributed significantly to the goals laid out in the 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan, which specifically addresses our goals of restoring a more fire-adapted ecosystem. Opportunities for implementing prescribed fire were somewhat limited this past year due to the extraordinary drought and extreme fire season on the Sierra. Though several attempts were made to conduct underburning, dry conditions and extreme fire behavior prohibited continuation of those activities. FY2015 accomplishments were achieved via pile burning and mechanical treatments. Ongoing significant beetle mortality is resulting in a need to reassess fire resiliency treatments, given potential challenges in meeting desired conditions.

Goal 3, Part A, of the Implementation Plan is the restoration of fire-adapted ecosystems, and the implementation outcome is the restoration and maintenance of these ecosystems, using appropriate tools, in a manner that will provide sustainable environmental, social, and economic benefits. In FY2015, 4,379 acres were moved toward desired conditions through collaboration consistent with the Implementation Plan. The opportunity to manage wildfire for ecological benefit did not present itself with the project boundary.

Goal 3, Part A, of the Implementation Plan is the restoration and post-fire recovery of fire-adapted ecosystems, and the implementation outcome is the recovery of lands damaged by wildfire to desired conditions. The project boundary does not include areas damaged by recent wildfire.

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**:

The Dinkey Landscape Restoration Project has contributed significantly to the goals laid out in the 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan. Opportunities for accomplishments in all categories did not present themselves this past year due to the extraordinary drought and extreme fire season on the Sierra, but the following discussion outlines some of the highlights of the FY2015 accomplishments:

Goal 1 of the Implementation Plan is to improve fire prevention and suppression, and the implementation outcomes are the elimination of loss of life and firefighter injuries, and reduction of wildfire damage to communities and the environment. During the FY15 fire season, there were 15natural ignitions and 3 human caused fires within the project boundary. Initial attack was successful in containing all ignitions to within 0.5 acres in size, with one exception which became the Muley Fire (contained at 4 acres) and was successfully suppressed with no injuries to firefighters or damage to the neighboring communities.

Goal 2 of the Implementation Plan is to reduce hazardous fuels, and the implementation outcome is the reduction of wildfire risk to communities and the environment. A total of 4,379.7 acres of hazardous fuels were treated within the project area during FY2015. 2496 of these acres were within the WUI and amount to 5.4% of the total number of WUI acres identified by collaboratively developed plans. The remaining 1883.5 acres were not located in the WUI, but were identified by collaboratively developed plans and were consistent with the Implementation Plan. Goal 4 of the Implementation Plan is the promotion of community assistance, and the implementation outcome is the increased capacity to prevent losses from Wildland fire and realize economic benefits resulting from treatments and services. In addition to the hazardous fuels reduction within the WUI, the Dinkey Collaborative and district staff the have been actively involved in community forums and programs to support and educate local communities and fire agencies in areas of extreme drought, the wildfire risk and the epidemic beetle actively affecting the local communities.

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/TREATUserGuide10112011.pdf.

Funding and Employment

Description	CFLR/N Funds Only	All Funds (CFLR/N and Match)
Total Funding	$1,424,843	$2,879,905
% of Funding used for Contracted Work	22%	28%
% of Funding used for Force Account Implementation and Monitoring	42%	55%
Annual Force Account FTEs for Implementation and Monitoring	11	23

Contract Funding Distribution

Description	CFLR/N Funds Only	All Funds (CFLR/N and Match)
Equipment intensive (No Commercial Products). Includes chipping in the woods and mechanical treatments such as non-commercial logging, mastication. Grapple piling. Excavator work, tree-tipping. Etc.	50%	80%
Labor intensive – (No Commercial Products). Includes labor intensive, simple mechanical treatments such as thinning with chain saws, hand piling, prescribed burning, tree planting, etc.	37%	15%
Material-Intensive Work – (No Commercial Products). Projects where materials represent a significant portion of project costs. Includes road work, culvert replacement, in-stream restoration, fence construction, some trail work, etc.	0%	0%
Technical Services – (No Commercial Products). Includes stand exams, marking, layout, biological surveys, cultural surveys, invasive weed spraying, etc.	0%	0%
Professional Services – (No Commercial Products). Includes studies completed by scientists, engineering design, acquisition or analysis of remotely-sensed data, scientific modeling, workshops, etc.	0%	0%
Contracted Monitoring (Does not include in-kind and volunteer contributions)	13%	5%

Amount of Harvest Volume

Description	CFLR/N Funds Only	All Funds (CFLR/N and Match)
CCF (100 cubic feet)	0	28
MBF (1000 board feet)	0	0
Dry Tons	0	0
Cords	0	566

Product Distributions

Description	CFLR/N Funds Only	All Funds (CFLR/N and Match)
Sawmills and Wood Preservation	N/A	4%
Veneer and Plywood Manufacturing	N/A	N/A
Engineered Wood Member and Truss Manufacturing	N/A	N/A
Reconstituted Wood Product Manufacturing	N/A	N/A
Wood Container and Pallet Manufacturing	N/A	N/A
Prefabricated Wood Building Manufacturing	N/A	N/A
All Other Miscellaneous Wood Product Manufacturing	N/A	1%

Description	CFLR/N Funds Only	All Funds (CFLR/N and Match)
Pulp Mills	N/A	N/A
Biomass – Co-gen	N/A	N/A
Firewood (Commercial)	N/A	N/A
Firewood (Home Use)	N/A	95%

FY 2015 Jobs 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[6]
Commercial Forest Product Activities	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Other Project Activities	**15**	**17**	**$505,791**	**$571,191**
TOTALS:	**15**	**17**	**$505,791**	**$571,191**

FY 2015 Jobs 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[7]
Commercial Forest Product Activities	1	1	$46,005	$60,717
Other Project Activities	32	37	$1,291,285	$1,437,564
TOTALS:	**33**	**38**	**$1,337,290**	**$1,498,281**

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).

Beyond the economic benefits reported in the tables in Section 3 of this report, the Dinkey Collaborative continues to engage the local community and public through a variety of education and outreach efforts, and has made socio-economic monitoring a priority focus for FY2015 and beyond. In 2015, Collaborative members updated the group's educational brochure and planned several public educational events. Though a public field trip had to be cancelled due to the Rough Fire and air quality, RSVPs for the event showed a good deal of public interest in Collaborative work. Members also staffed a table at a local hazardous fuels education demonstration and spoke to the visiting public about ongoing restoration efforts in which the Collaborative has been engaged.

Collaborative members formed a working group to examine restoration activity effects on the social and economic benefits to local communities. Specific monitoring questions and initial protocols were created through considerable member time and an external agreement with the Sierra Institute. The Dinkey Collaborative expects to begin implementing this monitoring effort in future years, beginning in FY2016.

Additionally, Collaborative funds were leveraged with local resources to support the Hands on the Lands Program, a partnership with a local High School to briefly employ and engage local students in forest management activities. In 2015, 18 students and 3 crew leaders participated in hazardous fuels reduction, timber stand improvement, and recreation management projects, and learned about wildlife and aquatic biology, fire suppression, the forestry industry, and restoration efforts with local Tribes. The Hands on the Lands program provides local youth an opportunity to learn about work opportunities that exist in their own communities, and many of the students return for several summers and speak about seeking careers in Forest or Fire management.

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

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).

The Dinkey Collaborative has exhibited a great interest in monitoring and adaptive management, and in FY2015 over 13% of the Collaborative budget was spent on ecological and socioeconomic monitoring development and implementation. The Collaborative continued to support external monitoring coordination through a challenge cost-share agreement with the Wilderness Society, and is anticipating an annual ecological monitoring report to review progress towards implementing the agreed upon monitoring plan and matrix. A subset of Collaborative members have been planning a 2017 ecological monitoring symposium that will examine various ecological monitoring indicators and progress has been made on identifying socio-economic monitoring questions and indicators. Additionally, the Forest Service invested approximately $850,000 in monitoring and research of two key wildlife species: the California Spotted Owl and the Pacific Fisher.

Pacific Southwest Research (PSW) California Spotted Owl Monitoring

The demographic study was initiated in March 1990 and continues contingent on funding. The ongoing study is primarily within the CFLR boundary. The study consists of monitoring spotted owls to answer existing critical questions and to provide for adaptive management of the owl in the future. The monitoring helps understand the movement of the owls when we are implementing mechanical treatments. The objectives of the study are to 1) estimate the spotted owl rate of population change, occupancy status of owl territories; 2) survival and reproductive rates by age class. The study also will look for associations among vital rates and habitats characteristics within the study area.

Kings River Fisher Project

The Kings River Fisher Project (KRFP) was initiated in 2007 by the USDA Forest Service Region 5 and the

Pacific Southwest Research Station for two reasons: 1) to fill gaps in our current understanding of fisher ecology and habitat requirements and 2) to address the uncertainty surrounding the effects of timber harvest and fuels treatments on select response variables of interest, including fishers and their habitat. Primary objectives include documenting demographic parameters such as reproduction and survival, identifying the range of natural variation associated with these values, and relating this information to potential limiting factors such as disease, predation, and habitat.

6. FY 2015 accomplishments

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished[8]	Proposal Goals Measured	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)[9]
Acres treated annually to sustain or restore watershed function and resilience WTRSHD-RSTR-ANN	Acres	n/a	n/a	n/a	Acres treated annually to sustain or restore watershed function and resilience WTRSHD-RSTR-ANN
Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres	5	n/a	CFLN = 5 acres	Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST

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

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished[8]	Proposal Goals Measured	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)[9]
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	467.4	n/a	CFLN = 205.4 acres NFXN = 154.3 acres SPFH = 107.7 acres	Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	n/a	n/a	n/a	Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC	Acres	n/a	n/a	n/a	Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial 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	n/a	n/a	n/a	Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions. S&W-RSRC-IMP
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-LAK	Acres	49.9	n/a	CFLN = 14.7 acres FDAS = 14.7 acres NFRW = 19.5 acres NFWF = 1.1 acres	Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-LAK
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	8.95	n/a	CFLN = 2.0 miles CMXN = 2.6 miles FDAS = 1.8 miles NFRW =2.4 miles NFWF = 0.2 miles	Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	248.9	n/a	CFLN = 77.9 acres FDAS = 61.9 acres NFRW = 82.6 acres NFWF = 26.4 acres	Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished[8]	Proposal Goals Measured	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)[9]
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved RG-VEG-IMP	Acres	781.9	n/a	CFLN = 303 acres NFVW = 45.8 acres NFWF = 103.7 acres NFXN = 329.4 acres	Acres of rangeland vegetation improved RG-VEG-IMP
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance RD-HC-MAIN	Miles	n/a	n/a	n/a	Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance RD-HC-MAIN
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance RD-PC-MAINT	Miles	n/a	n/a	n/a	Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance RD-PC-MAINT
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	n/a	n/a	n/a	Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles	n/a	n/a	n/a	Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles	n/a	n/a	n/a	Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage STRM-CROS-MTG-STD	Number	n/a	n/a	n/a	Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage STRM-CROS-MTG-STD
Miles of system trail maintained to standard TL-MAINT-STD	Miles	n/a	n/a	n/a	Miles of system trail maintained to standard TL-MAINT-STD
Miles of system trail improved to standard TL-IMP-STD	Miles	n/a	n/a	n/a	Miles of system trail improved to standard TL-IMP-STD
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard LND-BL-MRK-MAINT	Miles	n/a	n/a	n/a	Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard LND-BL-MRK-MAINT

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished[8]	Proposal Goals Measured	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)[9]
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC	Acres	n/a	n/a	n/a	Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF	21.8	n/a	NONE = 21.8 CCF	Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	n/a	n/a	n/a	Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons	n/a	n/a	n/a	Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	1883.5	n/a	CFLN = 342.8 acres NFWF = 74.9 acres NFXN = 555.5 acres PEP2 = 233.1 acres SPFH = 214.5 acres WFHF = 462.7 acres	Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic 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	2496.2	n/a	CFLN = 454.3 acres NFVW = 45.8 acres NFWF = 180.8 acres NFXN = 639.9 acres PEP2 = 122.0 acres SPFH = 173.4 acres WFHF = 880.0 acres	Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI
Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands SP-INVSPE-FED-AC	Acres	n/a	n/a	n/a	Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands SP-INVSPE-FED-AC

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

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

Implementation of restoration activities continued in several project areas throughout fiscal year 2015. Cumulative across the landscape, 467.5 acres were treated with pre-commercial thinning, 288.8 acres received biomass treatments, 951.9 acres were mechanically piled, and 29 acres received manual site preparation. Five acres of trees were planted, and 64 acres or recently planted trees were released.

Project monitoring and planning continued within the Eastfork, Bald Mountain, Soaproot, and Exchequer project areas, and in anticipation of future project proposals initial data was collected in the House project area. Individual program accomplishments are reported below.

Terrestrial wildlife program:

The Pacific Southwest Research Station (PSW) surveys for the California spotted owls and Pacific fisher within these project areas. Monitoring has occurred by the District on the Bald Mountain, Eastfork, and Exchequer projects for Great gray owls, goshawks, willow flycatchers. All surveys by the District were conducted to protocol.

Eastfork: 200 acres were surveyed for Northern goshawks according to protocol.

Bald Mountain: 1,672 acres were surveyed for great gray owls; 400 acres were surveyed for northern goshawk, 25 acres were surveyed for willow flycatcher and 63 acres were surveyed for bats with the Regional bat coordinator.

Soaproot: 1,001 acres were surveyed for great gray owl.

Exchequer: 2,428 acres were surveyed for great gray owls according to protocol. There were 3,257 acres surveyed to protocol for the Northern goshawk.

Heritage program:

House Project: Archaeological survey of nearly 500 acres and condition monitoring of 23 prehistoric and historic sites.

Nutmeg Plantation Hazard Removal: Survey of 43 acres and monitoring/flagging of 7 archaeological sites for site protection.

Upper Big Creek Watershed OHV routes: All routes examined, 17 archaeological sites monitored for condition assessment.

Implementation work (monitoring/flagging/etc.) for protection of heritage resources in ongoing projects, including Bald Mountain (Swanson and Cow Timber Sale preparation), Eastfork Sale, Soaproot Project, Dinkey South Underburns, etc.

Monitoring of priority heritage assets in the CFLR boundary, including sites at Ross Crossing and Trestle Meadow.

The SNF collaborated with the Haslett Basin Traditional Committee to ensure fire safety at their spring and fall ceremonies. The SNF provided water for fire protection and other uses.

Coordinated with Resource Advisors for cultural resource protection during contingency line construction in the CFLR boundary for the 2015 Rough Fire.

Updated Dinkey Creek recreation residence records.

Aquatics Program:

Dinkey North and South: Collected stream temperatures in three streams in Dinkey North and two streams in Dinkey South for project monitoring. Performed Best Management Practices Evaluation Program (BMPEP) monitoring at 2 locations in Dinkey South to evaluate BMP compliance for the project. Drought conditions prevented post project monitoring Stream Condition Inventory surveys.

Eastfork: Collected stream temperatures in four streams for project monitoring. Inventoried nine known occupied meadows for Yosemite toad (YT) (Threatened) breeding and habitat condition for compliance with the Programmatic Biological Opinion implementation and take monitoring. Inventoried Snow Corral Meadow for Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog population (SYLF) and habitat condition. Provided support to the Sale Administrator regarding limited operating periods for the YT in occupied units. Worked with the Sale Administrator to ensure that treatments protect stream channels and riparian areas. Performed Best Management Practices Evaluation Program (BMPEP) monitoring at 13 locations (including 3 Streamside Management Zone evaluations, 2 landing evaluations, and 2 skid trail evaluations, 6 meadow protection) to evaluate BMP compliance for the project and the PBO. These locations were randomly selected from the units in this project area, and were independent of the targets assigned to the Forest.

Soaproot: Collected stream temperatures in three streams for project monitoring. Coordinated limited operation periods within occupied Western pond turtle habitat for scheduled contract project work. Drought conditions prevented post project monitoring Stream Condition Inventory surveys. Also we had a volunteer student from Fresno State who assisted with Soaproot BMPEP data collection.

Bald Mountain: Collected a third year of pre-project stream temperatures in five perennial streams associated with TES species. Inventoried 11 occupied YT meadows (Visual encounter surveys) for presence; completed annual inventory of three reaches of WF Cow Creek for LCT population counts; and inventoried Cutts Meadow, Cutts Creek, and Swanson Meadow for SYLF population monitoring as per the terms and conditions of the Bald Mountain Project Biological Opinion (2014). Drought conditions prevented pre project monitoring Stream Condition Inventory surveys.

Exchequer: Collected stream temperatures in four streams for project monitoring. Established and collected during project stream temperatures in four perennial streams associated with TES species. Completed second year meadow inventories on 15 meadows and 34 first year surveys on newly mapped potential meadow areas. Inventoried 15 stream channels for presence and habitat suitability on perennial streams for the SYLF. Collected baseline information for monitoring project effects, including general Channel Analysis surveys in 4 additional streams. Drought conditions and safety issues prevented completion of these surveys (dry channels, wasp swarms)

Processed and developed field reports for all inventories completed including entering data into regional databases including NRIS, and WIT, labeling photos and filing data appropriately.

House Project: Inventoried 16 stream channels for presence and habitat suitability on perennial streams for the SYLF. Started to collect baseline information for monitoring project effects, including general Channel Analysis surveys in streams but was unable to due to drought conditions (dry stream channels). YT meadow surveys were not completed because it was outside of protocol timeframe). Completion of SYLF were not accomplished due to the Rough Fire road closures and drought conditions.

Wilderness Program:

Continued lakeshore habitat restoration and trail erosion control in the Dinkey Lakes Wilderness. The Collaborative project area encompasses the headwaters of Dinkey Creek including nine popular lakes and 7.5 miles of system trails.

Wilderness rangers and volunteers removed and rehabilitated 35 campsites within 100 feet of water at South Lake and First Dinkey Lake. Wilderness staff also maintained the trails in this area.

Project funds leveraged over 300 hours of volunteer labor and continued a partnership with Wilderness Corps, a recently formed wilderness stewardship organization with an interest in helping the Forest Service in the Dinkey Lakes Wilderness.

Hydrology/Soils:

Soaproot: Conducted monitoring of the larger headcut located to the north of 10S75C repaired in 2014. No repairs were needed this summer, follow-up monitoring will be completed next year to determine if any additional repair is needed.

Eastfork: Conducted monitoring of the headcut restoration structures within four of the meadows found in the Project area constructed by the YCC crew in 2012, 2013, & 2014. Two structures, one within Ahart Meadow and the other in House Meadow, required maintenance since their construction was completed. Additional follow-up monitoring will be

completed next year to determine if any additional repairs are needed.

Bald Mountain: Field evaluation of all the WIN sites within the Project area was completed to determine the type of crew needed to complete the proposed WIN site restoration, length of time potentially required for each site, materials that would be required, access routes into the sites, and rock cache sites. Multiple headcuts and unstable banks were repaired this summer by the YCC crew in the meadow (520M114) located to the east of Camp Fresno. Additional follow-up monitoring will be completed next year to determine if any additional repairs are needed.

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

Fiscal Year	Total number of acres treated (treatment footprint)
Total in FY15	1179 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 – 1650 acres FY11 – 5178 acres FY12 – 1209 acres FY13 – 2801 acres FY14 – 2316 acres FY15 – 1179 acres

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

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).

Significant challenges continued to occur in FY 2015 with regards to wildfire, climate, and the ongoing severe drought. The southern Sierra Nevada is experiencing the fourth year of an Extraordinary Drought (NWS designation) that has led to moisture stressed trees and epidemic levels of western pine beetle induced tree mortality at unprecedented levels throughout the Collaborative project area. The increased fuel load and extremely low fuel moistures, confounded with an extraordinarily active fire suppression season resulted in a lack of accomplishment in prescribed fire. Additionally, several years of large fires on the Sierra National Forest (Aspen, French, Willow, Rough) have commanded the Forests attention through suppression efforts and subsequent fire salvage projects.

10. Planned FY 2017 Accomplishments[11]

Performance Measure Code[12]	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment	Amount ($)
Acres treated annually to sustain or restore watershed function and resilience WTRSHD-RSTR-ANN	Acres	n/a	n/a
Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres	390	$252,000
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	1700	$215,000
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	10	$5,000

[10] This metric is separate from the annual performance measurement reporting as recorded in the databases of record. Please see the instructions document for further clarification.
[11] Please note that planned accomplishments are aggregated across the projects to determine the proposed goals for the program's outyear budget justification. These numbers should reflect what is in the CFLRP work plan, with deviations described in question 12.
[12] 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[12]	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment	Amount ($)
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC	Acres	n/a	n/a
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions. S&W-RSRC-IMP	Acres	n/a	n/a
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-LAK	Acres	n/a	n/a
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	n/a	n/a
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	n/a	n/a
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved RG-VEG-IMP	Acres	n/a	n/a
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance RD-HC-MAIN	Miles	n/a	n/a
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance RD-PC-MAINT	Miles	n/a	n/a
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	n/a	n/a
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles	n/a	n/a
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles	n/a	n/a
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage STRM-CROS-MTG-STD	Number	n/a	n/a
Miles of system trail maintained to standard TL-MAINT-STD	Miles	n/a	n/a
Miles of system trail improved to standard TL-IMP-STD	Miles	n/a	n/a
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard LND-BL-MRK-MAINT	Miles	n/a	n/a
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC	Acres	1200	$70,000
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF	10,000	
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	12,500	
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons	2,000	$140,000
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	1,500	$175,000
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	2,056	318,400
Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands SP-INVSPE-FED-AC	Acres	n/a	n/a

Performance Measure Code[12]	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment	Amount ($)
Number of priority acres treated annually for native pests on Federal lands SP-NATIVE-FED-AC	Acres	500	$145,000

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

1,200 acres of forestland treated using timber sales are the planned treatment in Eastfork Stewardship, Cow Stewardship, and planned hazard tree sales.

500 acres of small tree thinning in Soaproot and Eastfork.

10,000 CCF Volume of timber harvested is the planned harvest in Eastfork Stewardship, Cow Stewardship, and the planned hazard tree sales.

12,500 CCF volume of timber sold is the planned Swanson stewardship sale.

2,000 acres of green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production are the biomass treatments in Cow Stewardship.

1,500 acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the WUI to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire is the treatment of fuels in Cow Stewardship, Eastfork Stewardship, planned hazard tree sales, and the Haslet underburn.

2,056 acres of WUI high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire is the treatment of fuels in Cow Stewardship, planned hazard tree sales, Dinkey South underburn, Soaproot pile burning, and the Haslet underburn.

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):

Implementation of the original CFLRP project work plan has been affected by salvage sales following several years of large fires on the Sierra National Forest, 4 years of extreme drought, and may continue to be affected by an unprecedented and ongoing large scale tree-mortality event caused by epidemic insect outbreaks.

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.

Participating Organizations and Members are listed at:
http://www.fs.usda.gov/detailfull/sierra/home/?cid=stelprdb5389590&width=full

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

As reported throughout this report, the Dinkey Collaborative continues to have active, engaged membership. In FY2015, the value of member hours spent working on Collaborative priorities exceeded $56,000, and members continue to leverage funding to magnify the federal investment. Over a half million dollars were spent on implementing restoration projects on private lands within the Collaborative boundaries. Over $300,000 were granted to the Forest from the Sierra Nevada Conservancy, a participating organization. The Wilderness Society leveraged funds via a Challenge Cost Share agreement to promote ecological and socio-economic monitoring implementation and development. As in past years, the success of the Dinkey Collaborative in FY2015 is due to the passionate and committed engagement of its diverse membership.

Signatures:

Recommended by (Project Coordinator(s)):___Sarah LaPlante_____

Approved by (Forest Supervisor(s)):_____