

CFLR Project (Name/Number): Tapash/CFLR08

National Forest(s): Okanogan Wenatchee

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) | Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2015(\$) |
|---|---|
| CFLN13 | 740,544. |
| CFLN14 | 86,139 |
| CFLN15 | 9,006 |

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.

| Fund Source – (Funds expended from Washington Office funds (in addition to CFLR/CFLN) (please include a new row for each BLI)) | Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2015(\$) |
|---|---|
| NFTM | 98,029. |

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.

| Fund Source – (FS Matching Funds (please include a new row for each BLI)) | Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2015(\$) |
|--|---|
| BDBD | 1,442.91 |
| CMLG | 25,002.71 |
| CMXN | 43,154.29 |
| CWFS | 1,775,937.66 |
| NFVW | 1,043,916.48 |
| NFWF | 14,023.49 |
| NFTM | 9,294 |
| NFXN | 150,691.57 |
| RTRT | 35,750.10 |
| SSSS | 14,207.75 |
| WFHF | 169,127.31 |

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) | Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2015(\$) |
|---|---|
| n/a | n/a |

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) | Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2015(\$) |
|--|---|
| Total | 299,298 |
| Community Volunteer | 21,825 |
| University/Science Lab | 10,479 |
| Volunteer and pilot | 55,000 |
| Cascade Carnivore Project | 4,680 |
| Conservation Northwest Combined Volunteer Hours | 200,000 |

| Fund Source – (Partner In-Kind Contributions) | Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2015(\$) |
|--|---|
| Community Volunteer | 5,000 |
| Community Volunteer | 3,000 |
| Ruffed Grouse Society | 1,600 |

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 |

Total amount of stewardship credits charged for contracts awarded in FY15: This should be the amount in the “stewardship credits charged” column at the end of the fiscal year in the TSA report TSA90R-01. Total revised credit limit for contracts awarded in FY15: 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.

| Service work accomplishment through goods-for services funding within a stewardship contract | Totals |
|--|---------------|
| For Contracts Awarded Prior to FY15: Total amount of stewardship credits charged in FY15 | \$252,342. |
| Total revised credit limit for open and closed contracts awarded and previously reported prior to FY15 | \$278,522. |

Total amount of stewardship credits charged in FY15: This should be the amount in the “stewardship credits charged” column at the end of the fiscal year in the TSA report TSA90R-01. Total revised credit limit for open and closed contracts awarded and previously reported prior to FY15: 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). 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.

| Description of item | Where activity/item is located or impacted area | Estimated total amount | Forest Service or Partner Funds? | Source of funds |
|---|---|-------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| Commercial harvest, TSI, reforestation and fuel treatment. | Yakama Nation ownership within CFLR landscape | \$770,000 | Partner Funds | Yakama Nation |
| In-stream Wood Placement | 300 logs placed in ¼ mile reach of Oak Creek on State lands within CFLR landscape | \$45,000 | Partner Funds | Yakama Nation |
| Lidar | Multi-jurisdictional flight within CFLR landscape | \$8,000 | Partner Funds | Yakama Nation |
| Commercial and non-commercial thinning for forest health and wildlife habitat improvement | 390 acres of WDFW land within CFLR landscape | \$224,000 | Partner funds | WDFW |

| Description of item | Where activity/item is located or impacted area | Estimated total amount | Forest Service or Partner Funds? | Source of funds |
|---|--|------------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| Road decommissioning and maintenance to reduce sediment delivery to streams, wildlife habitat improvement and improvement to water quality and fisheries habitat. | 9.5 miles of road decommissioning/maintenance on WDFW roads within CFLR landscape | \$64,000 | Partner funds | WDFW |
| Culvert upgrades to improve aquatic organism passage | Three culverts upgraded on WDFW lands within CFLR landscape | \$24,000 | Partner funds | WDFW |
| Landscape Evaluation of Manastash-Taneum multi-jurisdictional landscape. Project planning and implementation | Identification of vegetation departure and aquatic restoration needs on 103,841 acres. Development of landscape prescriptions. | \$75,000 \$35,000 | Partner funds | TNC |
| Landscape Evaluation of Manastash-Taneum multi-jurisdictional landscape. Project planning and implementation | 150 acres of State lands within CFLRP landscape. | \$75,000 \$35,000 | Partner funds | TNC |
| Planning | Collaboration and NEPA, ESA consultation, prescription preparation, and project design for multiple CFLRP projects. | \$733,371 | Forest Service funds | NFTM/WFHF |
| Geomorphological assessment | Little Naches River floodplain on FS lands within the CFLRP landscape | \$10,150 | Partner funds | Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board |
| Lidar | Little Naches River floodplain on FS lands within the CFLRP landscape | \$11,721 | Partner funds | Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board |
| Collab. Participation | Little Naches River floodplain on FS lands within the CFLRP landscape | \$3,850 | Partner funds | Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board |
| Commercial and non-commercial thinning, fuels reduction, road improvement, weed treatment, and removal of barriers to fish passage. | 3,115 acres; 27.5 miles; 2,435 miles; 1 structure, respectively on WDNR lands within CFLRP landscape. | \$2,797,698 | Partner funds | WDNR |

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

There was a total value of \$4,801,790. in leveraged investments made into the Tapash landscape in FY15.

Investments continue to be made by the Washington Department of Wildlife and The Nature Conservancy toward land acquisition within the Tapash landscape (Little Naches, Manastash, Teanaway). Acquisition of at-risk lands

continues to be a high priority for the Tapash Sustainable Forest Collaborative. Tapash continues to work towards land exchange proposals that create a contiguous land ownership pattern.

Contributions made by working group members through active participation in meetings related to information sharing, identification of project objectives, project development; and in -field reviews intended to identify potential issues and develop solutions are also significant. Many participants are local community members and are not paid when investing time in collaboration and the collaborative process.

The Tapash CFLRP landscape is beginning to realize substantial benefits from maturing partnerships/relationships and the associated in-kind contributions and funding. The Tapash CFLR project has provided the venue for development of a dialogue that is beginning to build greater landscape-level awareness, a more comprehensive understanding of the needs, and identification of opportunities that meet a collective set of goals and objectives. The dialogue has also brought new relationships to the cumulative effort; including the Natural Resource Conservation Service and the Kittitas and Yakima County Conservation Districts. In addition to the establishment of new relationships, previously existing relationships, such as those with the Yakama Nation and the Washington Department of Natural Resources, have been greatly enhanced as a result of active engagement and on-going collaboration.

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).

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

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

This project meets two of the three primary goals of the National Cohesive Wildland Fire Management Strategy (Cohesive Strategy) by restoring and maintaining resilient landscapes and creating fire adapted communities. It is also consistent with the national objectives of the Cohesive Strategy in that it supports collaborative efforts; contributes to effective education and outreach; is proactive in utilizing vegetation management tools and techniques; and supports working forests, local economies and job creation, and diverse products and markets.

Within the Tapash landscape, 59% of wildland fires are natural ignitions. The 10 year average of wildfires controlled at initial attack remains 97%. Of the wildfires that occurred in FY15, most were controlled during initial attack, with only one that escaped Initial Attack. This last years' Meeks Table fire was human caused, burning 1,182 acres, many of these acres burned with low intensity.

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):

There was \$1,194,961 in wildfire preparedness (WFPR), invested directly to the Tapash landscape in FY15. Expenses included base salaries, training, and resource costs. In addition, we indirectly supported \$617,296 in wildfire preparedness. With respect to emergency fire suppression and Burn Area Emergency Rehabilitation within the project landscape, we spent approximately \$325,050 for the 33 initial attack fires that were contained at small acreages. One additional fire was not contained at small acres. The 33 initial attack fires contained were contained at 5.5 acres burned; the one additional fire was not contained (1,182 acres burned). All ignitions were prioritized and suppressed as resources were made available. There were no other hazardous fuels expenses incurred that are not captured elsewhere in this report. As in FY12, FY13 and FY14, there was an attempt to accomplish a large-scale, summer prescribed fire in the Tapash landscape. Due to Regional preparedness levels, Forest fire activity and the lack of qualified overhead, the Forest elected not to proceed with a summer burn.

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>.

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 |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Commercial Forest Product Activities | 51 | 101 | 3,303,337 | 5,433,903 |
| Other Project Activities | 14 | 17 | 468,151 | 566,435 |
| TOTALS: | 65 | 115 | 3,771,488 | 6,000,338 |

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 |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Commercial Forest Product Activities | 51 | 101 | 3,298,105 | 5,425,299 |
| Other Project Activities | 26 | 35 | 1,498,036 | 1,936,509 |
| TOTALS: | 77 | 136 | 4,896,141 | 7,361,808 |

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>.

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).

As described in more detail in Question # 5 below, the Tapash CFLRP multi-party monitoring working group is continuing to work on implementation of a project-specific monitoring plan. In our efforts to assess and monitor overall community benefit, the group has identified social values (recreational amenities, infra-structure, access, aesthetics, and air quality), economics (to supply existing and attract new forest product infrastructure that facilitates ecologically based restoration and creates sustainable local employment and community well-being), and cultural

resource values (historic and prehistoric heritage resources (archeological properties)) defined as physical evidence of past human activity expressed as artifacts and or features on the modern landscape; and treaty rights (the right of access to usual and accustomed fishing stations and the privilege to hunt, gather and graze animals) as key monitoring categories. These categories are intended to give emphasis to the social/community-related aspects of the project. Specific monitoring questions have now been framed under each of these key categories.

To date, much of the information gleaned on other community benefits is anecdotal in nature and derived from discussions at formal and informal meetings, field trips, and forums with individuals from local businesses and others who provide services within the local community and surrounding areas. Several CFLRP project specific collaborative groups are working toward identification of a process for data collection and analysis that is representative of their local community. The newly formed Washington Collaborative Coalition recently highlighted this topic on the agenda at their annual state-wide meeting in Ellensburg, Washington. Members of the Tapash CFLRP Economically Sustainable Forest Products Utilization Task Force continue to participate on field trips with members of forest products industry to identify barriers and find solutions to challenges associated with the economic feasibility of restoration projects, stewardship contracting, and providing more opportunities for purchasers, operators, and local mills.

As a means toward building stronger community relationships between the Forest Service and the Yakama Nation given our common interests in resource stewardship, restoration of fire-prone ecosystems, and sustainable economies; we continue to actively engage with our Tribal partners on the Anchor Forest Project and Tribal Forest Protection Act authority. The on-going Anchor Forest Project, sponsored by the Intertribal Timber Council with funding through the USDA Forest Service, is a multi-ownership, land based area which supports long-term wood and biomass production levels backed by local infrastructure and technical expertise and endorsed politically and publicly to produce desired land management objectives for working forests. Additionally, in July-August, 2015, TFPA authority was requested by the Yakama Nation, and approved by the Regional Forester for the Dry Stewardship Restoration project. We anticipate this project moving forward in FY16.

Another example of our efforts toward benefitting the local community is our continued persistence relative to exploring opportunities associated with biomass utilization. Although we continue to make biomass available, we continue to be unsuccessful in moving this small diameter, low-value material off of the landscape. As a means to identify solutions to this situation, we are continuing in our attempts to engage directly with our local community members and members of the Forest Biomass Coordination Group to utilize local resources for local benefit. We continue to explore non-traditional forest product development and innovative ways to accomplish forest restoration while maintaining local jobs and a sustainable economy. A recent local success is the selection of the Yakima Specialties project to receive a USDA Wood Innovations Funding Opportunity grant. The project is for design and engineering of a biomass boiler. The biomass boiler project at Yakima Specialties represents a unique opportunity for direct utilization of biomass sourced from restoration treatments. Not only will the facility use wood chips than can be processed directly from thinning projects, but also represents an expansion of bioenergy into sectors other than the forest products industry. Engaging with the local community in efforts such as this serves as a model for innovative projects in the future, while engaging the broader community in forest health issues.

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

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

To date, a suite of key monitoring categories have been developed, under which, specific questions have been framed. Each question has been evaluated using a set of previously agreed upon criteria. The criteria are intended to act as a screen or filter when assessing which monitoring questions to ask and to provide a basis for prioritizing each question. The group is currently working on identifying methodologies that are most effective and efficient in capturing the desired information to answer each monitoring question, development of a formal prioritization process that further engages our stakeholders and decision makers, and continued stakeholder communication and outreach.

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

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

A significant amount of monitoring is also being conducted within the Tapash CFLRP landscape via partnerships, matching funds, and/or volunteers, including: baseline monitoring for peregrine falcon and bald eagle, Northern spotted owl historic site monitoring, Mardon skipper site monitoring, and monitoring for Townsend's big-eared bat hibernacula and maternity roosts. Tapash continues to move forward in the collection of base-line data through the completion of stand exams, photo interpretation, and validation of vegetative conditions for use in modeling the ecological departure within the landscape; and the subsequent preparation of restoration strategy landscape objectives and prescriptions for large-scale restoration treatments. The Tapash Collaborative Forest Restoration Monitoring Plan is located at www.Tapash.org.

6. FY 2015 accomplishments

| Performance Measure | Unit of measure | Total Units Accomplished | Total Treatment Cost (\$) | Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match) |
|--|-----------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---|
| Acres treated annually to sustain or restore watershed function and resilience WTRSHD-RSTR-ANN | Acres | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST | Acres | 1,742 | 35,485 | RTRT |
| Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP | Acres | 13 | 265 | RTRT |
| Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC | Acre | 1,480.6 | 70,296. | NFVW SRS2 CWFS Partner match |
| Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC | 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 | 1,100 | 308,347.29 | CFLN CMXN |
| Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-LAK | Acres | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM | Miles | 10.8 | 308,347.29 | CFLN CMXN |
| Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR | Acres | 7,814.6 | 274,455 | NFWF NFVW CFLN NFTM NFXN RBRB Partner match |
| Acres of rangeland vegetation improved RG-VEG-IMP | Acres | 8,694 | Integrated accomplishment | NFTM WFHF CFLN NFVW SSSS BDBD |
| Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance RD-HC-MAIN | Miles | n/a | n/a | n/a |

| Performance Measure | Unit of measure | Total Units Accomplished | Total Treatment Cost (\$) | Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match) |
|--|------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance RD-PC-MAINT | Miles | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM | Miles | 16.56 | 308,347.29 | CFLN CMXN |
| Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP | Miles | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP | Miles | n/a | 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 | n/a |
| Miles of system trail maintained to standard TL-MAINT-STD | Miles | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Miles of system trail improved to standard TL-IMP-STD | Miles | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard LND-BL-MRK-MAINT | Miles | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC | Acres | 639 | Included below | NFTM SSSS CFLN |
| Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST | CCF | 20,206.6 | 426,726.75 | NFTM SSSS CFLN |
| Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD | CCF | 2,371.3 | Included above | NFTM SSSS CFLN |
| Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG | Green tons | 33 | Included above | WFHF CFLN |
| Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI | Acre | 722 | 86,824.52 | WFHF BDBD CFLN |

| Performance Measure | Unit of measure | Total Units Accomplished | Total Treatment Cost (\$) | Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match) |
|--|-----------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI | Acres | 1,881 | 204,081.22 | WFHF BDBD CFLN |
| Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands SP-INVSP-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 | Acres | n/a | n/a | n/a |

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

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

The Tapash Sustainable Forest Collaborative was chartered in 2007 to facilitate the common goals of landscape restoration and conservation of working forests in Central Washington. The ultimate goal of the Tapash CFLRP project proposal remains to increase our combined restoration footprint on the landscape by implementing restoration treatments which increase overall forest resiliency and aquatic health. The desired outcome is a vegetative landscape that is more resilient to changing climates, fire, and insects, and that responds in a manner that maintains and restores natural processes, patterns, and functions. The reestablishment of natural vegetative processes, such as insect and disease and fire regimes, is also intended to reduce the risk of uncharacteristic wildfire and associated management costs. As well, there is an additional focus to reduce adverse effects on stream flows, sediment regimes, and flood plain function caused by high road densities and/or poor road location.

Application of the Okanogan Wenatchee Forest Restoration Strategy early in the planning process continues to allow us to efficiently prepare for larger landscape treatments by informing the NEPA process. The Strategy provides the basis for implementation of large-scale landscape treatment, while at the same time providing for the development of a relatively narrow restoration purpose and need. This supports a proposed action that reflects the specific purposes of the CFLR Act to reduce the risk of uncharacteristic wildfire activity and the cost of wildfire suppression while encouraging economic and social sustainability. Because the strategy identifies multiple potential landscape treatment areas, we are able to prioritize and treat individual portions of the landscape as specific conditions and funding permit; a more efficient process than treating vegetation and fuels with a stand-by-stand approach. We are now beginning to realize NEPA efficiencies and subsequent implementation of restoration treatments.

CFLRP funding has contributed to the Forest's ability to develop projects that include the full complement of restoration activities, ultimately allowing the vegetation projects to move forward when otherwise they would not. The Oak Creek, Glass-Angel, and Nelli Restoration projects serve as examples of projects where improvement in road-related aquatic and fisheries conditions and reconstruction of crossings for aquatic organism passage provided for access to implement a timber sale and subsequent fuels treatments. Additionally, the vegetation and road work described above has resulted in significant integrated accomplishments with respect to acres of water and soil resources improved, miles of stream habitat improved, acres of terrestrial habitat improved, and acres of range vegetation improved. Most recently, there has been a significant effort to more fully integrate the recreation resource early in the planning process. This allows for collaborative problem framing and identification of solutions by all stakeholders in the initial stages of the process.

The partners are currently focusing significant efforts on areas within the landscape where restoration projects can be edge-matched across ownership boundaries to increase the overall restoration footprint through a multi-jurisdictional approach. Although implementation of an ownership blind, cross-boundary project presents a myriad of challenges yet to overcome (e.g., policy and contracting), we have already shown achievement in regard to edge-matching projects in the Oak Creek watershed where we have worked within a 3-partner checkerboard to implement vegetative and aquatic restoration treatments. As well, the Teanaway Fire Adapted Community, the Teanaway Community Forest, and the Manastash-Taneum Resilient Landscape areas are currently moving forward together with respect to proposing treatments across ownership boundaries. Subsequent to the recent acquisition of lands within the Tapash landscape, our TNC partners have taken an active role in initiating and participating in the Manastash-Teanaway cross-boundary landscape project that includes landscape evaluation across multiple ownerships, integrated planning, and project implementation. This effort brings in new partnerships with respect to the Natural Resources Conservation Service and the Kittitas and Yakima County Conservation Districts. Our partners also continue to add capacity in further development of the Okanogan Wenatchee Forest Restoration Strategy economic and aquatic modules. Additionally, through collaborative work with the Yakama Nation/Inter-Tribal Timber Council around Anchor Forests, there has been a forest restoration/timber supply assessment completed across all ownerships that is being used as the basis for a dialogue around a realistic mechanical treatment footprint and a sustainable wood supply. This effort will also help form the basis for a meaningful discussion related to infrastructure potential, right-sizing, and future investments.

In July-August 2015, the Yakama Nation requested and was approved Tribal Forest Protection Act authority for the Dry Restoration stewardship project. We are actively working with the Nation to develop and implement this project in FY16. The Tapash CFLRP landscape is beginning to recognize significant opportunities provided by the recently evolving relationship with the Yakama Nation. The cumulative opportunities available through Anchor Forests, Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration, Tribal Forest Protection Act authority, and stewardship contracting have the potential to advance a broad set of our common goals and objectives.

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

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?¹

| Fiscal Year | Total number of acres treated (treatment footprint) |
|---------------|---|
| Total in FY15 | 29,510s |

¹ 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.

| Fiscal Year | Total number of acres treated (treatment footprint) |
|--|--|
| 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 – 2,331 FY11 – 3,870 FY12 – 7,237 FY13 – 3,955 FY14 – 7,304 FY15 – 4,813 |

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

We assemble the” footprint” by counting the acre one time when the initial treatment is implemented; regardless of the chronology of the treatment (as determined by the prescription). The initial treatment sets a given acre on a trajectory towards a “restored acre” and displays progress towards a desired future condition.

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).

Forest wildfire activity – The Forest experienced unusually severe wildfire activity and subsequent consequences this year. The scale of wildfire activity on the Forest dictated the use of all available personnel and resources. Fire support took first priority.

Fire transfer – A significant amount of CFLN funding (\$95,305) that was to be obligated to existing pre-commercial thinning and piling contracts via task orders was caught up in fire transfer and the associated direction to stand down on further spending and obligation of currently unobligated funds. As well, another \$22,500 of BDBD and WFHF matching funds were also left unobligated as a result of fire transfer.

Forest staffing transitions – Several key leadership positions, including two Tapash CFLRP District Rangers and the Forest Supervisor, experienced staffing transitions this year.

10. Planned FY 2017 Accomplishments²

| Performance Measure Code | 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 | n/a | n/a |
| Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP | Acres | 500 (integrated) | 11,000. |
| Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC | Acre | 1,000 (integrated) | 47,465. |
| Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC | Acres | n/a | n/a |

² 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.

| Performance Measure Code | Unit of measure | Planned Accomplishment | Amount (\$) |
|---|-----------------|------------------------|---|
| Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions. S&W-RSRC-IMP | Acres | 500 (integrated) | 140,158. |
| 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 | 5 (integrated) | 155,000. |
| Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR | Acres | 3,000 | 105,364. |
| Acres of rangeland vegetation improved RG-VEG-IMP | Acres | 4,500 (integrated) | Integrated w/ vegetation, fuels, invasives, stream improvement, etc. costs. |
| 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 | 10 (integrated) | 186,200. |
| 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 | 2,762 | 483,350. (\$175/acre) |
| Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST | CCF | 40,000 | Included above |
| Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD | CCF | 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 | Green tons | n/a | n/a |

| Performance Measure Code | 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 | n/a | n/a |
| Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI | Acres | 2,800 | 420,000 (\$150/acre). |
| Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands SP-INVSP-E-FED-AC | Acres | n/a | n/a |
| Number of priority acres treated annually for native pests on Federal lands SP-NATIVE-FED-AC | Acres | n/a | n/a |

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.

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

FY2017 outputs emphasize two things – acres treated with mechanical harvest and prescribed fire to reduce fuels and commercial timber harvest and the associated timber sale volume. Integrated accomplishments in Forest Vegetation Improved, Range Vegetation Improved, and Terrestrial Habitat Improved would also be realized as a result of vegetation and fuel treatments. With respect to the fuel reduction emphasis on the Tapash landscape; previously, prescribed fire and full implementation of the prescribed fire program had been identified as the preferred treatment, followed by non-commercial mechanical treatments. However, recognizing the long-term and on-going challenges associated with the implementation of prescribed fire on this landscape; non-commercial mechanical treatments will now be the emphasis for fuel reduction treatments. A priority ranking where non-commercial mechanical treatments rank as the highest priority followed by road-related aquatic and fisheries improvements (road improvement and road decommissioning) providing for aquatic organism passage. Integrated accomplishments in Water or Soil Resources Protected, Maintained, or Improved to Achieve Desired Watershed Conditions and Miles of Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced would be realized as a result of the roads/aquatics treatments.

This is consistent with the Revised Tapash Project Proposal (February 07, 2014) with respect to identified outcomes and associated outputs.

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):

It does not differ from the Revised Tapash Project Proposal (February 07, 2014).

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 Tapash Sustainable Forest Collaborative signatory members continue to include:

The Nature Conservancy, James Schroeder

Okanogan Wenatchee National Forest Service, Mike Williams

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Michael Livingston

Washington Department of Natural Resources, Larry Leach

Yakama Nation, Phil Rigdon

Project specific working groups: These groups include diverse memberships representing a variety of stakeholders interested in a specific landscape. Representation may vary depending on the individual landscape, but typically include members from conservation, industry (timber, livestock, mining), recreation, permitted/special uses, regulatory agencies, and tribal representation.

Little Naches Working Group: Point of Contact: Lloyd McGee, The Nature Conservancy

Swauk Pine Working Group: Point of Contact: Jen Watkins, Conservation Northwest

Upper Yakima Working Group: Point of Contact: Jen Watkins, Conservation Northwest

Other collaborating members:

Bureau of Reclamation, Wendy Christensen

Kittitas County Conservation District, Suzanne Wade

Mid-Columbia Fisheries Enhancement Group, Rebecca Wassell

Natural Resource Conservation Service, Erin Kreutz

South Central Washington Resource Conservation and Development Council, Ryan Anderson

Woodwise Inc., Meagun Nuss

Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board, Alex Connelly

Yakima County Conservation District, Corey Bonsen

Yakama Wood Resources, Kelly Olney, Ron Holden, Steve Rigdon

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

Please refer to previous Item 1(b): (Optional) Additional narrative about leveraged funds on the landscape.

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.

[Burned-Out Forest Helping Some Birds Thrive](#): Yakima Herald, June 11, 2015

[Senator Cantwell meets with panel to consider future cost of wildfires](#): Yakima Herald, August 20, 2015

[Lawmakers' proposed budget for fighting, preventing wildfires vexes officials](#): Yakima Herald, March 31, 2015

<http://www.king5.com/story/tech/science/environment/2015/10/15/oak-creek-forest-restoration-wildfire/74023672/>

[Selective logging provides good work for crew and renewed habitat for wildlife](#): Yakima Herald, October 19, 2015

<http://crosscut.com/2015/05/big-change-for-forests-animals-east-of-snoqualmie/>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0ymMFz1FDOs>

<http://www.seattletimes.com/2015/10/fighting-fire-with-fire-state-policy-hampers-use-of-controlled-burns/>

Short link: <http://bit.ly/1LsxnUI>

Signatures:

Recommended by (Project Coordinator(s)): //s// Jodi Leingang

Approved by (Forest Supervisor(s))³: _____

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

³ If your project includes more than one National Forest, please include an additional line for each Forest Supervisor signature.