CFLR Project: Colorado Front Range Project/CFLR004

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

1. Match and Leveraged funds:

a. FY16 Matching Funds Documentation

Fund Source – (CFLN/CFLR Funds Expended)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2016($)
CFLN13	$33,737
CFLN16	$1,885,566

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 2016($)
NFLM14	$292,625
WFHF16	$1,200,000

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 2016($)
CMRD16	$33,864
RTRT16	$63,501
NFVW16	$409,475
NFWF16	$107,666
NFTM16	$234,596
SPFH16	$138,000
WFHF16	$899,812
WFHF14	$671,980

This amount should match the amount of matching funds obligated in the gPAS expenditure report, minus the Washington Office funds listed in the box above and any partner funds contributed through agreements (such as NFEX, SPEX, WFEX, CMEX, and CWFS) listed in the box below.

Fund Source – (Funds contributed through agreements)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2016($)
NFXNF213-Arbor Day Foundation ARP (FY13)	$125,839
NFXF5415-Bureau of Reclamation CBT ARP	$265,740
WFXN0215-Denver Water ARP (FY15)	$683,933
NFXN3416-Arbor Day Foundation PSICC (FY16)	$128,000
CWFSA414-Colorado Springs Utilities PSICC (FY14)	$46,397
CWFSA415-Colorado Springs Utilities PSICC (FY15)	$468,057
CWFSA416-Colorado Springs Utilities PSICC (FY16)	$379,463
NFXN0114-Denver Water PSICC (FY14)	$120,931
CFRI – Denver Water	$185,000

Please document any partner contributions to implementation and monitoring of the CFLR project through an income funds agreement (this should include partner funds captured through the gPAS job reports such as NFEX, SPEX, WFEX, CMEX, and CWFS). Please list the partner organizations involved in the agreement. Partner contributions for Fish, Wildlife, Watershed work can be found in WIT database.

Fund Source – (Partner In-Kind Contributions)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2016($)
Colorado Forest Restoration Institute	$46,640
Front Range Roundtable (CFLR Monitoring Team and UMC)	$25,000
Estimated total	$6,333
Coalition for the Upper South Platte	

Total partner in-kind contributions for implementation and monitoring of a CFLR project. Please list the partner organizations that provided in-kind contributions.

Service work accomplishment through goods-for services funding within a stewardship contract (for contracts awarded in FY16). Total revised non-monetary credit limit for contracts awarded in FY16	**Totals**
ARP, Red Feather 4	$15,098
PSICC, Painted Rocks	$2,069
PSICC, Phantom 5	$2,499
PSICC, Hybrook	$11,832
PSICC, Eco Beaver	$300

Note: revised non-monetary credit limits for contracts awarded prior to FY16 were captured in the FY 15 CFLR annual report. This should be the amount in contract's "Progress Report for Stewardship Credits, Integrated Resources Contracts or Agreements" in cell J46, the "Revised Non-Monetary Credit Limit," as of September 30. Additional information on the Progress Reports is available in CFLR Annual Report Instructions document. Note: revised non-monetary credit limits for contracts awarded prior to FY16 were captured in the FY15 CFLR annual report.

b. Please provide a narrative or table describing leveraged funds in your landscape in FY2016 (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, research conducted that helps project achieve proposed objectives, and purchase of equipment for wood processing that will use restoration by-products from CFLR projects. See "Instructions" document for additional information.

Organization	Type of Treatment	Ownership	Acres Treated	External Dollars Used	USDA/FS Grant Dollars
Denver Mountain Parks	Restoration / Hazardous Fuels Reduction	Non USFS within CFLRA Boundary	208	$58,000	$0
Colorado State Forest Service (Fort Collins District)	Fuels Reduction / Defensible Space / Forest Restoration	Non USFS within CFLRA Boundary	775	$850,961	$0
Colorado State Forest Service (Fort Collins District)	Fuels Reduction / Defensible Space	Non USFS within CFLRA Boundary	312	$0	$281,697

Organization	Type of Treatment	Ownership	Acres Treated	External Dollars Used	USDA/FS Grant Dollars
Colorado State Forest Service (Boulder District)	Forest Restoration	Non USFS within CFLRA Boundary	20	$58,817	$0
Colorado State Forest Service (Boulder District)	Fuels Reduction / Defensible Space	Non USFS within CFLRA Boundary	621	$0	$438,083
Colorado Forest Restoration Institute – Denver Water through CSFS	Monitoring, analysis, and collaborative adaptive management of fuels reduction projects	Non USFS within CFLRA Boundary	0	$82,500	$0
All	All	Above	1,936	1,152,778	719,780

2. Please tell us about the CFLR **project's progress to date in restoring a more fire-adapted ecosystem as described in the project proposal**, and how it has contributed to the wildland fire goals in the *10-Year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan*. This may also include a brief 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). ***Where existing fuel treatments within the landscape are tested by wildfire, please include a summary and reference the fuel treatment effectiveness report.***

VEGETATION MANAGEMENT

The Colorado Front Range Project aims to restore lower montane forest structure and function by reducing forest densities, creating diverse patterns of forest structure at stand and landscape-scales, and reducing the potential for uncharacteristically severe wildfire. Approximately 32,000 acres were identified for treatment under the CFLR project from the Pike-San Isabel National Forest (PSICC) in the southern Front Range to the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest (ARP) in the northern Front Range. The change in stand structure brought about by treatments has resulted in favorable changes in modeled fire behavior. Despite these favorable changes, treatments have generally increased surface fuel loads as material leftover from removal, mastication, or lop and scatter treatments is redistributed to the forest floor.

In general, monitoring and analysis has indicated that project treatments have created forest structure that more closely resembles historical forest structure. However, post-treatment monitoring has shown that there are a few differences between post treatment forest structure and historical stand structures. Post treatment stands were characterized by a higher abundance of Douglas-fir, a reduction of structural variability, fewer large openings, and small and medium groups of retained trees appeared to be under represented. Despite these conclusions, the landscape restoration and monitoring team felt that progress was being made in moving stand conditions closer to restored conditions.

WILDFIRE

The 2016 wildfire season on the Arapaho and Roosevelt NF totaled 53 fires with 16 of those occurring within the CFLR project boundary. Fourteen of those fires were less than a half-acre in size. The total area burned on NFS lands covered approximately 294 acres.

On July 9, 2016, a wildfire began within a Colorado Front Range Project treatment area. The Cold Springs Fire was started by an illegal campfire on private land, and burned a total of 606 acres over two days (531 acres private land). On the afternoon of July 10, 2016, the fire burned through approximately 75 acres of National Forest System land near Nederland, Colo. This area had been manually treated (restoration thinning) by a U.S. Forest Service contractor in April 2015 as part of the CFLR Project. While the slash piles had not yet been burned, this project treated a large amount of heavy fuels, increasing the spacing between the residual tree canopies. When the wildfire spread into the unit, fire activity moved from the tree crowns down to the ground vegetation, allowing firefighters to engage the fire and hold it on two sides of the unit. Firefighters who were on scene believe that the cutting of heavy fuels in this unit prevented the fire from causing more spot fires across Boulder Canyon, which would have put thousands more residences in the path of wildfire. Surrounded on all sides by private property, the unit is credited with preventing the destruction of more homes. While there were hundreds of homes along the fire's perimeter, the loss was limited to eight residences.

The 2016 wildfire season on the Pike NF within the CFLRP area was relatively quiet as there were numerous small fires less than one-half acre in size, with one around 10 acres. None of these fires were near previously treated areas so there was no testing of treatments.

Cold Springs Fire, July 9, 2016

Cold Springs Fire, September 21, 2016

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 – Restoration/documents/cflrp/TREAT/TREATUserGuide20151005.pdf.

FY 2016 Jobs Created/Maintained (FY16 CFLR/CFLN/ WO carryover funding):

FY 2016 Jobs Created/Maintained	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Direct)	Jobs (Full and Part-Time (Total)	Labor Income (Direct)	Labor Income (Total)
Timber harvesting component	6	7	242,355	399,932
Forest and watershed restoration component	23	27	373,927	561,996
Mill processing component	3	9	96,185	258,471
Implementation and monitoring	28	32	626,950	769,284
Other Project Activities	2	3	116,432	170,176
TOTALS:	**62**	**78**	**1,455,850**	**2,159,858**

FY 2016 Jobs Created/Maintained (FY16 CFLR/CFLN/ WO carryover **and matching funding**):

FY 2016 Jobs Created/Maintained	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Direct)	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Total)	Labor Income (Direct)	Labor Income (Total)
Timber harvesting component	6	7	242,355	399,932

FY 2016 Jobs Created/Maintained	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Direct)	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Total)	Labor Income (Direct)	Labor Income (Total)
Forest and watershed restoration component	46	55	766,463	1,151,959
Mill processing component	3	9	96,185	258,471
Implementation and monitoring	7	14	1,285,101	1,576,851
Other Project Activities	4	6	238,659	344,072
TOTALS:	**66**	**92**	**2,628,763**	**3,731,284**

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). *If you have one story you could tell a member of Congress or other key stakeholder about the benefits in the community the project has helped achieve, what would it be?*

The social and economic monitoring assessment for the Colorado Front Range Project is being generated through an agreement with the Colorado Forest Restoration Institute (CFRI). The current analysis for the 2016 Annual Report is in progress and will not be available until spring of 2017. Results of this analysis will be presented in the 2017 Annual Report. The economic and utilization statistics are calculated from implementation information 2 to 3 years prior to the current annual report. The current delay is due to challenges with acquiring data and running the economic software (Implan). The most current information was displayed in the 2014 Annual Report and was based on the 2013 Social and Economic Monitoring Assessment completed by CFRI.

The Colorado Front Range Restoration Initiative has built the foundation for collaboration and participation by surrounding communities, environmental organizations, other government agencies and universities, to implement and monitor restoration and natural resource management on public lands. This foundation will lead to increased awareness and understanding of the need for restoration and fuels treatments along the Colorado Front Range. A better understanding of the need for treatment will lead to community support, a more stable forest management industry, and overall project success. The Cold Springs Fire discussed previously in this report is another success story worth sharing.

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

MULTI-PARTY MONITORING PROCESS

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

The monitoring plan outlines a comprehensive ecological monitoring program to assess success of CFLRP treatments after project implementation, and guides future treatments through an adaptive management framework. Monitoring results are being used both to evaluate the rate and extent of achievement of individual project goals, and to incorporate data into analyses of cumulative effects at the landscape level. The monitoring protocols are designed to address specific Desired Conditions. Desired Conditions are expressed in broad, general terms, with achievement occurring at the end of the 10-year period. The group established Desired Ecological Conditions, based on the original CFLRP proposal, and which determined the group's choice of variables to measure and protocols to use. They are:

- Establish a complex mosaic of forest density, size and age (at stand scales).
- Establish a more favorable species composition favoring ponderosa pine over other conifers.
- Establish a more characteristic fire regime; increase coverage of native understory plant communities.
- Increase the occurrence of wildlife species that would be expected in a restored lower montane forest.
- Establish a complex mosaic of forest density, size and age, all at the landscape scale.

Multi-Party Monitoring Field Trip, September 21, 2016

KEY MONITORING RESULTS

Through the process of analyzing and interpreting data with an explicit goal of working toward advancing management recommendations, the LR Team made four conclusions and recommendations relevant to monitoring and analysis of future CFLRI projects:

- The LR team agreed that the type and extent of monitoring data currently being collected is adequate to evaluate treatments and make recommendations for future treatments. However, further development of additional analyses (e.g., opening size distribution, analysis of distribution of structural metrics) and further consideration of the relevance of reference conditions in identifying targets for future restoration treatments may be important next steps to improve monitoring analyses.
- The LR team concluded that simple spatial metrics are preferred for evaluating spatial components of desired metrics over more complex metrics. Presentations in this monitoring discussion used metrics such as percent openings in edge versus large openings, which were easier to interpret than more complex spatial heterogeneity metrics used previously (e.g., FragStats). However, some complex spatial heterogeneity metrics (e.g., those related to connectivity) may prove useful for monitoring changes in potential wildlife habitat.
- Although the LR team agreed that project-level data was adequate to address project-level evaluation of treatments, the group felt that landscape-scale analyses are still necessary to address the larger-scale questions about landscape-scale heterogeneity and for use in future treatment planning.
- The LR team felt that consideration of reference conditions allowed progress toward making more concrete recommendations for future treatments. However, refinement of how reference conditions are framed and evaluated may be necessary. Specifically, the group is interested in further consideration of the role of past disturbance history in shaping reference conditions.

WILDLIFE MONITORING PROGRAM

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

2016 Progress for Wildlife Working Team (WWT):

- Year 3 of the Agreement with Bird Conservancy of the Rockies (formally Rocky Mountain Bird Observatory) was implemented for sampling of Tier 1 avian species and pine squirrels under the IMBCR.
- The Bird Conservancy of the Rockies will analyze data over the winter of 2016/17 with results expected in the spring/summer of 2017.
- WWT meetings continue to be held to discuss on-going and future monitoring and data management needs as well as WWT role in the FRCFLP and associated teams.

UNDERSTORY MONITORING PROGRAM

Progress is being made toward evaluating how CFLR treatments impact understory plant communities. Progress toward this goal includes refining the desired conditions related to understory plants into seven testable monitoring hypotheses. Currently, they are collecting pre-treatment data in a variety of treatment areas to assess how treatments alter the abundance and diversity of (1) native species, (2) functional groups, (3) early seral species, (4) exotic plants, (5) key native species (i.e., threatened/endangered), (6) noxious weeds, and (7) spatial heterogeneity of herb communities (i.e., beta diversity). The seven treatment areas span the Front Range and include a total of 18 treatment and control pairs and three different treatment types (mechanical thinning, hand thinning, and prescribed fire). Because several treatments have not yet been implemented (and was one canceled), the team is exploring ways to make other inferences from the data such as relating overstory and understory data while remaining treatments are completed.

WATERSHED HEALTH MONITORING

The Forest Service initiated an effort to develop a watershed health monitoring protocol at the end of fiscal year 2016. The goal of this monitoring effort is to develop a methodology for understanding the effects of CFLRP treatments and similar fuels reduction and/or restoration treatments on watershed health. This monitoring is expected to be a long term effort (15-20 years). Since watershed monitoring would compete for funding with other monitoring efforts such as wildlife and understory vegetation, the intent is to tie in with other watershed health monitoring efforts and leverage existing field data as much as possible. The initial watershed health monitoring subgroup includes representatives from the City of Aurora, the Colorado Forest Restoration Institute, and the Nature Conservancy. Additional participants are likely Colorado Springs Utilities, Denver Water, and the Natural Resources Conversation Service. This working group hopes to have a

monitoring plan approved by the Landscape Restoration Team of the Front Range Fuels Treatment Partnership Roundtable by April 2017.

6. **FY 2016 accomplishments**.

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)
Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres	1,347	$63,501	RTRT (FY16)
Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres	Part of above	$128,000	NFXN3416 -Arbor Day PSICC
Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres	Part of above	$125,000	NFXN0114 -Denver Water PSICC
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	4,105	$550,070	CFLN (FY16)
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	Part of above	$33,737	CFLN (FY13)
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	Part of above	$712,628 ($292,625 reported in FMMI)	NFLM (FY14 In Lieu of CFLN)
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	Part of above	$348,925	WFHF (FY16 In Lieu of CFLN)
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	Part of above	$300,930	NFVW (FY16)
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	Part of above	$138,000	SPFH (FY16)
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	Part of above	$120,000 ($0 reported in FMMI)	SPFH (FY14)
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	Part of above	See FP-FUELS-WUI	See FP-FUELS-WUI
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acres	7,570	$84,738	NFVW (FY16)

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC	Acres	0		
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions. S&W-RSRC-IMP	Acres	196	$23,807	NFVW (FY16)
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-LAK	Acres	0		
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	2.157	$107,666	NFWF (FY16) See S&W-RSRC-IMP
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	10,197		See FOR-VEG-IMP
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved RG-VEG-IMP	Acres	0		
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance RD-HC-MAIN	Miles	0		
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance RD-PC-MAINT	Miles	0		
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	0		
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles	0		
Miles of high clearance system road improved	Miles	0		

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)
RD-HC-IMP				
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage STRM-CROS-MTG-STD	Number	0		
Miles of system trail maintained to standard TL-MAINT-STD	Miles	0		
Miles of system trail improved to standard TL-IMP-STD	Miles	0		
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard LND-BL-MRK-MAINT	Miles	0		
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC	Acres	0		
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF	0		
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	7,149	$234,596	NFTM (FY16)
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons	0		
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	0		
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire	Acres	9,993	$1,335,495	CFLN (FY16)

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)
FP-FUELS-WUI				
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	Part of above	$851,075	WFHF (FY16 In Lieu of CFLN)
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	Part of above	$890,812	WFHF (FY16)
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	Part of above	$671,980	WFHF (FY14)
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	Part of above	$46,397	CWFSA414-Colo Spgs Utilities PSICC
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	Part of above	$468,057	CWFSA415-Colo Spgs Utilities PSICC
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	Part of above	$379,463	CWFSA416-Colo Spgs Utilities PSICC
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire	Acres	Part of above	$683,933	WFXN0215-Denver Water ARP

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)
FP-FUELS-WUI				
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	Part of above	$120,931	NFXN0114-Denver Water PSICC
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	Part of above	$125,839	NFXNF213-Denver Water ARP
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	Part of above	$265,740	NFXF5415-BOR ARP
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	Part of above		See FOR-VEG-IMP
Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands SP-INVSPE-FED-AC	Acres	0		
Number of priority acres treated annually for native pests on Federal lands SP-NATIVE-FED-AC	Acres	0		

Units accomplished should match the accomplishments recorded in the Databases of Record. Please include the type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match) if you have accurate information that is readily available. Please report each BLI on a separate line within a given performance measures' "Type of Funds" box.

7. **FY 2016 accomplishment narrative** – Summarize key accomplishments and evaluate project progress not already described elsewhere in this report. (Please limit answer to three pages.)

FRONT RANGE LONG TERM STEWARDSHIP CONTRACT

Since the beginning of the CFLRP program in 2010, the Front Range Long Term Stewardship Contract (FRLTSC) had been the primary contracting instrument in acquiring services to complete activities within the Colorado Front Range CFLRP area for the Arapaho-Roosevelt NF and Pike-San Isabel NF. In 2015, the principal contractor of the Front Range Long Term Stewardship Contract (LTSC), West Range Reclamation LLC (WRR), filed for bankruptcy and in May of 2016 completed court proceedings that resulted in keeping the company solvent but they were forced to reorganize. As a result of the proceedings, the Forest Service modified the FRLTSC to reduce the commitment of the Forest Service to a minimal number of guaranteed acres. In FY16, one CFLRP task order was awarded to WRR on the Pike and San Isabel NF. Uncertainty by both Forests to the condition of WRR as a result of bankruptcy proceeding let to the reduced commitment, and resulted in both Forests seeking other contracts to complete work in the CFLRP area in FY16.

The modification to the FRLTSC canceled seven task orders that had been awarded in 2013 and 2014 but were untreated at the time of the modification. Three of these task orders, planned to treat a total of 695 acres, were awarded with CFLRP program funds. The de-obligated funding from these task orders was utilized to award the Redfeather 3 project on the Arapaho-Roosevelt in 2016. The 695 acres were deducted from the cumulative treatment footprint (see response to question #8) to avoid double counting these acres.

FY16 CONTRACTING

While WRR was awarded one CFLRP task order in FY16, most contracts were solicited either open market completive, or were sole-sourced to contactors under special contracting authorities. The results of contracting success in FY16 were mixed. Most contracts on both Forests were awarded to reputable contractors who had experience in the type of work required. Some contractors were new in the role of primary contractor on Federal contracts, but had experience as a subcontractor. With new contractors to the program came new prices for work activities. In general prices for services were 0%-50% higher that the prices under the Long Term Stewardship Contract. In FY16 both Forests were not able to award enough contracts to meet the 4,400 acre per year goal for the program (4,177 awarded in FY16, net 3,485 acres). If prices stay the same or increase it will be hard to meet 4,400 acres with a high level of mechanical treatments.

ARAPAHO AND ROOSEVELT NATIONAL FORESTS

The Colorado Front Range Project (COFRP) continued to make progress on restoration of lower montane, ponderosa pine forested stand conditions. After more than a year of implementation delay due to the reduced commitment of the Front Range Long-Term Stewardship Contract, we were finally able to move forward awarding new contracts and begin to catch up on the treatment acre commitments for the CFLR project. For FY16, the Colorado Front Range Project completed 9,994 (all funds and projects) acres of restoration in lower montane ponderosa pine stands.

On the Arapaho-Roosevelt NF, challenges still exist in planning and implementing some projects due to neighbor concerns over treatment goals, locations, and intensity. Progress in negotiation and collaboration is being made and treatments in these areas is expected to begin in FY 2017.

The Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forests awarded five CFLRP contracts in FY16 totaling 2,139 acres of restoration focused treatments within the project area. The Forest also completed fuel reduction treatments by pile burning on nearly 1,500 acres in CFLRP treatment stands, completing the initial restoration treatment objectives. The fire crews began broadcast burning operations in the Pingree Hill Project area by burning the perimeter of the burn unit. The interior of this unit is planned to be burned in 2017 and 2018. This successful burn will begin the restoration process on critical acres in the CFLRP project area in the Poudre Canyon.

During our annual monitoring field trip in September, 2016, the collaborative and monitoring team visited several older prescribed fire and wildfire locations. The Forest is looking at prescribed fire as a more dominant tool for restoration projects in the future. The goal for the monitoring fieldtrip was to look for examples of past successful prescribed burning as an example of what we hope to achieve in restoration burning.

PIKE AND SAN ISABEL NATIONAL FORESTS

Despite the reduced commitment to the FRLTSC, and uncertainty with interested contractors, the PSICC was able to contract 2,038 of acres of restoration and WUI fuels treatments. Timber volume was sold on five stewardship contracts that totaled over 3,700 CCF of sawtimber and other products. Reforestation efforts in the Hayman burn area continued with over 1,300 acres planted with ponderosa pine seedlings, funded in part through an ongoing partnership with the Arbor Day Foundation and other partners.

The PSICC awarded four stewardship and one service contract within the CFLRP area with restoration objectives. The objectives of these projects emphasis the retention of older trees in the ponderosa pine and dry mixed conifer types, opening up densely closed stands of mid to late seral classes, creating a more open forest environment and improving shrub and grass diversity, and increasing resilience to disturbances such as wildfire.

Partnerships continue to contribute significantly to matching treatments within the CFLRP area. With nearly 1,200 acres of reforestation being funded by partnership funds, and over 2,100 acres of fuels reduction, partnership contributions are an important component in being able to fund activities within the CFLRP area. The combined contribution of partnership funds in FY16 to fund treatments on NFS lands is over $2.3 million. Partners provided approximately 50 percent of the total matching funds.

An emphasis on the use of prescribed fire to accomplish restoration and WUI fuels reduction activities was initiated in FY15. In November of 2015 a prescribed burn was implemented that resulted in about 300 acres treated. Given the challenges of completing a prescribed burn in this area near Woodland Park, CO it was deemed a success and a template for future burns. The burn plans for the projects are similar to prescriptions for mechanical treatments.

Prescribed Burn-Manitou Experimental Forest Oct. 2016 (Adjacent and Similar Objectives to Nov 2015 Rx Burn CFLRP)

Field Trip in April

UPPER MONUMENT CREEK

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

Upper Monument Creek project area

The FRRT Landscape Restoration team continues to work collaboratively within the Upper Monument project area, identifying treatment types and locations, defining desired conditions for the vegetation types that occur within the project area, recommending project design criteria, and providing other management recommendations. The Pikes Peak Ranger District published the Notice of Availability for the Upper Monument Creek Landscape Restoration Draft Environmental Impact Statement on November 4, 2016. The DEIS is open for public review and is posted on the web at FS/USDA Project 44012.

8. ***Review the gPAS spatial information sent to you by the Washington Office after gPAS closes out on October 31***

Fiscal Year	Total number of acres treated (treatment footprint)
FY10 through FY16	18,238 acres
2010	988 acres
2011	4,081 acres
2012	3,284 acres
2013	2,978 acres
2014	2,638 acres
2015	784 acres
2016	3,485 acres

Funding	Forest	Project	Acres
FY16 CFLRP Funded Projects	ARP	Red Feather 4	609
FY16 CFLRP Funded Projects	ARP	Red Feather 3	1,105
FY16 CFLRP Funded Projects	ARP	Ridge (RFB)	205
FY16 CFLRP Funded Projects	ARP	Burnt/Blue Creek	220
FY16 CFLRP Funded Projects	PSICC	PPRD RX Burn	301
FY16 CFLRP Funded Projects	PSICC	Painted Rocks	151
FY16 CFLRP Funded Projects	PSICC	Phantom 5	246
FY16 CFLRP Funded Projects	PSICC	Hybrook	537
FY16 CFLRP Funded Projects	PSICC	Eco Beaver	582
FY16 CFLRP Funded Projects	PSICC	Tornado	221
FRLTSC CFLRP De-obligated Projects (Contract Modification)	ARP	Gold Hill	-50
FRLTSC CFLRP De-obligated Projects (Contract Modification)	ARP	Green Ridge	-217
FRLTSC CFLRP De-obligated Projects (Contract Modification)	PSICC	Little Scraggy	-425
Total	**All**	**All**	**3,485**

The footprint was derived from projects (awarded stewardship and service contracts and the RX burn on the PSICC) that were funded with CFLRP program funds (CFLN and "in lieu of funds"). The 695 acres were deducted from the cumulative treatment footprint to avoid double counting acres that had previously been awarded through the FRLTSC (see response to #7, Front Range Long Term Stewardship Contract).

9. **Describe any reasons that the FY 2016 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).

Project Progress 2010 – 2016

Cumulative project accomplishment is compared with the 2013 project "lifetime" goals submission in the table below. All expected accomplishments, except CFLR/N funded treatments (mechanical or manual fuels reduction), were accomplished via all funding sources including project funds (CFLR/N and "in lieu of"), matching, and partner funds.

Majority of the planned treatments for the 10 year period are on a trajectory to meet or have already exceeded expected cumulative outputs. Three performance outputs (see below) that are below the planned rate of progress (70% through FY2016) are associated with the decreased capacity of the Front Range Long Term Stewardship Contract (FRLTSC) in 2015. This contract was the primary contracting tool for implementing mechanical and manual fuels/restoration treatments on both forests from 2009-2014. The FRLTSC contractor filed for Bankruptcy in April 2015. Ultimately this situation was resolved through a contract modification in 2016 which reduced the minimum obligation from a total of 4,000 acres per year to 500 acres total for the remainder of the contract. During the modification process in 2015 the Forest Service was able to convert one project (West Creek 717, PSICC) that had been planned for implementation via the FRLTSC to a separate short term contract. This contract was awarded to a different company. Other contract conversion efforts, intended for sale on the open market, were unsuccessful due to limited time to rework contract packages or lack of interest.

- ***CFLR/N funded acres (mechanical or manual fuels reduction):*** Only one contract (West Creek 717, PSICC) that would treat 784 acres through mastication work was awarded in 2015 for the CO Front Range Project.
- ***Acres of forest vegetation improved***: CFLR/N funded projects typically treat pole sized material and biomass in conjunction with the removal of sawtimber. The capacity to implement these treatments also declined in 2015.
- ***Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production***: The economical removal of biomass has been a challenge region-wide. From 2009 through 2014 commercial biomass was primarily produced via the FRLTSC for a seasonal landscaping material market. Commercial removal of biomass for energy production from federal lands in the region has been limited and has occurred primarily through the White River Long Term Stewardship Contract (Eagle Valley Clean Energy, Gypsum, CO).

Both forests are confident that expected project outputs can be met through increasing annual output from 3,200 to 4,400 acres per year, primarily via short term, stand-alone stewardship or service contracts. This may require designing future projects to treat more acres through manual chainsaw work or mastication in lieu of tractor logging with product removal. Despite the significant challenges in 2015, there does appear to some market capacity to proceed with planned projects at higher treatment costs. In FY16 2,949 acres of project work were successfully awarded outside of the FRLTSC (out of 4,177 total acres).

Colorado Front Range CFLRP cumulative accomplishments 2010-2016 per annual reports.

Performance Measure	Code	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	TOTALS	PROJECTED EXPECTED	% ACCOMP-LISHED
CFLR/N funded acres (mechanical or manual fuels reduction)	None	988	4,081	3,284	2,978	2,638	784	4,087	**18,238**	**31,600**	**58%**
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production	BIO-NRG	5,514	1,128	459	260				**7,361**	**24,000**	**31%**
Acres of forest vegetation established	FOR-VEG-EST		1,047	1,100	1,564	1,199	996	1,347	**7,253**	**10,000**	**73%**
Acres of forest vegetation improved	FOR-VEG-IMP		5,562	2,181	5,758	5,414	3,095	4,105	**26,115**	**41,300**	**63%**
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire	FP-FUELS-WUI	3,224	6,922	5,506	9,625	6,530	2,438	9,994	**44,239**	**63,800**	**69%**
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced	HBT-ENH-TERR		1,402	6,615	1,414	4,163	4,540	10,198	**28,332**	**11,666**	**243%**
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants	INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	100		625	429	477	529	7,570	**9,730**	**5,600**	**174%**
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard	LND-BL-RK-MAINT		21						**21**	**21.25**	**100%**
Miles of unauthorized road decommissioned	RD-DECOM			5		7			**12**	**5**	**246%**
Miles of closed and high clearance system roads receiving maintenance	RD-HC-MAINT		2	33	8	69			**111**	**36**	**308%**
Miles of passenger car system roads improved[1]	RD-PC-IMP			1					**1**	**18**	**6%**
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance	RD-PC-MAINT		9	52		243			**304**	**61**	**497%**
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions	S&W-RSRC-IMP		43	9,763	3,003	881		196	**13,886**	**9,805**	**142%**

[1] Expected miles of passenger car system roads improved should have been designated as passenger car system roads receiving maintenance (497%).

Performance Measure	Code	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	TOTALS	PROJECTED EXPECTED	% ACCOMPLISHED
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage	STRM-CROS-MTG-STD			1					**1**	**1**	**100%**
Miles of system trail maintained	TL-MAINT-STD			110	9				**119**	**113**	**105%**
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales	TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC			20	256				**276**	**20**	**1,380%**
Volume of Timber sold (CCF)	TMBR-VOL-SLD		6,678	11,889	6,175	5,141	8,108	7,150	**45,141**	**62,000**	**73%**

10. **Planned FY 2018 Accomplishments**[2]

In an effort to simplify reporting, we've reduced the number of performance measures we are asking you for here. However, the ones below are still needed for our annual budget request to Congress. In our justification to Congress for continued funding each year, we have to display planned accomplishments for the coming year.

Performance Measure Code	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment	Amount ($)
Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres	1,000	$500,000
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	500	$100,000
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles		
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres		
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles		
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles		
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles		
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	5,600	
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons		
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre		

[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 11.

Performance Measure Code	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment	Amount ($)
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	6,500	$4,000,000

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. STRM-CROS-MTG-STD has been added since it tends to be one of the WLSH CFLRP largest funding needs.

11. **Planned accomplishment narrative and justification if planned FY 2017/18 accomplishments and/or funding differs from CFLRP project work plan** (no more than 1 page):

The planned FY17/18 accomplishments are based upon full proposal funding. Our ability to implement planned acres is dependent upon a reliable source of contractors with the capacity to implement projects along the Front Range. Reliable markets are a concern for projects with product removal. FY17/18 accomplishments will continue to emphasize restoration treatments in the ponderosa pine ecosystem and hazardous fuels reduction in WUI utilizing mechanical, manual, and prescribed fire treatments. Partners have agreed to help fund noxious weed treatments associated with CFLR projects as well.

On the Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forests, 2017 treatment accomplishments are dependent upon the approval of the Forsythe Project on the Boulder Ranger District. Neighbors living near the project area have raised concerns over fuel treatment operations, treatment prescriptions and the overall need for fuels treatments. A NEPA decision on the project is expected in December of this year. Treatment preparation and operations are expected to begin in the summer of 2017.

For the PSICC, FY17 and future projects are dependent on the approval of the Upper Monument Creek EIS that is expected to be signed in February 2017. Over 30,000 acres would be available for mechanical thinning with product removal, and use of prescribed fire to shift forest conditions on this landscape towards the desired conditions.

Similar to the ARP, the PSICC is working with new contractors to secure services to complete work in the CFLRP area. Contracting efforts in FY16 indicated that treatment prices are increasing, partly because inexperienced contractors are not yet comfortable with assigning prices to this type of work. Depending on location and product type, projects with a significant amount of timber volume appear to more value in keeping prices lower. Conversely prices are higher for contracts that primarily require service work with little product value. On the Pikes Peak and South Park Ranger Districts there appears to be favorable haul distances which helps to reduce rates. For the northern part of the PSICC, on the South Platte RD, haul distances are a detriment at this time, and prices are higher than anywhere in the CFLRP area on the PSICC. This will be a major consideration during project implementation.

As both Forests move forward with the limited capacity of the FRLTSC, the uncertainty with respect to the cost of treatments will continue. The FRLTSC was a fixed price with known treatment rates. The cost of new

contracts is unknown, but recent contracts are coming in much higher than expected. The high cost of new contracts could lower the number of acres that can be treated with funding that is comparable to prior years. The result could be fewer mechanical acres treated over the remaining life of the CFLRP project. There is an increased interest on both Forests to use prescribed fire as a primary tool to accomplish restoration projects. Prescribed fire acres could offset the expected decrease in mechanically treated acres.

12. **Please include an up to date list of the members of your collaborative if it has changed from the list you submitted in the FY15 report** (name and affiliation, if there is one). If the information is available online, you can simply include the hyperlink here. If you have engaged new collaborative members this year, please provide a brief description of their engagement.

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

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

Name	**Organization**
Rob Addington	The Nature Conservancy
Greg Aplet	The Wilderness Society
Hannah Bergmann	Colorado State University
Jenny Briggs	US Geological Survey
Peter Brown	Rocky Mtn. Tree-Ring Research
Jeff Cannon	Colorado State University, CFRI
Marin Chambers	Colorado State University, CFRI
Tony Cheng	Colorado State University, CFRI
Casey Cooley	Colorado Parks and Wildlife
Lynne Deibel	USFS, ARP
Jonas Feinstein	USDA NRCS
Paula Fornwalt	USFS, RMRS

Name	Organization
Ben Gannon	Colorado State University, CFRI
Jim Gerleman	USFS, PSICC
Mark Martin	USFS, ARP
Sara Mayben	USFS, PSICC
Kyle McCatty	Boulder County
Mike McHugh	Aurora Water
Patrick McLaughlin	Colorado Dept. of Public Health
Nick Stremel	Boulder County
Rick Truex	USFS, R2
Jeff Underhill	USFS, R2
Brett Wolk	Colorado State University, CFRI
Kevin Zimlinghaus	USFS, ARP

13. **Did you project try any new approaches to increasing partner match funding in FY2016 (both in-kind contributions and through agreements)? (no more than one page):**

The PSICC submitted an open letter of inquiry to the Arbor Day Foundation with a proposal to support activities beyond the traditional support for reforestation projects. The Arbor Day Foundation has only funded the cost of seedlings in the past. This proposal would expand the reforestation program to restoration work in riparian corridors within the CFLRP boundary. The proposal has been reviewed by ADF and is being considered for support.

Through a collaborative approach, the PSICC worked with the communities of Palmer Lake and Monument to consider treatments around an important water storage facility adjacent to a Colorado Roadless area. The area of treatment was originally not going to be considered due to limited access and inoperability. However, through conversations, it is now being included in NEPA analysis after it was recognized as a highly valuable treatment area for the surrounding communities. Palmer Lake and other partners are working to fund these proposed treatments through grants.

14. **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. You are welcome to include links or to copy/paste.

Csindy/Colorado Springs/rocky-mountain-field-institutes

YouTube watch feature

koaa/story/33292936/prescribed-burns-in-pike-national-forest-set-for-october

csindy/IndyBlog/archives/2016/10/18/colorado-state-forest-service-use-more-local-wood

krdo.com/news/money/forest-service-conducts-media-tour-of-waldo-canyon

Signatures:

Recommended by (ARP Project Coordinator(s)):_____

Recommended by (PSICC Project Coordinator(s)):_____

Approved by (ARP Forest Supervisor(s))[3]:_____

Approved by (PSICC Forest Supervisor(s))[4]:_____

(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.

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