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

National Forest(s): Deschutes National Forest

1. Match and Leveraged funds:

a. FY16 Matching Funds Documentation

Fund Source – (CFLN/CFLR Funds Expended)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2016($)
CFLN14	$ 267,081.87
CFLN16	$ 361,634.43

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($)
CFTM16	$ 78,651
CFHF16	$ 478,925

This value (aka carryover funds or WO unobligated funds) should reflect the amount expended of the allocated funds as indicated in the 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($)
CMLG	$ 4,672.91
CMRD	$ 5,732.89
CMTL	$ 16,713.43
CWK2	$ 3,037.72
CWKV	$ 119,125.71
NFTM	$ 547,355.32
NFVW	$ 22,640.59
RTRT	$ 300,414.54
SPFH	$ 33,367.10
WFHF	$ 512,935.34

These amounts reflect the gPAS expenditures for NFTM and WFHF minus the CFTM and CFHF expenditures shown in the "Funds Expended from the Washington Office" table above.

Fund Source – (Funds contributed through agreements)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2016($)
NFXN (contributed by Trout Unlimited and Upper Deschutes Watershed Council)	$ 249,920

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($)
Monitoring Subcommittee (including field trips) Outreach	**$ 3,807**
Subcommittee Restoration Planning Subcommittee	**$ 3,460**
Steering Committee	**$ 12,458**
Meeting Supplies and Equipment (COIC)	**$ 6,229**
Meeting Venues	**$ 900**
Forest Volunteer Program	**$ 900**
	$ 463,802

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)	Totals
Total revised non-monetary credit limit for contracts awarded in FY16	$ 39,501.10

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.

No leveraged funds were applied to the FY16 CFLR program of work.

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

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.***

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

CFLRP fuels reduction work in FY16 included several days of prescribed burning in high use recreation areas next to the communities of Bend and Sisters and over two thousand acres of small tree thinning and brush mowing in WUI areas. Following thinning and brush mowing, prescribed underburn implementation is the last step in a restoration treatment. The increase in prescribed burning adjacent to highly populated areas is evidence that, through focused funding and efforts on fuels reduction within the Deschutes Collaborative Forest Project, restoration goals have been fully achieved on parts of the landscape. In addition to thinning and mowing work, several other factors have led to increased burning in the CFRLA boundary. These include an improved response to public safety needs through a road flagging contract

(partially funded with CFLRP funding) and an improved public understanding of prescribed fire through efforts of the DCFP outreach subcommittee to the community, a field ranger designated specifically to work within the CFLR boundary and education provided by Central Oregon TREX (Prescribed Fire Training Exchange). A collaboration highlight is the successful implementation of an 82 acre prescribed fire on private property adjacent to USFS lands. The burn was conducted using a cooperative agreement between private landowners, the Bend Parks and Recreation District and the USFS. Continued burning across administrative boundaries is expected in the upcoming years as thinning and brush mowing work is completed on both private and federal lands within the CFLRP boundary.

This year's 61 wildfires is below the 10 year average (66 fires/year) within the CFLRA boundary. Most of the fires were human caused with over half of the 61 fires from escaped campfires. Thirty seven acres burned in wildfire events within the CFLR landscape and this is significantly less than the 10 year average of 3431 acres (still less than the 775 acre 10 year average minus Pole Creek of 2012).

One hundred percent of fuel treatments (3440 acres total) occurred in areas identified as priorities within collaboratively developed Community Wildfire Protection Plan boundaries. In FY16, contracts were awarded for 1316 acres of fuels reduction work (thinning, piling and/or mastication). Forty percent of acres treated were treated by prescribed fire (844 acres of underburning and 577 acres of pile burning). The remaining acres were treated by non-commercial thinning or mowing/mastication. All treatments (100%) in high priority areas achieved fire management objectives as identified in associated management plans or strategies. All treatments applied (100%) where the objective was to restore fire-adapted ecosystems moved the landscape towards desired conditions.

Deschutes National Forest expenses in wildfire preparedness (WFPR) for the area within the CFLR boundary were approximately $375,660 and this remains unchanged from FY15. This approximation is based on an 18% project landscape (257,850 acre CFLR landscape of an entire 1,458,706 acre total landscape (Bend/Fort Rock and Sisters Ranger Districts)), where a total of $2,087,000 was spent. Expenses in wildfire suppression (WFSU) for fires within the CFLR boundary were $261,500 with an average of $4,286 spent per fire. One hundred percent of the 61 fires that occurred within the CFLR boundary were contained at initial attack. Hazardous fuels expenses (CFHF and CFLN) for the CFLR boundary where 3440 acres of fuels treatments occurred were $550,732. There were no known wildfires that occurred in previous treatments.

3. **What assumptions were used in generating the numbers and/or percentages you plugged into the TREAT tool**? Information about Treatment for Restoration Economic Analysis Tool inputs and assumptions available here – http://www.fs.fed.us/restoration/documents/cflrp/R-CAT/TREATUserGuide10112011.pdf.

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

Project Type	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) - Direct	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) - Total	Labor Income - Direct	Labor Income Total
Timber harvesting component	**12**	**17**	**$962,493**	**$1,352,214**
Forest and watershed restoration component	**3**	**4**	**$58,781**	**$87,410**
Mill processing component	**17**	**68**	**$1,102,649**	**$3,047,996**
Implementation and monitoring	**16**	**20**	**$619,983**	**$788,688**
Other Project Activities	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
TOTALS:	**48**	**109**	**$2,743,906**	**$5,276,309**

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

Project Type	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) - Direct	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) - Total	Labor Income - Direct	Labor Income Total
Timber harvesting component	**33**	**46**	**$2,633,865**	**$3,700,338**
Forest and watershed restoration component	**8**	**10**	**$125,736**	**$192,947**
Mill processing component	**48**	**187**	**$3,017,402**	**$8,340,848**
Implementation and monitoring	**38**	**52**	**$1,927,282**	**$2,451,718**
Other Project Activities	**0**	**0**	**$6,999**	**$10,700**
TOTALS:	**127**	**296**	**$7,711,284**	**$14,696,550**

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

TREX: For example, members of the Deschutes Collaborative Forest Project (DCFP) supported the Central Oregon Prescribed Fire Training Exchange (TREX) this spring (May 2016). TREX, a program under the Fire Learning Network, advances understanding of fire and fire adapted landscapes and provides an experiential learning opportunity that engages experienced fire fighters in implementing prescribed fire. The Central Oregon TREX was unique in its incorporation of community engagement and communications in addition to traditional fire operations and fire monitoring curriculum. This program involved DCFP Steering Committee members, community members, policy-makers, and the media in a dialogue about the need for and benefits of prescribed fire use in dry forest restoration. DCFP members developed web, social media, and print public service announcements the importance of prescribed fire, invited DCFP stakeholders to attend a prescribed fire event, and engaged in educating the community about the role of fire in the ecosystem. Participants included representatives from The Nature Conservancy, U.S. Forest Service (7 National Forests), Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of Defense, University of Idaho, Oregon State University, Whitman College, municipal fire departments, and private contractors; a wide array of different organizations from around the nation.

International Workshops: In FY16, Forestry practitioners from around the globe spent several days in Central Oregon, learning from the Deschutes Collaborative Forest Project members and touring integrated vegetation management and aquatic restoration projects. The DCFP was included in the curriculum for International Programs' "Forest Landscape Restoration Seminar" for the second year, and we hosted government officials and practitioners from the Philippines, Guatemala and Honduras. DCFP members (and other community members engaged in community forestry and wildfire risk reduction efforts) benefited from a learning exchange that included sharing successes and challenges related to collaborative forestry efforts ongoing around the globe. Additionally, fire fighters from Central America visited Central Oregon and toured projects in the West Bend area. They discussed challenges and best practices related to cross-jurisdictional firefighting.

Community Outreach: The DCFP has made significant strides toward increasing public understanding of and support for active forest restoration work. This has been essential, since most of DCFPs projects are adjacent to population centers such as the communities of Bend, Sisters, Sunriver and Black Butte Ranch. DCFP utilizes a webpage (http://deschutescollaborativeforest.org/), re-designed in 2015, to outreach to the public with information about forest restoration work, including blog posts from DCFP members, USFS partners, and forest restoration practitioners. This webpage provides content that explains the interconnections between forest restoration activities, public safety, ecological resilience and the local economy. DCFP has also worked with the FS to build public understanding and support during the implementation of prescribed fire within the CFLR landscape and implementation of activities such as mowing and thinning. This effort has contributed to increased public support for restoration activities, even within high visibility and high use recreation areas. DCFP also maintains a Facebook page that engages the public in conversations about ongoing work in the West Bend project while providing information about forest restoration (https://www.facebook.com/DeschutesCollaborativeForest/?fref=ts). DCFP also hosted an interactive, multi-media event "The Era of Mega Fires" at the Old Stone Church. The event featured USFS PNW Research Station scientists and engaged an audience of over 200 people in learning about current forest conditions, effects on wildfire, and what they can do to co-exist with fire and support pro-active forest restoration efforts near them.

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

Monitoring Field Trips: The DCFP hosted a series of five multi-party monitoring field trips to projects on the CFLR landscape in various stages of implementation. The goal of these field trips was to engage DCFP members and Forest Service staff in discussions related to the implementation of DCFP recommendations, to begin identifying opportunities for adaptive management, to facilitate ongoing transparency from planning through to implementation, and to continue the delicate process of maintaining communication and trust between DCFP members and the Forest Service through the implementation phase.

Research and Models: The DCFP engaged with researchers from Oregon State University and the Pacific Northwest Research Station in working together to pilot the "Go Big or Go Home" project, which is a discussion support tool that models the long-term outcomes of various collaborative priorities on the landscape. We also worked closely with the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife and Deschutes National Forest to develop new approach and discussion-support tools to assist with incorporation of forest habitat fragmentation consideration in project planning. This led to the development of a forest habitat fragmentation map tool designed to engage DCFP members and FS staff in conversations about functional as well as structural habitat conditions on the Deschutes National Forest and to support conversations about where best to undertake forest restoration activities that benefit wildlife.

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

Multiparty Monitoring Field Trips: The DCFP undertakes multiparty monitoring field reviews in which collaborative members visit project areas pre-, mid- and post-implementation. All field trips were held in partnership with Deschutes

National Forest resource specialists who assist with identifying field trip stops and providing background information about the project. Prior to these field trips, key information about the project was synthesized from the NEPA document to provide an overview of the purpose and need, objectives and intended outcomes. A copy of the relevant DCFP recommendations was also provided.

During the field trips, the Forest Service shared how they interpreted the DCFP recommendations and applied them in the project area, highlighting any challenges they encountered. The Collaborative then viewed the area and discussed the degree to which the implemented (or soon to be implemented) project reflects DCFP recommendations. This year DCFP hosted 5 field trips and engaged a multi-party monitoring expert to assist us in identifying opportunities for adaptive management and follow-up post field season, which was captured in a summary report provided to DCFP and Forest Service partners. The monitoring subcommittee met in the late fall of 2016 to discuss this report, as well as next-steps for adaptive management.

DCFP finds this process vital for maintaining and enhancing trust, as work shifts from planning to implementation. The field trips provide an opportunity for Collaborative members to view the results of the prescriptions on the ground. We find this leads to opportunities for Collaborative members to grow and change in their thinking, often becoming more comfortable with agreements they have reached through science-based consensus processes. This year DCFP identified an opportunity to engage with the Forest Service prior to marking future units in the Rocket Project and West Bend Project areas in order to address our interest in greater spatial heterogeneity—what we call "clumpy, gappy, patchy" distribution patterns—in black bark pine stands. While the prescription will remain the same, we hope to provide input on how it is implemented. Additionally, we identified a need for additional DCFP-Forest Service discussion related to disagreement and discomfort related to the range of opening sizes in Forest Service's preferred alternative in the upcoming Kew and Lex Projects.

Development of Recommendations: After engaging researchers from Oregon State to conduct primary research mixed-conifer fire ecology and forest development history within the CFLR landscape, we finalized recommendations for dry and moist mixed-conifer forest types. We completed these recommendations in early 2016. This involved extensive work in the field and ongoing dialogue between the Collaborative and OSU researchers and provided a clear mechanism for adaptive learning on the part of the group.

After completing these recommendations, DCFP has begun work on the challenging issue of wildlife habitat and forest fragmentation, with the goal of addressing incorporating both functional and structural habitat conditions in project planning. We have engaged experts from the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, as well as Forest Service wildlife biologists. The outcome of this process will be the completion of a forest habitat fragmentation map tool to support DCFP and Forest Service in discussions about trade-offs among treatment alternatives and to identify priority areas for treatments to restore functional and structural habitat conditions.

6. **FY 2016 accomplishments**.

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished [1]	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)[2]
Acres of forest vegetation established	Acres	1266	419,541	

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

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

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished [1]	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)[2]
FOR-VEG-EST				
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	2590.1		Integrated accomplishment with TMBR-VOL-SLD and FUELS
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	2186.2	40,000	
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC	Acres			
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions. S&W-RSRC-IMP	Acres	1497.4		Integrated accomplishment with STRM-CROS-MTG-STD, TMBR-VOL-SLD and FUELS
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-LAK	Acres			
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	4.5		Integrated accomplishment with STRM-CROS-MTG-STD
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	2697.1		Integrated accomplishment with TMBR-SALES-SLD and FUELS
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved RG-VEG-IMP	Acres			
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance RD-HC-MAIN	Miles			
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance RD-PC-MAINT	Miles	29.5 *(accomplishment not included in gPAS due to reporting error)*	36,732	
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles			
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles			
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles			
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage STRM-CROS-MTG-STD	Number	1	131,200	
Miles of system trail maintained to standard	Miles	20.98	41,647	

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished [1]	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)[2]
TL-MAINT-STD				
Miles of system trail improved to standard TL-IMP-STD	Miles	.15		Same as TL-MAINT-STD
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard LND-BL-MRK-MAINT	Miles			
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC	Acres	5,312 *(only 205 acres were reported in gPAS due to assumed error)*		Same as TMBR-VOL-SLD
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF	31,341.27	493,124	
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	56859.76	1,041,965	
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons	12275.61		Same as TMBR-VOL-SLD
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	2395	$104,449	
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	9186.1	$445,283	
Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands SP-INVSPE-FED-AC	Acres			
Number of priority acres treated annually for native pests on Federal lands SP-NATIVE-FED-AC	Acres			

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.)

The Deschutes Collaborative focused on 2 main issues over the past fiscal year - finalizing recommendations for the management of mixed conifer forests and smoke management. While these issues have briefly been mentioned above, it is important to revisit them here to highlight the importance of this work.

East of the Cascade Mountain range, mixed conifer forest types are ecologically and socially complex, presenting a significant challenge for the diverse group of stakeholders that comprise the DCFP. In FY15, the Collaborative engaged with researchers from OSU and the Pacific Northwest Research Station on a scientific field study in the Kew Project planning area, which provided an opportunity for mutual learning around the development of best available science and its application to the NEPA process. The study focused on forest development and disturbance dynamics, which served to inform their understanding of historic and current conditions within the mixed-conifer forests of the DCFP landscape. In FY16, the Collaborative used this framework as the basis for building their recommendations, which aim to provide guidance to the Forest Service on collaborative desired future conditions for each of the seven unique mixed-conifer types at the landscape- project-, and stand-scale. They also included broad areas of agreement that incorporate social values within the group. Their recommendations were finalized in February 2016, which were incorporated by the Forest Service in the Kew planning effort and have potentially broader application in the CFLR landscape.

The DCFP continued to work with the Deschutes NF on the issue of smoke management, recognizing the limitations current policy places on holistic restoration. The DCFP formed a new subcommittee this year, with the goal of advancing prescribed fire implementation. They plan to work with the community, forest restoration partners (i.e. Deschutes County) and the Forest Service on developing a strategy to inform the revision of smoke management regulations to balance public health needs with agency goals for forest restoration and fire hazard reduction. This effort could have long-term benefits for increasing the pace and scale of restoration using prescribed fire in the context of an "all-lands" approach.

We continued to produce successful outreach efforts that have generated and sustained a broad level of community support for forest restoration work (including mowing, commercial thinning and prescribed fire) in high visibility, high use and high population areas. Diversifying outreach through social media, webpage development, public presentations and one-on-one conversations have shifted the tone and tenor of public dialogue about forest restoration. Outreaching and public education through less conventional methods also served the Deschutes NF and Collaborative well in FY16. In Bend, Oregon – microbreweries are prominent contributors to the local economy and tourism industry. The DCFP worked with Good Life Brewing to create a limited release pale ale labeled "Wildland Session Ale" to bring awareness to the need to enhance forest resiliency and the role of fire on the landscape. A portion of the proceeds will be donated by Good Life to the DCFP. More information can be found at the DCFP website: http://deschutescollaborativeforest.org/press-releases/goodlife-brewing-wildland-session-ale/

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

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

- **If the footprint estimate from gPAS is consistent and accurate**, please confirm and skip this question.
- **If the gPAS spatial information does NOT appear accurate**, describe the total acres treated in the course of the CFLR project below (cumulative footprint acres; not a cumulative total of performance accomplishments). What was the total number of acres treated?

Fiscal Year	Total number of acres treated (treatment footprint)
Total footprint of acres treated from start year through FY16.	83,142

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

Analysis Method

This was completed as a spatial exercise, and did not take into account differences in reporting that may be present in the tabular FACTS database. Acreage QA/QC was not run to verify that the tabular accomplishment acreage matched each associated polygon. Note that full spatial compliance for PAS measures was not mandatory until FY14. Also note that the Deschutes Collaborative Forest Project (CFLR) boundary increased from 142,460 acres to 257,851 acres in FY13 after the proposal was amended.

Using the FACTS Activity Polygons layer in the GI, an Actv160 RSW was run on a selection of polygons within and immediately surrounding the CFLR boundary, defining for all activity accomplished FY10 or later and for the following activities/parameters:

FOR-VEG-EST (4382, 4411, 4412, 4431, 4432, 4491, 4492, 4493, 4494, 4495)
FOR-VEG-IMP (4511, 4521, 4530, 4550)
INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC (All invasive plant activity: 2510, 2530, 2540, 2550, 2560)
TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC (All harvest codes: 4101 through 4242. Complete list in PAS document)
FP-FUELS-WUI & NON-WUI (All key-pointed activity and most will overlap with other PAS measures)
Watershed Resource Soil Productivity: 5550 - Subsoiling

To reach the footprint acreage of each fiscal year's activities, we defined and clipped for each individual fiscal year (choosing **FISCAL_Y_1** and not FISCAL_YEA or FISCAL_Y_2), then we set up each clip with the CFLR Boundary as input, and the activity units as the clip feature. This resulted in a single shape for calculating footprint acres by fiscal year:

FY10: 13,375 acres
FY11: 5,880 acres
FY12: 8,743 acres
FY13: 13,563 acres
FY14: 13,926 acres
FY15: 15,411 acres
FY16: 12,244 acres

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).

The program of work was completed as planned.

10. **Planned FY 2017 Accomplishments**[3]

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	---	
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	1000	
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	3	
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	1500	
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	5	
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles	2	
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles	---	
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	62,000	
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons	15,000	
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	1000	
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	8000	

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

[3] 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.

The table in question 10 above displays the projected FY17 program of work for the Deschutes Collaborative Project and reflects the planned work outlined in the 10 year proposal. Since we do not expect significant deviations from our planned work at this time, the CFLRP funds being requested for the above program of work match the FY17 CFLR request for funding.

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.

http://deschutescollaborativeforest.org/deschutes-collaborative-members-2/

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 Deschutes Collaborative was successful in bringing in the following additional funding to improve their ability to engage with the community and the Forest:

Bella Vista Foundation: $30,000

Oregon Forest Resource Institute: $25,000

OWEB Federal Forest Health Collaborative Assistance: $49335

Title II RAC: $57,000

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.

http://deschutescollaborativeforest.org/blog/

Bend Bulletin, September 21, 2016, "Mind Trail Closures West of Bend"

http://deschutescollaborativeforest.org/press-releases/goodlife-brewing-wildland-session-ale/

Bend Bulletin, May 30, 2016, "Tree Farm prescribed burns to begin Tuesday"

Bend Bulletin, April 27, 2016, "Plenty of mountain bike trail options during closure"

KTVZ, January 6, 2016, "Forest restoration work west of Bend prompts area closure"

Natural History Pub: Panel Discussion: Collaborative Forest Restoration

Signatures:

Recommended by (Project Coordinator(s)):_____

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

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

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