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

National Forest(s): **Sierra 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($)
CFLN	$789,921.63

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($)
NFWF	$955,606.14

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($)
NFTM	$482,202.95
NFVW	$513.00
WFHF	$4,592,112.61
WFPR	$95,452.77

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($)
None	**N/A**

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($)
Sierra Institute (Socio-economic monitoring)	$8,000.00
Sierra Resource Conservation District (comm. and outreach)	$2,915.00
Dinkey Collaborative Members (time)	$50,000.00

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 FY2016)	Totals
Total revised non-monetary credit limit for contracts awarded in FY16	$1,455,305.86

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.

Description of item	Where activity/item is located or impacted area	Estimated total amount	Forest Service or Partner Funds?	Source of funds
Southern California Edison (SCE) work on SCE lands w/in DFLRP boundary	1795 acres of thinning; 100 acres of veg/fuels treatment; 134 burning acres; 48 acres tree planning; 2077 total acres treated	$730,000	Partner Funds	Southern California Edison
Camp El-O-Win fuels reduction work w/in DFLRP boundary	5 acres of hand piling and burning	$2,000	Partner Funds	Camp El-O-Win

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 Sierra Nevada mountain range is currently experiencing unprecedented levels of tree mortality as a result of past management practices, drought, reduced snowpack, increased temperatures, and beetle outbreaks. This mortality event has had a significant impact on the structure, composition, and arrangement of forest fuels. In 2016, the majority of these dead trees are still in the "red phase" resulting in no increase in surface fuels or burn severity of the forest floor, but a significant increase in the probability of a crown fire, which also greatly increases the extent to which a fire can burn. Tree mortality and drought has reduced the prescription window to use prescribed fire in a manner that achieves resource objectives and remains a safe forest restoration tool. Attempts to use prescribed fire in the spring were ultimately shut down, due to safety

concerns. However, this fall a 700 acre prescribed fire was conducted within the Dinkey CFLRP, when conditions provided for optimal control and safety. Not only did this prescribed burn provide for natural resource benefit, but it also built confidence for the fire staff to use prescribed fire under these new ecological conditions. In addition, adjacent to the Dinkey CFLRP, a wildfire was managed for resource benefit within a wilderness area. Both of these successes help to build fire resiliency within this challenging landscape. The Dinkey Collaborative is also actively working to re-address current and future projects to build more defensible fuel profile zones into the landscape to provide for greater firefighter safety and reduce the extent to which a wildfire will spread into critical areas including the wildland urban interface and areas where ecological protection from high severity fires is a priority. These management actions will become increasingly important as burn severity increases as the needles and trees begin to fall and fuel loads accumulate.

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	**0**	**0**	**$0**	**$0**
Forest and watershed restoration component	**3**	**4**	**$99,366**	**$138,690**
Mill processing component	**0**	**0**	**$0**	**$0**
Implementation and monitoring	**16**	**21**	**$846,022**	**$1,039,916**
Other Project Activities	**1**	**1**	**$39,597**	**$59,789**
TOTALS:	**19**	**25**	**$984,985**	**$1,238,396**

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.

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	**3**	**4**	**$160,240**	**$253,638**
Forest and watershed restoration component	**30**	**34**	**$596,638**	**$815,123**
Mill processing component	**0**	**1**	**$15,022**	**$58,364**
Implementation and monitoring	**56**	**68**	**$2,025,043**	**$2,489,149**
Other Project Activities	**4**	**5**	**$51,698**	**$104,657**
TOTALS:	**93**	**112**	**$2,848,642**	**$3,720,931**

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?*

Beyond the economic benefits reported in the tables in Section 3 of this report, the Dinkey Collaborative continues to engage the local community through a variety of education and outreach efforts, and has made socio-economic monitoring a priority focus for FY2016. This year, the Collaborative continued its investment in monitoring by supporting a Challenge-Cost Share agreement with the Sierra Institute, to measure the effect of project work on local community capacity. The Institute conducted interviews and capacity workshops this year, and a report is expected in 2017. The Dinkey Collaborative also began working with the Sierra Resource Conservation District to increase the group's presence and education efforts at local community meetings. Through a Challenge-Cost Share agreement, this partnership is intended to increase community and public understanding and support of Collaborative efforts and restoration work.

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

The Dinkey Collaborative sought to bring on a Forest Service Presidential Management Fellow to act as the full-time CFLRP ecological monitoring coordinator. In this position, the monitoring coordinator has been able to analyze forest data that provides critical information on the effects of the mortality event on forest stand structure and composition.

Species of conservation concern, including the California spotted owl and the Pacific fisher, are actively monitored by the Forest Service Pacific Southwest Research Station. Due to the impacts of the mortality event on fuel loading, the Dinkey Collaborative has provided a letter of support to Dr. Morris Johnson of the Pacific Northwest Research Station for his Forest Health Monitoring grant, which includes modelling the succession of forest fuels within the CFLRP. In addition, the Dinkey Collaborative is working with the Southern Sierra Critical Zone Observatory (UC Merced), the Sierra Resource Conservation District, and the Bren School to develop a team-based graduate project incorporating ecological and sociological aspects of a forest restoration strategy within the Sierras where monitoring data collected from within the CFLRP will be incorporated into the project.

Lastly, as reported above in Section 4, the Collaborative continues to work with the Sierra Institute to better understand the impacts of restoration work to local communities and interest groups. In 2016, the Collaborative prioritized specific items within its socio-economic monitoring plan and the Forest Service partnered with the Sierra Institute to conduct monitoring. We are expecting a report in 2017, outlining the impacts of restoration work on the local economy, opportunities for education and training, and community capacity.

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	81	$22,800	CFLN
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	24.6	$4,920	CFLN ($3,520) SPFH ($1,400)
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	0		
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	0		
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-LAK	Acres	0		
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	6.731	$14,133	CFLN ($1,218) NFWF ($336) RTRT ($12,579)
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	974	$138,178	CFLN ($42,325) NFWF ($6,500) RTRT ($89,353)
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	Miles	0		

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)
receiving maintenance RD-PC-MAINT				
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 RD-HC-IMP	Miles	0		
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	306	$199,000	NFTM ($14,000) WFPR ($180,000) WFHF ($5,000)
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF	2,460	$199,000	NFTM ($14,000) WFPR ($180,000) WFHF ($5,000)
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	14,808.52	$440,250	NFTM ($75,250) WFPR ($180,000) WFHF ($185,000)
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed	Green tons	0		

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)
from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG				
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	1,555.1	$228,821	CFLN ($136,321) WFHF ($92,500)
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	4,322.8	$2,973,965	WFHF ($2,943,900) CFLN ($29,250) SPFH ($815)
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.)

The effect of the tree mortality has had a substantial impact on the work implemented and planned within the Dinkey CFLRP. Hazard tree removal, especially roadsides and campgrounds, has been a priority within the Dinkey CFLRP and the surrounding Sierra National Forest area. In response to hazard tree removal, district staff areas have had to assess the impacts of tree removal projects on critically important resources. For example, in the Dinkey CFLRP boundary the archeology program was initiated to update, monitor, and protect 66 sites and survey 40 acres culturally-sensitive landmarks, just for the impacts of hazard tree removal. In addition, the district staff has been collecting baseline data for the House project, finalizing the planning for the Exchequer project, implementing the Eastfork project, and ecological monitoring of the past projects –

Soaproot, and Dinkey North and South. We have prepared Swanson Stewardship project, which is 1,900 acres and the Markwood HT salvage for 700 acres,

Within the Dinkey CFLRP boundary this year, the fuels program conducted 713 acres of prescribed underburning and 677 acres of fuel reduction pile burning. Additionally, a total of 11,569 acres were surveyed and inventoried for pre- and post-treatment monitoring of terrestrial wildlife by District staff. The aquatics and hydrology staff continued stream and meadow monitoring for pre- and post-treatment impacts to stream conditions and sensitive species. Three types of restoration occurred to benefit the streams within the Dinkey CFLRP boundary: 1) Snow Corral meadow streambank stabilization with coconut cloth and blocking of cattle crossings in sensitive areas (Eastfork Project); 2) Road maintenance including creating waterbars, cleaning culverts and grading roads to reduce sedimentation into streams**;** and 3) reforestation along streams and within riparian areas (Soaproot Project). The Wilderness rangers covered a combined 333 miles within the Dinkey Lakes Wilderness this summer, spending more than 830 man hours working on managing the Dinkey Lakes Wilderness within the Dinkey CLFR boundary. This includes 314+ public contacts made, 62 campsites obliterated, 17 waterbars cleaned, repaired, or constructed, seven drain dips cleaned or constructed, 94 tree logs removed from trails, 310 ft of user trail rehabilitated, 42 pounds of trash removed, 205 ft of brushing, and 2,835 ft of rock removal. The range program measured utilization of forage within the Dinkey and Patterson Mountain allotments, administered over 70,000 acres to grazing standards, and worked with permittees within the collaborative boundary to promote responsible livestock grazing practices and to mitigate impacts to the Yosemite toad, willow flycatcher, and yellow-legged frog.

The heritage program has worked with student groups and tribal members within the Dinkey CFLRP. This included the Windows on the Past, a spring archeology project with C.A.R.T. High School of Clovis, which included about 30 acres of new surveys to relocate an historic sawmill near the Poison Meadow. In addition, the Heritage staff worked with the Haslett Basin Traditional Committee, to ensure fire safety at their spring and fall ceremonies. The Sierra National Forest provided water for fire protection and other uses. In the fall of 2016, the Sierra National Forest hosted a field trip with members of Cold Springs Rancheria to look at traditional territory in the CFLRP boundary.

Restoration Projects

House (in planning):

The House project is in the early planning stage and was initiated through the collaborative process. The District staff has begun collecting baseline pretreatment data and environmental scoping for this project. This project will need additional funding in order to complete the planning process. To date, the terrestrial wildlife program surveyed 457 acres for great grey owls, 200 acres for northern goshawks, and did 208 acres of habitat reconnaissance for willow flycatcher. Habitat reconnaissance was conducted on meadows within House Project to determine there was suitable habitat for willow flycatchers. The aquatics program inventoried 48 meadows for presence and habitat suitability for the Yosemite toad. Approximately $38,000 was allocated to the hydrology department on the High Sierra Ranger District of the Sierra National Forest to collect baseline data within the House boundary. Two temporary GS-5 hydrology technicians were hired to complete surveys from June 2016 to the end of September, 2016. The District Hydrologist provided oversight, training, and guidance, in order to collect baseline conditions for the House project. Data collected consisted of watershed improvement needs inventorying (WINI) along system roads and stream surveys along ephemeral, intermittent, and perennial streams. The archaeology program surveyed 250 acres within the House project area, in addition to the surveys they completed last year.

The hydrology crew was tasked with documenting WINI needs, in the form of erosion along system roads. Erosion along system roads is considered to be the highest contributor to non-point source pollution with regard to water quality. Once this excess erosion is deposited within stream channels, several negative impacts can occur. Aquatic habitat is impacted, as excess sediment causes stream channels to aggrade. The stream energy shifts to the banks causing erosion and additional sediment into the system. Pools begin to fill, as increased sediment continues to be deposited. Flood stages are also increased, due to excessive deposition of sediment. This, in turn, can cause plugging of culverts and road washouts. Approximately 100 sites were discovered with gully erosion. As a result of the gully erosion, excess sediment was found to disperse off the road and onto the landscape, while others deposited the sediment into a nearby creek. The extent various from site to site, in length and severity. Stream surveys followed, once the WINI surveys were completed.

Stream surveys were completed on approximately 50 miles of streams. Streams surveyed were primarily intermittent channels as the Stream Condition Inventory (SCI) sites were located on perennial channels to monitor long term management actions within the watershed. Surveys consisted of cross sections, pebble counts, gradients, large woody debris, water quality measurements, and pfankuch stream stability surveys. Results indicate that most channels were moderate to very high gradient, moderately entrenched, and characterized as A and B channel types, using the Rosgen Channel Classification system. Particle size distribution results vary from silt dominated systems to bedrock controlled. Pfankuch stream stability surveys were also completed for ocular observations of the channel. Ratings primarily ranged from fair to good condition. The different data collected, as a whole, indicates that the channels are stable to stable-sensitive. Depending on the duration, proximity, and severity, stable sensitive channels are susceptible to natural and management-related disturbances. Recovery, depending on the type of disturbance, can take years to decades. Methods to restores these areas vary from site to site and can be passive (remove the disturbance, nature fixes itself) or active (management removes and fixes the problems).

Exchequer (planning):
The Exchequer project is in the final stages of the planning process with expected finalization in 2017. The terrestrial wildlife program surveyed 2,428 acres for great gray owls, 3,841 acres for the Northern goshawk, and 15 acres for willow flycatcher. The aquatics staff collected temperatures in four streams for baseline data.

Bald Mountain (implementation 2017):
The Bald Mountain project includes two components: Swanson and Cow. The Swanson stewardship contract was awarded in 2016, with implementation expected in 2017. The terrestrial wildlife program surveyed 1,672 acres for great gray owls, 581 acres for northern goshawk, and 103 acres for bats, with the Regional bat coordinator. The aquatics program collected a fourth year of baseline stream temperatures in five perennial streams, associated with threatened and endangered species. In addition, they inventoried 4 of the 11 occupied Yosemite toad meadows, using visual encounter surveys for presence and completed the annual inventory of three reaches of WF Cow Creek for LCT population counts. They inventoried Cutts Meadow, Cutts Creek, and Swanson Meadow for SYLF population monitoring. Drought conditions prevented monitoring Stream Condition Inventory surveys again in WF Cow Creek. The archeology program for the Cow timber sale protected and updated 33 sites within the Bald Mountain project area. In addition, to meet Heritage Program Managed to Standard targets, a re-survey of approximately 120 acres in the Bald Mountain Project was accomplished to conform to current standards. This resulted in the identification of one new historic site.

Eastfork (implementation & monitoring):

The Eastfork project area is still in active implementation. The project is also going through collaborative review to determine if modifications need to be made, due to the extensive pine morality in the project area that occurred during and after mechanical thinning. The terrestrial wildlife program conducted post-treatment surveys across 422 acres for great gray owls and 641 acres for Northern goshawks. The aquatics program collected stream temperatures in four streams for first year post treatment monitoring. Inventoried two of the nine known occupied meadows for Yosemite toad breeding and habitat condition for compliance with the Programmatic Biological Opinion implementation and take monitoring.

Soaproot (monitoring):
The Soaproot project area is being monitored post treatment, however the District staff and the collaborative are reviewing the treatment areas to determine if changes are necessary due to the extensive mortality in the project post-treatment. The terrestrial wildlife program monitored 1,001 acres for great gray owl. The aquatics program collected stream temperatures in two streams for project monitoring and coordinated limited operation periods within occupied Western pond turtle habitat for scheduled contract project work, including road hazard removals due to tree mortality. Drought conditions prevented post treatment monitoring for Stream Condition Inventory surveys in this project area. The archeology program continued protection for implementation within this project area.

Dinkey North and South (monitoring): The Dinkey North and South project areas were the first to be implemented as part of the collaborative process. These project areas are currently being monitored by various district staff areas. The aquatics program collected stream temperatures in three streams in Dinkey North and one stream in Dinkey South for post treatment monitoring. However, drought conditions continue to prevent post treatment monitoring of Stream Condition Inventory surveys. The archeology program continued protection for implementation within this project area.

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

- **If the 2016 footprint estimate is consistent and accurate**, please confirm and copy below.
- **If it 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)?

Fiscal Year	**Total number of acres treated (treatment footprint)**
Total in FY16	15,694 acres
FY10, FY11, FY12, FY13, FY14, FY15, and FY16 (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 – 1,650 acres FY11 – 5,178 acres FY12 – 1,209 acres FY13 – 2,801 acres FY14 – 2,316 acres FY15 – 1,179 acres FY16 – 1,361 acres

If you did not use the database estimate, please briefly describe how you arrived at the total number of footprint acres: what approach did you use to calculate the footprint?

We have verified the database estimate.

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).

As the extent and severity of the mortality event has reached unprecedented levels, its impacts have been felt throughout the Dinkey CFLRP. The mortality event and extreme drought has reduced the ability to conduct prescribed fires in a manner that is safe and provides for resource benefit, has impacted the ability for aquatics and hydrology staff to measure and monitor project areas due to a lack of water, has reduced the ability to understand how wildlife species of conservation concern will respond to changes in wildlife habitat, and a need for Forest Service staff to react to concerns for human safety from hazard trees. Achieving restoration outcomes are not the same as they were when the Dinkey collaborative was founded. The mortality has impacted all levels of the original plan proposal, planned accomplishments, and the work plan. However, the Dinkey Collaborative continues to move forward by adapting past dialogs to new conditions, addressing current projects, and using the mortality event as a bridge for constructive conversations on how to manage and develop projects moving forward and thinking with a long-term approach. The developments made through the years of the collaborative process have aided in the ability to have engaged discussions with the diverse members of the collaborative group during this time of ecological uncertainty.

10. **Planned FY 2018 Accomplishments**[1]

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	470	$200,020
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre		
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles		
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	250	$5,000
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	16,000	

[1] 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 ($)
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	1,900	
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	60	$34,000

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.

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):

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.

Name	Organization
Jared Aldren	Cold Springs Rancheria
Charles Ashley	Private Landowner within Dinkey Boundary
Richard Bagley	Southern California Edison
Miles Baty	Big Sandy Rancheria
Maureen Barile	Huntington Lake/ Big Creek Historical Conservancy
Jeff Blewett	California Four-Wheel Drive Association
Sue Briting	Sierra Forest Legacy
Cheryl Burk	Huntington Lake Association
Sarah Campe	Sierra Nevada Conservancy

Name	Organization
John Capitman	Public Health – Fresno State University
Lois Conner Bohna	
Kent Duysen	Sierra Forest Products
Larry Duysen	Sierra Forest Products
Hazel Early	Big Sandy Rancheria
Patrick Emmerson	Southern California Edison
Dan Fidler	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
Pamela Flick	Defenders of Wildlife
Marcia Freedman	Coarsegold Resource Conservation District
Rod Goode	North Fork Mono Tribe
Amy Granat	California Off-Road Association
Steve Haze	Sierra Resource Conservation District
Joe Kaminski	4WD Club of Fresno and Backcountry Horseman
Elizabeth Kip	Big Sandy Rancheria
Randi Jorgensen	Sierra Nevada Conservancy
Ray Laclergue	Intermountain Nursery
John Mount	Southern California Edison Forester (Retired)
Chris Oberti	Huntington Lake Association
Justine Reynolds	Sierra Resource Conservation District
Mark Smith	Forest Service Silviculturist (Retired)
Erin Stacy	Southern Sierra CZO – UC Merced
John Stewart	California Association 4Wheel Drive Clubs
Craig Thomas	Sierra Forest Legacy
Dave Van Bossuyt	Interested Individual

Name	Organization
Melinda Van Bossuyt	Camp El-O-Win

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 Dinkey Collaborative continues to have an active, engaged membership. In FY2016, the value of member hours working on Collaborative priorities exceeded $50,000, and members continue to leverage funding to magnify federal investment. Over $730,000 was spent on implementing restoration projects on private lands within the Collaborative boundaries. We engaged with new partners to leverage funding and increase our Community outreach and engagement efforts, and have invited Regional grant-writing experts to speak with the Collaborative, in an effort to increase external support for our restoration work. As in past years, the success of the Dinkey Collaborative in FY2016 is due to passionate and committed engagement of its diverse membership.

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.

Dinkey Collaborative 2016 Fact Sheet

Nature.org/ourinitiatives/habitats/forests/2016-cflr-factsheet-california

Article in the Economist, with a focus on tree mortality within the Dinkey Collaborative, (however, not named specifically) and quotes the High Sierra District Ranger.

Economist.com/news/briefing-stricken-trees-provide-clues-about-how-america-will-adapt-global-warming

Signatures:

Recommended by (Project Coordinator): /s/ Sarah LaPlante, Deputy District Ranger, Sierra National Forest

Approved by (Forest Supervisor)[2]: /s/ Dean Gould, Forest Supervisor, Sierra National Forest

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