

Failed Fill Slope CFLR Project (Name/Number): Southwest Jemez Mountains CFLRP / CFLR006

National Forest(s): _____ *Santa Fe 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(\$)
CFLN16	\$1,542,633
CFLN15	\$59,791 (2015 \$)

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(\$)
NFRR16	1,356,000

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(\$)
CMRD	\$58,439
NFLM	\$636,290
NFRR	\$1,437,804
WFHF	\$435,828

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 (Partner In-Kind Contributions))	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2016(\$)
See below	4,719,4335 total \$1,172,437 on SFNF

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

Partner	Ownership	Amount	Organization Type
Climate Reference Network Station	NOAA	\$24,000	Collaborating Agency
Air Quality Monitoring at Valle Grande HQ weather station.	DOE, Jemez Pueblo	\$10,000	Collaborating Agency
ARCBURN: Fire impacts on archaeological resources.	BLM/JFSP	\$3,622	Collaborating Agency
Seismic monitoring of Jemez Mountains using the Los Alamos Seismic Network (LASN)	DOE/LANL	\$330,000	Collaborating Agency

Forest insect pest inventory	USFS	\$1,500	Collaborating Agency
Beneficial and pest insect biodiversity survey	USDA SEL/SI	\$269,815	Collaborating Agency
Monitoring wildlife and habitats in the VCNP and Jemez Mountains.	Texas Tech University	\$34,000	University
Long-term vulnerability and resilience of coupled human-natural ecosystems to fire regime and climate changes at an ancient Wildland Urban Interface	NSF	\$499,500	University/Agency

Service work accomplishment through goods-for services funding within a stewardship contract (for contracts awarded in FY16)	Totals
Total <u>revised non-monetary credit limit</u> for contracts awarded in FY16	\$841,395.78

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
Fuels Reduction thinning for wildfire protection & post fire flood mitigation	1682 acres thinned in Valles Caldera National Preserve, 1235 acres burned in RX fire.	\$2,400,550	Partner Funds	DOI OWF and NPS

Description of item	Where activity/item is located or impacted area	Estimated total amount	Forest Service or Partner Funds?	Source of funds
Wildlife herbivory impacts on Gambel oak stands	USDA Forest Service	\$10,000	Partner Funds	Collaborating Agency
Water Resources Course: Watershed assessment	UNM	\$5,000	Partner Funds	University
Inventory of Fungi and Lichens	Volunteer	\$50,000	Partner Funds	Volunteer
Service First Agreement VCNP	VCNP is the Valles Caldera National Park	\$331,000	Forest Service funds	USFS

The SWJM CFLRP project has created an outstanding opportunity for other state and federal agencies, universities, and non-governmental organizations to participate in monitoring activities and train students for careers in resource management. As shown in the table above, our project has leveraged over \$4.719 million in FY2016 – these funds come from grants and agency programs that contribute information useful to the adaptive management strategy of our CFLRP. The Valles Caldera National Preserve was transferred by Congress to the National Park Service in Oct. 2015, and the Preserve was able to successfully obtain \$2,529,616 in implementation/monitoring funds in FY16 from the Department of Interior – these funds are replacing the former USDA CFLRP implementation funds. The Preserve continues to participate as an active member of the Collaborative, assuming a lead role in the monitoring program and data sharing among participants. Other projects contributing leveraged funds include the University of Arizona’s Critical Zone Observatory, which monitors the effects of fires on soil chemistry, carbon sequestration, and snow water sublimation rates with varying forest stand structures; the USDA’s Systematic Entomology Laboratory monitoring pest and beneficial insect assemblages; and the University of New Mexico’s Civil Engineering Department’s monitoring of hydrologic responses to forest thinning and burning.

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.***

Prior year and proactive management of reducing fuels have led to signs of fire-adapted ecosystem repair. An example of such is the Ridge fire (human caused) which occurred in a previously thinned and masticated unit fairly close to the Thompson Ridge subdivision. Existing control lines for a planned

prescribed fire did help to maintain control of the fire. The combination of pretreatment and quick and efficient initial attack was mainly responsible for the suppression of the fire.

Increased efforts to reducing the threat of severe wildfire around the rural communities of Jemez NM has taken root and has gained public support of the surrounding communities. Although there may be some opposition towards treatment we remain optimistic towards the future roles of managing fire on the Jemez landscape. Such success include several areas treated in support of WUI (wildland urban interface) in this 2016 year Include.

- The 277 acre Vallecitos cut and pile unit creating a buffer of thinned out dry mixed conifer along private boundaries and structures in the Vallecitos subdivision. This project cutting in the Vallecitos is 50 % complete and fire treatment of piles to be burned in fall of 2017.
- The 91 acre thin and pile RX occurred along FR10 provides a buffer which will help with potential wildfires in San Juan Canyon. The FR10 will be used as a prepped containment line for a future 2500 acre burn block.
- The 1270 acre Virgin RX (broadcast) is on Virgin Mesa and adjacent to 3 communities (Jemez Springs, Area 1 and Area 3). The Virgin RX reintroduced fire into the 2011 Virgin Canyon foot print as well an additional 300 acres of previously thinned and pile burned units. Additionally the Virgin RX introduced fire into 150 acres of first entry timber. The Virgin RX also treated and protected over 200 Jemez Pueblo ancestral sites. The sites were thinned and the subsequent RX fire consumed the slash and left the arch site intact.

The Fire Program effort to reduce fuels are not limited to CFLR money and continue to make strides within the Southwest Jemez Mountains Landscape Restoration Project. Noted below are addition efforts that have benefited the local communities both with treatment and Wildfire containment within the Southwest Jemez boundaries.

- Containment of the Vallecitos Fire and the Battleship fire were critical events and occurred in high fire potential areas which could have had significant impacts to the watersheds, homes and USFS campgrounds. The fires were caught at 3 acres preventing further damage. Good and safe initial response was responsible for keeping the fires small.
- San Juan Fuelwood areas consisted of force account work utilizing hotshot crews to thin 22 acres of dense fuels. This areas was then utilized by the public has a fuelwood collection area.
- Reinforcement efforts on 320 acres adjacent to the CFLRP boundary addressed multiple objectives. The fire was adjacent to three tribal entities and include Jemez Pueblo, Santo Domingo Pueblo and Zia Pueblo. The treatment provided fuel reduction and black-line buffer which will protect tribal lands and FS lands from future high intensity fires. It also has added additional protection to an historic administration site within the area.

2016 was a highly motivational year and attributed to the above accomplishments and resulted in 3,513 treated acres within the CFLRP stewardship boundary. The Jemez District also contained 27 fires of which 13 were human caused, 14 lightning caused and two used for resource benefits or multiple objectives.

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 user guide 2015](#).

Total Spent is the sum of commitments, obligations, expenditures and disbursements; what this means is that awarded money under contract may not in fact be on the ground dollars thus may not properly reflect jobs created. For example: The 2016 report shows total money spent which includes 26,000 CCF of timber and task order work over 1,959 acres. Although on the ground work has yet to begin all money obligated already appears as spent. However, until the actual work is realized it will be difficult to calculate an accurate figure of jobs created.

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

FY 2016 Jobs Created/Maintained (FY16 CFLR/CFLN/ WO carryover funding)	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	28,680	39,001
Mill processing component	0	0	0	0
Implementation and monitoring	16	18	712,956	768,776
Other Project Activities	1	1	18,211	22,136
TOTALS:	64	67	758,847	896,913

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	62	108	2,665,460	3,227,566
Forest and watershed restoration component	23	25	238,117	313,332
Mill processing component	26	38	744,975	1,202,073
Implementation and monitoring	26	30	900,044	1,004,609
Other Project Activities	14	15	905,668	955,525
TOTALS:	149	214	4,634,731	5,834,702

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?

Socioeconomic monitoring efforts continue. Forest Stewards Guild staff collects this information via surveys that were adapted from the Front Range CFLR. Due to the lag time between the end of the federal fiscal year and the reporting deadline, the previous fiscal year data are reported here.

Category	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Fuels footprint	\$512.00	\$402.00		\$580.00	\$790.00	\$1,015.13
Fuels managed through wild and planned ignitions		\$35.00		\$72.00	\$173.00	\$64.71
Stream restoration	\$3,083.00	\$7,736.00	\$33,587.00	\$1,083.00	\$19,604.00	\$2,690.88
Road decommissioned			\$15,000.00	\$9,252.00	\$3,700.00	\$-

Table 1: Treatment costs per unit for CFLR project year.




Table 2: SW Jemez CFLR jobs, modeled TREAT jobs and direct tracked jobs.




Table 3: SW Jemez Wood Harvesting and Processing Jobs in FY15 (this represents 3.5 direct FTE and 10.6 indirect FTE jobs).




Table 4: FY15 jobs by type, based on survey results.




Table 5: FY15 Indirect economic impacts, non-labor costs. Figures in white are the percent of funds spent locally. Survey respondents spent a total of \$845,798 in the landscape’s local economy (less than a 2 hour drive).




Table 6: CCF removed from the CFLR landscape by project year.

The CFLR along with the transition of funding on the Valles Caldera National Preserve to DOI funding have been critical to build and sustain the wood harvesting, trucking, and processing jobs in the landscape. With the completion of the EIS, the jobs will be sustained through 2019. The NEPA-ready lands on the VCNP have been very important for the businesses, as have the amount of watershed restoration jobs in the project area.

Forest Stewards Guild youth crews again worked on USFS lands in the CFLR landscape in FY16 along with crews from the WildEarth Guardians who worked on the Valles Caldera National Preserve, also in the CFLR landscape. These crews are paid for their time, receive a great deal of education and hands-on training from natural resource professionals, and accomplish a large amount of conservation projects.

For example, the Forest Stewards Youth Corps had 2 crews in the landscape and employed 15 high school aged youth for 9 weeks. Additional accomplishments include:

- Removal of noxious weeds, 15 acres.
- Dug 4 miles of fire line in preparation for prescribed burns.
- Removed and disposed of invasive Russian olive trees along 3 miles of the Jemez River.
- Protected cottonwood trees from beaver along 2 miles of riparian corridor.
- Build 8 miles of fence to protect the endangered meadow jumping mouse.
- Received 2 college credits for their education and training sessions.



Image 1: Forest Stewards Youth Corps Jemez Crew. Fence built to protect the meadow jumping mouse.



Image 2: Jemez Crew member practices her hand viga peeling skills at a visit to the Walatowa Timber Initiative wood processing plant.



Image 3: Jemez Crew members build fence to protect riparian areas.

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 monitoring program for the Southwest Jemez Mountains CFLRP project is coordinated through the Valles Caldera National Preserve's Science and Resource Stewardship Division (VALL) and the Santa Fe National Forest (SFNF). The Nature Conservancy (TNC) functions as a neutral party, compiling the monitoring data sets and holding an annual "all hands" meeting of collaborators to evaluate the project's accomplishments, past and future. In addition to the VALL, SFNF, and TNC, our collaborators include Jemez Pueblo, Bandelier National Monument (National Park Service), the US Geological Survey's Jemez Mountain Field Station and the USGS Fish & Wildlife Coop Unit at New Mexico State University, Hawks Aloft, the USDA Systematic Entomology Laboratory/Smithsonian Institution (SEL/SI), WildEarth Guardians, the Forest Guild, the New Mexico Environment Department, Los Amigos de Valles Caldera, Trout Unlimited, New Mexico Trout, the Albuquerque Wildlife Federation, the New Mexico Wildlife Federation, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the Desert Research Institute (DRI), the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS), University of New Mexico, New Mexico Tech, Highlands University, Texas Tech University and the University of Arizona.

Our monitoring observations fall under 3 categories: The first is forest biomass (fuel) reduction through thinning operations and prescribed fire. Prescriptions have been developed to remove most white fir, and leave different age classes of aspen, Douglas fir and Ponderosa pine, as well as large logs that provide habitat for the endangered Jemez Mountains Salamander. Monitoring for responses of vegetation, large mammals, birds, and pest/beneficial insects to thinning and burning operations is underway, with control and treatment areas established and sampled before and after treatments. Results of vegetation monitoring indicate steady increases in grasses and herbaceous wildflower species. Large mammals (elk, deer, bear and cougar) are using restored areas; elk in particular are using burned forested sites that have new herbaceous vegetation. Bird communities appear to show little response to thinning thus far, although large areas were in managed burns in 2015, and the 2016 samples may show more pronounced changes. Insect assemblages in post-burned forests are showing changes in species, moving from those that inhabit forest-floor litter to meadow-grassland species (concomitant with increasing herbaceous vegetation after fire).

The second ecological monitoring effort has been in riparian areas that were restored with woody shrubs and trees by our collaborators with WildEarth Guardians. Survival of plants was initially high during the drought of 2011, but subsequent replanting efforts in 2012-2015 have high survivorship.

The third major monitoring effort dealt with the Las Conchas wildfire (summer, 2011), which burned ~30,000 acres of the project area, and the Thompson Ridge wildfire in 2013 that burned ~25,000 acres on the Valles Caldera National Preserve. Monitoring sites were established in burned and unburned grasslands, forests and streams, including many from before the fire. Monitoring results indicate that grassland vegetation recovered in <8 weeks for total cover, litter and bare ground, but that individual species exhibited significant increases/decreases in cover and height. Grassland pest insects (grasshoppers) were significantly reduced post-fire, but have recovered through 2015; some other species of pest/beneficial grassland insects did not decline in burned sites. Grassland birds generally were less abundant, with fewer species in burned grasslands 1 year after the fire; some species (crows, sparrows) increased after the fire. Prairie dog populations in grasslands did not decline following the fire. Forest

understory vegetation and forest-floor litter were significantly reduced by the fire, with concomitant increases in bare ground; however, by the end of 2015, herbaceous ground cover nearly 100% in Ponderosa pine forests and mixed-conifer stands that had suffered high-severity burns in 2011. Aspen sprouts were up to 7 m tall by September 2016 in some areas, but had been heavily browsed by elk and cattle in other areas. Forest birds remained abundant in both burned and unburned stands of Ponderosa pine and mixed-conifer. Small mammals were generally unaffected by fire in the short term, as they sheltered underground during the fire; tree squirrels were killed by the fire; by 2014, meadow mice (voles) had become common as the vegetation developed into a montane meadow. Most forest invertebrates exhibited little impact from the fire, and were recovering quickly through 2015; moths were the exception, with significantly reduced species numbers and abundances. Flash floods in streams caused reductions of trout by 95%; however, native non-game fish survived in good populations. Fish populations were nearly recovered by fall 2016. Ammonia concentrations likely caused the fish kills (streamwater ammonia was 2-3 times above the concentration needed for killing trout).

By fall 2016, trout populations had recovered, and native fish species had declined back to pre-flood levels. Aquatic invertebrate assemblages survived the floods, and although reduced somewhat in species diversity and abundance, were found to be largely intact in 2016. Water quality continues to suffer from high turbidity during and after spring snowmelt and summer thunderstorms in 2016.

Below is a hyperlink to the Section 13- Monitoring and Adaptive Management Proposal, further titled “Southwest Jemez Mountains Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Strategy Proposal for Funding” [Southwest Jemez Mountains Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Strategy](#)

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	N/A	N/A	N/A
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	339	\$203,400	CFLN0616 - \$ 203,400
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	79.8	\$80,000	CFLN0616 - \$80,000
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands	Acres	N/A	N/A	N/A

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost (\$)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)
INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC				
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions. S&W-RSRC-IMP	Acres	N/A	N/A	N/A
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-LAK	Acres	N/A	N/A	N/A
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	N/A	N/A	N/A
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	1,277	\$280,000	CFLN0616 - \$280,000
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved RG-VEG-IMP	Acres	N/A	N/A	N/A
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance RD-HC-MAIN	Miles	N/A	N/A	N/A
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving reconstruction to standard RD-HC-RCNSTR	Miles	1.153	\$75,000	CFLN0616
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance RD-PC-MAINT	Miles	5.29	\$10,580	CFLN0616
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	N/A	N/A	N/A
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles	N/A	N/A	N/A

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost (\$)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles	N/A	N/A	N/A
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage STRM-CROS-MTG-STD	Number	N/A	N/A	N/A
Miles of system trail maintained to standard TL-MAINT-STD	Miles	N/A	N/A	N/A
Miles of system trail improved to standard TL-IMP-STD	Miles	N/A	N/A	N/A
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard LND-BL-MRK-MAINT	Miles	3	\$61,000	CFLN0616 - \$9,777 CFRD0616 - \$51,223
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC	Acres	1959	\$860,918.14	CFLM0613 – \$584,000 SPFH CFHF
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF	N/A	N/A	N/A
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	26,008.73	\$860,918.14	CFLM0613 – \$584,000 SPFH CFHF
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons	23,024.62	\$0.00	N/A (cost is covered Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales)
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of	Acre	N/A	N/A	N/A

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost (\$)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)
catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI				
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	3,513	\$712,000	CFHF0616 - \$435,827.00 CFLN0616 - \$276,000.00
Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands SP-INVSpe-FED-AC	Acres	N/A	N/A	N/A
Number of priority acres treated annually for native pests on Federal lands SP-NATIVE-FED-AC	Acres	N/A	N/A	N/A

Units accomplished should match the accomplishments recorded in the Databases of Record. Please 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 Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the South West Jemez Mountains Landscape Restoration Project was signed in 12/03/2015. This FEIS document has since become the current CFLRP foot print. The FEIS decision was critical to the advancement forward with restoration implementation allowing the Santa Fe National Forest to work on large scale restoration. Since that point in time the foot print of restoration efforts in acres comes to 6,468.80 acres combined. The forest has also awarded 26,008 CCF of timber and treatment of fuels of 1, 959 acres by mechanized operation to a local contractor and owner of Walatowa Timber. Implementation of projects have allowed the forest to take part in unique partnerships and are slowly showing sign of economic development (pages 6 - 10). This not only has become a restoration effort but has attracted unique groups with specialized skill for monitoring to advanced erosion control and stream restoration.

Lower Jemez River Fish Structure Project:

This project restored four sections within an approximately 3.8 mile reach of the Jemez River and was completed in July 2016. Treatments focused on reducing erosion and sedimentation associated with the six failing log structures, including removal of the existing structures and stabilization of the

riverbed and banks. A secondary goal was to improve instream habitat within the four river sections (Las Casitas, San Diego, Spanish Queen, and The Bluffs public access sites) by reducing the overall bankfull width/depth ratio, which will help reduce water temperatures and increase the quantity of pool habitat. The restoration construction incorporates natural channel design techniques for this Rosgen C3 reach, including the use of large woody debris and boulders in the channel and floodplain. Increasing LWD (large woody debris) and boulder placement will also increase pool habitat over time as well as promote bar formation and woody riparian vegetation establishment. Partial funding for this project was provided by the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, Habitat Stamp Program. The New Mexico Trout organization also provided volunteer assistance as well as signage to inform the public of the objectives of the project.

This coming 2017 partnership with Wild Earth Guardians (WEG) to restore the San Antonio watershed is already in the draft phases and will likely take place within the summer months 2017. This partnership is an example how specialized skills will attribute to the long-term goals of restoration.

Ancestral grounds and cultural resources within the Southwest Jemez boundary are highly abundant and are a normal part of the planning process. There have been large efforts taken to protect such historical resources. Archaeology’s primary goal is to survey and project areas. Due to the fuel loads archaeology has decided that treating archaeological sites within the Southwest Jemez project area is of great importance. Mitigated measures to reduce the effects of fire, managed/prescribed and wildfire, on what are fire-sensitive cultural resources has begun. The treatment consists of removing trees from archaeological features and within site boundaries according to a desired prescription. These treatments are meant to not only reduce fire risk to sites but also blend in with future landscape restoration that may take place. This 2016 thinning was done by Contracting (crew of 10) and district archeologists directed the on the ground treatment. A total of 404 sites have been treated this year, 11 weeks on the ground. Thinning is accomplished by hand only and all fuels are hand carried, not dragged, outside of site boundaries and piled. Such efforts so that not just the restoration of the land but the protection of resources remains top priorities within Southwest Jemez project.

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.	6,468.80 acres (survey, archeology thinning, roads decommissioning and roads maintenance not included in acres)

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

9. Describe any reasons that the FY 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).

Roads for decommissioning were not reported properly tagged to project in to the system of record the result is this will not show up on the accomplishment report under line item 10. In total 13.9 miles of unclassified routes and maintenance level 1 roads have been awarded under Task orders to be decommissioned after mechanized operation have been completed.

Unexpected challenges to this year’s program of work include staff vacancies related to timber staff and administration. One CFLRP Implementation Leader, Timber Management Assistant, Forest Contracting Officer Representative and Presale Forester that support the CFLRP program are vacant. Such staff are vital members related to implementation and long term goals related to all projects but impact the timber volume / green tons harvested within the project. This could result in lagging time lines set forward in long term implementation.

10. Planned FY 2017 Accomplishments¹

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	N/A	N/A
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	80	\$80,000
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	3	\$160,000*
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	1,200	\$300,000
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	10	\$300,000

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 (\$)
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles	50	200,000
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles	25	100,000
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	26,392	\$1,700,00
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons	49,000	N/A
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	N/A	N/A
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	3,000	\$500,000

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 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):

*Funding related to river restoration currently not funded may include long-term design efforts from external parties. This approach would allow us to provide an agreement and allow us the ability to analyze impacts, consult with impacted resources and better grasp the long-term cost associated with the work on the ground.

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.

No updates to the list.

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): NO

The Santa Fe National Forest and Jemez District has been supporting collaborative joint meeting with our current partners. Such meetings have involved interested parties to look at work accomplished by partners related to river restoration both on National Forest and State Parks. We are also closely engaged with partners and moving forward with approaching several river restoration efforts addressed in our short term and long-term plans. We will continue use these joint meeting to gain support for partial funding or volunteer work from New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, Habitat Stamp Program, New Mexico Trout, Wild Earth Guardians, The Nature Conservancy (Rio Grande Water Fund). Continuation of support and reaching out to different organization continues to improve. The agency is aware of how valuable this partnership work is to the overall restoration efforts and is pursuing efforts to fill a Partnership Coordination position by midyear of 2017.

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.

[Santa Fe National Forest Southwest Jemez.](#)

[Fire could benefit forest](#)

Signatures:

Recommended by (Project Coordinator(s)): _____

Approved by (Forest Supervisor(s))²: _____

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

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