

**CFLR Project (Name/Number): Tapash/CFLR08**

**National Forest(s): Okanogan Wenatchee**

**1. Match and Leveraged funds:**

**a. FY16 Matching Funds Documentation**

| Fund Source – (CFLN/CFLR Funds Expended) | Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2016(\$) |
|--|--|
| CFLN14                                   | \$428,913.67                                 |
| CFLN15                                   | \$-113.15                                    |

*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(\$) |
|--|--|
| NA   | NA   |

*This value (aka carryover funds or WO unobligated funds) should reflect the amount expended of the allocated funds as indicated in the FY16 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(\$) |
|---|--|
| BDBD  | \$33,403.67                                  |
| CMXF  | \$2,147.24                                   |
| CWFS  | \$483,466.46                                 |
| NFTM  | \$133,785.99                                 |
| NFVW  | \$73,572.60                                  |
| NFWF  | \$16,987.23                                  |
| NFXN  | \$127,707.70                                 |
| RBRB  | \$1,234.81                                   |
| RTRT  | \$23,888.67                                  |
| SRS2  | \$29,742.19                                  |
| SSSS  | \$4,006.52                                   |
| WFHF  | \$293,838.74                                 |

*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(\$) |
|--|--|
| NA   | NA   |

| Fund Source – (Partner In-Kind Contributions) | Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2016(\$) |
|---|--|
| Washington Conservation Corps                 | \$4,039.80                                   |
| The Nature Conservancy                        | \$40,000.00                                  |

*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 FY16) | Totals |
|--|--------|
| Total <u>revised non-monetary credit limit</u> for contracts awarded in FY16   | \$NA   |

*Note: revised non-monetary credit limits for contracts awarded prior to FY16 were captured in the FY15 CFLR annual report last year.*

**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.

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

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

**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.**

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

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

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

Within the Tapash landscape, 59% of wildland fires are natural ignitions. The 10 year average of wildfires controlled at initial attack remains 97%. Of the wildfires that occurred in FY16, most were controlled during initial attack.

**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                | 22                               | 35                              | 1,808,209             | 2,300,778            |
| Forest and watershed restoration component | 21                               | 25                              | 236,458               | 373,251              |
| Mill processing component                  | 28                               | 68                              | 1,744,648             | 4,216,662            |
| Implementation and monitoring              | 10                               | 17                              | 1,431,735             | 1,701,981            |
| Other Project Activities                   | 0                                | 0                               | 0                     | 0                    |
| <b>TOTALS:</b>                             | <b>81</b>                        | <b>145</b>                      | <b>5,221,050</b>      | <b>8,592,672</b>     |

**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                | 85                               | 132                             | 6,832,472             | 8,693,686            |
| Forest and watershed restoration component | 28                               | 32                              | 308,801               | 487,445              |
| Mill processing component                  | 196                              | 483                             | 12,360,564            | 29,874,408           |
| Implementation and monitoring              | 25                               | 35                              | 1,869,768             | 2,222,694            |
| Other Project Activities                   | 22                               | 24                              | 0                     | 102,842              |
| <b>TOTALS:</b>                             | <b>355</b>                       | <b>706</b>                      | <b>21,371,605</b>     | <b>41,381,075</b>    |

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 Tapash CFLRP multi-party monitoring working group is continuing to work on implementation of a project-specific monitoring plan. In our efforts to assess and monitor overall community benefit, the group has identified *social values* (recreational amenities, infra-structure, access, aesthetics, and air quality), *economics* (to supply existing and attract new forest product infrastructure that facilitates ecologically based restoration and creates sustainable local employment and community well-being), and *cultural resource values* (historic and prehistoric heritage resources (archeological properties)) defined as physical evidence of past human activity expressed as artifacts and or features on the modern landscape; and treaty rights (the right of access to usual and accustomed fishing stations and the privilege to hunt, gather and graze animals) as key monitoring categories. These categories are intended to give emphasis to the social/community-related aspects of the project. Specific monitoring questions have now been framed under each of these key categories.

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

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

Another example of our efforts toward benefitting the local community is our continued persistence relative to exploring opportunities associated with biomass utilization. Although we continue to make biomass available, we continue to be unsuccessful in moving this small diameter, low-value material off of the landscape. As a means to identify solutions to this situation, we are continuing in our attempts to engage directly with our local community members and members of the Forest Biomass Coordination Group to utilize local resources for local benefit. We continue to explore non-traditional forest product development and innovative ways to accomplish forest restoration while maintaining local jobs and a sustainable economy. A recent local success is the selection of the Yakima Specialties

project to receive a USDA Wood Innovations Funding Opportunity grant. The project is for design and engineering of a biomass boiler. The biomass boiler project at Yakima Specialties represents a unique opportunity for direct utilization of biomass sourced from restoration treatments. Not only will the facility use wood chips than can be processed directly from thinning projects, but also represents an expansion of bioenergy into sectors other than the forest products industry. Engaging with the local community in efforts such as this serves as a model for innovative projects in the future, while engaging the broader community in forest health issues.

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

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

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

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

Consistent with the Tapash CFLRP proposal, monitoring will be implemented as part of an adaptive management approach as summarized in the Okanogan-Wenatchee Forest Restoration Strategy. Information gained through monitoring will be used to validate the appropriateness of restoration prescriptions and provide insight into necessary adjustments should they be indicated. In each case, monitoring will address the question whether the strategy was fully implemented and if implementation of the prescribed treatment resulted in the intended outcome. Annual and multi-

year synthesis and interpretation with stakeholders and decision makers will provide feedback and inform future decisions. This process could potentially provide for assessment of landscapes across multiple CFLRP projects.

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

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

**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<br>FOR-VEG-EST   | Acres           | 1000                     | RTRT                      | 20892.66   |
| Acres of forest vegetation improved<br>FOR-VEG-IMP  | Acres           | 149                      | RTRT<br>CFLN              | 881.67<br>98033.37                                   |
| Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants<br>INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC  | Acre            | 1989.9                   | SRS2                      | 11,410.79  |
| Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands<br>INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC              | Acres           |                          |                           |  |
| Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions.<br>S&W-RSRC-IMP | Acres           |                          |                           |  |
| Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced<br>HBT-ENH-LAK   | Acres           |                          |                           |  |
| Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced  | Miles           |                          |                           |  |

| Performance Measure  | Unit of measure | Total Units Accomplished | Total Treatment Cost (\$)                    | Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)               |
|--|-----------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| HBT-ENH-STRM   |                 |                          |  |  |
| Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced<br>HBT-ENH-TERR  | Acres           | 2506.9                   | BDBD<br>CFLN<br>NFVW<br>NFWF<br>NFXN<br>WFHF | 4247.813<br>100332.1<br>984.67<br>16987.23<br>127707.7<br>54821.36 |
| Acres of rangeland vegetation improved<br>RG-VEG-IMP   | Acres           | 7592                     | BDBD<br>NFTM<br>NFVW<br>SRS2<br>WFHF         | 8056.70<br>30000.00<br>57188.17<br>28266.04<br>85774.54            |
| Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance<br>RD-HC-MAIN   | Miles           |                          |  |  |
| Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance<br>RD-PC-MAINT   | Miles           |                          |  |  |
| Miles of road decommissioned<br>RD-DECOM   | Miles           |                          |  |  |
| Miles of passenger car system roads improved<br>RD-PC-IMP  | Miles           |                          |  |  |
| Miles of high clearance system road improved<br>RD-HC-IMP  | Miles           |                          |  |  |
| Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage<br>STRM-CROS-MTG-STD | Number          |                          |  |  |
| Miles of system trail maintained to standard<br>TL-MAINT-STD   | Miles           |                          |  |  |
| Miles of system trail improved to standard<br>TL-IMP-STD   | Miles           |                          |  |  |
| Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard<br>LND-BL-MRK-MAINT   | Miles           |                          |  |  |
| Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales<br>TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC   | Acres           | 358                      | SSSS   | 4006.52  |
| Volume of Timber Harvested<br>TMBR-VOL-HVST  | CCF             |                          |  |  |
| Volume of timber sold<br>TMBR-VOL-SLD  | CCF             | 21017.3                  | CFLN<br>NFTM                                 | 4006.52<br>73785.99  |

| Performance Measure   | Unit of measure | Total Units Accomplished | Total Treatment Cost (\$) | Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match) |
|---|-----------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| 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            | 1288                     | CFLN<br>RTRT<br>WFHF      | 226541.5<br>2114.337<br>33503.88                     |
| Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI   | Acres           | 2080                     | WFHF                      | 119739.00  |
| Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands SP-INVSP-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.)

In the spring of 2016 Washington State Legislature passed House Bill (HB) 2928, the Forest Resiliency Burning Pilot (Pilot) project. Prior to 2016, the management of prescribed fires across jurisdictional boundaries in the Tapash landscape drastically varied. The state of Washington’s and Yakima County’s regulation on air quality have restricted the use of prescribed fires as a treatment to make both federal and state forests more resilient to wildfire. The 2015 wildfire season had several mega fires in Eastern Washington which led to devastating effects on local communities and wildlife. The Washington State Lawmakers passed HB 2928 to examine the role of prescribed burning in creating healthier and more resilient forests.

HB 2928 provided funding to conduct control burns in three Eastern Washington regions (Tapash Landscape was selected); compare forecasted and actual air quality data by monitoring air quality during prescribed fires; analyze and monitor fuel reductions and conditions of the forest stands before and after prescribed burns; provide public education and outreach prior to prescribed burns; and track outcomes and make recommendations for the Pilot to achieve more resilient forest conditions and reduce wildfire risks to Eastern Washington communities.

The Forest Service, Washington Department of Natural Resources, Yakima Nation, The Nature Conservancy, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Kittitas and Yakima Counties and other partners worked on prescribed burns at Angel, Canteen, Liberty Fuels, Oak Creek and Orion landscapes.



Angel

**Management** Naches Ranger District

**Acres** 500 acres

**Location** Near Niles, WA and west of Naches, WA

**Lead Objectives** Ongoing forest restoration project designed to mimic natural fire effects and protect areas where houses and forests meet.

Canteen

**Management** Naches Ranger District

**Acres** 500 acres

**Location** Near Hwy 410 outside of Nile, WA and northwest of Naches, WA

**Lead Objectives** Ongoing forest restoration project designed to mimic natural fire effects and reduce leftover vegetation and fuel from recent timber sales

Liberty Fuels

**Management** Cle Elum Ranger District

**Acres** 115 acres

**Location** Near Hwy 97 outside Liberty, WA

**Lead Objectives** Forest health restoration, logging slash removal, promoting wildlife forage

Oak Creek

**Management** Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife

**Acres** 80 acres

**Location** Oak Creek Wildlife Area, near Hwy 12 west of Naches, WA

**Lead Objectives** Restoring fire-dependent dry forest and associated habitat

Orion

**Management** Cle Elum Ranger District

**Acres** 400 acres

**Location** Near Hwy 97 outside Liberty, WA

**Lead Objectives** Forest health restoration, logging slash removal, promoting wildlife forage

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)?

| <b>Fiscal Year</b>   | <b>Total number of acres treated (treatment footprint)</b>   |
|--|--|
| Total in FY16  | 36,256   |
| 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 – 2,331<br>FY11 – 3,870<br>FY12 – 7,237<br>FY13 – 3,955<br>FY14 – 7,304<br>FY15 – 4,813<br>FY16 – 3,368 |

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

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

#### 10. Planned FY 2018 Accomplishments<sup>1</sup>

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 treated annually to sustain or restore watershed function and resilience<br>WTRSHD-RSTR-ANN                           | Acres           |                        |             |
| Acres of forest vegetation established<br>FOR-VEG-EST   | Acres           |                        |             |
| Acres of forest vegetation improved<br>FOR-VEG-IMP  | Acres           | 500 (integrated)       | 11,000.     |
| Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants<br>INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC  | Acre            | 1,000<br>(integrated)  | 47,465.     |
| Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands<br>INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC              | Acres           |                        |             |
| Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions.<br>S&W-RSRC-IMP | Acres           | 500 (integrated)       | 140,158.    |
| Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced<br>HBT-ENH-LAK   | Acres           |                        |             |
| Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced<br>HBT-ENH-STRM  | Miles           | 5 (integrated)         | 155,000.    |

<sup>1</sup> Please note that planned accomplishments are aggregated across the projects to determine the proposed goals for the program's outyear budget justification. These numbers should reflect what is in the CFLRP work plan, with deviations described in question 11.

| Performance Measure Code  | Unit of measure | Planned Accomplishment | Amount (\$)  |
|---|-----------------|------------------------|--|
| Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced<br>HBT-ENH-TERR   | Acres           | 3,000<br>(integrated)  | 105,364.   |
| Acres of rangeland vegetation improved<br>RG-VEG-IMP  | Acres           | 4,500<br>(integrated)  | Integrated with vegetation, fuels, invasives, stream improvement, etc. costs |
| Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance<br>RD-HC-MAIN  | Miles           |                        |  |
| Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance<br>RD-PC-MAINT  | Miles           |                        |  |
| Miles of road decommissioned<br>RD-DECOM  | Miles           | 10 (integrated)        | 186,200.   |
| Miles of passenger car system roads improved<br>RD-PC-IMP   | Miles           |                        |  |
| Miles of high clearance system road improved<br>RD-HC-IMP   | Miles           |                        |  |
| Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage<br>STRM-CROS-MTG-STD              | Number          |                        |  |
| Miles of system trail maintained to standard<br>TL-MAINT-STD  | Miles           |                        |  |
| Miles of system trail improved to standard<br>TL-IMP-STD  | Miles           |                        |  |
| Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard<br>LND-BL-MRK-MAINT  | Miles           |                        |  |
| Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales<br>TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC  | Acres           | 2,762                  | 483,350. (\$175/acre)  |
| Volume of Timber Harvested<br>TMBR-VOL-HVST   | CCF             | 40,000                 | Included above   |
| Volume of timber sold<br>TMBR-VOL-SLD   | CCF             |                        |  |
| Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production<br>BIO-NRG | Green tons      |                        |  |

| Performance Measure Code   | Unit of measure | Planned Accomplishment | Amount (\$)           |
|--|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire<br>FP-FUELS-NON-WUI | Acre            |                        |                       |
| Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire<br>FP-FUELS-WUI   | Acres           | 2,800                  | 420,000 (\$150/acre). |
| Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands<br>SP-INVSP-FED-AC   | Acres           |                        |                       |
| Number of priority acres treated annually for native pests on Federal lands<br>SP-NATIVE-FED-AC  | Acres           |                        |                       |

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.

No changes.

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): See question 7

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.

**Signatures:**

Recommended by (Project Coordinator(s)): AMANDA VELASQUEZ

Approved by (Forest Supervisor(s))<sup>2</sup>: \_\_\_\_\_

(OPTIONAL) Reviewed by (collaborative chair or representative): \_\_\_\_\_

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