**CFLR Project (Name/Number): Southern Blues Restoration Coalition/CFLN17**
***National Forest(s): Malheur National Forest***

**1. Match and Leveraged Funds:**

**a. FY17 Matching Funds Documentation**

| Fund Source – (CFLN/CFLR Funds Expended) | Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2017 |
|---|---|
| CFLN1714 | $707,520.00 |
| CFLN1717 | $1,971,624.41 |

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 2017 |
|---|---|
| CFWF1717 | $1,660,903.56 |

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 2017 |
|---|---|
| NFMP | $152,782.54[1] |
| NFTM | $433,244.10 |
| SRS2 | $105,442.00 |
| WFHF | $559,102.92 |

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 2017 |
|---|---|
| Powder River Correctional Facility | $165,156 |

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 2017 |
|---|---|
| Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Mule Deer Initiative | $88,000 |

[1] Expenditure tagged in database as CFLRP FS Matching Funds in error

| Fund Source – (Partner In-Kind Contributions) | Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2017 |
|---|---|
| Harney County Restoration Collaborative/High Desert Partnership | $18,820 |
| Blue Mountain Forest Partners Collaborative | $198,000 |
| Western Environmental Law Center, Susan Jane Brown | $112,500 |
| North Fork Watershed Council/OYCC | $106,984 |
| Burns – Paiute Tribe | $17,015 |
| Grant Soil and Water Conservation | $76,255 |
| Harney County Watershed Council | $1,963 |
| The Nature Conservancy | $14,446 |
| Oregon Department of Agriculture | $6,454 |

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 FY17) | Totals |
|---|---|
| Total revised non-monetary credit limit for contracts awarded in FY17 | $49,578 |

Revised non-monetary credit limits for contracts awarded prior to FY17 were captured in previous reports. 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.

**b. Please provide a narrative or table describing leveraged funds in your landscape in FY2017** (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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Investments in biomass utilization equipment including both for** | **John Day, OR and Seneca, OR** | **$2,205,000** | **Partner Funds** | **Iron Triangle** |

| Description of item | Where activity/item is located or impacted area | Estimated total amount | Forest Service or Partner Funds? | Source of funds |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **restoration and processing** | | | | |

**(Optional) Additional narrative about leverage on the landscape if needed:**
In 2017, the primary contractor on the stewardship contract doing a majority of the work in the SBRC project was once again able to add equipment to broaden implementation capabilities and keep up with increased workload. Our continued sustained yield of small diameter material has been used to attract business interest in the area, and that primary contractor has recently expanded into a post-and-pole operation based in Seneca, OR. Negotiations continue for a potential chip facilities as well as a torrefaction plant to be located in John Day, OR which could utilize 130,000 tons of biomass towards energy production each year.

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***.

The Southern Blues Restoration Coalition (SBRC) project work plan describes four restoration goals that tie in closely with all of the performance measures described in the *10 Year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan*. From restoring landscape resiliency and improving collaborative and social capacity to increasing economic capacity and increased efficiency, the accomplishments this year moved the landscape towards meeting the performance measures outlined in the Comprehensive Strategy.

A total of over 128,860 acres of vegetation and fuels treatments have been completed within the SBRC project area in the first 6 years of the project. These treatments included everything from commercial harvest and biomass removal to landscape underburning. These treatments had integrated benefits of restoring landscape resiliency for wildlife, soil, watershed and range forage. Specific accomplishments were seen for wildlife and fisheries in the form of aspen restoration, riparian fencing and road closures.

With the help of the two collaborative groups, we are getting the message out to the publics and the smoke regulators about the need to not only increase the mechanical treatments to reduce fire hazard and intensity but also the huge need to increase the amount of landscape underburning to really get the landscape in a more resilient condition. The Blue Mountain Forest Partners specifically have been very involved in the discussion and science behind smoke management related to prescribed fire. Their comments to the Oregon Department of Forestry Smoke Management Advisory Committee can be seen on their web site at, Blue

Mountains forest partners prescribed fire smoke management,
http://www.bluemountainsforestpartners.org/2016/07/prescribed-fire-smoke-management/

We have been able to capitalize on this assistance to increase our underburning acres each year except one (2015, the year of the Canyon Creek Fire) during the life of the Southern Blues Restoration Coalition project.

With the expansion of the SBRC landscape in 2015, the total acres within the landscape of Malheur NF fire protection is 877,288 acres or approximately 51% of the entire Malheur NF. Pre-suppression expenditures for the year totaled $2 million within the SBRC landscape. There were 54 fires in the SBRC project area for a total of 10.35 acres burned with the largest being 2.5 acres. All of the fires that started in treatment units were caught at less than .1 acre and the firefighters that responded feel that the weather conditions and a quick response had more of an effect on quick containment than the treatments themselves. The fires were so small that the severity impacts were minimal. We do know from past very severe fire seasons that the treatments, if done at a large enough scale, do have a positive impact on reducing fire severity and giving firefighters opportunities to use fuels treatments as containment areas.

With CFLRP support we recently utilized supplemental Hazardous Fuels funding to begin contracting landscape burn implementation, with the first contract awarded in FY16. We plan to continue to utilize the burn contract to help expand our capacity to complete the ever increasing shelf stock of underburning acres. We also improved existing contracts for prescribed fire support and now have reimbursable agreements with Oregon Department of Forestry and adjacent BLM units to further increase implementation capacity.

CFLN funding continued to be the principle method for awarding work to the Malheur 10 Year Stewardship contract. As documented throughout this report, this has increased economic capacity in local communities and moved the Forest towards increased efficiencies.

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.

The numbers came directly from the end of year accomplishments and expenditure reports. The product distribution percentages came from information from TIMS and from the different contracts used. Assumptions are based on all of the work being completed within the year it was funded.

FY 2017 Jobs Supported/Maintained (FY17 CFLR/CFLN/ WO carryover funding):

| FY 2017 Jobs Supported/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 | 11 | 18 | $249,987 | $460,730 |

| FY 2017 Jobs Supported/Maintained | Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Direct) | Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Total) | Labor Income (Direct) | Labor Income (Total) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mill processing component | 0 | 0 | $0 | $0 |
| Implementation and monitoring | 50 | 55 | $1,232,903 | $1,364,604 |
| Other Project Activities | 1 | 1 | $19,026 | $27,725 |
| **TOTALS:** | 63 | 74 | $1,501,916 | $1,853,059 |

**FY 2017 Jobs Supported/Maintained (FY16 CFLR/CFLN/ WO carryover and matching funding):**

| FY 2017 Jobs Supported/Maintained | Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Direct) | Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Total) | Labor Income (Direct) | Labor Income (Total) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Timber harvesting component | 95 | 130 | $8,077,246 | $9,895,675 |
| Forest and watershed restoration component | 12 | 18 | $258,766 | $476,910 |
| Mill processing component | 70 | 134 | $4,097,367 | $6,188,568 |
| Implementation and monitoring | 59 | 67 | $1,985,201 | $2,197,263 |
| Other Project Activities | 1 | 1 | $19,695 | $28,699 |
| **TOTALS:** | 237 | 350 | $14,438,274 | $18,787,115 |

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).

A comment from one of the collaborative members highlights the excitement in the community as a result of the accelerated restoration efforts and CFLR, “The money is coming back to the county because things are working here. Housing sales are at an all-time high. There’s more ‘help wanted’ signs in town than I’ve seen in a long time. Those are certainly big wins for the community."—Dave Hannibal, Grayback Forestry.

The socioeconomic benefits resulting from CFLR and the 10-year Stewardship Contract are substantial. Grant County enjoyed most of these benefits due to the fact Iron Triangle LLC, which holds the 10-year Stewardship Contract, is headquartered here, as is Malheur Lumber Company and most of the Malheur National Forest offices. The re-investment of these funds into local milling infrastructure and local community projects has a multiplying effect on the impact of the CFLR funds.

Continuing a trend noted last year, more community members have shared their increased appreciation for what’s happening with CFLR on the Malheur, as well as more willingness to consider a collaborative approach to public land management in Grant and Harney counties.

Particularly important to emphasize in all this is that public land restoration efforts are providing substantial socioeconomic benefits to federal public land dominated rural counties, and community members and organizations increasingly associate such benefits with the approach to restoration work exemplified on the

Malheur under CFLR. The article called "Restoration Renaissance – A New Paradigm in John Day" describes very well the economic and restoration benefits realized in a big part because of the CFLR funding. It can be found at "Restoration Renaissance – A New Paradigm in John Day", https://spark.adobe.com/page/bG8wBdrKy9vGO/.

In 2017 BMFP tackled management issues related to riparian restoration and aspen habitats. The Blue Mountain Forest Partners reached "Zones of Agreement" for both in 2017. They have committed to an intensive monitoring program to follow the effectiveness of future treatments in both riparian and aspen habitats. BMFP and Harney County Restoration Coalition (HCRC) continued to work with Malheur National Forest staff to address challenging issues related to roads and treatments in moist mixed conifer and riparian areas. These agreements help move projects to the implementation phase quicker than in the past.

The nature and focus of these efforts represent particularly good examples of adaptive management being implemented within a collaborative context, represent significant milestones in public land management that likely would not have occurred apart from CFLRP support, and nicely illustrate how CFLR has enhanced planning and decision making in the restoration context and provided additional impetus to approach land management activities in a more informed, integrated, and responsible manner.

CFLR has helped bring about a more effective, mature, and publicly involved approach to public land management on the Malheur that has significant socioeconomic benefits for area communities. It has also spotlighted some issues at the state and federal level that significantly increase the cost and limit the effectiveness of public land management—at least management on a scale that will make a difference for forest and community health.

As noted last year, additional mill and biomass capacity would increase return on CFLR investment as well as increase socioeconomic benefits to area communities. Only one mill operates locally, and it can't handle everything that comes off CFLR projects. It targets ponderosa pine and is tooled to handle saw log sizes down to a 6- or 8-inch top. That focus and capacity addresses only part of what we need to remove from the forest, species and size wise, if we are to create resilient landscapes. Increased mill or industrial capacity that readily handles non-pine species found in the area, as well as smaller diameter material and biomass, would lower restoration costs and significantly increase community benefits by further solidifying existing jobs, creating more, and diversifying the value of natural resource products coming off federal private lands in the area.

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 Southern Blues CFLRP Multi-Party Monitoring Program was developed by a multi-disciplinary team that included multiple Forest Service Units, collaborative groups, universities, and non-governmental organizations. Multi-Party Monitoring Program currently consists of ten monitoring subgroups that correspond to their respective monitoring projects (see table below). The majority of monitoring projects were developed to be

statistically rigorous and to conclusively inform future management decisions in the project area and in similar ecological habitats across the region.

**Monitoring Projects/Subgroups, Principle Investigators, and Monitoring Partners**

| Monitoring Project | Principle Investigator (first listed) and Partners * |
|---|---|
| Forest Vegetation and Fuels (FVF) | Oregon State University<br>MNF Silviculture & Fuels Programs (FS)<br>Blue Mountain Forest Partners |
| White-headed Woodpecker (WHWP) | Rocky Mountain Research Station (FS-R&D)<br>MNF Wildlife Program (FS) |
| Woodpecker Monitoring following Canyon Creek Fire Salvage | Rocky Mountain Research Station (FS-R&D)<br>MNF Wildlife Program (FS) |
| Landscape Pattern Analysis | Remote Sensing Application Center (FS-WO)<br>Blue Mountains Area Ecology Program (FS)<br>Blue Mountains Forest Health Program (FS)<br>MNF Silviculture Program (FS) |
| Spatial Patterning (stand-level) | University of Washington<br>Blue Mountains Area Ecology Program (FS) |
| Invasive Species | MNF Botany & Invasive Species Programs (FS)<br>Grant Soil and Water Conservation District<br>Harney County Weed Control<br>North Fork John Day Watershed Council |
| Watershed | PacFish/InFish Biological Opinion Monitoring Program (FS-WO)<br>MNF Soil & Water Programs (FS) |
| Riparian Restoration & Fish Passage | Blue Mountains Area Ecology Program (FS)<br>MNF Botany Program (FS)<br>Pacific Northwest Research Station (FS-R&D) |
| Aspen | MNF Botany, Wildlife, & Silviculture Programs (FS)<br>Oregon State University, College of Forestry<br>Blue Mountains Area Ecology Program (FS) |
| Collaborative Effectiveness | Blue Mountain Forest Partners<br>Harney County Restoration Collaborative |
| Socio-economic | University of Oregon, Ecosystem Workforce Program<br>Blue Mountain Forest Partners |

** MNF = Malheur National Forest, FS = Forest Service Unit, WO = Detached Washington Office Unit, R&D = Research Unit*

Forest vegetation and fuels (FVF), white-headed woodpecker (WHWO), riparian restoration, invasive species, socio-economic, and collaborative effectiveness monitoring projects are in their fourth year of implementation. The FVF, invasive species, and WHWO programs which have a significant field data collection component. For some of these projects, both pre-treatment and post-treatment data have been successfully collected and meaningful preliminary data analysis and management recommendations can begin. The

primary mechanisms by which monitoring findings have been, or will be communicated to managers and incorporated into an adaptive management framework are summarized below.

**SBRC Multiparty Monitoring Metrics and Delivery Status**

| Product | Delivery status |
|---|---|
| Regular informal communication between monitoring principal investigators, MNF interdisciplinary team members, MNF leadership, and membership of the BMFP and HCRC. | Ongoing |
| Annual monitoring progress reports for MNF and BMFP | Ongoing |
| Regular presentations to full collaborative group meetings (BMFP and HRCR). | 16 completed to date |
| Biennial monitoring symposium: Full day meeting for monitoring PIs, managers, stakeholder groups, scientists, and the general public. | May 2016 symposium; plans, manuals, and presentations online: Planning 2nd symposium in spring 2018 |
| Spatial Patterning: *Historical Forest Structure, Composition, and Spatial Pattern in Dry Conifer Forests of the Western Blue Mountains, Oregon* | Published general technical report in November 2017: |
| Landscape Pattern Analysis Tool | Prototype expected in 11/2017 and full delivery early 2018. Webinar presenting initial results occurred in 2017: |
| Preliminary and final reports and publications | Will be released as data collection is completed or sufficient to make inferences or meaningful management recommendations |

In May of 2016, the CFLRP multiparty monitoring program hosted the first of a series of monitoring symposia to bring together all of the investigators to share information and results to date. We are planning a second symposium in spring of 2018. Through this and regular presentations at collaborative meetings, we have not identified significant weaknesses or shortcomings of our monitoring program – specific monitoring projects were developed with a statistically-robust design and/or in a manner that should conclusively inform future adaptive management. However, challenges that the monitoring team are currently addressing include developing robust databases compatible with Forest Service corporate databases, adapting and developing new fire behavior modeling tools, and ensuring capacity to analyze, synthesize, and effectively communicate information from large datasets. Developing information that provides robust answers to monitoring questions takes considerable time, and our team is constantly challenged to build fiscal and political support for long-term organizational commitments to our monitoring program. Additionally, we encourage all stakeholders to exercise patience before significant management recommendations will occur or before we can determine if the implemented actions measurably achieved the desired results. We have no doubt that

the MNF CFLRP Multiparty Monitoring Program will produce significant results, in the expected timeframes, that will describe the social, economic, and ecological impacts of the Southern Blues CFLRP.

**6.** FY 2017 accomplishments

| Performance Measure | Unit of measure | Total Units Accomplished | Total Treatment Cost ($) *(Contract Costs)* |
|---|---|---|---|
| Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST | Acres | 4,152 | $500,000 |
| Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP | Acres | 4,879 | $2,685,000 |
| Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC | Acre | 1,067 | $550,000 |
| Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC | Acres | 0 | $0 |
| Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions. S&W-RSRC-IMP | Acres | 7,933 | $602,908 |
| Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-LAK | Acres | 0 | $0 |
| Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM | Miles | 45 | $230,265 |
| Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR | Acres | 15,451 | $230,000 |
| Acres of rangeland vegetation improved RG-VEG-IMP | Acres | 33,583* | $2,350,810 |
| Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance RD-HC-MAIN | Miles | 116 | $24,157 |
| Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance RD-PC-MAINT | Miles | 82 | $32,516 |
| Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM | Miles | 1.7* | $44,589 |
| Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP | Miles | 0 | $0 |
| Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP | Miles | 0 | $0 |
| Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage STRM-CROS-MTG-STD | Number | 0 | $0 |
| Miles of system trail maintained to standard TL-MAINT-STD | Miles | 55* | $28,884 |
| Miles of system trail improved to standard | Miles | 0 | $0 |

| Performance Measure | Unit of measure | Total Units Accomplished | Total Treatment Cost ($) *(Contract Costs)* |
|---|---|---|---|
| TL-IMP-STD | | | |
| Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard LND-BL-MRK-MAINT | Miles | 46 | $13,210 |
| Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC | Acres | 2,402 | $0 |
| Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST | CCF | 0 | $0 |
| Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD | CCF | 86,573 | $2,486,378 |
| Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG | Green tons | 15,483 | $168,782 |
| Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI | Acre | 19,183 | $2,973,558 |
| Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI | Acres | 13,205 | $2,046,775 |
| Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands SP-INVSPE-FED-AC | Acres | 0 | $0 |
| Number of priority acres treated annually for native pests on Federal lands SP-NATIVE-FED-AC | Acres | 0 | $0 |
| Acres mitigated FP-FUELS-ALL-MIT-NFS *(note: this performance measure will not show up in the WO gPAS reports – please use your own records)* | Acres | 14,861 | $771,045 |
| Please also include the acres of prescribed fire accomplished *(note: this performance measure will not show up in the WO gPAS reports – please use your own records)* | Acres | 3,130 | $219,100 |

Units accomplished should match the accomplishments recorded in the Databases of Record. *Values were not captured in the Agency database of record (gPAS).

7. **FY 2017 accomplishment narrative** – Summarize key accomplishments and evaluate project progress not already described elsewhere in this report. (Please limit answer to three pages.)

In addition to the accomplishments captured in the table above, we also had 3,841 acres accomplished under STWD-CNTRCT-AGR-AC as reported in gPAS.

*Additionally, 1.7 miles of road decommissioning, 55 miles of trail improvement within riparian habitat and 33,583 acres of range habitat improvement was completed but did not get correctly linked to the SBRC project in the database of record.

FY17 was another successful year for the SBRC project on all possible fronts. As you can see from the tables above, we continue our restoration efforts into a wide variety of performance measures. We are making strides towards our proposed road and riparian work throughout our project area using appropriated funds, partnership contributions, and monies generated through our 10-year stewardship.

By the end of the fiscal year 20,290 acres (footprint) of vegetation treatments to restore the landscapes resiliency, improve wildlife habitat and restoring watershed condition were accomplished with a combination of service contract, stewardship contracts, partnership in-kind and force account work.

Our partners continued to be a big player in the success of the project this year. The members of the Southern Blues Restoration Coalition provided important feedback on the effectiveness of the activities for adaptive management. Partners such as Susan Jane Brown (WELC), Dave Hannibal (Grayback Forestry), Jack Southworth (HCRC), Zach Williams (Iron Triangle Logging), Mark Webb (BMFP) along with many others continue in the role of advocating for SBRC through educating other coalition members and challenging the Forest to constantly look for more efficient ways to conclude its business.

Oregon OYCC youth crews as well as AmeriCorps helped complete several of the wildlife habitat improvement projects including aspen and riparian protection, riparian planting, building fence exclosures, thinning and installing road closure gates or slashing in roads. The AmeriCorps group was able to help with prescribed burning and burn preparation which was a first for youth crews on our forest. Our district biologists continued use of the Powder River Correctional Facility crews for riparian enhancement project work such as fence placement and improvement.

CFLN funds were used to hire additional summer employees to help prepare the many large contracts awarded this year. Fire crews worked the off season in the SBRC project either completing fuels reduction activities or preparing contracts. CFLN and match funds were also used to complete implementation monitoring of the many activities completed this year.

8. **The WO will use spatial data provided in the databases of record close to estimate a treatment footprint for your review and verification**.

- **If the estimate is consistent and accurate**, please confirm that below 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 | Footprint of Acres Treated (without counting an acre of treatment on the land in more than one treatment category) |
|---|---|
| FY 2017 | 20,290 acres |

| Fiscal Year | Footprint of Acres Treated (without counting an acre of treatment on the land in more than one treatment category) |
|---|---|
| | |
| Estimated Cumulative Footprint of Acres (2010 or 2012 through 2017) | 72,359 acres |

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

The EDW estimate appeared to be high. We used the total of underburning, pile burning and commercial thin acres to estimate footprint acres. These, in most cases, either represent the final treatment (using the pile burning and underburning) or the most impactful treatment with the commercial thin which also includes biomass removal.

9. **Describe any reasons that the FY 2017 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).

In FY17 the Southern Blues Restoration Coalition Project met or exceeded our proposal in many areas. We exceeded expectations in invasive weed treatments, stream habitat restoration and terrestrial habitat restoration. We were on track at meeting the goals for vegetation and fuels treatments even though we were not able to utilize normal appropriated match funds to the extent we did in previous years. The Forest Wide Aquatic Environmental Assessment (EA) is being widely implemented and many of the increased accomplishments in watershed restoration work are a direct result. Activities include fish passage restoration, large wood placement, livestock fencing, riparian vegetation treatments and road and trail erosion control.

We remain behind on our target for miles of road decommissioning but are beginning to see progress there as well. As with riparian treatments, the mechanical treatments need to occur before the road decommissioning will take place. We are beginning to close out portions of our 10-year stewardship contract and as that continues, expect the scale of these other treatments to increase as well.

**10.** Planned FY 2019 Accomplishments

| Performance Measure Code | Unit of measure | Work Plan 2019 | Planned Accomplishment For 2019 | Amount ($) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST | Acres | NA | 5,000 | $500,000 |
| Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC | Acre | NA | 1,000 | $550,000 |
| Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM | Miles | NA | 50 | NA |
| Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR | Acres | NA | 5,000 | $250,000 |
| Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM | Miles | NA | 5 | $25,000 |
| Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP | Miles | NA | NA | NA |
| Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP | Miles | NA | NA | NA |
| Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD | CCF | NA | 120,000 | $0 |
| Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG | Green tons | NA | 15,000 | $150,000 |
| Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI | Acre | NA | 20,000 | $3,100,000 |
| Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI | Acres | NA | 20,000 | $3,100,000 |

Please include all relevant planned accomplishments, assuming that funding specified in the CFLRP project proposal for FY 2019 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 2018/19 accomplishments and/or funding differs from CFLRP project work plan** (no more than 1 page):

The efforts to increase the pace of restoration continue. With the help of local and state elected officials and the Oregon Governor's Office, the goal is to sustain or increase annual outputs from restoration activities including the volume of commercial products and the acres of land treated over the next 10 years. The outputs listed in question #10 reflect that expectation. The total funds needed to attain those outputs exceed

the SBRC proposal of $4 million of CFLN funds and $4 million in match funds. Through efforts from outside partners and the SBRC, we expect we will exceed the $4 million of match funds. We also believe with increased efficiency and leveraging of partnerships the cost per acre to complete these treatments will continue to be reduced.

Planned accomplishments will meet or exceed most performance measures in the SBRC proposal and work plan. One area that may fall short of meeting the defined performance measure is BIO-NRG, where we still have little local capacity to process small diameter materials. This is beginning to change, as noted above, with an increase in post-and-pole operations in Seneca and ongoing dialogues about chipping facility and a torrefaction plant.

As designed, the Malheur 10 Year IRSC Stewardship Contract has provided the consistency needed for continued economic growth in the local area. This continues to enable accelerating pace of restoration on the Malheur NF. We expect to start exceeding accomplishments originally planned for many performance measures going forward. We are moving into units with higher timber value, which has decreased the investment needed for the stewardship contract and enabled the forest to divert funds to other contracts, agreements, and force account work. We expect this to continue, which will increase our output and accomplishment overall.

12. **Please include an up to date list of the members of your collaborative if it has changed from previous years**. 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 from last year.

13. **Did you project try any new approaches to increasing partner match funding in FY2017** (both In-Kind contributions and through agreements)? (No more than one page):

For 2017 we saw a dramatic increase in partner match from the Grant County Soil and Water Conservation District and from the Powder River Correctional Facility. The work completed by the folks from the correctional facility expands our capacity to get work done on the ground at no cost and offers opportunities for the inmates to gain work experience. The Grant Soil and Water Conservation District has been a valuable partner in the noxious weed removal program within the SBRC. This year's in-kind contributions came from a variety of sources, including Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife through the Mule Deer Initiative, youth crews, local tribes and Oregon Department of Forestry. We have partnered with The Nature Conservancy for a shared position to help prioritize our treatments within the SBRC project area. This effort will help with future efficiencies within our prescribed fire program. Our staffs have been able to make time to use our successes through CFLR to leverage matching funds as well as in kind contributions for a wide range of projects, and we expect to see this trend continue.

In terms of in-kind contributions, both of our neighboring tribal partners have been working with the Malheur to substantially increase restoration efforts across ownership boundaries. The confederated tribes of Warm Springs and the Burns-Paiute tribes have been valuable partners.

A large part of the partnership and in-kind contributions has been a direct result of the 2015 CFLR expansion. The expansion area includes high priority watersheds, and with our forest-wide Aquatics EA as well as other planning efforts, staff have leveraged critical restoration proposals for matching contributions. The expansion area also brings more integrated work with the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs and other partners. Finally, this increase reflects an increase in professional capacity which enables our staffs to seek and leverage contributions. All of these trends we expect to continue into FY18 and beyond.

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.

- Blue Mountains Forest Partners web pages have a wealth of information, including recent research as well as our finalized Zones of Agreement, http://www.bluemountainsforestpartners.org/
- High Desert Partnership includes the Harney County Restoration Collaborative. Information on recent work can be found online here, http://highdesertpartnership.org/
- Ecosystem Workforce Program, Institute for a Sustainable Environment, University of Oregon Fact Sheets and briefing papers, https://ewp.uoregon.edu/
- Canyon Creek Fuels Treatment Effectiveness Presentation, https://www.frames.gov/files/2914/6738/9937/FTE_Canyon_Creek_Assessment_presentation.mp4
- Sustainable Northwest, Blues Coalition Science, Management, and Collaboration Workshop, http://www.sustainablenorthwest.org/blog/posts/blues-coalition-workshop-riparian-ecosystems

**Signatures:**

Recommended by (Project Coordinator(s)):_____

Approved by (Forest Supervisor(s)): _____

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