CFLR Project (Name/Number): Tapash/CFLR08
National Forest(s): Okanogan-Wenatchee

Reports are due to the Washington Office (via the Regional Forester through a submission to Leslie Weldon, cc'ing Lindsay Buchanan and Jessica Robertson) no later than December 4, 2017 for review.

1. Match and Leveraged Funds:

a. FY17 Matching Funds Documentation

Fund Source – (CFLN/CFLR Funds Expended)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2017
CFLN17	$220,156.41

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
NA	$0

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
BDBD	$77.20
CWKV	$29,753.57
NFVW	$64,350.91
NFWF	$894.56
NFTM	$53,783.41
CWFS	$-157,566.82
RTRT	$490,798.58
WFHF	$26,928.19

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
NFXN	$396,210.81

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**
USGS-USFWS – Experimental barred owl removal study	$81,312.00

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 FY17)	**Totals**
Total revised non-monetary credit limit for contracts awarded in FY17	$8,682

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**
In-stream wood placement	**Indian Creek (Teanaway watershed - DNR) 39 acres/3,910 logs/root wads on Tribal ceded land within CFLR landscape**	**$88,750**	**Partner Funds**	**Yakama Nation**

Description of item	Where activity/item is located or impacted area	Estimated total amount	Forest Service or Partner Funds?	Source of funds
In-stream wood placement	Middle Creek (Teanaway watershed - DNR) 27 acres/2,509 logs/root wads on Tribal ceded land within CFLR landscape	$88,750	Partner Funds	Yakama Nation
In-stream wood placement	Jungle Creek (Teanaway watershed - DNR) 17 acres/2,201 logs/root wads on Tribal ceded land within CFLR landscape	$88,750	Partner Funds	Yakama Nation
In-stream wood placement	First Creek (Swauk watershed - DNR) 16 acres/1,188 logs/root wads on Tribal ceded land within CFLR landscape	$30,000	Partner Funds	Yakama Nation
Temperature Monitoring Pre-project drone flight Photo Monitoring Trail Cameras	Tribal ceded land within CFLR landscape	$4,000 $1,600	Partner Funds	Yakama Nation
Lidar	multi-jurisdictional flight within CFLR landscape	$200,000	DNR Yakama Nation	Multiple
In-stream wood placement	Bumping River – USFS 6 miles of stream restored/140 large trees placed on Tribal ceded land within CFLR landscape	$85,000	Partner Funds Yakama Nation	Yakama Nation and TNC

Description of item	Where activity/item is located or impacted area	Estimated total amount	Forest Service or Partner Funds?	Source of funds
In-stream wood placement	**Taneum – on TNC ground – 1.5 miles of floodplain on Tribal ceded land within CFLR landscape**	**$500,000**	**Yakama Nation**	**BPA**
Aquatic Organism Passage	**Miriam Creek Bridge Replacement – USFS on Tribal ceded land within CFLR landscape**	**$156,550 $128,200**	**USFS USFS**	**Title II Funds CWKV17**
Aquatic Supplement to Landscape Analysis done by The Nature Conservancy	**Taneum-Manstash Joint Chiefs Project**	**$42,704**	**USFS**	**FNHF funds**
LiDar Coverage	**Taneum-Manstash Joint Chiefs Project**	**$18,311**	**USFS**	**FNHF funds**

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***.

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 maintain desirable conditions where they already exist. 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 Yakima 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 support 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 FY17, most were controlled during initial attack.

The 2017 fire season saw two large fires on the OKA-WEN within the Tapash landscape.

1) The Jolly Mountain fire located in Kittitas County, Washington, began with lightning strikes August 11, 2017 and burned for over three months. Total area burned was 36, 808 acres. A majority of the fire was in a USFS inventoried roadless area but slowly worked its way out and onto additional USFS lands and private land including the Teanaway Community Forest. The wildfire burned through the Teanaway Fuels Project which included 20 acres of ladder-fuel-reduction which had been accomplished but hand piles not yet burned; 57 acres of commercial logging where harvesting had been partially accomplished but decked wood still on site and fuel treatments not done yet; and 317 acres of planned harvest where harvesting had not yet started.

BAER link jolly mountain fire, http://centralwashingtonfirerecovery.info/wildfire-reports/jolly-mountain-fire/

2) The Norse Peak/American Fires located in Yakama County and Pierce County Washington, began with lightning strikes August 11, 2017 and burned for over three months. Total area burned was 55,920 acres. A majority of the fire was in the William O. Douglas and Norse Peak Wilderness Areas.

BAER link Norse peak American fires, http://centralwashingtonfirerecovery.info/norse-peak-american-fires/

On the Cle Elum RD, approx. 12 acres were initial attacked and contained at a cost of $29,305.

On the Naches RD, 25 fires totally 28.6 acres were initial attacked and contained at a cost of $134,377.

Resource benefits on both districts were a reduction in fuel loading on small acreage and possible snag creation.

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, https://www.fs.fed.us/restoration/CFLRP/guidance.shtml.

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

Copy/paste the totals from TREAT spreadsheet provided for each project from USFS EMC Economics Team:

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	**13**	**21**	1,085,947	1,357,248
Forest and watershed restoration component	**0.27**	**0.39**	4,443	10,105
Mill processing component	**13**	**33**	850,446	1,785,676
Implementation and monitoring	**20**	**20**	3,351	4,073
Other Project Activities	**0**	**0**	0	0
TOTALS:	**46**	**74**	1,944,207	3,157,103

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

Copy/paste the totals from TREAT spreadsheet provided for each project from USFS EMC Economics Team:

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	**13**	**21**	**1,085,947**	**1,357,248**
Forest and watershed restoration component	**1**	**1**	**10,735**	**24,414**
Mill processing component	**24**	**62**	**1,615,885**	**3,392,785**
Implementation and monitoring	**24**	**28**	**655,806**	**797,023**
Other Project Activities	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
TOTALS:	**62**	**111**	**3,368,373**	**5,571,470**

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).

Indicator	Brief Description of Impacts, Successes, and Challenges	Links to reports or other published materials (if available)
Tribal Connection	The Yakama Nation was awarded the Dry Stewardship thru the Tribal Forest Protection Act. This is the first time that the Yakama Nation has had a timber contract with the OKA-WEN	Dry Stewardship award https://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/fseprd513706.pdf
Relationship building/collaborative work	The Little Naches Working Group is a project level collaborative within the Tapash Collaborative on the Naches RD focusing on the Little Naches Watershed restoration opportunities.	Little Naches Working Group https://sites.google.com/site/littlenacheswg/ Tapash R6 CFLR panel http://www.sustainablenorthwest.org/uploads/general/Carruthers_-_Tapash_R6CFLRpanelpres.pdf
Media citations	NA	see #14 further down in this report for links
Project partnership composition	The Tapash Collaborative is composed of five agencies all of which are striving to restore the landscape. Within the umbrella of the Tapash Collaborative is the Little Naches Working Group.	Tapash Collaborative http://www.tapash.org/ see links under Relationship building/collaborative work

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

The Tapash Collaborative monitoring work 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 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.

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 ad 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 with 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, Cascade Red Fox Summer/Winter Monitoring and White-headed woodpecker monitoring. 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 treatment.

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	441 USFS & Partners	$4,652
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	NA	NA
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	1167.5 USFS & Partners	$50,263

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost ($) *(Contract Costs)*
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC	Acres	NA	NA
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions. S&W-RSRC-IMP	Acres	399	$2,794.99
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-LAK	Acres	NA	NA
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	NA	NA
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	1,150	$24,096.31
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved RG-VEG-IMP	Acres	6,041	$69,113.21
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance RD-HC-MAIN	Miles	NA	NA
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance RD-PC-MAINT	Miles	NA	NA
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	NA	NA
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles	NA	NA
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles	NA	NA
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage STRM-CROS-MTG-STD	Number	NA	NA
Miles of system trail maintained to standard TL-MAINT-STD	Miles	NA	NA
Miles of system trail improved to standard TL-IMP-STD	Miles	NA	NA
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard LND-BL-MRK-MAINT	Miles	NA	NA
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC	Acres	570[1]	NA
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF	10,931[2]	NA
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	54,197.9	$26,891.71
STWD-CNTRCT-AGR	Acres	710	$26,891.70

[1] Value not captured in the gPAS database of record

[2] Value not captured in the gPAS database of record

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost ($) *(Contract Costs)*
TMBR-BRSH-DSPSL	Acres	28	$77.20
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	NA
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	1,021	$7,152.11
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	1,264	$8,854.32
Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands SP-INVSPE-FED-AC	Acres	NA	NA
Number of priority acres treated annually for native pests on Federal lands SP-NATIVE-FED-AC	Acres	NA	NA
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	NA	NA
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	2,029	$30,435.00

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

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.)

A significant accomplishment this year was the successful advertising and award of the Huck Stewardship sale located on the Naches RD. This was the first sale out of the Little Crow Project and consisted of 29.7 million board feet off of 711 acres in matrix land for the objective of restoring huckleberry habitat. This resulted in ~6 million dollars in retained receipts available to fund restoration projects. The presale preparations for this sale was partially funded with CFLR dollars.

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	9,756.70 acres
Estimated Cumulative Footprint of Acres (2010 or 2012 through 2017)	FY10 = 2,331 FY11 = 3,870 FY12 = 7,237 FY13 = 3,955 FY14 = 7,304 FY15 = 4,813 FY16 = 3,368

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? We used the EDW acres for FY2017 as was sent to us. For the Estimated Cumulative Footprint of Acres, we took the values off the FY 2016 report.

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).

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	NA	NA
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	1,000 (integrated)	NA	$11,000
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	10	NA	$30,000
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	2,000 (integrated)	NA	$25,000
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	10	NA	$190,000
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles	NA	NA	NA

Performance Measure Code	Unit of measure	Work Plan 2019	Planned Accomplishment For 2019	Amount ($)
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles	NA	NA	NA
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	24,000	NA	480,000
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons	NA	NA	NA
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	2,000	NA	$300,000
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	1000	NA	$175,000

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 TAPASH will continue to strive to restore the landscape through acres of forest vegetation improved, management of noxious weeds, watershed acres improved, stream habitat and terrestrial habitat restored/enhanced, rangeland improved, miles of road decommissioned and acres of WUI treated.

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.

Sustainable Forest Collaborative

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

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.

Collaboration builds policy to aid forests prevent fires, http://www.yakimaherald.com/opinion/editorials/collaboration-builds-policy-to-aid-forests-prevent-fires/article_9aa040d0-ba8d-11e7-bdfa-07a4ef6a800e.html?utm_medium=social&utm_source=email&utm_campaign=user-share

The nature conservancy developing partnerships to preserve forests, http://www.yakimaherald.com/news/local/the-nature-conservancy-developing-partnerships-to-preserve-forests/article_f259b832-b539-11e7-a92e-6fb7dc057057.html

Visions of Restoration in Fire-Adapted Forest Landscapes: Lessons from the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program, https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00267-016-0791-2

Tapash sustainable forest collaborative blog, https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=L3xGDgAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA116&dq=tapash+sustainable+forest+collaborative&ots=xVCYtF0_hc&sig=FjX5xoW_nRy42fEF1XxdQQHb1a8#v=onepage&q=tapash%20sustainable%20forest%20collaborative&f=false

Central Washington forest collaborative is thriving, http://www.wfpa.org/news-resources/blog/central-washington-forest-collaborative-is-thriving/

Living in the Era of MegaFires – Friday October 6, 2017 - Sponsored by The Nature Conservancy, Kittitas Fire Adapted Communities Coalition, National Fire Learning Network, Tapash Sustainable Forest Collaborative, Washington Resource Conservation and Development Council, Washington Department of Natural Resources, and Base Camp Books and Bites.

Commission adds 1,300 acres, http://wdfw.wa.gov/news/oct3017a/

Signatures:

Recommended by (Project Coordinator(s)):_____

Approved by (Forest Supervisor(s)): _____

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