CFLR Project (Name/Number): Deschutes Collaborative Forest Project

National Forest(s): Deschutes National Forest

1. Match and Leveraged Funds:

a. FY18 Matching Funds Documentation

Fund Source – (CFLN/CFLR Funds Expended)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2018
CFLN17	**$108,487.33**
CFLN 18	**$803,937.69**

This amount should match the amount of CFLR/CFLN dollars obligated in the FMMI CFLRP 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 2018
NFRR	**$0.00**

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 2018
CMTL	**$12,734.07**
NFHF	**$534,541.23**
NFTM	**$220,713.42**
SSCC*	**$60,269***

This amount should match the amount of matching funds obligated in the FMMI CFLRP 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. **SSCC was not included in the gPAS report as FS matching funds because workplans were consolidated for all reforestation activities across the Forest.*

Fund Source – (Funds contributed through agreements)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2018
NFXN (Trout Unlimited and Upper Deschutes Watershed Council contributions to aquatic restoration)	**$58,853.27**

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 FMMI CFLRP reports such as NFEX, SPEX, WFEX, CMEX, and CWFS**). Please list the partner organizations involved in the agreement. Partner contributions for Fish, Wildlife, and Watershed work can be found in WIT database.

Fund Source – (Partner In-Kind Contributions)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2018
DCFP Volunteer Time	$28,199.25
DCFP Collaborative Travel Expenses	$851.58
DCFP Collaborative Supplies and Equipment	$436.50
Forest Volunteer Program	$710,138.72

Total partner in-kind contributions for implementation and monitoring of a CFLR project on NFS lands. 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 FY18)	Totals
Total revised non-monetary credit limit for contracts awarded in FY18	$40,030

Revised non-monetary credit limits for contracts awarded prior to FY18 were captured in previous reports (FY16 and FY15). 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 fill in the table describing leveraged funds in your landscape in FY2018. Leveraged funds refer to funds or in-kind services that help the project achieve proposed objectives but do not meet match qualifications.

No leveraged funds were applied to the FY18 CFLR Program of Work.

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***.

FY2018 Overview

FY18 Activity Description (Agency performance measures)	Acres
Number of acres treated by prescribed fire	2,364
Number of acres treated by mechanical thinning	8,229
Number of acres of natural ignitions that are allowed to burn under strategies that result in desired conditions	N/A
Number of acres treated to restore fire-adapted ecosystems which are maintained in desired condition	69
Number of acres mitigated to reduce fire risk	2,364

Narrative

Please provide a narrative overview of treatments completed in FY18. How was this area prioritized for treatment? Please tell us whether these treatments were in "high or very high wildfire hazard area from the "wildfire hazard potential map."

The Deschutes Collaborative Forest Project (DCFP) landscape provides countless ecosystem services to the residents and visitors of central Oregon and the region more broadly, including clean air, clean water, strong sense of place, and a robust economy based on forest products, tourism and recreational opportunities. The DCFP landscape also incorporates a significant proportion of the Deschutes National Forest (NF) Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI) and numerous high use recreation areas. Treatments within the DCFP boundary were focused around the communities of Bend and Sisters and as a result nearly all of the fiscal year 2018 (FY18) treatments were located in areas rated "high" on the Wildfire Hazard Potential map. Bend is ranked 4th and Sisters is ranked 20th on "The 50 communities in Oregon with greatest cumulative housing-unit exposure to wildfire" (Exposure of human communities to wildfire in the Pacific Northwest.) In addition, approximately 110,000 people permanently call central Oregon home, and a 2016 "Visit Bend" survey recorded over 3 million visitor trips to the Bend area, with numbers steadily increasing every summer.

Several prescribed fires were implemented within the DCFP landscape in FY18. Two of these projects involved cross-boundary burning under participating agreements using Wyden Amendment authorities. On May 23, 2018 the Deschutes NF and High Desert Museum successfully completed a 121 acre mixed ownership prescribed fire that included 47 acres of U.S. Forest Service (USFS) managed land and 74 acres of High Desert Museum owned property. Located just a few miles south of Bend, Oregon, the High Desert Museum is one of central Oregon's top attractions. The two primary objectives of the project were improving defensible space surrounding the museum and providing an educational opportunity for the public to learn about fire-adapted ecosystems. Successful implementation was dependent upon a collaborative effort that included assistance from Oregon Department of Transportation, City of Bend Fire Department and the Nature Conservancy. In addition, Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF) provided firefighters and equipment under an existing Prescribed Fire Good Neighbor Authority (GNA) agreement.

(Figure 1)
Dan Leonard, Bend Fort Rock Ranger District Silviculturist, assisting with the Shevlin Park/USFS prescribed fire, 2018.

FY18 also marked the third year of implementation for the Shevlin Park Prescribed Fire project (Figure 1). To date, 475 acres of cross-boundary prescribed burning has been completed with 198 of the burned acres within Shevlin Park, (a popular park northwest Bend) and 277 acres within the DCFP landscape adjacent to the park. The project is being implemented under a participating agreement between the Deschutes NF and the Bend Park & Recreation District using Wyden Amendment authorities. Objectives of the project include returning fire to the ponderosa pine forests surrounding the City of Bend, reducing fuels in the WUI and providing a highly visible place for the public to learn about the important role of fire in dry forest systems. It is anticipated that it will take another two years to complete all of the work. The City of Bend Fire Department and ODF have been key partners in implementation of the project. Successful implementation has been attributable to a solid relationship between the Park District and local Forest Service personnel, based on common goals and consistent communication. The primary challenge with this project however, has been finding windows to apply prescribed fire without impacting the numerous events hosted in the park.

What have you learned?

Over the last several years, the Deschutes NF has focused its prescribed fire program in the WUI surrounding the communities of Bend and Sisters which is important because of the high number of socioeconomic values at risk. The per acre cost of implementing a WUI prescribed burn is typically 3-4 times higher than non-WUI prescribed burning. For example, on May 22, 2018 the Bend-Fort Rock Ranger District of the Deschutes NF implemented two prescribed burns; a 77 acre prescribed burn within the DCFP boundary adjacent to the City of Bend and an 800 acre prescribed burn in a remote area of the District. These burns had comparable implementation organizations and occurred under similar weather conditions, but in this case approximately 10 times more acres were accomplished on the non-WUI burn. Fuels "acres treated" is the generic metric used to reflect fuels reduction accomplishment. However, it is important not to view every treatment acre the same, as the associated complexity and relative resource benefit is quite different. Prioritizing fuels reduction treatments in the WUI is the best investment of limited resources, time and funding and it is clear the Forest Service (FS) needs the expanded capacity of a partnership based approach to treat these critical acres. We are also dependent upon a strong outreach and education campaign before, during and following implementation of prescribed fires in close proximity to communities to enhance public understanding and increase social license (Figure 2). The DCFP Community Outreach and Engagement Planning Subcommittee progressively invests a significant amount of time and resources in developing short videos about the benefits of active forest management and particularly the application of prescribed fire. The following video "Restoration in a Fire Forest: The Benefits of Burning" highlights the historic context of fire suppression and the importance of reintroducing prescribed fire to restore ecological function in fire-adapted ecosystems.

Figure 1.
Media coverage during the cross-boundary Shevlin Park/USFS prescribed fire, early summer 2018.

Restoration in a Fire Forest: The Benefits of Burning

Expenditures

Category	Cost $
FY2018 Wildfire Preparedness[1]	**$468,414**
FY2018 Wildfire Suppression[2]	**$371,446**
The cost of managing fires for resource benefit if appropriate (i.e. full suppression versus managing)	**N/A**
FY2018 Hazardous Fuels Treatment Costs (CFLN)	**$534,541.23**
FY2018 Hazardous Fuels Treatment Costs (other BLIs)	**$976,822**

[1] Include base salaries, training, and resource costs borne by the unit(s) that sponsors the CFLRP project. If costs are directly applicable to the project landscape, describe full costs. If costs are borne at the unit level(s), describe what proportions of the costs apply to the project landscape. This may be as simple as Total Costs X (Landscape Acres/Unit Acres).

[2] Include emergency fire suppression and BAER within the project landscape. Describe acres of fires contained and not contained by initial attack. Describe acres of resource benefits achieved by unplanned ignitions within the landscape. Where existing fuel treatments within the landscape are tested by wildfire, summary and reference the fuel treatment effectiveness report.

How may the treatments that were implemented contribute to reducing fire costs?

Every year, a large number of fire starts are expected within the DCFP landscape due to both human actions and lightning strikes. There has also been a history of fires that have burned structures and threatened fire fighter and public safety. In FY17, close to **$6,800,000** was spent on suppression costs in the CFLRP, primarily due to the Milli Fire -which started in the wilderness and quickly advanced toward the town of Sisters. A more important piece of the Milli Fire story was the successful suppression effort around private property attributable to the fuels reduction treatments within the CFLRP boundary as illustrated in the following video: (Milli Fire: Fuels Reduction Program - Before the Fire). In FY18, all fires were suppressed during initial attack and suppression expenditures were significantly lower at only $840,000. The rational conclusion is that continued investment in fuels reduction activities (especially prescribed burning) will lead to a decrease in suppression costs, although no formal cost comparisons between proactive fuels treatments and wildfire suppression costs have been conducted.

When a wildfire interacts with a previously treated area within the CFLR boundary:

Each unit is required to complete and submit a standard fuels treatment effectiveness monitoring (FTEM) entry in the FTEM database (see FSM 5140) when a wildfire occurs within or enters into a fuel treatment area.

The FTEM database contained monitoring information for two FY18 fires that interacted with fuels treatments within the DCFP boundary

Treatment Name	Type	Completion Date	Treatment and wildfire inter-action details*	*Treatment Acres Burned By Wildfire?	Date Wild-fire Inter-acted with Treatment?
WEST BEND COD 8	Broad-cast Burn	April 12, 2014	Wildfire started in the treatment	0.25	Oct 20, 2018
EAST TUMBULL F-118	Machine Pile Burn	Nov. 2, 2016	Wildfire started in the treatment	0.25	July 16, 2018

Fire Behavior change?	Treatment contribute to Control/ Manage	*Treatment strategically located?	Comment	How did treatment contribute?	How did treatment contribute?
yes	Yes	yes	Rx fire made control of the fire easier & mitigated fire behavior	Able to direct suppression attack	Fire spread slowed
yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Able to direct attack	Fire spread slow

Both the West Bend and East Tumball prescribed burns are located in WUI and highly used recreation areas adjacent to the City of Bend and the resort community of Sunriver. Treatment goals for both burns included increasing public safety and improving defensible space to protect properties from uncharacteristically severe wildfire behavior. The West Bend COD 8 prescribed burn was implemented in 2014. This was the first underburn completed in the West Bend Vegetation Management Project area, which was planned with heavy involvement with the DCFP Collaborative. The West Bend COD 8 prescribed burn did not include other ownerships, however the City of Bend fire department assisted in the implementation of the prescribed fire. More recent prescribed burn efforts within the West Bend project area have included cross-boundary work with the "Tree Farm" (a new luxury residential development) and the Bend Park & Recreation District as previously mentioned above. The treatments did help address these concerns, and they successfully slowed fire spread and decreased fire behavior to allow for direct suppression attack. The interactions of wildfire with fuels treatments highlights the importance of investing limited resources in the WUI. In addition, one of the interactions was in an area underburned four years ago, demonstrating the importance of following up first entry prescribed fire with subsequent maintenance burning.

Fuels reduction dollars (NFHF) were used to implement these treatments. The West Bend COD unit 8 was implemented concurrently with COD unit 1 for a total of 234 acres of prescribed burning at a cost of $57,096. The cost for the fuels reduction work in the 170 acre East Tumbull F-118 unit was $57,120. This includes thinning, pile building and pile burning.

When a wildfire occurs within the CFLR landscape on an area <u>planned</u> for treatment but not yet treated:
In FY18, there were 62 wildfires in the CFLRP landscape. These were all suppressed at less than one acre with the exception of the 49 acre Bessie Butte Fire. The Bessie Butte fire was located a mile from private property structures on the southeast side of the City of Bend, and it was contained during initial attack. The fire occurred in WUI where targeted prescribed burning treatments have been applied over the last several years, but the wildfire did not interact the recent treatments. However, if the Bessie Butte Fire had progressed closer to the City boundary, it would have likely intersected the prescribed burned unit. Data on fire causes for 2018 has not yet been compiled, but human starts typically account for 75% of the fires starts in this area.

Please include acres of fires contained and not contained by initial attack and acres of resource benefits achieved by unplanned ignitions within the landscape, and costs:

- About 55 acres of the CFLRA area burned in a wildfire in 2018. All fires were contained during initial attack.
- Approximately $371,000 was spent suppressing these fires.
- No BAER requests within the project area for FY18.

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 TREAT Treatments for Restoration Economic Analysis Tool user guide.

FY 2018 Jobs Supported/Maintained (FY18 CFLR/CFLN/ WO carryover funding):

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

FY 2018 Jobs Supported/Maintained	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Direct)	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Total)	Labor Income (Direct)	Labor Income (Total)
Timber harvesting component	38	60	$3,201,043	$4,498,418
Forest and watershed restoration component	1	2	$46,156	$72,544
Mill processing component	60	189	$3,968,971	$9,674,689
Implementation and monitoring	15	20	$637,307	$839,813
Other Project Activities	2	3	$45,404	$72,995
TOTALS:	114	275	$7,898,882	$15,158,459

FY 2018 Jobs Supported/Maintained (FY18 CFLR/CFLN/ WO carryover and matching funding):

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

FY 2018 Jobs Supported/Maintained	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Direct)	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Total)	Labor Income (Direct)	Labor Income (Total)
Timber harvesting component	67	108	$5,712,239	$8,027,395
Forest and watershed restoration component	3	5	$66,288	$114,512
Mill processing component	107	338	$7,082,601	$17,264,414
Implementation and monitoring	26	35	$1,218,677	$1,605,914
Other Project Activities	4	5	$78,155	$126,056
TOTALS:	207	490	$14,157,960	$27,138,291

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).

Prescribed Fire Implementation: The Deschutes NF, in partnership with The Nature Conservancy, the Upper Deschutes Fire Learning Network, and the DCFP, once again hosted the Central Oregon Prescribed Fire Training Exchange (COTREX) from April 30 to May 11, 2018. COTREX is made possible because of a Supplemental Participating Agreement tiered to the national Fire Learning Network Master Agreement. The training brought together 39 participants and cadre from 10 states and 2 countries representing 3 municipal fire/fire protection districts, 3 NGOs, 2 universities, 1 private contractor, 1 county forestry department, 4 state agencies, 2 Bureau of Indian Affairs units, 1 Bureau of Land Management regional office, 1 U.S. Forest Service regional office, and 6 national forests. Collectively, COTREX participants received more than 70 position taskbook training assignments while supporting local forest and fire professionals to complete 1,669 acres of prescribed fire on

the Deschutes NF and adjacent private land, improving fire-adapted forest health and resilience, as well as community and firefighter safety. Furthermore, stakeholders and staff for the DCFP Community Outreach and Engagement Sub-committee utilized these high-priority, high-visibility prescribed fires to continue the annual spring prescribed fire community outreach campaign about the importance of forest restoration and prescribed fire treatments (see the Community Outreach and Presentation and Education sections below for more details).

Prescribed Fire, Smoke, & Public Health: For the past year, staff and stakeholders from the DCFP Prescribed Fire Sub-committee have engaged with state agencies to review and propose revisions to Oregon's Prescribed Fire Smoke Management Plan. Through this process, two pressing needs emerged that the DCFP was well-positioned to assist with: revising the definition of and thresholds for quantifying prescribed fire smoke intrusions into communities, and improving local efforts to provide proactive, advanced messaging about upcoming prescribed fire and smoke impacts on communities and people. The rationale for addressing these two topics in concert was to facilitate state policy that simultaneously allows for more prescribed fire while also addressing public health concerns associated with prescribed fire smoke. The DCFP served a central role in coordinating statewide engagement by local community leaders and forest collaboratives in the smoke management rule review process. Input from local communities and forest collaboratives underscored the need for increased prescribed fire to address growing wildfire risk, and reflected the need for smoke management rules that account for the capacity and resource constraints that local (often rural) communities in southwest, central, and eastern Oregon face when implementing the proposed rules. The final decision on new smoke management rules is due in January 2019. On the public health front, DCFP stakeholders and staff convened a new technical working group composed of state and federal forest and prescribed fire managers, county and state public health agencies, and air quality regulators (a group that had not previously worked together) to develop a new strategy and online platform to disseminate essential information. The outcome of this effort is an interactive clearinghouse for communities and the public regarding fire, smoke, air quality and public health, as well as working agreements between the collaborating organizations to improve communication and coordination on outreach and messaging.

International and National Workshops: In FY18, Forestry practitioners from around the globe spent several days in Central Oregon, learning from the DCFP members while touring integrated vegetation management and aquatic restoration projects. The DCFP was included in the curriculum for USFS International Programs' "Forest Landscape Restoration Seminar" for the fourth year, and we hosted government officials and practitioners from nations including Turkey, Indonesia, and Kenya. DCFP members (and other community members engaged in community forestry and wildfire risk reduction efforts) benefited from a learning exchange that included sharing successes and challenges related to collaborative forestry efforts ongoing around the globe.

Community Outreach: The DCFP continues to make significant strides toward increasing public understanding of and appreciation of active forest restoration efforts. This has been essential, since most of DCFPs projects are adjacent to population centers such as the communities of Bend, Sisters, Sunriver, La Pine, Camp Sherman and Black Butte Ranch.

DCFP continues to leverage our strong web presence (Deschutes Collaborative Forest Project) and social media strategy (facebook-Deschutes Collaborative Forest) to outreach to our communities regarding dry forest restoration, including the development of videos and original blog posts written by DCFP members, USFS partners, and forest restoration practitioners. DCFP engages the public with content that explains the interconnections between forest restoration activities, public safety, ecological resilience and the local economy. *Also see responses to CFLRP Annual Report Question #13. Media recap.*

Implementation Monitoring

Post-Implementation Spatial Patterning

The DCFP Restoration Planning and Implementation Monitoring Subcommittee continued its exploration of accomplishing diverse spatial variability and patterning through implementation of forest restoration treatments. Our work in FY17 highlighted that variable distribution of trees is correlated with a wide variety of ecological outcomes, including increased snow retention and creation of wildlife habitat. In FY18, DCFP members outlined a three-phase pilot project designed to answer the following questions:

Phase 1:

- Are current treatments in West Bend leading to more variable spatial patterning of trees and setting stands on a trajectory to increase spatial variability over time?
- How can we analyze within-stand spatial data to better understand/answer the above question?

Phase 2:

- What can we learn from past treatments about whether different prescriptions and/or designation methods lead to more diverse/more uniform stands?
- What can we learn from past treatments about which variables are involved in determining the most effective prescriptions and/or designation approaches for creating spatial variability?

Phase 3:

- Do different designation methods lead to more diverse/more uniform stands when implementing similar prescriptions with explicit spatial variability goals?
- What variables are involved in determining the most effective and efficient approaches to designation?
- How do key variables (such as stand type, stand complexity, availability of FS marking crew, contractor experience, impact the efficiency and effectiveness of the various designation approaches used for implementing spatial diversity?)
- What are the costs, challenges and opportunities of different approaches to implementing spatial diversity (FS mark, DxP, or hybrid approaches that utilize a mix of marking and DxP, etc)?

We contracted a local sUAS expert to collect aerial imagery (PhoDAR) data on five treated stands in the CFLRP West Bend Vegetation Management Project for the purpose of creating post-implementation orthomosaic imagery and tree stem maps to compare with pretreatment LiDAR-derived stem map data. With the support of The Nature Conservancy DCFP completed Phase 1 of this pilot project, developing an analysis method that compares pre- and post-treatment stem maps and assesses whether the treatment increased within-stand

spatial diversity (heterogeneity), decreased it (uniformity), or led to a random outcome. The beauty of this method is that it takes into account the existing (pre-treatment) stand conditions and thus assesses whether treatments are moving the stand in a direction of greater variability or greater uniformity given a realistic range of possible outcomes.

The Collaborative has begun work on Phase 2. This involves working with the FS to identify an additional 6 stands distributed across all three districts on the Forest. These stands will have similar characteristics and represent a range of designation methods, including Forest Service marking and designation by prescription.

Multi-party Monitoring Field Trips

In FY18, the DCFP engaged intensively with the Forest Service to cross-walk DCFP's recommendations on moist mixed conifer with the proposed action developed in the Lex and Kew EISs. Engagement on the Lex Projected included:

- A discussion at the Restoration Planning Subcommittee (June 12)
- A field trip to discuss the proposed moist mixed-conifer treatments in Lex (July 2)
- A Steering Committee discussion (July 10) focused on identifying opportunities to improve communication between the FS and DCFP through the implementation process
- A follow-up meeting (July 12) with the Restoration Planning Subcommittee (July 12)
- A final letter to the FS outlining DCFP's discussion and agreements through the multi-party monitoring effort of June through July

DCFP's engagement on Kew began earlier than on Lex, thanks in large part to lessons learned from Lex. DCFP hosted one field trip to the Kew project area and discussed the project twice within the Restoration Planning Subcommittee. Members expressed an appreciation for the FS's proactive approach in Kew and largely felt that the proposed work aligned with DCFP's recommendations.

Science & Research

As part of the Implementation Monitoring effort described above, DCFP engaged scientists from The Nature Conservancy, University of Washington, and Oregon State University with expertise in forest ecology, spatial analysis, and ecological modeling. This partnership brought newly synthesized science on the link between fine-scale (within-stand tree spatial pattern) and important ecological functions in our dry forests and underscored the need to consider the effect of restoration thinning on post-treatment tree spatial patterns. This effort in turn led to development of a new methodology to analyze pre- and post-treatment within-stand tree spatial and the design of Phase 2 and 3 of the spatial pattern pilot described above.

Indicator	Brief Description of Impacts, Successes, and Challenges	Links to reports or other published materials (if available)
Social Media Analytics	Analytics • 52% female, 48% male audience with our largest viewership between the age of 35-44, but we continue to see an increase in the 25-34 age range. • Followers reside primarily in Deschutes County with a small following from Eugene, Portland and Corvallis. • Website has recorded 7,869 visitors, which is a 53% improvement from the previous half of the year. • 84% of our visitors are visiting our website for the first time. • MailChimp email marketing has 920 active subscribers with an average 34% open rate from recipients. • Facebook has 1,271 total page likes with an average of 5,800 people reached weekly • New Videos received total of 2,320 views	N/A
Project Partnership Composition	Both COTREX and the Prescribed Fire, Smoke, Air Quality, & Public Health projects reflect the innovative partnerships and diverse composition of partners that coming together to address pressing fire-adapted forest restoration and fire-adapted community development in Central Oregon.	For more information, please visit: Central Oregon Fire
Media Citations	The DCFP continues to use both paid and earned media as a primary community outreach and engagement strategy. This includes stories we work actively to generate, as well as media attention focused on events we coordinate.	See Media Recap below.

Indicator	Brief Description of Impacts, Successes, and Challenges	Links to reports or other published materials (if available)
Public Input in Political Processes	DCFP stakeholders played a central coordination role during engagement in the review of Oregon's Prescribed Fire Smoke Management Plan, including generating more than 30 letters from community leaders, local businesses, and partner organizations to the state agencies responsible for smoke management expressing local support for more prescribed fire.	N/A
Community Support for Relevant Initiatives	The DCFP continues to make significant strides toward increasing public understanding of and support for active forest restoration work. This has been essential, since most of DCFPs projects are adjacent to population centers such as the communities of Bend, Sisters, Sunriver and Black Butte Ranch.	See Community Outreach above and Presentation and Education below.
Relationship-building/Collaborative Work	The CFLR has inspired a broad array of community benefits, resulting in part from disparate stakeholders developing trust-based relationships that encourage ongoing conversations. Through these discussions, stakeholders share information, coordinate activities, and develop new partnership opportunities.	See answer to question 4 above.

5. Based on your project monitoring plan, **describe the multiparty monitoring process.**

Multiparty Monitoring Field Trip Design

The DCFP undertakes multiparty monitoring field reviews in which collaborative members visit project areas pre-, mid- and post-implementation. All field trips were held in partnership with Deschutes NF resource specialists who assist with identifying field trip stops and providing background information about the project. Prior to these field trips, key information about the project was synthesized from the NEPA document to provide an overview of the purpose and need, objectives and intended outcomes. A copy of the relevant DCFP recommendations was also provided.

During the field trips, the FS shared how they interpreted the DCFP recommendations and applied them in the project area, highlighting any challenges they encountered. The Collaborative then viewed the area and discussed the degree to which the implemented (or soon to be implemented) project reflects DCFP recommendations.

This past year, the DCFP hosted 3 multiparty monitoring field trips. The first two focused on the Lex project area. The third was to the Kew project area. These field trips were instrumental in helping collaborative members feel more confident that the FS's proposed treatments aligned with DCFP recommendations. The investment of effort and time also helped DCFP stakeholders more clearly articulate their perspectives related to 1) retention of old trees and large trees, 2) opening sizes, and 3) roads and trails.

What parties are involved in monitoring, and how?

DCFP's monitoring efforts include biophysical monitoring and multi-party implementation monitoring. Our biophysical monitoring plan was developed in consultation with Mamut Consulting. We identified biophysical indicators that would allow us to answer key questions related to the CFLR's effectiveness, including watershed and forest health indicators. To keep costs low and ensure data collection, we selected indicators that are regularly collected by Forest Service. We worked with Mamut Consulting at the 5-year CFLRP mark to coordinate the collection, synthesis and analysis of these biophysical indicators, which will be repeated in FY19.

Our multiparty monitoring efforts engage the collaborative and interested members of the public in pre- and post-implementation field trips to discuss projects before and after they have been executed. Pre-implementation field trip create a forum for participants to cross-walk DCFP's recommendations with the FS's proposed treatments in specific projects and to discuss with FS staff the intentions behind their recommendations as well as to identify any issues of concern prior to implementation. Post-implementation field trips offer an opportunity for the Forest to showcase what has been completed and to share any challenges encountered during implementation as well as how these were addressed.

DCFP's multi-party monitoring field trips consistently engage a diverse breadth of stakeholder interests and membership across our Steering Committee and Adaptive Management and Implementation Subcommittee. This includes environmental interest, loggers and timber industry representatives, recreational interests, education and research, city and county government, fire and fuels reduction, and other interests.

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.

Our biophysical monitoring encompasses a breadth of indicators including water quality, erosion, spread of invasive plants, acres of fuels reduction completed, and miles of road decommissioned. Multi-party monitoring field trips are designed to build trust and ensure that DCFP's recommendations are being implemented on the ground. The field trips involve engaging the collaborative in the following:

- Refreshing their recollection of the purpose, need, and landscape context of the project
- Reviewing the science and data that supported DCFP's recommendations
- Reviewing the desired future condition for the project
- Reviewing the DCFP's relevant recommendations at the landscape, project, and stand level

- Hearing from the Forest about the issues they are facing in the project: wildlife, riparian concerns, recreational use, proximity to nearby communities, etc.
- Cross-walking the Forest's proposed treatments to the desired future condition and DCFP's recommendations
- Identifying any concerns and clarifying and resolving them

This process has been extremely helpful in resolving concerns that arose in the Lex project area, which is the first project with includes significant acres of moist-mixed conifer. DCFP and the FS engaged in 2 field trips to the Lex area to review the proposed treatments and clarify key concerns. There was a perception among some collaborative members that the proposed treatments did not integrate DCFP's recommendations. The field trips provided a forum for the Forest to clarify how treatments would be implemented and why and for collaborative members to more clearly explain their interests, which included retaining large and old structure in moist mixed conifer stands, limiting opening sizes to no greater than 2 acres, and ensuring that road deconstruction was a part of the project and located in areas that would strategically enhance core wildlife habitat. This discussion resolved the key concerns of stakeholders involved and created a pathway for future pre-implementation discussions that was utilized when the Kew project moved through the NEPA process. The result has been improved communication between the Forest and the collaborative as projects transition from planning into implementation. It has also engaged DCFP in in-depth conversations about our recommendations and helped us identify some aspects of our agreements that we could refine to provide greater clarity to the Forest as they implement them.

What are the current weaknesses or shortcomings of the monitoring process? (Please limit answer to one page. Include a link to your monitoring plan if it is available).

Monitoring is time consuming and can seem less important to members than the initial development of recommendations. DCFP staff work diligently to call individual stakeholders from across all interest groups to ensure their participation in the multi-party monitoring field trips.

Monitoring conversations require collaborative members to retain and draw upon a great deal of information for a purpose that is distinct from the consensus decision process utilized in planning. Specifically, to participate effectively in monitoring discussions collaborative members must move away from their original positional stances and embrace the collective agreement reached by the group. Then they must hold the planned (or implemented) treatment up against that collective agreement and assess the degree to which it aligns with the group's agreements and is likely to lead to the desired future conditions. Such a conversation requires a good memory as well as emotional maturity. Many collaborative participants are comfortable comparing a planned treatment with their individual positional preference. They are less comfortable assessing how their individual positional preference is accommodated by a planned treatment and reflected in the group's agreements. The result is often that despite careful framing of the topics and reminders about the group's consensus-based agreements, monitoring field trips involve a great deal of rehashing old conversations and rearguing points that were agreed upon months before. This can be frustrating for those in attendance and may lessen the attractiveness of the field trips.

Additionally, it is challenging to reach consensus in the field. Whole participation in field trips is robust, not everyone can attend due to timing and the time commitment required. Those involved participate in multi-party monitoring field trips by sharing their individual concerns about a project and/or concerns about how the recommendations have been interpreted and applied. Others in the group may be very comfortable with how the recommendations are being applied. The result is a list of areas of concern from some members of the

collaborative rather than an agreement on the part of all attending about whether they collectively support the project. When asked in the field whether they support the project, some individual stakeholders refrain from offering support, perhaps with the hope that if they hold out their concern will be resolved in a way that more closely reflects their individual positional stance. This is part of why it is vital to have diverse participation on field trips of this kind to ensure that all voices are heard by the Forest so that counter balancing perspectives can be shared.

Despite these challenges, DCFP's multi-party implementation monitoring field trips to Kew and Lex were very productive in clarifying concerns among stakeholders and leading to general agreement among those present that the Forest had done a good job applying DCFP's recommendations. Additionally, in Lex the implementation monitoring field trips reduced confusion about what the Forest intended to do and why.

Adaptive management opportunities for DCFP includes refining our recommendations on road and trail systems to more clearly describe the values of the group by specifically asking that roads and trails decommissioning be thoughtfully place so as to augment core habitat. We also have the opportunity to clarify what we mean by retaining large and old structure, specifically with regard to fir trees which may be large but not old. Environmental members of the group have struggled with a 30" diameter limit for fir trees, arguing that fir trees smaller than 30" should be retained. A key challenge is that species composition and structure vary greatly across moist mixed conifer and the grand-fir ponderosa stands, creating very different outcomes for the same prescription across the landscape. DCFP has an opportunity to move beyond positional statements related to diameter limits and more precisely address the key issues of retaining large and old structure.

We have also modified our process for engaging with the forest during implementation. We now communicate early and often as projects move toward draft EIS. Forest staff flag any issues of concern and collaborative members do the same. The Forest develops a "cross-walk" document that compares the Forest's planned treatments with DCFP's recommendations. We then talk through this document on a field trip to specific sites that highlight issues the Forest and collaborative know may be contentious. The group responds to whether the proposed treatment is in alignment with DCFP's recommendations and develops a written letter of support that is approved by the Steering Committee and forwarded to the Forest.

6. FY 2018 Agency performance measure accomplishments:

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost ($) *(Contract Costs)*
Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres	581	$60,269
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	3,134.2	Integrated accomplishment with TMBR-VOL-HVST and FUELS

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost ($) *(Contract Costs)*
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	1,461.4	$20,000 ($10,800 into ODA contract)
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC	Acres	N/A	N/A
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions. S&W-RSRC-IMP	Acres	1,296	Integrated accomplishment with RD-DECOM, TMBR-VOL-HVST and FUELS
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-LAK	Acres	N/A	N/A
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	1.9	$95,653.27
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	2,720	Integrated accomplishment with TMBR-VOL-HVST and FUELS
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved RG-VEG-IMP	Acres	360	Integrated with FP-FUELS-WUI
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance RD-HC-MAIN	Miles	39.1	$6,582
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance RD-PC-MAINT	Miles	36.1	$77,882 ($48,875 into PW Contract)
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	5.7	Integrated accomplishment with TMBR-VOL-HVST and FUELS and ($28,555 into PW Contract)
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles	N/A	N/A
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles	N/A	N/A

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost ($) *(Contract Costs)*
Road Storage *While this isn't tracked in the USFS Agency database, please provide road storage miles completed if this work is in support of your CFLRP restoration strategy for tracking at the program level.*	Miles	N/A	N/A
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage STRM-CROS-MTG-STD	Number	1	Integrated accomplishment with HBT-ENH-STRM
Miles of system trail maintained to standard TL-MAINT-STD	Miles	202*	$22,935
Miles of system trail improved to standard TL-IMP-STD	Miles	4*	Integrated accomplishment with TL-MAINT-STD
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard LND-BL-MRK-MAINT	Miles	N/A	N/A
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC	Acres	4,922	Included in TMBR-VOL-SLD cost
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF	64,822.17	Included in TMBR-VOL-SLD cost
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	19,092.3	$836,563.42
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons	82.0	Included in TMBR-VOL-SLD cost
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	49	Included in FP-FUELS-WUI cost
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	10,904	$534,541.23 ($165,704 in Baloo IRSC contract)
Acres mitigated FP-FUELS-ALL-MIT-NFS	Acres	N/A	N/A
Please also include the acres of prescribed fire accomplished	Acres	2,364	Included in FP-FUELS-WUI cost

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost ($) *(Contract Costs)*
Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands SP-INVSPE-FED-AC	Acres	N/A	N/A
Number of priority acres treated annually for native pests on Federal lands SP-NATIVE-FED-AC	Acres	N/A	N/A

Units accomplished should match the accomplishments recorded in the Databases of Record.
** gPAS accomplishments for MAINT-STD and TL-IMP-STD within the CFLRP were not accurately reported into INFRA. These numbers reflect actual accomplishments achieved through force account and volunteers.*

7. FY 2018 accomplishment narrative – Summarize key accomplishments and evaluate project progress *not already described elsewhere* in this report. (Please limit answer to three pages.)

We are very proud of the diversity and engagement of our membership. The DCFP steering committee is comprised of 19 individuals across a diverse spectrum of stakeholder constituencies that include the traditional collaborative voices of environmental organizations and the forest products industry, as well as watershed, local government, recreation and tourism, Tribal, researchers and community fire protection. This broad representation and engagement strengthens our Collaborative and ensures that a more inclusive suite of social values is reflected in our work. In FY18, the DCFP and Deschutes NF shifted their focus to implementation challenges and the concept of adaptive management, specifically engaging on how to cross-walk DCFP recommendations from the planning document to on the ground outcomes, enhancing spatial heterogeneity through new science and expanding outreach and education. While these efforts have already been mentioned above, it is important to highlight the context and importance of this work.

<u>Cross-walking Collaborative Recommendations to Outcomes on the Ground:</u> As the DCFP engages more consistently in project implementation, they are closely examining how the Plant Association Group (PAG)-level recommendations they have provided to the FS are being cross-walked from environmental analysis and decision making to outcomes on the ground. In just the past 2 years, the full cycle of pre-planning, NEPA, implementation and monitoring has played out for several projects in the CFLRP landscape and the Collaborative is interested in incorporating their lessons learned into an adaptive management approach. The FS recognized the importance of drafting a cross-walk document to more easily display the relationship of the DCFP recommendations to the NEPA decision. And as mentioned above in the Multiparty Monitoring section, the DCFP and FS engaged in 2 field trips to the Lex project to review the proposed treatments and clarify key concerns because several collaborative members felt the proposed treatments did not integrate DCFP's recommendations. The field trips provided an opportunity for the Forest to explain specific treatment prescriptions, and for collaborative members to articulate their concerns. These field trips and several follow-up meetings finally resolved the key concerns of stakeholders involved and created a pathway for future pre-implementation discussions. These efforts took several months, reminding everyone involved that sustaining momentum to come to a resolution requires a focused intent and expert facilitation to continuing working together on forest restoration.

Spatial Heterogeneity: The exploration of implementation efficiencies highlighted silvicultural and timber sale preparation tools and methods in FY18. The DCFP's existing recommendations identify variable spatial pattern (i.e. spatial variability/heterogeneity or "gappy/patchy/clumpy") as one important component of forest restoration to provide for a wide range of ecological functions and benefits (i.e. wildlife habitats, understory diversity, snow retention, fire behavior modification, etc.). For example, DCFP field trips and conversations with practitioners emphasized that current FS approaches to creating diverse spatial patterning of trees go a long way towards achieving some elements of variability, while larger clumps and gaps are less often accomplished and are missing components of spatial diversity within stands and projects where dry forest restoration is a primary purpose. The DCFP Post-Implementation Spatial Patterning Pilot Project aims to leverage their improved understanding of spatial pattern science with Deschutes NF knowledge to collaboratively test and evaluate new tools and techniques that help achieve spatial pattern goals. The highlight of this effort is the collaborative investment to understand and apply new scientific protocols that illustrate the trajectory of various silvicultural treatments to achieve desired spatial pattern objectives.

Outreach and Education: The DCFP and Deschutes NF continued to produce highly successful and diverse outreach efforts that have generated and sustained a broad level of community support for forest restoration work (including mowing, commercial thinning and prescribed fire) in high visibility, high use and high population areas. Diversifying outreach through social media, webpage development, public presentations and one-on-one conversations have shifted the tone and tenor of public dialogue about forest restoration. Outreaching and public education through less conventional methods also served the Deschutes NF and Collaborative well in FY18. Three excellent new videos were produced this year, offering clear, "bite-sized" messaging around the significance of managing a fire-adapted forests: *The Faces of Forest Restoration, Restoring Our Fire-Adapted Forests, and Forest Restoration in the Deschutes National Forest.*

8. **The WO (EDW) will use spatial data provided in the databases of record 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 2018	**10,633 acres**
Estimated Cumulative Footprint of Acres (2010 or 2012 through 2018)	**106,402 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?

Analysis Method:

This is a spatial exercise, and does not take into account differences in reporting that may be present in the tabular FACTS database. All activity from the measures listed below that fall within the spatial CFLR boundary

have been included, regardless of if they have 'CFLR' listed in their implementation project field. Acreage QA/QC has not been run to verify that the tabular accomplishment acreage matches each associated polygon. Any activity unit that straddles the CFLR boundary will be clipped such that only the acreage within boundary is counted. Also note that full spatial compliance for PAS measures was not mandatory until FY14, so older accomplishments may be in FACTS but might not have a polygon associated and will not be counted through this analysis.

Using the FACTS Activity Polygons layer in the GI, an Actv160 RSW was run on a selection of polygons within and immediately surrounding the CFLR boundary. (The Actv160 provides the most attributes to include WUI, Keypoints, Implementation Project, etc. Defining for all activity accomplished FY10 or later, the footprint acres were summarized based on the following activities/measures:

FOR-VEG-EST (4382, 4411, 4412, 4431, 4432, 4491, 4492, 4493, 4494, 4495)
FOR-VEG-IMP (4511, 4521, 4530, 4550)
INVPLT-NXWD-FED & INVSPE-TERR-FED (All invasive plant activity: 2510, 2530, 2540, 2550, 2560)
TMBR-SALES-TRT (All harvest codes: 4101 through 4242. Complete list in PAS document)
TMBR-BRSH-DSPSL (BDBD fund code)
RG-VEG-IMP (Range codes)
FP-FUELS-WUI & NON-WUI
S&W-RSRC-IMP: 5550 – Subsoiling
[HBT-ENH-LAK & HBT-ENH-TERR are reported through WIT]

DCFP footprint acres by fiscal year resulted in the following totals:

<u>CFLR Treatment Acres</u>
FY10: 13,375 acres
FY11: 5,880 acres
FY12: 8,743 acres
FY13: 13,563 acres
FY14: 13,926 acres
FY15: 15,411 acres
FY16: 12,244 acres
FY17: 12,627 acres
FY18: 10,633 acres

Note that the CFLR boundary increased from 142,460 acres to 257,851 acres in FY13 (These CFLR boundary acreages both include private/state inholdings, and are calculated off the outer shape.)

9. **Describe any reasons that the FY 2018 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).

The final FY18 accomplishments are generally consistent with the planned accomplishments.

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	N/A	740	$225,000
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	N/A	2,000	$40,000
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	N/A	0	N/A
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	N/A N/A	6,500	Integrated accomplishment with TMBR-VOL-SLD and FUELS
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	N/A	8	$40,000
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles	N/A	0	N/A
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles	N/A	0	N/A
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	N/A	24,000	$1,611,000
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons	N/A	36,000	Included in TMBR-VOL-SLD costs
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acres	N/A	6,950	$750,000
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	N/A	0	N/A

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 2019 accomplishments and/or funding differs from CFLRP project work plan**

N/A

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.

Deschutes Collaborative Members

13. **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.

Presentations & Educational Events:

In-person Events:

- Upper Deschutes River Coalition: Pete Caligiuri and Ed Keith gave a presentation on fire ecology in Central Oregon forests and the work of the DCFP.
- Bend Bike Film Festival shows our 3-minute PSA at the beginning of their program.
- Local Homeowners Association Meetings: Nicole Strong, Sally Russell and Alison Green spoke at a number of HOA meetings for neighborhoods immediately adjacent to restoration activity.
- Central Oregon Trail Alliance: During their summer movie series at McMenamins Theater, COTA played our 3-minute PSA trailer at the start of each film.
- GoodLife Brewing's Wildland Session Ale: For the third year in a row, DCFP was chosen as the recipient of GoodLife's Sustainable Session Series with the re-release the Wildland Session Ale.

New Videos: (Combined views = 2,320)

The Faces of Forest Restoration. : 30
The Faces of Forest Restoration

Restoring Our Fire-Adapted Forests. 2:58
Restoring Our Fire-Adapted Forests

Forest Restoration in the Deschutes National Forest. : 30

Forest Restoration in the Deschutes National Forest

Top Website Traffic:

The Pandora Moth returns to Central Oregon Forests 1,427 page views

Follow-up to our original story due to more recent hatching. Written by Robbie Flowers, Forest Entomologist, Deschutes National Forest, edited by Nicole Strong
The Pandora Moth returns to Central Oregon Forests

Pandora Moth appears in Central Oregon 1,068 page views

Original story written in 2016 by Robbie Flowers, Forest Entomologist, Deschutes National Forest. This post saw such a rapid increase in traffic during the summer of 2018 that we asked Robbie to help us write the follow-up story with more up-to-date information.
Pandora Moth appears in Central Oregon

Prescribed Burning locations across Central Oregon 986 page views

Working in conjunction with our partners at the Deschutes National Forest, all press releases announcing prescribed burning were posted to the website, emailed through MailChimp and posted to all social media accounts.
Prescribed Burning locations across Central Oregon

Why Prescribed Fire Matters: Healthier forests. Safer communities 795 page views

Written by: Pete Caligiuri – Forest Ecologist, The Nature Conservancy, Bob Madden – Deputy Chief of Fire Operations, Bend Fire Department, and Alex Enna – Prescribed Fire & Fuels Program Manager, Deschutes National Forest.
Why Prescribed Fire Matters: Healthier Forests. Safer communities

Why is there paint on trees within the Deschutes Forest? 676 page views

One of our earliest original content blog posts and it continues to rank in our top 5 most visited pages! The successful Q&A style format continues to guide our content calendar.
Why is there paint on trees within the Deschutes Forest?

Living with Fire - How trees, plants, and critters have adapted to live with wildfire 405 page views

Written by Nicole Strong, OSU Extension Forester, serving Crook, Deschutes, Jefferson Counties and the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs
Living with Fire - How trees, plants, and critters have adapted to live with wildfire

FY18 Press Releases re: DCFP activities, news and treatments:

USFS plans to log, treat 12,000 acres SW of Bend

Deschutes NF ignores latest science on wildfire

Project saved central Oregon homes from wildfires, but can it be duplicated?

Wildfire Management, Prevention Bill

Controlled burns in Central Oregon: By the numbers

Forest Service ignites controlled burn Sunday

More controlled burns scheduled near Bend

Wenz: Adapt now to changing climate

Forest Service resumes burning near Sisters, Sunriver

Prescribed burns to begin on Deschutes, Ochoco Forests

More prescribed burns planned around Central Oregon

Signatures:

Recommended by (Project Coordinator(s)): */s/ Kristen McBride*, Natural Resources Staff Officer

Approved by (Forest Supervisor(s)): */s/ John Allen*, Deschutes NF Forest Supervisor

Draft reviewed by (collaborative chair or representative): _____