CFLR Project (Name/Number): Southern Blues Restoration Coalition/CFLN17

National Forest(s): Malheur 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	$0
CFLN18	$2,161,909.49

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
CFTM1718	$1,722,880.72

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
NFHF	$808,779
NFVW	$19,966
SRS2	$253,387

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.

Fund Source – (Funds contributed through agreements)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2018
Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation	$15,000
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Mule Deer	$24,747
Malheur Watershed Council, Malheur River LWD	$157,000

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, Watershed work can be found in WIT database.

Fund Source – (Partner In-Kind Contributions)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2018
Blue Mountain Forest Partners, Operations Group Members	$60,250
North Fork John Day Watershed Council	$77,677
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Fish Passage	$229,300
Oregon Department of Forestry	$100,000
Harney County Restoration Collaborative/High Desert Partnership	$18,000
Burns Paiute Tribe	$3,992

Fund Source – (Partner In-Kind Contributions)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2018
Grant County Soil &Water Conservation District	$19,520
Harney County Training & Employment Consortium	$1,209

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	$0

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

Description of item	Where activity/item is located or impacted area	Estimated total amount	Forest Service or Partner Funds?	Source of funds
Wood processing improvements to the Seneca Small Log Facility	**Seneca, OR**	**$210,000**	**Partner Funds**	**Iron Triangle**
Forest Restoration Equipment Purchases	**John Day, OR**	**$1,520,000**	**Partner Funds**	**Iron Triangle**
Purchase and Installation of a Small Log Breakdown Mill	**John Day, OR**	**$1,500,000**	**Partner Funds**	**Malheur Lumber Company**
Equipment Purchases and Permitting for Torrefaction	**John Day, OR**	**$5,081,515**	**Partner Funds**	**Restoration Fuels, LLC**

(Optional) Additional narrative about leverage on the landscape if needed:

In 2018, 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 added capacity to the post-and-pole operation based in Seneca, OR.

The local lumber mill in John Day added a small log breakdown mill to their current infrastructure to increase the feasibility of processing small logs coming off local restoration stewardship projects and contracts.

Oregon Torrefaction with Restoration Fuels, LLC have invested heavily into forest restoration and the community by working towards bringing a Torrefaction plant into John Day. They have invested in the permitting, site design and surveying and purchase of the equipment. The Torrefaction facility will utilize small diameter biomass from restoration projects within the Southern Blues project area and convert that material to a high-grade, renewable, solid biofuel.

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	16,948
Number of acres treated by mechanical thinning	18,898
Number of acres of natural ignitions that are allowed to burn under strategies that result in desired conditions	0
Number of acres treated to restore fire-adapted ecosystems which are maintained in desired condition	35,846
Number of acres mitigated to reduce fire risk	16,948 (final treatment is prescribed fire)

Please provide a narrative overview of treatments completed in FY18, including data on whether your project has expanded the pace and/or scale of treatments over time, and if so, how you've accomplished that – what were the key enabling factors?

We continued the focus on fire resiliency projects such as thinning, mastication and large landscape underburning. Early in the planning stages of the SBRC project, we used analysis from The Nature Conservancy and local assessments to prioritize treatments. Our two local Counties established Community Wildfire Protection Plans with the help of the Malheur NF and Oregon Department of Forestry to identify priority areas for treatment within the urban interface. The Forest Fire Management staff developed a fuel treatment priority map that highlights areas where treatments will be most effective to help manage fire on the landscape by using treatments along roads, ridges and existing large fire areas. All of the above mentioned projects have helped focus treatments that will be most effective. In 2018, we added focus to other restoration activities. We prioritized aquatic restoration through fish passage improvements, floodplain restoration, riparian fencing, riparian plantings and road/trail improvements. For all of these treatments, we focused on the use of local contractors, local youth organizations and agreements with our many partners.

A total of over 170,456 acres of vegetation and fuels treatments have been completed within the SBRC project area in the first 7 years of the project. These treatments ranged from mechanical treatments such as commercial harvest, small diameter tree thinning, mastication, slash piling, burning piles and biomass removal to landscape underburning. To help expand our capacity for underburning, we awarded two additional task orders towards contractor burning. Several of the units were burned by the contractors this fall with good results.

The majority of the fuels treatments took place in areas of the project that have been identified as having high fire hazard according to the wildfire hazard potential map produced by the USDA Forest Service, Fire Modeling Institute.

Working with our two local collaborative groups, we are identifying strategies moving forward to increase efficiencies. There is concern from all sides involved that we need to be treating a higher percentage of the landscape, especially with small diameter thinning and prescribed fire. Our monitoring field trips have highlighted that the prescriptions that are being implemented on the ground don't necessarily match the expectations the collaboratives expected. They often find the stands to still be too dense and we are leaving too many non-fire resistant trees. We have developed a working group to better move our "Zones of Agreement" to contract specification language.

Expenditures

Category	**$**
FY2018 Wildfire Preparedness[1]	$2,000,000
FY2018 Wildfire Suppression[2]	$0
The cost of managing fires for resource benefit if appropriate (i.e. full suppression versus managing)	N/A
FY2018 Hazardous Fuels Treatment Costs (CFLN)	$2,027,949*
FY2018 Hazardous Fuels Treatment Costs (other BLIs)	$1,062,166

*includes CFTM1719 that was part of the overall core CFLR

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

If additional assessments have been completed since the FY2017 CFLRP annual report on fires within the CFLRP area, please note that and provide responses to the questions below.

With the minimal amount of lightning on the Forest in 2018, there were only 21 fires in the SBRC project area for a total of 46.2 acres burned with the largest being 13.5 acres. This number of fires is 50% below the 10 year average. We do know from very severe fire seasons in the recent past 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.

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. **For fuel treatment areas within the CFLR boundary, please copy/paste that entry here and respond to the following supplemental questions. Note that the intent of these questions is to understand progress as well as identify challenges and what didn't work as expected to promote learning and adaptation.**

[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.

Of the 21 fires that occurred within the CFLR boundary, four (31 acres; total acreage burned) had interactions with past treatment and were monitored within the FTEM database. Treatments that impacted fire behavior and provided successful opportunity for suppression action included commercial harvest and pile burning.

- *Please describe if/how partners or community members engaged in the planning or implementation of the relevant fuels treatment.*
  Three project activities affected the four monitored fires. These included Canyon Creek WUI, Dads, and Starr. Dads was the first project the BMFP collaborated with the Malheur NF. Starr was a collaborated project signed after Dads. Planning and implementation was part of the collaboration process for these two projects.
- *Did treatments include coordinated efforts on other federal, tribal, state, private, etc. lands within or adjacent to the CFLR landscape?*
  Although Canyon Creek planning occurred prior to CFLR, protecting the WUI was main reason for the project. State, private and other federal stakeholders were coordinated with in this project. The Dads project was also a WUI corridor along highway 26, east of Prairie City. Reduction of fire behavior and protection of the WUI were a main goal as well. This project is adjacent to numerous private landowners. Starr Aspen project, west of Bear Valley and adjacent to private lands, looked to enhance aspen stands through removal of conifers (shade).
- *What resource values were you and your partners concerned with protecting or enhancing? Did the treatments help to address these value concerns?*
  The values the collaboratives and FS intended to enhance/protect fire resilient landscapes, WUI, and aspen. The timing of these projects in the life of the collaboratives played a large role in addressing the values. As the collaboratives matured and came to more common ground (zones of agreement) more trust was built within the group and between the groups and the FS. This allowed more impactful treatments to be proposed and start to be implemented across the landscapes.
- *Did the treatments do what you expected them to do? Did they have the intended effect on fire behavior or outcomes? Please include a brief description.*
  On a small scale the treatments did as expected. They reduced fire behavior to allow suppression resources to take direct attack on the small fires. The moderated fire behavior, prompt response by resources along with slightly moderated weather conditions resulted in a positive outcome and the ability of the suppression resources to contain and control fires in a timely manner.
- *What is your key takeaway from this event – what would you have done differently? What elements will you continue to apply in the future?*
  A concentrated effort on one specific project or area within one project to completion so we could begin landscape underburning on a larger scale sooner. Science shows that commercial and pre commercial harvest along with treatment of the residual slash are effective at reducing fire behavior. Adding the next activity of landscape burning is what results in the more effective reduction in fire behavior. Collaboration as a whole results in a more robust project. Utilizing best science in addition to applicable input from collaboratives and public would add to a robust planning process and implementation.
- *What <u>didn't</u> work as expected, and why? What was learned?*
  Our suppression resources are 98% effective at putting out the ignitions we have. As weather and fuels conditions moderate throughout the season, we are allowed more time to be deliberate with modified management (suppression strategy) of fires. As we continue to manage fires, we need to improve our messaging to the public. We need to communicate more regularly what our intent is with how we manage the fires that occur in treated areas; how we manage the fires that occur under less extreme conditions.
- *Please include the costs of the treatments listed in the fuels treatment effectiveness report: how much CFLR/CFLN was spent? How much in other BLI's were spent? If cost estimates are not available, please note and briefly explain.*
  Just over $20,000 was expended for the treatments that affected the 4 fires. Approximately $2600 of CFLN money was spent. The treatments that were not paid for with CFLN money were accomplished prior to the establishment of the CFLR and the Malheur's inclusion in the CLFR area. The one treatment that was accomplished with CFLN funds was done so in 2013. Approximately $17,000 of WFHF was spent and the remainder was funded through timber dollars for commercial harvest.

When a wildfire occurs within the CFLR landscape on an area <u>planned</u> for treatment but not yet treated:

- Please include:
  - *Acres impacted and severity of impact*
  - *Brief description of the planned treatment for the area*
  - *Summary of next steps – will the project implement treatments elsewhere? Will they complete an assessment?*
  - *Description of collaborative involvement in determining next steps.*

  None for FY 2018.

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.

None in FY 2018.

- Include expenses in wildfire preparedness and suppression, where relevant
- Include summary of BAER requests and authorized levels within the project landscape, where relevant

3. **What assumptions were used in generating the numbers and/or percentages you plugged into the TREAT tool**?

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

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	0	0	$0	$0
Forest and watershed restoration component	28	32	$219,706	$333,145
Mill processing component	0	0	$0	$0
Implementation and monitoring	59	67	$1,283,586	$1,604,383
Other Project Activities	0	1	$17,778	$22,740
TOTALS:	**88**	**100**	$1,521,070	$1,960,267

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

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	73	100	$6,184,775	$8,455,060
Forest and watershed restoration component	23	26	$187,437	$284,233
Mill processing component	90	250	$5,868,414	$13,770,852
Implementation and monitoring	69	85	$2,459,857	$3,074,629
Other Project Activities	0	0	$14,840	$18,981
TOTALS:	**255**	**461**	**$14,715,323**	**$25,603,755**

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).

While no new task orders where issued in 2018, work continued on task orders awarded in previous years under the Malheur 10 Year Stewardship contract. The socioeconomic benefits resulting from CFLR projects and the use of the local 10-year Stewardship Contract have been substantial. Grant County enjoyed most of these benefits due to the fact Iron Triangle LLC, which holds the 10-year Stewardship Contract, is headquartered there, 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. Although no new stewardship task orders were awarded in 2018, most of the other contracts awarded using CFLR funds placed an emphasis on benefit to the local communities with the expectation for the primary contractors to hire employees locally.

Local wood processing companies have invested heavily in upgrades and new infrastructure to utilize small diameter wood, adding jobs to the community. These companies have been using the leverage of CFLR funds along with the expectation of continued contracting with a focus on local benefit to help secure investments into their businesses.

The table below has several links that speak to the community benefits as a result of CFLR.

Indicator	**Brief Description of Impacts, Successes, and Challenges**	**Links to reports or other published materials (if available)**
Agency requests for information/data	Since becoming a CFLR Forest, we have had interest in learning about our project from researchers, scientist, politicians, volunteers, new partners, and the media	
% Locally retained contracts	According to the TREAT analysis completed each year, the majority of the CFLR funds and match funds stay in the communities of Grant and Harney County. This data has been backed up by Ecosystem Workforce Program in two separate publications.	Ecosystem Workforce Program https://drive.google.com/uc?id=0B_QX-GiwQraUZFVYb1hqWEJ1OUk&export=download
Relationship building/collaborative work	The two collaborative groups tied to the SBRC CFLR project have been very successful at bringing together different interests to work together using 'Common Ground" and "Zones OF Agreement" to increase the pace a scale of forest residency treatments along with improving watersheds, fisheries and wildlife habitat.	NWnewsnetwork Document Link https://drive.google.com/uc?id=0B_QX-GiwQraURHNLU2t6SHI3ams&export=download
Economic dependency/sectors impacted/expanding market development	3 noticeable additions to biomass utilization opportunities since the start of CFLR on the Malheur NF. Small log sort yard, small log breakdown mill and Torrefaction.	Oregon Torrefaction Blue Mountain Eagle https://treesource.org/news/goods-and-services/wildfires-restoration-economy-oregon/

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

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. The 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 eco-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 MNF Silviculture & Fuels Programs (FS) Blue Mountain Forest Partners
White-headed Woodpecker (WHWP)	Rocky Mountain Research Station (FS-R&D) MNF Wildlife Program (FS)
Landscape Pattern Analysis	Remote Sensing Application Center (FS-WO) Blue Mountains Area Ecology Program (FS) Blue Mountains Forest Health Program (FS) MNF Silviculture Program (FS)
Spatial Patterning (stand-level)	University of Washington Blue Mountains Area Ecology Program (FS)
Invasive Species	MNF Botany & Invasive Species Programs (FS) Grant Soil and Water Conservation District Harney County Weed Control North Fork John Day Watershed Council
Watershed	PacFish/InFish Biological Opinion Monitoring Program (FS-WO) MNF Soil & Water Programs (FS)
Riparian Restoration & Fish Passage	Blue Mountains Area Ecology Program (FS) MNF Botany Program (FS) Pacific Northwest Research Station (FS-R&D)
Aspen	MNF Botany, Wildlife, & Silviculture Programs (FS) Oregon State University, College of Forestry Blue Mountains Area Ecology Program (FS)
Collaborative Effectiveness	Blue Mountain Forest Partners Harney County Restoration Collaborative
Socio-economic	University of Oregon, Ecosystem Workforce Program 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 fifth year of implementation. The FVF, invasive species, and WHWO programs 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 are currently underway. 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: Multi Party Monitoring Planning 2nd symposium in spring 2019
Spatial Patterning: *Historical Forest Structure, Composition, and Spatial Pattern in Dry Conifer Forests of the Western Blue Mountains, Oregon*	Punished general technical report in November 2017: GTR
Landscape Pattern Analysis Tool	The tool was developed to meet the needs of the Southern Blues CFLRP; however, the workflow is generalizable across landscapes and can be implemented in any region of the country with the right reference data. Webinars and presentations have occurred in 2017 & 2018: Geotraining Final version of tool officially released in 2018: Southern Blues Appspot
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 2019. Through this and regular presentations at collaborative meetings and forest leadership 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 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	5,243.6	$630,000
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	8,151.3	$4,480,000
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	17.8	$9,175
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC	Acres	Not Reported	
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions. S&W-RSRC-IMP	Acres	31,489.1	$2,393,164
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-LAK	Acres	0	
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	41.6	$213,000
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	40,455.7	$606,000
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved RG-VEG-IMP	Acres	Not Reported	
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance RD-HC-MAIN	Miles	212.6	$44,000
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance RD-PC-MAINT	Miles	24.0	$9,500
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	Not Reported	
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles	Not Reported	
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles	Not Reported	
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	0	
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage STRM-CROS-MTG-STD	Number	2	$300,000
Miles of system trail maintained to standard TL-MAINT-STD	Miles	Not Reported	
Miles of system trail improved to standard TL-IMP-STD	Miles	Not Reported	
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard LND-BL-MRK-MAINT	Miles	Not Reported	
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC	Acres	Not Reported	
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF	Not Reported	
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	103,233.9	$0

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost ($) *(Contract Costs)*
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons	11,344.5	$124,000
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	17,843.4	$2,765,844
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	23,753.4	$3,681,715
Acres mitigated FP-FUELS-ALL-MIT-NFS	Acres	7,118	$710,000
Please also include the acres of prescribed fire accomplished	Acres	17,325	1,732,000
Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands SP-INVSPE-FED-AC	Acres	Not Reported	
Number of priority acres treated annually for native pests on Federal lands SP-NATIVE-FED-AC	Acres	Not Reported	

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

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.)

FY18 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 continued the focus on fire resiliency treatments and implementing riparian restoration treatments using appropriated funds, partnership contributions, and monies generated through our 10-year stewardship. Both collaborative groups have taken on the challenge of increasing social acceptance and sharing the science for the need for more “good fire” on the landscape. Because of that support, we continue to increase the number of prescribed fire acres each year.

By the end of the fiscal year 20,892 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, the Blue Mountain Forest Partners and the Harney County Restoration Collaborative 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), Mark Owens (Harney County Commissioner) 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 conduct its business.

Oregon YCC youth crews again 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. Our district biologists continued use of the Powder River Correctional Facility crews for riparian enhancement

project work such as fence placement and improvement. With the help of many volunteers from Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, a large aspen restoration project was completed in the SBRC project. In a partnership with the Malheur Watershed Council and Oregon Watershed enhancement Board, we completed 3.5 miles of instream/floodplain connectivity enhancement in the Malheur River.

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 (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	20,892 acres
Estimated Cumulative Footprint of Acres (2012 through 2018)	93,251 acres

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).

In FY18 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 still have a challenge reporting expenditures and accomplishments correctly in some areas. In many cases, more restoration work is getting completed than make the final accomplishment reports. This year, 26 miles of trail work in riparian areas was completed to help reduce potential sediment into streams, but not linked to SBRC in the database of record. Similarly, we had 12 miles of road decommissioned in 2018 that were reported as stream or upland habitat acres of accomplishments and linked to SBRC, but weren't linked in INFRA as road decommission to SBRC.

11. **Planned accomplishment narrative and justification if planned FY 2019 accomplishments and/or funding differs from CFLRP project work plan** (no more than 1 page): If do want to compare lifetime goals to date, link here.

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.

We still have two collaborative groups that are very involved in restoration work in our Southern Blues Restoration Coalition project. Information about the Blue Mountain Forest Partners can be found at Blue Mountains Forest Partners. Information about the Harney County Restoration Collaborative can be found at https://highdesertpartnership.org/our-initiatives/harney-county-restoration-collaborative/about-hcrc/our-story.html

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.

Signatures:

Recommended by (Project Coordinator(s)):_____
Roy L. Walker

Approved by (Forest Supervisor(s)): _____
Craig P. Trulock

Draft reviewed by (Blue Mountain Forest Partners): _____
Mark Webb, Executive Director