CFLR Project (Name/Number): TAPASH/CFLR08

National Forest(s): Okanogan-Wenatchee

Please review the "CFLR Annual Report Instructions" document before filling out template below. Responses to the prompts in this annual report should be typed directly into the template. Example information is included in red below. Please delete red text before submitting the final version.

Please note that responses to the CLFRP scenario planning template are due along with the report. Please reach out to lindasysbuchanan@fs.fed.us with any questions. Reports are due to the Washington Office (via the Regional Forester through a submission to Acting USFS Deputy Chief for National Forest System Christopher B. French, cc'ing Lindsay Buchanan and Jessica Robertson) no later than December 7, 2018 for review.

1. Match and Leveraged Funds:

a. FY18 Matching Funds Documentation

Fund Source – (CFLN/CFLR Funds Expended)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2018
CFLN17	$89,128.00
CFLN18	$256,264.73

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
NA	NA

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
BDBD	$-11860.72
CWFS	$419831.05
NFHF	$167,681[1]
NFTM	$96,271[2]
NFVW	$87350.18
SSSS	$33645.51

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
NFXN	$213,250.18

[1] Corrected using workplan after year-end database closeout – there official total reported is $5,621,455

[2] Corrected using workplan after year-end database closeout – there official total reported is $2,665,609

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
Mountains to Sound Greenway	$150,000
USGS-USFWS - Experimental Barred Owl Removal Study	$90,000

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	$66,930.60

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. Examples include but are not limited to: investments within landscape on non-NFS lands, investments in restoration equipment, worker training for implementation and monitoring, research conducted that helps project achieve proposed objectives, and purchase of equipment for wood processing that will use restoration by-products from CFLR projects. See "Instructions" document for additional information.

Description of item	Where activity/item is located or impacted area	Estimated total amount	Forest Service or Partner Funds?	Source of funds
Complete a GIS layer for all active large landscape projects linked to a Geodatabase	**TAPASH landscape**	**$25,000**	**Partner- DNR**	**DNR grant**
Wood Fiesta (helicopter work)	**WDNR and WDFW lands**	**$530,000**	**Partner - YN**	**SRFB, BPA, McNary Mitigation Fund and Tapash Collaborative**
Ragland/Taneum 1.8 (river mile 1.8).	**WDFW lands**	**$340,000**	**Partner - YN**	**BPA and SRFB**

Description of item	Where activity/item is located or impacted area	Estimated total amount	Forest Service or Partner Funds?	Source of funds
Fence removal and LWD placement				
South Cle Elum Ridge WUI - NEPA	123 acres on pvt land for fuel treatments	$10,000	Partner - TNC	grant thru Western Landscape Scale Restoration
Wild Plum Sorts Timber Sale	528 acres on DNR lands	$30,000	Partner - DNR	DNR
Murray Shaded Fuel Break	143 acres on DNR lands	$250,000	Partner - DNR	DNR
Robinson Canyon - NEPA -	500 acres of thinning for wood placement in NF Manastash Cr/Swauk Cr/Umptanum Cr. by YN on WDFW lands	$375,000	Partner	grant from Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program
LT Murray Pre-Commercial Thinning	1200-1500 acres of PCT WDFW lands	$450,000	Partner	DNR Forest Health
Weed Treatment	WDFW land	$5,000	Partner	WDFW
TREX multi-agency fire training	DNR Jurisdiction Lands	$26,340 $9,270	Partner	DNR & Registration Fees
Community Wildfire Protection Plan	on PVT lands	$36,000	Partner	FEMA
Firewise	200 acres on PVT lands	$200,000	Partner	Capital $ & Joint Chiefs

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

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	817 (Cle Elum) 1714 (Naches)
Number of acres treated by mechanical thinning	529 (Cle Elum chipping) 171 (Naches)

FY18 Activity Description (Agency performance measures)	**Acres**
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	1392 (Cle Elum) 1933 (Naches)
Number of acres mitigated to reduce fire risk	1392 (Cle Ellum) 3251 (Naches)

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?

The Cle Elum District is working on Restoration projects (Swauk Pine and Taneum) that were planned at a smaller scale to develop lessons learned for working with an outdated Forest Plan, in Late Successional Reserve and Northern Spotted Owl critical habitat. Future projects, Wild Blew and Teanaway, will have larger restoration footprints and will increase in pace, as we have improved on process and understanding.

The Naches District has some newer landscape NEPA. The intent of the projects, whether RX fire, non-commercial thinning, or commercial thinning is to move the landscape to a condition where fire is allowed to burn and produce positive effects naturally. That said, the project plans are designed to be at the landscape scale for most all treatments. We have completed prescribed burns and burn plans covering a large array of landscape types, setting us up for a mixed portfolio of opportunities in the future.

- **How was this area prioritized for treatment?** What kinds of information, input, and/or analyses were used to prioritize? Please provide a summary or links to any quantitative analyses completed.

  For Cle Elum - these areas were prioritized by the need to treat around the town of Liberty and Liberty Mountain home sites. The treatments will provide anchor points and opportunity to suppress fires started on private or Forest service jurisdiction with minimal effort. It would also limit over-story mortality and provide for a more natural fire to occur.

  For Naches - Our main prescribed burn area was prioritized based off of funding that was collected to reduce activity created slash from the timber sale purchaser. After that, locations are chosen due to length of time since mechanical treatments occurred and location of the project in relation to public exposure and risk. Outside of those, treatments may also be prioritized based off of weather patterns and where the areas of opportunity are that will produce the best outcomes.

- **Please tell us whether these treatments were in "high or very high wildfire hazard area** from the "wildfire hazard potential map" (Firelab.org)

  For Cle Elum District - Based on the map the treatments were in a high and very high hazard areas as identified by the Forest Service modeling and reinforce in the Washington State Wildland Fire Protection 10 year Strategic Plan.

  For Naches District - Both high and very high.

  - Were the treatments in **proximity to a highly valued resource** like a community, a WUI area, communications site, campground, etc.?

  For Cle Elum District - Yes, these areas are in close proximity with predicted high intensity to communities, watersheds, timber and infrastructure.

For Naches District - Yes, all of the above plus more.

- **What have you learned** about the interaction between treatment prioritization, scale, and cost reduction? What didn't work? Please provide data and further context here.

  For Cle Elum – We have learned that in such complex landscapes increasing scale and reducing costs are not the most important metrics. We value the restoration outcomes, relationships with stakeholders, relevance to our communities and lessons learned through this collaborative process as higher metrics at this point. Moving into the next phase of taking what we have developed and growing in scale and pace, as well as, using GNA, TFPA, and stewardship authorities to prioritize treatments with our partners and reduce cost per acre.

  What didn't work was increasing the pace. As we struggled to work through an outcome based approach, we spent far more time than expected on LSR and habitat issues.

  For Naches - We need to not forget about finishing projects before we move on to the next. Increasing the pace and scale only works if we actually do the right work and complete that work before taking on/promising more work, even though it may sound good to "increase pace and scale".

Please provide visuals if available, including maps of the landscape and hazardous fuels treatments completed, before and after photos, and/or graphics from fire regime restoration analysis completed locally. You may copy and paste these below or provide a link to a website with these visuals.

Expenditures

Category	**$**
FY2018 Wildfire Preparedness[3]	$300,000.00 (Cle Elum) $300,000 (Naches)
FY2018 Wildfire Suppression[4]	12 million (Cle Elum) 15 million (Naches)
The cost of managing fires for resource benefit if appropriate (i.e. full suppression versus managing)	0 (Cle Elum) 15 million (Naches)
FY2018 Hazardous Fuels Treatment Costs (CFLN)	0
FY2018 Hazardous Fuels Treatment Costs (other BLIs)	$180,000 (Cle Elum) $130,000 (Naches)

How may the treatments that were implemented contribute to reducing fire costs? If you have seen a reduction in fire suppression costs over time, please include that here. ?

During a wildfire event, these treated landscapes are in a condition that gives us flexibility to focus our attention on other more critical areas of safety concerns or natural resource concerns due to their ability to host fire in a natural/beneficial way. Which means we spend less time and money on those areas thus reducing overall fire costs.

However, in 2018 a 150 acre fire burned on the Cle Elum Ranger District. Total suppression costs were 12 million dollars. We used full suppression tactics due to private property and infrastructure located within .25 miles of the ignitions. In

[3] 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).

[4] 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.

addition, the fire was located in a Northwest Forest Plan Late Successional Reserve, in close proximity to previously occupied spotted owl locations. No landscape level treatments were conducted in proximity to this wildfire.

Have there been any assessments or reports conducted within your CFLRP landscape that provide information on cost reduction, cost avoidance, and/or other cost related data as it relates to fuels treatment and fires? If so, please summarize or provide links here:

No Additional Assessments to list.

3. **What assumptions were used in generating the numbers and/or percentages you plugged into the TREAT tool**? Information about Treatment for Restoration Economic Analysis Tool inputs and assumptions available here.

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	9	17	790,250	994,292
Forest and watershed restoration component	0	0	4,032	7,780
Mill processing component	18	44	1,175,889	2,291,890
Implementation and monitoring	16	16	63,933	82,446
Other Project Activities	0	0	5,162	6,824
TOTALS:	**43**	**77**	**2,039,266**	**3,383,233**

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	12	22	1,026,298	1,291,289
Forest and watershed restoration component	1	2	29,047	44,592
Mill processing component	18	44	1,175,889	2,291,890
Implementation and monitoring	16	17	103,406	133,350
Other Project Activities	0	0	13,120	17,345
TOTALS:	**47**	**84**	**2,347,760**	**3,778,465**

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).

The Executive Committee of the Tapash and the place-based workgroups have built strong relationships with the local community, non-governmental organizations, and interagency partners. The collaborative includes a broad stakeholder group with continued involvement in workgroups as well as the continued high attendance at public meetings suggests that Tapash is successful engaging the public. The collaborative relationships have built trust in the partnership, put

projects on the ground with multiple partners and other collaborative groups, resulting in a drastic increase in the social license allowed for the agency to work through 'wicked' problems.

Choose at least four of the socioeconomic indicators below that are most relevant and important for your project.

Enter your four (or more) most important indicators in the table below: The table that is currently filled out is for an example:

Indicator	Brief Description of Impacts, Successes, and Challenges	Links to reports or other published materials (if available)
Regulatory Compliance	Working within the Northwest Forest Plan area the Tapash has been more successful at integrating Regional specialist and interagency (e.g. USFWS, NOAA, etc) into the planning and implementation monitoring of projects.	
Public input in political processes	The community and partners have become much more active in the political discussions and (mostly state) legislation that affect the CFLN landscape.	Washington Department of Natural Resources 20 Year Plan
Tribal Connections	The relationship with the Yakama Nation has been strengthened. The Yakama are frequently a strong driving force behind many aquatic and riparian restoration projects.	Tribal employees are working out of FS offices and are helping to build strong relationships beyond the ceded lands fisheries.
Ease of business	The ease of business has been facilitated in some ways as our public and partners make getting through project planning and implementation fairly simple as they frequently agree and are part of the planning process. The strong collaborative relationships have made business, including seeking external funds for high priority projects a team effort. The collaborative has also helped bridge communications within the region.	

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

The Tapash Collaborative monitoring working group continues their efforts toward implementation of a monitoring plan that identifies common goals and objectives, develops a process for identifying and prioritizing monitoring questions, identifies a learning method for addressing each question and constructs an outreach and communication framework outlining information transfer between project stakeholders.

Using the Manastash-Taneum all lands planning area as a test case, the monitoring strategy is being implemented to design and implement an adaptive protocol that is scale-able and applicable to various landscapes and can serve several monitoring objectives and eliminate redundant work efforts. The chosen suite of key monitoring categories have been developed, and specific questions are being framed. The group is will then work to identify specific methodologies that

are most effective and efficient in capturing the desired information to answer each monitoring question, development of a formal prioritization process that further engages our stakeholders and decision makers and continued stakeholder communication and outreach.

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

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

6. FY 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	70	
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	0	
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	1641.8	
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC	Acres		
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions. S&W-RSRC-IMP	Acres	14	
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-LAK	Acres		
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	2.2	
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	50,532.50	
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved RG-VEG-IMP	Acres	13281.8	
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance RD-HC-MAIN	Miles	2.13	

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost ($) *(Contract Costs)*
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance RD-PC-MAINT	Miles		
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles		
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles		
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles		
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		
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage STRM-CROS-MTG-STD	Number		
Miles of system trail maintained to standard TL-MAINT-STD	Miles	78.066	
Miles of system trail improved to standard TL-IMP-STD	Miles		
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard LND-BL-MRK-MAINT	Miles		
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC	Acres	155**	
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF	11,000.28	
TMBR-BRSH-DSPSL	AC	226	
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	5290.41	
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons	7626	
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	464	
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	1462	
Acres mitigated FP-FUELS-ALL-MIT-NFS	Acres		
Please also include the acres of prescribed fire accomplished	Acres	2531	
Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands SP-INVSPE-FED-AC	Acres		
Number of priority acres treated annually for native pests on Federal lands SP-NATIVE-FED-AC	Acres		

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

** Not showing in database because unit has not been accepted but acres were treated.

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.)

Two modest sized projects have been made great progress in getting past some regulatory hurdles. These two projects are designed to promote resilient landscapes through active management. They include commercial, pre-commercial timber, prescribed fire, aquatic improvements, and improved hydrologic function.

The Tapash has also been extremely successful in accomplishing work across multiple ownerships that account for many thousands of acres of habitat (terrestrial and aquatic) restoration and fire mitigation as documented elsewhere. However, on FS lands the Tapash has accomplished implementation of fire mitigation acres that are high cost because of the lack of merchantable material as well as prescribed fire on a landscape that is constrained by smoke approval and endangered species issues.

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	1,703
Estimated Cumulative Footprint of Acres (2010 or 2012 through 2018)	FY10 = 2,331 FY11 = 3,870 FY12 = 7,237 FY13 = 3,955 FY14 = 7,304 FY15 = 4,813 FY16 = 3,368 FY17 = 9,756

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

We used the EDW acres for FY2018 as was sent to us. For the Estimated Cumulative Footprint of Acres, we took the values off the FY 2017 report

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

10. Planned FY 2019 Accomplishments

This table only needs to be filled out **if** your FY19 expected accomplishments are different from what you submitted in your FY17 report.

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

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** (no more than 1 page):

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.

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.

Yakima Basin Wood Fiesta

[Daily Record News](#)

July 2018, Manastash-Taneum featured in article "Washington Lawmakers Hope to Fight Forest Fires with Fire"

2018 Cascadia TREX Burn Notice Mailer -

K_Tribune_09132018_043423.pdf

NKCFall_articlev2.pdf

NKCFall_articlev1.pdf

NKTribune_Article_RSCB.pdf

CascadiaTREX_Fire_Districts_Communica

Cacaida 2018 Prescribed Fire Train

Signatures:

Recommended by (Project Coordinator(s)): _____

Approved by (Forest Supervisor(s)): _____ 3/26/2019

Draft reviewed by (collaborative chair or representative): _____