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

National Forest(s): Malheur

1. Match and Leveraged Funds:

a. FY19 Matching Funds Documentation

Fund Source – (CFLN/CFLR Funds Expended)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2019
CFLN1719	$2,203,067.76

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 2019
NFHF1719	$1,383,691.00

This value (aka "core funds" "in lieu of 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 2019
NFTM	$187,744.06
NFHF	$150,978.46
NFVW	$34,864.20
NFWF	$78,489.47
RTRT	$424,174.03
SRS2	$95,730.00
SSSS	$135,897.24
Total	$1,107,877.46

This amount should match the amount of matching funds 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 2019
North Fork John Day Watershed Council Agreement • OWEB Grant Funds • Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Total	 $181,772 $105,000 $286,772
Powder River Corrections	$65,052

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 the WIT database.

Fund Source – (Partner In-Kind Contributions)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2019
Blue Mountain Forest Partners	$279,480
Harney County Restoration Coalition	$57,538

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 FY19)	Totals
Total revised non-monetary credit limit for contracts awarded in FY19	$1,554,904.94

Revised non-monetary credit limits 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. Information for contracts awarded prior to FY19 were captured in previous annual reports.

b. Please fill in the table describing leveraged funds in your landscape in FY2019. 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
Forest Restoration Equipment Purchases	**John Day, OR**	**$1,325,000**	**Partner Funds**	**Iron Triangle Logging**
Wood Processing improvements to the Seneca Small Log Facility	**Seneca, OR**	**$65,000**	**Partner Funds**	**Iron Triangle Logging**
Equipment and Set-up of (Capital Expenses)Torrefaction Facility	**John Day, OR**	**$13,718,485**	**Partner Funds**	**Restoration Fuels, LLC**

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

In 2019, 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 additional capacity to the post-and-pole operation based in Seneca, OR.

Restoration Fuels, LLC continued investments in the Torrefaction facility in John Day. They have invested in additional equipment and construction this year. 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***.

FY2019 Overview

FY19 Activity Description (Agency performance measures)	**Acres**
Number of acres treated by prescribed fire	7,914
Number of acres treated by mechanical thinning	17,407
Number of acres of natural ignitions that are allowed to burn under strategies that result in desired conditions	3,407
Number of acres treated to restore fire-adapted ecosystems which are maintained in desired condition	34,681
Number of acres mitigated to reduce fire risk	16,887

Please provide a narrative overview of treatments completed in FY19, 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? ***For projects finishing their tenth year***, if you have any additional insights from your cumulative work over the course of the project please share those here as well.

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.

A total of over 204,546 acres of vegetation and fuels treatments have been completed within the SBRC project area in the first 8 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.

As an outcome of this wildfire hazard potential analysis, the SBRC was able to be part of a pilot project in 2019 to assess our projects change in wildfire risk due to the treatments completed to date. While the conclusions for the risk index are draft, they are showing a decrease of nearly 21% for the SBRC project, a movement in the right direction.

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. While this year, fewer acres were treated with prescribed fire than the previous year, the work the collaborative groups are doing towards acceptance of prescribed fire will go a long ways towards getting more "good fire" on the ground. 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 . The collaborative groups have worked hard to define Zones of Agreement and Common Ground Principles around stand densities, species composition and structure. The Malheur National Forest employees have been involved through the process and have started developing prescriptions that reflect these agreements. But we often find the treated stands to still be too dense and we are leaving too many non-fire resistant trees. Knowing that there is a time lag between contract development and implementation monitoring and often agreed to language is not communicated well, we have developed a working group to better move our "Zones of Agreement" to contract specification language.

The Forest was able to manage a wildfire, the Cow Fire, which burned into the SBRC area this summer. While utilizing full suppression, we were able to use an indirect strategy to allow for many landscape benefits. The fire team was able to manage the fire intensity and severity by taking advantage of weather conditions and actively putting fire on the ground at the right time and place. The team was also able to use a CFLR treated area for an indirect line on the south side of the fire as a containment line. While the treatment areas had recently been treated and there was still some activity slash in the units, the reduced stand densities saved time in prepping and holding those fire lines. Approximately 3,407 acres of the Cow Fire was in the SBRC project area. This link **https://lnkd.in/gSrq6mH** takes you to a video that tells the story of the Cow Fire.

Below are before and after pictures of the prescribed fire results in the Dads Project in the SBRC (September 15th, 2019) showing excellent consumption of down wood and fine fuels.

The pictures below show a unit before thinning, after thinning and the effects of a prescribed burn in the Elk-16 SBRC project area. Very similar to many of the treatments occurring throughout the SBRC project area.

Expenditures

Category	**$**
FY2019 Wildfire Preparedness[1]	$1,596,000
FY2019 Wildfire Suppression[2]	$4,080,000
The cost of managing fires for resource benefit if appropriate (i.e. full suppression versus managing)	$12,000,000
FY2019 Hazardous Fuels Treatment Costs (CFLN)	$1,834,275
FY2019 Hazardous Fuels Treatment Costs (other BLIs)	$1,762,288

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. ***For projects finishing their tenth year***, if you have any additional insights from your cumulative work over the course of the project please share those here as well.

More treatments across the landscape are providing the forest with additional decision space when we have an ignition. As we continue to complete larger treatment blocks outside the immediate adjacency or private property and under the right conditions, we have more opportunity to utilize alternative suppression strategies. As we build social license and gain trust with our partners, the cost of suppression should decrease over time. The utilization of the treatment blocks as they were planned (to reduce fire behavior & flame lengths and improve resiliency) should allow us to utilize technological advances in resources and not require direct suppression tactics across the entire CFLR landscape.

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:

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

If additional assessments have been completed since the FY2018 CFLRP annual report on fires within the CFLRP area, please note that and provide responses to the questions below. ***For projects finishing their tenth year****, if you have any additional insights from your cumulative work over the course of the project please share those here as well.*

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.

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.**

- *Please describe if/how partners or community members engaged in the planning or implementation of the relevant fuels treatment.*
  Four project activities affected 3 monitored fires. These projects included Dads, Balance, and Marshall Divine (2). Dads was the first project the BMFP collaborated with the Malheur NF. Marshall Devine was a collaborated project signed after Dads. Planning and implementation was part of the collaboration process for these two projects. Balance was not a collaborated project but the collaborative group has been involved in implementation discussions and field trips to observe the treatments in this project area.

- *Did treatments include coordinated efforts on other federal, tribal, state, private, etc. lands within or adjacent to the CFLR landscape?*
  The Dads project was a WUI corridor along highway 26, east of Prairie City. Reduction of fire behavior and protection of the WUI were a main goal that included state and private stakeholder coordination as well. This project is adjacent to numerous private landowners. Marshall Devine was a WUI project in Harney County. The Balance project falls within the Middle Fork of the John Day River. This project had a WUI component to reduce fire behavior along main forest roads as well.

- *What resource values were you and your partners concerned with protecting or enhancing? Did the treatments help to address these value concerns?*
  All 3 of these projects addressed FS and collaborative values; WUI, old growth fire resilient trees, and aspen stands. Treatments were concentrated along highways and travel corridors. Treatments to promote aspen growth and reduce competition of old Ponderosa Pine trees through removal of competing conifers occurred in the project areas. The FS relationships with the two collaborative groups continue to mature. Common ground/zones of agreement have resulted in more impactful landscape scale treatments being implemented across the forest.

- *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.*
  The treatments did as expected on a small scale. The small fires in the vicinity of high values were directly attacked and kept small. The combination of slightly moderated seasonal weather conditions, prompt response by suppression resources and reduced fire behavior as a result of treatments allowed suppression resources to contain and control these small fires promptly.

- *What is your key takeaway from this event – what would you have done differently? What elements will you continue to apply in the future?*
  Science shows that commercial and pre commercial thinning along with the treatment of the residual slash are effective at reducing fire behavior. Adding the next activity of landscape burning to the suite of cutting treatments on the landscape is what results in more effective reduction of fire behavior. By concentrating treatments and funding on one project area to completion will result in landscape

burning sooner and on more contiguous acres.
Utilization of the best available science and collaboration results in a more robust and thorough projects. The planning and implementation processes result in more deliberate work getting done on the ground.

- *What didn't work as expected, and why? What was learned?*
  Our suppression resources are 98% effective at keeping fires small and putting the fires out partly because they have been taught to put them out from their initial firefighter training. As weather and fuels moderate throughout the season as they did this year, we allowed more time to be deliberate with our suppression actions (modified suppression strategies on fires.) As the forest continues to suppress fires using alternative strategies, we need to continue to improve our messaging to the public. We need to communicate more often what our intent is with fire management strategies with the public. The public (and the FS) need to come into fire season prepared and aware of our intent before we have an ignition we decide to manage with modified strategies in areas that have been treated.
  The fires we monitored against fuels treatments in the FTEM database were small enough that combined with the fuels treatments, generally allowed us to apply direct suppression tactics. Surface fire was experienced.
  Fuels and weather conditions were moderate this fire season. Our suppression resources were prompt and efficient. These three factors contributed to our fuels treatment effectiveness on the fires we monitored this year.

- *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.*
  Approximately $100,000 was expended on the treatments that affected the 78 fires. The majority of fires were affected by Canyon Creek fire in 2015 (as a treatment). $12,000 of CFLN was expended on thinning and piling treatments. Just under $6,000 of NFHF was expended on thinning and landscape burning treatment units that were not within the initial boundary of the CFLR area but are within the adjusted boundary.

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

- Please include:

  - *Brief description of the planned treatment for the area*
    Twenty-one acres of pre commercial thinning were accomplished at the southern end of the 204 Cow fire. Crews were able to build indirect line around the fire that included these 2 units. Under mild weather conditions, fire resources secured this division by actively lightning the perimeter. Low severity fire moved through these units.

  - *Summary of next steps – will the project implement treatments elsewhere? Will they complete an assessment?* With low severity fire effects across the area, an integrated team of FS resources would assess the area to determine the feasibility of implementing the treatments as planned.

  - *Description of collaborative involvement in determining next steps.*
    Collaborative group will be invited out on any field trips and could be involved in conversations regarding how planned treatments might result in small scale adjustments so they still meet the

intent of the planning process post fire.

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.

- Include expenses in wildfire preparedness and suppression, where relevant
  One third of the 204 Cow fire was the only fire we utilized alternative suppression strategy within the circle that amounted to acreage greater than 0.25 acres. See cost above in expenditures table. The 3 additional fires we attempted to utilize alternative suppression strategies did not burn in areas where conditions were conducive to the fire spreading to road systems, natural barriers, or treatment units.

- Include summary of BAER requests and authorized levels within the project landscape, where relevant BAER for the Cow Fire include treatment for invasive weeds, replacement of a culvert, improvement of one recreation trail, and recreation sign replacement along the east boundary of the fire for a total of $54,000.

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 2019 Jobs Supported/Maintained (FY19 CFLR/CFLN/ WO funding):

FY 2019 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**	**34**	$321,107	$458,423
Mill processing component	**0**	**0**	0	0
Implementation and monitoring	**57**	**61**	$916,868	$1,057,144
Other Project Activities	**2**	**2**	$45,719	$57,476
TOTALS:	**87**	**97**	$1,283,694	$1,573,043

FY 2019 Jobs Supported/Maintained (FY19 CFLR/CFLN/ WO <u>and matching</u> funding):

FY 2019 Jobs Supported/Maintained	**Jobs (Full and Part- Time) (Direct)**	**Jobs (Full and Part- Time) (Total)**	**Labor Income (Direct)**	**Labor Income (Total)**
Timber harvesting component	86	108	$7,261,299	$8,501,329
Forest and watershed restoration component	44	53	$474,047	$695,624
Mill processing component	121	213	$7,993,061	$11,307,715
Implementation and monitoring	67	73	$1,119,355	$1,290,610

FY 2019 Jobs Supported/Maintained	Jobs (Full and Part- Time) (Direct)	Jobs (Full and Part- Time) (Total)	Labor Income (Direct)	Labor Income (Total)
Other Project Activities	**2**	**3**	**$55,417**	**$69,668**
TOTALS:	**321**	**450**	**$16,903,179**	**$21,864,946**

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).

4 new task orders where issued in 2019 and 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. Most of the other service contracts awarded using CFLR funds continue to place 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)
Project Partnership Composition	We have several partners involved with the SBRC project. The diversity of partners is what makes the SBRC successful. We have partners representing industry, local and state governments, environmental organizations, universities, watershed councils, correctional facility, wildlife non-profit and Good Neighbor Agreements with State fish and wildlife and State Forestry.	N/A

Indicator	Brief Description of Impacts, Successes, and Challenges	Links to reports or other published materials (if available)
% Locally retained contracts	100% of the larger restoration projects that had **commercial products** went to local contractors. A large percentage of the **service contracts** in the SBRC went to local contractors.	N/A
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.	A documentary filmed last fall should be coming out soon. The documentary was to cover the tension between industry and environmentalists and show how collaboration is bringing both together. The film will include BMFP members and a Malheur NF employee. A link to the film will be made available when it is completed.
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 resiliency treatments.	http://www.bluemountainsforestpartners.org / https://highdesertpartnership.org/our- initiatives/harney-county-restoration- collaborative/about-hcrc/our-story.html

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).	20 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: http://www.bluemountainsforestpartners.org/work/multiparty-monitoring/ Planning 2nd symposium in spring 2020
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: https://www.fs.fed.us/pnw/pubs/pnw_gtr956.pdf
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: http://fsweb.geotraining.fs.fed.us/www/index.php?lessons_ID=3918 Final version of tool officially released in 2018: https://southern-blues-dev.appspot.com/
Preliminary and final reports and publications	Will be released as data collection is completed or sufficient to make inferences or meaningful management recommendations

In October of 2019, the CFLRP multiparty monitoring program hosted the second of a series of monitoring symposia "Southern Blues Science and Monitoring Workshop" to bring together scientists from around the state for an event that describes how managers and stakeholders are using the latest research to plan and implement restoration treatments on the Malheur National Forest (MNF). Topics included regeneration after wildfire, tree response to thinning, can wildfire restore dry mixed-conifer stands, the use of LiDAR, monitoring

of restoration treatments across the MNF, evolution of silviculture prescriptions on the MNF and monitoring of upland silviculture treatments in the SBRC.

We continue to collect monitoring data across all aspects of SBRC restoration projects. 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 2019 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	3,517.7	$422,040
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	5,401.8	$2,971,100
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	3,522.2	$76,709
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC	Acres	Not Reported	N/A
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions. S&W-RSRC-IMP	Acres	29,398.7	$2,234324
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-LAK	Acres	Not Reported	N/A
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	30.8	$157,696
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	41,327.1	$619,905
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved RG-VEG-IMP	Acres	Not Reported	N/A
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance RD-HC-MAIN	Miles	Not Reported	N/A
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance RD-PC-MAINT	Miles	Not Reported	N/A
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	.77	$20,196
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles	Not Reported	N/A
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles	Not Reported	N/A
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	Not Reported	N/A
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage STRM-CROS-MTG-STD	Number	4	$600,000
Miles of system trail maintained to standard TL-MAINT-STD	Miles	32.5	$65,000
Miles of system trail improved to standard TL-IMP-STD	Miles	Not Reported	N/A

Performance Measure	**Unit of measure**	**Total Units Accomplished**	**Total Treatment Cost ($)** ***(Contract Costs)***
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard LND-BL-MRK-MAINT	Miles	Not Reported	N/A
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC	Acres	4,862.4	$0
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF	Not Reported	N/A
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	110,041.5	$0
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons	22,427	$246,697
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	17,676.1	$2,739,780
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	16,414.5	$2,544,247.5
Acres mitigated FP-FUELS-ALL-MIT-NFS	Acres	16,887	$1,688,700
Please also include the acres of prescribed fire accomplished	Acres	7,914	$791,400
Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species	Acres	Not Reported	N/A
on Federal lands SP-INVSPE-FED-AC			N/A
Number of priority acres treated annually for native pests on Federal lands SP-NATIVE-FED-AC	Acres	Not Reported	N/A

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

7. FY 2019 accomplishment narrative –

FY19 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.

By the end of the fiscal year 51,906 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.

In 2019, we were finally able to increase our treatment to invasive plants with the use of the herbicide using our Forest Weeds EIS. We continued to prioritize 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.

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.

North Fork John Day Watershed Council 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. The North Fork John Day Watershed Council also worked with us to provide a veteran crew that focused on trail maintenance to reduce sediment into our streams. 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, another large aspen restoration project was completed in the SBRC project. In a partnership with the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife and with help from many volunteers, we completed 3.5 miles of instream/floodplain connectivity enhancement in the Camp Creek drainage. The volunteers planted willows and built cages around hardwoods to help with stream bank stabilization. An AmeriCorps National Civilian Community Corps crew spent the summer on the Forest helping with prescribed fire, aquatics and wildlife projects, all within the SBRC area.

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. This information will be posted here on the internal SharePoint site for verification *after the databases of record close October 31*.

Fiscal Year	Footprint of Acres Treated (without counting an acre of treatment on the land in more than one treatment category)
FY 2019	51,906 acres
Estimated Cumulative Footprint of Acres (2010 or 2012 through 2019)	145,157 acres

9. Describe any reasons that the FY 2019 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? ***For projects finishing their tenth year***, if you have any additional insights from your cumulative work over the course of the project please share those here as

well. (Please limit answer to two pages).

In FY19 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 exclosure fencing, riparian vegetation treatments 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, road maintenance and road closures did not get reported correctly. Several miles of this work was done to help reduce potential sediment into streams, but not linked to SBRC in the database of record.

9b. **(OPTIONAL) FOR INTERNAL USE:** The following responses are directed towards feedback on *internal* bottlenecks or issues that may impact your project. Please use this space to raise awareness on key internal issues, or opportunities to improve processes moving forward. Responses will be included in an internal document. What are the limiting factors to success or more success of the CFLR? How can the National Forest and its collaborators operate in a more integrated and synergized way?

10. *Project selected in 2012 and 2013 ONLY* - Planned FY 2020 Accomplishments

Performance Measure Code	**Unit of measure**	**Planned Accomplishment for 2020** (National Forest System)	***Planned Accomplishment on non-NFS lands within the CFLRP landscape[3]***
Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres	3,500	N/A
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	3,500	1,000
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	30	N/A
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	40,000	N/A
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	3	N/A
Miles of passenger car system roads maintained RD-PC-MAIN	Miles	200	N/A
Miles of high clearance system road maintained RD-HC-MAIN	Miles	20	N/A
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	100,000	N/A

Performance Measure Code	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment for 2020 (National Forest System)	*Planned Accomplishment on non-NFS lands within the CFLRP landscape*[3]
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons	15,000	N/A
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	22,000	2,000
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	22,000	N/A

Please include all relevant planned accomplishments, assuming that funding specified in the CFLRP project proposal for FY 2020 is available.

11. *Project selected in 2012 and 2013 ONLY* - Planned accomplishment narrative and justification if planned FY 2020 accomplishments and/or funding differs from CFLRP project work plan (no more than 1 page):

Planned accomplishments are expected to be on track with the CFLR project work plan.

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.

[3] As we shift to more emphasis on sharing results across all lands within the CFLRP projects – if relevant for your project area – please provide estimates for planned work on non-NFS lands within the CFLRP areas for work that generally corresponds with the Agency performance measure to the left and supports the CFLRP landscape strategy. Give your best estimate at this point; if it's unknown how much work will occur off NFS lands, simply state unknown.

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 http://www.bluemountainsforestpartners.org/. 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

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

Draft reviewed by (Harney County Restoration Coalition): _____
Ben Cate