

**CFLR Project (Southern Blues Restoration Coalition/CFLN17)
Malheur National Forest**

1. CFLRP Expenditures, Match, and Leveraged Funds:

a. FY20 CFLN and Matching Funds Documentation

Fund Source – (CFLN Funds Expended)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2020
CFLN1720	\$3,845,998.41

This amount should match the amount of CFLN dollars obligated in the FMMI CFLRP expenditure report. Include prior year CFLN dollars expended in this Fiscal Year. CFLN funds can only be spent on NFS lands.

Fund Source – (FS Matching Funds)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2020
NFHF	\$869,614.76
NFTM	\$607,789.10
NFVW	\$29,482.22
NFWF	\$5,854.88
<u>SSSS</u>	<u>\$90,003.09</u>
Total	\$1,602,744.05

This amount should match the amount of matching funds in the FMMI CFLRP expenditure report, *minus* any partner funds contributed through agreements (such as NFEX, SPEX, WFEX, CMEX, and CWFS) listed below. Per the updated [Program Funding Guidance](#), federal dollars spent on non-NFS lands (for example, through Wyden authority) may be included here if aligned with CFLRP proposal implementation within the CFLRP landscape. NOTE: In FY20, projects received their allocation only in CFLN – there are no “Washington Office funds” to report.

Fund Source – Partner Match	In-Kind Contribution or Funding Provided?	Total Estimated Funds/Value for FY20	Description of CFLRP implementation or monitoring activity	Where activity/item is located or impacted area
Blue Mountains Forest Partners (BMFP)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In-kind contribution <input type="checkbox"/> Funding Budget Line Item, if relevant: ¹	\$148,882	The BMFP Collaborative supports the SBRC by taking the lead on Multi-Party monitoring and working to develop Zones of Agreement across a diverse group of collaborative members. Their work focuses on the north half of the Malheur NF.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Forest System Lands <input type="checkbox"/> Other lands within CFLRP landscape:

¹ If funding from partner(s) is captured in USFS database (such as as NFEX, SPEX, WFEX, CMEX, or CWFS), please provide Budget Line Item here. See CFLRP FMMI expenditure report for reference.

Fund Source – Partner Match	In-Kind Contribution or Funding Provided?	Total Estimated Funds/Value for FY20	Description of CFLRP implementation or monitoring activity	Where activity/item is located or impacted area
Harney County Restoration Collaborative (HCRC)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In-kind contribution <input type="checkbox"/> Funding Budget Line Item, if relevant: ¹	\$63,046	The HCRC supports the SBRC by helping with Multi-Party monitoring and working to develop Common Operating Principles across a diverse group of collaborative members. Their work focuses on the south half of the Malheur NF.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Forest System Lands <input type="checkbox"/> Other lands within CFLRP landscape:
Oregon Department of Corrections	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In-kind contribution <input type="checkbox"/> Funding Budget Line Item, if relevant: ¹	\$104,934	Corrections crews built buck and pole fences to protect hardwoods from excessive browse.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Forest System Lands <input type="checkbox"/> Other lands within CFLRP landscape:
Grant County Soil and Water District	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In-kind contribution <input type="checkbox"/> Funding Budget Line Item, if relevant: ¹	\$13,867	The District bought fencing supplies and funded/administered a contract for hardwood protection fencing.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Forest System Lands <input type="checkbox"/> Other lands within CFLRP landscape:
Oregon Natural Desert Association	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In-kind contribution <input type="checkbox"/> Funding Budget Line Item, if relevant: ¹	\$8,204.18	ONDA volunteers helped plant hardwoods on the Camp Creek and Clear Creek Riparian Restoration Projects.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Forest System Lands <input type="checkbox"/> Other lands within CFLRP landscape:
Malheur Watershed Council	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In-kind contribution <input type="checkbox"/> Funding Budget Line Item, if relevant: ¹	\$6,000	The Malheur Watershed Council helped with monitoring of large wood placement in streams through drone imagery, survey and analysis.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Forest System Lands <input type="checkbox"/> Other lands within CFLRP landscape:
Burns Training and Education Consortium TEC/OYCC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In-kind contribution <input type="checkbox"/> Funding Budget Line Item, if relevant: ¹	\$16,289.53	The youth crews helped with wildlife habitat restoration, road closures, aspen exclosure maintenance, wildlife guzzler maintenance, riparian	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Forest System Lands <input type="checkbox"/> Other lands within CFLRP landscape:

Fund Source – Partner Match	In-Kind Contribution or Funding Provided?	Total Estimated Funds/Value for FY20	Description of CFLRP implementation or monitoring activity	Where activity/item is located or impacted area
			planting and aspen stand restoration thinning.	
Mt. Adams Institute, VETS WORK	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In-kind contribution <input type="checkbox"/> Funding Budget Line Item, if relevant: ¹	\$6,000	The Mt. Adams VETS Work program provides job training opportunities to military veterans. This year the intern helped with wildlife habitat projects.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Forest System Lands <input type="checkbox"/> Other lands within CFLRP landscape:

Total partner in-kind contributions for implementation and monitoring of a CFLR project across all lands within the CFLRP landscape.

Service work accomplishment through goods-for services funding within a stewardship contract (for contracts awarded in FY20)	Totals
Total <u>revised non-monetary credit limit</u> for contracts awarded in FY20	\$2,757,116.71
Revenue generated through Good Neighbor Agreements	Totals
	\$0

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 FY20 were captured in previous annual reports. Revenue generated from GNA should only be reported for CFLRP match if the funds are intended to be spent within the CFLRP project area for work in line with the CFLRP project’s proposed restoration strategies and in alignment with the CFLRP authorizing legislation

b. (If needed) Describe additional leveraged funds in your landscape in FY2020. In 2020, the primary contractor on the stewardship contract doing a majority of the restoration work in the SBRC project was able to leverage additional funds towards equipment and infrastructure. They invested \$1,525,000 towards equipment for restoration and \$180,000 towards infrastructure at their Seneca Post and Pole plant in the center of the SBRC project. Below are pictures of the

Seneca Post and Pole Plant showing the doweler, large deck of small logs and finished poles. This plant runs 8 million board feet of small diameter logs each year and employs 12 year-round.



Restoration Fuels, LLC continued investments in the Torrefaction facility in John Day, OR. They have invested in additional equipment and construction this year totaling \$8.7 million in capital investments. 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.**

FY2020 Overview

FY20 Activity Description (Agency performance measures)	Acres
Number of acres treated by prescribed fire	5,398
Number of acres treated by mechanical thinning	29,832
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	0
Number of acres mitigated to reduce fire risk	8,460

Please provide a narrative overview of treatments completed in FY20, 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 footprints. All of the above mentioned projects have helped focus treatments that will be most effective.

A total of over 239,776 acres of vegetation and fuels treatments have been completed within the SBRC project area in the first 9 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 landscape underburning, we awarded one additional task order towards contractor burning this year. We also utilize task orders to increase our resource capacity to assist in implementation of landscape burning and pile burning. We've utilized contract engines and hand crews to assist our agency resources with landscape burning and pile burning.

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.

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, more acres were treated with prescribed fire than in 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 of the collaborative groups. 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 continue to be involved through the process and continue 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 resilient 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.

Below are during and after pictures of the prescribed fire results in the Soda Bear Project in the SBRC (October 16th, 2019) showing consumption of down wood and fine fuels and raising the canopy on some of the smaller trees. This unit had previously been harvested (commercial and small diameter thinning) and the associated fuels treated prior to the implementation landscape burning.



Expenditures

Category	\$
FY2020 Wildfire Preparedness ²	\$3,500,000
FY2020 Wildfire Suppression ³	\$750,000
The cost of managing fires for resource benefit if appropriate (i.e. full suppression versus managing)	\$0
FY2020 Hazardous Fuels Treatment Costs (CFLN)	\$2,540,207
FY2020 Hazardous Fuels Treatment Costs (other BLIs)	\$649,510

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.

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:

More treatments across the landscape are providing the forest with additional decision space when we have a natural ignition. As we continue to implement and complete larger treatment blocks outside the immediate adjacency of 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.

² 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).

³ 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.

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

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

Eight project activities affected 10 monitored fires. These projects included Silvies Canyon (2), 16-Rd, Jane, Marshall Devine, Galena (2), Wolf (2), Summit, and Dove. Silvies Canyon, 16-Rd, and Jane all utilized stewardship authority to implement activities and a less formal version of collaboration occurred on those projects. Active partners provided input into the planning and implementation priority process. Marshall Devine, Galena, Wolf, Summit, and Dove were projects that went through a collaborative process with either the Blue Mountains Forest Partners or Harney County Restoration Collaborative. Planning and implementation has been an integral part of the collaborative process for all of the listed projects with collaborative partners and local participants.

- *Did treatments include coordinated efforts on other federal, tribal, state, private, etc. lands within or adjacent to the CFLR landscape?*

The 16 Rd project was a WUI corridor project along Forest road 16, a main travel route that could be used in the event of egress out of the forest in the case of a wildfire. Reduction of fire behavior and protection of that WUI buffer were a main goal that included private stakeholder coordination. This project area is adjacent to a Forest Service guard station (that annually houses fire suppression resources during fire season) and a small parcel of private property utilized for grazing. Marshall Devine, Silvies Canyon, Jane, Dove, and Wolf were WUI projects in Harney County. Summit and Galena were both landscape restoration projects with emphasis on reduction of fire behavior across forest and county roads used for egress in the event of a wildfire.

- *What resource values were you and your partners concerned with protecting or enhancing? Did the treatments help to address these value concerns?*

All 8 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 as directed by the annual Chief's Letter prior to fire season. The combination of lower than average number of ignitions, 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?*

Once again in 2020 our suppression resources were 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. We were directed to **aggressively initial attack all fires** using local resources to the maximum extent possible to keep fire fighters safe and minimize the spread of COVID-19.

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. Our suppression resources were prompt and efficient. These two 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 \$180,000 was expended on the treatments that affected the 71 fires. One fire was affected by Canyon Creek fire in 2015 (as a treatment). \$127,025 of CFLN was expended on thinning and piling treatments. Approximately \$30,000 was expended on pile and landscape burning treatment units.

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

Approximately five acres of a 35 acre unit planned for pile burning were impacted by fire this summer. The completed treatments in combination with prompt response by suppression resources kept the severity of impact to low.

A pre-commercial thinning and grapple piling contract had been awarded with the thinning and piling completed. Fire spread was kept out of the majority of the piles that had not been burned to date. Pile burning is expected to occur under the right environmental conditions once the piles have cured, likely next winter. Since the thinning and piling treatments had already occurred at the time of the fire, and the conditions during fire season weren't conducive to burning the grapple piles, the district Fuels specialist, silviculturist, resource specialists, and line officer can be expected to have open dialogue with the collaborative group and discuss lessons learned with this fire and treatment unit.

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.

Due to the Chief's 2020 letter of intent for wildland fire and the direction to aggressively initial attack all fires this year, there was minimal opportunity to manage a fire with alternative management strategies.

There were just under 10% of the fires that fell within a project area with signed nepa and minimal treatments initiated. These project areas include: Magone and Camp Lick. These project areas have a suite of treatments planned across most of the project area; commercial harvest, pre-commercial thinning, associated fuels treatments, and landscape burning.

Had we had opportunities to utilize natural ignitions to implement the planned activities, the forest would have engaged with the collaborative groups and internal resources to assure fire would have met the objectives of the planned treatment (s). Fire staff, Fuels specialists, resource specialists (ie. timber, wildlife, fisheries), and line officers would have completed a risk analysis and utilized WFDSS to inform a decision.

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](#).

The numbers came directly from the end of year accomplishments and expenditure reports. The product distribution percentages came from information from TIM, conversations with contractors, and from the different contracts used. Assumptions are based on all of the work being accomplished or completed in the year it was funded.

FY 2020 Jobs Supported/Maintained (CFLN and matching funding):

FY 2020 Jobs Supported/Maintained	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Direct)	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Total)	Labor Income (Direct)	Labor Income (Total)
Timber harvesting component	89	138	\$7,816,324	\$9,650,903
Forest and watershed restoration component	49	81	\$725,541	\$1,878,540
Mill processing component	124	233	\$8,645,043	\$22,702,084
Implementation and monitoring	79	85	\$1,313,983	\$1,538,473
Other Project Activities	3	4	\$145,390	\$192,692
TOTALS:	344	541	\$18,646,280	\$35,962,691

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).

One new task order was issued to a project in the SBRC in 2020 that will treat 5,307 acres (36 million board feet of biomass and saw logs). Work continued on task orders awarded in previous years under the Malheur 10 Year Stewardship contract that uses all local contractors for the work. 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.

Additionally, two Blanket Purchase Agreements (BPA's) were awarded that also went to local contractors. BPA's are very similar to stewardship contracts in that restoration service work can be added to the contracts. These two BPA's will treat 4,328 acres and remove nearly 20 mmbf of biomass and saw logs.

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.

All but 4% of CFLR funds for contracts, agreements and supplies went to local vendors. We continue to place an emphasis on benefit to the local communities with the expectation that the primary contractors hire employees locally when their projects are funded with CFLR.

Indicator	Brief Description of Impacts, Successes, and Challenges	Links to reports or other published materials (if available)
Relationship building/collaborative work	<p>The Podcast from OPB “Timber Wars” Episode 7 tells the story of collaboration and relationship building on the Malheur National Forest. It focuses on the work of the Blue Mountains Forest Partners, one of the collaborative groups that make up the Southern Blues Restoration Coalition.</p> <p>Blue Mountains Forest Partners took the lead on Monitoring and Research related to Salvage logging impacts to several woodpecker species. The monitoring occurred within the SBRC project area as part of the salvage for the Canyon Creek Fire of 2015.</p>	<p>Link to OPB Timber Wars Episode 7 https://www.opb.org/show/timberwars/</p> <p>Link to Science Bulletin from Rocky Mountain Research Station on salvage and woodpeckers. https://www.bluemountainsforestpartners.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/SYCU_issue38_woodpeckers_FINAL.pdf</p>
% Locally retained contracts	<p>Out of the total of nearly \$3 million spent on contracts, agreements and supplies, only 4% of the funds went to a non-local contractor. We continue to emphasize benefit to local in our contracts and buy supplies from local vendors.</p>	<p>The stories at the link below give an opportunity for two of our local SBRC partners to discuss the effects of COVID on their businesses this year. Sponsored by Blue Mountains Forest Partners.</p> <p>https://www.bluemountainsforestpartners.org/2020/10/forest-restoration-in-an-era-of-covid-19/</p>
Job Training Opportunities	<p>We utilized two Mt. Adams VetsWork interns and a Harney County Training and Consortium youth crew to help complete several projects. Our local Watershed Council’s Conservation Corps provided youth to help with riparian hardwood plantings as well as many other restoration projects over the years.</p>	<p>Mt. Adams Institute https://mtadamsinstitute.org/</p> <p>North Fork John Day Watershed Council https://www.nfjdwcc.org/jdbcc-1</p>
Project partnership composition	<p>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 Oregon State Fish and Wildlife and Oregon State Forestry.</p>	

5. Based on your project monitoring plan, **describe the multiparty monitoring process.** (Please limit answer to two pages).

The Southern Blues CFLRP Multi-Party Monitoring Program was developed by a multi-disciplinary committee that included two collaborative groups, multiple Forest Service units, 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). Most 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 *
<i>Forest Vegetation, Structure, Fuels, and Patterning</i>	
Forest Vegetation and Fuels (ongoing)	Oregon State University MNF Silviculture & Fuels Programs (FS) Blue Mountain Forest Partners
Landscape Pattern Analysis (completed)	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 (completed)	University of Washington Blue Mountains Area Ecology Program (FS)
Aspen (ongoing)	MNF Botany, Wildlife, & Silviculture Programs (FS) Oregon State University, College of Forestry Blue Mountains Area Ecology Program (FS)
<i>Wildlife & Fish</i>	
White-headed Woodpecker (ongoing)	Rocky Mountain Research Station (FS-R&D) MNF Wildlife Program (FS)
Riparian & Aquatic Restoration (ongoing)	Blue Mountains Area Ecology Program (FS) MNF Botany Program (FS)
<i>Invasive Species</i>	
Invasive Species Control (ongoing)	MNF Botany & Invasive Species Programs (FS) Grant Soil and Water Conservation District Harney County Weed Control
Native Plant Seeding (ongoing)	MNF Botany & Invasive Species Programs (FS)
<i>Social & Economic</i>	
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 sixth 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 have begun. The WHWO monitoring will be in its final season of data collection in 2021. 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 HCRC).	Over 20 completed to date
Monitoring symposia: Full day meeting for monitoring PIs, managers, collaborative and other stakeholder groups, scientists, and the general public.	2016 and 2019 symposia; plans, manuals, and presentations online: http://www.bluemountainsforestpartners.org/work/multi-party-monitoring/ The 3 rd symposium was planned for spring 2020, but canceled due to COVID-19 restrictions
Spatial Patterning: <i>Historical Forest Structure, Composition, and Spatial Pattern in Dry Conifer Forests of the Western Blue Mountains, Oregon</i>	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. As a result of the FVF monitoring by OSU, there are currently six manuscripts in press, revision, or preparation for the following scientific journals: <i>Forest Science</i> , <i>Journal of Forestry</i> , <i>Ecosphere</i> , and <i>Forest Ecology and Management</i> . These will be made available to the MNF, SBRC, and the public upon publication.

In October of 2019, the 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, wildfire restoration in 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. COVID-19 precautions have prevented hosting of a similar monitoring symposium in 2020.

Preliminary data and results of the FVF monitoring have helped shape the Blue Mountain Forest Partners' Zones of Agreements, which is a guiding document to silvicultural prescriptions and other restoration topics that are mutually agreed upon by SBRC and the MNF. 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 2020 Agency performance measure accomplishments:

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost (\$) (Contract Costs) ⁴
Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres	121	\$14,520
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	7,825.7	\$1,369,498
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	2,822.7	\$61,478
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC	Acres	0	
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions. S&W-RSRC-IMP	Acres	6,574.4	\$499,654
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-LAK	Acres	0	
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	38	\$194,560
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	6,498.2	\$97,473
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved RG-VEG-IMP	Acres	0	
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance RD-HC-MAIN	Miles	0	
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance RD-PC-MAINT	Miles	0	
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	0	
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles	0	
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles	0	
Road Storage <i>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.</i>	Miles	17	\$3,500
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	14.9	\$29,800
Miles of system trail improved to standard TL-IMP-STD	Miles	0	

⁴ Please include the costs associated with a contract to complete acres reported, if this level of detail is available, including partner funds

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost (\$) (Contract Costs) ⁴
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard LND-BL-MRK-MAINT	Miles	0	
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC	Acres	4,992.7	\$0
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF	N/A	
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	129,415.2	\$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	9,280	\$102,080
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	20,440.8	\$3,168,324
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	14,789.4	\$2,292,357
Acres mitigated FP-FUELS-ALL-MIT-NFS	Acres	8,460	\$846,000
Please also include the acres of prescribed fire accomplished	Acres	5,398	\$539,000
STWD-CNTRCT-AGR-AC	Acres	14,323	\$0
TMBR-BRSH-DSPL	Acres	5,257.7	\$210,308

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

7. FY 2020 accomplishment narrative – Summarize key accomplishments and evaluate project progress *not already described elsewhere* in this report. What impact, if any, has Shared Stewardship in your region had on your CFLRP work? (This could be from a Shared Stewardship MOU or the general emphasis in your region on working cross-boundary on shared priorities at the scale needed to have your desired impact). (Please limit answer to two pages).

FY20 was another successful year for the SBRC project on all possible fronts. Even with the early concerns surrounding COVID 19 related to contractors being able to work or our agency folks being able to work to get contracts packaged up for bid. Across most performance measures, our total acres/miles were down slightly except for timber, fuels and riparian habitat restoration. Much of the reduction is due to reduced opportunities for working with our partners during the pandemic. 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. With all the challenges, the Forest still accomplished the second most acres of hazardous fuels reduction and the most volume of biomass/sawlog removal in the past 22 years.

By the end of the fiscal year 69,854 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.

An example of one of the units that received underburning. The pictures below show before, during and after of a unit in the Dads project area of the Southern Blues CFLR area. The Dads project was the first NEPA decision that the Blue Mountains Forest Partners collaborated with the Malheur NF on. The third photo, taken in the summer of 2020, clearly shows the canopy lift as well as the reduction in duff, down fuels and small trees.

Dads 2B



In 2020, we were able to continue our treatments to invasive plants with the use of the herbicide using our Forest Weeds EIS and a partnership with Grant County Soil and Water Conservation District. We continued to prioritize aquatic restoration through fish passage improvements, floodplain restoration, riparian fencing, riparian plantings and road/trail improvements. For all 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), Pam Hardy (WELC) 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. This year the collaborative groups focused on getting more “good fire” on the landscape, worked to improve silviculture prescriptions, and improve contracting efficiencies.

Because of COVID, we were not able to use the North Fork John Day Watershed Council youth crews this year. Harney County Training and Employment Consortium was able to put a youth crew together this year to help reinforce road closure systems, aspen exclosures and riparian hardwood restoration projects.

Our district biologists continued use of the Powder River Correctional Facility crews for riparian enhancement project work such as fence placement and improvement. In a partnership with the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife and with help from many volunteers, we completed 2 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.

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.*

- 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 2020	69,854 acres
Estimated Cumulative Footprint of Acres (2010 or 2012 through 2020)	215,011 acres

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

9. **Describe any reasons that the FY 2020 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).

As with all the CFLR projects, 2020 had it's added challenges in balancing a very aggressive restoration program while limiting potential impacts from the COVID 19 virus on our employees, contractors and partners. There were so many uncertainties on how to mitigate the hazards due to COVID early in the field season, many contracts, agreements and other partnerships had to be set aside. COVID concerns also had a huge impact on our ability to complete any large landscape scale prescribed burns during the spring of 2020. Concerns about adding smoke particulates into the air while the risk was high for COVID induced respiratory issues for our local publics was valid.

As a coalition of collaborative groups, the Blue Mountains Forest Partners, the Harney County Restoration Coalition and the Malheur National Forest have started to recognize over the past few years that we will not be able to complete all the work we have planned to do in the 10 years of CFLR funding on our landscape. We started out with a goal of treating 40% of the 877,288 acres (350,915 acres) within the Southern Blues Restoration Coalition project. As stated above, to date, we have treated 215,011 footprint acres of which most was costly mechanical treatments to reduce the hazardous fuels loads down to a level we could start using prescribed fire to maintain. While we do still have a large amount of mechanical fuels treatments left to complete on the SBRC landscape, we expect the majority our work over the next 10 years will roll over into prescribed fire, both first entry and maintenance burning.

10. Planned FY 2021 Accomplishments

Performance Measure Code	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment for 2021 (National Forest System)	Planned Accomplishment on non-NFS lands within the CFLRP landscape⁵
Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres	100	
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	3,000	
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	40	
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	10,000	
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	5	
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles	200	
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles	20	
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	130,000	
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons	10,000	
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	25,000	
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	15,000	

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

⁵ 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.

11. Planned accomplishment narrative and justification if planned FY 2021 accomplishments and/or funding differs from CFLRP project work plan (no more than 1 page):

Planned accomplishments are in FY 2021 are expected to be on track with the SBRC 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.

Blue Mountains Forest Partners <https://www.bluemountainsforestpartners.org/>

Harney County Restoration Collaborative. <https://highdesertpartnership.org/collaboratives/harney-county-restoration-collaborative/hcrc-landing-page.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.

All media and reports completed this year are linked in the main part of the report.

Signatures:

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

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

Draft reviewed by Blue Mountains Forest Partners: _____

Draft reviewed by Harney County Restoration Coalition: _____