

Lakeview Stewardship Project (CFLR016)
Fremont-Winema National Forest

1. CFLRP Expenditures, Match, and Leveraged Funds:

a. FY21 CFLN and Matching Funds Documentation

Fund Source – (CFLN Funds Expended)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2021
CFLN18	\$413,794
CFLN19	\$5,867
CFLN20	\$336,815
<u>CFLN21</u>	<u>\$857,353</u>
TOTAL	\$1,613,829*

This amount should match the amount of CFLN dollars spent 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.

*Total amount reflected in Agency database of record is \$1,554,652

Fund Source – (Forest Service Salary and Expense Match Expended)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2021
WFSE	\$250,000*
<u>NFSE</u>	<u>\$226,760*</u>
TOTAL	\$476,760*

This amount should match the amount of matching funds in the FMMI CFLRP expenditure report for Salary and Expenses. Staff time spent on CFLRP proposal implementation and monitoring may be counted as CFLRP match – see [Program Funding Guidance](#) for details.

Fund Source – (Forest Service Discretionary Matching Funds)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2021
FNHF	\$668,943*
CMRD	\$139,300*
<u>NFRW</u>	<u>\$8,645*</u>
TOTAL	\$816,888*

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) which should be reported in the partner contribution table below. Per the [Program Funding Guidance](#), federal dollars spent on non-NFS lands may be included if aligned with CFLRP proposal implementation within the landscape.

Fund Source – (Partner Match)	In-Kind Contribution or Funding Provided?	Total Estimated Funds/Value for FY21	Description of CFLRP implementation or monitoring activity	Where activity/item is located or impacted area
<i>Northwest Youth Corp</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In-kind contribution <input type="checkbox"/> Funding	\$24,491	Trail maintenance	<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 FY21	Description of CFLRP implementation or monitoring activity	Where activity/item is located or impacted area
Step Up	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In-kind contribution <input type="checkbox"/> Funding	\$8,432	Trail maintenance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Forest System Lands <input type="checkbox"/> Other lands within CFLRP landscape:
Lake County Resources Initiative	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In-kind contribution <input type="checkbox"/> Funding	\$40,937	Ecological monitoring	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Forest System Lands <input type="checkbox"/> Other lands within CFLRP landscape:
Northwest Youth Corp	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In-kind contribution <input type="checkbox"/> Funding	\$44,510	Aspen and meadow restoration	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Forest System Lands <input type="checkbox"/> Other lands within CFLRP landscape:
Lake County Cooperative Weed Board	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In-kind contribution <input type="checkbox"/> Funding	\$21,000	Invasive weed treatments	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Forest System Lands <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other lands within CFLRP landscape:
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In-kind contribution <input type="checkbox"/> Funding	\$1,399	Road decommissioning	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Forest System Lands <input type="checkbox"/> Other lands within CFLRP landscape:
Natural Resources Conservation Service	<input type="checkbox"/> In-kind contribution <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Funding	\$839,000	Forest thinning and piling on private lands	<input type="checkbox"/> National Forest System Lands <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other lands within CFLRP landscape:
Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board	<input type="checkbox"/> In-kind contribution <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Funding	\$366,293	Forest thinning and piling on private lands	<input type="checkbox"/> National Forest System Lands <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other lands within CFLRP landscape:
TOTALS	Total In-Kind Contributions: \$140,769 Total Funding: \$1,346,062			

Total partner in-kind contributions for implementation and monitoring of a CFLR project across **all lands** within the CFLRP landscape. For CFLRP projects under the CFLRP Common Monitoring Strategy, note that this table addresses the [core CFLRP common monitoring strategy question](#), “If and to what extent has CFLRP investments attracted partner investments across the landscapes?”

Service work accomplishment through goods-for services funding within a stewardship contract (for contracts awarded in FY21)	Totals
Total <u>revised non-monetary credit limit</u> for contracts awarded in FY21	\$0
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](#),” the “Revised Non-Monetary Credit Limit,” as of September 30. Additional information on the Progress Reports is available in CFLR Annual Report Instructions document.

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

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 wildfire risk reduction goals.

FY2021 Overview

FY21 Activity Description (Agency performance measures)	Acres
Number of acres treated by prescribed fire	15,676
Number of acres treated by mechanical thinning	402
Number of acres of natural ignitions that are allowed to burn under strategies that result in desired conditions	0
Number of acres mitigated to reduce fire risk	47,460

Please provide a narrative overview of treatments completed in FY21, 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?

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

In 2014, the Fremont-Winema National Forest developed an Accelerated Restoration and Priority Landscape document to help support and guide decisions at the Forest and local level. This process delineated large landscapes (generally >100,000 acres) and prioritized them based on the following variables: Regional and National priorities (i.e. Watershed Condition Framework, Terrestrial Restoration and Conservation Strategy, Oregon Conservation Strategy, and R6 Aquatic Restoration Strategy), past management, large tree structure, Wildland Urban Interface (WUI), crown fire potential, and landscape fire opportunities. Landscapes were then prioritized as high, moderate, or low. This has guided the NEPA planning and implementation of projects within the Lakeview Stewardship CFLRP.

The Klamath-Lake Forest Health Partnership (KLFHP) then used the Fremont-Winema NEPA priority landscapes to guide the priority and selection of cross-boundary landscape-scale restoration projects within Lake and Klamath Counties. The KLFHP is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization in South Central Oregon with a mission to “facilitate restoration projects on public and private forestland in Klamath and Lake Counties through education, outreach, and diverse partnerships.” KLFHP partners conducted a risk assessment of all private lands within the

counties to determine the focus for all lands restoration. A variety of risk rating criteria were considered including land ownership, broad vegetation classes, fire history, communities at risk identified in the Community Wildfire Protection Plans and the Oregon State Communities at Risk Project, and personal knowledge of the landowners and communities.

Based on this risk assessment, the North Warner Multi-Ownership Forest Health Project was selected in 2016 and Thomas Creek All Lands Project was selected in 2019 as a priority for focused restoration and shared stewardship across public and private land. The Thomas Creek Project is at the beginning phases of planning for upland dry forest restoration, while the North Warner Project is moving into the maintenance stage with the use of prescribed fire. These two KLFHP focused landscapes, titled the Lake County All Lands Restoration Initiative, are now building upon each other, while increasing the geographic area of forest restoration, wildfire risk reduction, improvements in aquatic and wildlife habitat, and overall resiliency. The KLFHP has written a Strategic Action Plan for the [Lake County All Lands Restoration Initiative](#). In 2021, this project was awarded a Joint Chiefs Landscape Restoration grant (2021-2023) and an Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board restoration grant. The partnership is currently working on an Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board Focused Investment Partnership grant that will be submitted in January of 2022. If selected for funding, this grant would bring \$12 million for restoration on the adjacent private lands.

- **Please tell us whether these treatments were in “high or very high wildfire hazard area from the “wildfire hazard potential map”** (<https://www.firelab.org/project/wildfire-hazard-potential>)

Most of the treatments within the Lakeview Stewardship CFLRP are in the “high” to “moderate” wildfire hazard areas, according to the national wildfire hazard potential map. In 2021, approximately 84% of the treatments were in WUI as identified in the Lake County Community Wildfire Protection Plan.

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

When all partners agree to the priority of focused landscapes and shared stewardship of that landscape, it is much easier to obtain support and funding. The Lake County All Lands Restoration Initiative is a great example. The partners are working together from planning through implementation to restore this landscape across ownership boundaries. With grant funding, the KLFHP was able to complete a mapping and inventory of 80,565 of private lands for 100+ landowners. Each vegetation association was delineated and assessed to evaluate 1) risk of disturbance, 2) recommendations for forest health treatments, 3) priority for treatment, and 4) funding needs within the larger landscape, beneficial for private landowners to determine forest management treatment options and/or to develop forest management plans for their property. Data was also collected for riparian, juniper, and invasive vegetation. The inventory of private land allowed partners to prioritize stands for treatment based upon density of conifers, surface fuel loading, and relative risk of disturbance. The partners worked together to assess the condition and priority for treatments.

This data was then used to obtain funding from a variety of sources. The partners have used CFLR funding to leverage funding for dry forest restoration totaling approximately \$8 million for private lands and \$10 million for federal lands. To date, approximately 21,333 acres of private and 15,631 acres of federal land dry forest restoration have been completed, and the partners are currently working together to prepare for cross-boundary prescribed fire. The shared stewardship approach -- 1) setting priorities at the County and project scale, 2) assessing and mapping current conditions across public and private land, 3) prioritizing treatments within a focused landscape, and 4) implementing cross-boundary forest restoration has resulted in additional funding, acres treated, and increased scale of dry forest restoration.

Partners are hopeful that the extensive thinning across public and private lands will set the stage for introducing fire as an ecological process and maintaining the thinning treatments in the short- and long-term. Partners are

working to develop landscape prescribed burn plans and the necessary agreements that allow for prescribed fire across public and private lands. The first cross-boundary prescribed fire was implemented in May of 2021 (see photos below).

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

Cross-Boundary Prescribed Fire and Private Landowner Workshop



Prescribed Burning





Step Up Program



Youth Conservation Corp



Existing Vault Toilet to be Demolished



New Vault Toilet



Category	\$
FY21 Wildfire Preparedness ¹	\$2,765,000
FY21 Wildfire Suppression ²	\$137,998,211
The cost of managing fires for resource benefit if appropriate (i.e. full suppression versus managing)	\$0
FY21 Hazardous Fuels Treatment Costs (CFLN)	\$281,844
FY21 Hazardous Fuels Treatment Costs (other BLIs)	\$27,000

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.

Treatments that have been implemented lead to reducing fire suppression costs and improving the ability to control fires. In general, where treatments that have occurred intersect with wildfires, we have seen fire behaviors reduced which has contributed to a reduction in effort and resources needed to facilitate control of the fire. The places where treatments occurred were the areas that allowed the fire fighters to have a high probability of success with their containment options. In 2021, the Patton Meadow and Cougar Peak fires occurred under extreme weather conditions and there were very limited resources available due to the extensive wildfire activity across the West. Under these conditions, previous treatments become less effective in controlling spread and reducing costs.

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:

There have not been any assessments or reports at this time that have been conducted within the CFLN landscape in regard to cost reduction, cost avoidance, etc.

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.

In 2021, there were 10 fires that burned within the project area and contained at a very small scale (<1.0 acres) using initial attack. With an estimated preparedness budget of \$2,765,000 and suppression budget of \$100,000, these 10 fires were contained at a small size. The Bootleg, Patton Meadow, and Cougar Peak Fires were not contained by initial attack. The estimated suppression budget for the Bootleg is \$96,838,000, Patton Meadow is \$13,661,000, and Cougar Peak \$27,499,000. The acres that were of resource benefit have not been calculated on these fires as the fires have not been called out at the time of the report, but an estimate is a combined total 15,000 acres that may be resource benefit achieved by unplanned ignitions within the Lakeview CFLRP. None of the acres within Cougar Peak will be able to be utilized for fuels target accomplishment as it was determined to be a human caused fire. The Bootleg and Patton Meadow Fires were both natural lightning ignition and it is estimated that 7,000 acres that could be utilized for fuels target accomplishment. This accomplishment will only reflect on the Region 6 totals not within our local Forest accomplishment.

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.

The BAER report requested the following funding needs for the Cougar Peak and Patton Meadow:

Summary of the Bootleg BAER request:

Treatment	Unit	Unit Cost	# of Units	Total Cost
Invasive Plant Surveys/Detection	Acre	\$120	494	\$59,280
Invasive Plant Treatments	Acre	\$120	1416	\$169,920
Preventative Seeding	Acre	\$455	33	15,015
Storm Proofing Roads	Miles	\$2,053	12.75	\$26,176
Storm Inspection/Response	Days	\$3,138	10	\$31,800
Critical Dip	Each	\$5,421	2	\$10,842
Low Water Crossing	Each	\$9,050	1	\$9,050
Cattle Guard Fill	Each	\$1,100	2	2,200
Trail Drainage	Miles	\$2,580	37.6	\$97,008
Road Hazard Signs	Each	\$190	35	\$6,638
Trail Hazard Signs	Each	\$70	16	\$1,120
Trail Hazard Gates	Each	\$12,000	3	\$36,000
Infrastructure Protection	Each	\$100	138	\$13,830
			Total	\$484,271

Summary of the Cougar Peak BAER request:

Treatment	Unit	Unit Cost	# of Units	Total Cost
Invasive Plant Surveys/Detection	Acre	\$10	2003	\$20,030
Invasive Plant Treatments	Acre	\$200	275	\$55,000
Storm Proofing Roads	Miles	\$21,000	5	\$10,500
Storm Inspection/Response	Days	\$3,140	10	\$31,400
Trail Drainage	Each	\$		\$
Road Hazard Signs	Each	\$500	11	\$5,500
Trail Hazard Gates	Each	\$1,500	1	\$1,500
Trail Hazard Signs	Each	\$300	7	\$2,100
Trail Stabilization	Each	\$2,580	5	\$12,900
			Total	\$138,930

Summary of the Patton Meadow BAER request:

Treatment	Unit	Unit Cost	# of Units	Total Cost
Invasive Plant Treatments	Acre	\$120	91	\$10,920
Storm Inspection/Response	Days	\$3,140	2	\$6,276
Road Hazard Signs	Each	\$242	3	\$726
			Total	\$17,922

If a wildfire interacted 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.**

The FTEM report for the Cougar Peak Fire is included in Appendix A below. Patton Meadow Fire did not have any previously treated units so there is not a FTEM report. Only a small portion of the 413,716 acres Bootleg Fire burned

within the Lakeview CFLRP so the FTEM report is not included. The BLIs used for each treatment unit is unknown because treatments were completed before the Lakeview CFLR Project was funded. The majority of the treatments had input and support from the Lakeview Stewardship group through the NEPA process. Values at risk are many, with the priority being private industrial and non-industrial property, human life, and natural resources.

Of the three large fires within the Lakeview CFLRP the Cougar Peak fire was the fire that impacted prior treated areas. The project area that Cougar Peak impacted was the Upper Thomas Creek (UTC) project area. The Lakeview Stewardship Group was involved to collaborate and coordinate treatments within UTC project area. Within the UTC project area commercial and precommercial treatments were followed up by prescribed fire about 10 years ago. Due to the weather and fuels conditions affecting the Cougar Peak fire, completed treatments did help protect values, but were not as successful as expected. The majority of the treatments within these fires did reduce the fire behavior, and some treatments were more successful than others. Treatments that removed fuel (timber sales, pile and burn and/or under burning) helped to minimize fire behavior to an extent that reduced tree mortality.

One key aspect of treatments that we have learned is that the placement on the landscape of these treatments plays a vital role in their success to minimize the effects of a wildfire. We also identified that having treatments planned and completed adjacent to each other (linking treatments together without vast untreated land between them) is key to protecting adjacent values. Treatments within the landscape that did not account for possible fire behavior generated by surrounding fuels or were not strategically located, did not provide the desired outcome. A few small treatments within the fire's footprint were too small to make a difference in the fire behavior. In conclusion, large areas of treatments linked together, and located appropriately on the landscape, have the best chance to be successful at minimizing wildland fire effects.

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

Bootleg Fire – Bootleg burned a total of 413,716 acres, including 260,012 acres of USFS land, 141,753 acres of private land, and 11,949 acres of other jurisdictional lands. The portion of the Bootleg fire that impacted this CFLRP project area was outside of any planned treatment area. The majority of the CFLRP ground impacted consisted of the Gearhart Wilderness, Deadhorse Rim Roadless area, and a minimal piece of the Deuce project area. This same portion of the project had already been impacted by the Watson fire in 2018.

Patton Meadow Fire – Patton Meadow burned a total of 8,929 acres, including 7,677 acres of USFS land and 1,247 acres of private land. The fire was initially a fast-moving, high severity burn on the south and east slopes. The fire burned toward a high elevation and heavily timbered north slope with limited access. Once the fire reached the north slope, the rate of spread dropped dramatically, allowing for the planning and preparation for a tactical firing operation of about 2,500 acres to secure the north end of the fire. The tactical firing operations resulted in low severity underburn-like conditions. All 7,677 acres of Forest Service land burned within the Thomas Creek Landscape Restoration Project in which a decision was signed Nov. 25, 2019. The Thomas Creek Landscape Restoration Project is very large and authorizes forest restoration on approximately 95,000 acres total. The Patton Meadow fire impacted only 8% or 7,677 acres of the area authorized for restoration.

Cougar Peak Fire – Cougar Peak burned a total of 91,810 acres, including 53,181 acres of USFS land, 5,790 acres of BLM land, and 32,729 acres of private land. Cougar Peak was a very fast-moving fire that burned most of the acres in the first three burn periods. Due to the fast-moving surface and crown fire, much of the area burned at high severity. All 53,181 acres of Forest Service land burned within the Thomas Creek Landscape Restoration Project in which a decision was signed Nov. 25, 2019. The Thomas Creek Landscape Restoration Project is very large and authorizes forest restoration on approximately 95,000 acres total. The Cougar Peak fire impacted 56% or 53,181 acres of the area authorized for restoration.

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 (TREAT) inputs and assumptions available [here](#).³

TREAT analyzes for an “impact area,” which is defined as Lake County for the Lakeview Stewardship CFLRP. Only funding that went to contractors located within this impact area were included in the calculations. It was estimated that 18% of the CFLN funds and 10% of the total funds (CFLR and matching) were used to fund contractors from Lake County for service work project activities such as invasive plant treatments or monitoring. Contracting funds that were expended on contracts that went to firms outside the impact area contribute to leakage from the local economy. Commercial forest product activities considered in the TREAT analysis consisted of 33,692 CCF harvested from the National Forest in the CFLR landscape in FY21, and all the saw timber was processed locally at the Collins Pine Sawmill.

Looking at your CFLRP project’s TREAT Data Entry “Full Project Details” Tab, what percent of funding was used for contracts within the local impact area? (see cell D13).⁴ If you have data on what percent of funding was used for agreements within the local impact area, please note.

Contract Funding Distributions (“Full Project Details” Tab):

Description	Project Percent
Equipment intensive work	14%
Labor-intensive work	54%
Material-intensive work	
Technical services	
Professional services	32%
Contracted Monitoring	
TOTALS:	100%

Please provide a brief description of the local businesses that benefited from CFLRP related contracts and agreements, if known. Consider characteristics such as tribally-owned firms, veteran-owned firms, women-owned firms, minority-owned firms, and business size.⁵

There were five agreement that employed local people: 1) YCC, NYC, and Step programs hired primarily local high school students, 2) through the Good Neighbor Agreement with Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, the State hired a local equipment operator to complete the work, and 3) LCRI hired primarily local high school and college students for the ecological monitoring efforts.

³ For CFLRP projects under the CFLRP Common Monitoring Strategy this and the responses below address the [core CFLRP common monitoring strategy questions](#), “How have CFLRP activities supported local jobs and labor income?” and “How do sales, contracts, and agreements associated with the CFLRP affect local communities?”

⁴ If you would prefer to use other data collected locally, you may include that here. Do not include dollars that were contracted to firms outside of the local area.

⁵ This information is publicly available through usaspending.gov, there are other firm characteristics that may be more relevant for your CFLRP project or important for tracking over time.

FY 2021 Modelled Jobs Supported/Maintained (CFLN and matching funding):

FY 2021 Jobs Supported/Maintained	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Direct)	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Total)	Labor Income (Direct)	Labor Income (Total)
Timber harvesting component	37	49	3,232,374	3,590,698
Forest and watershed restoration component	3	4	154,296	188,445
Mill processing component	40	68	2,585,899	3,529,998
Implementation and monitoring	8	9	337,387	357,595
Other Project Activities	0	0	0	0
TOTALS:	88	130	6,309,956	7,666,736

4. Briefly describe community benefits that align with the CFLRP proposal and strategies socioeconomic goals. How has CFLR and related activities benefitted your community(ies) from a social and/or economic standpoint? Please link to monitoring reports or other relevant information if available.

All of the social and economic reports can be found here:

- [Social and Economic Monitoring for the Lakeview Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Project fiscal years 2012 and 2013](#)
- [Social and Economic Monitoring for the Lakeview Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Project fiscal years 2014 and 2015](#)
- [Social and Economic Monitoring for the Lakeview Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Project fiscal years 2016 and 2017](#)
- [Social and Economic Monitoring for the Lakeview Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Project fiscal years 2018 and 2019](#)

Indicator	Brief Description of Impacts, Successes, and Challenges	Links to reports or other published materials (if available)
# Cross-institutional agreements/policies	<p>The Lake County All Lands Restoration Initiative is a landscape level project involving 200+ private landowners, 8 federal, state, and county agencies, and 7 non-governmental partners. The goal of the partnership is to collaborate across ownership boundaries to implement forest health treatments with a goal of creating a seamless, healthy forest landscape resilient to natural disturbance. The partners have used CFLR funding to leverage funding for dry forest restoration totaling approximately \$8 million for private lands and \$10 million for federal lands. To date, approximately 21,333 acres of private and 15,631 acres of federal land are completed.</p> <p>Key partners have worked closely to provide the resources for private landowners to manage their properties based upon the landowner’s objectives. With the integration of resources, the partners have been successful in finding opportunities to implement private land treatments concurrently with adjacent federal treatments. The partners are also maximizing use of all authorities, agreements, and understandings to increase pace and scale of restoration within the project area.</p>	<p>In 2020, the KLFHP wrote a Strategic Action Plan for the Lake County All Lands Restoration Initiative which is located within the Lakeview Stewardship CFLRP klfhp.org/sap.</p> <p>The process for planning and implementing landscape-scale cross-boundary restoration was published in Oct. 2018. This includes details on a case study for the North Warner Project (Chapter 11 p. 40-46). https://catalog.extension.oregonstate.edu/pnw707</p>

Indicator	Brief Description of Impacts, Successes, and Challenges	Links to reports or other published materials (if available)
Social/economic Outcomes	<p>The 2018/2019 social-economic report for the Lakeview CFLRP reports the following:</p> <p>Results show how the Lakeview CFLR Project has notably increased the capacity of the Fremont-Winema National Forest to address landscape restoration needs and leverage accomplishments for work across boundaries. At the same time, the project has supported local social and economic benefits, particularly through restoration timber sales and work done through agreements.</p>	<p>2018/2019 Social-Economic Report for the Lakeview CFLR Project.</p> <p>http://ewp.uoregon.edu/sites/ewp.uoregon.edu/files/WP_105.pdf</p>
Local Contracting	<p>The 2018/2019 social-economic report for the Lakeview CFLRP reports the following:</p> <p>The successes and challenges of the project are similar to those reflected in other CFLR projects. In particular, local business capture of restoration service contracts has remained a prominent challenge throughout the project. Despite a variety of efforts aimed at supporting and encouraging local business participation in contracts, results suggest that the project to date has not led to greater local business capacity being created for this work. Other research has found that this is a common challenge, and that the CFLR Program has overall not been successful in creating new businesses or encouraging existing businesses to expand significantly. This suggests that local capture of CFLR contracts is a widespread concern with continued challenges likely in the foreseeable future.</p>	<p>2018/2019 Social-Economic Report for the Lakeview CFLR Project.</p> <p>http://ewp.uoregon.edu/sites/ewp.uoregon.edu/files/WP_105.pdf</p>

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

The current [Lakeview CFLRP Monitoring Plan](#) has guided the monitoring program since 2015. The Chewaucan Biophysical Monitoring Team, employed by LCRI, collects ecological data. The Rocky Mountain Research Station (RMRS) collects white-headed woodpecker data. Fremont-Winema National Forest personnel collect soil disturbance, fish habitat, and watershed condition data. The Ecosystem Workforce Program (a joint research program between the University of Oregon and Oregon State University) address the social-economic monitoring questions. In 2021, an ArcGIS online web app platform was set up for the [Lakeview Stewardship CFLRP Monitoring Program](#). This website provides a clearinghouse to access all data, maps, and information about the monitoring program for partners or the public.

Several monitoring reports have been completed that provide summaries and results of the monitoring efforts:

- The 5-year ecological indicator reports have been completed as required.
- [Lakeview Stewardship CFLRP Ecological, Social, and Economic Monitoring Report 2012-2019](#)
- Links to the social and economic reports are list above under question 4.

In 2021, the KLFHP developed a [Klamath-Lake Forest Health Partnership All-lands Monitoring Plan](#) to guide monitoring efforts across Klamath and Lake Counties, including the Lakeview CFLRP Extension, as well as monitoring required for other programs or grants associated with KLFHP all-lands projects (i.e. Joint Chiefs, OWEB grants, etc.). The official monitoring questions for this all-lands monitoring plan include all the core questions from the CFLRP common monitoring strategy, as well as other local questions that are a priority to the KLFHP partners. A KLFHP sub-committee was convened to develop the monitoring plan, with representation from a diverse group of stakeholders so that

questions would represent a broad diversity of perspectives. This effort was led jointly by personnel from LCRI and the Fremont-Winema National Forest who sought input from all collaborative members and revisited the list of suggested questions from the current monitoring plan. The Klamath-Lake Forest Health Partnership All-Lands Monitoring Plan will guide monitoring for the next 10 years for all partners and projects associated with the KLFHP.

The priority questions identified for monitoring for both the current monitoring plan, as well as the newly developed Klamath-Lake Forest Health Partnership All-Lands Monitoring Plan, were sifted through a series of criteria, including evaluating whether the questions tied to the goals of the CFLRP. This assured a focus on monitoring that would address the goals of the Lakeview Stewardship CFLRP. Our ecological monitoring includes vegetation, fire occurrences, predicted fire behavior, and other indicators of ecosystem health including soil, water, and wildlife habitat. Our social-economic monitoring includes local contract capture and revenue, local processing options, demographics, and participation in the collaborative process. It is worth noting that one emerging monitoring question identified in the Klamath-Lake Forest Health Partnership All-Lands Monitoring Plan is to monitor the conversion of forest cover to shrub cover from past and future wildfires.

As identified in the current Lakeview CFLRP Monitoring Plan, monitoring results are used to adjust treatments through adaptive management. Monitoring results are reported to the Fremont-Winema National Forest leadership and staff, and members of the KLFHP annually through field trips and reporting. The newly published [Lakeview Stewardship CFLRP Ecological, Social, and Economic Monitoring Report 2012-2019](#) is a comprehensive monitoring report with results that highlight our success in meeting restoration objectives, and where and how we might adapt for the future.

The analysis in the Lakeview Stewardship CFLRP Ecological, Social, and Economic Monitoring Report 2012-2019 shows a decrease in vegetation departure in all watersheds with at least 1,000 acres of restoration. Targeted restoration will continue to return forested landscapes to their natural range of variation. Treated areas show a predicted decrease in modeled wildland fire behavior, which is progress towards returning the fire regime to its natural range of variation. Restoring the fire regimes will lessen the likelihood of conversion to non-forest cover following uncharacteristic high-severity fire. For the most part, stand level monitoring results (average basal area, average tree diameter, live crown base height, ladder fuels, etc.) indicate projects are meeting the objectives identified in the NEPA decision. However, continued monitoring through to post-prescribed fire is needed to fully realize the effects of restoration.

Monitoring results also suggest that some thinning treatments retained residual basal area above targets established in silvicultural prescriptions. In addition, a LiDAR data analysis revealed that too few large clumps and too few large openings were left following thinning treatments as compared to historical spatial patterns. Through adaptive management, silvicultural prescriptions will be adjusted to retain appropriate basal area objectives while leaving larger clumps and larger openings.

Lessons learned from the past 10 years of monitoring have been captured in the newly published Lakeview Stewardship CFLRP Ecological, Social, and Economic Monitoring Report 2012-2019. The lessons learned were instrumental in the development of the Klamath-Lake Forest Health Partnership All-Lands Monitoring Plan. These lessons learned were applied to updating the field data sampling scheme, establishing benchmarks and trigger points, and selecting more effective targeted indicators. Another key lesson learned is the importance of having a dedicated data analyst to manage the monitoring data, analysis, and reporting.

In the next 10 years, the Fremont-Winema National Forest and LCRI will continue working together to oversee the monitoring program, in partnership with external partners. LCRI will continue to employ a data analyst and the Chewaucan Biophysical Monitoring Crew to collect the ecological field data. The RMRS will continue to oversee the wildlife monitoring, and the Ecosystem Workforce Program will continue to oversee and help advance the social and economic monitoring. Region 6 Forest Service will assist with the Common Monitoring Strategy indicators, and Fremont-Winema National Forest specialists (fuels, wildlife, soils, hydrology, fish, invasives, silviculture) will continue to assist the overall monitoring program.

6. FY 2021 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	2,312	\$0
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	966	\$312,750
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	270.5**	\$134,000
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	12,525	\$523,500
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	10.49	\$45,000
Miles of system trail maintained to standard TL-MAINT-STD	Miles	69*	\$37,050
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard LND-BL-MRK-MAINT	Miles	4.25*	\$90,075
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD*	CCF	33,692**	\$45,000
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	3,805	\$0
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	19,828	\$0
Acres mitigated FP-FUELS-ALL-MIT-NFS	Acres	47,460	\$0
Please also include the acres of prescribed fire accomplished	Acres	15,676	\$40,000

Units accomplished should match the accomplishments recorded in the Databases of Record. For CFLRP projects under the CFLRP Common Monitoring Strategy, items marked with a * help to address the [core CFLRP common monitoring strategy question](#), “Did CFLRP increase economic utilization of restoration byproducts?”

* Not entered in the database of record but accomplished with CFLN funding.

** There was a mistake in the reporting. The actual accomplishment is higher than what is reported in the Database of Record.

7. The Washington Office (Enterprise Data Warehouse) will use spatial data provided in the databases of record to estimate a treatment footprint for each CFLRP project’s 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 2021	39,428 acres
Estimated Cumulative Footprint of Acres (CFLRP start year through 2021)	FY12 – 17,166 acres FY13 -- 6,378 acres FY14 – 20,523 acres FY15 – 15,076 acres FY16 – 12,143 acres FY17 – 20,632 acres FY18 - 29,654 acres FY19 – 24,801 acres FY20 – 16,837 acres

8. Describe any reasons that the FY 2021 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?

The extreme fire season on the Fremont-Winema National Forest resulted in some planned projects not getting accomplished. Many employees assisted with firefighting, BAER, or suppression repair for much of the field season.

9. Planned FY 2022 Accomplishments (for CFLRP projects with **known** ongoing funding in FY22)⁶

Performance Measure Code	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment for 2022 (National Forest System)	Planned Accomplishment on non-NFS lands within the CFLRP landscape ⁷
Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres	1,000	0
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	1,000	1,000
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	10	0
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	15,250	2,500
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	0	0
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles	0	0
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles	0	0
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	57,692	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	0	0
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	13,750	500
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	11,250	2,500

Please include all relevant planned accomplishments, assuming that funding specified in the CFLRP project proposal for FY 2021 is available.

10. **Planned accomplishment narrative and justification if planned FY 2022 accomplishments and/or funding differs from CFLRP project work plan (for CFLRP projects with known ongoing funding in FY22):**

Any additional important accomplishments not covered in the FY21 table above, but will yield long-term results if funded, include ecological, social, and economic monitoring completed by Lake County Resources Initiative and the University of Oregon. It's important to note the goal of monitoring across public and private lands in 2022.

⁶ Projects funded beginning in FY21, or extensions of 5 years or more, will be following the new Common Monitoring Strategy and will be asked to provide information on invasives, wildlife habitat, and reduction in fuels that go beyond acre tallies. Please work with your Regional CFLRP Coordinator as these are implemented.

⁷ 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

11. 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.⁸

The list of collaborative members has not changed from 2021.

Signatures:

Recommended by (Project Coordinator(s)): _____

Approved by (Forest Supervisor(s)): _____

Draft reviewed by (collaborative chair or representative): _____

⁸ For CFLRP projects under the CFLRP Common Monitoring Strategy, this table addresses the [core CFLRP common monitoring strategy question](#), “Who is involved in the collaborative and if/how does that change over time?”

Appendix A FTEM for Cougar Peak Fire

Treatment Name	Agency	Treatment and Wildfire Interaction Details?	Treatment Acres Burned by Wildfire	Date Wildfire Entered Treatment	Did the Fire Behavior Change as A Result Of Treatment?	Did the Treatment Contribute to Control and/or Management of Fire?	Was the Treatment Strategically Located in Order to Facilitate Control of Fire?
JAKABE SPC BY2	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	36.44	Sept 09, 2021	no	no	no
JAKABE RX UNDERBURN UNIT 21	USFS	Treatment was used primarily for suppression actions	48.83	Sept 09, 2021	yes	yes	yes
BY RIPARIAN 6	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	8.74	Sept 09, 2021	no	no	no
CAMP CRK IRSC 2	USFS	Wildfire burned through some acres treated	56.8	Sept 08, 2021	yes	no	yes
JAKABE SPC BY4	USFS	Wildfire burned through some acres treated	14.99	Sept 09, 2021	no	no	no
JAKABE SPC BY 12	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	27.17	Sept 09, 2021	no	no	no
CAMP CRK IRSC 1	USFS	Wildfire burned through some acres treated	92.56	Sept 08, 2021	yes	no	yes
BEN YOUND RX BURN 1	USFS	Treatment was used primarily for suppression actions	99.03	Sept 22, 2021	yes	yes	yes

JAKABE SPC BY23	USFS	Wildfire burned through some acres treated	4.98	Sept 22, 2021	no	no	no
JAKABE SPC BY24	USFS	Wildfire burned through some acres treated	45.84	Sept 21, 2021	yes	yes	no
JAKABE SPC BY1	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	40.08	Sept 08, 2021	no	no	no
JAKABE RX UNDERBURN UNIT 14	USFS	Wildfire burned through some acres treated	345.74	Sept 09, 2021	yes	yes	yes
ABE DANGER TREE ROAD FELLING	USFS	Wildfire burned through some acres treated	1850.85	Sept 08, 2021	no	no	yes
TRAIL 25	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	120.3	Sept 08, 2021	yes	no	no
TRAIL #24	USFS	Wildfire burned through some acres treated	184.14	Sept 09, 2021	yes	yes	no
ABE IRSC 17	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	25.96	Sept 08, 2021	no	no	yes
SWAMP 39	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	37.73	Oct 04, 2021	yes	no	no
ABE IRSC 40	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	27.79	Sept 08, 2021	no	no	yes
JAKABE RX UNDERBURN UNIT 20	USFS	Wildfire burned through some acres treated	287.71	Sept 09, 2021	yes	yes	no
CAMP CREEK PCT & PILE 1	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	5	Sept 08, 2021	no	no	yes

JAKABE SPC BY 6	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	34.94	Sept 09, 2021	no	no	no
ABE IRSC 44	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	56	Sept 09, 2021	no	no	yes
CLEM 6	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	12.48	Sept 08, 2021	no	no	no
SWAMP 26	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	297.57	Sept 08, 2021	no	no	no
CLEM 11	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	103.8	Sept 08, 2021	no	no	no
CLEM #11	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	22.92	Sept 08, 2021	no	no	no
SWAMP 41	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	402.33	Sept 09, 2021	yes	no	no
SW 4	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	107.46	Sept 08, 2021	no	no	no
TRAIL 27	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	228.79	Sept 09, 2021	yes	no	no
ABE IRSC 42	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	47.93	Sept 08, 2021	no	no	yes
JAKABE SPC BY13	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	2.71	Sept 09, 2021	no	no	no
CAMP CRK IRSC 4	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	74.68	Sept 08, 2021	no	no	yes

CAMP CRK IRSC 3	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	135	Sept 08, 2021	yes	no	yes
JAKABE THINNING SW 42	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	74.36	Sept 09, 2021	no	no	no
BY 32	USFS	Wildfire burned through some acres treated	125.6	Oct 06, 2021	yes	no	yes
JAKABE SPC BY7	USFS	Wildfire burned through some acres treated	26.5	Sept 09, 2021	no	no	no
JAKABE SPC BY10	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	15.56	Sept 09, 2021	no	no	no
GREEN CREEK 1	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	24.66	Sept 09, 2021	no	no	no
ABE IRSC 52	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	9	Sept 08, 2021	jno	no	yes
JAKABE THINNING BY 29	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	17.62	Sept 08, 2021	no	no	no
JAKABE SPC BY28	USFS	Wildfire burned through some acres treated	39.24	Sept 09, 2021	no	no	no
GREEN CREEK 2	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	7.48	Sept 09, 2021	no	no	no
SWAMP 41	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	402.33	Sept 09, 2021	yes	no	no
CAMP CRK IRSC 2	USFS	Wildfire burned through some acres treated	56.8	Sept 08, 2021	yes	no	yes

CAMP CRK IRSC 1	USFS	Wildfire burned through some acres treated	92.56	Sept 08, 2021	yes	no	yes
SWAMP 56	USFS	Wildfire burned through some acres treated	20.71	Sept 19, 2021	yes	yes	no
SWAMP 26	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	297.57	Oct 03, 2021	no	no	yes
BY 33	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	112.78	Sept 09, 2021	yes	no	no
SWAMP 57	USFS	Wildfire burned through some acres treated	77.33	Sept 19, 2021	yes	yes	no
BY RIPARIAN 6	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	8.74	Oct 03, 2021	no	no	yes
JAKABE RX UNDERBURN UNIT 14	USFS	Wildfire burned through some acres treated	345.74	Sept 09, 2021	yes	yes	yes
JAKABE RX UNDERBURN UNIT 15	USFS	Wildfire burned through some acres treated	246.01	Sept 09, 2021	yes	yes	yes
SW 4	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	107.46	Oct 04, 2021	no	no	no
TRAIL 27	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	228.79	Oct 04, 2021	yes	yes	yes
TRAIL #24	USFS	Wildfire burned through some acres treated	184.14	Sept 09, 2021	yes	yes	no
JAKABE SPC BY28	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	39.24	Sept 09, 2021	yes	no	no

ABE IRSC 44	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	56	Sept 09, 2021	no	no	yes
JAKABE SPC BY7	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	26.5	Oct 03, 2021	no	no	yes
ABE IRSC 42	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	47.93	Sept 08, 2021	no	no	yes
SWAMP 39	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	37.73	Oct 04, 2021	yes	no	no
JAKABE THINNING BY 11	USFS	Wildfire burned through some acres treated	12.28	Sept 09, 2021	yes	no	no
BY 32	USFS	Wildfire burned through some acres treated	125.6	Sept 09, 2021	yes	yes	no
GREEN CREEK 1	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	24.66	Sept 09, 2021	no	no	no
JAKABE SPC BY23	USFS	Wildfire burned through some acres treated	4.98	Sept 20, 2021	no	no	no
JAKABE SPC BY2	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	36.44	Sept 09, 2021	no	no	no
CLEM #11	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	22.92	Sept 08, 2021	no	no	no
CAMP CRK IRSC 3	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	135	Sept 08, 2021	yes	no	yes
BY 33	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	112.78	Sept 09, 2021	no	no	no

CAMP CRK IRSC 4	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	74.68	Sept 08, 2021	no	no	yes
CAMP CRK IRSC 1	USFS	Wildfire burned through some acres treated	92.56	Sept 08, 2021	yes	no	yes
JAKABE SPC BY13	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	2.71	Sept 09, 2021	no	no	no
JAKABE SPC BY1	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	40.08	Sept 08, 2021	no	no	no
JAKABE THINNING SW 42	USFS	Wildfire burned through some acres treated	74.36	Sept 09, 2021	no	no	no
SWAMP 39	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	37.73	Sept 09, 2021	yes	no	no
CLEM 11	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	103.8	Sept 08, 2021	no	no	no
CAMP CRK IRSC 2	USFS	Wildfire burned through some acres treated	56.8	Sept 08, 2021	yes	no	yes
ABE IRSC 44	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	133	Sept 09, 2021	no	no	yes
CAMP CRK IRSC 3	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	135	Sept 08, 2021	yes	no	yes
CAMP CRK IRSC 1	USFS	Wildfire burned through some acres treated	92.56	Sept 08, 2021	yes	no	yes
JAKABE SPC BY 12	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	27.17	Sept 09, 2021	no	no	no

CLEM #11	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	22.92	Sept 08, 2021	no	no	no
SNYDER EVALUATION PLANTATION	USFS	Wildfire burned through some acres treated	0.1	Sept 09, 2021	yes	yes	yes
SW 7	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	168.12	Sept 09, 2021	yes	no	no
ABE IRSC 42A	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	54.07	Sept 08, 2021	no	no	yes
CLEM 6	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	12.48	Sept 08, 2021	no	no	no
SW 7	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	168.12	Sept 09, 2021	yes	no	no
CLEM 6	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	12.48	Sept 08, 2021	no	no	no
SWAMP 41	USFS	Wildfire burned through some acres treated	402.33	Sept 09, 2021	yes	no	no
JAKABE SPC BY24	USFS	Wildfire burned through some acres treated	45.84	Sept 20, 2021	yes	yes	no
GREEN CREEK 2	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	7.48	Sept 09, 2021	no	no	no
CLEM 11	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	103.8	Sept 08, 2021	no	no	no
TRAIL 26	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	168.99	Sept 09, 2021	yes	no	no

TC NCT 57	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	23	Sept 09, 2021	no	no	yes
TC NCT 62	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	20	Sept 09, 2021	no	no	yes
TC NCT 60	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	16	Sept 09, 2021	no	no	yes
TC NCT 64	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	25.86	Sept 08, 2021	yes	no	yes
TC NCT 63	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	34.07	Sept 09, 2021	no	no	yes
THOMAS CREEK NCT 56B	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	20	Sept 09, 2021	no	no	yes
BRATTIAN DECKS	USFS	Wildfire burned through some acres treated	146.6	Sept 09, 2021	yes	yes	yes
THOMAS CREEK NCT-PINK PANTHER 015	USFS	Wildfire burned through all acres treated	58	Sept 08, 2021	no	no	yes