

**CFLRP Project Name (CFLR#): Dinkey Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Project
National Forest(s): Sierra National Forest**

1. Executive Summary

It has been an interesting year for the Dinkey Collaborative. We originally met monthly with in person meetings at the Supervisors Office. As our finances were not completely known and Covid came into play we began with virtual meetings. We met approximately five times in 2022. Although we had fewer meetings, the District was continuing work in the current contracts. We modified existing an IRSC to treat fuels and slash so that reforestation could occur. In other areas we addressed and removed hazard trees, fuel accumulation and prepped more ground for reforestation efforts as well. We also treated biomass and cull and began treatments benefiting the protection of giant sequoias in the McKinley Grove.

Approximately 200,000 seedlings were planted in the Creek fire, Blue fire and Blue Canyon area. The latter two areas are within the collaborative boundary. Portions of the Creek fire are within the collaborative boundary as well. We had two public planting days were held for public participation. Approximately 1000 acres were reforested on the High Sierra District.

2. Funding

CFLRP and Forest Service Match Expenditures

Fund Source: CFLN and/or CFIX Funds Expended	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2022
CFLN022	\$601,730.87
CFLN020	\$67,700.06
CFLN019	\$26,381.25
Total	\$ 695,812.18

This amount should match the amount of CFLN/CFIX 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.

Fund Source: Forest Service Salary and Expense Match Expended	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2022
Total	\$0

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](#).

Fund Source: Forest Service Discretionary Matching Funds	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2022
TOTAL	\$0

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 as match if aligned with CFLRP proposal implementation.

Partner Match Contributions¹

Fund Source: Partner Match	In-Kind Contribution or Funding Provided?	Total Estimated Funds/Value for FY22	Description of CFLRP implementation or monitoring activity	Where activity/item is located or impacted area
Yosemite Sequoia Resource and Conservation District	Funding	\$20,000	Provided facilitator for on line/virtual meetings, note taking	National Forest System Lands Other lands within CFLRP landscape: Southern California Edison
Dinkey Collaborative Members	In-kind contribution	Estimated \$30,000	N/A	National Forest System Lands
TOTALS	Total In-Kind Contributions: \$30,000 Total Funding: \$20,000			

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

3. Activities on the Ground

FY 2022 Agency Performance Measure Accomplishments² - Units accomplished should match the accomplishments recorded in the Databases of Record. Please note any discrepancies.

Core Restoration Treatments	Agency Performance Measure	NFS Acres	Non-NFS Acres	Total Acres
Hazardous Fuels Reduction (acres) in the Wildland Urban Interface	FP-FUELS-WUI (reported in FACTS) ³	0	0	0
Hazardous Fuels Reduction (acres) in the Wildland Urban Interface - COMPLETED	FP-FUELS-WUI-CMPLT (reported in FACTS) ⁴	0	0	0
Hazardous Fuels Reduction (acres) outside the Wildland Urban Interface	FP-FUELS-NON-WUI (reported in FACTS) ³	672	0	672 (not captured in gPAS)
Hazardous Fuels Reduction (acres) outside the Wildland Urban Interface - COMPLETED	FP-FUELS-NON-WUI-CMPLT (reported in FACTS) ⁴	18	0	18 (not captured in gPAS)
Prescribed Fire (acres)	Activity component of FP-FUELS-ALL (reported in FACTS)	100	0	100

¹ Addresses [Core Monitoring Question #13](#)

² This question helps track progress towards the CFLRP projects lifetime goals outlined in your CFLRP Proposal & Work Plan. Adapt table as needed.

³ For service contracts, the date accomplished is the date of contract award. For Force Account, the date accomplished is the date the work is completed

⁴ New Agency measure reported in FACTS when completed

Core Restoration Treatments	Agency Performance Measure	NFS Acres	Non-NFS Acres	Total Acres
Wildfire Risk Mitigation Outcomes - Acres treated to mitigate wildfire risk	FP-FUELS-ALL-MIT-NFS (reported in FACTS)	0	0	0
Invasive Species Treatments (acres) - Noxious weeds and invasive plants	INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC (reported in FACTS) ³	0	0	0
Invasive Species Treatments (acres) - Noxious weeds and invasive plants - COMPLETED	INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC-CMPLT (reported in FACTS) ⁴	0.1	0	0.1 (not captured in gPAS)
Invasive Species Treatments (acres) - Terrestrial and aquatic species	INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC (reported in FACTS) ³	0	0	0
Invasive Species Treatments (acres) - Terrestrial and aquatic species - COMPLETED	INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC- CMPLT (reported in FACTS) ⁴	0	0	0
Road Decommissioning (Unauthorized Road) (miles)	RD-DECOM-NON-SYS (Roads reporting)	0	0	0
Road Decommissioning (National Forest System Road) (miles)	RD-DECOM-SYS (Roads reporting)	0	0	0
Road Improvement (High Clearance) (miles)	RD-HC-IMP-MI (Roads reporting)	0	0	0
Road Improvement (Passenger Car System) (miles)	RD-PC-IMP-MI (Roads reporting)	0	0	0
Road Maintenance (High Clearance) (miles)	RD-HC-MAINT-MI (Roads reporting)	0	0	0
Road Maintenance (Passenger Car System) (miles)	RD-PC-MAINT-MI (Roads reporting)	0	0	0
Trail Improvement (miles)	TL-IMP-STD (Trails reporting)	0	0	0
Trail Maintenance (miles)	TL-MAINT-STD (Trails reporting)	0	0	0
Wildlife Habitat Restoration (acres)	HBT-ENH-TERR (reported in WIT)	0	0	0
Stream Crossings Mitigated (i.e. AOPs) (number)	STRM-CROS-MITG-STD (reported in WIT)	0	0	0
Stream Habitat Enhanced (miles)	HBT-ENH-STRM (reported in WIT)	0	0	0
Lake Habitat Enhanced (acres)	HBT-ENH-LAK (reported in WIT)	0	0	0
Water or Soil Resources Protected, Maintained, or Improved (acres)	S&W-RSRC-IMP (reported in WIT)	0	0	0

³ For service contracts, the date accomplished is the date of contract award. For Force Account, the date accomplished is the date the work is completed

⁴ New Agency measure reported in FACTS when completed

Core Restoration Treatments	Agency Performance Measure	NFS Acres	Non-NFS Acres	Total Acres
Stand Improvement (acres)	FOR-VEG-IMP (reported in FACTS)	0	0	0
Reforestation and revegetation (acres)	FOR-VEG-EST (reported in FACTS)	0	0	0
Forests treated using timber sales (acres)	TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC (reported in FACTS)	0	0	0
Rangeland Vegetation Improvement (acres)	RG-VEG-IMP (reported in FACTS)	0	0	0

Is there any background or context you would like to provide regarding the information reported in the table above?
 In the Blue Canyon area, the Forest worked with National Forest Foundation with objectives to complete fuels treatments (fuels reduction and roadside hazard reduction) in the project. Prior to September 2021, approximately 158 acres of fuels treatments were accomplished. Twelve of the acres are within the Creek Fire scar.

Also in the Blue Canyon area we partnered with Yosemite/Sequoia Resource Conservation and Development Council with a grant from Sierra Nevada Conservancy to burn piles (equivalent to 100 acres) and install a sign to educate the public with regards to the project.

Reflecting on treatments implemented in FY22, if/how has your CFLRP project aligned with other efforts to accomplish work at landscape scales?

The Sierra National Forest works with the utility companies, Southern California Edison and Pacific Gas and Electric for hazard tree removal as well as updating the infrastructure for the utility poles. We work with the utility companies when we need to accomplish burning.

4. Restoring Fire-Adapted Landscapes and Reducing Hazardous Fuels

Narrative Overview of Treatments Completed in FY22 to restore fire-adapted landscapes and reduce hazardous fuels, including data on whether your project has expanded the pace and/or scale of treatments over time, and if so, how you’ve accomplished that – what were the key enabling factors?

The treatments that were accomplished within the boundary were done so by the existing contracts that are in place. The treatments were hazard tree removal, remove bug killed trees. Contracts have commercial green tree thinning , salvage treatment for the fire affected areas and some biomass thinning. We also began hazard tree removal in a project for FY22.

If a wildfire interacted with a previously treated area within the CFLRP boundary:

- From FTEM (can be copied/summarized): Did the wildfire behavior change after the fire entered the treatment?
- From FTEM (can be copied/summarized): Did the treatment contribute to the control and/or management of the wildfire?
- From FTEM (can be copied/summarized): Was the treatment strategically located to affect the behavior of a future wildfire?
- Please describe if/how partners or community members engaged in the planning or implementation of the relevant fuels treatment. Did treatments include coordinated efforts on other federal, tribal, state, private, etc. lands?
- What resource values were you and your partners concerned with protecting or enhancing? Did the treatments help to address these value concerns?
- How are planned treatments affected by the fire over the rest of the project? Was there any resource benefit from the fire that was accomplished within the CFLRP footprint or is complementary to planned activities?

- What is your key takeaway from this event – what would you have done differently? What elements will you continue to apply in the future?

FY22 Wildfire/Hazardous Fuels Expenditures

Category	Expenditure
FY22 Wildfire Preparedness*	\$0
FY22 Wildfire Suppression**	\$0
FY22 Hazardous Fuels Treatment Costs (CFLN, CFIX)	\$0
FY22 Hazardous Fuels Treatment Costs (other BLIs)	\$0

* 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).

** Include emergency fire suppression and BAER within the project landscape.

How may the treatments that were implemented contribute to reducing fire costs?

There were no wildfires in the Dinkey Collaborative boundary in 2022.

5. Additional Ecological Goals

Narrative Overview of Treatments Completed in FY22 to achieve ecological goals outlined in your CFLRP proposal and work plan. This may include, and isn’t limited to, activities related to habitat enhancement, invasives, and watershed condition.

- We retained snags for wildlife habitat such as the oaks and larger snags that may be utilized for fisher
- Aquatics biologist worked with loggers to educate them in the habitat and protection of the threatened species, Yosemite Toad
- We are continually working with the contractors to review the Limited Operating periods (LOPs) that may put a pause on working in certain areas. We try and survey in a timely manner so we can provide an answer as to whether they can modify the LOP or it will be fully implemented for the timeframe.

6. Socioeconomic Goals

Narrative overview of activities completed in FY22 to achieve socioeconomic goals outlined in your CFLRP proposal and work plan.

- The logs that were harvested were sent to the Terra Bella mill
- The local businesses were awarded the contracts and continued to work in the areas- (Messer Logging and Lite on the Land)
- Hands on the Land were not utilized in 2022 due to Covid. We are working closely with the high school to try and have this work in the future.

Results from the Treatment for Restoration Economic Analysis Toolkit (TREAT). For guidance, training, and resources, see materials on [Restoration Economics SharePoint](#).⁷ After submitting your data entry form to the Forest Service Washington Office Economist Team, they will provide the analysis results needed to respond to the following prompts.

Percent of funding that stayed within the local impact area: 65%

⁷ Addresses [Core Monitoring Question #7](#)

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

Description	Project Percent
Equipment intensive work	15%
Labor-intensive work	85%
Material-intensive work	0%
Technical services	0%
Professional services	0%
Contracted Monitoring	0%
TOTALS:	100%

Modeled Jobs Supported/Maintained (CFLRP and matching funding):

Jobs Supported/Maintained in FY 2022	Direct Jobs (Full & Part-Time)	Total Jobs (Full & Part-Time)	Direct Labor Income	Total Labor Income
Timber harvesting component	10	17	583,691	725,912
Forest and watershed restoration component	6	10	295,431	472,272
Mill processing component	9	18	589,163	1,147,909
Implementation and monitoring	7	8	233,838	278,915
Other Project Activities	1	1	19,261	37,835
TOTALS:	33	55	1,721,384	2,662,843

Were there any assumptions you needed to make in your TREAT data entry you would like to note here? To what extent do the TREAT results align with your observations or other monitoring on the ground? As reported by the economist, results are consistent with expectation: you reported more funding and volume harvested than last year, and results increased accordingly.

Please provide a brief description of the local businesses that benefited from CFLRP related contracts and agreements, including characteristics such as tribally-owned firms, veteran-owned firms, women-owned firms, minority-owned firms, and business size.⁸ For resources, [see materials here](#) (external Box folder).

7. Wood Products Utilization

Timber & Biomass Volume Table⁹

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF	0 (actual)
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	5,550

⁸ Addresses [Core Monitoring Question #8](#)

⁹ Addresses [Core Monitoring Question #10](#)

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished
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

Reviewing the data above, do you have additional data sources or description to add in terms of wood product utilization (for example, work on non-National Forest System lands not included in the table)? No.

8. Collaboration

Please include an up-to-date list of the core members of your collaborative if it has changed from your proposal/work plan (if it has not changed, note below).¹⁰ For detailed guidance and resources, see materials [here](#). Please document changes using the [template](#) from the CFLRP proposal and upload to [Box](#). Briefly summarize and describe changes below.

Our collaborative member list is the same that we have provided annually.

9. Monitoring Process

Briefly describe your current status in terms of developing, refining, implementing, and/or reevaluating your CFLRP monitoring plan and multiparty monitoring process.

In August 2022, an ecologist was hired that works for the Province (this includes the Sierra, Sequoia and Inyo NF). He will be completing the monitoring report as it pertains to the Dinkey Collaborative. The sections he compiled are listed below (4-6).

10. Conclusion

Describe any reasons that the FY 2022 annual report does not reflect your proposal or work plan. Are there expected changes to your FY 2023 plans you would like to highlight? We will be working in the McKinley Grove as it pertains to the protection of the grove.

Signatures

Recommended by (Project Coordinator(s)): /s/Kim Sorini-Wilson

Approved by (Forest Supervisor(s)): /s/Dean Gould, Forest Supervisor

Draft reviewed by (collaborative representative): /s/ Susan Britting, Sierra Forest Legacy Director

Attachment: CFLRP Common Monitoring Strategy Core Questions

The 2021 cohort will complete the common monitoring strategy questions in FY22. CFLRP projects awarded in 2022 (2012 extensions and new projects) will be required to respond to these questions starting in FY23.

The [CFLRP common monitoring strategy](#) is designed to reflect lessons learned from the first ten years of the program, expand monitoring capacity, and improve landscape-scale monitoring. It is intended to strike a balance between standardization and local flexibility and to be responsive to feedback that more guidance and capacity are needed. Questions are standardized nationally and indicators are standardized regionally. Many CFLRP projects have been implementing restoration treatments and monitoring progress prior to the common monitoring strategy. This effort may not capture the progress of every project over its lifetime but provides an opportunity for all projects to take a step together in a unified monitoring approach.

- Question 1: “What is the reduction in fuel hazard based on our treatments?”

¹⁰ Addresses [Core Monitoring Question #11](#)

- Question 2: “What is the effect of the treatments on moving the forest landscape toward a more sustainable condition?”
- Question 3: “What are the specific effects of restoration treatments on the habitat of at-risk species and/or the habitat of species of collaborative concern across the CFLRP project area?”
- Question 4: “What is the status and trend of watershed conditions in the CFLR area, with a focus on the physical and biological conditions that support key soil, hydrologic and aquatic processes?”
- Question 5: “What is the trend in invasive species within the CFLRP project area?”
- Question 6: “How has the social and economic context changed, if at all?”
- Question 7: “How have CFLRP activities supported local jobs and labor income?”
- Question 8: “How do sales, contracts, and agreements associated with the CFLRP affect local communities?”
- Question 9: “Did CFLRP maintain or increase the number and/or diversity of wood products that can be processed locally?”
- Question 10: “Did CFLRP increase economic utilization of restoration byproducts?”
- Question 11: “Who is involved in the collaborative and if/how does that change over time?”
- Question 12: “How well is CFLRP encouraging an effective and meaningful collaborative approach?”
- Question 13: “If and to what extent have CFLRP investments attracted partner investments across the landscapes?”

The tables in the section below are copy/pasted from the suggested monitoring tracking [templates](#) to help organize data across CFLRP projects. Adapt the reporting tables as needed to align with regional monitoring indicators.

Monitoring Question #1: “What is the reduction in fuel hazard based on our treatments?” (Reported Annually)

For detailed guidance, training, and resources, see corresponding reporting template [here](#). Use it to respond to the following prompts:

Briefly describe monitoring results in table above – include an interpretation of the data provided and whether the indicator is trending toward or away from desired conditions for your landscape. If the data above does not accurately reflect fire and fuel hazard on your landscape please note and provide context. While generally smaller flame lengths are desirable, this isn’t the case in all ecosystems – please note if this applies.

Briefly describe monitoring results in table above – include an interpretation of the data provided, and whether the indicator is trending toward or away from desired conditions for your landscape. If the data above does not accurately reflect fire and fuel hazard on your landscape please note and provide context.

Does your CFLRP project have additional hazardous-fuels related monitoring results to summarize and interpret? If so, please provide that here.

Based on the information in this section, (and any other relevant monitoring information and discussion), what (if any) actions or changes are you considering?

Monitoring Question #2: “What is the effect of the treatments on moving the forest landscape toward a more sustainable condition?” (Reporting frequency determined by Regional indicator)

For detailed guidance, training, and resources, see corresponding reporting template [here](#). Use it to respond to the following prompts:

- Briefly summarize how your landscape has departed from historic ecological conditions including disturbance.
- Briefly describe monitoring results – include an interpretation of the data provided above, and whether the indicator is trending toward or away from desired conditions for your landscape (including resiliency to future disturbances and climate projections). If the data above does not accurately reflect condition on your landscape, please note and provide context.

Monitoring Questions #3: “What are the specific effects of restoration treatments on the habitat of at-risk species and/or the habitat of species of collaborative concern across the CFLRP project area?” (Reporting frequency determined by Regional indicator)

For detailed guidance, training, and resources, see corresponding reporting template [here](#). Use it to respond to the following prompts

Monitoring Question #4: “What is the status and trend of watershed conditions in the CFLRP area?” (Reported every 5 years)

Watershed Status

CFLRP Project Name: Dinkey Creek

Fiscal Year: 2022

Point of contact(s) completing template: Michael L. Kennedy, District Hydrologist, High Sierra Ranger District

Introduction

Since the start of 2020, there has not been a Hydrologist for the High Sierra Ranger District (HSRD) to conduct monitoring within the Dinkey CLFRP watersheds. The HSRD hired a new Soil Scientist/District Hydrologist who began in July of 2022. The results below represent the most up to date status of the subwatersheds present in the Dinkey CLFRP boundaries. Due to large gaps in collected data, the results below reflect the status of the subwatersheds in year one of monitoring.

Subwatershed Name (HUC)	Watershed	Aquatic Biota	Riparian/Wetland Vegetation	Water Quality	Water Quantity	Aquatic Habitat	Road & Trails	Soils	Fire Effects/Fire Regime	Forest Cover	Forest Health	Terrestrial Invasive Species	Rangeland Vegetation
Deer Creek (180300100503)	Functioning at Risk	Poor	Fair	Good	Good	Fair	Fair	Good	Fair	Good	Poor	Good	Fair
Lower Dinkey Creek (180300100504)	Functioning at Risk	Fair	Fair	Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Good	Fair	Good	Poor	Good	Fair
Middle Dinkey Creek (180300100502)	Functioning at Risk	Poor	Fair	Good	Good	Poor	Poor	Fair	Fair	Good	Poor	Good	Fair
Upper Dinkey Creek (180300100501)	Functioning at Risk	Poor	Fair	Good	Good	Fair	Good	Good	Fair	Good	Poor	Good	Fair
Lower Big Creek (180300100802)	Functioning at Risk	Poor	Fair	Good	Good	Poor	Fair	Good	Good	Good	Fair	Fair	Fair
* Upper Big Creek (180300100801)	Functioning at Risk	Fair	Fair	Good	Good	Poor	Poor	Fair	Fair	Good	Poor	Good	Fair
Stevenson Creek (180400061002)	Functioning at Risk	Poor	Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Fair	Good	Fair	Good	Fair	Good	Good
2022 Dinkey CFLRP Average	Functioning at Risk	Poor (2.74)	Fair (1.85)	Good (1)	Good (1.14)	Poor (2.57)	Poor (2.28)	Good (1.28)	Fair (1.85)	Good (1)	Poor (2.71)	Good (1.14)	Fair (1.85)

Table 1. Summary of Watershed Condition Scores for the subwatersheds within our CFLRP boundary as of 2022

Listed as priority subwatershed in WCATT as of December 2022

Table 2. Watershed Condition Score averaged across all affected priority subwatersheds within our CFLRP boundary in 2022**Aquatic Physical (Weighted 30%)**

Indicator Number	Indicator Name	Avg. Indicator Value	Year	Change in Avg.* (Improvement, Deterioration, or No Change)
1	Water Quality	1	2022	N/A
2	Water Quantity	1.14	2022	N/A
3	Aquatic Habitat	2.57	2022	N/A

Aquatic Biological (Weighted 30%)

Indicator Number	Indicator Name	Avg. Indicator Value	Year	Change in Avg.* (Improvement, Deterioration, or No Change)
4	Aquatic Biota	2.74	2022	N/A
5	Riparian/Wetland Vegetation	1.85	2022	N/A

Terrestrial Physical (Weighted 30%)

Indicator Number	Indicator Name	Avg. Indicator Value	Year	Change in Avg.* (Improvement, Deterioration, or No Change)
6	Roads & Trails	2.28	2022	N/A
7	Soils	1.28	2022	N/A

Terrestrial Biological (Weighted 10%)

Indicator Number	Indicator Name	Avg. Indicator Value	Year	Change in Avg.* (Improvement, Deterioration, or No Change)
8	Fire Regime or Wildfire	1.85	2022	N/A
9	Forest Cover	1	2022	N/A
10	Rangeland Vegetation	1.85	2022	N/A
11	Terrestrial Invasive Species	1.14	2022	N/A
12	Forest Health	2.71	2022	N/A
Avg. Watershed Condition Score		<u>1.86</u>	2022	N/A

Results

The results above show all subwatersheds within the Dinkey CFLRP are functioning but at risk, with an average watershed condition score of 1.86. Aquatic Biota, Aquatic Habitat, Roads & Trails, and Forest Health seem to be the primary factors negatively impacting the watersheds within the Dinkey CFLRP boundary. Priority for FY23 should be on applying relevant BMP's on these four factors, and conduct BMP monitoring to ensure they are having the desired effect of mitigating these negative impacts.

Additional Information

In addition to this information, attached are the most recent reports by the previous hydrologist regarding ongoing activities within the Dinkey CFLRP boundary. These provide greater context to the above results, and previous work that has occurred in the area.

Monitoring Question #5: “What is the trend in invasive species within the CFLRP project area?” (Reported Annually)

Invasives Tracking

CFLRP Project Name: Dinkey Creek

Fiscal Year: 2022

Point of contact(s) completing template: Joanna Clines, Forest Botanist, Sierra NF.

Introduction

The Forest Botanist and Assistant Forest Botanist surveyed for invasive plants for input to specific NEPA projects within the CFLR boundary, mapping, treating, monitoring, entering treatments into FACTS. Following the Creek Fire 2020, BAER surveys for invasives were conducted within the Dinkey CFLR boundary by botany personnel in the fall of 2021 (FY 2022) on dozer lines, staging areas, heli-spots, and other sites disturbed during fire suppression.

Table 1. Treatment data for priority invasive species within FY22 (plants, animals, terrestrial, aquatic. Lists all high priority invasive non-native plants known to occur within the CFLR boundary.

Common Name	Treatment Action	Acres Treated ¹	Acres Monitored	Avg. Efficacy (%)	Acres Restored ²	Response of Desirable Species ³
BULL THISTLE	None	0	0	0	0	N/A
FOXGLOVE	Manual removal	0.1	0	95	0.1	N/A
HIMALAYAN BLACKBERRY	None	0	0	0	0	N/A
ITALIAN THISTLE	None	0	0	0	0	N/A
LENS-PODDED HOARY CRESS	None	0	0	0	0	N/A
NORTH AFRICA GRASS	None	0	0	0	0	N/A
SPANISH BROOM	None	0	0	0	0	N/A
KLAMATHWEED (ST. JOHNSWORT)	None	0	0	0	0	N/A
WOOLLY MULLEIN	None	0	0	0	0	N/A
YELLOW STARHISTLE	None	0	0	0	0	N/A
Totals/Avg		0.1	0	95	.1	N/A

¹ “Treated” is defined as prevented, controlled, or eradicated.

² Agency performance accomplishment code INVPLT-INVSP-E-REST-FED-AC, which is calculated in FACTS.

³ “Desirable Species” includes everything that is not an undesirable species or bare ground. If the response of desired species was not monitored, write N/A.

Results

Foxglove was discovered at a new location along Forest Road 10S01 (Fresno County Road FRE2400), likely imported from known foxglove occurrences south of this road during suppression efforts. Botany crews hand pulled all identified plants in the fall of 2021 and again in summer of 2022; no plants were allowed to bolt and set seed (foxglove is a biennial). Other invasives were mapped but not treated within the CFLR boundary (Table 1); however, only the foxglove invasions were treated.

Additional Information

Opportunities for CFLR to procure more funding and engage more with USFS staff and other invasive weed partners (Fresno County, CDFA, RCDs, NGOs such as the California Native Plant Society) are necessary to ensure invasive weed controls are accomplished before further spread can occur.

The following questions apply across the topics addressed across Questions 1-5:

Are there accomplishments towards long-term goals which may not be reflected in short-term monitoring? Are there short-term treatments that work towards long-term goals which may be reflected adversely in short-term monitoring? Briefly summarize short- & long-term tradeoffs of your landscape treatments and goals.

Monitoring Questions #6: “How has the social and economic context changed, if at all?” (Reported every 5 years)

Socioeconomic Tracking

CFLRP Project Name: Dinkey Creek

Fiscal Year: 2022

Point of contact(s) completing template: Travis Sowards, Associate Ecologist, Southern Sierra Province

Table 1.

Indicators	Response for Initial Year of CMS*	Notes	Response for Year 5 of CMS	Percent Change
Population , most recent year available (tab 1, Forest Service report)	1,610,084	None	N/A	N/A
Percent of total, race & ethnicity , most recent year available (tab 11, Forest Service report)	White alone – 62.2 % Black or African American – 3.6 % American Indian – 1.2 % Hispanic ethnicity – 57.2 % Non-Hispanic Ethnicity – 42.8 %	None	N/A	N/A
Unemployment rate , most recent year available (tab 1, Forest Service report)	9.6 %	None	N/A	N/A
Per capita income , most recent year available (tab 1, Forest Service report)	\$49,725	None	N/A	N/A
Wildfire Exposure, % of Total, Homes , most recent year available (see Wildfire Risk report)	Homes Directly Exposed – 22.0 % Homes Indirectly Exposed – 39.0 % Homes Not Exposed – 40.0 %	None	N/A	N/A

*Initial Year of Common Monitoring Strategy (CMS) Reporting

Summary

Supporting local communities through relationship building and job stability has been the most significant socioeconomic influence of the Dinkey Creek collaborative. Forest management and restoration activities have contributed to the maintenance of 169 full and part time jobs, providing a cumulative labor income of over \$8.5 million. As the last remaining local sawmill, Sierra Forest Projects (SFP) in Terra Bella has directly benefited from Dinkey CFLR forest products. As the recipient of nearly all forest products produced in the Sierra National Forest, the success of the SFP mill is essential to the welfare of both the local community, and for maintaining a market for Dinkey CFLR forest products.

Monitoring Questions #7 & #8

Covered earlier in annual report template

Monitoring Questions #9 “Did CFLRP maintain or increase the number and/or diversity of wood products that can be processed locally?” (Reported every 5 years)

Data will be provided to 2021 cohort projects in FY23 to address this question – responses in FY22 are optional. If your CFLRP project has data available about the current timber harvest by county and/or product, the number of active processing facilities in the area, or other data about forest products infrastructure please provide here.

Monitoring Questions #10 & #11

Covered earlier in annual report template

Monitoring Questions #12: “How well is CFLRP encouraging an effective and meaningful collaborative approach?” (In FY22, Northern Blues only – reported every 2-3 years)

For detailed guidance, training, and resources, see corresponding reporting template [here](#). Please upload your completed assessment summary provided by the Southwestern Ecological Restoration Institutes [here](#) and use it to respond to the prompts below:

- Reflecting on the summary provided, do you have any additional context for the results to share?
- Do you have any feedback about the assessment process?
- What have you done, or plan to do, in response to the challenges, needs, and recommendations identified in the collaboration assessment? Please provide up to 3 specific actions.
- What types of support or guidance do you need to address any of the challenges, needs, and recommendations identified in the collaboration assessment?

Monitoring Question #13

Covered earlier in annual report template