

**CFLRP Project Name (CFLR#): North Yuba Priority Landscape  
National Forest(s): Tahoe National Forest (lead), Plumas National Forest**

**1. Executive Summary**

The North Yuba Priority Landscape partners are most proud of completing the 272,680 North Yuba Forest Resilience Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) pertaining to the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program (released on November 18, 2022). This is the largest forest health project in USFS Region 5 and makes use of innovative financing, partner-contracted IDT facilitation and NEPA writing, and innovative risk modelling resulting objective sub-project prioritization.

Additionally, because of the energy surrounding the nine-member North Yuba Forest Partnership additional funding of \$25,000,000 through Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) has been received.

There have been successes on the ground as well including establishing and/or enhancing partner implementation capability through Programmatic Agreements and/or Supplemental Programmatic Agreements with National Forest Foundation (NFF), Sierra County, South Yuba River Citizens League (SYRCL), and Mooretown Rancheria. This has enabled forest health and resilience treatments in multiple parts of the CFLRP project area including Yuba, Trapper, Red Ant, and Pendola Projects comprising fuels treatments (piling, burning, thinning and hardwood culturing), timber harvesting, and meadow and aspen restoration.

Because the project is new for fy22, there are no monitoring results although the Forest Service is working with the Pacific Southwest Research Station and leveraging science and capacity from our collaborative partners such as The Nature Conservancy, Blue Forest Conservation, and South Yuba River Citizens League, to establish baseline data agreed to by all collaborative partners.

**2. Funding**

**CFLRP and Forest Service Match Expenditures**

Fund Source: CFLN and/or CFI Funds Expended	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2022
CFLN22	\$2,750,000
CFLN21	\$0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$2,750,000</b>

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
CFSE22	\$0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$0</b>

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
CFRD	\$0
CFHF	\$0
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 Contributions<sup>1</sup>**

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
Sierra County	In-kind contribution Funding	\$40,000 In-kind/indirect \$30,000 direct	Indirect: Funding for the County Forester, required matches for grants, applying for grants such as SNC, Calfire, Wildlife Cons Board, State Fire Safe, Title II and III, Secure Rural Schools, Firewise, commitment to North Yuba Forest Partnership including field trips, meetings, DEIS work, workshops with key FS staff. Direct: County-Forest Service agreements for projects, service work (County Forester - tree marking, layout, preparation, project-specific solicitations), staff time directly related to the development of the Master Stewardship Agreement, Greene Acres Planning Grant (SNC), and 49 Yuba Grant (SNC).	National Forest System Lands Other lands within CFLRP landscape: Assisting Private Landowner inholdings
National Forest Foundation	In-kind contribution Funding	\$113,344 in kind \$547,658 funding match	In kind includes Project Management of 3,116 hours and Travel of \$3,242. Funding includes match for CFLRP of \$294,057.91 used for Graveyard Fuels Layout, and match for BIL of \$253,600 for North Yuba Hazard Tree SPA for conifer treatment and chipping in campgrounds <sup>0</sup>	National Forest System Lands

---

<sup>1</sup> Addresses [Core Monitoring Question #13](#)

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
South Yuba River Citizens League (SYRCL)	In-kind contribution Funding	\$10,000 \$373,815.45	In-kind staff hours (salaries/labor) for time spent on CFLR/NYFP events and meetings, planning, field courses and outings, and contractor planning meetings Funding: Budget line items: Salaries/labor, travel expenses, supplies/materials, NICRA eligible contracts + NICRA, overhead	National Forest System Lands
Blue Forest Conservation (BFC)	In-kind contribution Funding	\$30,500 In- kind \$1,460,000 funding to partners	In-Kind staff time to attend partnership meetings, and plan/track implementation work. Funding deployed through the Yuba I & II Forest Resilience Bond's for the National Forest Foundation to manage Aspen Regeneration, Fuels Reduction, and Hardwood Culturing.	National Forest System Lands
Nevada City Rancheria (Maidu)	In-kind contribution	\$2500	Staff time to participate in partnership meetings, and project design meetings.	National Forest System Lands
Yuba Water Agency (YWA)	In-kind contribution Funding	12,859 in-kind 900,000 funding	In kind includes staff time to attend partnership meetings, draft EIS review and discussion, federal and state grant opportunity tracking and communications.  The \$900k was to fund a Forest Resilience Bond (FRB) for NFF.	National Forest System Lands
The Nature Conservancy (TNC)	In-kind contribution Funding	125,000 in kind (personnel, other, travel)  \$53,000 funding (contracts)	Planning and Implementation meetings, contracting Rx prep work, setting up monitoring baselines for CFLRP outyears	National Forest System Lands
Camptonville Community Partnership (CCP)	In-kind contribution	\$2,500	CCP staff time to participate in partnership meetings, and project design meetings and review DEIS.	National Forest System Lands

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
Sierra Nevada Conservancy (SNC)	In-kind contribution	\$3,000	Contributed staff time. SNC is a major State of California funder of projects throughout the state and has recently funded Yuba Project and Greene Acres Project work immediately prior to FY22	National Forest System Lands
TOTALS	Total In-Kind Contributions: \$339,703 Total Funding: \$3,364,473 Grand Total: 3,704,176 in FY22			

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

**Goods for Services Match**

Service work accomplishment through goods-for services funding within a stewardship contract (for contracts awarded in FY22)

- Total revised non-monetary credit limit for contracts awarded in FY22: \$0

Revenue generated through Good Neighbor Agreements

- No GNA on North Yuba CFLRP: \$0

“Revised non-monetary credit limit” should be the amount in the [“Progress Report for Stewardship Credits, Integrated Resources Contracts or Agreements”](#) as of September 30. Additional information on the Progress Reports available in CFLR Annual Report Instructions. “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 proposal and work plan.

**3. Activities on the Ground**

FY 2022 Agency Performance Measure Accomplishments<sup>2</sup> - Units accomplished should match the accomplishments recorded in the Databases of Record. Please note any discrepancies.

---

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

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) <sup>3</sup>	0	0	0
Hazardous Fuels Reduction (acres) in the Wildland Urban Interface - COMPLETED	FP-FUELS-WUI-CMPLT (reported in FACTS) <sup>4</sup>	0	0	0
Hazardous Fuels Reduction (acres) outside the Wildland Urban Interface	FP-FUELS-NON-WUI (reported in FACTS) <sup>3</sup>	0	0	0
Hazardous Fuels Reduction (acres) outside the Wildland Urban Interface - COMPLETED	FP-FUELS-NON-WUI-CMPLT (reported in FACTS) <sup>4</sup>	0	0	0
Prescribed Fire (acres)	Activity component of FP-FUELS-ALL (reported in FACTS)	0	0	0
Wildfire Risk Mitigation Outcomes - Acres treated to mitigate wildfire risk	FP-FUELS-ALL-MIT-NFS (reported in FACTS)	1119	0	1119
Invasive Species Treatments (acres) - Noxious weeds and invasive plants	INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC (reported in FACTS) <sup>3</sup>	0	0	0
Invasive Species Treatments (acres) - Noxious weeds and invasive plants - COMPLETED	INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC-CMPLT (reported in FACTS) <sup>4</sup>	0	0	0
Invasive Species Treatments (acres) - Terrestrial and aquatic species	INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC (reported in FACTS) <sup>3</sup>	0	0	0
Invasive Species Treatments (acres) - Terrestrial and aquatic species - COMPLETED	INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC-CMPLT (reported in FACTS) <sup>4</sup>	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

---

<sup>3</sup> 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

<sup>4</sup> New Agency measure reported in FACTS when completed

<sup>3</sup> 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

<sup>4</sup> New Agency measure reported in FACTS when completed

Core Restoration Treatments	Agency Performance Measure	NFS Acres	Non-NFS Acres	Total Acres
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
Stand Improvement (acres)	FOR-VEG-IMP (reported in FACTS)	0	0	0
Reforestation and revegetation (acres)	FOR-VEG-EST (reported in FACTS)	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?**

The above table does not capture the actual magnitude of success in the North Yuba CFLRP. This is the first year of CFLRP and funds were not available for commitment until May 2022. We nonetheless have successfully placed CFLR funds plus \$6.8M of BIL funding into agreements with partners for work beginning in FY23. An additional caveat to the above data is that due to staffing shortages, the Tahoe NF has not had expertise to keep up all FACTS, NRM and WIT data. The Tahoe NF is working proactively to rectify that as well as set up our reporting to readily capture data for the above fields in FY23 which is also essential for monitoring success.

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

The North Yuba CFLRP cooperates across ownership and organizational boundaries to coordinate and/or implement treatments. A key example of cross-ownership cooperation is with the large industrial landowner Sierra Pacific Industries (SPI), with whom the Tahoe and Plumas NFs coordinate fuel break linkage as well as timing of harvest

activities for minimal impact on species and water resources. We also work closely with partners for implementation and to develop type and location prioritization of treatments. Partners currently assisting with direct implementation on the USFS' behalf include National Forest Foundation (NFF), Sierra County, The Nature Conservancy (TNC), South Yuba River Citizen's League (SYRCL), and Mooretown Rancheria. Additionally, the Tahoe National Forest relies heavily on American Conservation Experience (ACE) for interns to assist with wildlife, botany and archeological surveys as well as to assist with timber harvest operations including layout, marking and cruising. The partnership also works with the University of Wisconsin for California Spotted Owl and Goshawk surveys and through our NGO partners with companies such as Pyrologix (fire modelling) and Vibrant Planet (landscape modeling and treatment prioritization) and the University of Massachusetts, Amherst via the Pacific Northwest Research Station for Historic Range of Variability (HRV) modelling.

Because of the energy and need for immediate action surrounding the CFLRP geography, we have also been designated a Priority Landscape and we have received \$25M in Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) funding in FYs 22-24. Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) is now also likely to provide funding on the CFLRP landscape beginning in FY23.

So far there have been many successes as we seek to restore the CFLRP landscape to a resilient state before it either burns catastrophically or is overcome by insect and disease. There are, however, challenges to be overcome:

- The CFLRP landscape is very expensive to treat. Terrain is extremely steep and requires very expensive aerial logging systems resulting in treatment costs frequently netting over \$10,000 an acre even after the value of saw logs is factored in.
- Specialized logging systems are in short supply and are booked multiple years in advance and not immediately available for any amount of investment. (It is possible that international companies may have greater capacity but are currently not available to us).
- Excess funding in existing agreements cannot be used for match in other agreements and funds from future allocations are not allowed to be comingled with funds from existing agreements. This puts an undue burden on our implementer partners to find match even though they are overall in excess as well increases the workload for FS understaffed Grants and Agreements personnel. Should we receive IRA funds, this could mean that each implementation partner and the USFS will have to have and monitor three separate agreements per project area.
- There are intrinsic bottlenecks to pace and scale in the USFS support system outside the control of the CFLRP Forests' ability to control. They include:
  - Inability to hire nimbly—HR is understaffed
  - Inability to complete multiple and/or complex contracts and agreements. Both contracting and grants and agreements are understaffed. Additionally, prioritizing CFLRP over other work comes at the expense of other necessary Forest projects.
  - Inability to complete cadastral—much of the project area has out-of-date or incomplete survey and there are no FS surveyors in Region 5.
- The CFLRP has large excess biomass, but limited ways to utilize/dispose of it:
  - The value of raw wood products is low

- Biomass facilities are distant and transport costs are significant
  - The local planned biomass facility, Camptonville Community Partnership, had to reduce the size of their proposed facility from 5MW to 3MW due to rapidly rising costs.
  - Local mill capacity is limited and busy with salvage logging from recent fires.
  - Raw wood products are not allowed to be exported per the Forest Resources Conservation and Shortage Relief Act of 1990 which prohibits sale of raw logs for export
- Inflation has been in a major issue in FY22 forcing our partners to seek additional funding or reducing the scope of treatment
  - There are only a limited number of contractors and many interested parties including state and local government as well as private industry such as utility companies competing for them.

#### **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 North Yuba CFLRP is new for FY22 and much of the work surrounding it has been two-pronged: Increasing the capacity for future work through work with our partners and continuing to implement and support already planned work on the ground.

The North Yuba Watershed has been a community, partner, and Tahoe NF priority since it is clearly identified as being at high risk of wildfire, is significantly departed from its historic range of variability, has numerous communities and inholdings at risk, is an exceptionally productive watershed for both flora and fauna, and is a water resource feeding New Bullards Bar Reservoir, one of the largest impoundments in California.

Starting in 2018, the Tahoe NF began significantly increasing the pace and scale of treatment in the watershed although not at the rate needed to ensure forest health and resiliency, community safety, or reliable water to downstream users. With the North Yuba Forest Partnership, vested NGOs and political entities we have been able to leverage our collective expertise, influence, and drive to bring additional funding and science to bear on the landscape. The result is two major completed NEPA documents, Yuba Project EA, 15,000 acres, 2018 and Trapper Project EA, 30,000 acres, 2021, with a third, North Yuba Forest Resilience Project, 273,000 acres, well underway (the DEIS was published November 18, 2022). Additionally, older NEPA has been revisited as part of our priority allowing immediate work to happen throughout the CFLRP footprint allowing work to happen in Bullards, Pendola, Red Ant, Sierra City Fuel Break, Plum, and Golden Stewardship. We have set up agreements and our partners have let contracts for understory thinning in Trapper (Streamflow enhancement), and the Graveyard Agreement with National Forest Foundation for biomass and timber was signed in FY22 (2157 acres, 27MMBF). While we work on the massive CFLRP-driven North Yuba Forest Resilience Project EIS, we are simultaneously working with Sierra County and others on the smaller Greene Acres project as well as Trapper and older NEPA to ensure a continuous stream of activity if the DEIS becomes delayed.



There was no wildfire within the CFLRP and no wildfire interacted with a previously treated area within the CFLRP boundary.

**FY22 Wildfire/Hazardous Fuels Expenditures**

Category	Expenditures
FY22 Wildfire Preparedness*	\$77,000
FY22 Wildfire Suppression**	\$0
FY22 Hazardous Fuels Treatment Costs (CFLN, CFIX)	\$0
FY22 Hazardous Fuels Treatment Costs (other BLIs) (WFHF)	\$36,785

\* 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?** If you have seen a reduction in fire suppression costs over time, please include that here. N/A.

Treatments applied in FY22 will improve the survivability of treated areas, whenever possible, anchor with prior treatments, and provide a basis for intervention in the event of wildfire. Fire suppression costs for this project area are not relevant for this year.

**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.**

The most significant activity for this new-in-FY22 CFLRP has been establishing the foundation for success. We have established Programmatic Agreements and/or Supplemental Program Agreements with National Forest Foundation, South Yuba River Citizens League, The Nature Conservancy, Sierra County, and Mooretown Rancheria to enable work on the ground without having to burden G&A and Contracting so heavily. Additionally, our partners, knowing that there is a reliable cash flow and government commitment are increasing their staffing to become more capable implementers on Forest Service Lands. Additionally, our collaborative partners are also building capacity to assist with planning and monitoring (being mindful of Federal Advisory Committee Act law and regulation).

Simultaneously our partners are already implementing within the CFLRP footprint such as meadow and aspen restoration in Yuba Project by NFF, meadow restoration in Yuba Project by SYRCL, hardwood culturing, piling and burning in Pendola project by NFF, aspen restoration by Sierra County in Yuba Project, invasives weed abatement by NFF in Bullards and Pendola Projects, understory burn prep by TNC in Red Ant Project and NFF in Yuba Project, and hazard tree abatement in campgrounds by NFF along the Highway 49 corridor.

Prioritization of project areas with the CFLRP is very important to maximize immediate benefits to communities, the watershed and to the forest. To do this we collaborated with our partners to establish Strategic Assets and Risk Assessment (SARAs) criteria and then using a 10-point weighted value system, analyzed those objectively to determine a



from USFS and partners. Local fire safe councils had been created (prior to CFLRP), but have increased local visibility due to CFLRP activity and energy.

**Results from the Treatment for Restoration Economic Analysis Toolkit (TREAT).** For guidance, training, and resources, see materials on [Restoration Economics SharePoint](#).<sup>7</sup> 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: 87 %

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

Description	Project Percent
Equipment intensive work	50
Labor-intensive work	30
Material-intensive work	5
Technical services	15
Professional services	0
Contracted Monitoring	0
<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Modelled 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	0	0	0	0
Forest and watershed restoration component	18	37	1,137,450	2,132,112
Mill processing component	0	0	0	0
Implementation and monitoring	0	0	0	0
Other Project Activities	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>1,137,450</b>	<b>2,132,112</b>

**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?**

**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.**<sup>8</sup>

Because our CFLRP is new this FY, no new local CFLRP benefits are noted. Future work is expected to generate additional jobs with National Forest Foundation, Sierra County, Camptonville Community Partnership, South Yuba

<sup>7</sup> Addresses [Core Monitoring Question #7](#)

<sup>8</sup> Addresses [Core Monitoring Question #8](#)

Citizens League, and Mooretown Rancheria. We hope that with this long-term commitment to the landscape, that more local contractors will become available.

## 7. Wood Products Utilization

### Timber & Biomass Volume Table<sup>9</sup>

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF	0
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	49,670.4
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)?

Volume of Timber Harvested is from Golden Stewardship for 2.9MMBF, 5500 CCF on 71.29 acres. Volume of timber sold is through a Supplemental Program Agreement with NFF on the Trapper Project’s Graveyard timber sale for 27MMBF, 49,000 CCF on 2157 acres. They have not yet awarded a contract although solicited an RFP. The Green tons are by NFF from Yuba Project meadow and aspen restoration.

## 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).<sup>10</sup>**

There are no changes to the CFLRP MOU partnership (8 plus the Forest Service with 2 formal Supporters). Although there have been some personnel changes, each organization remains committed to the original Memorandum of Understanding, the North Yuba Forest Partnership. Support, engagement, and collaboration remain solid, cooperative, and unchanged.

Partners include:

- Blue Forest Conservation (BFC)
- Camptonville Community Partnership, CCP
- National Forest Foundation, NFF
- Nevada City Rancheria, Maidu
- Sierra County
- South Yuba River Citizens League, SYRCL
- Tahoe National Forest, TNF
- The Nature Conservancy, TNC
- Yuba Water Agency, YWA
- MOU Supporters include:
- Sierra Nevada Conservancy (SNC)
- Sierra Pacific Industries (SPI)

<sup>9</sup> Addresses [Core Monitoring Question #10](#)



North Yuba Forest Partners at Saddleback Lookout at the center of the North Yuba watershed. Photo credit SYRCL.

## 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.**

As a new-in-FY22 project, this CFLRP does not require monitoring reporting. However, in anticipation of FY23 requirements, the USFS and our collaborative partners have established an active monitoring committee and are working with our partners to establish roles and responsibilities as well as developing baseline data and consistent protocols for outyear monitoring based on the 13 questions which will be part of future reports. Monitoring will also be important to other interested NGOs to determine their level of support and involvement and the partnership is striving to complete transparency of data.

## 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?

The North Yuba Forest Partnership CFLRP is part of a synergistic process in the North Yuba River watershed and an example of a successful partnership because our partners are vested in the landscape. The partnership was launched significant planning and implementing work within the CFLRP boundary in 2018 that included \$13M in fundraising outside the Forest Service. Along with CFLRP approval, the North Yuba Landscape was selected as a Wildfire Crisis Strategy priority landscape for \$6.8M in Bipartisan Infrastructure Law funds which were received in late FY22. Due to the late authorization for use of funding, most of the CFLRP funding and all of the BIL funding were obligated into partnership agreements near the end of the fiscal year.

Following the FY22 expenditure of CFLRP and BIL funding, a request for \$220M was submitted to accomplish additional necessary work on the ground to preserve the watershed, its human, animal and plant communities and the water, flood control and recreation opportunities. These funds were to be used over the next 5 years and allow the forest to

both stabilize and expand on capacity, including staffing, office space, housing, and technology. This funding was to allow the forest and partners to increase pace at the scale of operations being planned. Much of the funding was to treat very difficult terrain that has a high cost/acre. On December 12, we were notified that we would receive \$153M in BIL and Inflation Reduction Act funding and it all would need to be obligated in one fiscal year rather than over five years. Thus, the short turnaround would not allow for increasing capacity, but rather utilizing the existing capacity. Though less than requested and for less time, this funding would not have been allocated had the USFS and our partners not done the initial work and follow through to receive CFLRP. This also means that CFLRP staff will be very busy setting up a business model for success with this additional, needed funding and that annual reporting for FY23 will be complex due to multiple fund sources (appropriated, CFLRP, BIL & IRA) being used on the same project areas.

## **Optional Prompts**

### **FY 2022 Additional Accomplishment Narrative and/or Lessons Learned Highlights**

A shortcoming to highlight in this annual report is database reporting. Due to vacancies and limited trainings available for new people, TNF is limited on its ability to input data into FACTS, WIT, and NRM for timely reporting. Because of this we have treatments for which we are not able to receive credit for in this year’s annual report. Treatments which did not make it into the Agency’s database of record, gPAS include:

Core Restoration Treatments	Agency Performance Measure	Acres
Hazardous Fuels Reduction (acres) in the Wildland Urban Interface	FP-FUELS-NON-WUI (reported in FACTS)	673.5
Hazardous Fuels Reduction (acres) in the Wildland Urban Interface – COMPLETED	FP-FUELS-NON-WUI-CMPLT (reported in FACTS)	673.5
Wildfire Risk Mitigation Outcomes – Acres treated to mitigate wildfire risk	FP-FUELS-ALL-MIT-NFS (reported in FACTS)	1119
Invasive Species Treatments (acres) – Noxious weeds and invasive plants	INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC (reported in FACTS)	29.23
Invasive Species Treatments (acres) – Noxious weeds and invasive plants – COMPLETED	INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC-CMPLT (reported in FACTS)	29.23
Invasive Species Treatments (acres) – Terrestrial and aquatic species.	INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC (reported in FACTS) (reported in FACTS)	29.3
Invasive Species Treatments (acres) – Terrestrial and aquatic species – COMPLETED	INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC-CMPLT (reported in FACTS)	29.23
Road Maintenance (Passenger Car System) (miles)	D-PC-MAINT-MI (Roads reporting)	31.12
Trail Improvement (miles)	TL-IMP-STD (Trails reporting)	2
Trail Maintenance (miles)	TL-MAINT-STD (Trails reporting)	60
Wildlife Habitat Restoration (acres)	HBT-ENH-TERR (reported in WIT)	195.49
Water or Soil Resources Protected, Maintained, or Improved (acres)	S&W-RSRC-IMP (reported in WIT)	71.29



Core Restoration Treatments	Agency Performance Measure	Acres
Forests treated using timber sales (acres)	TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC (reported in FACTS)	119.46
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	Unit of measure is CCF	550
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Unit of measure is green tons	9780

**Media Recap**

Tahoe National Forest seeks public input on North Yuba Landscape Resilience Project draft environmental impact statement, [Tahoe National Forest - News & Events \(usda.gov\)](https://www.usda.gov/press-releases/2022/05/12/220512tahoeforest)

**Visuals**

Cable Yarding Summer 2022 on Yuba River Ranger District (Golden Stewardship) within CFLRP



**Signatures**

- Recommended by (Project Coordinator(s)): /s/ Lon Henderson
- Approved by (Forest Supervisor(s)): /s/ Matt Jedra
- Draft reviewed by (collaborative representative): /s/ Angel Hertslet [angel.hertslet@tnc.org](mailto:angel.hertslet@tnc.org)