CFLRP Project Name (CFLR#): Southern Blues Restoration Coalition
National Forest(s): Malheur National Forest

1. Executive Summary

Briefly summarize the top ecological, social, and economic accomplishments your CFLRP project participants are most proud of from FY22 and any key monitoring results. This is a space for key take-home points (< 200 words).

The Southern Blues Restoration Coalition through our CFLRP project continues to have profound impacts for our local communities in Grant and Harney Counties. In FY22 we had 26 separate projects that did work on fuels reduction, stream enhancement, riparian planting, road decommissioning and invasives control. Commercial and pre commercial thinning of fuels and riparian restoration work continue to be our main areas of focus.

Our monitoring efforts continue to show that our fuels reduction efforts greatly reduce the risk of large stand replacement wildfire. While we had no large fires in treated areas in FY22, the monitoring results from the Black Butte Fire (FY21) show that our fuels treatment accomplished in the CFLR project greatly reduce stand mortality in larger fires.

Utilizing local contractors, the work we did in FY22 created 163 direct and 119 indirect jobs resulting in over $17,450,000 in labor income to the local economy. With 2021 population estimates of only 14,847 people living in Grant and Harney Counties the jobs and income created by our CFLRP project are extremely impactful to the local economy.

2. Funding

CFLRP and Forest Service Match Expenditures

Fund Source: CFLN and/or CFIX Funds Expended	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2022
CFLN15	$5,008.00
CFLN20	$279,372.54
CFLN21	$618,585.21
CFLN22	$2,000,198.19
TOTAL	**$2,903,163.94**

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	$521,840.90
TOTAL	**$521,840.90**

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
CFHF	$539,204.00
TOTAL	**$539,204.00**

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[1]

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
Blue Mountain Forest Partners (BMFP)	In-kind contribution	$179,733	The BMFP Collaborative supports the SBRC by taking the lead on Multi- Party monitoring and working to develop Zones of Agreement across a diverse group of collaborative members. Their work focuses on the north half of the Malheur NF.	National Forest System Lands
Harney County Restoration Collaborative (HCRC	In-kind contribution	$62,000	The HCRC supports the SBRC by helping with Multi-Party monitoring and working to develop Common Operating Principles across a diverse group of collaborative members. Their work focuses on the south half of the Malheur NF.	National Forest System Lands
Oregon State University (OSU)	In-kind contribution	$39,167	OSU associate time performing monitoring through our Forest Vegetation and Fuels Monitoring Agreement with OSU	National Forest System Lands
North Fork John Day Watershed Council	In-kind contribution and Funding	$27,502 $239,724	Camp Creek riparian and aquatic restoration including hardwood planting, large wood placement and reconnecting floodplain.	National Forest System Lands
Oregon Natural Desert Association (ONDA) working with Northwest Youth Corps Tribal Stewards Program	In-kind contribution	$5,658	ONDA volunteers did 208 hours, planting riparian hardwood on Beaver and Ruby Creeks during the summer of 2022	National Forest System Lands
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODF&W)	In-kind contribution	$13,400	ODF&W worked cooperatively with Forest Service personnel and private contractors reestablishing existing road closures in the Dove and Silvies project areas.	National Forest System Lands
Training and Employment Consortium (TEC)	In-kind contribution	$3,400	Youth crew implemented road closures and Aspen Restoration projects	National Forest System Lands
TOTALS	Total In-Kind Contributions: $330,860 Total Funding: $239,724			

[1] Addresses Core Monitoring Question #13

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: $1,012,626.55

Revenue generated through Good Neighbor Agreements: $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[2] - 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]	21611	0	21611
Hazardous Fuels Reduction (acres) in the Wildland Urban Interface - COMPLETED	FP-FUELS-WUI-CMPLT (reported in FACTS)[4]	25934	0	25934
Hazardous Fuels Reduction (acres) outside the Wildland Urban Interface	FP-FUELS-NON-WUI (reported in FACTS) [3]	20132	0	20132
Hazardous Fuels Reduction (acres) outside the Wildland Urban Interface - COMPLETED	FP-FUELS-NON-WUI-CMPLT (reported in FACTS) [4]	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)	41744	0	41744
Invasive Species Treatments (acres) - Noxious weeds and invasive plants	INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC (reported in FACTS)[3]	940	0	940
Invasive Species Treatments (acres) - Noxious weeds and invasive plants - COMPLETED	INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC-CMPLT (reported in FACTS)[4]	0	0	0

[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
Invasive Species Treatments (acres) - Terrestrial and aquatic species	INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC (reported in FACTS)[3]	940	0	940
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)	17654	0	17654
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)	21	0	21
Lake Habitat Enhanced (acres)	HBT-ENH-LAK (reported in WIT)	2	0	2
Water or Soil Resources Protected, Maintained, or Improved (acres)	S&W-RSRC-IMP (reported in WIT)	2886	0	2886
Stand Improvement (acres)	FOR-VEG-IMP (reported in FACTS)	1734	0	1734
Reforestation and revegetation (acres)	FOR-VEG-EST (reported in FACTS)	33	0	33
Forests treated using timber sales (acres)	TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC (reported in FACTS)	4438	0	4438
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? Reflecting on treatments implemented in FY22, if/how has your CFLRP project aligned with other efforts to accomplish work at landscape scales?

[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

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?

FY21 Activity Description (Agency performance measures)	Acres
Number of acres treated by prescribed fire	6,923 of landscape under burning
Number of acres treated by mechanical thinning	6,101
Number of acres of natural ignitions that are allowed to burn under strategies that result in desired conditions	6,239 (Rx accomplished as a result of Black Butte Fire in FY 2022)
Number of acres mitigated to reduce fire risk	15,878

Please provide a narrative overview of treatments completed in FY22, including data on whether your project has expanded the pace and/or scale of treatments over time, and if so, how you've accomplished that – what were the key enabling factors?

We continued the focus on fire resiliency projects such as thinning, mastication and large landscape under burning. Early in the planning stages of the SBRC project, we used analysis from The Nature Conservancy and local assessments to prioritize treatments. Our two local Counties, with the help from the Malheur NF and Oregon Department of Forestry, established Community Wildfire Protection Plans to identify priority areas for treatment within the urban interface. The Forest Fire Management staff developed a fuel treatment priority map that highlights areas where treatments will be most effective to help manage fire on the landscape by using treatments along roads, ridges, and existing large fire footprints. All the above-mentioned projects have helped focus treatments that will be most effective.

Treatments ranged from mechanical treatments such as commercial harvest, small diameter tree thinning, mastication, slash piling, burning piles, and biomass removal, to landscape under burning. To increase the scale of under burning needed to meet our restoration goals, we plan to increase our utilization of contractors to help complete our backlog of prescribed fire. We've utilized contract engines and hand crews to assist our agency resources with landscape burning and pile burning. We've also utilized an agreement with the State of Oregon to provide engines, hand crew modules, dozers, and aviation to increase the capacity of our agency resources to implement landscape and pile burning across the CFLR.

FY22 Wildfire/Hazardous Fuels Expenditures

Category	Expenditures
FY22 Wildfire Preparedness*	$6,305,864
FY22 Wildfire Suppression**	$29,122,487
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? If you have seen a reduction in fire suppression costs over time, please include that here. (If not relevant for this year, note "N/A"). It is difficult to identify the dollar value of fuels treatments in reducing fire costs, especially against the increases in fire danger each year due to

continued hotter, dryer and longer fire seasons. Antidotally, we feel that the Crockets Knob fire had the potential to spread more to the east (where no treatments had been proposed nor completed) and cost much more had fuels treatment work on the western flank had not been completed ahead of the fire and help us contain the fire where we did. Additionally, the few completed treatments, located in strategic areas along the western road system, allowed fire crews to focus suppression efforts and to be more successful more easily contain the fire, reducing exposure to fire crews and decreasing the need for resources necessary to manage fire containment. Additional Ecological Goals

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.

Big Creek floodplain wood placement and exclosures

Big Creek is an important cold-water tributary to the Middle Fork of the John Day River containing threatened Mid-Columbia steelhead and bull trout critical habitat. A previous project in 2018 restored floodplain connection within a large mining reclamation area within the alluvial valley and placed some large wood. Still, portions of Big Creek's floodplain and side channel network lacked riparian vegetation and sufficient large wood. Riparian vegetation is important for streambank shading to maintain cool water temperatures and the roots provide bank stability. Large wood is important for sediment catchment, which is important for creating fish habitat and storing spawning gravel. This project placed trees within the floodplain and side-channels to support the increased waterflow being observed through the area and improve fish habitat. Two buck and pole exclosure fences totaling 12.7 acres were constructed around sections of the restored floodplain to reduce browse during plant recovery and future planting.

Excavator placing large wood on the floodplain

Buck and pole exclosure on Big Creek

Camp Creek Exclosures and Riparian Planting

On Camp Creek, three exclosures totaling 20.5 acres were built within previous restoration areas to aid in plant recovery and reduce browse on new plantings. Restoration projects in these areas improved floodplain reconnection and water retention through beaver dam analogs, wood jams, and berm removals. Exclosure locations were identified by areas with measured high levels of solar radiation into the stream and maximum daily water temperatures which sometimes exceed lethal levels for steelhead. These exclosures will protect twelve thousand riparian shrubs that were planted with

funding from the National Reforestation Partners to increase shade and therefore reduce solar input directly into Camp Creek. With temporary protection from browse, it is expected that riparian vegetation will recover quickly and aid in seed dispersal in the area.

Planting within completed exclosure 2022

Willows three years post planting from 2019 project

Deep Creek Restoration

This project removed a high priority fish barrier, obliterated 1.5 miles of decommissioned road, and added large woody debris, improving stream habitat, alluvial fans, and side channel habitat. The high priority fish barrier that was removed reopened 3.2 miles of Threatened Mid-Columbia River Steelhead habitat. This project completed the last essential action for the Bear Creek sub-watershed restoration action plan.

Beaver and Ruby Creek Riparian Restoration

This project enhanced 1.7 miles of stream habitat complexity within Mid-Columbia River Steelhead critical habitat. Large woody debris was added to the stream and floodplain, 49 log weirs that were seasonal juvenile fish barriers were removed. A combination of 3,000 willows and cottonwoods were planted to enhance riparian habitat.

Road Treatment Project for Emigrant Creek RD- CFLR

Road treatments entailed reclosing existing barriers in four project areas. An excavator was rented and operated with four operators including ODF&W personnel, local service contractor, and forest service personnel. Approximately 45miles of road was treated placing debris, constructing earth berms, rocks, and boulders to make the existing closures more effective. One gate was installed, and five gates purchased to be installed in 2023. Partners for this project include ODF&W and OYCC. In addition to improving closure barriers drainage structures were placed in some of the roadbeds to make water flow down the original channel instead of the road. This reduces erosion, improves stream channel function, and makes the road easier to repair in the future for timber extraction, fire suppression, or other resource needs. Photos 1-3 illustrate road damage and repair.

Figure 1 Note the erosion down the existing road

Figure 2 Excavator starting to re-direct water flow

Figure 3 Cleaning culvert and berming road

Harney County Invasive Plant Prevention and Treatment

The Harney County Weed Control crew treated priority weed species within approximately 1100 acres under the current participating agreement with Harney County. Some treatments were focused on areas of known weed infestation, and others in areas with no known sites but new disturbance from forest management. Many sites were located near landing piles and skid trails from commercial and pre-commercial prescriptions. These weed treatments are one of the main steps to restore the resilience of the understory and forest ecosystem after disturbance. The CWMA surveyed four major trails on ECRD as well as five of the most-visited campgrounds on the district to identify any weed infestations and provide information for recreationists, under the current participating agreement with the Harney CWMA/SWCD.

6. Socioeconomic Goals

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

Nearly 100% of contracts awarded for restoration work went to local contractors and a high percentage of the wood products were processed at local mills. The local mill, Malheur Lumbar, has been able to stay in business over the past 10 years, due in large, to our long term 10-year stewardship contract, which requires the prime contractor to offer the commercial volume locally first. With the support of CFLR funds to help with the removal of small diameter wood products, the prime contractor has also been able to invest in a post and pole mill. With the success of our Southern Blues Restoration Coalition CFLR project, Malheur Lumber has been able to maintain a work force of over 70 individuals. The prime contractor has been able to expand their operations both in equipment and personnel. In 2012, prior to CFLR and the stewardship contract, this company could only support 20-30 employees, now with this support over 100 employees are employed here. See the article "Riding the Cutting Edge" from Timber West magazine TimberWest Magazine - September/October 2017 - Iron Triangle Logging, John Day, Oregon (forestnet.com) .

The contracts for thinning, slash treatments, riparian restoration, invasive weed management and other restoration activities are also primarily awarded to companies that can show a strong benefit to the local communities and economies. All companies in our pool of contractors appreciate the steady, consistent opportunities for work that comes with the CFLR funding. Prior to CFLR, funding for restoration work was constantly fluctuating from year to year. With that uncertainty it was difficult for our local contractors to commit to expanding their operations in equipment, infrastructure or employees.

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: 73%

Contract Funding Distributions Table ("Full Project Details" Tab):

Description	Project Percent
Equipment intensive work	22%
Labor-intensive work	17%
Material-intensive work	61%
Technical services	0%
Professional services	0%
Contracted Monitoring	0%
TOTALS:	**100%**

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	59	84	5,419,738	6,642,889
Forest and watershed restoration component	14	36	775,673	1,572,823
Mill processing component	89	170	5,900,617	9,484,904
Implementation and monitoring	81	83	708,289	796,909

Jobs Supported/Maintained in FY 2022	Direct Jobs (Full & Part-Time)	Total Jobs (Full & Part-Time)	Direct Labor Income	Total Labor Income
Other Project Activities	0	0	0	0
TOTALS:	**244**	**373**	**12,804,317**	**18,497,525**

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?

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

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.

Work continued on the task orders awarded in previous years under the Malheur 10 Year Stewardship contract. That uses all local contractors for the work. The socioeconomic benefits resulting from CFLR projects and the use of the local 10-year Stewardship Contract have been substantial. Grant County enjoyed most of these benefits due to the fact Iron Triangle LLC, which holds the 10-year Stewardship Contract, is headquartered there, as is Malheur Lumber Company and most of the Malheur National Forest offices. The re-investment of these funds into local milling infrastructure and local community projects has a multiplying effect on the impact of the CFLR funds.

Local wood processing companies have invested heavily in upgrades and new infrastructure to utilize small diameter wood, adding jobs to the community. These companies have been using the leverage of CFLR funds along with the expectation of continued contracting with a focus on local benefit to help secure investments into their businesses. We continue to place an emphasis on benefit to the local communities with the expectation that the primary contractors hire employees locally when their projects are funded with CFLR.

7. Wood Products Utilization

Timber & Biomass Volume Table[8]

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF	53,969
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	21602
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons	7155

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)?

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).[9] 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 list of collaborators has not changed.

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.

With recent changes for the CFLRP common monitoring strategy the multiparty monitoring process will be two-fold moving forward. The Southern Blues CFLRP will assist the region in providing data and feedback on the strategies to answer the 13 core monitoring questions, as well as continue the established Multi-Party Monitoring Program. This program was developed by a multi-disciplinary committee and currently consists of ten monitoring subgroups that correspond to their respective monitoring projects.

Monitoring Projects/Subgroups, Principle Investigators, and Monitoring Partners

Forest Vegetation, Structure, Fuels, and Patterning

Monitoring Project	Principle Investigator (first listed) and Partners *
Forest Vegetation and Fuels (ongoing)	Oregon State University MNF Silviculture & Fuels Programs (FS) Blue Mountain Forest Partners
Landscape Pattern Analysis (completed)	Remote Sensing Application Center (FS-WO) Blue Mountains Area Ecology Program (FS) Blue Mountains Forest Health Program (FS) MNF Silviculture Program (FS)
Spatial Patterning – stand-level (completed)	University of Washington Blue Mountains Area Ecology Program (FS)
Aspen (ongoing)	MNF Botany, Wildlife, & Silviculture Programs (FS) Oregon State University, College of Forestry Blue Mountains Area Ecology Program (FS)

Wildlife & Fish

Monitoring Project	Principle Investigator (first listed) and Partners *
White-headed Woodpecker (completed)	Rocky Mountain Research Station (FS-R&D) MNF Wildlife Program (FS)
Riparian & Aquatic Restoration (ongoing)	Blue Mountains Area Ecology Program (FS) MNF Botany Program (FS)

Invasive Species

Monitoring Project	Principle Investigator (first listed) and Partners *
Invasive Species Control (ongoing)	MNF Botany & Invasive Species Programs (FS) Grant Soil and Water Conservation District Harney County Weed Control

Monitoring Project	Principle Investigator (first listed) and Partners *
Native Plant Seeding (ongoing)	MNF Botany & Invasive Species Programs (FS)

Social & Economic

Monitoring Project	Principle Investigator (first listed) and Partners *
Collaborative Effectiveness	Blue Mountain Forest Partners Harney County Restoration Collaborative
Socio-economic	University of Oregon, Ecosystem Workforce Program Blue Mountain Forest Partners

* MNF = Malheur National Forest, FS = Forest Service Unit, WO = Detached Washington Office Unit, R&D = Research Unit

Most of the ongoing monitoring projects are in their eighth year of implementation and were developed to be statistically rigorous and to conclusively inform future management decisions in the project area and in similar ecological habitats across the eco-region. The FVF, invasive species, and WHWO programs have had a significant field data collection component. For some of these projects, both pre-treatment and post-treatment data have been successfully collected and meaningful preliminary data analysis and management recommendations have begun. The primary mechanisms by which monitoring findings have been or will be communicated to managers and incorporated into an adaptive management framework are summarized below.

SBRC Multiparty Monitoring Metrics and Delivery Status

Product	Delivery status
Regular informal communication between monitoring principal investigators, MNF interdisciplinary team members, MNF leadership, and membership of the BMFP and HCRC.	Ongoing
Annual monitoring progress reports for MNF and BMFP	Ongoing
Regular presentations to full collaborative group meetings (BMFP and HRCR).	Over 29 completed to date; 4 completed in 2022.
Presentations to conferences, professional societies (e.g., Central Oregon Society of American Foresters), university seminars	Over 30 completed to date; 5 completed in 2022
Monitoring symposia: Full day meeting for monitoring PIs, managers, collaborative and other stakeholder groups, scientists, and the general public.	2016 and 2019 symposia; plans, manuals, and presentations online: http://www.bluemountainsforestpartners.org/work/multiparty-monitoring/ The 3rd symposium is tentatively planned for spring 2023
Spatial Patterning: *Historical Forest Structure, Composition, and Spatial Pattern in Dry Conifer Forests of the Western Blue Mountains, Oregon*	Published general technical report in November 2017: https://www.fs.fed.us/pnw/pubs/pnw_gtr956.pdf

Product	Delivery status
Landscape Pattern Analysis Tool	The tool was developed to meet the needs of the Southern Blues CFLRP; however, the workflow is generalizable across landscapes and can be implemented in any region of the country with the right reference data. Webinars and presentations have occurred in 2017 & 2018:http://fsweb.geotraining.fs.fed.us/www/index.php?lessons_ID=3918 Final version of tool officially released in 2018: https://southern-blues-dev.appspot.com/
Preliminary and final reports and publications	Will be released as data collection is completed or sufficient to make inferences or meaningful management recommendations. As a result of the FVF monitoring by OSU, there is currently one manuscript in press and nine published manuscripts (one of which was published in 2022) in the following scientific journals: *PLOS ONE, Journal of Forestry, Forests, Ecosphere*, *Frontiers in Forests and Global Change*, *Journal for Nature Conservation*, and *Forest Ecology and Management*.

10. Conclusion

The Malheur National Forest is continuing to have a robust program of work within the boundary of the SBRC project area. We have had great successes in fuels reduction and habitat restoration. Fiscal year 2022, however, saw a temporary slowdown in under burning due to the moratorium on burning in the spring season. We returned to under burning this fall and are very well set up for the spring of fiscal 2023.

Our habitat work accomplished riparian repair and planting, spring enhancement, road decommissioning, pre commercial and commercial thinning. We had a wide variety of local contractors perform work this year within our CFLR project area which in turn continues to have a positive economic impact on our local community.

The work we accomplished in fiscal 2022 and are planning for fiscal 2023 has and will continue to be directly aligned with our CFLR project proposal.

For Internal Use

Signatures

Recommended by (Project Coordinator(s)): "/s/Scott Officer"
Approved by (Forest Supervisor(s)): "/s/Craig Trulock"
Draft reviewed by (collaborative representative): "/s/Mark Webb"