

CFLR Project(Name/Number): ___ Tapash CFLRP _____

National Forest(s): _ Okanogan Wenatchee _____

Responses to the prompts on this annual report should be typed directly into this template, including narratives and tables:

1. Match and Leverage funds:

a. FY13 Matching Funds Documentation

Fund Source – (CFLR Funds Expended ¹)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2013(\$)
	1,454,042.

Fund Source – (Carryover funds expended (Carryover to in addition to CFLR/CFLN) ² (please include a new row for each BLI))	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2013(\$)
NFTM	0.
WFHF	0.
NFVW	0.

*We also received \$274,849. in R6 FY12 Carryover funds: NFTM (132,959.), NFVW (40,692.), and WFHF (101,198.). When combining FY12 balances, minus expenditures, with FY13 balance; the total carryover balance by BLI is:

NFTM The balance is \$421,214. As there have been total expenditures of \$48,714.

WFHF The balance is \$128,756. As there have been total expenditures of \$13,821.

NFVW The balance is \$182,620. There were no authorized expenditures.

NFWF The balance is \$101,198. There were no authorized expenditures

These funds total a carryover balance of \$833,788. This includes carryover from FY12 and FY13 for “other” funds.

The funds are needed to transition from the initial Tapash project proposal (2010) to the revised proposal (2014) for unobligated commitments previously made with Tapash partners relative to project implementation and to support the MOU that is currently being developed between the FS and the Yakama Nation, as recommended at our WO R6 Site Visit in July-August, 2013 and included in the revised proposal currently in the RO.

Fund Source – (FS Matching Funds (please include a new row for each BLI) ³)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2013(\$)
CWFS	4,695.
NFVW	16,695.
NFWF	1,924.
NFXN	6,169.
RTRT	6,571.
SRS2	153,979.
SSSS	<u>14,225.</u>
	204,258.

¹ This amount should match the amount of CFLR/CFLN dollars obligated in the PAS report titled CFLR Job Code Listing and Expenditure Report – Detailed Analysis by Fiscal Year.

² This value should reflect the amount of carryover funds allocated to a project as indicated in the program direction, but does not necessarily need to be in the same BLIs as indicated in the program direction. These funds should total the matching funds obligated in the PAS report.

³ This amount should match the amount of matching funds obligated in the PAS report.

Fund Source – (Funds contributed through agreements ⁴)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2013(\$)
MOU with The Nature Conservancy, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Washington Department of Natural Resources, Yakama Nation, and Forest Service	15,000.

Fund Source – (Partner In-Kind Contributions ⁵)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2013(\$)
	0

Fund Source – (Service work accomplishment through goods-for-services funding within a stewardship contract ⁶)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2013(\$)
	0

b. Please provide a narrative or table describing leveraged funds in your landscape in FY2012 (one page maximum)

There was a total of \$4,259,100. in leveraged funds and in-kind services invested into the Tapash landscape in FY13.

The Washington Department of Wildlife and The Nature Conservancy contributed significantly to this investment through their efforts in planning and implementation of restoration treatments on adjacent State administered lands within the landscape. These contributions included the costs associated with planning, ESA consultation, prescription preparation, layout, marking, and project implementation. The Department of Fish and Wildlife also contributed direct funding toward a Cost Agreement that provided for the Forest Service to complete the necessary NEPA to implement vegetation and aquatic restoration projects on WDFW administered lands.

Investments through active participation in meetings related to restoration project prioritization, program of work validation, and monitoring plan development represent a large proportion of the investment. As well, the participation by Task Force members, members of the wood products industry, and members of the environmental community in field reviews intended to identify potential issues and develop solutions were also significant. Our Tapash partners also contributed valuable time responding to various information gathering and reporting efforts associated with the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program.

Investments continue to be made by the Washington Department of Wildlife and The Nature Conservancy toward land acquisition within the Tapash landscape. Acquisition of at-risk lands continues to be a high priority for the Tapash Sustainable Forest Collaborative.

The Okanogan Wenatchee N.F. invested approximately \$378,300. into the planning of CFLRP restoration projects. These funds paid for the costs associated with completing the NEPA process, completing ESA consultation, prescription preparation, and project design.

⁴ Please document any partner contributions to implementation and monitoring of the CFLR project through an agreement (this should only include funds that weren't already captured through the PAS job code structure for CFLR matching funds). Please list the partner organizations involved in the agreement.

⁵ Total partner in-kind contributions for implementation and monitoring of a CFLR project. Please list the partner organizations that provided in-kind contributions. See "Annual Report instructions" for instructions on how to document in-kind contributions.

⁶ This should be the amount in the "stewardship credits charged" column at the end of the fiscal year in the TSA report TSA90R-01.

Approved by (Forest Supervisor): *Michael J. Ballion*

2. Discuss how the CLFR project contributes to accomplishment of the performance measures in the 10 year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan⁷, dated December 2006. Please comment on the cumulative contributions over the life of the project if appropriate. This may also include a description of the fire year (fire activity that occurred in the project area) as a backdrop to your response (please limit answer to one page).

Our project contributes to the performance measures identified in the 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy by implementing treatments designed to restore and maintain sustainable environmental, social, and economic benefits. High priority acres have been identified in watershed assessments, LSR and MLSA assessments, the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest Restoration Strategy, and Ecosystem Management Decision Support modeling. Collaboratively designed desired conditions for priority acres continue to be validated and further articulated through on-going engagement in the CWPP planning process and via regular communication between the Tapash Collaborative partners and project-specific collaborative teams. Early and frequent public involvement has resulted in public input and cooperation throughout the planning process. Tribal leaders, industry representatives, environmental groups, regulatory agencies, and the public at large have greatly increased their early participation in project identification and design, leading to a sense of ownership and trust.

We utilized CFLRP funds to implement projects that treat departed forest vegetation and hazardous fuels by using mechanical methods and prescribed fire to reduce the risk of high severity wildfire around communities and in the dry forest environment. These projects moved communities toward the identified desired conditions and maintained desirable conditions where they already exist. Refer to Item 6 for specific acres of accomplishment in WUI and non-WUI. In addition to the improvements made through the treatment of high priority vegetation and hazardous fuels, contributions that promote community assistance are being derived through the development of Memoranda of Understanding and the award of contracts, agreements, and permits. Working partnerships have been or are being formed with the local Clean Air Agency and Yakama Nation, which has greatly increased local acceptance of implementing prescribed fire.

The 10 year average of wildfires controlled at initial attack is 97%. Those wildfires that escaped initial attack were lightning caused, limited access areas or lower priority response during storm passage (meaning resources were allocated to protecting WUI). The number of human caused wildfires is 40% of the total. All of these fires were suppressed at initial attack. It will be difficult to realize savings on fire suppression costs without a fundamental shift in suppression policy. While restoration and hazardous fuels treatments are and have been successfully implemented on a number of landscapes, suppression strategy within these landscapes continues to be immediate full suppression with 100% mop-up, several days of patrol, and equipment refurbishing, repair and replacement. Encouragement by management to take full advantage of "P-code savings" discourages potential reductions in suppression costs intended by CFLR funded projects.

The Forest did spend more dollars suppressing the wildfires that escaped initial attack. In FY13, increased costs were associated with fires that either the Forest Service was responding to partner agencies requests to take aggressive action; or were located in inaccessible terrain with limited availability of adequate hand-crews (Type 1 and II IA crews).

Not all cooperating agencies share the Forest Service's vision of fire as a natural process in the ecosystem, where appropriate. Managers within these agencies strongly advise that Forest Service Line Officers and on-the-ground

⁷ The 10-year Comprehensive Strategy was developed in response to the Conference Report for the Fiscal Year 2001, Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act (Public Law 106-291).

Incident Commanders implement aggressive, often more expensive, suppression tactics on fires adjacent to their jurisdiction, even when viable containment/confinement options are available.

3. What assumptions were used in generating the numbers and/or percentages you plugged into the TREAT tool?

With the exception of personal use firewood, we did not speculate regarding where the timber was going; instead, lumping all of it under “Sawmills and Wood Preservation”. Logs may have gone to other facilities after being sorted at the mill, which could have an effect on the number of jobs produced, but our sales do not track this specific information.

FY 2013 Jobs Created/Maintained (FY13 CFLR/CFLN/ Carryover funding only):

Type of projects	Direct part and full-time jobs	Total part and full-time jobs	Direct Labor Income	Total Labor Income ⁸
Commercial Forest Product Activities	14.9	35.8	1,064,777.	2,360,248.
Other Project Activities	33.9	42.1	1,063,043.	1,352,001.
TOTALS:	48.8	77.9	2,127,820.	3,712,249.

FY 2013 Jobs Created/Maintained (FY13 CFLR/CFLN/ Carryover and matching funding):

Type of projects	Direct part and full-time jobs	Total part and full-time jobs	Direct Labor Income	Total Labor Income ⁹
Commercial Forest Product Activities	15	36.1	1,074,606.	2,380,843.
Other Project Activities	35.7	44.2	1,116,530.	1,416,638.
TOTALS:	50.7	80.3	2,191,137.	3,797,481.

4. Describe other community benefits achieved and the methods used to gather information about these benefits

(Please limit answer to two pages).

As described in more detail in Question # 5 below, the Tapash CFLRP multi-party monitoring working group is continuing to work on development of a site-specific monitoring plan. In our efforts to assess and monitor overall community benefit, the group has identified *social values* (recreational amenities, infra-structure, access, aesthetics, and air quality), *economics* (to supply existing and attract new forest product infrastructure that facilitates ecologically based restoration and creates sustainable local employment and community well-being), and *cultural resource values* (historic and prehistoric heritage resources (archeological properties)) defined as physical evidence of past human activity expressed as artifacts and or features on the modern landscape; and treaty rights (the right of access to usual and accustomed fishing stations and the privilege to hunt, gather and graze animals) as key monitoring categories. These categories are intended to give emphasis to the social/community-related aspects of the project. Specific monitoring questions have now been framed under each of these key categories. At this time, the group is working on identifying the methodologies that are most effective and efficient in capturing the desired information.

To date, much of the information gleaned on other community benefits is anecdotal in nature and derived from discussions at formal and informal meetings, field trips, and forums with individuals from local businesses and others who provide services within the local community and surrounding areas. For example, this summer members of the

⁸ Values obtained from Treatment for Restoration Economic Analysis Tool (TREAT) spreadsheet, “Impacts-Jobs and Income” tab. Spreadsheet and directions available at <http://www.fs.fed.us/restoration/CFLR/submittingproposals.shtml#tools>.

⁹ Values obtained from Treatment for Restoration Economic Analysis Tool (TREAT) spreadsheet, “Impacts-Jobs and Income” tab. Spreadsheet and directions available at <http://www.fs.fed.us/restoration/CFLR/submittingproposals.shtml#tools>.

Tapash CFLRP/Monitoring Task Group, the Terrestrial Restoration Task Group, and the Economically Sustainable Forest Products Utilization Task Force participated on a field trip with members of forest products industry to identify barriers and find solutions to challenges associated with the economic feasibility of restoration projects, stewardship contracting, and providing more opportunities for purchasers, operators, and local mills.

As a means toward building stronger community relationships between the Forest Service and the Yakama Nation given our common interests in resource stewardship and restoration of fire-prone ecosystems; we are actively engaging with our Tribal partners on the Anchor Forest Project. The Anchor Forest Project, sponsored by the Intertribal Timber Council with funding through the USDA Forest Service, is a multi-ownership, land based area which supports long-term wood and biomass production levels backed by local infrastructure and technical expertise and endorsed politically and publicly to produce desired land management objectives for working forests.

Another example of our efforts toward benefitting the local community is associated with our work around biomass. Although we have been successful in making biomass available, we have been unsuccessful in moving this small diameter, low-value material off of the landscape. As a means to identify solutions to this situation, we have initiated a Community Business Forum to engage directly with our local community members to utilize local resources for local benefit. We are exploring ideas such as fuels for schools, non-traditional forest product development, and innovative ways to accomplish forest restoration while maintaining local jobs and a sustainable economy. We have also been working with USDA Renewable Energy Business Advisor and USDA Rural Development Business Program Specialist to find solutions to this problem and have been made aware of the many existing opportunities. We are now in the process of identifying a meaningful project and developing partnerships.

Youth employment and training opportunities continue to be realized through employment of Washington Conservation Crews to implement a variety of projects including: thinning and hand-piling of fuels, invasive species treatment, sediment monitoring, and range restoration projects. Additionally, tangible benefits derived from the WCC program include providing mentoring and leadership skills to youth and young adults who are/will be entering the workforce. Benefits relative to education continue to come through collaboration with faculty and students at the University of Washington and Portland State University in the arena of prescription development, monitoring, socio-economics, and collaboration. Additionally, CFLRP funding provided the opportunity to hire force account crews from the local community and extend the work tours of current seasonal Forest Service employees (many local residents), providing skilled labor where needed and reducing Forest Service unemployment costs.

5. Describe the multiparty monitoring, evaluation, and accountability process (please limit answer to two pages)

The Tapash CFLRP monitoring working group continues their efforts toward development of a monitoring plan that identifies common goals and objectives, develops a process for identifying and prioritizing monitoring questions, identifies a learning method for addressing each question (where, when, and who), and constructs an outreach and communication framework outlining information transfer between project stakeholders. An additional objective of this effort is to build and implement an adaptive protocol that is scale-able and applicable to various landscapes and can serve several monitoring objectives and eliminate redundant work efforts (e.g., CFLRP monitoring, Forest Plan Revision monitoring, Regional monitoring). The group continues to engage the Regional Office CFLRP interdisciplinary team and other CFLRP projects to develop a regional adaptive management framework that is driven by a set of monitoring questions developed through a collaborative, multi-party process.

To date, a suite of key monitoring categories have been developed, under which, specific questions have been framed. Each question has been evaluated using a set of previously agreed upon criteria. The criteria are intended to act as a screen or filter when assessing which monitoring questions to ask and to provide a basis for prioritizing each question. The group is currently working on identifying methodologies that are most effective and efficient in capturing the desired information to answer each monitoring question, development of a formal prioritization process that further engages our stakeholders and decision makers, and continued stakeholder communication and outreach.

Consistent with the Tapash CFLRP proposal, monitoring will be implemented as part of an adaptive management approach as summarized in the Okanogan-Wenatchee Forest Restoration Strategy. Information gained through monitoring will be used to validate the appropriateness of restoration prescriptions and provide insight into necessary adjustments should they be indicated. In each case, monitoring will address the question whether the strategy was fully implemented and if implementation of the prescribed treatment resulted in the intended outcome. Annual and multi-year synthesis and interpretation with stakeholders and decision makers will provide feedback and inform future decisions. This process could potentially provide for assessment of landscapes across multiple CFLRP projects.

The Forest Service, in partnership with the Yakima Nation, continues to move forward with sediment monitoring in key watersheds within the CFLRP landscape. As well, our partnership with the Yakama Nation to monitor white-headed woodpecker use of managed-stands and the impact of forest treatments on demographic parameters such as density, survivorship, and productivity continues. The objective of the monitoring is to identify the specific features of managed stands that are used for foraging, roosting, and nesting, especially, in areas where large diameter trees are unavailable, and how woodpeckers respond to thinning and burning within these areas.

Tapash continues to move forward in the collection of base-line data through the completion of stand exam exams for use in modeling the ecological departure within the landscape; and the subsequent preparation of restoration strategy objectives and prescriptions for restoration treatments.

6. FY 2013 accomplishments

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished ¹⁰	Total Treatment Cost (\$)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match) ¹¹
Acres treated annually to sustain or restore watershed function and resilience WTRSHD-RSTR-ANN	Acres	Pull number from PAS report		
Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres	Pull number from PAS report		CFLN NFTM SSSS NFVW RTRT
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	Pull number from PAS report	1,197	CFLN NFTM SSSS NFVW WFHF BDBD
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	Pull number from PAS report	679	SRS2 NFVW CFLN
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC	Acres	Pull number from PAS report		
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions. S&W-RSRC-IMP	Acres	Pull number from PAS report		
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-LAK	Acres	Pull number from PAS report		
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	Pull number from PAS report	3.5	CFLN
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	Pull number from PAS report	1,657	NFTM SSSS NFVW WFHF NFWF
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved RG-VEG-IMP	Acres	Pull number from PAS report	1,787	NFTM SSSS NFVW WFHF

¹⁰ Units accomplished should match the accomplishments recorded in the Databases of Record.

¹¹ Please use a new line for each BLI or type of fund used. For example, you may have three lines with the same performance measure, but the type of funding might be two different BLIs and CFLR/CFLN.

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished ¹⁰	Total Treatment Cost (\$)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match) ¹¹
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance RD-HC-MAIN	Miles	Pull number from PAS report	45	SRS2 CMGL CMRD CFLN
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance RD-PC-MAINT	Miles	Pull number from PAS report	265	SRS2 CMGL CMRD CFLN
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	Pull number from PAS report		
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles	Pull number from PAS report		
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles	Pull number from PAS report		
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage STRM-CROS-MTG-STD	Number	Pull number from PAS report		
Miles of system trail maintained to standard TL-MAINT-STD	Miles	Pull number from PAS report		
Miles of system trail improved to standard TL-IMP-STD	Miles	Pull number from PAS report		
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard LND-BL-MRK-MAINT	Miles	Pull number from PAS report		
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC	Acres	Pull number from PAS report	397	NFTM SSSS CFLN
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF	Pull number from PAS report	6,350.20	NFTM SSSS CFLN
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	Pull number from PAS report	26,407.90	NFTM SSSS CFLN
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons	Pull number from PAS report		
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the	Acre	Pull number from PAS	4	WFHF CFLN

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished ¹⁰	Total Treatment Cost (\$)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match) ¹¹
wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI		report		BDBD
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	Pull number from PAS report	794	WFHF CFLN BDBD
Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands SP-INVSpe-FED-AC	Acres	Pull number from PAS report		
Number of priority acres treated annually for native pests on Federal lands SP-NATIVE-FED-AC	Acres	Pull number from PAS report		

Key FY13 accomplishments not captured in the above table include the preparation of 997 acres for restoration treatment (layout, posting, and marking) and approximately 5,769 CCF of firewood sold from NFS lands within the Tapash landscape. Additionally; 930 acres of hand-piling and burning, two stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage, and 0.5 acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained, or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions were not captured in the database of record. We continue to experience discrepancies between the numbers displayed in the PAS reports/databases of record (primarily FACTS and WFRP) and the actual accomplishments. We will continue to work to correct these issues.

7. FY 2013 accomplishment narrative (summarize key accomplishments and evaluate project progress) (please limit answer to three pages).

The Tapash Collaborative was chartered in 2007 to facilitate the common goals of landscape restoration and conservation of working forests in Central Washington. This area supports an overabundance of dense mid-seral stands prone to fire, coupled with high unemployment and a struggling rural economy. Having become keenly aware of the existing situation; the Yakama Nation, The Nature Conservancy, the Washington State Department of Natural Resources, and the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife recognized the need to collaborate across ownership boundaries to address these issues. The ultimate goal of the Tapash CFLRP project proposal remains to increase our combined restoration footprint on the landscape by implementing restoration treatments which increase overall forest resiliency and aquatic health. The desired outcome is a vegetative landscape that is more resilient to changing climates, fire, and insects, and that responds in a manner that maintains and restores natural processes, patterns, and functions. The reestablishment of natural vegetative processes, such as insect and disease and fire regimes, is also intended to reduce the risk of uncharacteristic wildfire and associated management costs. As well, there is an additional focus to reduce adverse effects on stream flows, sediment regimes, and flood plain function caused by high road densities and/or poor road location.

Accomplishments to date include 7,380 acres of hand piling, 217 acres of grapple piling, approximately 5,000 acres of grapple pile burning, 3,045 acres of hand-pile burning, 961 acres of prescribed burning, 5,691 acres of pre-commercial thinning, and a combined 843 acres of lop and scatter, ladder fuel reduction and mastication. While some of the initial numbers fell short of projected outputs, several integrated outputs have been realized that were not identified in the original project proposal. These include acres of forest vegetation improved (1,291 acres); acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions (25 acres); acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced (5,310 acres); miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced (0.5 miles); and manage noxious weed and invasive plants (2,197 acres). CFLRP funding has also enabled the Forest to develop projects that include the full complement of restoration activities, ultimately allowing the vegetation projects to move forward when otherwise they would not. The Oak Creek Restoration Project, Jung Way and Roaring are examples of projects where improvement in road-related aquatic and fisheries conditions and reconstruction of crossings for aquatic organism passage provided for access to implement a timber sale and subsequent fuels treatment.

Application of the Okanogan Wenatchee Forest Restoration Strategy early in the planning process has allowed us to effectively “gear-up” for large landscape treatments, and is expected to facilitate our NEPA process. The Strategy provides the basis for implementation of large-scale landscape treatment, thus identifying the foundation for development of a relatively narrow restoration purpose and need. This supports a proposed action that reflects the specific purposes of the CFLR Act to reduce the risk of uncharacteristic wildfire activity and the cost of wildfire suppression while encouraging economic and social sustainability. Because the strategy identifies multiple potential landscape treatment areas, we are able to prioritize and treat individual portions of the landscape as specific conditions and funding permit; a more efficient process than treating vegetation and fuels with a stand-by-stand approach. With the combined Dry Orr, Little Naches, S. Fork Tieton, Upper Yakima, and Swauk sub-watersheds, we will have completed landscape analysis on 318,000 acres. We expect that by completing analysis on such a large scale we will realize significant NEPA efficiencies and subsequent accelerated implementation of restoration treatments. The Forest is also exploring strategies to increase our planning capacity by dedicating interdisciplinary teams to CFLRP project planning.

The Tapash Collaborative remains united in our dedication to accomplish the meaningful work of implementation of the CFLRP 10-year program of work, increase our restoration footprint, and contribute to a sustained restoration economy. Strategically located and integrated restoration treatments are being implemented to get maximum benefits for a given fixed cost while minimizing unintended adverse effects. With careful placement of treatments, a larger impact of fire behavior and ecology across the landscape will be achieved. The Tapash Collaborative partners are focusing treatments in high priority landscapes while integrating aquatic, terrestrial, and socio-economic considerations to increase the probability of success of restoration while reducing wildfire cost. With implementation of these treatments, land managers are being provided the latitude to take a less aggressive suppression response over the treated landscape, ultimately, lowering fire suppression costs and reducing investments necessary for maintenance of vegetation and capital improvements in support of aquatic health.

The efforts described above contribute directly to meeting a key purpose of the CFLRA, to facilitate the reduction of wildfire management costs, reestablish natural fire regimes, and reduce the risk of uncharacteristic wildfire. The partners are focusing their efforts on areas within the landscape where restoration projects can be edge-matched across ownership boundaries to increase the overall restoration footprint through a multi-jurisdictional approach. Although implementation of an ownership blind, cross-boundary project presents a myriad of challenges yet to overcome (e.g., policy and contracting), we have already shown achievement in regard to edge-matching projects in the Oak Creek watershed where we have worked within a 3-partner checkerboard to implement vegetative and aquatic restoration treatments.

In recent discussions with our TNC partners, we have identified tremendous potential for TNC to take an active role in initiating and conducting a new Tapash cross-boundary landscape project that would include landscape evaluation across multiple ownerships, planning, and project implementation. There is also potential for TNC to add capacity in further development of the Okanogan Wenatchee Forest Restoration Strategy economic and aquatic modules. Additionally, through their work with the Yakama Nation/Inter-Tribal Timber Council around Anchor Forests and the Economically Sustainable Forest Products Utilization Task Force, TNC is conducting a forest restoration/timber supply assessment across all ownerships that will be used as the basis for a collaborative dialogue around a realistic mechanical treatment footprint and a sustainable wood supply. This effort will also help form the basis for a meaningful discussion related to infrastructure potential, right-sizing, use of the Tribal Forest Protection Act authority and tribal stewardship contracting with the goal of creating opportunities.

There is also the potential for a funding stream for restoration actions in the Tapash landscape via a partnership with the Bureau of Reclamation. This proposal is in the early stages of discussion. The Yakima River Basin remains one of the most promising locations in Oregon and Washington for this partnership.

8. Describe the total acres treated in the course of the CFLR project (cumulative footprint acres; not a cumulative total of performance accomplishments). What was the total number of acres treated?¹²

Fiscal Year	Total number of acres treated (treatment footprint)
FY13	3,955
FY10, FY11, FY12 and FY13 (as applicable- projects selected in FY2012 may will not have data for FY10 and FY11; projects that were HPRP projects in FY12, please include one number for FY12 and one number for FY13 (same as above))	17,303

9. In no more than two pages (large landscapes or very active fire seasons may need more space), describe other relevant fire management activities within the project area (hazardous fuel treatments are already documented in Question #6):

There was \$1,114,864 in wildfire preparedness (WFPR), invested directly to the Tapash landscape in FY13. Expenses included base salaries, training, and resource costs. In addition, we indirectly supported \$732,985 in wildfire preparedness. With respect to emergency fire suppression and BAER within the project landscape, we spent approximately \$213,730 for the 54 initial attack fires that were contained at small acreages, no BAER activities occurred with respect to the 2 larger fires. Two additional fires were not contained at small acres, at a cost of approximately \$11,073,792. The 54 initial attack fires contained, were contained at 29 acres burned, with a cost of \$7,370 per burned acre; the two additional fires that were not contained (3,432 acres), were at the expense of \$3,227 per acre burned. All ignitions were prioritized and suppressed as resources were made available. There were no other hazardous fuels expenses incurred that are not captured elsewhere in this report.

As in FY12, there was an attempt to accomplish a large-scale, summer prescribed fire in the Tapash landscape. Ignition began on July 17, 2013. Due to National preparedness levels, the Region asked that we stand down with respect to continued ignition, and as a result, we were able to only accomplish 450 acres rather than the projected 7,000 acres.

¹² This metric is separate from the annual performance measurement reporting as recorded in the databases of record. Please see the instructions document for further clarification.

Though we had all resources needed available on the Forest and were in prescription, we were unable to implement the restoration treatment.

10. Describe any reasons that the FY 2013 annual report does not reflect your project proposal, previously reported planned accomplishments, or work plan. Did you face any unexpected challenges this year that caused you to change what was outlined in your proposal? (please limit answer to two pages)

In the first four years of implementation, the Forest fell short of projected outputs for a variety of reasons, including budget timing, NEPA readiness, smoke limitations, lower timber values/receipts, the associated lack of success in our initial stewardship contract offering, and a significantly large ERFO workload on the Forest in FY13. The original Tapash CFLRP proposal was ambitious, especially the cross-ownership boundary treatment aspect and expected timber receipts.

The recession and bad timber market were not kind to our initial IRSC contract offering and the Forest was forced to repackage that offering. We see this as an opportunity to more fully use Stewardship Contracts for getting restoration work accomplished. We are working closely with the Regional Office to identify opportunities and efficiencies in this area. Because economics is so important to these vegetation management activities, the Forest is also working with the Regional Office to incorporate an economics package into the Restoration Strategy. As well, the Tapash Collaborative Economic Sustainability Task Force is working with individual Interdisciplinary Teams to identify ways to reduce costs, shorten timelines, and increase the outputs of CFLRP projects. From recent discussions it is clear the Regional Office, Forest leadership, and collaborative partners are all dedicated to exploring all opportunities to increase outputs and strengthen the collaborative process.

The spotted owl recovery plan and Critical Habitat Rule have added complexity to our vegetation treatments in owl habitat. With increasing pressure to address our road system, the issues around roads and the fisheries and aquatics resource have resulted in increased planning timelines and costs associated with mitigation design. We are working directly with our state and federal partners to develop and integrate an aquatics module into the Okanogan-Wenatchee Restoration Strategy. Full implementation of the Restoration Strategy, which includes an aquatic element, will ultimately serve to streamline planning and reduce the time associated with the Endangered Species Act and Section 7 Consultation. The Forest will be working closely with the Regional Office to reach out to State Agencies to ensure personnel at all levels of both agencies support management and are effectively and efficiently completing required consultation.

Although we have been successful in making biomass available, we have been unsuccessful in moving this small diameter, low-value material off of the landscape. The issue with biomass is the inability to economically remove this material from NFS lands. At the current time, there is no interest in this by-product from an economic perspective and there are few, if any, options for removal. However, we are investigating all options to make this successful. As a means to identify solutions to this situation, we have initiated a Community Business Forum to engage directly with our local community members to utilize local resources for local benefit. We are exploring ideas such as fuels for schools, non-traditional forest product development, and innovative ways to accomplish forest restoration while maintaining local jobs and a sustainable economy. We have also been working with USDA Renewable Energy Business Advisor and USDA Rural Development Business Program Specialist to find solutions to this problem and have been made aware of the many existing opportunities. We are now in the process of identifying a meaningful project and developing partnerships. We are committed to working closely with the Regional Office on pursuing biomass opportunities that can offset treatment costs while benefiting local rural communities.

Because of air quality concerns and the potential for smoke intrusion into the nearby city of Yakima, the Washington State Department of Natural Resources has been reluctant to issue permission to perform prescribed fire at the scale or frequency anticipated and needed. The Tapash partners are working aggressively with state and local agencies to resolve this. The result is the recent signing of a Memorandum of Understanding by the Yakima Clean Air Authority and the Okanogan-Wenatchee N.F. which emphasizes the mutual interest in providing and maintaining clean air to the citizens of Washington State and Yakima County on both a short-term and long-term basis. Under the MOU, the Parties agree to work together to minimize prescribed fire smoke impacts to the residents of Yakima County, to inform the public of the need for and benefits of prescribed fire, and to support smoke emission reductions by encouraging proper wood-burning techniques.

Having had the opportunity to implement the Tapash CFLR project, and subsequently realizing the challenges that our proposal presents to reaching the original projections, the Forest became clearly aware of the need to re-evaluate our initial proposal and to adjust our course of action into the future. The Tapash Collaborative remains committed to the goals of landscape restoration and fostering the local economy in collaboration with the Yakama Nation and other partners. Recognizing the emphasis the CFLRA places on our combined restoration footprint, the Forest is submitting a Proposed Project Change Request. The revised proposal will address the recommendations of the WO/RO field review (July, 2013), will stretch the Forest capacity, and will explore new collaborative ground with the Yakima Nation. Similar to the original proposal, the revised proposal will emphasize the acres treated with prescribed fire and mechanical harvest to reduce fuels and commercial timber harvest and the associated timber sale volume. Recognizing the challenges of carryover funds associated with prescribed fire acres that are not accomplished annually, the Forest is proposing a “contingency” scenario to immediately redirect those funds to accomplish other previously identified priority restoration treatments.

Under the revised proposal, the Forest would utilize the existing carry-over and a portion of the originally requested funding to support smaller annual fuel reduction and timber sale programs than initially projected. Prescribed fire treatments are the highest priority, followed by non-commercial mechanical treatments. If found necessary, the “contingency” scenario would redirect the unspent prescribed burning funds based on a priority ranking where non-commercial mechanical treatments rank as the highest priority followed by road-related aquatic improvements (road improvement and road decommissioning) providing for aquatic organism passage. Integrated accomplishments would also be realized as a result of these roads/aquatics treatments.

11. Planned FY 2015 Accomplishments

Performance Measure Code ¹³	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment	Amount (\$)
Acres treated annually to sustain or restore watershed function and resilience WTRSHD-RSTR-ANN	Acres		
Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres		
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres		
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre		
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC	Acres		
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions. S&W-RSRC-IMP	Acres		
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-LAK	Acres		
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles		
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres		
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved RG-VEG-IMP	Acres		
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance RD-HC-MAIN	Miles	10	35,000.
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance RD-PC-MAINT	Miles	15	52,000.
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	10	35,000.
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles	10	35,000.

¹³ Please include all relevant planned accomplishments, assuming that funding specified in the CFLRP project proposal for FY 2015 is available. Use actual planned funding if quantity is less than specified in CFLRP project work plan, and justify deviation from project work plan in question 13 of this template.

Performance Measure Code ¹³	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment	Amount (\$)
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles	10	35,000.
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage STRM-CROS-MTG-STD	Number	1	105,000.
Miles of system trail maintained to standard TL-MAINT-STD	Miles		
Miles of system trail improved to standard TL-IMP-STD	Miles		
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard LND-BL-MRK-MAINT	Miles		
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC	Acres	3,150	
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF	54,127	930,000.
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF		
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons		
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre		
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	8,086	1,212,900.
Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands SP-INVSP-FED-AC	Acres		
Number of priority acres treated annually for native pests on Federal lands SP-NATIVE-FED-AC	Acres		

12. **Planned FY 2015 accomplishment narrative** (no more than 1 page):

As described previously in this report, the Okanogan-Wenatchee N.F. is in the process of submitting a Proposed Project Change Request. However, the outputs displayed in the table above (FY15) align with the outputs identified in the

original Tapash CFLRP Proposal. The costs reflect the current estimated averaged costs of completing the accomplishment. For the reasons described here, and in the Proposed Project Change Request, these outputs/outcomes are not consistent with what the Forest believes is the current capacity. At such time as the proposed change request is approved, should it be, this table will be changed to reflect those changes. To briefly summarize, under the revised proposal, the Forest would utilize the existing carry-over and some portion of the originally requested funding to support smaller annual fuel reduction and timber sale programs than initially projected. Recognizing the challenges of carry-over funds associated with prescribed fire acres that are not accomplished annually, the Forest is proposing to immediately redirect those funds to accomplish other previously identified priority restoration treatments.

13. Describe and provide narrative justification if planned FY 2014/15 accomplishments and/or funding differs from CFLRP project work plan (no more than 1 page):

The revised proposal fulfills the original Tapash Collaborative CFLRP project proposal objectives to “make a measurable difference on the landscape through the results of working partnerships focused on restoring healthy forests and supporting sustainable communities”. The Forest continues to be committed to a science-based, all lands approach to restoration through collaboration.

The revised proposal will also meet the purposes of the CFLR Act. The Act speaks specifically to encouraging ecological, economic, and social sustainability; leveraging local resources with national and private resources, facilitating the reduction of wildfire management costs through reestablishing natural fire regimes, reducing the risk of uncharacteristic wildfire; and demonstrating restoration techniques that achieve ecological and watershed health objectives and affect wildfire activity and costs; and utilizes forest restoration by-products to offset treatment costs while benefiting local rural economies and improving forest health. The revised Tapash Collaborative CFLRP project proposal strives to enhance the resiliency and sustainability of forests through treatment that incrementally return the ecosystem to a state that is within a historical range of conditions. Strategically focused and integrated restoration approaches are being planned that will get maximum benefits for a given fixed cost while minimizing unintended adverse effects. Tapash partners are focusing treatments in high priority landscapes while integrating aquatic, terrestrial, and socio-economic considerations to increase the probability of success of restoration while reducing wildfire cost. Like the original proposal, the revised proposal utilizes this partnership of public, non-profit and tribal land managers to leverage local resources with national and private resources to increase the combined capacity of the Collaborative and accelerate the rate of restoration on the Tapash landscape.

Due to lower than projected timber outputs/acres, lower than projected prescribed fire acres, and the sizeable reduction in timber receipts, the overall number of treatments across the landscape is scaled back from the original proposal. We are working aggressively, however, to increase outputs and increase the effectiveness of treatments through strategic placement on the landscape. The “edge-matching” of projects and ownerships will increase the impact of restoration within the Tapash landscape, as well as furthering our relationship with the Yakama Nation and other partners.

Given the outputs to date of 7,597 acres of piling, 9,006 acres of burning, 5,691 acres of pre-commercial thinning, 8,824 acres of restoration outputs not previously captured, and the increased projected outputs through 2019, the Tapash proposal is clearly viable and provides a compelling argument for implementation. The proposed changes are realistic and feasible to implement.