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Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Projects (CFLRPs)

• Report required to Congress at the five-year point on how well the CFLRP objectives are being met

• Release of the report is imminent
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Projects (CFLRPs)

July 2012 letter to Regional Foresters

Outlined reporting in five areas:

1. Collaboration
2. Leveraged funds
3. Fire costs--Address with RCAT, the Risk and Cost Analysis Tools
4. Ecology-Four ecological indicators
5. Jobs/economic impacts
Ecological Indicator: Four Metrics of Ecological Restoration

- Fire Regime Restoration
  - Good - 1
  - Fair - 2
  - Poor - 3

- Fish and Wildlife Habitat Condition
  - Good - 1
  - Fair - 2
  - Poor - 3

- Watershed Condition
  - Good - 1
  - Fair - 2
  - Poor - 3

- Invasive Species Severity
  - Good - 1
  - Fair - 2
  - Poor - 3
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Projects (CFLRPs)

Report based on the four indicators:

- Desired conditions (outcomes)
- Both at landscape and project scales
  (Invasives only reported on at landscape scale)
Completing the Ecological Indicator Template

- For each indicator, report in terms of X% change in desired condition across X% of the landscape by a specified date.

- Include 1-5 quantifiable desired condition statements upon which target is based. These must directly relate to the desired condition for the indicator.
Desired conditions (outcomes)

• At landscape scale, base accomplishment on percent of the landscape where the desired condition is attained.

• Use desired condition from the original project proposal where possible.
Desired Conditions Target for Fire Regime Restoration: 100% change (relative to the desired condition) occurs across 17% of the operable landscape area by FY 2014.

Expected Progress toward Desired Condition in 5 years:

- **Good**= Expected progress is being made towards Desired Conditions across 17% or more of the operable National Forest CFLR landscape area.
- **Fair**= Expected progress is being made towards Desired Conditions across 14 to 17% of the operable National Forest CFLR landscape area.
- **Poor**= Expected progress is being made towards Desired Conditions across less than 14% of the operable National Forest CFLR landscape area.
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Projects (CFLRPs)

*Current Landscape-scale Evaluation*
*(Based on the Collaborative’s landscape scale monitoring)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ecological Indicators</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Regime Restoration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish and Wildlife Habitat Condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed Condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invasive Species</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Good**
- **Fair**
- **Poor**
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Projects (CFLRPs)

Current Project-Scale Evaluation
(Based on the Collaborative’s project scale monitoring)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ecological Indicators</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Regime Restoration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish and Wildlife Habitat Condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed Condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invasive Species</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Good
- Fair
- Poor
Discussion

- Accomplishment is a relative measure, defined by each CFLRP. So comparisons among CFLRPs are difficult.

- Also means the evaluation will depend on how high the CFLRP set the bar in their original proposal. A CFLRP could have a high actual achievement but be evaluated relatively low.
Discussion

CFLRPs varied in how well they did at landscape scale. They generally felt they did well at project scale (i.e., their treatments are effective).

Wildlife accomplishment mostly inferred from fire regime accomplishment.
Discussion

• General consensus CFLRPs want to do better on watershed and invasives. Perhaps a way to focus attention on these indicators and garner more support.

• Monitoring in this case perhaps more valuable as a learning tool than as accomplishment reporting.
If you want to go fast, go alone.

If you want to go far, go together.

--African proverb
1. What are the areas you are making good progress in, and why?
2. What are you struggling with, and why?
3. What would you change about the monitoring questions if you could?
4. What changes in management will you make based on this monitoring effort?
5. How much ownership do you feel in this process?