

# Colorado Uncompahgre Plateau Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Project: Social and Economic Monitoring Report for 2012



Torsten Lund Snee, Tony Cheng, Kathie Mattor

Colorado Forest Restoration Institute, Colorado State University  
Fort Collins, CO 80523

Washington Office and Rocky Mountain Regional Office, USDA Forest Service,  
Golden, CO 80401

November 2014



Colorado State University



## Executive Summary

The Uncompahgre Plateau in western Colorado holds significant social, economic, and ecological value across the region. The Colorado Uncompahgre Plateau Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Project (UP-CFLRP) intends to protect these values through forest restoration projects spanning 572,000 acres within a 1.0 million-acre collaboratively identified landscape. The UP-CFLRP is overseen by the USDA Forest Service's (USFS) Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison (GMUG) National Forests in conjunction with the Western Colorado Landscape Collaborative (WCLC). This report presents the findings from the social and economic monitoring assessment of the UP-CFLRP for calendar year 2012. This project-level assessment identifies the local economic contributions and summarizes the wood utilization associated with the UP-CFLRP task orders.

### UP-CFLRP Funding and Accomplishments

Each Regional Forester is required to prepare an annual report describing the work accomplished and the sources of funding of the CFLR projects (USDA Forest Service, 2013). This section provides an overview of the information provided in the annual report for FY2012 to provide readers an improved understanding of the funding, as well as the collaborative accomplishments the group has achieved.

The primary source of funding toward the CFLR projects is the Congressional appropriations. A total of \$733,237 was appropriated to the UP-CFLRP by Congress for FY2012. These appropriated funds were supplemented by \$221,540 in carryover funds from the previous year. The resulting \$954,777 total of CFLR and supplemental funds went to contracts to complete work in the UP-CFLRP project area in FY 2012.

A total of \$1,090,946 in matching funds was also used to complete work for the UP-CFLRP in FY2012. This included: 1) \$625,957 in USFS matching funds, which were primarily used for USFS salary related to contract preparation and work associated with the UP-CFLR project; 2) 'Funds contributed through agreements' with partner organizations to implement and monitor efforts within the CFLR project area totaling \$199,750; 3) 'Partner in-kind contributions' totaled \$179,192 toward monitoring and road restoration efforts; and 4) 'Service work accomplishment through goods-for services funding...', were equal to \$86,047 for work completed through stewardship contracts in FY2012.

Additionally, leveraged funds, which are funds used by partners to accomplish restoration activities on non-National Forest System lands associated with the UP-CFLRP project area, totaled \$800,000 in FY2012. The leveraged funds come from the construction of The Native Seed Warehouse

completed by Colorado Parks and Wildlife and the Uncompahgre Partnership, in conjunction with several federal agencies and non-profit organizations.

Although the annual report identifies over two dozen performance measures for the CFLRPs, four significant accomplishments were highlighted:

- 1,962 acres of forest vegetation improvements;
- 8,202 acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced;
- 359 miles of roads maintained or decommissioned; and
- 1,494 acres of wildland-urban interface high priority hazardous fuels treatment.

### **Economic Contributions**

Creating jobs and supporting local economies is a high priority for the UP-CFLRP. An analysis of the contract-level economic contributions in calendar year 2012 was used to identify the extent these economic goals were met. It should be noted that the economic impact estimates in this analysis contrast with the estimates reported in the FY2012 CFLRP Annual Report (USDA Forest Service, 2013) due to differences in methodologies and data assumptions (Appendix C). This report focuses on CFLR funded task orders.

Five contractors worked on six task orders associated with the UP-CFLR project in 2012. Five task orders associated with the UP-CFLRP were initiated in 2012, with one of these task orders fulfilled and four partially completed by the year’s end. One task order initiated in 2010 was also completed in 2012. The economic effects of these restoration activities were identified using Input-Output (I-O) modeling of operational expenditure and labor information obtained from the contractor. Our analysis estimates the restoration activities in 2012 contributed approximately \$497,000 in labor income and \$642,000 in GDP to the local economy (Table 1). In addition, a total of 12.3 full- and part-time jobs were calculated. All company employees reside within Colorado and are able to commute to work. The UP-CFLRP primary commercial contractor subcontracted other companies from Colorado to assist with mechanical forest management operations and trucking operations.

Table 1. Economic Contributions of UP-CFLRP Task Orders in 2012

Employment (Full and part time jobs)	Labor Income (2012 US)	Value Added (2012 US)
12.3	\$497,172	\$642,637

### Recommendations for Future Monitoring – Economic Contributions

1. The 2012 UP-CFLRP monitoring of local economic impacts used labor and operational expenditures obtained directly from the contractor. This analysis adds to the national fiscal year report by providing a more locally-based understanding of the project's social and economic impact. This locally-based analysis should be completed on an annual basis.
2. Additional labor and operational expenditures should be collected for other project activities under the UP-CFLR project. This could include labor and expenditures related to the monitoring efforts and service contracts related to additional restoration activities (e.g. invasive weed mitigation or road decommissioning). This would provide an improved understanding of the labor and economic impacts of the UP-CFLRP project.

### **Wood Utilization**

A total of 1,482 acres were treated through task orders under the UP-CFLRP in 2012. A majority of the acres were treated through four non-commercial task orders to improve wildlife habitat, regenerate aspen stands, reduce fuels, and prepare for prescribed fire treatments, and did not remove value-added wood products. The primary commercial contractor removing material on the project reported that all (100 percent) of the materials removed on the GMUG were through mechanical treatments. Most of the materials removed (95 percent) were available for value-added use, while 5 percent was piled and burned. This is due to the types and quality of materials removed through these treatments. These treatment prescriptions were identified to meet the restoration goals outlined by the UP-CFLR collaborative and the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forest plans.

Five businesses purchased the available value-added materials from the UP-CFLRP commercial treatments in 2012. All of the businesses that purchased material were located in Colorado, either in the same county or a county near where the work was being done. The value-added materials included sawtimber and mulch. All (100 percent) of the sawtimber removed from the project area was used for dimensional lumber, and 100 percent of the products other than logs removed from the project area was used for mulch.

### Recommendations for Future Monitoring – Wood Utilization

1. The 2012 wood utilization monitoring for the UP-CFLRP used data obtained directly from the contractors. This analysis adds to the national fiscal year report by providing a more locally-based understanding of the project's social and economic impact. This locally-based analysis should be completed on an annual basis.



# Table of contents

Executive Summary	i
Goals and Indicators	1
Findings	
▪ Funding and Accomplishments	3
▪ Economic Contributions	8
▪ Wood Utilization	11
Appendix A – The Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program	13
Appendix B – The Western Colorado Landscape Collaborative	14
Appendix C – Methods	
▪ Economic Contributions Analysis	16
▪ The Colorado Model	20
▪ Wood Utilization	23
Appendix D – Economic Impact Questions	24
Appendix E – Wood Utilization Questions	30



## Goals and Indicators

The Colorado Uncompahgre Plateau Collaborative Landscape Restoration Project (UP-CFLRP) is one of 23 projects funded nationally under the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration program of the USDA Forest Service (USFS). It is intended to accelerate ongoing forest restoration treatments that provide long-lasting ecological, social and economic benefits across a 1.0 million-acre landscape covering parts of the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests (GMUG) in Colorado. This project will facilitate additional treatment of approximately 160,000 high-priority acres on National Forest System (NFS) lands within the Western Colorado Landscape Collaborative's designated 1.0 million acre restoration zone and will be enhanced by existing and future treatments on adjacent federal and non-federal lands.



The forests (both federal and non-federal) within this proposed area exhibit a high to very high degree of ecological departure from historic norms and are susceptible to uncharacteristic high intensity wildfire and insect and disease infestations. These conditions increasingly threaten human health and well-being, as well as critical ecosystem services throughout the region. Through strategic placement of

treatments, the UP-CFLRP plans to restore historic fire regimes, including low intensity wildland fires, with a goal of reducing risks to the ecosystem and communities and lowering suppression costs. Much of the area is deemed important for protecting communities and critical watersheds from the impacts of uncharacteristic fire.

Opportunities for job creation, business support and development, and meaningful biomass utilization to support local industry are emphasized in the design and implementation of treatments. The goal of the CY2012 socioeconomic monitoring was to measure the economic contributions of the UP-CFLRP project study area and to develop a baseline measure for future monitoring efforts. The socioeconomic monitoring plan is based upon: 1) topics and indicators identified by the Western Colorado Landscape Collaborative, and 2) national CFLR program monitoring outcomes and indicators. The monitoring plan identifies two key objectives for the 2012 social and economic assessment:

1. Determine the economic contributions associated with the UP-CFLRP project funded task orders
2. Measure the types and amounts of wood utilization that occurred as a result of these funded task orders.

The remainder of this report presents the findings associated with these objectives. Subsequent appendices provide background information to the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration program and the Western Colorado Landscape Collaborative, as well as the methods used to obtain and analyze this data.

## Findings

The following subsections outline the UP-CFLRP funding and accomplishments, and present results from analyses of economic contributions, employment, and wood utilization associated with the UP-CFLRP.

### UP-CFLRP Funding and Accomplishments

This section provides an overview of the sources of funding and key accomplishments identified in the USFS “Uncompahgre Plateau CFLRP Annual Report” for Fiscal Year 2012. Each Regional Forester is required to prepare an annual report describing the work accomplished and an evaluation of progress for each Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Project (CFLRP) within their region. The annual report records the sources of funding and the accomplishments of the CFLR project.<sup>1</sup> This section provides an overview of the sources of funding and key accomplishments identified in the USDA Forest Service’s (USFS) “Uncompahgre Plateau Project CFLRP Annual Report” for Fiscal Year (FY) 2012 (USDA Forest Service, 2013). Additional detail and insight on these funds, accomplishments, and the annual reporting were obtained through interviews with the USFS UP-CFLRP representatives: Carmine Lockwood, the Renewable Resources & Strategic Planning Staff Officer, and Clay Speas, Wildlife, Fish and Rare Plants Lead Officer, on the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests (GMUG). Each CFLRP has six funding sources which are documented in the CFLRP annual report. These sources include the appropriated funding, four types of matching funds, and leveraged funds. The

---

<sup>1</sup> The annual report records: the sources of funding; how the CFLR work has contributed toward meeting performance measures outlined in the USFS 10 year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan (2006); the assumptions used to generate numbers and/or percentages entered into the TREAT model; A description of other community benefits achieved; a description of the multiparty monitoring efforts; the Fiscal Year accomplishments; a description of the total acres treated during the CFLRP process; the fire management activities which have occurred in the project area; a description of challenges associated with implementing the CFLRP; and anticipated management activities for the following fiscal year.

GMUG received \$2,045,723 in total funding for the UP-CFLRP in FY 2012. The following subsections outline the sources of this funding and the resulting accomplishments.

#### Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Funds

The Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration funds (CFLN) are the appropriated funds designated by Congress on an annual basis to each of the CFLR projects. A total of \$733,237 was appropriated to the Uncompahgre Plateau Project CFLRP (UP-CFLRP) by Congress for FY 2012. These appropriated funds were supplemented by \$221,540 in FY 2011 carryover funds. This included funds from the FY 2011 forest products, wildlife and fisheries habitat management, vegetation and watershed management, and hazardous fuels reduction budget line items (BLIs). The resulting \$954,777 total of CFLN and supplemental funds went to contracts to complete work in the UP-CFLRP project area in FY 2012.

#### Matching Funds

The matching funds are defined as any non-CFLR funds from within the USFS and/or external partners used to conduct work on national forest system lands associated with the CFLR project. In FY 2012 the UP-CFLRP reported a total of \$1,090,946 in matching funds. There are four types of matching funds reported in the annual report – the USFS matching funds, funds contributed through agreements, partner in-kind contributions, and service work accomplishments through goods-for-services contracts. The USFS matching funds are defined as any non-CFLR funds that are used to complete work in the CFLR project area. There was a total of \$625,957 in USFS matching funds in FY 2012 used to accomplish UP-CFLRP work.<sup>2</sup> The majority of these funds were used for USFS salary related to contract preparation and work associated with the UP-CFLRP.

---

<sup>2</sup> USFS matching funds came from the following budget line items (BLIs): Hazardous fuels reduction - \$148,777 to salary; Range betterment fund - \$148 to fence construction; Capital Improvement and Maintenance-Roads - \$4,506 to salary for road crews; Reforestation trust fund - \$107,895 to salary; Forest products - \$120,635; Vegetation and watershed management - \$40,905; Wildlife and fisheries

The second type of matching funds reported are ‘Funds Contributed through Agreements.’ These are funds provided under agreements with partner organizations to implement projects and monitoring efforts within the CFLRP area. The total amount of funds contributed through agreements with the GMUG for the UP-CFLRP was \$199,750 in FY 2012 and included:

- The Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation contributed \$60,000 through five contracts to conduct restoration work, prescribed burning, thinning and reseeding, road rehabilitation, and sulphur cinquefoil treatment;
- The Mule Deer Foundation contributed \$5,000 through a contract for mule deer population studies on the Uncompahgre Plateau;
- The Tri-State Energy Association contributed \$12,000 and the Western Area Power Authority contributed \$14,000 in agreement to treat weeds on the Ironhorse project;
- The National Wild Turkey Federation provided \$10,000 through the Turkey Track Forest Habitat Restoration Project;
- Colorado Parks and Wildlife provided \$10,000 to support the high school internship program;
- The Western Slope ATV Association provided a grant for \$48,750 to support seasonal workers conducting trail maintenance work;
- Colorado Forest Restoration Institute contributed \$30,000 through an in-kind agreement to conduct monitoring in the UP-CFLRP area; and
- Colorado State University contributed a \$10,000 undergraduate research grant to conduct research in the UP-CFLRP area.

The third type of matching funds reported is ‘Partner In-Kind Contributions’ and totaled \$179,192. These are primarily through volunteer in-kind time contributions but also include cash donations through agreements and grants. The majority (\$126,494) of the partner in-kind contributions in FY 2012 was through volunteer time contributed by local organizations and individuals.<sup>3</sup> In addition,

---

habitat management - \$10,000; Salvage Fund - \$16,381 to salary; Capital Improvement and Maintenance-Trails - \$16,922 for temporary crew pay; Forest products - \$247, 873 to salary; National fire plan – forest health management, federal lands - \$17,951 to salary; Wildlife and fisheries habitat management (\$54,434) and Cooperative work, agreement based (\$10,000) both went toward salary and toward a contract to accomplish habitat management work.

<sup>3</sup> This includes: Delta County Joint School District (\$7,750); Delta High School students (\$15,688); Montrose High School students (\$4,100); Uncompahgre Partnership (\$19,200); Colorado Parks and Wildlife (\$1,080); Citizen

the local county governments provided in-kind support for two projects through agreements – the Delta County Correctional Facility supported road restoration efforts (\$6,700) and Mesa County supported the installation of wildlife crossings (\$20,000). In addition, the Colorado Forest Restoration Institute contributed \$9,978 of salary in-kind contributions toward economic and ecological monitoring. A \$10,000 grant from the National Forest Foundation provided an opportunity to further develop and implement the UP-CFLRP monitoring program to coincide with the national CFLRP monitoring indicators.

The fourth type of matching funds reported are ‘Service work accomplishments through goods-for-services funding within a stewardship contract’. These funds are the stewardship credits a contractor receives for completing service agreement work within a stewardship contract. The matching fund amount recorded equals the amount of stewardship credits the contractor reimburses the national forests for in return for timber product removal (i.e. trading goods for services). In FY2012 the stewardship credits reimbursed totaled \$86,047 for work completed through stewardship contracts.

#### Leveraged Funds

Leveraged funds are those funds used by partners to accomplish restoration activities on non-National Forest System lands associated with the UP-CFLRP project area. This category of funding was first added in the FY2012 annual reporting and a total of approximately \$800,000 in leveraged funds was recorded for the UP-CFLRP. The leveraged funds come from the construction of The Native Seed Warehouse which Colorado Parks and Wildlife and the Uncompahgre Partnership, in conjunction with several federal agencies and non-profit organizations completed near Delta, CO. The warehouse will provide storage for approximately 300,000 lbs. of seed and will provide local native seed to better facilitate restoration efforts in the Uncompahgre CFLR project area.

---

groups (\$4,092); Back Country Hunters (\$168); Southwest Conservation Corps / Veteran Green Corps (\$36,364 in-kind and cash contribution); The Audubon Society (\$336); and the Western Slope ATV Club (\$37,716).

## FY2012 Accomplishments

This section provides a brief overview of the UP-CFLRP accomplishments reported in the USFS “Uncompahgre Plateau Project CFLRP Annual Report” for FY2012 (USDA Forest Service, 2013). The report provides a detailed review of the UP-CFLRP accomplishments through 26 performance measures (USDA Forest Service, 2013, pp. 9-11). The accomplishments reported include all work completed by the USFS and partner organizations on the national forests within the UP-CFLRP area. It therefore includes work funded through each of the categories identified above except for leveraged funding. Based on interviews with USFS project team leaders, the UP-CFLRP’s significant accomplishments for FY2012 include:

- 1,962 acres of forest vegetation improvements;
- 8,202 acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced;
- 359 miles of roads maintained or decommissioned; and
- 1,494 acres of wildland-urban interface high priority hazardous fuels treatment.



## Economic Contributions

The CFLR program funding proposal requirements sent to Regional Foresters identified multiple topics to be addressed. The investments section specifically asks: “Will jobs be created? If so, what kind, how many, and for how long?” The following analysis estimates the economic effects resulting from the implementation of CFLR program funded restoration treatments on the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests in 2012.

Five UP-CFLRP contractors worked on six task orders associated with this project in 2012. Five task orders associated with the UP-CFLRP were initiated in 2012, with one of these task orders fulfilled and four partially completed by the year’s end. One task order initiated in 2010 was also completed in 2012.

The economic effects of these restoration activities were identified using IMPLAN® (IMpacts for PLANing), a regional economic impact analysis system originally developed by the USFS to model pertinent operational expenditure and labor information obtained from the contractor. This analysis estimated the restoration activities contributed approximately \$497 thousand in labor income and \$643 thousand in value-added (i.e. Gross Domestic Product or GDP) contributions to the local economy in 2012 (Table 2). These contributions to the local economy were stimulated by the contractors’ operational expenditures as well as labor income.

**Table 2. Economic Contributions of UP CFLR Task Orders in 2012**

	<b>2012</b>
Employment (Full and part time jobs)	12.3
Labor Income	\$497,172
Value Added (GDP)	\$642,637

Labor income includes all forms of employment income (wages, benefits, and proprietor income). The value-added contributions consist of: (1) employee compensation – wages and salaries plus benefits paid by local industries; (2) proprietor income – income from self-employment; (3) other property income – corporate income, rental income, interest and corporate transfer payments; and (4) indirect business taxes – sales, excise, fees, licenses and other taxes paid, including non-income based payments to the government.

A total of 12.3 full- and part-time jobs were calculated for the UP-CFLRP in 2012. These estimates are lower than those reported in the 2012 USFS Uncompahgre Plateau CFLR annual report because this analysis focuses on forest treatment task orders (USDA Forest Service, 2013). Two of the task orders were for commercial contracts which result in value-added product removal. The other four task orders did not involve product removal but focused on forest restoration objectives. Lower employment calculations also result from all six task orders being completed through mechanical treatments, which generally require fewer employees than manual treatments. Mechanical treatments involve the use of heavy machinery and are less cost prohibitive and less labor intensive than the manual treatments which involve individual sawyers removing trees and brush designated by the USFS prescription.



Photo: Pam Motley

Jobs reported in IMPLAN are annual averages of both full- and part-time total wage and salary employees, as well as self-employed jobs. This method of counting employment is a standard convention and consistent with methods used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. However, one cannot discern the number of hours worked or the proportion of work that is full-time time vs. part-time. It is also important to reiterate the employment contributions calculated are reported simply as jobs, not full time equivalents (FTEs). The impacts include both full- and part-time employment; therefore a person with more than one job could show up more than once in the data. This prohibits comparisons to population data and inferences about the effect on unemployment rates. It is also important to note that IMPLAN is a static model representing a snapshot in time.

In addition to the economic contributions data, the contractors supplied information concerning the location of their employees and subcontractors. Four of the five companies are based in in Colorado. One Colorado company completed the two commercial timber task orders. This company's employees all reside within Colorado and are able to commute to work. A long-term stewardship contract awarded to the company prior to the UP-CFLRP project being funded allowed them to hire additional permanent employees, from both in- and out-of-state locations. The primary commercial contractor implements most of the contract work but does subcontract with other companies to assist in forest management and trucking operations.

## Wood Utilization

The following section reports the number of acres treated by treatment type, the types of materials sold, the products produced from those materials, and the number and location of the businesses to which the materials were sold. The 2012 USFS Uncompahgre Plateau CFLR annual report indicates that all funding sources contributed to the treatment of a total of 3,313 acres in 2012 (USDA Forest Service, 2013). This report focuses on CFLR-funded task orders, which contributed to the mechanical treatment of 1,482 acres.

The majority of the treatments, 1,097 acres, were completed through four non-commercial task orders with the objectives of regenerating aspen stands, improving wildlife habitat, reducing fuels, and preparing stands for future prescribed fire treatments (Table 2). No commercial materials were removed from the forest under these task orders.

Two task orders were completed by one contractor through commercial contracts which removed value-added materials (Table 2). This contractor reported treating a total of 385 acres in 2012. The amount of material available for wood utilization largely depends upon the type of forest treatment used – mechanical or manual – with mechanical treatments resulting in a greater availability of value-

**Table 2. Number of acres mechanically treated in 2012 by treatment type and task order**

Task Order	Location (County)	Non-commercial Treatment Acres	Commercial Treatment Acres
Monitor Mesa	Montrose		185
Uncompahgre Mesa	Montrose		200
Dominguez Ridge	Mesa	231	
Divide Aspen Treatment	Mesa	86	
Sanborn Park	Montrose	689	
Turkey Track	Mesa	91	
		<b>1,097</b>	<b>385</b>

added materials. The contractor reported that all (100 percent) of the materials removed on the GMUG were through mechanical treatments. In addition, of the material that was removed through mechanical treatments, 95 percent was available for value-added use, while 5 percent was piled and burned (not a prescribed burn). These treatment prescriptions were identified to meet the restoration goals outlined by the UP-CFLR collaborative and the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forest plans.

The types of value-added wood materials sold from the UP-CFLRP include sawtimber and products other than logs. The contractor reported a total of five businesses purchased the available value-added materials from the UP-CFLRP treatments in 2012. These businesses were located within or near the counties where work was completed.

Estimates of the types of products developed from these materials were provided by the contractor (Table 4). The value-added materials included dimensional lumber and mulch. The majority of materials (95 percent) from the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests went to sawtimber, while five percent of the material was used for mulch.

**Table 3. Wood products created in 2012**

	<b>Percent of total material sold</b>	<b>Product Value</b>
Dimensional Lumber	95	High
Mulch	5	Low
	<b>100%</b>	

## **Appendix A – The Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program**

The Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration (CFLR) Program was established by Congress under Title IV of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009. The primary purpose of the CFLR program is to support collaborative science-based restoration of priority forest landscapes, while encouraging ecological, social, and economic sustainability. It provides a mechanism to promote wood utilization as a way to offset treatment costs and to benefit local rural economies while improving forest health. It also promotes the reduction of wildfire management costs by reducing the risk of uncharacteristic wildfire and re-establishing natural fire regimes. This is meant to be accomplished by leveraging local, national and private resources. For additional information on the CFLR program see: [www.fs.fed.us/restoration/CFLRP/index.shtml](http://www.fs.fed.us/restoration/CFLRP/index.shtml).

## **Appendix B – The Western Colorado Landscape Collaborative**

The Western Colorado Landscape Collaborative is a coalition of representatives from state and federal agencies, local governments, environmental and conservation organizations, the academic and scientific communities, industry, and user groups. The convening force of this coalition is a commitment to forest health and fire risk mitigation along Colorado’s Western Slope.

The Western Colorado Landscape Collaborative convened for the first time in 2001 under the name Uncompahgre Plateau Project. This precedent-setting meeting included representatives from the Colorado Division of Wildlife, Bureau of Land Management, Western Area Power Administration, and policymakers, all of whom wanted to engage communities and foster support for the implementation of forest management goals that help protect communities and restore forest health across all jurisdictions. In 2011, the partners in this endeavor agreed to expand their efforts beyond the Uncompahgre Plateau and reorganized as the Western Colorado Landscape Collaborative.

The Collaborative now encompasses five working groups focused on community engagement, native species, public lands, economics, and policy. These groups developed information and data to foster discussion and support for the adoption and implementation of a Western Slope vision focused on community protection and forest health. This vision document was the result of a rigorous, science-based process during which the WCLC (as the Uncompahgre Partnership) identified a 1.0 million acre area for treatment on Colorado’s Western Slope. This area consists of 572,000 acres where treatment is needed to both protect communities and restore forest ecosystems, to include 55,000 acres of prescribed burning, 68,000 acres of collaborative ‘Citizen Scientist’ multi-party monitoring, 9,200 acres of noxious weed treatments, and 3,500 acres of reseeding with key native plants. Since the publication of this document the WCLC has focused its efforts on promoting treatment on these collaboratively identified areas in need of treatment and on pursuing additional policy and economic solutions to ensure these goals can be accomplished.

After the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program was established under the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 the WCLC partners were introduced to this opportunity and agreed to submit a proposal. The Uncompahgre Partnership, a sub-group of the WCLC, developed a draft proposal for the CFLRP using the 2006 vision document. The proposal was circulated to the full WCLC for revisions and submitted by the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests. For additional information on the Western Colorado Landscape Collaborative, see: <http://westcolc.org>, and for the Uncompahgre Partnership, see: <http://upartnership.org>

## Appendix C – Methods

A key component of the UP-CFLR project proposal was to measure the associated social and economic impacts of the UP-CFLR project. The social and economic monitoring component of the UP-CFLRP project was further developed through a multi-party monitoring effort after the proposal was accepted. Implementation of the social and economic monitoring has been conducted by a collaborative team from the Forest Service’s Rocky Mountain Regional Office (Julie Schaefers) and Washington Office (Kawa Ng) and the Colorado Forest Restoration Institute (Tony Cheng, Torsten Lund Snee, and Kathie Mattor) since 2011.

The following sections outline the methods used by the social and economic monitoring team to measure the economic contributions and the levels of wood utilization related to the UP-CFLRP project.

### Economic Contributions Analysis

This analysis estimated the economic effects resulting from the implementation of CFRLP funded vegetation restoration treatments on the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests in 2012. The economic contributions to the regional economy in terms of employment, labor income and value added are estimated with an Input-Output model using primary data provided by the contractor. The following paragraphs briefly describe the estimation methodology and results.

Economic effects of the UP-CFLRP were analyzed in terms of employment, labor income and value-added resulting from vegetation restoration treatment activities on National Forest system lands. It was therefore important to model these effects from the amount of expenditures and labor actually required to carry out the task orders<sup>4</sup> during the 2012 calendar year, instead of relying on the amount of

---

<sup>4</sup> “A ‘Task order contract’ means a contract for services that does not procure or specify a firm quantity of services (other than a minimum or maximum quantity) and that provides for the issuance of orders for the performance of tasks during the period of the contract.” (U.S. Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR), <https://www.acquisition.gov/far/>).

funding distributed<sup>5</sup>. Pertinent operational expenditure and labor information was collected from the contractor to appropriately model the economic contributions using an Input-Output model. The contractor was provided with a list of questions, which were reviewed with the team and the contractor before and after providing expenditure and labor information (See Appendix D). These reviews helped the contractor better understand what information the team was requesting and how the results would be used, as well as helping the team understand how the contractor interpreted the questions and reported the information. The UP-CFLR project utilized five contractors in CY2012 to carry out vegetation treatment task orders, and the results in this report have been aggregated to not disclose any detailed or sensitive information collected during the modeling process. Rather than assuming all expenditures for a project are incurred in the same location, the pertinent information collected to model inputs included: the location (county) where task orders are performed, where operational expenses are incurred, where labor hours and costs required for each task orders, and non-labor expenses such as equipment and fuel are incurred.

### **The Input-Output Model**

This analysis used Input-Output (I-O) modeling in order to estimate the economic effects of restoration activities. The U.S. Forest Service routinely uses I-O models to estimate local economic contributions of agency activities as part of the social and economic impact assessment in the environmental impact assessment required by NEPA. The I-O model used in this analysis is built using IMPLAN<sup>®</sup> software and its 2011 county-level data. IMPLAN<sup>®</sup> (IMPact analysis for PLANing, Minnesota IMPLAN Group, Inc.) is a regional economic impact analysis system. It is capable of determining the

---

<sup>5</sup> Unlike the Colorado Uncompahgre Plateau Project FY2012 report compiled by the National CFLRP team (available at: <http://www.fs.fed.us/restoration/CFLRP/results.shtml#annualreports>), which estimates the economic impact based upon the funding distributed, our analysis focused on detailed expenditure and operational data obtained from the contractors. Our analysis therefore focuses on just one component of the distribution of UP-CFLR funding. The calendar year was used because this is the method used by the contractors we obtained information from.

extent to which a given activity such as logging contributes to the local economy in terms of jobs, income, output and value-added. The model accomplishes this by tracing interactions among different sectors within the local economy and calculates the economic effects resulting from a direct impact on the economy. In this analysis, the direct impacts refer to both labor and non-labor operation expenditures incurred by the contractors.

## Study Area

The first step in building the I-O model is to select the counties to be included (i.e. the Study Area). The relative size of the economy plays an important role in the estimate of contributions on jobs and income; include too many counties and the results may be washed out, include too few counties and the full impact of the activity may not be accounted for in the model area. The study area for this analysis includes only counties that were identified by the contractor as locations where vegetation treatment task orders/expenditures have occurred. This includes four counties in Colorado: Delta, Gunnison, Mesa, and Montrose Counties.

## Calculating economic effects with the IMPLAN model

In order to estimate the economic effects of contractor expenditures, IMPLAN is used to generate “response coefficients” for a range of expenditure categories. Response coefficients, or more intuitively ‘the rates of economic activity’, represent how that activity would ripple through the economy and impact employment and income levels. They are expressed in term of the impacts to jobs, income and value-added per a specified unit of an activity (for example the dollar amounts in final demand). Based on data collected from the contractor, twelve categories<sup>6</sup> of response coefficients are generated<sup>7</sup>:

---

<sup>6</sup> The categories correspond to IMPLAN sectors which are based on NAISC (North American Industry Classification System) sectoring.

1. commercial and industrial machinery equipment (including repair and maintenance service),
2. petroleum refineries,
3. agriculture and forestry support activities (edited Industry Spending Pattern),
4. broadcast and wireless communications equipment manufacturing,
5. retail stores,
6. hand tools and vehicle parts,
7. other crop farming products, and
8. commercial trucking

In addition to the industry sector coefficients, four separate groups of response coefficients representing different household income groups were also generated using IMPLAN. These response coefficients are used to track how direct labor income (paychecks received by laborers hired by contractor) can be re-circulated through the household spending patterns causing further local economic activity. The groups are based on the estimated annual salaries for different types of workers in the contractor's firm, including office administration, project manager, forester, mechanic, trucking, manual hand crew, and equipment operator. Similar designations were made to distinguish between salary types for workers employed in monitoring activities. Direct labor hour requirements for the task orders were also collected from the contractors, and were used to calculate the total direct jobs.

---

<sup>7</sup> Based on information collected from the contractor, additional adjustments have been made by editing the activities in IMPLAN in order to further refine the model. For example, if only a proportion of the expenditure occurred in the study area, the LPP (local purchase percentage) in the IMPLAN model is adjusted accordingly.

## The Colorado Model

It should be noted that the economic impact estimates in this analysis contrasted with the estimates reported in the FY2012 CFLRP Annual Report for the Uncompahgre Plateau (USFS 2013) due to differences in methodologies and data assumptions.

The FY2012 CFLRP Annual report employed an Excel-based tool called ‘Treatments for Restoration Economic Analysis Tool’ (*TREAT*) for its analysis of all CFLR projects (USFS 2010). The Excel tool *TREAT* relies on existing response coefficients from IMPLAN and therefore is also able to estimate jobs and income. *TREAT* was designed to streamline data entry and preparation for the generation of economic impact tables to be used in the CFLRP proposals. The goal for this tool is to assist teams with estimating the economic impacts of restoration activities while providing a standard approach during the development of CFLR project proposals (USFS 2010).

Since this social-economic analysis aims to serve as part of a monitoring reporting effort, *TREAT* was not used to complete this analysis. Instead, a customized IMPLAN model was built using data inputs from the contractors. This customized IMPLAN model will be referred to as ‘*The Colorado Model*’ henceforth. The following section highlights the major dissimilarities between *TREAT* and *The Colorado Model*.

IMPLAN model study area: *The Colorado Model* was built using counties where contractor expenditures have occurred, with linkage to the county where office operation expenditures occurred via the Single-Region Input-Output (SRIO) modeling technique. *TREAT*, on the other hand, used counties where task orders are proposed to occur (excluding the contractor’s home office county).

Model / data year: *The Colorado Model* is based on IMPLAN data from calendar year 2011 (the latest available), using contractor’s expenditure information from calendar year 2012 as inputs. All figures

adjusted with GDP deflator. *TREAT* is based on IMPLAN data from calendar year 2009, while using the total awarded funding amount from fiscal year 2012 as inputs.

Economic impacts from matching funds and USFS employee salaries: *The Colorado Model* focused exclusively on impacts derived from CFLR funded task orders. *TREAT* on the other hand, included impacts derived from matching funds, as well as induced effects from USFS force salary by assuming a fairly substantial Forest Service FTEs allocated to CFLR responsibilities.

Modeling restoration activities: *The Colorado Model* obtained detailed expenditure and operational data from the contractor. These include the dollar amounts spent on various non-labor expenditures such as equipment maintenance or daily use rates, gasoline, office, tools, seeds and other operation costs. For labor, information on salaries and hours worked for different types of workers in the contractor's firm were collected, including office administration, project manager, forester, mechanic, trucking, manual hand crew, and equipment operator. Next, using the above information, analysis-by-parts modeling method was used to estimate impacts from various IMPLAN sectors. The *TREAT* model begins with the total awarded funding amount, and then estimates the impacts to the logging and supporting forestry sectors, by proportioning a percentage of the award that is going to be used for contracted work by Regional firm(s).

Impacts from Wood utilization: A detailed account on the amount and types of materials removed by task orders, as well as the number and location of businesses purchasing these forest product materials was provided in this report (see the 'Wood Utilization Analysis' section). Since we were unable to obtain data on the volume of timber harvested in terms of CCF/MBF/dry ton for calendar year 2012 alone, we did not use *The Colorado Model* to identify the economic impacts from forest products. Nevertheless, *TREAT* was able to estimate the jobs and income effects from forest products, by assuming that over six thousand CCF (cubic feet) worth of saw timber entered the regional economy in 2012.

## Conclusion

It is worth noting that both methods utilized IMPLAN at one point during the analytical process and that any multipliers IMPLAN produced are simply projections of impacts from various economic activities based on static models. While a genuine attempt at modeling the impacts from implementation (actual expenditures and labor entering the economy as outlined in this *Colorado Model*) should be taken at the project monitoring stage rather than projecting impacts from the total funds awarded, it is evident that the customized *Colorado Model*, constructed using expenditure data from the contractor, required greater commitments of time and effort. Considering these increased commitments, *TREAT* is by far a more streamlined and easy-to-use tool based out of Excel. *TREAT* is unquestionably the tool of choice when the extra effort of a customized model (such as *The Colorado Model*) proves unwarranted given the time, budget and expertise constraints being faced.

## References

- USDA Forest Service (USFS). 2010. Treatments for Restoration Economic Analysis Tool: User Guide. *An internal technical guide*. United States Forest Service.
- USDA Forest Service (USFS). 2013. Uncompahgre Plateau CFLRP Annual Report, FY2012. Available online at: <http://www.fs.fed.us/restoration/CFLRP/results.shtml> (last accessed July 25, 2014).

## Wood Utilization Analysis

The goals of the wood utilization analysis were to:

1. Identify the types of materials taken off of the National Forest according to the UP-CFLRP vegetation treatment task orders.
2. Determine the number and location of businesses purchasing these forest product materials.
3. Identify the types and values of wood products produced.

We provided the contractor with a list of questions to collect wood utilization data and reviewed these with the contractor before and after providing wood utilization information (Appendix E). These reviews helped the contractor better understand what information the team was requesting and how the results would be used, as well as helping the team understand how the contractor interpreted the questions and reported the information. The data from the contractor was then compiled and analyzed using basic statistical analyses.

# Appendix D –

## Economic Impacts of Restoration: Questions for Contractors

**1. Name of the restoration site and the project(s) you worked on:**

Please list all task orders associated with CFLR during calendar year 2012

(if more than one forest, please indicate; add more lines as needed)

Forest 1: _____	Ranger District	County	Mechanical Acres	Manual Acres	Date signed	Date started
Project	_____ Ranger District		###	###		
_____ NF Total			_____	_____		

**2. Check if you are responding for all of the work conducted on the restoration site or for specific site-related project(s) within a restoration site:**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Entire restoration site
- \_\_\_\_\_ Site-related restoration project(s)

**3. Site/project(s) and firm location:**

Use the following table to list the location of the site/project(s) that you worked on and any off-site locations for your firm that worked on **this restoration site/project(s)**. If there are more than two off-site locations, please choose the top two locations.

Site/Project(s) Location	State	County
Off-site Location 1		
Off-site Location 2		

**4. What type of restoration work did this site/project(s) include (check all that apply):**

- |                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| _____ Ag/grazing          | _____ Bird habitat/populations              |
| _____ Air quality         | _____ Fish habitat/populations              |
| _____ Fresh surface water | _____ Mammal habitat/populations            |
| _____ Groundwater         | _____ Reptile/amphibian habitat/populations |
| _____ Sediments           | _____ Other _____                           |
| _____ Shoreline           | _____ Other _____                           |
| _____ Wetland/marsh       | _____ Other _____                           |
| _____ Woodland/forest     | _____ Other _____                           |

**5. Did the site/project(s) have any chemical disturbance (e.g. oil spill, Superfund site)?**

\_\_\_\_ Yes  
 \_\_\_\_ No

**6. Which of the following roles did your firm play in this restoration project (check all that apply):**

____ Project management	____ Other project implementation
____ Management consulting	____ Monitoring
____ Restoration planning/design	____ Product vendor
____ Site Surveying	____ Other _____
____ On-site construction	____ Other _____

**7. Please describe your role in the project:**

**8. Subcontracting:**

a. Did you contract out any tasks to subcontractors? Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_

b. If yes, please provide:

- i. the name(s) of the subcontractor(s):
- ii. a description of the work performed by the sub-contractor(s):
- iii. where the sub-contractor(s) are based:

c. If necessary, can we have your permission to contact the subcontractor(s)? If yes, please provide the appropriate contact information.

**9. Direct employment for this project:**

Please indicate the total number of labor hours (including employees and managers) that worked on **this restoration site/project(s)** in each location (please refer to the locations identified in Question #2).

Task Order	Number of Acres completed for this task order:	Number of labor hours for employees working primarily at the Site/Project(s) Location:	Number of labor hours for employees working primarily at Off-Site Location 1:	Total number of labor hours for this restoration project:
				(Sum)
<b>Total:</b>				

a. Do the above labor hours include work done by subcontractors?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes

\_\_\_\_\_ No

b. If yes, what is the total number of labor hours billed by the subcontractor(s)? \_\_\_\_\_

**10. Overall breakdown of costs:**

Use the following table to identify the percent split between labor and non-labor costs for **this restoration site/project(s)**. Labor costs include benefits, wages, and proprietor’s income. Non-labor costs include all other expenses including overhead, administration and subcontracting.

Expenditure Category	% of total site/project(s) cost
Labor Costs	
Non-Labor Costs	

100%

**Breakdown of non-labor costs:**

Use the columns in the table below to answer the following two questions about non-labor expenses for **this restoration site/project(s)**. If you are unable to provide exact percentage breakdowns, please use your professional judgment to provide best-known estimates.

---

**Column 1:** What percentages of total non-labor expenses were spent on the following types of expenses for this project? This column should add to 100%.

**Column 2:** What percentages of these non-labor expenses were purchased within the local area surrounding the project location? (**Note: the local area is defined as a reasonable commuting distance**).

**\*Note:** Equipment refers to durable goods such as vehicles and machinery. Materials refer to goods purchased as inputs specifically for this project (e.g. gravel, fencing, office supplies, etc.)

<b>Non-Labor Costs</b>	<b>Column 1</b> Percentage of total non-labor expenses:	<b>Column 2</b> Percentage expended within the local area surrounding the site/project(s) location:
Equipment rental / leasing / daily use rates		
Equipment maintenance and repair		
Materials		
Travel		
Overhead /Administration		
Other (please describe)		
	<b>100%</b>	

**11. Breakdown of travel costs:**

If you had travel costs for this project, use the columns in the table below to answer the following two questions about travel expenses for ***this restoration site/project(s)***. If you are unable to provide exact percentage breakdowns, please use your professional judgment to provide best-known estimates.

---

**Column 1:** What percentages of total travel costs were spent on the following types of expenses for this project? This column should add to 100%.

**Column 2:** What percentages of these non-labor expenses were purchased within the local area surrounding the project location? (***Note: the local area is defined as a reasonable commuting distance.***)

---

<b>Travel Costs</b>	<b>Column 1</b> Percentage of total travel costs:	<b>Column 2</b> Percentage expended within the local area surrounding the site/project(s) location:
Per diem		
Car/truck rental (for travel)		
Gas (for travel)		
Other (including airfare)		

100%

**12. Breakdown of materials costs:**

Please use the table on the following page to indicate the types of materials used for **this restoration site/project**. Place a check mark next to all materials that were used in the project. **Please complete columns 1 and 2 only for the materials used in the project.**

**Column 1:** Please indicate the percent of total material costs spent on each material. This column should add to 100%. If you are unable to provide exact percentage breakdowns, please use your professional judgment to provide best-known estimates.

**Column 2:** Please use the check boxes to indicate if the material was purchased from a retailer.

Materials	Column 1 Percentage of total materials cost:	Column 2 Purchased from a retailer?	
		Yes	No
___ General retail merchandise (e.g. food, clothes, work gloves)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
___ Office Supplies		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
___ Gasoline		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
___ Tools and Parts (for equipment and vehicles)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
___ Seeds		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
___ Communications equipment		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
___ Other _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
___ Other _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
___ Other _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
___ Other _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

100%

**13. Breakdown of labor costs:**

What percentage of total labor costs (direct wages and non-payroll) typically go to the following types of workers? The column should add to 100%.

<b>Type of Worker</b>	<b>Percentage of total labor costs that go to labor for the following worker types:</b>
Project Managers	
Forester/ Biologists/ecologists/other	
Engineers and other planners/designers	
Mechanics	
Administrative Staff	
Machine and equipment operators	
Truck drivers	
Manual laborers	
Technicians	
Others (please describe)	
Others (please describe)	

100%

# Appendix E – Wood Utilization Survey

**1. Name of the restoration site and the project(s) you worked on:**

Please list all task orders associated with CFLR during calendar year 2012

*(if more than one forest, please indicate; add more lines as needed)*

Forest 1: _____	Ranger District	County	Mechanical Acres	Manual Acres	Date signed	Date started
<i>Project</i>	_____ <i>Ranger District</i>		###	###		
_____ NF Total			_____	_____		

**2. What percentage of the total amount of material harvested is:**

**Manual (out of 100%)**

- a. Available for value-added use? \_\_\_\_\_%
- b. Piled and burned (not for prescribed burn) \_\_\_\_\_%
- c. Left for wildlife habitat? \_\_\_\_\_% or \_\_\_\_\_ tons/acre

**Mechanical (out of 100%)**

- a. Available for value-added use? \_\_\_\_\_% (Sawtimber, POL and biomass)
- b. Piled and burned (not for prescribed burn) \_\_\_\_\_%
- c. Left for wildlife habitat? \_\_\_\_\_% or \_\_\_\_\_ tons/acre

**3. How many businesses purchase material from you (specifically related to this project)?**

Forest 1: \_\_\_\_\_ (Copy for additional forests)

- a. Total businesses: \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Colorado businesses: \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Other states: (please specify state and number of businesses): \_\_\_\_\_

**Overlap?**

If there are two or more forests associated with this project, are there any businesses that purchase from multiple forests? If yes, how many businesses? \_\_\_\_\_

4. What types of materials did you sell from the restoration site and project(s)?  
Where did these materials go?

Forest 1: \_\_\_\_\_ (Copy table for additional forests)

Materials Sold			Locations material was sold to: (please identify locations)		
	Amount (Green Tons)	The county the project was located in	County in CO	State outside of CO	County outside of CO (if available)
<b>Sawtimber</b> <i>(Specs?</i> _____)					
<b>Small diameter timber</b> <i>(Specs?</i> _____)					
<b>Blue stain</b>					
<b>Products other than logs (POL)</b>					
<b>Limbs/ brush</b>					
<b>Bark Fines</b>					
<b>Other</b> <i>(please specify):</i>					
<b>Total:</b>					

5. What percentage of the materials removed from the site went to each category of products?  
Where are the purchasers located? What is the value of the product?

Forest 1: \_\_\_\_\_ (Copy table for additional forests)

Products created	Column 1 Percent of total material sold:	Column 2 Product Value (low, medium, high)	Column 3 Locations material was sold to: (please specify <u>location</u> and <u>percentage</u> across row)				
			The county where the project was located:	Other county in CO:	State outside of CO:	County outside of CO:	
<i>example: firewood</i>	10%	Low	Larimer, 5%	Moffat, 2%; Montrose 3%	n/a	n/a	100%
Wood Fuel Pellets							100%
Biomass Electricity							100%
Firewood							100%
Pallets & Crates							100%
Dimensional lumber							100%
Logs - log homes							100%
Logs - other							100%
Beams & Timbers							100%
Trusses							100%
Posts/ poles							100%

Products created (continued)	Column 1 Percent of total material sold:	Column 2 Product Value (low, medium, high)	Column 3 Locations material was sold to: (please specify <u>location</u> and <u>percentage</u> across row)				
			The county where the project was located:	Other county in CO:	State outside of CO:	County/town outside of CO:	
<b>Flooring &amp; Paneling</b>							100%
<b>Doors</b>							100%
<b>Windows</b>							100%
<b>Veneer</b>							100%
<b>Custom Cabinets</b>							100%
<b>Mass produced cabinets</b>							100%
<b>Mass produced furniture</b>							100%
<b>Custom furniture</b>							100%
<b>Siding &amp; Decking</b>							100%
<b>Molding</b>							100%
<b>Holiday trees &amp; transplants</b>							100%
<b>Paper products</b>							100%

Products created (continued)	Column 1	Column 2	Column 3				
	Percent of total material sold:	Product Value (low, medium, high)	Locations material was sold to: (please specify <u>location</u> and <u>percentage</u> across row)				
			The county where the project was located:	Other county in CO:	State outside of CO:	County outside of CO:	
Shavings							100%
Soil Fertilizer/ Biochar							100%
Animal Bedding							100%
Landscape ties							100%
Chips							100%
Mulch							100%
Compost							100%
Fencing							100%
Other - specify							100%
	100%						

## About the Colorado Forest Restoration Institute

The Colorado Forest Restoration Institute (CFRI) was established in 2005 as an application-oriented program of the Department of Forest & Rangeland Stewardship in Warner College of Natural Resources at Colorado State University in 2005. CFRI's purpose is to develop, synthesize, and apply locally-relevant science-based knowledge to achieve forest restoration and wildfire hazard reduction goals in Colorado and the Interior West. We do this through collaborative partnerships involving researchers, forest land managers, interested and affected stakeholders, and communities. Authorized by Congress through the Southwest Forest Health and Wildfire Prevention Act of 2004, CFRI is one of three Institutes comprising the Southwest Ecological Restoration Institutes, along with centers at Northern Arizona University and New Mexico Highlands University.

The Colorado Forest Restoration Institute at Colorado State University receives financial support through the Cooperative and International Programs of the U.S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, under the Southwest Forest Health and Wildfire Prevention Act. In accordance with Federal law and U.S. Department of Agriculture policy, this institution is prohibited from discriminating on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age, or disability. To file a complaint of discrimination, write: USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights Room 326-A, Whitten Building 1400 Independence Avenue, SW Washington, DC 20250-9410 or call (202) 720-5964 (voice & TDD)

The Full Report is available at: <http://coloradoforestrestoration.org/>



**Colorado State University**