1. Funds Expended

| Fund Source | Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year (\$) |
|--|--|
| CFLR Funds | \$985,943 |
| Partner Matching Funds | \$551,000 |
| FS Matching BLI (please include a new row for each | |
| BLI) | |
| NFTM | \$2,548,000 |
| NFVW | \$887,000 |
| NFWF | \$60,000 |
| NFN3 | \$416,000 |
| WFHF | \$3,451,000 |
| WFW3 | \$221,000 |
| CMRD | \$4,000,000 |
| CMII | \$140,000 |
| CMTL | \$309,000 |
| CMLG | \$2,100,000 |
| HTAP | \$74,000 |
| SSSS | \$99,000 |
| CWKV | \$111,000 |
| CWK2 | \$30,000 |
| BDBD | \$6,000 |
| RTRT | \$488,000 |
| SPS4 | \$253,000 |
| SPFH | \$315,000 |
| ARRA | \$8,998,000 |
| SRS2 | \$851,000 |
| Partner in-kind services | \$444,360 |
| Product value – total sawtimber volume sold within | |
| the 4FRI area is 63,451 ccf (from PTSAR); low end base | |
| rate is \$3 | \$190,353 |
| Total Match | \$26,442,713 |

2. Report on the performance measures outlined in the plan entitled 10 year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan¹, dated December 2006:

There has been no change in the performance measures identified below as the "on the ground" treatment associated with the CFLR funds has not begun.

| Performance Measure | Units | Value for Fiscal Year |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Percent change from 10-year average for wildfires | | |
| controlled during initial attack | Percent Change | 0 |
| Percent change from 10 year average for number of | | |
| unwanted human-caused wildfires | Percent Change | 0 |
| Percent of fires not contained in initial attack that | | |
| exceed a stratified cost index | Percent of Fires | 0 |
| Number and percent of WUI acres treated that are | | |
| identified in CWPPS or other application collaboratively | Number of Acres, | |
| developed plans ² | Percent of Acres | 0 |
| Number and percent of non-WUI acres treated that are | | |
| identified through collaboration consistent with the | Number of Acres, | |
| Implementation Plan | Percent of Acres | 0 |
| Number of acres treated per million dollars gross | | |
| investment in WUI and non-WUI areas ³ | Number of Acres | 0 |
| Percent of collaboratively identified high priority acres | | |
| treated where fire management objectives are achieved | | |
| as identified in applicable management plans or | | |
| strategies | Percent of Acres | 0 |
| Number and percent of acres treated by prescribed fire, | | |
| through collaboration consistent with the | Number of Acres, | |
| Implementation Plan. | Percent of Acres | 0 |
| Number and percent of acres treated by mechanical | | |
| thinning, through collaboration consistent with the | Number of Acres, | |
| Implementation Plan. | Percent of Acres | 0 |
| Number of acres and percent of the natural ignitions | | |
| that are allowed to burn under strategies that result in | Number of Acres, | |
| desired conditions | Percent of Ignitions | 0 |
| Number and percent of acres treated to restore fire- | | |
| adapted ecosystems which are moved toward desired | Number of Acres, | |
| conditions | Percent of Acres | 0 |
| Number and percent of acres treated to restore fire- | Number of Acres, | |
| adapted ecosystems which are maintained in desired | Percent of Acres | 0 |

¹ 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). A copy of the plan is available at HTTP://WWW.FS.FED.US/RESTORATION/CFLR/ANNUAL.SHTML.

² This value should reflect only fuels treatments.

³ This value should reflect both CFLR and Match funds

| conditions | | |
|--|----------------------|---|
| Number and percent of burned acres identified in | | |
| approved post-wildfire recovery plans as needing | Number of Acres, | |
| treatments that actually receive treatments | Percent of Acres | 0 |
| Percent of burned acres treated for post-wildfire | | |
| recovery that are trending towards desired conditions | Percent of Acres | 0 |
| Number of green tons and/or volume of woody biomass | | |
| from hazardous fuel reduction and restoration | | |
| treatments on federal land that are made available for | | |
| utilization through permits, contracts, grants, | | |
| agreements or equivalent | Number of Green Tons | 0 |

3. Evaluate project progress:

Restoration accomplishments to date: The restoration work that has occurred to date on the 4FRI landscape has been primarily under the normal programs of work on the four forests. The Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest (ASNF) has put the majority of its restoration efforts into the White Mountain Stewardship Contract (WMSC).

Collaborative Achievements: During the past year the 4FRI Collaborative Stakeholder Group has accomplished numerous tasks that include:

- 1. Completion of the Path Forward to guide 4FRI implementation and describe the areas of agreement by the members of the collaborative. The document includes a vision, principles, key strategies, ecological goals, science and collaboration-based adaptive management strategies, and sideboards.
- 2. Completion of a Charter that describes the collaborative stakeholder internal operating structure, including deliberation and decision rules, and participation guidelines.
- 3. A draft of a Memorandum of Understanding between the Forest Service and the 4FRI Collaborative Stakeholder Group outlining a framework for ongoing collaboration.
- 4. Preparation of a landscape strategy designed to help inform the NEPA process. These include:
 - a. A GIS based landscape strategy for analyzing and identifying treatment areas for the first 750,000 analysis area that includes methods for treatment identification and prioritization and collaboratively approved Desired Future Conditions.
 - b. Recommendations for monitoring and adaptive management (soon to be followed by recommendations for research.
 - c. An Economic and Utilization Analysis that defines industry needs in order to successfully stimulate new and expanded investment in harvest and utilization.
- 5. Numerous public meetings and media placements to build broad public support for the 4FRI effort.

4. Jobs Created:

| Type of projects | Total direct | Total indirect | Total Direct | Total Indirect |
|----------------------------|--------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| | jobs | jobs | Labor Income | Labor Income ⁴ |
| Commercial Forest Products | 374.8 | 405.4 | \$13,557,715 | \$16,503,535 |
| Other Project Activities | 71.4 | 29.6 | \$2,929,337 | \$1,225,981 |
| TOTALS: | 446.2 | 435.0 | \$16,487,051 | \$17,729,516 |

The information included in the TREAT spreadsheet for the percentages to contracting and the distribution of products is a rough estimate at this time. This will be updated and revised with the FY11 annual report once the contract is awarded and we know the type(s) of industry and the schedule for implementation.

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

The 4FRI Stakeholders identified a series of monitoring indicators to determine progress towards economic and social goals. A final choice of indicators will depend on the NEPA document and available human and financial resources provided by the Forest Service and stakeholders. The indicators that were proposed by the Stakeholders and sent to the Forest Service on October 1, 2010 as part of the Landscape Strategy Include:

| Monitoring Item | Monitoring Indicator | Frequency of Measurement | Data Source/Spatial Scale/Cost |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Economics | | Medsarement | Scale, cost |
| The byproducts of mechanical | Policy and implementation is | • | G |
| forest restoration offset the costs | benefits of restoration activit | ies, including non-marl | ket costs and benefits. |
| of treatment implementation. | | | |
| The economic value of | Aspirational goal. | | |
| ecosystem services provided by | | | |
| restored forests are realized and | | | |
| reinvested to support forest | | | |
| restoration and ecosystem | | | |
| management. | | | |
| Rural communities receive direct | Aspirational goal. | | |
| and indirect economic benefits | | | |
| and ecosystem services as a | | | |
| result of forest restoration and | | | |
| resilient forests. | | | |

⁴ Values obtained from Treatment for Restoration Economic Analysis Tool (TREAT) spreadsheet, "Impacts-Jobs and Income" tab. Spreadsheet available at HTTP://WWW.FS.FED.US/RESTORATION/CFLR/ANNUAL.SHTML

| The average net cost of treatment per acre for all treatments in the analysis area over a ten year period is reduced significantly. | Aspirational goal. Monitoring to track non-governmental co | _ | costs, but note that it is difficult llues. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Sufficient harvest and manufacturing capacity exists to achieve restoration of at least 300,000 acres in the next ten years. | Estimate of harvesting and utilization capacity. | 5 yrs | Government records, inferences from response to contracts, expert opinion. |
| Social Systems There is broad public support or acceptance of collaboratively-based forest restoration decisions, processes, and outcomes, including the use of fire as a management tool. | Public support/concerns assessed (minimum threshold of support? 50?) | 1. Pre and post treatment 2. Pre and post education/outreach program delivery | Interviews with land managers and focus groups with community members to assess specific issues/concerns, used to develop telephone survey questions./Data analyzed: Short term: within analysis area; Long term: across the four forests/\$30K each pre and post measures per analysis area. |
| Social values and recreational opportunities are protected or enhanced through forest restoration activities. | Social values and recreational opportunities assessed | Pre and post treatment Pre and post education/outreach program delivery | Targeted focus groups (two/organization) aimed at specific user groups (hunters, hikers, ORV, etc.) and/or telephone survey with general public./Data analyzed: Short term: within analysis area; Long term: across the four forests/Focus groups:\$5-10K per organization; telephone survey (cost as above). |
| Rural communities are protected from high-severity fire and their quality of life is enhanced through forest restoration. | Frequency and acreage of high-severity fire in and around rural communities (w/in xx miles) Quality of life assessed | As projects are completed around communities. Pre and post treatment Pre and post education/outreach program delivery | 1. USFS wildfire database within analysis area (short term); across the 4FRI area (long term)/\$500/analysis area. 2. Telephone survey (cost as above). |

| Rural communities play an active part in reducing fire risk by implementing FIREWISE actions and creating defensible space around their property. | 1. Number of households/neighborhoods that are implementing (the degree of) "Fire Wise" principles 2. Number of communities in the analysis/4FRI area that are recognized as "Fire Wise" | 1. Pre and post treatment 2. Pre and post education/outreach program delivery | 1. Telephone survey (cost as above) 2. Interview fire station personnel in neighborhood/home assessments and/or review fire station field survey logs/\$2-5K 3. Number of neighborhoods certified through Firewise/Communities/ USA./\$500 |
|---|--|---|---|
| Treatments within the analysis area minimize short-term impacts and enhance vegetation characteristics valued by Forest users over the long-term. | Forest user perceptions of treatments within the analysis area. | One year post- treatment Five years post- treatment | Multiple field trips with Forest users (random selection of participants to adequately represent general public)/Analysis area/\$5K |
| There is low potential for fires to enter communities. Communities and homeowners are prepared for the undesirable case that fires that do enter communities. | Fire modeling Number of households and neighborhoods implementing "Fire Wise" principles | Pre and post treatment in WUI communities. Pre and post education/outreach program delivery | 1. 4FRI Science & Monitoring WG/Communities within analysis area/Cost? 2. Telephone survey (cost as above). 3. Interview fire station personnel in neighborhood/home assessments and/or review fire station field survey logs/\$2-5K 4. Number of neighborhoods certified through Firewise/Communities/USA./\$500 |
| Fire management costs are reduced; aggressive fire suppression is unneeded or rare. | Forest Service fire suppression costs Number and acreage of USFS suppressed wildfires | 10 yrs. | Forest Service records. National Interagency Fire Center records on wildfire occurrence/Analysis area/\$1K |

6. Describe the results of the multiparty monitoring, evaluation, and accountability process.

This project is in the start-up phase and therefore cannot report results from multi-party monitoring. However, collaborative monitoring for this effort will be led by the Science and Monitoring Working Group in conjunction with the Forest Service. It will be multi-party and multi-scale and will contribute to an adaptive management strategy. One of the inherent strengths of the 4FRI effort is that it brings together science providers and interpreters from academia, NGOs, and resource management agencies. This group brings to the effort decades of work experience in the 4FRI landscape as well as substantial public and private resources vital to any monitoring program's long-term success. Key researchers

Four Forest Restoration Initiative CFLRP Annual Report | 2010

who developed an understanding of how fire disturbance works in southwestern ponderosa pine communities, how these communities have changed since European-settlement, and how these factors influence wildlife and forest health participate in the 4FRI. Many of the stakeholders who have worked for decades with these researchers are also participating.

Multi-party monitoring is a well established way of engaging stakeholders in the 4FRI Region and includes implementation monitoring to ensure that treatment prescriptions designed to meet the desired condition are followed. Lessons learned form other monitoring efforts are being used to inform the design of the 4FRI monitoring strategy.

Annual reporting will be conducted and will tie directly to the goals and objectives laid forth in the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Act (CFLRA) (such as, acres treated, economic benefits realized, monitoring results, and cost summaries), 10-Year Strategy from the Western Governors' Association (December 2006), and the Performance Accountability Systems associated with the Forest Service's databases. Annual reports will be an essential component in evaluating and communicating the effectiveness and efficiency of restoration treatments across the 4FRI treatment area and will support a long-term process of adaptive management. The reports will be based on a transparent effort among all relevant stakeholders to ensure data is coordinated, timely, accurate, and scientifically supported. Key contacts within all relevant land management agencies, existing and future multi-party monitoring groups, and academia will be established to ensure critical data needs are sustained.

7. A summary of the costs of treatments

The project is just beginning and there have been no treatments specific to this project. The following information is based on the accomplishments of the portions of the 4 forests within the project area from their regular program. The accomplishments are from the various databases of records.

| | | | | | | | Type of Funds |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Ecological restoration | | | | Range of | | Funds Utilized | (CFLR, Specific |
| treatment | Unit of | Total Units | Total Units | Costs per | Average Cost | to Accomplish | FS BLI, Partner |
| (Performance Measure Code) | measurement | Accomplished ⁵ | Completed ⁶ | Unit | per Unit | Treatment (\$) | Match) ⁷ |
| | | 11 | | | | | NFWF |
| | | 8 | | | | | PTNR |
| | | 671 | | | | | RTRT |
| | | 90 | | | | | SPFH |
| Acres of forest vegetation | | 1,141 | | | | | WRHR |
| established | Acres | Total = 1,921 | | | | | |
| | | 145 | | | | | CWKV |
| | | 1,269 | | | | | NFVW |
| | | 924 | | | | | RTRT |
| | | 945 | | | | | SPFH |
| | | 575 | | | | | SPS4 |
| | | 989 | | | | | WFHF |
| | | 7,917 | | | | | WRHR |
| Acres of forest vegetation improved | Acres | Total = 12,764 | | | | | |

⁵ Units Accomplished should reflect the number of units designated through awarded contracts or force account implementation in progress ⁶ Units Completed should reflect work actually done on the ground.

⁷ Please use a new line for each 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.

| Ecological restoration | | | | Range of | | Funds Utilized | Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific |
|--|-------------|---------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|----------------------------------|
| treatment | Unit of | Total Units | Total Units | Costs per | Average Cost | to Accomplish | FS BLI, Partner |
| (Performance Measure Code) | measurement | Accomplished ⁵ | Completed ⁶ | Unit | per Unit | Treatment (\$) | Match) ⁷ |
| | | 337 | | \$10-\$1,979 | \$337 | \$61,670 | NFN3 |
| | | 2,736 | | \$10-\$200 | \$123 | \$151,157 | NFVW |
| | | 625 | | \$0-\$200 | \$172 | \$129,487 | PTNR |
| | | 44 | | \$80-\$300 | \$172 | \$8,2626 | WFPR |
| Manage noxious weeds and | | 1,463 | | \$7-\$75 | \$61 | \$96,155 | WFW3 |
| invasive plants | Acres | Total = 5,202 | | | | | |
| Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved | | | | | | | |
| to achieve desired watershed | | | | | | | |
| conditions. | Acres | 16,763 | | | | | |
| Acres of lake habitat restored or | | | | | | | |
| enhanced | Acres | 2.5 | | | | | |
| Miles of stream habitat restored or | | | | | | | |
| enhanced | Miles | 14.6 | | | | | |
| Acres of terrestrial habitat restored | | 50.745 | | | | | |
| or enhanced | Acres | 59,745 | | | | | |
| | | 646 | | 450 4000 | 4400 | 4=0.0=0 | NFN3 |
| | | 272 | | \$62-\$388 | \$186 | \$58,050 | NFVW |
| | | 1,389 | | \$100-\$120 | \$110 | \$110,830 | NFWF |
| | | 2,474 | | 4 4 | 4 | 4 | NONE |
| | | 11,449 | | \$20-\$80 | \$54 | \$252,646 | |
| | | 270 | | | \$250 | \$122,250 | SPS4 |
| | | 13,250 | | \$20-\$200 | \$97 | \$956,000 | WFHF |
| | | 663 | | | \$200 | \$132,600 | WFSU |
| | | 2,288 | | | | | WRFH |
| Acres of rangeland vegetation | | 39 | | | | | WFHR |
| improved | Acres | Total = 32,740 | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | Type of Funds |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Ecological restoration | | | | Range of | | Funds Utilized | (CFLR, Specific |
| treatment | Unit of | Total Units | Total Units | Costs per | Average Cost | to Accomplish | FS BLI, Partner |
| (Performance Measure Code) | measurement | Accomplished ⁵ | Completed ⁶ | Unit | per Unit | Treatment (\$) | Match) ⁷ |
| | | 859 | | | | | CMRD |
| | | 1 | | | | | ARRA |
| | | 17 | | | | | CWFS |
| Miles of high clearance system | | 121 | | | | | Other |
| roads receiving maintenance | Miles | Total = 998 | | | | | |
| | | 20 | | | | | CFLR |
| | | 555 | | | | | CMRD |
| | | 3 | | | | | ARRA |
| | | 15 | | | | | CWFS |
| Miles of passenger car system | | 90 | | | | | Other |
| roads receiving maintenance | Miles | Total = 683 | | | \$49,297 | \$985,943 | |
| | | 13 | | | | | CMLG |
| | | 3 | | | | | Other |
| Miles of road decommissioned | Miles | Total = 16 | | | | | |
| | | 66 | | | | | CMRD |
| | | 6 | | | | | ARRA |
| Miles of passenger car system | | 1 | | | | | Other |
| roads improved | Miles | Total = 73 | | | | | |
| | | 20 | | | | | CMRD |
| | | 31 | | | | | ARRA |
| Miles of high clearance system road | | 33 | | | | | Other |
| improved | Miles | Total = 84 | | | | | |
| Miles of system trail maintained to | | | | | | | |
| standard | Miles | 136.5 | | | | | |
| Miles of system trail improved to | | | | | | | |
| standard | Miles | 20 | | | | | |
| Miles of property line | Miles | 11.05 | | | | | |
| marked/maintained to standard | Miles | 11.65 | | | | | |

| Ecological restoration | | | | Range of | | Funds Utilized | Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific |
|------------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|----------------------------------|
| treatment | Unit of | Total Units | Total Units | Costs per | Average Cost | to Accomplish | FS BLI, Partner |
| (Performance Measure Code) | measurement | Accomplished ⁵ | Completed ⁶ | Unit | per Unit | Treatment (\$) | Match) ⁷ |
| | | 4,448 | • | | • | | NONE |
| | | 806 | | | | | WFHF |
| Acres of forestlands treated using | | 3,226 | | | | | WRHR |
| timber sales | Acres | Total = 8,480 | | | | | |
| | | 121,969 | | | | | NFTM |
| | | 15,836 | | | | | SSSS |
| Volume of timber sold (CCF) | CCF | Total = 137,805 | | | | | |
| Green tons from small diameter | | | | | | | |
| and low value trees removed from | | | | | | | |
| NFS lands and made available for | | | | | | | |
| bio-energy production | Tons | 382,357 | | | | | |
| | | 188 | | | | | CWKV |
| | | 105 | | | | | NFVW |
| | | 1,409 | | | | | NFWF |
| | | 1,219 | | | | | NONE |
| | | 11,448 | | | | | PTNR |
| | | 893 | | | | | RTRT |
| | | 945 | | | | | SPFH |
| | | 305 | | | | | SPS4 |
| | | 12,253 | | | | | WFHF |
| | | 1,959 | | | | | WFPR |
| Acres of hazardous fuels treated | | 14,007 | | | | | WFSU |
| outside the wildland/urban | | 2,288 | | | | | WRFH |
| interface (WUI) to reduce the risk | | 1,527 | | | | | WRHR |
| of catastrophic wildland fire | Acres | Total = 48,546 | | | | | |

| 7 | Λ | 1 | Λ |
|---|---|---|---|
| Z | U | L | U |

| Ecological restoration treatment (Performance Measure Code) | Unit of measurement | Total Units Accomplished ⁵ | Total Units Completed ⁶ | Range of Costs per Unit | Average Cost per Unit | Funds Utilized to Accomplish Treatment (\$) | Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match) ⁷ |
|---|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | 1,447 | | | | | NFVW |
| | | 3,271 | | | | | NONE |
| | | 654 | | | | | PTNR |
| | | 422 | | | | | RTRT |
| | | 540 | | | | | SPS4 |
| | | 28,194 | | | | | WFHF |
| | | 689 | | | | | WFPR |
| Acres of wildland/urban interface | | 1,412 | | | | | WFSU |
| (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels | | 1,934 | | | | | WRFH |
| treated to reduce the risk of | | 12,563 | | | | | WRHR |
| catastrophic wildland fire | Acres | Total = 51,126 | | | | | |

8. Describe other relevant fire management activities (hazardous fuel treatments will be covered in the above table):

None

9.

| Number of miles of temporary road constructed in | Number of miles of temporary road decommissioned in | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| Fiscal Year | Fiscal Year | | | |
| 8.7 | 10.7 | | | |

10. Describe any reasons that the annual report does not reflect your work plan. Did you face any unexpected challenges this year that caused you to change what was outlined in your proposal? (no more than two pages)

The project is just beginning. We are still on the basic schedule outlined in the proposal. The workplan has not been completed yet.