CFLR Project(Name/Number): Dinkey Landscape Restoration Project/CFLR07
National Forest(s): Sierra National Forest

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. FY12 Matching Funds Documentation

Fund Source	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2012($)
CFLR Funds Expended[1]	CFLR - $602,012.28
	CFLN - $806,778.53
Carryover funds expended (HPRP funds or Carryover to supplement CFLR/CFLN)[2] (please include a new row for each BLI)*	NFTM - $116,750.00
	NFWF - $37,401
	WFHF - $112,500
	NFVW - $42,563
FS Matching Funds (please include a new row for each BLI)[3]	NFLM - $2,275.78
	NFTM - $139,667.79
	NFVW - $3,584.71
	WFHF - $210,906.92
Funds contributed through agreements[4]	The Wilderness Society - $20,000
	National Forest Foundation - $10,000
Partner In-Kind Contributions[5]	$0
Service work accomplishment through goods-for services funding within a stewardship contract[6]	$154,177

*The balance of $95,849 was not used because it was sent to the Forest in September, which is late in the year. It was used as carryover in FY2013.

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

In FY2012, the project entered into a cost-share agreement with the Wilderness Society to fund an ecological monitoring coordinator, received a grant from the National Forest Foundation to support the collaborative development of desired conditions, and received in-kind contributions in the form of event venues, multi-party monitoring, environmental education activities and time in meetings.

Approved by : *//S//*
Dean Gould, Acting Forest Supervisor

[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 tited Listing and Expenditure Report – Detailed Analysis by Fiscal Year minus the below matching funds.
[3] This amount should match the amount of matching funds obligated in the PAS report titled CFLR Job Code Listing and Expenditure Report – Detailed Analysis by Fiscal Year minus the above carryover/HPRP funds.
[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.

2. Discuss how the CLFR project contributes to accomplishment of the performance measures in the *10 year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan*[7], 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).

The Dinkey Landscape Restoration Project has contributed significantly to the goals laid out in the *10-Year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan*. Opportunities for accomplishments in all categories did not present themselves this past year, but the following discussion outlines some of the highlights of the FY2012 accomplishments:

Goal 1 of the *Implementation Plan* is to improve fire prevention and suppression, and the implementation outcomes are the elimination of loss of life and firefighter injuries, and reduction of wildfire damage to communities and the environment. During the FY12 fire season, there were 8 natural ignitions that occurred within the project boundary. Initial attack was successful in containing all ignitions to within .1 acre in size, with one exception which became the Ross fire and was successfully suppressed with no injuries to firefighters or damage to the neighboring communities.

Goal 2 of the *Implementation Plan* is to reduce hazardous fuels, and the implementation outcome is the reduction of wildfire risk to communities and the environment. A total of 3,737 acres of hazardous fuels were treated within the project area during FY2012. 2,789 of these acres were within the WUI and amount to 5% of the total number of WUI acres identified by collaboratively developed plans. The remaining 948 acres were not located in the WUI, but were identified by collaboratively developed plans and were consistent with the *Implementation Plan.*

Goal 3, Part A, of the *Implementation Plan* is the restoration of fire-adapted ecosystems, and the implementation outcome is the restoration and maintenance of these ecosystems, using appropriate tools, in a manner that will provide sustainable environmental, social, and economic benefits. In FY2012, 5,329 acres were moved toward desired conditions through collaboration consistent with the *Implementation Plan*. The opportunity to manage wildfire for ecological benefit did not present itself with the project boundary.

Goal 3, Part A, of the *Implementation Plan* is the restoration and post-fire recovery of fire-adapted ecosystems, and the implementation outcome is the recovery of lands damaged by wildfire to desired conditions. The project boundary does not include area damaged by recent wildfire.

Goal 4 of the *Implementation Plan* is the promotion of community assistance, and the implementation outcome is the increased capacity to prevent losses from Wildland fire and realize economic benefits resulting from treatments and services. In addition to the acres of hazardous fuels within the WUI reduced on Forest Service lands, 1,290 green tons of woody biomass from fuel reduction and restoration treatments was been removed from federal land and made available for utilization in FY12, and the Highway 168 Fire Safe Council has been actively represented in the Dinkey Collaborative.

[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).

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

The following assumptions were used in generating numbers:

- All commercial timber sold in FY12 would be processed by Sierra Forest Products
- The actual CFLN/CFLR allocation for FY12 was used, rather than the proposed funding
- Funding obligated to Enterprise Teams was not considered a "Contract Funding Distribution"

FY 2012 Jobs Created/Maintained (FY12 CFLR/CFLN/HPRP/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	**8**	**19.1**	**$433,617**	**$854,557**
Other Project Activities	**4.7**	**6.9**	**$182,301**	**$265,313**
TOTALS:	**12.6**	**26.0**	**$615,918**	**$1,119,870**

FY 2012 Jobs Created/Maintained (FY12 CFLR/CFLN/HPRP/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	**53.6**	**128.6**	**$2,917,311**	**$5,749,332**
Other Project Activities	**5.9**	**8.7**	**$230,089**	**$334,863**
TOTALS:	**59.5**	**137.4**	**$3,147,401**	**$6,084,195**

4. Describe other community benefits achieved and the methods used to gather information about these benefits (Please limit answer to two pages).

The employment benefits outlined in the question above (137.4 direct and indirect jobs) and the ecological and fire management accomplishments summarized in question 6 below only tell a piece of the story. This project encompasses a complex landscape where management objectives conflict, stakeholders have a history of antagonism, and land management efforts have often been stymied. The collaborative approach to project planning, the engagement of key stakeholder groups, the funding of the CFLRP, and the hard work of Forest Service staff have enabled thoughtful, leading-edge land management to take place within the Dinkey Landscape Restoration Project. Data collection for the socio-economic monitoring will begin in FY13, under a cost-share agreement with the Sierra Institute.

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

[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.*

In FY12, a Monitoring Coordinator position was advertised and a panel of Collaborative members was convened to interview and select a candidate. The position is filled by Dr. Susan Roberts, who began working with the Collaborative on October 1st, 2012. The contract will be administered through a cost-share with the Wilderness Society. The scope of work will include supporting both the ecological and socioeconomic monitoring efforts (e.g. helping organize incoming data, tracking associated action items).

There is an overall Monitoring Work Group with approximately 10 active members. Historically this group has worked both on ecological and socioeconomic issues. An ecological monitoring matrix and corresponding monitoring questions, as well as a list of priority monitoring projects, has been developed by the Monitoring Work Group and endorsed by the Collaborative.

Monitoring has occurred by different resources within the CFLR boundary. Summaries are provided below for the following resources: archaeology, aquatics, botany, fuels, silviculture, and terrestrial wildlife.

Archaeology

The High Sierra Heritage Resources Department conducted cultural resource monitoring to meet Stipulations III.B and IV of the Regional Programmatic Agreement for complying with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Monitoring actions are documented in Cultural Resource Reports, and reported to the State Historic Preservation Officer in the annual Sierra NF Heritage Report. Within the Dinkey Collaborative Boundary in 2012, monitoring of archaeological and historic sites was conducted. For Dinkey North and South, four cultural resource sites were monitored in units planned for implementation. For Eastfork Project, thirteen sites were monitored in units planned for layout and implementation. In Bald Mountain Project, approximately 1,000 acres were newly surveyed for cultural resources, three new sites recorded, and over 60 cultural *resources* monitored to assess condition and site protection needs. In order to comply with Section 110 of the NHPA, the Heritage department also conducts survey and site monitoring; approximately ten acres were surveyed and one site monitored in the Dinkey Collaborative Boundary.

Aquatics

Completed the BE/BA's for Eastfork and Soaproot. Ten water temperature devices were installed for monitoring stream water temperatures in TES habitat within the collaborative project boundary. Within the Bald Mountain project area, 1.2 miles of Stream Condition Inventory was completed on 2 streams, 12 meadows (44 acres) and 21 streams (15 miles) were surveyed for TES aquatic species such as Yosemite toad and Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog and WF Cow Creek annual population monitoring was completed (3 miles) for Lahontan cutthroat trout population estimates. Channel Analysis surveys were conducted on 10 streams (5.5 miles) for channel type and condition. Within the Eastfork Project area, 7 meadows (16 acres) were monitored for Yosemite toad populations and the annual population monitoring in Snow Corral Meadow (36.5 acres) was completed for the isolated population of Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog.

Botany

Noxious weed monitoring has occurred in approximately 10% of Dinkey South and about 10-15% of Dinkey North. The surveys were done along major roads through both units. Surveys are expected to continue in both units for the next two years.

Updated Threatened, Endangered and Forest Service sensitive species information:

- One new occurrence of *Hulsea brevifolia*, one new occurrence of *Epilobium howellii*, and one new occurrence of *Meesia triquetra* were found.
- At least four new bull thistle occurrences were found in the project area.
- Reasonably sure that some new TES occurrences will be found in the extreme NE corner of project adjacent to Dinkey Pendant Roof geological Area but not yet identified (due to soil type and habitat occurring in the area)
- Older occurrences of *Bruchia bolanderi* and *Viola pinetorum* ssp. *grisea* were not re-located or found despite being within the project area boundary. Cannot be ruled out, of course but they were not relocated in this year's survey.
- One new occurrence of a SNF Watch List species (*Drosera rotundifolia*) was found.

Fuels

Prescribed fire burn monitoring plots was conducted for the burns. Preburn plots have been put in on Dinkey South unit 172, Haslett and Clarence.

Silviculture

In Dinkey North and Dinkey South Projects 220 vegetation monitoring plots have been taken. The plots were variable radius plots which sampled live tree size, density, species composition, vigor, and disease problems. In addition to the variable radius plot taken, a fix plot was also taken which sampled the ground cover of shrubs, grasses, herbs, and other non-tree plant life. Another ¼ acre fixed plot sampled snag size, density, species, and decay class. In areas where tractor piling has been completed, the snag plot also included collecting similar information on logs. Plots were GPSed with a sub-meter accurate geo-correctable GPS and two photos were taken at each plot location The vegetation plots will allow us a preliminary understanding of how close we came to hitting the targeted vegetation indicators identified in the NEPA documents.

LiDAR has also been flown over the Dinkey North and South Projects in 2012. This will allow us to compare the pre and post treatment LiDAR data for the projects. This data will give us a seamless understanding of pre and post treatment canopy height, cover, basal area, snags, and many other vegetation indicators. LiDAR data was also collect in 2012 over parts of the Bald Mountain Project Area, and many other project areas planned in the future for the Dinkey Landscape.

Approximately 720 plots were taken in 2012 in the Bald Mountain Project Area. The plots included variable radius plots sampling trees in a way similar to the Dinkey Monitoring plots. In addition, information on the site class of the plot was collected via coring trees. Information on the small woody fuels in the plot was collected using fuel photo series books. Information on brush, logs, and snags was also collected. Plots were also GPSed using a sub-meter accurate geo-correctable GPS, and two photos were taken at each plot.

2012 vegetation plots (both Dinkey Monitoring and Bald Mountain) were taken using a crew of four seasonal employees and the supervision of one permanent employee. Set up, quality control, information storage, processing, modeling, and preliminary analysis of plots required the part time effort of an additional permanent employee. Sampling began on June 25th 2012 and continued until the end of the fiscal year.

Terrestrial wildlife

Monitoring has occurred on the Dinkey North and South Restoration Projects with the collaborative group and recommendations have been brought forward for future projects as it pertained to species specific information. The monitoring and recommendations improved the next projects (Eastfork and Soaproot) by providing ways to improve habitat for Forest Service Sensitive species.

Within Eastfork project, 422 acres were monitored for great gray owls and 319 acres monitored for Northern goshawk. Within the Soaproot project, 296 acres were monitored for great gray owls and 125 acres monitored for Northern goshawk. In the Bald Mtn project, baseline data was collected for great gray owl (690 acres) and Northern goshawk (608 acres), also bat surveys were conducted. California spotted owl data is collected by Pacific Southwest Research station.

6. **FY 2012 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	Acres	-		
Acres of forest vegetation established	Acres	32.9	7,640 5,688	CFLR/CFLN NFVW
Acres of forest vegetation improved	Acres	976.5	24,543 34,680	CFLR/CFLN NFVW
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants	Acre	-		
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands	Acres	-		
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions.	Acres	-		
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced	Acres	-		
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced	Miles	-		
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced	Acres	-		
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved	Acres	560	23,504	CFLR/CFLN
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance	Miles	10	14,560	CFLR/CFLN

[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 passenger car system roads receiving maintenance	Miles	.7	4,670	CFLR/CFLN
Miles of road decommissioned	Miles	-		
Miles of passenger car system roads improved	Miles	-		
Miles of high clearance system road improved	Miles	-		
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage	Number	-		
Miles of system trail maintained to standard	Miles	-		
Miles of system trail improved to standard	Miles	-		
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard	Miles	-		
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales	Acres	-		
Volume of timber sold (CCF)	CCF	14,918.3	680,402 160,454	CFLR/CFLN NFTM
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production	Green tons	-		
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire	Acre	2,789.6	214,640	WFHF
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire	Acres	948.1	80,780	WFHF
Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands	Acres	-		
Number of priority acres treated annually for native pests on Federal lands	Acres	-		

7. FY 2012 accomplishment narrative (summarize key accomplishments and evaluate project progress) (please limit answer to three pages).

Although the core group of collaborators involved in the Dinkey Landscape Restoration Project had developed working relationships prior to the CFLR proposal, the Dinkey Collaborative, as it exists today, held its first meeting in the Supervisors Office of the Sierra National Forest at the start of FY2011 and is now approaching its 2 year anniversary meeting in December of 2012. Given the complexity of the planning process and the tumultuous history of the stakeholders, this group's continued commitment is a major accomplishment. The Dinkey Collaborative membership includes local landowners and user groups, local and national conservation organizations sawmill owners, tribal chairmen, and retired foresters, and their interests often conflict. Their hard work and level of engagement is a testament to the value of this project.

In addition to the progress that the Dinkey Collaborative has made strengthening working relationships amongst stakeholders and expanding its membership, the projects third stewardship contract was awarded in FY2012, the Eastfork Restoration Project. The project covers more than 1,200 acres in one of the most complex areas in the forest and its implementation is a milestone in collaboratively restorative management in this region. The project includes commercial and non-commercial timber harvesting, biomass removal, prescribed burning, meadow restoration and road decommissioning and work will begin the spring of 2013.

Work has also been ongoing on the two previous stewardship sales, the Dinkey North Restoration Project and the Dinkey South Restoration project. The commercial harvest has been completed; non-commercial thinning, plantation maintenance, and biomass removal are nearing completion; and prescribed pile burning has just begun.

With regards to planning, the NEPA analyses were completed for two more restoration projects and the decisions were signed with Collaborative support. The Eastfork project, identified above, was one of these, and the other was the Soaproot restoration project which is currently in the Sale Preparation phase and it expected to be awarded in FY 13. The Collaborative has also worked hard on planning and developing the Scoping Notice for the Bald Mountain Restoration project, encompassing more than 17,000 acres and expected to begin implementation in FY14.

On the subject of monitoring, the Collaborative group has continued to refine the multiparty monitoring plan and the Sierra NF has established a cost-share agreement with The Wilderness Society to hire a monitoring Coordinator. Post treatment data has been collected on the Dinkey North and Dinkey South projects, as well as the activities described in question five above. Also a cost-share agreement with the Sierra Institute to conduct socio-economic monitoring is in draft form and the data collection is expected to begin in FY13.

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)**

[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.

FY12	1,209
FY10, FY11, and FY12	9,687

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):

In addition to the 3,798 acres of hazardous fuels forest restoration treatments in FY12 to reduce the risk of catastrophic fire; prescribed burning activities took place in several individual project areas, grants were awarded for fuel reductions on private lands within the CFLR project boundary, and Dinkey Collaborative members reduced hazardous fuels on their private lands.

Prescribed burning to reduce hazardous fuels and to return fire as a landscape process was completed on the following:

- Bear Creek Burn – 10 acres timber understory burn.
- Clarence Burn – 5 acres of fisher den research burning with Pacific Southwest Research Station (PSW) Pacific fisher researcher scientists.
- Barnes North- 310 acres of third entry timber understory burning.
- Wildlife Habitat Improvement Project (Haslett and Haslett 2 Burns) – burned 100 acres of brush piles for fireline preparation.
- An additional 4 miles of dozer and handline construction work was completed around all burns.

The research burning on the Clarence burn cost approximately $2,450 per acre to ignite, monitor and extinguish. Temperature and carbon monoxide (CO) sensors were placed in previously used Pacific fisher dens. Temperature was monitored directly outside and inside fisher dens and CO was monitored inside fisher dens. Prescribed burning was also conducted directly adjacent to a denning fisher with kit for a period of 4 hours. PSW researchers monitored natal den activity and movements of adult fisher during and for 48 hours before and after ignition.

The following grant was awarded to the California Conservation Corps for the Veteran Green Crew hiring program for hazardous fuels reduction work on private lands within the Dinkey Collaborative Forest project. Acre totals below are cumulative for the various activities; they do not represent the project footprints.

- Southern California Edison property – Approximately 82 acres of fireline, brush removal and thinning in preparation for prescribed fire in support of forest restoration efforts.

Southern California Edison, a member of the Dinkey Collaborative, accomplished 100 acres of prescribed fire underburning for hazardous fuels reduction on their private lands within the CFLR project boundary.

The veteran Green Corps program also participated in the following prescribed burns:
San Diego Veteran Crew expanded their firefighter and prescribed fire qualifications on the Barnes North underburn and on the Clarence burn.

One naturally ignited wildland fire occurred within the DFLR. The Ross fire cost $96,300 to suppress due to its inaccessible location. Due to Federally mandated rules during the 2012 fire season, all fires were required to be fully suppressed.

10. Describe any reasons that the FY 2012 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)

The BLIs for two of the major sources of funding (Trust Funds and Pacific Southwest Research Station Funding) identified in the project proposal were not considered eligible matching funds. In light of the funding situation, the Sierra National Forest worked with its partners in the Dinkey Collaborative to streamline the planning and implementation process. Additionally, leadership on the Sierra NF chose to fulfill the funding commitments made to the project regardless of the limited definition of matching funds. The current project schedule has shifted from the original proposal, resulting in FY12 accomplishments that did not reach the proposal levels, after implementation in FY11 that surpassed the proposal levels.

11. **Planned FY 2014 Accomplishments**

Performance Measure Code[13]	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment	Amount ($)
Acres treated annually to sustain or restore watershed function and resilience	Acres	-	
Acres of forest vegetation established	Acres	250	73,140
Acres of forest vegetation improved	Acres	900	264,360
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants	Acre	45	22,500
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands	Acres	-	
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions.	Acres	-	
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced	Acres	-	
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced	Miles	-	
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced	Acres	50	50,000
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved	Acres	-	

[13] Please include all relevant planned accomplishments, assuming that funding specified in the CFLRP project proposal for FY 2014 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 roads receiving maintenance	Miles	-	
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance	Miles	-	
Miles of road decommissioned	Miles	-	
Miles of passenger car system roads improved	Miles	-	
Miles of high clearance system road improved	Miles	-	
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage	Number	-	
Miles of system trail maintained to standard	Miles	-	
Miles of system trail improved to standard	Miles	-	
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard	Miles	-	
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales	Acres	5,946	969,150
Volume of timber sold (CCF)	CCF	19,600	164,350
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production	Green tons	2,280	
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire	Acre	500	117,595
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire	Acres	2,500	587,980
Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands	Acres	45	22,500
Number of priority acres treated annually for native pests on Federal lands	Acres	-	

12. Planned FY 2014 accomplishment narrative (no more than 1 page):

After completion of the NEPA analysis for the Bald Mountain project in FY13, the project will be divided into two stewardship contracts and the first one awarded in FY14. The project includes commercial and non-commercial thinning, prescribed burning, watershed improvement, meadow restoration, plantation maintenance, and wildlife habitat improvement. In addition to the initiation of these activities in FY14, the Sierra NF will continue to administer the contracts awarded in FY10 and FY11, and collect data for the ecological, implementation and socio economic monitoring.

13. Describe and provide narrative justification if planned FY 2013/14 accomplishments and/or funding differs from CFLRP project work plan (no more than 1 page):

In FY2013, the Dinkey Landscape Restoration Project will continue the on-the ground implementation of the Dinkey North and Dinkey South Restoration Projects, begin administering the Eastfork stewardship contract, and award the Soaproot stewardship contract. Also in FY13, the NEPA analysis of the Bald Mountain Project will be completed, socio-economic monitoring will begin, ecological and implementation modeling will continue. In FY14, the first stewardship contract for Bald Mountain will be awarded and all other project activities will continue. .