CFLR Project (Name/Number): Lower Kootenai River Watershed
National Forest(s): Idaho Panhandle NFs

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]	$174,911
Carryover funds expended[2] (please include a new row for each BLI)	0
FS Matching Funds (please include a new row for each BLI)[3]	CMRD: $51,286 NFRR: $95,895 RTRT: $16,422 SSCC: $189,198 Total: $527,712
Funds contributed through agreements[4]	0
Partner In-Kind Contributions[5]	Kootenai Tribe of Idaho ($50,000) KVRI ($46,368) Idaho Transportation Department($11,000) State of Idaho ($12,500) Boundary County ($29,200) Arbor Day Foundation ($12,750) Total: $161,818
Service work accomplishment through goods-for services funding within a stewardship contract[6]	0

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

Not Applicable.

[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.

Approved by: /s/ Mary Farnsworth_____Approved by: _____
Forest Supervisor Forest Supervisor

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 2012 fire season resulted in very light activity on National Forest System lands within the lower Kootenai River project area, as compared to previous years or compared to other forests across the west. Late snow packs and a wet spring and early summer kept fuel moistures and fire danger indices above average through typical periods of high fire danger, and characteristic dry lightning associated with late-July and August thunderstorms either did not materialize or were accompanied with wetting rains. As a result, only four fires were detected, none of which occurred in areas treated under the project, and all were successfully controlled through direct attack suppression tactics, resulting in less than one total acre burned. For comparison, the 10-year average (2002-2011) is 20 fires per fire year.

Therefore, the contributions of the project to accomplishments of the performance measures specifically related to improved suppression, wildfire control and reduction in unwanted human-caused ignitions in the 10-year Strategy are difficult to measure for this first year. For example, a well-below average fire year did not allow us to effectively measure change from 10-year average for wildfires controlled during initial attack (all four were controlled during initial attack), for percent change from 10 year average for number of unwanted human-caused fires (1 of the 4, or 25% human-caused – average is 22%), or for percent of fires not contained in initial attack that exceeded a stratified cost index (all were contained in initial attack). However, project activities contributed to fuels reduction and forest restoration through commercial and non-commercial harvest and the use of planned ignitions on several hundred acres. As the project develops across the landscape we expect opportunities to assess the aforementioned measures and an increased ability of the local fire organization to better meet the objectives in the 10-year Strategy. This is based on the following accomplishments of the 10-year Strategy performance measures:

- Percent change from 10-year average for wildfires controlled during initial attack: *see above*
- Percent change from 10-year average for number of unwanted human-caused wildfires: *see above*
- Percent of fires not contained in initial attack that exceed a stratified cost index: *see above*
- Number and percent of WUI acres treated that are identified in CWPPs: *1661 acres – 100% in the WUI. CFLR project accomplishments included as part of this determination include commercial thin/biomass removal, improvement harvest, regeneration harvest, pre-commercial thinning, and prescribed burning.*
- Number and percent of non-WUI acres treated identified through collaboration consistent with the *Implementation Plan*: *0 acres – all acres treated were in the WUI*
- Number of acres treated per million dollars gross investment in WUI and non-WUI areas: *For FY12 – $244,436 was invested for CFLR targets specific to the commercial thin, improvement harvest, regeneration harvest, and pre-commercial thinning and prescribed burning for 1661 acres treated in the WUI.).*
- Percent of collaboratively identified high priority acres treated where fire management objectives are achieved as identified in applicable management plans or strategies: *100% of acres treated were in collaboratively identified high priority areas as displayed in Attachment G to the lower Kootenai River Watershed CFLR proposal.*

[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).

Applicable fire management objectives include using planned ignitions to meet the goals of the management areas, providing for more efficient fire protection (initial attack strategies specific to management area objectives) through reduced natural and activity fuels in the event of a future wildfire, and protection of human life and property by moderating expected future fire behavior through fuels reduction.

- Number and percent of acres treated by prescribed fire, through collaboration consistent with the *Implementation Plan*: *116 acres treated with prescribed fire – 100% of acres burned identified through collaboration consistent with the plan.*
- Number and percent of acres treated by mechanical thinning, through collaboration consistent with the *Implementation Plan*: *1545 acres of mechanical thinning (includes commercial harvest and pre-commercial thinning) identified through collaboration consistent with the plan – 100% identified through collaboration consistent with the plan.*
- Number of acres and percent of the natural ignitions that are allowed to burn under strategies that result in desired conditions: *0 natural ignitions allowed to burn*
- Number and percent of acres treated to restore fire-adapted ecosystems which are moved toward desired conditions: *Of the 1661 total acres treated, 1307 acres of timber harvest associated with the Meadow Creek and East Fork Meadow Creek Timber Sales[8] moved toward a natural fire regime condition class as part of the desired conditions outlined in the Environmental Assessment. Additionally, 116 acres moved toward desired conditions of reduced fuel loadings through burning[9] in Borderline Stew treatment area. Total of 86% of the total treated acres moved toward desired conditions.*
- Number and percent of acres treated to restore fire-adapted ecosystems which are maintained in desired conditions: *238 acres of pre-commercial thinning to maintain desired conditions in W. Mission Gillion, E. Fork Boulder, Italian Peak treatment areas[10] by favoring long-lived seral species, reducing wildfire hazard in the long-term and increasing the health and vigor of the residual stand in the long term by reducing stocking levels. This is considered maintenance of desired conditions as outlined in the long-term silvicultural objectives of the regeneration harvests which established these plantations. Total of 14% of the total treated acres maintained in desired conditions.*
- Number and percent of burned acres identified in approved post-wildfire recovery plans as needing treatments that actually received treatments: *None – NA*
- Percent of burned acres treated for post-wildfire recovery that are trending towards desired conditions: *None – NA*

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

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[11]
Commercial Forest Product Activities	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Other Project Activities	**3.5**	**4.9**	**$97,899**	**$142,335**
TOTALS:	**10.8**	**12.6**	**$141,713**	**$196,374**

FY 2012 Jobs Created/Maintained (FY12 CFLR/CFLN/HPRP/Carryover and matching funding):

[8] Desired conditions as outlined in the East Fork of Meadow Creek EA
[9] Desired conditions as outlined in the Mission Brush Supplemental Final EIS, pages 1-9 through 1-11
[10] Purpose and Need for pre-commercial thinning taken from the NZ Juvenile Tree Thinning Decision Memo, 2010
[11] *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.*

Type of projects	Direct part and full-time jobs	Total part and full-time jobs	Direct Labor Income	Total Labor Income[12]
Commercial Forest Product Activities	**52.6**	**122.2**	**$2,998,325**	**$5,526,266**
Other Project Activities	**11.8**	**15.7**	**$311,783**	**$434,922**
TOTALS:	**82.7**	**156.6**	**$3,354,748**	**$6,016,247**

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

In addition to job creation and income for local communities, the first year of implementing the Lower Kootenai Watershed CFLRP has also resulted in improved understanding of local resource issues among the community and real improvements to the community's watershed. Numerous public meetings have been conducted within the project area to explain both the need for restoration and the specifics of proposed projects. Field trips for the first major CFLR project in the area, the Twenty Mile Creek Restoration Project, were conducted to provide educational opportunities and greater understanding of the project's benefits.

Additionally, real improvements to the community watershed were implemented in the East Fork Meadow Creek area. Work included road decommissioning, noxious weeds treatments, silvicultural treatments and the installation of aquatic organism passages. As a whole these treatments will result in improved water quality for the local community in the future. However, the immediate benefit to communities from these treatments lies in the jobs created in contracting the work and the additional income provided to the community through this work.

These community benefits are just the tip of the iceberg as the Lower Kootenai Watershed CFLRP wraps up its first year of implementation. In future years communities can expect both more jobs and income from a greater number of projects being implemented as well as more widespread and varied watershed improvements.

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

Title IV of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (the Act), which authorized the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program (CFLRP) requires that a "multiparty monitoring, evaluation, and accountability process" be used to "assess the positive or negative ecological, social and economic effects of projects…for not less than 15 years after project implementation commences" (Sec. 4003 (g)(4)). The requirements for the CFLRP include a diverse and balanced group of stakeholders as well as appropriate Federal, Tribal, State, County, and Municipal government representatives in the design, implementation, and monitoring of the project. They also include a multiparty assessment to identify existing condition and desired future condition; and report on the positive or negative impact and effectiveness of the project including improvements in local management skills and on the ground results. The monitoring must include social, economic, and ecological factors.

Multiparty Meetings

[12] *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.*

Multiparty meetings to develop the monitoring plan were held on April 24, 2012 (overview of multiparty monitoring), May 5, 2012 (discussions of social and economic monitoring, initial discussion of ecological monitoring), and June 11, 2012 (completed discussion of ecological monitoring). People at the meetings included representatives from KVRI, Idaho Conservation League, Idaho Forest Group, Kootenai Tribe of Idaho, Idaho Department of Lands, Idaho Department of Labor, Idaho Department of Environmental Quality, Idaho Panhandle National Forests, and private citizens. As an outcome of these meetings, a draft monitoring plan was developed. The monitoring plan will be finalized this fall.

National Indicators

The Forest Service and partners developed a suite of national indicators covering the purpose of the Act to be used to report to Congress. Of the five national indicators (Ecological, Fire Costs, Jobs/Economics, Leveraged Funds, and Collaboration), two were integrated into the monitoring plan (Jobs/Economics and Ecological).

Local Indicators

The draft monitoring plan includes the following local indicators and the parties responsible for the monitoring.

Social Monitoring:

- *Indicator*: Improvement of Skills (Idaho Forest Group; IPNF)

Economic Monitoring:

- *Indicator:* Number and kind of jobs created (Idaho Forest Group; IPNF)
- *Indicator:* Income and Wages for Local Contractors and Workers (Industry representatives)
- *Indicator:* Diversity of Wood Products Produced (Mills)
- *Indicator:* Value of Wood Products Produced (Industry representatives; Mills)

Ecological Monitoring: The IPNF has the primary responsibilities for ecological monitoring because of quality control with data collection, data entry, and database management. The desire is that over time stakeholders and other volunteers can be trained and participate in the ecological monitoring.

- Vegetation Management Monitoring Elements
  - Vegetation Composition
  - Vegetation Structure
  - Acres treated by prescribed fire
- Aquatic Restoration Monitoring Elements
  - Change in miles of available habitat
  - Reductions in sediment delivery from improvement in roads in Riparian Conservation Areas and unstable landtypes
- Wildlife Habitat Restoration Monitoring Elements
  - Effectiveness of road management techniques
  - Vegetation as habitat components
  - Changes in road density
  - Changes in Bear Management Unit (BMU) standards
- Recreation Monitoring Elements
  - Miles of trail treated (maintained or reconstructed)
  - Miles of road maintained
  - Number of bridges replaced
- Invasive Species Monitoring Elements
  - Acres of weeds treated

This is the first year of project implementation so there is no monitoring data available to report.

6. **FY 2012 accomplishments**

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished [13]	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)[14]
Acres treated annually to sustain or restore watershed function and resilience	Acres	2,900.4		
Acres of forest vegetation established	Acres	30.4 30.4 15.2	26,350 26,350 12,750	CFLN RTRT PTNR
Acres of forest vegetation improved	Acres	119 119	35,700 35,700	CFLN NFRR
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants	Acre	203 88.7 120.8	21,315 9,240 12,684	CFLN SRS2 NFRR
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands	Acres	0		
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions.	Acres	5.5 3	Integrated targets	CFLN NFRR
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced	Acres	0		
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced	Miles	1.3 1.25	Integrated targets	CFLN NFRR
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced	Acres	100* 10*	11,000 594	PTNR NFRR *Project inadvertantly not coded as CFLN in database of record (WFRP) so it did not show in the PAS pulled data..
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved	Acres	41.4	4,400	NFRR
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance	Miles	3*	6,000	CMRD * Actual miles of roads maintained but not included in the PAS report when data was pulled. PAS shows 0 mi.
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance	Miles	18.7*	30,000 3,000	CFLN CMRD * Actual miles of roads maintained but not included in the PAS report when data was pulled. PAS shows 0 mi.
Miles of road	Miles	0.6	6,000	CFLN

[13] Units accomplished should match the accomplishments recorded in the Databases of Record.

[14] 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 [13]	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)[14]
decommissioned		1.8* 1.0*	18,000 10,000	CFLN NFRR * Includes road storage that does not get pulled in the PAS report to date. PAS shows 0.6 mi
Miles of passenger car system roads improved	Miles	0		
Miles of high clearance system road improved	Miles	2.5		
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage	Number	2*	140,000 20,000	CFLN NFRR *An additional AOP (another one on Meadow Creek) accomplished but not included in final PAS report "pulled" data, for a total of 2. PAS shows 1.
Miles of system trail maintained to standard	Miles	0		
Miles of system trail improved to standard	Miles	0		
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard	Miles	0		
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales	Acres	1,307*		*1307 acres accomplished but not included in the final PAS report "pulled" data.
Volume of timber sold (CCF)	CCF	19,321.2		
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production	Green tons	2745.3		
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire	Acre	0		
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire	Acres	116.5 110 116.5 364	Integrated targets	CFLN WFHF NFRR XXXX
Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands	Acres	0		
Number of priority acres treated annually for native	Acres	0		

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished [13]	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)[14]
pests on Federal lands				

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

The lower Kootenai River Watershed was chosen for a CFLRP proposal because the restoration needs were substantiated through Tribal, Federal and State assessments. These assessments identified this area as a high priority for restoration and provided the foundation for effective treatments that would enhance ecosystem function and resiliency. Based on this science, the proposal's strategy ensures balance between social and ecological needs such as watershed and ecosystem health, wildfire use and protection, recreation and public access and economic sustainability for local communities.

In support of the goals outlined in the assessments listed above, the following treatment objectives were developed for this landscape restoration proposal:

- Reduce the risk of unwanted wildland fire on the landscape.
- Increase the resilience of the landscape to the effects of unwanted wildland fire in the event that such a fire occurs.
- Increase the resilience of the forested landscape to insect and disease epidemics.
- Protect and enhance fish and wildlife habitat.
- Increase the number of watersheds that are in fully functional hydrologic condition.
- Provide high quality outdoor recreational opportunities.
- Reduce the impacts from invasive species.
- Provide the opportunity for the utilization of a variety of wood products, including but not limited to lumber, biomass and alternative energy sources.

The lower Kootenai River Watershed proposal was funded at $324,000 for 2012. Our proposal, as submitted, identified NEPA ready projects for 2012. The Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative (KVRI) Forestry Subcommittee, a subset of the parent collaborative, met on February 27, 2012 to develop a priority program of work for 2012; the Forest Service maintained the decision space regarding the final program of work, and all treatments were subject to NEPA. The approved program included projects that would achieve the following outcomes: prescribed burning (115 acs), invasive plant management (400 acs), culvert upgrades (3), fish passage/culvert replacement (1), road decommissioning (11.2 miles), road maintenance (30 miles), timber harvest (1307 acres, including biomass utilization), and reforestation/tsi (61 acs). In almost all cases we met or exceeded our targets and in those that we did not, the few remaining acres or miles are included in our 2013 program of work.

In addition to the NEPA approved project implementation targets, significant work included numerous collaborative meetings and field trips during 2012 regarding the Twenty Mile project. The purpose and need, as identified by the Collaborative group for Twenty Mile is to:

1) Protect the existing infrastructure of the Twenty Mile Creek drinking water association and communication site,

2) Maintain or enhance the ecological and hydrological values of the Twenty Mile Creek watershed,

3) Improve and maintain forest health in the ecosystem composition, structure, and diversity of the landscape by providing for tree species and stocking levels similar to historic levels which will better resist insects, diseases and wildfire and

4) Maximize opportunities to utilize forest products and provide economic opportunity through restoration work.

In October of this year KVRI supported the Forest Service moving forward with a decision that will allow implementation of the many components of the project in 2013. Working in collaboration with KVRI the District also conducted field work on two other major vegetation projects and one ecosystem burn project.

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?[15]

Fiscal Year	Total number of acres treated (treatment footprint)
FY12	2,301
FY10, FY11, and FY12	2,301

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):

The lower Kootenai River project area falls within the Bonner's Ferry District. The district had a preparedness budget of $350,000. The project area is roughly equal to the district boundary, so the district's preparedness costs can all be ascribed to the project. This includes all salaries, training, and resource costs that are involved with running the Bonner's Ferry District preparedness program. Some of these preparedness staff were utilized in planning for and implementing project landscape treatments.

We had limited suppression costs in the Bonner's Ferry District. The 2012 fire season resulted in a record low number of starts and acres for the Bonner's Ferry District. There were four fires totaling one acre within the project area and district. Suppression costs totaled less than $100,000. All fires were contained at initial attack and there was no BAER funds requested for any of the fires nor were there any opportunities to claim resource benefit acres from the limited number of fires that occurred. There were no fires managed for resource benefit. There were no fuels treatments that were burned within the landscape that were tested.

The Bonner's Ferry District had a WFHF budget of $208,848. This budget includes base salaries, analysis of projects, project implementation dollars, and costs for GIS and database support. These funds can all be ascribed to the lower Kootenai River project area. These funds in addition to NFRR and BD funds were utilized to plan and/or implement treatments associated with the project area.

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)

- $63,000 went to fire transfer.

[15] 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.

- $81,000 could not be implemented in 2012 because contracts had expired and will be carried over into the 2013 program of work.

11. **Planned FY 2014 Accomplishments**

Performance Measure Code[16]	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment	Amount ($)
Acres treated annually to sustain or restore watershed function and resilience	Acres		
Acres of forest vegetation established	Acres	150	$97,750
Acres of forest vegetation improved	Acres	250	$75,000
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants	Acre	400	$42,000
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	12	$18,000
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced	Acres		
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced	Miles	1	$150,000
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced	Acres		
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved	Acres	150	$15,750
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance	Miles	10	$20,000
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance	Miles	25	$50,000
Miles of road decommissioned	Miles	7.5	$75,000
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	6	$330,000
Miles of system trail maintained to standard	Miles	80	$32,000

[16] 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[16]	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment	Amount ($)
Miles of system trail improved to standard	Miles	7	$96,000
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard	Miles		
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales	Acres	3,100	
Volume of timber sold (CCF)	CCF	24,000	$337,500
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production	Green tons	12,500	$250,000
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire	Acre	190	$19,000
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire	Acres	810	$202,500
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		

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

The lower Kootenai River Watershed proposal was funded at a total of $2,616,000 for 2014. Our proposal, as submitted, identified projects that require NEPA. Several NEPA projects needed to accomplish FY2014 projects are currently in the analysis process, including Hellroaring Creek, Kriest Creek, and Buckhorn Restoration Burn. The Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative (KVRI) Forestry Subcommittee, a subset of the parent collaborative, met on February 27, 2012 to review a priority program of work for FY2012, as well as to review the program of work for FY2013 and 2014; the Forest Service maintains the decision space for all implementation, and all work is subject to NEPA. The program for FY2014, although not reviewed by KVRI to date, includes projects that will achieve the following outcomes: prescribed burning (250 acs), habitat improvement/fuels reduction (1000 ac), invasive plant management (400 acs), culvert upgrades (3 ea), fish passage/culvert replacement (3 ea), road decommissioning (15 miles), road maintenance (35 miles), commercial timber harvest (2,100 acres or 10 mmbf, including biomass removal), roadside salvage/road maintenance (1000 miles or 2 mmbf), biomass utilization (12,500 green tons), pre-commercial thinning (250 acs), reforestation (150 acs), trail reconstruction (6 mi), instream fisheries improvement (1 mi), trail bridge replacement (1 ea), riparian area improvements (12 acs), allotment weed treatments (150 acs), and trail maintenance (80 miles). These projects are consistent with the original proposal and no deviations are planned at this time, with the exception of the commercial harvest

helicopter project. We are moving it back to FY2015 and making it a larger sale, in hopes that the market will continue to recover making it more feasible.

In the winter of this year, we plan to meet with KVRI for their review of these proposed projects. NEPA will then be conducted for these proposed projects.. Working in collaboration with KVRI, the District conducted field work on two major vegetation projects and one ecosystem burn project, as described above. This will allow implementation of the many components of the projects for 2013 and 2014.

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):

After reviewing the Grizzly Bear Access Amendment and the number of miles of road that would need to be decommissioned to meet the standards contained therein, we have discovered that the original number submitted in the proposal was an overestimation. Upon further review, 25 miles of road decommissioning for the course of the project would more clearly reflect what is needed for grizzly bear standards, as well as any additional aquatic restoration needs. It is expected that 3 miles per year could be accomplished.