CFLR Project (Name/Number: **Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative**

National Forest(s): Idaho Panhandle National Forests

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. FY13 Matching Funds Documentation

Fund Source – (CFLR Funds Expended[1])	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2013($)
CFLR Funds Expended	$176,479

Fund Source – (Carryover funds expended (Carryover in addition to CFLR/CFLN)[2] (please include a new row for each BLI))	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2013($)
Carryover Funds Note: All FY12 CFLN carryover was rolled into FY13. No matching non-CFLN carryover funds were used in FY13.	*$0*

Fund Source – (FS Matching Funds (please include a new row for each BLI)[3])	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2013($)
CMRD	**$ 78,120**
NFRR	**$334,201**
RTRT	**$ 79,170**
SSCC	**$ 15,504**

Fund Source – (Funds contributed through agreements[4])	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2013($)
	0

Fund Source – (Partner In-Kind Contributions[5])	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2013($)
KVRI Collaborative Committee	**$39,507.98**
Boundary County	**$4,700**
Aquatics Volunteer	**$2,060**

Fund Source – (Service work accomplishment through goods-for services funding within a stewardship contract[6])	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2013($)
	$123,111.71

[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.

[3] This amount should match the amount of matching funds obligated in the PAS report.

[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.

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

Approved by (Forest Supervisor): __/s/ Christine Dawe for Mary Farnsworth_____

Approved by (Forest Supervisor):_____

2. **Discuss how the CFLR project contributes to accomplishment of the performance measures in the 10 year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan, 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 2013 fire season resulted in average activity on National Forest System lands within the Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative (KVRI) project area, as compared to previous years or compared to other forests across the west. Fuel moistures and fire danger indices were above average through typical periods of high fire danger, but characteristic dry lightning associated with late-July and August thunderstorms was accompanied with wetting rains. As a result, 21 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 17.5 acres burned. For comparison, the 10-year average (2003-2012, 188 fires, 4,550 ac) is 19 fires per year, and 450 acres burned per year. Three large fires occurred during this time frame; Myrtle Creek, 2003 (3,449 acres), Long Canyon, 2006 (200 acres), and Birthday, 2011 (801 acres). Excluding these large fires results in approximately 10 acres burned per year across the previous 10 year period.

The effect of the project on accomplishment of the performance measures identified in the 10-year Comprehensive Strategy is difficult to measure directly, because no fires occurred within areas treated by the project and all 21 fires were controlled during initial attack. Five of the 21 fire starts were human-caused (23%) compared to a 10-year average of 22%. All fires were contained during initial attack which is slightly higher than the 10-year average. No fires exceeded a stratified cost index, because no fires exceeded initial attack.

Project activities did contribute 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 an increased opportunity to meet the objectives in the 10-year Strategy due to increases in the areas we have treated and an increased presence in the forest, which may help reduce the occurrence of human-caused fires. 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: *1141 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 – 0% – all acres treated were in the WUI*
- Number of acres treated per million dollars gross investment in WUI and non-WUI areas: *For FY13 – $244,436 was invested for CFLR targets specific to the commercial thin, improvement harvest, regeneration harvest, and pre-commercial thinning and prescribed burning for 1141 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 KVRI CFLR proposal. 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*: *509 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*: *497 acres of mechanical thinning (includes commercial harvest and pre-commercial thinning, white pine pruning) 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 acres – 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 1141 total acres treated, 509 acres moved toward desired conditions of reduced fuel loadings through burning[7] in Borderline Stew, Ruby Copper, Northern Prairie, and Twin Skin. Total of 44% 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: *497 acres of pre-commercial thinning and pruning to maintain desired conditions in Union Gap, Hell roaring, Hall Mountain Pulp, and Italian Peak treatment areas[8] by favoring long-lived seral species, reducing long-term wildfire hazard and increasing the long-term health and vigor of the residual stand 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 44% 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: 0 acres – 0% *None – NA*
- Percent of burned acres treated for post-wildfire recovery that are trending towards desired conditions: 0% *None – NA*

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

FY 2013 Jobs Created/Maintained (FY13 CFLR/CFLN/ Carryover funding only):

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	**0**	**0**	**$0**	**$0**
Other Project Activities	**3.9**	**5.3**	**$105,407**	**$150,058**
TOTALS:	**3.9**	**5.3**	**$105,407**	**$150,058**

FY 2013 Jobs Created/Maintained (FY13 CFLR/CFLN/ 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[10]
Commercial Forest Product Activities	**24.7**	**56.7**	**$1,378,635**	**$2,544,566**
Other Project Activities	**9.7**	**13.1**	**$259,292**	**$ 366,660**
TOTALS:	**34.4**	**69.9**	**$1,637,927**	**$2,911,225**

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, implementation of the KVRI CFLRP has resulted in improved understanding of local resource issues among the community and real improvements to the community's watershed.

[7] Desired conditions as outlined in the Mission Brush Supplemental Final EIS, pages 1-9 through 1-11

[8] Purpose and Need for pre-commercial thinning taken from the NZ Juvenile Tree Thinning Decision Memo, 2010

[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.*

[10] *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.*

Numerous public meetings have been conducted within the KVRI area to explain the need for restoration across the landscape and the specifics of how proposed projects will accomplish this restoration. Field trips to discuss the current CFLR project areas (Kreist Creek and Hellroaring) were conducted this past field season. Participants on these trips included members of the KVRI Forestry Subcommittee and other interested individuals from throughout Boundary County. The field trips provided the opportunity to share information on the benefits of the projects and a chance to exchange thoughts and ideas with groups that share a common interest in restoration.

In 2013, road maintenance and road reconstruction were accomplished in the East Fork Meadow Creek project area and contracts for culvert upgrades were awarded in the Roman Nose project area. These treatments will result in improved water quality for the local community in the future, and the more immediate benefit of contracts and job creation in the community.

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).

Multiparty Meetings

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). Participants included representatives from the KVRI collaborative, 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. The outcome of these meetings was a draft monitoring plan. A final monitoring plan will be in place for 2014, and monitoring will begin in that same year.

National Indicators

Of the five national indicators (Ecological, Fire Costs, Jobs/Economics, Leveraged Funds, and Collaboration) developed by the Forest Service and partners, two were integrated into the monitoring plan (Jobs/Economics and Ecological).

Local Indicators

The draft monitoring plan for the KVRI CFLRP 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 Idaho Panhandle National Forests (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 land types
- 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

We have just completed the second full year of project implementation, but haven't collected any monitoring data yet. We are currently working through the logistics of collecting this data through the efforts of the Idaho Panhandle National Forests, the KVRI collaborative, and our industry partners. We believe the process we have outlined will allow us to collect the data necessary to track any ecological, social, and economic shifts as we implement the varied activities within our project area. We are leaning heavily on our partners to assist with the social and economic monitoring, because they are the most closely connected to the mills, jobs created, and wood product data. Our partners assisted in the development of our monitoring plan, and we are confident in their ability to collect this data and assist us in interpreting any evident shifts from year to year. We also believe that our monitoring plan will give us the tools necessary to see where we need to make adjustments in our project implementation to best meet the important social, economic, and ecological elements contained in our initial project proposal. We know that monitoring is rarely easy to accomplish, but also understand its critical role in the success of our project.

6. **FY 2013 accomplishments**

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished [11]	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)[12]
Acres treated annually to sustain or restore watershed function and resilience WTRSHD-RSTR-ANN	Acres	2,440.7		
Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres	36 130 491	30,600 110,500 417,350	CFLN CWKV RTRT
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	124.5 124.5 200 35	37,350 37,350 60,000 10,500	CFLN NFRR RTRT SPS4
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	211 39.9 78.6 79.9	22,155 4,190 8,253 8,390	CFLN CWKV NFRR PTNR
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC	Acres	0		
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions. S&W-RSRC-IMP	Acres	22.5	33,750	CFLN
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-LAK	Acres	0		
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	1.5	Integrated Targets	CFLN
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	0		*No acres available in PAS
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved RG-VEG-IMP	Acres	25.4 40.3 8.6 70.5	2,667 4,232 903 7,403	CFLN CWKV NFIM NFRR
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance RD-HC-MAIN	Miles	16.4	32,800	CMRD
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance	Miles	18.75 25.2	37,500 50,400	CFLN CMRD

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

[12] 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 [11]	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)[12]
RD-PC-MAINT				
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	0		
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles	0.4	800	CFLN
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles	0.4 7.48	800 14,960	CFLN SSCC
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage STRM-CROS-MTG-STD	Number	0		
Miles of system trail maintained to standard TL-MAINT-STD	Miles	0		
Miles of system trail improved to standard TL-IMP-STD	Miles	0		
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard LND-BL-MRK-MAINT	Miles	0		
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC	Acres	0		(248 acres were already counted in 2012 report)
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF	9899.8		
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	2678.9 3033.9		CFLR NFTM
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons	584.6	11,692	XXXX *In addition to the 584.6 tons, 7,288 tons were removed through personal use firewood permits – this was reported in TIM, but not in PAS
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	0		
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	276 447	69,000 111,750	WFHF XXXX

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished [11]	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)[12]
Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands SP-INVSPE-FED-AC	Acres	0		
Number of priority acres treated annually for native pests on Federal lands SP-NATIVE-FED-AC	Acres	0		

7. **FY 2013 accomplishment narrative** (summarize key accomplishments and evaluate project progress) (please limit answer to three pages).

The KVRI 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. The proposal's strategy uses this science to ensure 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.

The following landscape restoration treatment objectives were developed in support of the goals outlined in the assessments noted above:

- 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 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 KVRI proposal was funded at $399,000 for FY2013. The KVRI Forestry Subcommittee, a subset of the parent collaborative, met on November 6, 2012 to develop a priority program of work for FY2013; the Forest Service maintained the decision space regarding the final program of work, and all treatments were subject to the NEPA. The approved program included projects designed to achieve the following planned targets: prescribed burning (1035 ac), invasive plant management (400 ac), culvert upgrades (5), fish passage/culvert replacement (1), road decommissioning (1.5 miles), road maintenance (38 miles), timber harvest (893 acres, including biomass utilization), and reforestation/tsi (69 ac).

The Bonners Ferry Ranger District met or exceeded many of the above FY2013 planned CFLR targets as shown in the FY 2013 accomplishments table. The project also made 584.6 tons of material available for bio-energy production through vegetation treatments, and 7,288 tons through the sale of personal use firewood permits. Not all targets were realized due to delays in NEPA which prevented some timber sale and prescribed burn projects from being available for implementation in 2013. Any residual targets have been included in our 2014 program of work.

In addition to the NEPA approved project implementation targets, significant work was accomplished through numerous collaborative meetings and field trips during 2013 regarding the Kreist Creek and Hellroaring projects. The purpose and need, as identified by the KVRI collaborative group for Kreist Creek and Hellroaring are to:

1) 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,
2) Improve habitat and forage for big game through vegetation treatments and broadcast burning,
3) Enhance the scenic integrity of the area by softening the boundaries of previous harvest units and avoiding straight lines and hard edges when designing treatment areas within these projects, and
4) Maximize opportunities to utilize forest products and provide economic opportunity through restoration work.

KVRI Collaborative took part in field trips to Kreist Creek and Hellroaring this year and gave their continued support to the Forest Service as it moves forward with decisions that will allow implementation of many components of these two projects in 2014 and 2015. Working in collaboration with KVRI Collaborative, the District conducted fieldwork this past summer on the Boulder and Deer Creek vegetation projects. The District will meet this winter with KVRI Collaborative to review the two proposed projects, and then begin the NEPA. Implementation of the Boulder and Deer Creek projects is scheduled to begin in FY16 and FY17.

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?[13]

Fiscal Year	**Total number of acres treated (treatment footprint)**
FY2013	2,440
FY2010, FY2011, FY2012 and FY2013 (as applicable- projects selected in FY2012 may will not have data for FY2010 and FY2011; projects that were HPRP projects in FY2012, please include one number for FY2012 and one number for FY2013 (same as above))	FY2012 = 2,300 FY2013 = 2,440

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 KVRI area falls within the Bonner's Ferry District. The district had a Preparedness (WFPR) 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 proposal area. 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.

The 2013 fire season resulted in an average number of starts and below average acres for the Bonner's Ferry District. There were twenty one fires totaling 17.5 acres within the KVRI area and district. Suppression costs totaled less than $150,000. All fires were contained at initial attack; there were no requests for BAER funds on 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, and no fires burned within any of the existing fuels treatments in the proposal area.

The Bonner's Ferry District had a Fuels (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 Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative proposal area. These funds in addition to NFRR and BD funds were utilized to plan and/or implement treatments associated with the area.

[13] 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.

10. **Describe any reasons that the FY 2013 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)

No significant changes or unexpected challenges occurred in FY2013.

11. **Planned FY 2015 Accomplishments**

Performance Measure Code[14]	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment	Amount ($)
Acres treated annually to sustain or restore watershed function and resilience WTRSHD-RSTR-ANN	Acres		
Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres	150	127,500
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	250	75,000
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acres	400	42,000
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC	Acres		
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions. S&W-RSRC-IMP	Acres	12	18,000
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-LAK	Acres		
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	1	150,000
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres		
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved RG-VEG-IMP	Acres	150	15,750
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance RD-HC-MAIN	Miles	10	20,000

[14] Please include all relevant planned accomplishments, assuming that funding specified in the CFLRP project proposal for FY 2015 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[14]	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment	Amount ($)
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance RD-PC-MAINT	Miles	25	50,000
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	3	30,000
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles		
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles		
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage STRM-CROS-MTG-STD	Number	1	100,000
Miles of system trail maintained to standard TL-MAINT-STD	Miles	80	42,000
Miles of system trail improved to standard TL-IMP-STD	Miles	6	6,000
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard LND-BL-MRK-MAINT	Miles		
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC	Acres		
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF		
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	23,400	
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons	10,000	200,000
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	100	10,000
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	900	225,000
Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands SP-INVSPE-FED-AC	Acres		

Performance Measure Code[14]	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment	Amount ($)
Number of priority acres treated annually for native pests on Federal lands SP-NATIVE-FED-AC	Acres		

12. **Planned FY 2015 accomplishment narrative** (no more than 1 page):

The KVRI proposal was funded at a total of $2,694,000 for FY2015. Our proposal, as submitted, identified projects that require environmental analysis. Several projects needed to meet FY2015 accomplishment targets are currently in the analysis process, including Hellroaring, Kriest Creek, and Buckhorn Restoration Burn. The KVRI Forestry Subcommittee, a subset of the parent Collaborative, met on November 14, 2013 to review a priority program of work for FY2014 and to receive an initial briefing of projects slated for FY2015; the Forest Service maintains the decision space for all implementation, and all work is subject to the NEPA. The program of work for FY2015, although not yet reviewed by the Subcommittee at this level of detail, includes projects that will achieve the following outcomes: prescribed burning (250 ac), habitat improvement/fuels reduction (1000 ac), invasive plant management (400 ac), culvert upgrades (3 ea), fish passage/culvert replacement (1 ea), road decommissioning (3 miles), road maintenance (35 miles), commercial timber harvest (1,687.5 ac or 11.2 mmbf, including biomass removal), roadside salvage/road maintenance (250 ac or 0.5 mmbf), biomass utilization (10,000 green tons), pre-commercial thinning (250 ac), reforestation (150 ac), trail reconstruction (6 mi), instream fisheries improvement (1 mi), trail bridge replacement (1 ea), riparian area improvements (12 ac), allotment weed treatments (150 ac), and trail maintenance (80 miles). These projects are consistent with the original proposal and no deviations are planned at this time.

We plan to meet with KVRI Forestry Subcommittee over the winter, to update them on the status of the Kreist Creek, Hellroaring Creek, and Idaho Buckhorn Restoration Burn projects. These three projects will have signed decisions in FY14 and work will begin in FY14 and FY15.

13. **Describe and provide narrative justification if planned FY 2014/15 accomplishments and/or funding differs from CFLRP project work plan** (no more than 1 page):

Two clarifications need to be made regarding planned accomplishments and funds necessary to meet those accomplishments for FY2014 and FY2015.

The initial proposal submitted underestimated the costs associated with maintaining and reconstructing trails. The proposal identified costs of $400/mile and $1,000/mile for trail maintenance and trail reconstruction respectively. The actual costs are closer to $1,200/mile for maintenance and $12,000/mile for reconstruction. We are currently using the lower costs in FY2014 and FY2015, and plan to leverage these costs with grants, partnerships, and volunteers to accomplish as many miles as possible.

The second clarification pertains to the number of aquatic organism passages (AOPs) that are planned to be accomplished in FY2014 and FY2015. Though funding had been planned for accomplishing three AOPs per year, we are not able to find as many sites to accomplish the work as we had initially anticipated. The current plan is two in FY14 and one in FY15. We will continue to look for opportunities each year, and will likely accomplish between one and three AOPs per year.