CFLR Project (Name/Number): Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative – CFLR011

National Forest(s): Idaho Panhandle National Forests

Responses to the prompts in this annual report should be typed directly into the template. Example information is included in red below. Please delete red text before submitting the final version.

1. Match and Leveraged funds:

a. FY15 Matching Funds Documentation

Fund Source – (CFLN/CFLR Funds Expended[1])	**Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2015($)**
CFLN1114	$143,229
CFLN1115	$512,390

Fund Source – (Funds expended from Washington Office funds (in addition to CFLR/CFLN)[2] (please include a new row for each BLI))	**Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2015($)**
CMRD	$57,977
NFRR	$480,000
WFHF	$33,000

Fund Source – (FS Matching Funds (please include a new row for each BLI)[3)]	**Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2015($)**
BDBD	$ 51,481
CWKV	$ 82,546
NFRR	$ 100,220
RTRT	$ 11,129
SSSS	$ 77,313
WFHF	$ 7,814

Fund Source – (Funds contributed through agreements[4])	**Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2015($)**
Grants to support trails accomplishments	$206,352
CMXN	$110,935.14
NFXF	$ 50,000
NFXN	945,416.4

Fund Source – (Partner In-Kind Contributions[5])	**Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2015($)**
Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative – Social/Economic Monitoring	$5,000
Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative – Project Meetings	$12,428.98
Trails and Resource Program Volunteers	$366,482.60

[1] This amount should match the amount of CFLR/CFLN dollars obligated in the PAS expenditure report. Include prior year CFLN dollars expended in this Fiscal Year.

[2] This value (aka carryover funds or WO unobligated funds) should reflect the amount expended of the allocated funds as indicated in the FY15 program direction, but does not necessarily need to be in the same BLIs or budget fiscal year as indicated in the program direction.

[3] This amount should match the amount of matching funds obligated in the PAS expenditure report. These funds plus the Washington Office funds (unobligated funds) listed above should total the matching funds obligated in the PAS report.

[4] Please document any partner contributions to implementation and monitoring of the CFLR project through an income funds 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. Partner contributions for Fish, Wildlife, Watershed work can be found in WIT database. Please list the partner organizations that provided in-kind contributions.

For Contracts Awarded in FY15

Service work accomplishment through goods-for services funding within a stewardship contract	Totals
Total amount of stewardship credits charged for contracts awarded in FY156	$ 0.00
Total revised credit limit for contracts awarded in FY157	$ 80,650.00

For Contracts Awarded Prior to FY15

Service work accomplishment through goods-for services funding within a stewardship contract	Totals
Total amount of stewardship credits charged in FY158	$ 239,429.50
Total revised credit limit for open and closed contracts awarded and previously reported prior to FY159	$ 926,847.71

b. Please provide a narrative or table describing leveraged funds in your landscape in FY2015 (one page maximum).

Leveraged funds refer to funds or in-kind services that help the project achieve proposed objectives but do not meet match qualifications. Examples include but are not limited to: investments within landscape on non-NFS lands, investments in restoration equipment, worker training for implementation and monitoring, and purchase of equipment for wood processing that will use restoration by-products from CFLR projects. See "Instructions" document for additional information.

Not applicable in FY2015.

2a. Discuss how the CLFR project contributes to accomplishment of the wildland fire goals in the 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan and describe the progress to date on restoring a more fire-adapted ecosystem, as identified in the project's desired conditions. This may also include a description of the current fire year (fire activity that occurred in the project area) as a backdrop to your response (please limit answer to one page).

Discussions 2a and 2b have been combined below for better clarity.

2b. 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**:

The KVRI area falls within the Bonners Ferry Ranger District, Idaho Panhandle National Forest (IPNF). The district had a hazardous fuels (WFHF) budget of approximately $151,000. This budget included 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, BD, and KV funds were utilized to plan and/or implement treatments associated with the area. Over 1,000 acres within the project area were treated utilizing either mechanical thinning or prescribed burning. The prescribed burning was a combination of activity fuel burning and natural fuels burning. All burning activities shared a goal of reducing hazardous fuels across the landscape and all work was done in high priority areas. Mechanical thinning is often done in conjunction with the burning of activity

[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.
[7] This should be the amount in contract's "Progress Report for Stewardship Contracts, Integrated Resources Contracts or Agreements" in cell J46, the "Revised Credit Limit," *as of September 30*. Additional information on the Progress Reports is available in CFLR Annual Report Instructions document.
[8] This should be the amount in the "stewardship credits charged" column at the end of the fiscal year in the TSA report TSA90R-01.
[9] This should be the amount in each contract's "Progress Report for Stewardship Contracts, Integrated Resources Contracts or Agreements" in cell J46, the "Revised Credit Limit." *For open contracts*, this should be as of September 30. *For closed contracts*, this should be at the time of contract closure.

fuels. In some mechanical thinning areas the fuels is left on the ground for nutrient cycling, but in areas of heavy fuel or in high risk areas, adjacent to the wildland interface or main road systems, the thinned material is piled and burned.

The district had a wildfire preparedness (WFPR) budget of $315,000. 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 included all salaries, training, and resource costs that are involved with running the Bonner's Ferry District preparedness program. Some preparedness staff were utilized in planning for and implementing landscape level project treatments.

The 2015 fire season resulted in above average activity on National Forest System (NFS) lands within the Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative (KVRI) project area. Fuel moistures and fire danger indices were above average from the first part of June through the end of October. The IPNF implemented Stage 1 Fire Restriction on June 30th and on July 13th Stage 2 fire restrictions when into effect. The district took initial attack on 23 fires this year and successfully controlled 21 of these fires for a total of 8 acres burned. Of these 21 fires, one occurred in an area previously treated under the CFLR project. This project area still contained slash piles, but the light fuels between the piles and the open canopy allowed quick and successful suppression utilizing aviation and ground resources; the fire was held to ¼ ac. The two fires that were not successfully controlled through initial attack suppression tactics occurred in remote areas and were managed with a modified point protection strategy. These two fires burned a total of 6,670 acres.

Details of the two lightning caused large fires:

Bakers Camp Fire started on June 29th in the Upper Smith Creek drainage area adjacent to private timberlands. This fire quickly exceed initial attack capabilities due to the dry fuel conditions, above average temperatures and low relative humidity at this time of year. Given the steep terrain and adjacent values at risk, a Type 3 IMT managed this fire with a heavy dose of air resources to support type 1 crews assigned to the incident. The fire was contained on July 30th at 50 ac and a final cost of $2,200,000.

Parker Ridge fire started on July 29th on the ridge between Parker Canyon and Long Canyon. The fire was spotted by air patrol in a pocket of bug-killed timber and soon grew to 10 acres. Heavy amounts of retardant were used to hold the fire in check until ground resources could arrive on scene. Ground resources arrived on the fire the next morning and the decision was made to not staff the fire due to safety concerns associated with heavy pockets of snags. A Type 3 IMT was assigned to safely manage the fire. On August 14, a dry cold front with high winds moved into the area causing extreme fire behavior. The fire moved off NFS lands and onto private lands. The fire was controlled on November 5th at 6,620 ac and a final cost of $3,800,000,

3. What assumptions were used in generating the numbers and/or percentages you plugged into the TREAT tool? Information about Treatment for Restoration Economic Analysis Tool inputs and assumptions available here – http://www.fs.fed.us/restoration/documents/cflrp/R-CAT/TREATUserGuide10112011.pdf.

Some basic background information:

All biological surveys, marking, and layout are done with force account crews.

Prescribed burning (both activity fuel and natural fuels) is accomplished with force account crews.

Planting and thinning is done primarily via contract, but the contractors are all from out of area.

FY 2015 Jobs Created/Maintained (FY15 CFLR/CFLN/ WO carryover funding

Type of projects	Direct part and full-time jobs	Total part and full-time jobs	Direct Labor Income	Total Labor Income10
Commercial Forest Product Activities	73	147	3,657,772	5,631,816
Other Project Activities	19	23	584,663	693,738

[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.

Type of projects	Direct part and full-time jobs	Total part and full-time jobs	Direct Labor Income	Total Labor Income10
TOTALS:	**92**	**170**	**4,242,435**	**6,325,554**

FY 2015 Jobs Created/Maintained (FY15 CFLR/CFLN/ WO carryover and matching funding):

Type of projects	Direct part and full-time jobs	Total part and full-time jobs	Direct Labor Income	Total Labor Income11
Commercial Forest Product Activities	146	296	7,364,878	11,339.588
Other Project Activities	39	45	1,169,112	1,389,214
TOTALS:	185	341	8,533,990	12,728,802

4. Describe other community benefits achieved and the methods used to gather information about these benefits. How has CFLR and related activities benefitted your community from a social and/or economic standpoint? (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. 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 CFLRP planning areas (Deer Creek, and Boulder) were conducted this past field season. Participants on these trips included members of the KVRI Forestry Subcommittee and many other interested individuals from throughout Boundary and Bonner counties. The field trips have provided a great forum for information sharing and a chance to exchange thoughts and ideas with groups that share a common interest in restoration. Field trips give resource specialists a chance to explain how logging, prescribed burning, roads, culverts, aquatic organism passages (AOPs), and streams are all interconnected in the ecosystem and explain how restoration projects benefit this ecosystem. Sites visited during field trips included Field trips proposed project areas and project acres where similar activities have taken place to better explain the "before and after" of treatment activities. The KVRI Forestry Subcommittee expressed interest in rolling up their sleeves and assisting with some stream restoration work and recently assisted in helping create stream-bank stabilizers from willow cuttings and netting.

Idaho congressional staffers regularly attend meetings and field trips to keep abreast of restoration activities and local opportunities provided as a result of this work.

In FY2015, road maintenance and road reconstruction were accomplished in the Twentymile project area and culvert upgrades were installed in the Twentymile and Kreist Creek project areas. These treatments will result in safer access on forest roads and improved water quality for the local community in the future. These activities further benefit the local community by providing job opportunities for local contractors. This job creation will be tracked through survey forms sent to contractors who worked on forest service projects in FY15 and will continue to be part of all such future contracts.

The increased number of trail miles maintained and reconstructed as a part of CFLRP has resulted in far greater volunteer opportunities for individuals and groups who have interest in giving something back to their public lands. It has also provided many opportunities for local youth to be employed in our summer trails program. These youth and volunteers contribute an immense amount of work in support of improved trails and watersheds while building a foundation as future stewards of our public lands. These volunteers remain in the community for varying amounts of time throughout the summer and contribute to the local economy.

[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.

5. Based on your project monitoring plan, describe the multiparty monitoring process. What parties (who) are involved in monitoring, and how? What is being monitored? Please briefly share key broad monitoring results and how results received to date are informing subsequent management activities (e.g. adaptive management), if at all. **What are the current weaknesses or shortcomings of the monitoring process?** (Please limit answer to two pages. Include a link to your monitoring plan if it is available).

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 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 fourth year of project implementation, and have been working to refine our monitoring protocols. We currently have performed or are in the process of performing the following monitoring in the key areas identified in our Monitoring Plan:

KVRI enlisted Research Economist and Clinical Assistant Professor of Economics, Steven Petersen, from the University of Idaho to report on the Socio-Economic impacts of the CFLR Project on Northern Idaho and on the broader Idaho economy. The positive effects of the CFLR Project are clearly depicted in the final report attached at the end of this annual report.

Approximately 350 acres of natural fuels burning was accomplished in the Idaho Buckhorn project area and monitoring is underway to determine how effective this has been in meeting the objectives of fuels reduction and improved berry and other forage production for big game and grizzly bear.

Stocking surveys were completed on 319 acres and post treatment precommercial thin surveys on 85 acres within the project area. These surveys are the primary mechanism for monitoring vegetation composition and structure following treatment activities. These same areas are utilized to determine effectiveness of the treatment activities in meeting the silvicultural objectives. These areas are also instrumental in demonstrating the pre and post treatment condition of timber stands when visiting project areas with our collaborative.

The Parker Ridge Fire burned approximately 6,720 acres within the CFLR project area and 3,921 of those acres were managed for resource benefit. A monitoring plan has been developed and plots have been established to assess the effectiveness of this fire in meeting the landscape objectives of the CFLR project.

Zone aquatics staff are continuing to track the number of fish barriers within our stream systems and prioritizing opportunities to upgrade these structures. All new and upgraded culverts and AOPs installed throughout the project area will be monitored to determine their effectiveness in providing additional miles of stream habitat.

Zone wildlife staff has been tracking the changes in overall road densities within each Bear Management Unit (BMU) in the project area. They have also been monitoring the incremental gains, made by the Bonners Ferry Ranger District, in meeting the BMU standards outlined in the Grizzly Bear Access Amendment. All CFLR projects have the goal of balancing grizzly bear security needs and the need for road access.

Zone staff utilize the INFRA database together with local workplans to monitor and track the current status of the trail system and road system within the project area. This monitoring and planning is instrumental in prioritizing and accessing opportunities for improvements to these systems as we plan for each new project.

Zone weed and range staffs have been continually mapping the known populations of noxious weeds within the project area. An improved database and GPS equipment being utilized in FY16 will allow for improved monitoring of the size of existing populations and the mapping of new populations. This information will allow for improved efforts in controlling these populations.

Zone botanist and weed staff have established a monitoring unit within the Deer Creek project area to measure the effects of differing fuels treatments on existing populations of weed species. The unit will have the same logging prescription, but the fuels will be treated in three different ways. These three subunits will then be monitored relative to existing and new populations of weeds.

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished[12]	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)[13]
Acres treated annually to sustain or restore watershed function and resilience WTRSHD-RSTR-ANN	Acres	21,018.4	NA	CFLN CWKV NFRR NFXF RTRT SPFH SSCC WFHF WFSU XXXX
Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres	28.9 94.1 56.0	$24,565 $79,985 $47,600	CFLN CWKV RTRT
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	173.0 65.0 511.0 269.0 131.0	$51,900 $19,500 $153,300 $80,700 $39,300	CFLN CWKV NFRR SSCC SPFH
Highest priority acres treated annually for noxious weeds and invasive plants on NFS lands INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acres	419.8 4.4	$44,079 $462	CFLN NFRR
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial & aquatic species on NFS lands INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC	Acres	0.0	NA	NFRR
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions S&W-RSRC-IMP	Acres	0.9 1.0 0.1	$1,350 $1,500 $150	CFLN NFRR NFXF
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-LAK	Acres	NA	NA	NA
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Mile	1.7 2.5 0.2	$255,000 $375,000 $30,000	CFLN NFRR NFXF
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	9,966.0 3,923.0	Integrated Target	CFLN WFSU
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved with non-NFRG funding sources RG-VEG-IMP	Miles	136.2	$14,301	CFLN
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving	Miles	56.6	$56,600	CFLN

maintenance RD-HC-MAINT-MI				
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance RD-PC-MAINT-MI	Miles	45.4 19.5	$90,800 $39,000	CFLN CMRD
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM – MI	Miles	6.1 1.9	$61,000 $19,000	CMRD NFRR
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP-MI	Miles	29.1 20.3	$58,200 $40,600	CFLN CMRD
Miles of high clearance system roads improved RD-HC-IMP-MI	Miles	39.7 36.2	$39,700 $36,200	CFLN CMRD
Number of stream crossings constructed, reconstructed or removed to provide for aquatic organism passage STRM-CROS-MITG-STD	Crossing	3.0 0.0 2.0	$300,000 $200,000	CFLN CMRD NFRR
Miles of system trail maintained TL-MAINT-STD	Miles	225.1 7.8 25.3 9.1 2.5 47.5	$90,040 $3,120 $3,640 $1,000 $19,000	CFLN CMTL XXXX NFRW WFPR CMXN
Miles of system trail improved TL-IMP-STD	Miles	62.2 1.0 4.1 6.1 2.5 28.9	$62,200 $1,000 $6,100 $2,500 $28,900	CFLN CMTL XXXX NFRW WFPR CMXN
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard LND-BL-MRK-MAINT	Miles	NA	NA	NA
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC	Acres	327.0	NA	XXXX
Volume of Timber harvested (CCF) TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF	3,810.9	NA	XXXX
Volume of Timber sold (CCF) TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	51,117.5 0.0 65.0	Integrated Target	CFLN NFRR NFTM
Green tons from small	Green Tons	8314.8	NA	XXXX

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

[13] 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.

diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG				
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	119.5 451.5 285.0 3,942.0 114.0	$11,950 $45,150 $28,500 $394,200 $11,400	CFLN NFRR WFHF WFSU SPFH
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	379.5 42.0 32.5 269.0 544.0 1,321.0 17.0	$94,875 $10,500 $8,125 $67,250 $136,000 $4,250	CFLN CWKV NFRR SSCC WFHF XXXX SPFH
Number of acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands SP-INVSPE-FED-AC	Acres	NA	NA	NA
Number of acres treated annually for native pests on Federal lands SP-NATIVE-FED-AC	Acres	NA	NA	NA

6. FY 2015 accomplishments

7. FY 2015 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.

FY2015 Target Accomplishment -

The KVRI proposal was funded at $655,619 for FY2015 and met or exceeded many of the planned FY2015 CFLR targets. This success was particularly evident in program areas that weren't as weather dependent such as AOPs (4) culvert replacements (7), bridge replacements (1), forest vegetation established (179 acres) and improved (1,149 acres), invasive plant management (560 acres), and timber volume sold (51,183 ccf). The most challenging targets to accomplish were those tied to weather windows such as prescribed burning and road maintenance. The most inconsistent targets are those tied to timber sales (timber volume harvested and the acres treated through timber sales), because this work is tied to timber markets and the business models of the purchaser. Despite these challenges we were able to harvest 3,811 ccf, treat 327 acres with timber sales, treat 4,472 acres with prescribed fire, and accomplish 247 miles of road maintenance and improvement. The timber related accomplishments were accompanied by impressive accomplishments in other resource areas such as 2 acres of soil or water resources protected, replacement of 5 fish passages/culverts, 179 acres of thinning/pruning, 210 acres of reforestation, and trail maintenance and improvement on nearly 422 miles of trails. The project also made 8,315 tons of material available for bio-energy production through vegetation treatments. Weather conditions and fire transfer prevented us from accomplishing some targets this year, but in general, targets are becoming easier to accomplish because our more recent projects were planned with a greater eye towards the many restoration opportunities afforded us through the CFLR project. Any residual targets have been included in our outyear program of work.

FY2015 Planning and Future Implementation -

The KVRI Forestry Subcommittee, a subset of the parent KVRI collaborative, met frequently in collaborative meetings and field trips during FY2015 in support of project planning on the Bonners Ferry Ranger District. The project planning for FY2015 consisted of finishing the NEPA and signing a decision on the Hellroaring EA and continuing the analyses on Deer Creek, Boulder, and Trout Ball EAs. The Placer Nugget and Hellroaring timber sales and Brushy Mission II stewardship sales were all awarded in FY2015. These projects resulted in the sale of 51,183 ccf of timber in FY2015.

FY2016 will see the continued collaborative planning and development of the Deer Creek, Boulder, and Trout Ball projects. The purpose and need, as identified by the KVRI collaborative group for these three projects is to:

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,

Improve habitat and forage for big game through vegetation treatments and broadcast burning,

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

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

Outyear Planning and Implementation -

The benefits of working with KVRI in a collaborative fashion as projects are developed has been obvious for many years, but CFLR funding is allowing us to realize more fruits of this labor by having the additional funding to focus more heavily on the restoration component of our projects during implementation. Having this funding allows everyone in this collaborative to look harder for opportunities to improve resources during our field trips and meetings. The planned projects in Deer Creek, Boulder, and Trout Ball will benefit most directly from the combination of a strong collaborative effort combined with funding to get work done on the ground. For example, the collaborative has been instrumental in assisting with the development of recreation opportunities within the Deer Creek Project Area such as better road access, snowmobile parking area, and restoration of the Salomon Lake Campground to reduce sedimentation problems.

Resource specialists reports have been completed for Deer Creek and a draft EA will be completed in the 1st quarter of FY2016. Stand exam contracts and some initial data collection began in the Trout Ball project area, but the bulk of the data collection will occur in the summer of FY2016. The district will meet this fall and winter with the KVRI Collaborative to continue discussions on the Deer Creek, Boulder, and Trout Ball projects as we continue to move these projects through the NEPA. The busy fire season of FY15 and subsequent fire salvage efforts in FY16 across the IPNF have resulted in some adjustments to outyear project schedules. Implementation of the Deer Creek project has been moved to FY17; the Boulder project to FY18; and the Trout Ball project to FY19.

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?[14]

Fiscal Year	Total number of acres treated (treatment footprint)
Total in FY15	Total footprint of acres treated from start year through FY15 = 18,798
FY10, FY11, FY12, FY13, FY14, and FY15 (as applicable- projects selected in FY2012 may will not have data for FY10 and FY11; projects that were HPRP projects in FY12, please include one number for FY12 and one number for FY13 (same as above))	FY12 – 2,300 acres FY13 – 2,440 acres FY14 – 5,795 acres FY15 – 8,263 acres

Please briefly describe how you arrived at the total number of footprint acres: what approach did you use to calculate the footprint?

We've been utilizing the FACTS database to provide these numbers, but we need to continue to fine-tune our approach. We plan to revisit the numbers for all project years to assure accuracy when we prepare future reports.

9. Describe any reasons that the FY 2015 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 on-the-ground challenges occurred in FY2015. However, fiscal and workforce capacity issues associated the 2015 fire season did in some projects not being accomplished. Approximately $250,000 in CFLN funding was transferred to fire suppression efforts. The bulk of this funding was tied to contracts that were submitted to acquisitions. Acquisition personnel were not able process and award these contracts in a timely manner because their priorities were shifted to support fire suppression buying teams. Project not accomplished included road decommissioning, culvert upgrades, AOP installations, and purchasing of GPS units needed for range and noxious weed monitoring.

10. Planned FY 2017 Accomplishments[15]

Performance Measure Code[16]	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment	Amount ($)
Acres treated annually to sustain or restore watershed function and resilience WTRSHD-RSTR-ANN	Acres	NA	NA
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	Acre	400	42,000
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC	Acres	NA	NA
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions. S&W-RSRC-IMP	Acres	47.5	71,250

[14] 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.
[15] Please note that planned accomplishments are aggregated across the projects to determine the proposed goals for the program's outyear budget justification. These numbers should reflect what is in the CFLRP work plan, with deviations described in question 12.
[16] Please include all relevant planned accomplishments, assuming that funding specified in the CFLRP project proposal for FY 2017 is available. Use actual planned funding if quantity is less than specified in CFLRP project work plan.

Performance Measure Code[16]	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment	Amount ($)
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-LAK	Acres	NA	NA
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	6	NA
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	2,000	NA
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved RG-VEG-IMP	Acres	250	26,250
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance RD-HC-MAIN	Miles	28	56,000
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance RD-PC-MAINT	Miles	2	4,000
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	3	30,000
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles	0.5	5,000
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles	1	10,000
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage STRM-CROS-MTG-STD	Number	3	450,000
Miles of system trail maintained to standard TL-MAINT-STD	Miles	80	32,000
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	NA	NA
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC	Acres	2,700	NA
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF	5,000	NA
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	27,000	NA
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	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 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	2,000	500,000
Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands SP-INVSPE-FED-AC	Acres	NA	NA

Performance Measure Code[16]	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment	Amount ($)
Number of priority acres treated annually for native pests on Federal lands SP-NATIVE-FED-AC	Acres	NA	NA

11. Planned FY 2017 accomplishment narrative (no more than 1 page).

The KVRI proposal was funded at a total of $1,419,334 for FY2017. Our proposal, as submitted, identified projects that require environmental analysis. FY2017 targets will be accomplished primarily through treatments in the Deer Creek, Twenty-mile, Kreist Creek, Hellroaring Creek, and Brushy Mission project areas. The Deer Creek project is still in the planning process and will have a decision signed in FY16. The NEPA has been completed in the other project areas and treatment activities are either on-going or will begin soon. A meeting has been scheduled with the KVRI Forestry Subcommittee, a subset of the parent Collaborative, in December to review and discuss a priority program of work for FY2016 and to receive a briefing of projects slated for FY2017 and FY2018; the Forest Service maintains the decision space for all implementation, and all work is subject to the NEPA. The program of work for FY2017, although not yet reviewed by the Subcommittee at this level of detail, includes projects with the following objectives: prescribed burning (1000 ac), invasive plant management (400 ac), culvert upgrades (6), fish passage/culvert replacement (3), road decommissioning (3 miles), road maintenance (30 miles), commercial timber harvest (2,700 ac or 10 mmbf), biomass utilization (12,500 green tons), pre-commercial thinning (250 ac), reforestation (150 ac), trail reconstruction (6 mi), instream fisheries improvement (6 mi), allotment weed treatments (250 ac), and trail maintenance (80 miles). These projects are consistent with the original proposal and no deviations are planned at this time. Accomplishments may vary considerably depending on completion dates of NEPA, and when the purchaser actually begins work in a particular sale area. However, as we complete more NEPA we will have greater opportunities to complete more restoration work throughout the life of the CFLR project.

We plan to meet with KVRI Forestry Subcommittee throughout FY2016 to update them on the status of the Deer Creek, Boulder, and Trout Ball NEPA and target accomplishments in NEPA ready projects. Deer Creek will have a decision signed in FY2016, Boulder in FY2017, and Trout Ball in FY2018.

12. Describe and provide narrative justification if planned FY 2016/17 accomplishments and/or funding differs from CFLRP project work plan (no more than 1 page):

There are no significant differences in FY 2016/17 that haven't already been described in previous annual reports. A meeting with all resource areas and the budget shop will be scheduled this winter to discuss accomplishments to date and to formulate a solid plan as the project moves forward.

13. Please include an up to date list of the members of your collaborative (name and affiliation, if there is one). If the information is available online, you can simply include the hyperlink here. If you have engaged new collaborative members this year, please provide a brief description of their engagement.

KVRI Contact List

Name	Affiliation
Bob Blanford	Business/Industry
Brad Corkill	Idaho Fish & Game Commission
Chip Corsi	Idaho Fish & Game (Alt.)
Dan Dinning	District 3 Commissioner
Dave Anderson	Mayor
Dave Gray	Social/Cultural/Historical
Dave Wattenbarger	Soil Conservation District/ Ag Landowner
Denise Winey	KTOI/KVRI recording Secretary
Don Allenberg	Corporate Agriculture/Landowner (Alt)
Ed Atkins	Corporate Agriculture/Landowner
Gary Aitken Jr.	KTOI
Jennifer Porter	KTOI
Jim Cadnum	Landowner/Industry
Kennon McClintock	Conservationist/Environmentalist (Alt.)
Kevin Knauth	U.S. Forest Service- IPNF (Alt.)
LeAlan Pinkerton	Boundary County Commissioner
Mary Farnsworth	U.S. Forest Service- IPNF
Patty Perry	KTOI/KVRI facilitator
Robyn Miller	Conservationist/Environmentalist
Ron Abraham	Kootenai Tribe of Idaho (Alt.)
Sandy Ashworth	Social/Cultural/Historical
Tim Dillin	Soil Conservation District/Ag Landowner
Tim Dougherty	Business/Industry

14. How has your project increased support from partners in terms of in-kind contributions and funding? (no more than one page):

The program of work on the Bonners Ferry Ranger District has always had the interest of the local community, and the District has participated within the KVRI collaborative for many years prior to CFLRP. However, the funding associated with the CFLR project has given the District the opportunity to greatly increase the amount of restoration work beyond what is typically possible with the usual budgeted program of work. This, in turn, has lead to increased partnering with local volunteers and businesses. These partnerships have been in the form of volunteer labor from local churches, excavation companies, and the Backcountry Horsemen. There also were donations of equipment time and materials to restore trails, roads, and trailheads.

15. Media recap. Please share with us any hyperlinks to videos, newspaper articles, press releases, scholarly works, and photos of your project in the media that you have available.

Signatures:

Recommended by (Project Coordinator(s)):

Approved by (Forest Supervisor(s))[17]:____/s/ Mary Farnsworth_____

(OPTIONAL) Reviewed by (Collaborative chair or representative): _____

[17] If your project includes more than one National Forest, please include an additional line for each Forest Supervisor signature.