

**CFLR Project (Name/Number): Selway-Middle Fork  
National Forest(s): Nez Perce-Clearwater / Bitterroot**

**1. Match and Leveraged funds:**

**a. FY16 Matching Funds Documentation**

<b>Fund Source – (CFLN/CFLR Funds Expended)</b>	<b>Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2016(\$)</b>
CFLN	2,640,768.05

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.

<b>Fund Source – (Funds expended from Washington Office funds (in addition to CFLR/CFLN) (please include a new row for each BLI))</b>	<b>Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2016(\$)</b>
NFRR	557,568
G350	359,600
NFLM	581,974
WFHF	721,148

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.

<b>Fund Source – (FS Matching Funds (please include a new row for each BLI))</b>	<b>Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2016(\$)</b>
CMRD	41,697.52
CMTL	185117.26
CWFS	50,000.00
NFRR	417,038
NFXN	134,743.31
RTRT	5,558.36
SRS2	99,070.81
SSCC	200,153.00

This amount should match the amount of matching funds obligated in the gPAS expenditure report, minus the Washington Office funds listed in the box above and any partner funds contributed through agreements (such as NFEX, SPEX, WFEX, CMEX, and CWFS) listed in the box below.

<b>Service work accomplishment through goods-for services funding within a stewardship contract (for contracts awarded in FY16)</b>	<b>Totals</b>
Total <u>revised non-monetary credit limit</u> for contracts awarded in FY16	\$ 0.00 - There were no stewardship contracts awarded in FY 16

Note: revised non-monetary credit limits for contracts awarded prior to FY16 were captured in the FY15 CFLR annual report. This should be the amount in contract's "Progress Report for Stewardship Credits, Integrated Resources Contracts or Agreements" in cell J46, the "Revised Non-Monetary Credit Limit," as of September 30. Additional information on the Progress Reports is available in CFLR Annual Report Instructions document.

**b. Please provide a narrative or table describing leveraged funds in your landscape in FY2016** (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, research conducted that helps project achieve proposed objectives, and purchase of equipment

for wood processing that will use restoration by-products from CFLR projects. See “Instructions” document for additional information.

**Suggested Format:**

<b>Description of item</b>	<b>Where activity/item is located or impacted area</b>	<b>Estimated total amount</b>	<b>Forest Service or Partner Funds?</b>	<b>Source of funds</b>
<b>Fuel reduction on private lands with CFLRP landscape</b>	<b>86 acres</b>	<b>\$173,600</b>	<b>Partner Funds</b>	<b>County Fire Mitigation</b>
<b>Weed treatment on private lands within CFLRP landscape</b>	<b>29,470</b>	<b>\$461,700</b>	<b>Partner Funds</b>	<b>Idaho County Weed Management, In-Kind (private)</b>

2. Please tell us about the CFLR **project’s progress to date in restoring a more fire-adapted ecosystem as described in the project proposal**, and how it has contributed to the wildland fire goals in the *10-Year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan*. This may also include a brief 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). ***Where existing fuel treatments within the landscape are tested by wildfire, please include a summary and reference the fuel treatment effectiveness report.***

The start of FY 2016, in terms of fire/fuels management, was really a continuation of the record setting 2015 fire season. Wildland fires that had started in July and August of 2015, were still actively burning in October. The threat to communities such as Lowell, Syringa and the Selway, was largely diminished in October, but fire suppression rehabilitation, Burned Area Emergency Rehabilitation (BAER) and community outreach were in full-swing. The Slide Fire (10,279 acres), Wash Fire (36,721 acres) and the Woodrat Fire (6,459 acres), had not only threatened local communities, but created significant short and long-term impacts to infrastructure, roads and public safety within the fire areas. Suppression rehabilitation activities were implemented to minimize and/or mitigate immediate threats to public safety and prevent mass erosion, as an effect of the fires and fire suppression activities. BAER teams worked diligently through December, to identify and prescribe mitigation activities to minimize the potential long-term negative impacts within the fire area(s). These activities included (but is not limited to); culvert replacements, road reconditioning, and hazard tree removal from roads and trails. An additional team was convened, to assess the potential salvage of burnt and dying trees within the impacted road systems.

All suppression rehabilitation and most of the identified BAER work has been completed this FY, or is scheduled to be completed by the end of the calendar year. Hazard tree removal from the fire area(s) road

system(s) will continue into next field season. CFLRP accomplishment acres for 2016, include many of the fire acres that were still actively burning and increasing in acreage, after October 1<sup>st</sup>.

Fire season 2016, was a stark contrast compared to the previous fire season. The CFLRP area, only experienced 11 wildland fires, including two person-caused ignitions. The non-wilderness front country, had 6 fires, accounting for 1.6 acres, while the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness had 5 wildland fires accounting for 10,078 acres. The Moose fire (8,644 acres), Elk Ridge fire (1,220 acres), Freeman Fire (159 acres), Sixty Two (55 acres), and Battle Creek (.1 acres), were all managed for resource objectives. Total expenditures for management of the wilderness fires were approximately \$55,000, while suppression costs for the 6 front-country fires was approximately \$15,600.

Preparedness funds spent to train and maintain local Fire Management resources, was \$500,000.

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 – [Restoration documents cflrp TREAT user Guide 2015](#).

Assumptions used to generate the TREAT numbers

**CFLN FUNDING:**

<b>Funding and Employment</b>	
<b>Enter Funding:</b> 1 <b>EITHER</b> for multi-year reports, proposals and work plans, enter funding for all years <b>OR</b> for annual reports, enter funding for 1 year	4,580,668
<b>Enter number of years for project implementation:</b> <b>EITHER</b> enter total number of years for multiple year reports or anticipated funding for proposals and work plans <b>OR</b> enter "1" for annual reports	1
<b>Annual Project Funding</b>	4,580,668
<b>Enter percent of this funding that is going to be used for contracted work within the impact area:</b> Contractors must be located in one of the counties in your impact area, shown in cell B6. If work was contracted out to a firm based outside of this area, then that portion of funding "leaked" and isn't included in the contribution analysis.	70%
<b>Enter percent of project funding that is going to be used for Force Account Implementation &amp; Monitoring:</b> This is the only place Force Account is tracked.	25%
<b>Total Percent</b> Must be less than or equal to 100%	95%
<b>Enter Annual Force Account FTEs For Implementation &amp; Monitoring:</b>	35

Contract Funding Distributions		
Enter % of Contracted Funding for activities that <b>do not</b> generate commercial volume		
Description	Types of Products	Project Percent
Equipment intensive work	<b>No commercial products.</b> Includes chipping in the woods (but no saleable chips), equipment intensive logging operations that produce no commercial products, and mechanical treatments such as mastication, grapple piling, excavator work, etc. Most work done by machinery.	5%
Labor-intensive work	<b>No commercial products.</b> Includes labor intensive, simple mechanical treatments such as thinning with chain saws, hand piling, prescribed burning, tree planting, etc. Most of the work done is by human effort with few materials and little machinery.	15%
Material-intensive work	<b>No commercial products.</b> Projects where materials represent a significant portion of project costs. Includes road work, culvert replacement, in-stream restoration, fence construction, some trail work, etc.	50%
Technical services	<b>No commercial products.</b> Includes stand exams, marking, layout, biological surveys, cultural surveys, invasive weed spraying, etc.	15%
Professional services	<b>No commercial products.</b> Includes studies completed by scientists, engineering design, acquisition or analysis of remotely-sensed data, scientific modeling, workshops, etc.	5%
Contracted Monitoring (Does not include in-kind and volunteer contributions)	Services Contracted for monitoring	10%
Totals -- must be less than or equal to 100%		100%

**FULL FUNDING:**

Full Funding and Employment	
Enter Funding: <b>EITHER</b> for multi-year reports, proposals and work plans, enter funding for all years <b>OR</b> for annual reports, enter funding for 1 year	5,994,437
Enter number of years for project implementation: <b>EITHER</b> enter total number of years for multiple year reports or anticipated funding for proposals and work plans <b>OR</b> enter "1" for annual reports	1
Annual Project Funding	5,994,437
Enter percent of this funding that is going to be used for contracted work within the impact area: Contractors must be located in one of the counties in your impact area, shown in cell B6. If work was contracted out to a firm based outside of this area, then that portion of funding "leaked" and isn't included in the contribution analysis.	80%
Enter percent of project funding that is going to be used for Force Account Implementation & Monitoring: This is the only place Force Account is tracked.	15%
Total Percent Must be less than or equal to 100%	95%
Enter Annual Force Account FTEs For Implementation & Monitoring:	35

Contract Funding Distributions		
Enter % of Contracted Funding for activities that <b>do not</b> generate commercial volume		
Description	Types of Products	Project Percent
Equipment intensive work	<b>No commercial products.</b> Includes chipping in the woods (but no saleable chips), equipment intensive logging operations that produce no commercial products, and mechanical treatments such as mastication, grapple piling, excavator work, etc. Most work done by machinery.	5%
Labor-intensive work	<b>No commercial products.</b> Includes labor intensive, simple mechanical treatments such as thinning with chain saws, hand piling, prescribed burning, tree planting, etc. Most of the work done is by human effort with few materials and little machinery.	15%
Material-intensive work	<b>No commercial products.</b> Projects where materials represent a significant portion of project costs. Includes road work, culvert replacement, in-stream restoration, fence construction, some trail work, etc.	50%
Technical services	<b>No commercial products.</b> Includes stand exams, marking, layout, biological surveys, cultural surveys, invasive weed spraying, etc.	15%
Professional services	<b>No commercial products.</b> Includes studies completed by scientists, engineering design, acquisition or analysis of remotely-sensed data, scientific modeling, workshops, etc.	10%
Contracted Monitoring (Does not include in-kind and volunteer contributions)	Services Contracted for monitoring	5%
Totals -- must be to 100%		100%

**FY 2016 Jobs Created/Maintained (FY16 CFLR/CFLN/ WO carryover funding):**

Project Type	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) Direct	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) Total	Labor Income - Direct	Labor Income - Total
Timber harvesting component	2	3	88,023	113,061
Forest and watershed restoration component	35	40	380,135	515,173
Mill processing component	3	9	157,138	330,118
Implementation and monitoring	37	40	758,989	865,319
Other Project Activities	2	3	61,358	88,420
<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>1,445,643</b>	<b>1,912,091</b>

**FY 2016 Jobs Created/Maintained (FY16 CFLR/CFLN/ WO carryover and matching funding):**

Project Type	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) Direct	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) Total	Labor Income - Direct	Labor Income - Total
Timber harvesting component	2	3	88,023	113,061
Forest and watershed restoration component	55	62	661,631	883,756
Mill processing component	3	9	157,138	330,118
Implementation and monitoring	36	39	595,945	679,434
Other Project Activities	2	2	45,883	66,120
<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>1,548,620</b>	<b>2,072,489</b>

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>.

**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). *If you have one story you could tell a member of Congress or other key stakeholder about the benefits in the community the project has helped achieve, what would it be?*

CFLR continued to provide jobs and training for local youth through the popular Clearwater Basin Youth Conservation Corps (CBYCC) program. In FY 2016, the program expanded to provide opportunities for 23 young people between the ages of 16 and 18 in the communities of Grangeville, Kooskia, Orofino and Pierce.

CBYCC builds on the Department of Agriculture’s Youth Conservation Corps program, bringing the resources of state, federal, county and private partners together to build and implement a comprehensive program tailored for local youth. In 2016, supporting partners included the Forest Service, Clearwater Basin Collaborative, Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, National Park Service, Idaho Department of Labor, Idaho Firewise, Idaho County, and Framing Our Community.

The youth crews received rave reviews from all partners and accomplished significant forest restoration work, planting trees, clearing trails, pulling and hacking down weeds, pruning white pine, reducing fuels, cleaning open-tops on forest roads, and much, much more.

The 2015 Youth Corps video will remain posted to CBC's website and 2016 photos will be shared in next year's presentations for high school youth to view prior to applying so they can get an idea of what the Youth Corps is all about and what is expected. This video will also be posted to Framing Our Community's website for availability.

Youth and leaders also posted pictures to Facebook during the 2016 season:

[https://www.facebook.com/search/top/?q=clearwater%20basin%20collaborative%20youth%20corps&filters\\_rp\\_creation\\_time=%7B%22start\\_year%22%3A%222016%22%2C%22end\\_year%22%3A%222016%22%7D](https://www.facebook.com/search/top/?q=clearwater%20basin%20collaborative%20youth%20corps&filters_rp_creation_time=%7B%22start_year%22%3A%222016%22%2C%22end_year%22%3A%222016%22%7D) to share with family and friends.

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).

The Monitoring Advisory Committee (MAC) for the Selway-Middle Fork CFLRP project has been in place since 2012 and is a true third party group consisting of CBC members and affiliates, Forest Service representatives, local contractors and community members, private industry, governmental entities, university researchers, and representatives from regional USDA Forest Service research stations. Typically, monitoring projects are developed and reviewed by a representative technical team from the MAC with work completed by local contractors. The partnership between the CBC, the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forests, the Clearwater RC&D, and many other partners and contributors is integral to the funding and implementation of high quality monitoring projects benefiting the CFLRP area. One of the limitations of the MAC has been developing projects at a scale that allows managers to have enough confidence in the findings to adapt project level prescriptions or activities.

The MAC continues to develop and implement monitoring projects that assess ecological and socioeconomic changes in the project area resulting from CFLRP-funded restoration work as well as natural disturbances. Much of the information produced by the MAC, contractors, and other partners helps inform Forest Service managers and the CBC on forest health issues, the direct and indirect impacts of the project on the local community, and ecosystem services important in the Clearwater Basin.

In FY16, several effectiveness monitoring projects were completed including some that were begun in the previous year:

- **Keep It Simple Initiative:** Due to recent wildfires within the CFLRP landscape, the Monitoring Advisory Committee has developed a series of data gaps that further research would help inform a revised program of restoration work on affected landscapes. In addition to furthering the general body of knowledge on post-fire ecological impacts, this information is intended to provide mostly project-level information that can be incorporated into the "best available science" specific to the Selway and Middle Fork Clearwater River watersheds. The MAC issued an RFP to seek out contractors available to conduct literature searches, collect data, summarize anecdotal evidence, perform analyses, and write basic reports as appropriate on specific questions posed by the MAC. The premise of these projects was

based on a “Keep it Simple” philosophy meaning that the MAC was not looking for in-depth research projects, but want the questions answered as simply and easily as possible while still being scientifically sound.

- - “KIS Question #1 – What effect do recent fires have on wildlife habitat?” Assessing the status of wildlife habitats that may be impacted by wildfires and other disturbances provides managers essential information on habitats or species that might be at risk. This analysis evaluates the level of currently available habitat for the following wildlife species: fisher, American marten, flammulated owl, northern goshawk, black-backed woodpecker, pileated woodpecker, Canada lynx stand initiation and multi-storied habitat, and songbirds associated with Riparian Habitat Conservation Areas. These species represent guilds of species that occupy habitats characterized by the representative species selected.
  - “KIS Question #4 – What is the recovery of vegetation in areas that were salvaged versus those that were not?”: This project was commissioned to conduct field surveys and a review of the data to assess the impacts to vegetation recovery attributable to timber salvage efforts after a wildfire, which is relevant to the Clearwater Basin’s Selway–Middle Fork Collaborative Forest landscape Restoration Program (CFLRP). Specifically, field data were collected in July of 2016 to analyze the impacts of post-wildfire salvage efforts from the greater Lolo Pass area, including the 2000 Crooked Fire, the 2003 Hopeful 2 Fire, and the 2011 Granite Pass Fire. These three fires were chosen so that comparisons could be made across a variety of fire ages and management efforts.
  - “KIS Question #13 – Review, Analysis, and Crosswalk of the Best Available Science for Erosion/Sedimentation and Elk Modeling”: The overarching purpose of this white paper was to provide an overview of the best available information on erosion/sedimentation models and elk habitat assessment methods. The first section of the paper assesses erosion/sedimentation models and discusses some of the importance regarding model selection and identifying desired system attributes for prediction. The second section of the paper discusses methods for estimating elk habitat and forage, distribution patterns, and mortality as a function of human influence. Each model and assessment method overview provides a brief history of the developed intention, data rigor, outputs, applicable scale where available and applicable as well as a discussion of the limitations of each method.
- FY15 Socio-economic Addendum: The 2015 report is the 4<sup>th</sup> annual socioeconomic monitoring report for the CFLRP project and summarizes available data on labor and employment statistics, the state of the forest products industry, wildfire conditions and trends, CFLRP contracting statistics and trends, TREAT information, and interpretation of impacts on socioeconomic and economic factors within the project area.
- Clear Creek Aquatic Habitat Condition Assessment and Fish Population Monitoring Addendum: The goal of the Aquatic Habitat Condition Assessment and Fish Population Monitoring project is to provide an inventory of habitat conditions, and document fish distribution and relative abundance in the Clear Creek watershed on the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forests. As required by the Biological Opinion for the Clear Creek Integrated Restoration Project, two of the long-term monitoring stations established

and surveyed in 2015 were re-surveyed in summer 2016. This report presents the results of these surveys and compares them with 2015 surveys.

- **Prioritization of Reaches for Large Wood Enhancement on Clear Creek Memo:** The Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forests plans to implement large woody debris (LWD) enhancements in the Clear Creek watershed and requested assistance from the MAC with prioritizing locations that would be most suitable for LWD placement, with a focus on larger channels that have the potential to support larger numbers of anadromous salmonids (steelhead, Chinook salmon, and coho salmon). The memo describes the methods used to evaluate and prioritize reaches for LWD enhancements that are most likely to benefit anadromous salmonid populations, and presents the results in an annotated list summarizing the locations recommended for enhancement.
- **Restoration Action Strategy:** The Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forests and the CBC are partnering to develop a Restoration Action Strategy (RAS) for the Forests. The RAS will help identify areas not meeting desired conditions, prioritize areas for restoration, and develop a schedule of work for at least a 15 year period. The RAS is based on the Integrated Restoration Projection Strategy developed by Region 1 in 2011, but will be tailored to the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forests. The RAS framework will be easily updated in order to continually adapt to changing conditions and implementation of projects across the landscape.
- **Ecosystem Services Assessment:** The MAC developed an ecosystem services work plan to assess the production, value, provisioning, and management of ecosystem services in the Clearwater Basin. The deliverables from this work plan will contribute information to the decision space regarding the ecosystem services produced in the project area, especially for recreation, timber, and water services.
- **Weed Booklet (draft publication):** One of the recommendations from the MAC's 2014 assessment on Weed Management within the CFLRP was to develop a weed guide targeting species impacting local landowners. In 2016, the MAC began working on a publication designed to help landowners in Lewis, Clearwater, and Idaho Counties with the identification, treatment, and restoration of landscapes affected by noxious and invasive weeds.



6. FY 2016 accomplishments.

A column labeled “Proposal Goals Measured” was added to the accomplishment summary table in order to accurately describe how the performance measures link to the goals outlined in the Selway-Middle Fork restoration proposal – how we are measuring success. The following table identifies the proposal goals and their abbreviations used in the accomplishment summary table.

<b>Goals from Selway-Middle Fork Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Proposal</b>	<b>Abbreviated As</b>
<b>1. Ensure adequate protection of rural communities, private land and Wild and Scenic River values from uncharacteristic wildland fire.</b>	<b>WUI / Fire / Fuels</b>
<b>2. Re-establish and perpetuate a landscape that has a diversity of vegetation communities that are resilient in the presence of wildfire, invasive species, insects, disease and climate change.</b>	<b>Resilience and Diversity</b>
<b>3. Restore/maintain forest structure, function and ecologic processes that promote aquatic health and diverse aquatic native species habitat including bull trout, steelhead and westslope cutthroat trout.</b>	<b>Aquatic Restoration</b>
<b>4. Restore/maintain forest structure, function and ecologic processes that promote habitat for a large variety of native terrestrial species including mule deer, elk and other big game.</b>	<b>Terrestrial Restoration</b>
<b>5. Eliminate or contain noxious weeds to the greatest extent possible.</b>	<b>Weeds</b>
<b>6. Promote landscape conditions that allow fire to function as the primary ecosystem restoration agent within the Middle and Upper Selway River watersheds.</b>	<b>Fire Regime Restoration</b>

<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Unit of measure</b>	<b>Total Units Accomplished</b>	<b>Proposal Goals Measured</b>	<b>Total Treatment Cost (\$)</b>	<b>Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)</b>
Acres treated annually to sustain or restore	Acres	79,186.64	<b>All goals are represented by this performance measure</b>	Integrated	Integrated

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Proposal Goals Measured	Total Treatment Cost (\$)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)
watershed function and resilience WTRSHD-RSTR-ANN					
Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres	33 <i>(112 accomplished but coded to CFLR in facts)</i>	<b>Goal 2:</b> Resilience and Diversity, <b>Goal 4:</b> Terrestrial Restoration	\$55,950 <i>(cost for 112 acres)</i>	CFLN NFRR
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	0	<b>Goal 2:</b> Resilience and Diversity, <b>Goal 4:</b> Terrestrial Restoration	--	
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	3,144.8	<b>Goal 2:</b> Resilience and Diversity, <b>Goal 3:</b> Aquatic Restoration, <b>Goal 4:</b> Terrestrial Restoration <b>Goal 5:</b> Weeds	\$430,000	CFLN MCC Participating Agreement (Partner in-kind) Outfitter in-kind NFRR RAC (Secure Rural Schools Act Funds) NFXN (National Fish and Wildlife Foundation) Nez Perce Tribe
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions.	Acres	65 <i>(100 ac reported but not coded correct)</i>	<b>Goal 3:</b> Aquatic Restoration	\$1,705,175	CFLN (\$216,175) NFLM/G350 (\$851,000) (federal highways) SSCC (\$200,000) (stewardship) WFSU (\$156,000) (BAER) NFXN (\$150,000) (BPA/NPT) CFRR (\$20,000)

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Proposal Goals Measured	Total Treatment Cost (\$)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)
S&W-RSRC-IMP					Partner in-kind match (\$112,000) (Nez Perce Tribe)
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-LAK	Acres	0	<b>Goal 3:</b> Aquatic Restoration		
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	9.066 <i>(14 reported but not coded correct)</i>	<b>Goal 3:</b> Aquatic Restoration	Integrated with roads and trails	
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	5,806.84	<b>Goal 4:</b> Terrestrial Restoration, <b>Goal 2:</b> Resilience and Diversity, <b>Goal 6:</b> Fire Regime Restoration	Integrated with fire and invasives	MCC partner in-kind NFRR
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance RD-HC-MAIN	Miles	74.272	<b>Goal 3:</b> Aquatic Restoration	\$35,200	CMRD WFPR CFLN
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance RD-PC-MAINT	Miles	66.81	<b>Goal 3:</b> Aquatic Restoration	\$120,342	WFSU CFLN CMRD NFRR
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	0	<b>Goal 3:</b> Aquatic Restoration	\$1,998	CFLN

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Proposal Goals Measured	Total Treatment Cost (\$)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles	13.693	<b>Goal 3:</b> Aquatic Restoration	\$992,184	SSCC G350 NFRR WFSU NFLM CFLN
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles	0.91	<b>Goal 3:</b> Aquatic Restoration	\$494,191	CMRD BAER CFLN
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage STRM-CROS-MTG-STD	Number	1	<b>Goal 3:</b> Aquatic Restoration	\$274,744	NFXN CMRD CFLN
Miles of system trail maintained to standard TL-MAINT-STD	Miles	982.29	<b>Goal 3:</b> Aquatic Restoration	\$932,300	CFLN MCC agreements (partner in-kind) SBFC agreements (partner in-kind) FDSD Outfitter in-kind/volunteer BAER
Miles of system trail improved to standard TL-IMP-STD	Miles	12.9	<b>Goal 3:</b> Aquatic Restoration	\$225,524	MCC

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Proposal Goals Measured	Total Treatment Cost (\$)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard LND-BL-MRK-MAINT	Miles	N/A	Necessary for all goals	--	--
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC	Acres	N/A	<b>Goal 1:</b> WUI/Fire /Fuels, <b>Goal 2:</b> Resilience and Diversity, <b>Goal 4:</b> Terrestrial Restoration, <b>Goal 6:</b> Fire Regime Restoration	--	
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF	1,514	<b>Goal 1:</b> WUI/Fire /Fuels, <b>Goal 2:</b> Resilience and Diversity, <b>Goal 4:</b> Terrestrial Restoration, <b>Goal 6:</b> Fire Regime Restoration	Associated with volume sold	
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	62,897.55	Same as above	\$551,034	CFLN \$453,951 CFRR \$19,928 CFTM \$77,155
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and	Green tons	5,738.51	Same as above	Associated with volume sold	

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Proposal Goals Measured	Total Treatment Cost (\$)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)
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	59,858	<b>Goal 2:</b> Resilience and Diversity, <b>Goal 4:</b> Terrestrial Restoration, <b>Goal 6:</b> Fire Regime Restoration	\$175,000	WFSU
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	10,279	<b>Goal 1:</b> WUI/Fire /Fuels, <b>Goal 2:</b> Resilience and Diversity, <b>Goal 4:</b> Terrestrial Restoration, <b>Goal 6:</b> Fire Regime Restoration	\$800,000	WFSU WFHF

Units accomplished should match the accomplishments recorded in the Databases of Record. Please include the type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match) if you have accurate information that is readily available. Please report each BLI on a separate line within a given performance measures' "Type of Funds" box.

**7. FY 2016 accomplishment narrative** – Summarize key accomplishments and evaluate project progress not already described elsewhere in this report. (Please limit answer to three pages.)

Fiscal year 2016 began just like FY 2015 – with smoke lingering in the air following an historic fire season. The aftermath of the fire season set the stage for a year of accomplishments, challenges, evaluation, and finally a renewed resolve to work through adversity and on to successful implementation of critical vegetative restoration work planned for the Selway-Middle Fork Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Area.

### Accomplishments

Most notable of the FY 16 accomplishments was the continued commitment between the Forests and Clearwater Basin Collaborative to ensuring the Selway-Middle Fork project remains successful. This was not easy considering the challenges, however, the Project's maturity and relationships developed over the last seven years paid dividends when working through difficult situations this year. Key messages generated by the wisdom of the group were to continually recognize and share credit for what has been accomplished, and not focus solely on the challenges.

Some highlighted accomplishments from FY 16:

The Interface Fuels (sold FY 11), Lodge Point (sold FY 12), and Iron Mountain (sold FY 14) project activities have either been completed or in the final project phases. All of these collaboratively supported projects located in WUI areas restored forest health, reduced fuels and produced wood products for local mills. The Forests are continuing to forward an ambitious vegetation restoration program, with supplemental work and decisions being developed for the Johnson Bar, Clear Creek and Lowell WUI projects.

A large investment was made into maintenance and improvement of important road and bridge infrastructure on the upper Selway River, administered by the Bitterroot National Forest. The Bitterroot has been an important partner since the project's beginning and contributed many of the combined CFLR accomplishments reported annually. Their road and bridge improvements contributed significantly towards the watershed restoration program by reducing sediment and maintaining important administrative and public access. A photo report of their projects is included as appendix A of this document.

The invasive plants program on both the Nez Perce-Clearwater and Bitterroot Forests celebrated another successful year of working with our partner groups in the Montana Conservation Corps and Selway Bitterroot-Frank Church Foundation to manage weeds in remote, yet ecologically important areas of the backcountry. Many of the areas impacted by invasive plants provide important wildlife habitat and the investments made towards restoring and maintaining native plant communities are showing impressive results. The Nez Perce Tribe, Backcountry Horsemen, Counties and individual outfitter/guides also contributed significantly towards accomplishments and education in this vitally important component of our project.

### Challenges

Following the fire season of 2014, the Forest initiated a salvage and restoration effort in response to the Johnson Bar Fire which burned across 13,000 acres, much of which was within the CFLR area. Johnson Bar was the first substantial post-fire project undertaken by the Forest in many years, and was done so at the urging of the Clearwater Basin Collaborative and other interested groups.

While the Forest could have fast-tracked the analysis, it opted to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement which was shaped through collaborative and public involvement processes. Following the issuance of a decision in early 2016, the project was litigated. In May 2016, the Forest Supervisor rescinded the decision to ensure the project adequately protected the Wild and Scenic River corridor.

Additional analysis is currently underway to address concerns day lighted through the litigation, as well assess the deterioration in the value of the trees identified for removal.

Concurrently, in early March 2016, the Nez Perce Tribe announced its intent to withdraw from the Clearwater Basin Collaborative. The Tribe acknowledged respect for the collaborative process, but stated it did “not believe continued participation in the CBC is in the best interest of the Tribe...” The Tribe also requested the Collaborative and Forest Service “...cease using the Tribe’s work in their accounting for the grant award under the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program.”

Attempts by the Clearwater Basin Collaborative to meet with the Tribal Chairman to discuss concerns and redefine the Tribe’s role in the collaborative process were unsuccessful. Understanding the Tribe’s desire to focus its resources on government-to-government consultation processes with the Forest, the Clearwater Basin Collaborative respected the Tribe’s decision to withdraw, and requested continued discussions so the Collaborative could share information about proposals and activities and learn about tribal issues and perspectives.

The Tribal Chairman recently encouraged the Collaborative to schedule a meeting with either the Natural Resources Subcommittee or the Nez Perce Tribal Executive Committee as a way to restart a dialogue. The Collaborative is working to schedule that meeting and desires to establish a process that revitalizes the relationship and facilitates two-way communication.

At the same time, the Forest has had meetings with the Tribe to clarify and discuss the Tribe’s request to cease using tribal work within the CFLR area as matching contributions. The Tribe remains respectfully committed to their request, however, the meetings have been a good opportunity to acknowledge joint accomplishments and reaffirm mutual areas of agreement that we can continue to productively work towards.

Both the Forest Service and Clearwater Basin Collaborative continue to discuss future youth program and monitoring opportunities with tribal leadership.

The Forest and Clearwater Basin Collaborative experienced another significant setback in July when the Nez Perce Tribe filed a lawsuit challenging the Clear Creek Integrated Restoration Project, the first landscape-scale comprehensive restoration proposal analyzed within the Selway-Middle Fork area. The project, developed to address critical forest health needs, was expected to yield significant amounts of wood products and labor income for local communities.

The lawsuit was based on tribal concerns about sediment models used in the analysis. In the Tribe’s announcement regarding the lawsuit, Tribal Chairman Mary Jane Miles recognized the working relationship that had developed between the Tribe and the Forest over the years.

Forest Supervisor Cheryl Probert withdrew the decision in August in order to more closely examine the analysis on which the decision was based, and the Tribe subsequently dropped the lawsuit. The Forest Service continues to work closely with the Tribe to resolve concerns and have contracted with the Rocky Mountain Research



Station to thoroughly review and analyze the project’s sediment effects using some of the latest science available.

The Clearwater Basin Collaborative publically commended the Forest for designing the Clear Creek comprehensive restoration package that made good sense from both ecologic and socioeconomic standpoints. The group also pledged to work with the Forest to resolve analysis issues so critical restoration work can commence.

**Renewal**

There are many inspirational quotes that advocate turning stumbling blocks into stepping stones. The Forest and the Clearwater Basin Collaborative are determined to do just that: learn from this year’s challenges and use the lessons learned to produce better analyses and improve working relationships and collaboration into the future.

For its part, the Clearwater Basin Collaborative is evaluating its organizational structure and collaborative processes to ensure procedures are efficient, thorough, and inclusive, and that collaborative products add value to agency projects.

The group is committed to re-establishing communications with the Nez Perce Tribe and others who have an interest in collaboration.

While collaboration builds buy-in and social license, it is no guarantee projects won’t be litigated. While this experience is new to the Clearwater Basin Collaborative, it is not unique to other collaborative groups. The Clearwater Basin Collaborative intends to actively seek lessons learned from other collaboratives with the goal of preventing litigation when possible and responding effectively when it happens.

The Forest continues to improve Johnson Bar and Clear Creek analyses with the goal of correcting deficiencies and re-issuing decisions that will result in future on-the-ground restoration activities. While actual implementation may not fall within CFLR reporting timeframes, the Forest remains optimistic implementation will occur, making the forest more resilient and benefitting local communities.

**8. \*Review the gPAS spatial information sent to you by the Washington Office after gPAS closes out on October 31\***

- **If the footprint estimate from gPAS is consistent and accurate**, please confirm and skip this question.
- **If the gPAS spatial information does NOT appear accurate**, describe the total acres treated in the course of the CFLR project below (cumulative footprint acres; not a cumulative total of performance accomplishments). What was the total number of acres treated?

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Total number of acres treated (treatment footprint)</b>
FY 16	74,441
FY10 thru FY 15	106,446
<b>Total project footprint to-date</b>	<b>180,887</b>

Footprint by Fiscal Year	(Acres)
FY10	5,784
FY11	16,768
FY12	24,597
FY13	29,509
FY14	5,047
FY15	24,741
FY16	74,441

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

Measure	Unit
Road decom	4 acres/mile
Culvert replace	0.1 ac each
Bridge replace	0.1 ac each
Road improve/maint	4 ac/mile
Trail Imp/maint	0.5 ac mile
Fuels/Fire	acres
Wildlife	acres (no duplication with fire)
Veg improve/est	acres (no duplication)
Weed treatment	acres
Timber acres treated	acres

**9. Describe any reasons that the FY 2016 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).

To-date we have outperformed many of the 10 year expected accomplishments and are still on-track with others. Many of these indicators, such as fuel reduction, weed treatments and trail maintenance are important measures of success to the Collaborative.

The 2015 fire season impacted a large portion of the Nez Perce Clearwater Forests. Salvage efforts began early in FY 16 and diverted a number of resources towards rehabilitation and restoration of fire impacted areas, both in and out of the CFLR project area. Those efforts have been generally successful, resulting in three decisions covering over 1000 acres and over 130 miles of roadside. A forth draft decision for a post-fire salvage project on over 500 acres was released December 2, 2016. Prioritizing post-fire projects meant deferring some CFLR projects until subsequent years, however the streamlined effort put forth by the forests to accomplish these focused projects serves as a successful example of employing an Incident Management Team approach to post-fire projects.

Litigation and the subsequent withdrawal of both Records of Decision for the Johnson Bar and Clear Creek Projects resulted in the loss of a number of NEPA cleared miles of road decommissioning and other watershed improvement projects. The preliminary injunction granted in the Johnson Bar case cited issues with proposed activities in the Wild and Scenic River corridor, which also apply to the Lowell WUI project. That project

decision has been delayed to allow for a thoughtful approach to bringing that decision forward while at the same time correcting deficiencies in both the Johnson Bar and Clear Creek EIS's.

10. Planned FY 2018 Accomplishments<sup>1</sup>

Performance Measure Code	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment	Amount (\$)
Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres	300	105,000
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	4000	\$350,000
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	14	\$902,000
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	5,000	150,000 / integrated
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	20	110,000
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles	19	445,000
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles	19	145,000
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	34,450	\$516,750
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons	Byproduct of above	Associated with above
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	5,000	\$35,000 WFHF

<sup>1</sup> 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 11.

Performance Measure Code	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment	Amount (\$)
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres		500 \$115,000 WFHF

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.

**11. Planned FY 2017 accomplishment narrative and justification if planned FY 2017/18 accomplishments and/or funding differs from CFLRP project work plan (no more than 1 page):**

The Forests and CBC are currently exploring opportunities to amend the 2010 Selway-Middle Fork proposal and work plan to account for unforeseen changes that have occurred within the landscape and partners. This proposal review is ongoing and subsequent proposal amendments will be developed in close coordination with the Regional and Washington Offices.

Litigation-induced setbacks and additional NEPA analysis will cause a delay in the expected outputs, (notably timber sale volume) associated with the Johnson Bar and Clear Creek projects. It is anticipated that a Supplemental EIS and ROD will be completed during FY 17 for Johnson Bar with Clear Creek following soon after.

**12. Please include an up to date list of the members of your collaborative if it has changed from the list you submitted in the FY15 report (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.**

CBC Membership:

<http://clearwaterbasincollaborative.org/about/membership/>

**13. Did you project try any new approaches to increasing partner match funding in FY2016 (both in-kind contributions and through agreements)?:**

The Nez Perce Clearwater Forests were the first in Idaho to execute a Supplemental Project Agreement with the Idaho Department of Lands under the Good Neighbor Authority (GNA). The Wapiti timber sale on the Nez Perce Clearwater Forest was the first sale auctioned by the IDL at the end of September. Although the Wapiti sale is not located in the Selway-Middle Fork project area, the Program Income generated from the sale is earmarked for Forestwide capacity building projects such as data collection and stand exams for future restoration projects including CFLR projects. The Forests and IDL are currently working on structuring a long term sustainable program that will generate capacity and increase the pace and scale of restoration projects in the Clearwater Basin.

**Signatures:**

Recommended by Project Coordinator: Mike Ward

Approved by Forest Supervisor: /s/ Cheryl Probert Nez Perce-Clearwater Forest Supervisor

Approved by Forest Supervisor: /s/ Julie King Bitterroot Forest Supervisor

**Appendix A**

---

---

**2016 CFLRP ENGINEERING ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

**BITTERROOT NATIONAL FOREST**

**Magruder Slope Stabilization: April – August 2016**

Stabilized approximately 1050' of failing roadway fill slope. Utilized a combination of gabion baskets, geosynthetic reinforced soil, and rebar pins. This section of roadway had been an area of concern for many years. Failing fill slope and sloughing cut slope would make the road almost impassable each spring until Forest Service road crew was able to get on site and cut road back in to allow for vehicle traffic.

Before Picts:



Narrow Road width / Sloughing Cut slope





Failed Fill Slope / Fill slope Slide

During Construction:



Difficult access



Weight of equipment initiated additional slides. Only a matter of time before entire road failed.



Gabions incorporated in re-design to further stabilize weak slopes / Goesynthetic reinforced soil lifts.





Site overview. Over 1000' of roadway.

Concrete cloth facing for fire/UV protection.

After Picts:



From below – Road Stabilized / Before gravel Surfacing – Long wall



Increased Road width



**Cayuse Creek Bridge Replacement: August 2016**

Replaced old, out-of-date, stream constricting bridge with new glued-laminated spill-through design bridge.

Construction Picts:



**Old Bridge Abutment / New Abutments**



**Temporary Bypass / New Bridge**

**Selway Road Cut Slope Stabilization: August - November 2016**

Stabilize cut slope in areas where continuous sloughing and rock slides occur onto roadway. Precast concrete blocks were designed, cast and painted to blend with wilderness characteristic of corridor. Three sites currently on contract incorporating approx. 570' of wall. Additional 9 sites designed but not yet awarded.

Construction Picts:





Before – Attempts to use logs in the past have failed.



Forms custom built and blocks cast throughout winter months



Some existing bedrock needs drilled and blasted / Teaming with Forest Service blasters





Placing Blocks to lines and grade / Wall construction in progress



...and more progress / Hillside Stabilized

### Gravel Crush, Haul, and placement: September 2015 - September 2016

Contracted to Crush, Haul, and Stockpile 8700 Tons of Gravel for placement in the Selway river Drainage. Forest Service Road crew was able to place, shape and compact all stockpiled gravel providing new surfacing on over 4 miles of old native surfaced roadway reducing sediment contribution to drainage.



Crushing operation



### Running Creek Bridge inspection: November 2016

Running Creek Bridge was installed with CFLRP funding in 2014. Engineer able to coordinate with Forest Service Trail crew to conduct inspection and make plan to improve bridge approach to address comments received from packers, outfitters, etc.



### Install Water Bars: September - October 2016

Forest Service Road crew installed multiple water bars to improve drainage on roadway and prevent erosion and sediment discharge in drainage.



Sample Install / How they Work – directing water off roadway

### Additional Work accomplished with 2016 CFLRP:

- Professional Survey Completed for Deep Creek Bridge 468F for future design
- Survey and Design Completed for Deep Creek Bridge Replacement at Hells Half Road – Ready to Award when construction is funded
- 10 Miles of Roadway along Selway River Brushed by Forest Service Road Crew
- Paradise Campground road surfaced with gravel and brushed