CFLR Project (Name/Number): Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative – CFLR011
National Forest(s): Idaho Panhandle National Forests

1. Match and Leveraged Funds:

a. FY17 Matching Funds Documentation

Fund Source – (CFLN/CFLR Funds Expended)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2017
CFLN	$655,288.11

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.

Fund Source – (Funds expended from Washington Office funds (in addition to CFLR/CFLN) (please include a new row for each BLI))	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2017
CWK2	$592,745.69

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

Fund Source – (FS Matching Funds) (please include a new row for each BLI)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2017
BDBD	$64,726.12
CMRD	$21,119.12
CWKV	$29,493.83
NFRR	$10,866.59
NFXF	$25,000.00
SPFH	$138,490.07
WFHF	$3,392.89

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.

Fund Source – (Funds contributed through agreements)	**Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2017**
CMXN	$22,119.12
CWFS	$20,745.02
NFXF	$25,000.00

Please document any partner contributions to implementation and monitoring of the CFLR project through an income funds agreement (this should include partner funds captured through the gPAS job reports such as NFEX, SPEX, WFEX, CMEX, and CWFS). Please list the partner organizations involved in the agreement. Partner contributions for Fish, Wildlife, Watershed work can be found in WIT database.

Fund Source – (Partner In-Kind Contributions)	**Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2017**
Trails Maintenance & Reconstruction and Monitoring: Camp Thunderbird, Access Outdoors, Retired Smokejumpers, Sierra Club, Idaho Trails Association, Kootenai Valley Volunteers, Out of the Ashes, Mobilize Green, Priest River Backcountry Horsemen, Idaho Conservation League	$244,246.52
Noxious Weed Treatment – Boundary County, ID	$4,700.00
Range Monitoring Volunteers	$375.84
Collaborative Project Meetings: Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative (KVRI)	$16,208.10

Total partner in-kind contributions for implementation and monitoring of a CFLR project. Please list the partner organizations that provided in-kind contributions.

Service work accomplishment through goods-for services funding within a stewardship contract (for contracts awarded in FY17)	**Totals**
Total revised non-monetary credit limit for contracts awarded in FY17	$0.00

Revised non-monetary credit limits for contracts awarded prior to FY17 were captured in previous reports. 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 FY2017 (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.

Description of item	Where activity/item is located or impacted area	Estimated total amount
Kootenai River Restoration work implemented by Kootenai Tribe of Idaho	Accomplishments: + 1.3 miles of river improved + 26.5 acres of floodplain improved/created + 9 acres of pool habitat created + 4,700 feet of streambank restored + 4,000 plantings	$4.0 million

(Optional) Additional narrative about leverage on the landscape if needed:

The Kootenai Tribe of Idaho has been implementing river restoration projects in the mainstem of the Kootenai River to improve morphology, riparian and aquatic habitat conditions for native fish and wildlife species. The first phase of the Lower Meander Project was implemented during the 2017 construction season.

The Lower Meander project area is located upstream of the US Highway 95/2 Bridge. This project is planned for two construction seasons in 2017 and 2018. Phase 1 was recently completed in November 2017. Restoration activities include excavation of two deep pools (20 to 30 feet deep depending on flows), enhancement of six islands, restoration and stabilization of stream banks, construction of three pool-forming structures, installation of approximately 15 large wood structures in a channel that runs between the islands, and planting of native vegetation and seeds. These restoration actions improve habitat conditions for adult and juvenile Kootenai River white sturgeon, bull trout, burbot, and other native fish and wildlife.

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***.

Fire #1 – Bethlehem Mountain Fire (2015) Treatment Unit: East Fork Stew #17
Acres: Contained and Controlled at 0.3 acres

East Fork unit 17 (39 acres) was harvested as a seed tree cut in 2012, with slashing of damaged trees from timber harvest and excavator piling and pile burning of activity fuels following in 2013. The cost of these treatments (slashing, piling and pile burning) totaled approximately $14,000 of which zero CFLN dollars were used. Planning of all harvest and fuels reduction activities for this project were done in collaboration with the

Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative and targets were accomplished for CFLR. Fuels were effectively reduced to be consistent with a light fuel model 8 and minimal ladder or overstory fuels, where expected flame lengths would be low (between 1-2 feet) in a subsequent fire with almost zero potential for torching, spotting or transition to crown fire within the treated area.

The Bethlehem fire started by lightning on the morning of July 20, 2015 and was discovered by a private citizen later that evening. Initial attack resources included nine firefighters and two helicopters (to deliver water to the fire). This was during a particularly busy fire season, fire danger was rated HIGH, and severity resources had been ordered on to the Forest. However, within the previously treated area, fire behavior was minimal, as expected, and the fire was controlled at 0.3 acres (total fire size, all within unit 17) with suppression strategies attained by the following afternoon.

Fire #2 – Mount Hall Fire (2017)

Treatment Unit: Borderline Stew #125

Acres: Contained and Controlled at 1 acre

Borderline Stew Unit 125 (121 acres) was harvested under a shelterwood system in late 2010/early 2011; slashing of damaged or undesired understory trees occurred in the spring of 2011. Excavator fireline was constructed by the purchaser of the timber sale following harvest and an underburn was implemented in the spring of 2012. The total cost of all aforementioned activities to accomplish site prep and fuels reduction burning was approximately $40,000, of which zero CFLN was used (primarily brush disposal generated by the timber sale and some hazardous fuels dollars). The prescribed burning contributed to target accomplishments for the Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative CRLRP (fuels treatment in the wildland-urban interface) and was accomplished with two primary objectives – reduce the existing heavy down woody fuel load (as well as slash from harvest) and prepare the site for planting. Upon monitoring, it was determined objectives of the underburn were met.

The Mount Hall Fire was ignited sometime before discovery on 08/23/2017. No strike tree was discovered and it was not in an area where lightning had occurred, so it was believed to be human caused. Weather leading up to discovery of the fire had been extremely hot and dry with no significant moisture since June. Fire danger for the “North Mountains” fire danger rating area, where this fire occurred, was extreme at the time of discovery until control. Resource values of concern in this area are timber and potential fire spread across this International Border into Canada.

Due to previous fuels treatments and resulting lack of fuels, observed fire behavior was low, with primarily smoldering in the surface and ground fuels and flame lengths well within the limit of direct attack by ground firefighters (<4 feet). As all fuels had been treated with the previous entry, there was no observed torching, high rates of spread, or any other extreme fire behavior. Fuels treatments were successful at keeping this fire small and well within our capabilities to directly suppress the fire, without engines or other resources (such as aerial resources, i.e. helicopter with water bucket).

Due to minimal fire behavior, even under extreme fire danger conditions, the fire was controlled within two days of discovery on 8/25/2017 at one acre. It was observed that had the fire spread outside the unit, into the adjacent untreated stand, fuel conditions were such that torching, spotting, and crown fire runs with high rates of spread would have been probable. See photos below.

Figure 1. Edge of treated unit (Borderline Stew #125) with old fireline from the prescribed burn separating the unit from untreated fuels. Note the fire burned right up to the edge of the unit and went out.

Figure 2. Photo depicting the burned and unburned areas and the 'severity', or lack thereof, of the Mount Hall fire. Notice the minimal surface fuels (mostly just live grasses), no ladder fuels, and spaced tree crowns. The intensity of the fire, following a treatment a few years prior (Borderline Stew #125), was so low that a small tree within the perimeter survived (see foreground, middle of photo).

Since the beginning of the Kootenai Valley Resource Initiatives CFLR project, nearly all acres treated have been done with an objective of fuels reduction to help meet the goals of the project and 10-year comprehensive strategy: 1) Improve fire prevention and suppression; 2) treat hazardous fuels to reduce risks to communities;

3) restore fire adapted ecosystems; and 4) promote community assistance. As the examples show, our activities to reduce canopy, ladder, and surface fuels contributed to a notable reduction in observed fire behavior, even under extreme conditions, and allowed for safe direct attack by firefighting resources to bring the fires under control during initial attack. Resource damage was avoided and associated firefighting costs were in the thousands, rather than the tens or hundreds of thousands. The restoration activities will contribute to long-term fire resilience as vegetative management and fuels reduction has favored the growth and development of more fire adapted species and forest conditions which would result in low-intensity fire.

When a wildfire occurs within the CFLR landscape on an area <u>planned</u> for treatment but not yet treated:

<u>Black Creek Fire (2016)</u>

<u>Planned Treatment Unit: Twentymile #26</u>

Acres: Contained and Controlled at 21 acres

Twentymile unit 26 (21 acres) was *partially* treated before lightning struck a tree within the unit and ignited a wildfire. The unit had been harvested during the winter season of 2015/16 and the tops of the harvested trees were lopped and scattered in the woods. This created a bit of down wood in addition to what was existing before harvest occurred. Thus, at the time of ignition, surface fuels were still relatively heavy and arranged in jackpots; however, most ladder fuels had been removed and overstory tree canopies spaced through harvest. The prescription called for an underburn to occur following harvest, but the purchaser had not completed the fireline in order for that to happen before the ignition occurred.

Ignition occurred from a lightning strike and the fire was detected on 05/13/2016 – this was an early season fire – however, the spring of 2016 had been abnormally hot and dry across northern Idaho (mid-80s with low relative humidity by the middle of April). Observations from multiple prescribed burns during March and April suggested surface fuels, especially slash fuels, were very receptive and burning with moderate to high intensity.

Aside from firefighter and public safety, suppression objectives included containing the fire to Unit 26 and keeping fire below the 2260F road. Firefighting resources included heavy equipment (excavator use fireline construction), fire crews, helicopters for bucket drops, and water handling equipment.

The fire was controlled after 11 days and declared out on 6/09/2016. Due to the removal of ladder fuels and spacing of crown fuels, fire stayed in the surface fuels, where resources could direct attack the fire. Fire spread was limited to just the harvest unit. The fire actually resulted in meeting most of the objectives intended for an underburn – mortality of residual trees was minimal, the site was prepared, and surface fuels were adequately reduced. No additional treatments were planned and fire effects did not result in the collaborative group needing to plan out how to move forward.

Please include acres of fires contained and not contained by initial attack and acres of resource benefits achieved by unplanned ignitions within the landscape, and costs.

All fires occurring in the CFLR landscape in 2017 were contained during initial attack. Total acres for 2017 were 12.

Over the life of the Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative CFLRP (2012 to current) there have been 23.4 acres of fires contained by initial attack (a total of 73 initial attack fires) and 6,760 acres of fires not contained by initial attack (this included 4 fires – the Placer Ridge Fire in 2013 for 13 acres, the Parker Ridge Fire in 2015 for 6,675 acres, the Bakers Camp Fire in 2015 for 50 acres and the Black Creek Fire in 2016 for 21 acres). There have been 3,920 acres claimed for resource benefit over the life of the Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative CFLR project from wildfires and all of these came from the Parker Ridge fire in 2015. No BAER activities were conducted on the Parker Ridge Fire.

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.

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 2017 Jobs Supported/Maintained (FY17 CFLR/CFLN/ WO carryover funding):

FY 2017 Jobs Supported/Maintained	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Direct)	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Total)	Labor Income (Direct)	Labor Income (Total)
Timber harvesting component	18	27	$928,236	$1,130,962
Forest and watershed restoration component	10	11	$80,306	$135,562
Mill processing component	26	65	$1,475,268	$2,692,147
Implementation and monitoring	12	15	$529,198	$622,238
Other Project Activities	0	0	$0	$2,201
TOTALS:	66	119	$3,013,007	$4,583,104

FY 2017 Jobs Supported/Maintained (FY16 CFLR/CFLN/ WO carryover and matching funding):

FY 2017 Jobs Supported/Maintained	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Direct)	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Total)	Labor Income (Direct)	Labor Income (Total)
Timber harvesting component	37	56	$1,894,299	$2,308,011

FY 2017 Jobs Supported/Maintained	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Direct)	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Total)	Labor Income (Direct)	Labor Income (Total)
Forest and watershed restoration component	18	20	$149,993	$251,053
Mill processing component	52	130	$2,950,440	$5,384,108
Implementation and monitoring	15	20	$247,426	$1,113,997
Other Project Activities	1	1	$0	$4,402
TOTALS:	122	228	$5,942,158	$9,061,573

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).

Choose at least four of the socioeconomic indicators below that are most relevant and important for your project: * means blank cell

Indicator	Brief Description of Impacts, Successes, and Challenges	Links to reports or other published materials (if available)
Relationship building/collaborative work	CFLRP has provided the opportunity for increased amounts of work to be planned and accomplished within Boundary County. Public participation has increased throughout the life of the project and has resulted in stronger projects that can be supported by the public. The public feels comfortable sharing their ideas with the IDT during project development and has been a valuable source of local insight. This participation has led to improved trails, trailheads, snowmobile parking areas, transportation planning, and vegetation management. A recent example was the work with a local sportsman group that is working with the Forest Service to do monitoring along a stored road system. The low risk drainage structures along this	*

Indicator	Brief Description of Impacts, Successes, and Challenges	Links to reports or other published materials (if available)
	stored road were left in place to allow foot and horse traffic along a popular route. The sportsman group has been monitoring these drainage structures and will report any problems they see in order for the Forest Service to mitigate any issues.	
% Locally retained contracts	Contracting for the restoration work associated with the CFLRP area is done in support of timber sales and also to accomplish restoration work such as AOPs within project areas. Typically contracts in support of timber sales involve road maintenance, road reconstruction, timber harvest, log hauling, and slash treatment. This work is accomplished almost exclusively by local contractors hired by the purchaser of the sale and local subcontractors hired by the contractors. Local contractors and subcontractors get this work because of the relationships they've built through the years and the quality of their work. Contracts offered by the Forest Service to accomplish restoration work are available to any contractor who wishes to bid, but many of the contracts go to local contractors because their lower mobilization costs and familiarity with local project areas allow them to bid very competitively.	*
Duration of jobs	The logs coming off of timber sales within the CFLRP area help support loggers, log truck drivers, mechanics, and mill workers to name a few. A single project may result in multiple timber sales and the sales may take several years to complete. This steady flow of timber from Forest Service sales combined with timber coming from other ownerships is critical to maintaining the local timber infrastructure and supporting the local timber jobs. This consistent source of timber allowed the local mill to modernize their equipment in 2012, increase efficiency, stay competitive and	*

Indicator	Brief Description of Impacts, Successes, and Challenges	Links to reports or other published materials (if available)
	continue to employ local workers. The other forms of restoration activities such as road maintenance, culvert replacement, bridge replacement, and AOP replacement provide a consistent source of work for local contractors. These types of restoration contracts are typically accomplished in less than one year's time, but the contractors have invested in the types of equipment and skills necessary to accomplish this type of work and it makes them very competitive when bidding on projects both locally and in neighboring areas.	
Volunteer/outreach participation	Restoration work within the project area is heavily dependent on work accomplished by volunteers and partners. These volunteers and partners are critical to restoring the local trail systems and high mountain lakes. Trails and lake shores are a regular source of sediment to local waterways unless they are regularly maintained, reconstructed, rerouted, and/or stabilized. This work is not possible without the assistance of volunteers and partners. In 2017, volunteers from across the country joined members of local user groups, conservation groups, and Forest Service employees to restore approximately 343 miles of trail as well as improving plant communities along lakeshores. These volunteers and partners accounted for 10,367 hours of combined restoration work across the project area. 2017 also saw a new volunteer step up to support critical monitoring work on the range allotments within the project area. This individual had a long career in conservation and brought his expertise to the woods to assist the Forest Range Specialist. This range monitoring is vital to supporting a proactive range program.	*

(Optional) Additional narrative about leverage on the landscape:

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 sixth 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:

- Stocking surveys and post vegetation exams were completed on 697 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 in FY15 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.
- Recreation staff monitored the condition of the Parker Ridge Trail to assess damages as a result of the 2015 Parker Ridge fire. Work has continued in FY 2017 with 2 miles of trail maintenance and 700 feet of rerouted trail. The trail work, water bars and other trail structures will continue to be monitored to determine their effectiveness in reducing the sediment that reaches Parker Creek. The trail continues to be closed to stock animals until further repairs can be accomplished.
- Zone aquatics staff are continuing to track fish populations and the presence 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 KVRI CFLR projects have the goal of balancing grizzly bear security needs and the need for road access. Currently work is being done in the Keno, Boulder, Grouse, and Bluegrass BMUs.
- 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 assessing opportunities for improvements to these systems as we plan for each new project. An interactive program was made available on the

Idaho Panhandle National Forest webpage in 2016 using data mined from INFRA. This programs allows the public to research the current status of all trails on the Forest.

- Zone weed and range staffs have been continually mapping the known populations of noxious weeds within the project area. All data collected is entered into a database to 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.
- The Forest range specialist worked closely with the zone botanist, and regional ecologist to establish stronger monitoring protocols for the bog, fen, and peatland areas within the existing range allotments. This information will allow for better decision making related to grazing within these more sensitive ecotypes. The range specialist was assisted in 2017 by a retired county extension office employee.

What is your initial thinking on how the project will meet Program requirements to monitor social, economic, and ecological impacts for no less than 15 years after implementation commences (as required in the CFLR Act)?

Ecological monitoring by Forest Service personnel is a normal part of business in the project area and will continue indefinitely so long as funding allows for capacity. The economic monitoring associated with TREAT can also continue so long as TREAT continues to be supported nationally. The social monitoring will also continue due to the nature of how the Bonners Ferry Ranger District utilizes a collaborative approach to project planning and implementation. This collaborative approach assures regular feedback regarding the social impacts of all work, or lack of work, within the project area (Bonners Ferry Ranger District). Regular meetings with the Boundary County Commissioners is another valuable source of social and economic monitoring information relative to the impacts of work, or lack of work, within Boundary County.

6. FY 2017 accomplishments

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost ($) *(Contract Costs)*
Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres	139	$118,150

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost ($) *(Contract Costs)*
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	624	$187,200
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	448.6	$47,103
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	12	$18,000
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-LAK	Acres	NA	NA
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	3.96	$594,000
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	0	NA
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved RG-VEG-IMP	Acres	230.7	$24,224
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance RD-HC-MAIN	Miles	45.86	$45,860
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance RD-PC-MAINT	Miles	20.76	$41,520
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	0	NA

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost ($) *(Contract Costs)*
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles	0	NA
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles	0	NA
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage STRM-CROS-MTG-STD	Number	1	$50,000
Miles of system trail maintained to standard TL-MAINT-STD	Miles	318.02	$127,208
Miles of system trail improved to standard TL-IMP-STD	Miles	24.79	$24,790
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	2,015	NA
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF	31,028.79	NA
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	2,572.24	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	5,547.93	NA

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost ($) *(Contract Costs)*
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	400	$40,000
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	408	$102,000
Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands SP-INVSPE-FED-AC	Acres	NA	NA
Number of priority acres treated annually for native pests on Federal lands SP-NATIVE-FED-AC	Acres	NA	NA
Acres mitigated FP-FUELS-ALL-MIT-NFS *(note: this performance measure will not show up in the WO gPAS reports – please use your own records)*	Acres	691	NA
Please also include the acres of prescribed fire accomplished *(note: this performance measure will not show up in the WO gPAS reports – please use your own records)*	Acres	556.9	NA

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

7. **FY 2017 accomplishment narrative** – Summarize key accomplishments and evaluate project progress not already described elsewhere in this report. (Please limit answer to three pages.)

FY2017 Planning and Future Implementation -

The KVRI Forestry Subcommittee, a subset of the parent KVRI collaborative, met frequently in collaborative meetings and field trips during FY 2017 in support of project planning on the Bonners Ferry Ranger District. The project planning for FY 2017 consisted of NEPA on the Boulder Creek EA and the Camp Robinson EA.

FY 2018 will see the continued collaborative planning and development of the Boulder Creek and Camp Robinson projects. The Boulder Creek project is being analyzed by a local IDT from the north zone of the Forest and the Camp Robinson project will be analyzed by a regionally funded NEPA Strike Team hosted by the Forest. The NEPA Strike Team is being utilized in order to accelerate the planning and ultimately the implementation of restoration work within the CFLR project area. The purpose and need, as identified by the KVRI collaborative group for these two projects is to:

1. Improve and maintain forest health in the ecosystem composition, structure, and diversity of the landscape by providing for tree species and stocking levels similar to historic levels which will better resist insects, diseases and wildfire,
2. Improve habitat and forage for big game through vegetation treatments and broadcast burning,
3. Enhance the scenic integrity of the area by softening the boundaries of previous harvest units and avoiding straight lines and hard edges when designing treatment areas within these projects, and
4. Maximize opportunities to utilize forest products and provide economic opportunity through restoration work.

8. **The WO will use spatial data provided in the databases of record close to estimate a treatment footprint for your review and verification**.

- **If the estimate is consistent and accurate**, please confirm that below 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?

Fiscal Year Estimated Cumulative Footprint of Acres (2010 or 2012 through 2017)	**Footprint of Acres Treated (without counting an acre of treatment on the land in more than one treatment category)**
FY 2017	4,546.88
FY 12	2,300 acres (from previous annual report)
FY 13	2,440 acres (from previous annual report)
FY 14	5,795 acres (from previous annual report)
FY15	8,263 acres (from previous annual report)
FY 16	3,785 acres (database estimate)
FY 17	4,546.88 acres
Total treatment footprint through FY17	27,130 Acres

If you did not use the EDW estimate, please briefly describe how you arrived at the total number of footprint acres: what approach did you use to calculate the footprint? NA

9. **Describe any reasons that the FY 2017 annual report does not reflect your project proposal, previously reported planned accomplishments, or work plan.** Did you face any unexpected challenges this year that caused you to change what was outlined in your proposal? (Please limit answer to two pages).

The Forest Service utilizes stewardship contracting as an effective means of selling timber and accomplishing the myriad of other restoration work needed within each project area. One such steward contract was slated for 2017 in the Deer Creek project area. A decision was signed in the spring of 2017 and bids were solicited for the stewardship contract in late summer. A number of prospective bidders reviewed the stewardship package, but no bids were submitted. This stewardship package included approximately 13.7 mmbf of timber sold, road storage, road improvements, weed treatments, pre-commercial thinning, pruning, and construction of an AOP. All work included in the stewardship package would have counted towards planned targets for FY 2017. This stewardship package is currently being reviewed internally and will be available again in FY 2018.

10. Planned FY 2019 Accomplishments

Performance Measure Code	Unit of measure	Work Plan 2019	Planned Accomplishment For 2019	Amount ($)
Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres	NA	250	NA
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	NA	400	NA
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	NA	8	NA
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	NA	500	NA
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	NA	1	NA
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles	NA	10	NA
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles	NA	20	NA
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	NA	33,000	NA

Performance Measure Code	Unit of measure	Work Plan 2019	Planned Accomplishment For 2019	Amount ($)
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons	NA	10,000	NA
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	NA	300	NA
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	NA	1,250	NA

Please include all relevant planned accomplishments, assuming that funding specified in the CFLRP project proposal for FY 2019 is available. Use actual planned funding if quantity is less than specified in CFLRP project work plan. Accomplishments are in line with the final proposed revision of lifetime goals submitted November 2017.

11. **Planned accomplishment narrative and justification if planned FY 2018/19 accomplishments and/or funding differs from CFLRP project work plan**:
The KVRI project area submitted a revised project proposal to the Washington Office. This revised proposal made some adjustments to the targets submitted in the original proposal and these changes are reflected in FY2019 Planned Accomplishments table shown above.

12. **Please include an up to date list of the members of your collaborative if it has changed from previous years**. 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	Representing/ Area of Interest	Phone	Email
Adam Arthur	(Alt.) City of Bonners Ferry, KVRI Co-Chair	208.267.3105	adamea77@gmail.com

Name	Representing/ Area of Interest	Phone	Email
Angela Cooper	(Alt.) Kootenai Tribe of Idaho (KTOI), KVRI Co-Chair	208.267.3519	acooper@kootenai.org
Bob Blanford	Business/Industry	208.290.4659	bob.blanford@gmail.com
Brad Corkill	Idaho Fish & Game Commission	208.682.4602	bradcorkill@whitemanlumber.com
Chip Corsi	(Alt.)Idaho Fish & Game Commission	208.769.1414	charles.corsi@idfg.idaho.gov
Dan Dinning	Boundary County Commissioners, KVRI Co-Chair	208.267.7723 208.290.7758	dmding@frontier.com
David Sims	Mayor City of Bonners Ferry, KVRI Co-Chair	208.267.3105	dsims@bonnersferry.id.gov
Dave Gray	(Alt.) Social/Cultural/Historical	208.267.2576	daddg@frontier.com
Dave Wattenbarger	Soil Conservation District/ Landowner	208.267.7468	daveandjeanw@yahoo.com
Don Allenberg	(Alt.) Corporate Agriculture/Landowner	208.267.8569	don.allenberg@anheuser-busch.com
Ed Atkins	Corporate Agriculture/Landowner	208.267.8569	ed.atkins@anheuser-busch.com
Gary Aitken Jr.	Kootenai Tribe of Idaho (KTOI), KVRI Co-Chair	208.267.3519	garyjr@kootenai.org
Jim Cadnum	Landowner/Industry	208.267.5776	jkcornman@gmail.com
Kennon McClintock	(Alt.) Conservationist/Environmentalist	208.267.8999 208.255.9158	kmcclintock@tnc.org
Kevin Knauth	(Alt.) U.S. Forest Service- IPNF	208.267.6701 208.691.7657	kevinsknauth@@fs.fed.us
LeAlan Pinkerton	(Alt.)Boundary County Commissioners, KVRI Co-Chair	208.267.7723	pink4caz@yahoo.com
Mary Farnsworth	U.S. Forest Service- IPNF	208.765.2223	mfarnsworth@fs.fed.us

Name	Representing/ Area of Interest	Phone	Email
Patty Perry	KTOI/KVRI Facilitator	208.267.3519	patty@kootenai.org
Robyn Miller	Conservationist/Environmentalist	208.691.2468	robyn_miller@tnc.org
Sandy Ashworth	Social/Cultural/Historical	208.267.3803	shoeboxacres@hotmail.com
Sherrie Cossairt	KTOI/KVRI Recording Secretary	208.267.3519	scossairt@kootenai.org
Tim Dillin	(Alt.)Soil Conservation District/ Landowner	208.267.7192	tdillin@hotmail.com
Tim Dougherty	(Alt.)Business/Industry	208.290.6562	tdougherty@idfg.com

13. **Did you project try any new approaches to increasing partner match funding in FY2017 (both In-Kind contributions and through agreements)? (No more than one page)**:

We have continued to strengthen our relationship with Idaho State Parks and Recreation to receive grants for improving and maintaining motorized recreation opportunities within the project area. These funds are instrumental to providing recreation on trails that are maintained to prevent negative environmental impacts.

We are fostering a relationship with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) to acquire funds for making improvements to stream habitat throughout the project area. The USFWS has funds available for this type of work, but doesn't manage significant acres of land, so they depend on the Forest Service to do this type of restoration work.

14. 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. You are welcome to include links or to copy/paste.

This year we will highlight the tremendous amount of trail work done annually on this district, using CFLN funds and matched with an amazing amount of partner and volunteers. During the 2017 summer season the trail crew, along with various partners/volunteers built a trail bridge on the Deer Creek Trail crossing over the creek. The bridge was designed to handle motorcycles as well and horses and hikers. CFLN dollars were used to match a grant for the Student Conservation Corp, along with other volunteers.

Figure 3: The Danquist trail crosses over a boggy area where the trail crew dug out and buried concrete blocks to stabilize and reduce erosion. The trail has been built for motorcycle and stock as well as hikers. CFLN dollars were used to fly in the materials and was matched by a grant and volunteers.

Figure 4: These before and after Slate Ridge trail pictures show traditional trail reconstruction and maintenance work on the district, again using a combination of Forest Service Trail crew and Partners/Volunteers. This highly eroded trail had little soil remaining. The trail tread was re-established to provide better access for multiple users.

Signatures:

Recommended by (Project Coordinator(s)):_____

Approved by (Forest Supervisor(s)): _____

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