

CFLR Project (Name/Number): Southwestern Crown Collaborative (SWCC) / CFLR0001

National Forest(s): Flathead, Lolo, Helena-Lewis and Clark 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
CFLN15	\$0.00
CFLN17	\$1,903,320.00

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
NFRR	\$302,000.00
WFHF	\$1,500,000.00

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
CMRD	\$32,114.48
CMTL	\$221,956.45
CWF2	\$40,866.45
NFRR	\$330,635.01
SSCS	\$10,000.00
WFHF	\$19,992.22

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
NFXN*	\$965,232.00
Swan Valley Connections	\$39,443.00

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.

*BLI was not tagged and is not reflected in the Agency database of record (gPAS).

Fund Source – (Partner In-Kind Contributions)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2017
Forest Restoration Group	\$135,581.00

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 <u>revised non-monetary credit limit</u> 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.

Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) and Non-WUI Fuel Reduction and Forest Restoration Treatments

Description of item	Where activity/item is located or impacted area	Estimated total amount	Forest Service or Partner Funds?	Source of funds
Fuel mitigation and Forest restoration on private lands	Seeley-Swan CWFPF area-private	\$131,260	Clearwater Resource Council	Federal through MT DNRC; private landowners
Fuel mitigation and Forest restoration on private lands	Private	\$112,527	Swan Valley Connections	Federal (Thru DNRC)

Description of item	Where activity/item is located or impacted area	Estimated total amount	Forest Service or Partner Funds?	Source of funds
Fuel mitigation and Forest restoration on private lands	Private	\$119,966	Swan Valley Connections	Landowners
Fuel mitigation and Forest restoration on private lands	Private	\$360,892	Blackfoot Challenge	State/NGO

DRAFT

Invasive and Exotics Treatments

Description of item	Where activity/item is located or impacted area	Estimated total amount	Forest Service or Partner Funds?	Source of funds
Aquatic Invasive Species: outreach & monitoring	Morrell Creek on state land	\$15,331	Clearwater Resource Council	State/NGO
Verbenone and MCH Distribution	Private	\$26,953	Swan Valley Connections	Landowners
Weed Management Treatment	Private	\$9,444	Swan Valley Connections	Missoula Cty. Landowners
Weed Management Education & Outreach	Private	\$3,400	Blackfoot Challenge	Private/State

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

Description of item	Where activity/item is located or impacted area	Estimated total amount	Forest Service or Partner Funds?	Source of funds
Water Quality and Flow measurement; Morrel Creek/Seeley/Swan Students in Action program	Morrell Creek on state land	\$1,400	Clearwater Resource Council	County
Wetland Restoration on Private Lands, Outreach and Monitoring	Private	\$16,504	Swan Valley Connections	Federal (Thru USFWS)

Description of item	Where activity/item is located or impacted area	Estimated total amount	Forest Service or Partner Funds?	Source of funds
Wetland Restoration on Private Lands, Outreach and Monitoring	Private	\$20,606	Swan Valley Connections	Foundation
Water Stewardship, efficiency, and monitoring	State/Private	\$66,420	Blackfoot Challenge	State/NGO/Federal/Private
Wildlife Technician and carcass removal program	USFS/State/Private	\$69,239	Blackfoot Challenge	State/NGO/Private

Watershed Restoration: BMPs, Decommissioning, Storage, Trails, Mine Reclamation

Description of item	Where activity/item is located or impacted area	Estimated total amount	Forest Service or Partner Funds?	Source of funds
Mission Mtns. & Swan Front Recreational Trail Maintenance	USFS	\$15,000	Swan Valley Connections	Federal

Planning

Description of item	Where activity/item is located or impacted area	Estimated total amount	Forest Service or Partner Funds?	Source of funds
AIS Monitoring & Outreach planning	Clearwater chain of lakes: private, state, federal ownership	\$3,100	Clearwater Resource Council	NGO

Description of item	Where activity/item is located or impacted area	Estimated total amount	Forest Service or Partner Funds?	Source of funds
Swan Valley Connections Staff, SWCC/Swan Valley Coordinating Regional Planning	USFS/State/Private	\$20,793	Swan Valley Connections	USFS/State/Private

Total \$1,032,278

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.**

In FY 2017 the Lincoln fuels program treated 674 acres not including wildfire acres. These acres are a mix of prescribed burning, hand piling and slashing. A very active fire season limited resource availability to implement unit prep and fall burning, resulting in a reduced acre target. By both mechanically treating and implementing prescribed burning within the wildland urban interface, the Swan District is reducing surface fuel loading, reducing crown bulk density and increasing crown heights. This all serves to reduce the probability of intense surface fires, crown fires and long range spotting thus giving firefighters the ability to protect values at risk with reduced exposure to extreme fire behavior. While our focus has been in or near the WUI to protect values at risk, we are also implementing natural fuels burning over larger areas on the upper slopes to restore fire adapted ecosystems and enhance wildlife habitat.

When a wildfire interacts with a previously treated area within the CFLR boundary:

Each unit is required to complete and submit a standard fuels treatment effectiveness monitoring (FTEM) entry in the FTEM database (see FSM 5140) when a wildfire occurs within or enters into a fuel treatment area. **For fuel treatment areas within the CFLR boundary, please include in your database entry an additional report that briefly responds to the following supplemental questions:**

Please describe if/how partners or community members engaged in the planning or implementation of the relevant fuels treatment.

The Rice Ridge fire impacted the Auggie Mountain, and Monture Project areas. All these projects were pre CFLR. The local community had more planning collaboration during the Auggie Mountain Project.

The Alice Creek Fire burned portions of the Alice Creek wildlife enhancement project. During the project development and scoping process the public had the opportunity to comment on project specifics during formal and informal open houses. Local tribal input was also taken during this process. The Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation and the Whitebark Pine Foundation helped with funding implementation of several units within the Alice Creek project area.

- ***Did treatments include coordinated efforts on other federal, tribal, state, private, etc. lands within or adjacent to the CFLR landscape?***

The treatments in all units were primarily on Forest Service lands. Some projects were adjacent to Montana DNRC land and on Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes treaty rights land. District staff coordinated with both entities. We have also used the CWPP to address identified treatment priority areas.

- ***Did the treatments do what you expected them to do? Did they have the intended effect on fire behavior or outcomes? Please include a brief description.***

Yes and No, the primary reason is the extreme dryness of the season and unusually high winds. The Rice Ridge fire only impacted the edges of treated areas, which were also where the containment lines were located. In one area the fire did drop from the crowns to the ground, in other areas it did not.

On the Alice Creek Fire the treatments had varied effects on fire behavior. In general there was a noticeable decrease in fire behavior but difficult to quantify due to all the variabilities in fire behavior. Within treatment areas fire behavior tended to move from active crown to passive or isolated torching with moderate ground fire. Treatment areas also tended to have green islands and lower mortality within the overstory.

- ***What resource values were you and your partners concerned with protecting or enhancing? Did the treatments help to address these value concerns?***

The resource values we were concerned about were primarily the community and homes, followed by our infrastructure. The treatments did help to address these concerns. On other fires with minimal threats to communities and homes, we and our partners were concerned with protecting and enhancing Whitebark pine, enhancing elk transition winter range, enhancing bunchgrass communities

and providing a mosaic of habitat of interspersed openings with wildlife hiding cover. Historically, the treatments have helped to address the concerns. However, it is too early to fully articulate the effects of the 2017 fires.

- ***What is your key takeaway from this event – what would you have done differently? What elements will you continue to apply in the future?***

The key take away from this event is this year provided a new view of how fire reacts. In many places it behaved more actively than it typically has. The fuels treatments that were done may have provided some protection but were not impacted severe enough to really test them. Handpile treatments around Whitebark were very effective in reducing Whitebark mortality and reducing fire behavior. Treatment areas need to be larger, at a landscape level 2,500 acres plus, to really have much of an effect on reducing suppression cost.

- ***Please include the costs of the treatments listed in the fuels treatment effectiveness report: how much CFLR/CFLN was spent? How much in other BLI's were spent? If cost estimates are not available, please note and briefly explain.***

In the areas impacted by the Rice Ridge fire, a rough estimate of \$10,000 CFLN and \$10,000 other BLI's (HF,BD,KV) was spent. Costs, acres, funding source, and polygons are tracked in the FACTS database.

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

- ***Acres impacted and severity of impact***

The Rice Ridge Fire impacted the Center Horse Project area, burning the project area just days before signing the Decision. This project was a 60,000 acre project that burned with high, moderate, and low severity fire. The fire also impacted one Auggie Mountain project area unit of 16 acres with High severity fire. Within the Stonewall project 2,686 acres were impacted that were planned for treatment. The Alice Creek wildlife enhancement project had 2,800 acres of planned treatment that burned within the Alice Creek fire.

- ***Brief description of the planned treatment for the area:***

Several units within Auggie Mountain are still slated for prescribed fire treatment while the other treatments have occurred. Planned treatment of Stonewall and Alice Creek areas ranged from commercial and pre-commercial thinning to prescribed fire.

- ***Summary of next steps – will the project implement treatments elsewhere? Will they complete an assessment?***

For the area impacted by the Rice Ridge Fire, the intent is to continue with the current projects due to the limited extent of the Rice Ridge fire into the current treatment areas. Road and stream treatments may continue to move forward. The agency is currently working on an assessment of the next steps forward. We will continue with planned activities.

- ***Description of collaborative involvement in determining next steps.***

The Collaborative will be involved in the next planning phase and the currently planned implementation will continue. The Lincoln Restoration Committee is involved in determining what the next appropriate steps will be with the Stonewall project. We will continue to work with our partners within the SWCC, who have voiced their interest in moving parts of the Center Horse project 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.

- **Include expenses in wildfire preparedness and suppression, where relevant:**

On the Lolo National Forest's Seeley Lake Ranger District: Total fires = 9.

- The Forest Service initially attacked 3 fires, containing 2 fires at 1.2 acres.
- The MT DNRC initially attacked 4 fires on Federal lands containing them at 2 acres.
- One fire was managed as a wilderness fire with final acres totaling 3,261 acres.
- One fire was managed as a wilderness fire for a couple days before the Rice Ridge Fire enveloped it. Rice Ridge escaped initial attack and grew to 160,000 acres, both within and outside wilderness.
- One fire started on tribal lands and grew on to the forest and was managed by the tribe.
- FY 2017 Wildfire preparedness budget \$435,000.
- FY 2017 Suppression expenditure \$50,000,000.

DRAFT

On the Helena – Lewis & Clark National Forest’s Lincoln Ranger District: Total fires = 8.

- During the 2017 fire season the Lincoln Ranger District had 8 initial attack fires.
- Three fires exceeded initial attack capabilities and grew to large long term events. The Park and Arrastra fires ended up combining for a total of 18,000 acres burned. The Alice Creek Fire burned a total of 29,252 acres.
- A total of five fires were contained during initial attack. These fires combined for a total of 1.5 acres burned.
- The FY 2017 Lincoln Ranger District preparedness budget was \$488,000.

On the Flathead National Forest’s Swan Lake Ranger District: Total fires = 2.

- There were two fires in the CFLR boundary for a total of 0.25 acres.
- The suppression costs for these fires totaled \$10,000.00 (A high end estimate based on resources assigned due to the severity of the season). Neither of these fires occurred in a previously treated area.
- Although fuel conditions on the Swan Lake District would have been receptive to active burning, the District experienced very little lightning.
- The FY 2017 Swan Lake Ranger District wildfire preparedness budget was approximately \$367,000.00.

- **Include summary of BAER within the project landscape, where relevant:**

A BAER assessment was completed for the Rice Ridge fire and resulted in a \$1,547,474 authorization for road and trail stabilization and weed prevention.

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](#).

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	0	0	\$0	\$0
Forest and watershed restoration component	14	16	\$206,448	\$331,663
Mill processing component	0	0	\$0	\$0
Implementation and monitoring	23	34	\$1,376,131	\$1,760,734
Other Project Activities	2	3	\$90,805	\$151,384
TOTALS:	38	53	\$1,673,383	\$2,243,781

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	3	5	\$154,409	\$220,864
Forest and watershed restoration component	50	61	\$811,049	\$1,383,667
Mill processing component	5	18	\$275,649	\$797,400
Implementation and monitoring	49	64	\$1,897,225	\$2,427,464
Other Project Activities	6	10	\$320,613	\$534,508
TOTALS:	112	157	\$3,458,945	\$5,363,903

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).

Indicator	Brief Description of Impacts, Successes, and Challenges	Links to reports or other published materials (if available)
% Locally retained contracts	In FY15 (the most recent data available), 50 percent of CFLR contract dollars went to local businesses. The 6-year average is 67%. Total value of locally-retained contracts between 2010 and 2015 was \$3.5 million. This data does not reflect USFS matching fund expenditures.	Latest report coming soon to: Social and economic monitoring
Media citations	In 2017, several active fires burned within the SWCC area, including the Stonewall Project area, which had also had been impacted by litigation. These fires generated a lot of social and political attention, including media activity that addressed facts and opinion about the role that active forest management should play in restoring forest health and preventing wild fires. Public discourse and potential legislation will continue on these subjects.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative Group Seeks Consensus After Montana's Summer Of Smoke • state and regional litigation over forest service projects at helena roundtable • Forest ecologist comments senator Daines fire call • Effectiveness of fuel treatment on wildfires • DC delegation visits Lolo fire

Indicator	Brief Description of Impacts, Successes, and Challenges	Links to reports or other published materials (if available)
Volunteer/outreach participation	Through our citizen science monitoring we estimate that 782 hours were contributed by 65 students and 17 community members. Partners spent approximately 301 hours (paid) in outreach, training, and coordination for these efforts. The data collected from these efforts have improved community discussions and knowledge around management of natural resources, especially water quality.	Citizen science 2016 stream monitoring report ,
Relationship building/collaborative work	The relationship between the SW Crown Collaborative (SWCC) and the engaged Forests is constantly evolving. It is a good working relationship where both sides listen and learn about the concerns of the other. For example, SWCC members voiced their interest in being more involved in the planning stages of the Blackfoot Swan landscape Restoration Project and consequently, the project team opened their working meetings to anyone interested in attending. Not surprisingly, most challenges relate to lack of capacity on both sides.	SW Collaborative , http://www.swcrown.org/

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 Committee recommended investing \$360,590 of CFLN funding toward ongoing monitoring projects (~10% of FY 2017 CFLR funds). The SWCC Monitoring Committee is in the process of identifying the key monitoring projects that will be important to carry forward after 2019. We plan to use funding expected in FY18 and FY19 to allocate to partnership agreements to complete monitoring from 2020-2024. We believe the Districts and Forests see the value in continuing our monitoring projects into the future and will continue to invest in these projects. The Forest Service makes all final decisions on monitoring project funding.

The majority of CFLN funds were allocated through Partnership Agreements to conduct the multiparty monitoring. Partners this year included the University of Montana (Franke College of Forestry and Conservation, the Bureau of Business and Economic Research, and the Flathead Biological Station), Montana Natural Heritage Program, Blackfoot Challenge, Clearwater Resource Council, Swan Valley Connections, three local schools, the USFS’s Rocky Mountain Research Station (Boise and Missoula) and Youth Forest Monitoring

Program. Some funds are used for Forest Service employees to participate in the monitoring. Partners provide a minimum of 20% matching funds for every project, greatly stretching the value of each CFLN dollar. The long-term SWCC Monitoring Plan, project summaries and reports, and a Five-Year Monitoring Summary Report are available on the SWCC [website](#).

The following 12 monitoring projects were funded in FY 2017.

1. **GRAIP and PIBO.** These projects focus on roads and sediment to determine if restoration treatments will help meet goals. Several important conclusions ([summary here](#)) have been drawn from this work and are being used when determining the best locations for CFLR culvert and road improvements. Many previous and ongoing monitoring locations were burned in the Rice Ridge Fire in 2017 and we are well-positioned to monitor potential increases in sediment released as a result of this event.
2. **Citizen Science Stream Monitoring.** Turbidity, flow, and temperatures of local streams were monitored by students and partners in four communities within the landscape. Results through 2016 and curriculum materials are available [here](#). 2017 results are being compiled and used by schools and local organizations for educational purposes and for setting restoration priorities. Turbidity results showed considerable variability within and across watersheds, potentially due to management intensities. Several stretches of potential concern were identified with elevated nutrient levels. Many of these streams were also burned over in 2017 providing the opportunity for fire effects monitoring going forward.
3. **Aquatic invasive species monitoring.** Invasive mussels were detected in two lakes in Montana in 2017 leading to increased testing and monitoring in lakes in the Southwest Crown. Funding helped pay for laboratory testing of samples collected by the Clearwater Resource Council. To date, no positive results have been reported for lakes in the Southwest Crown.
4. **Youth Forest Monitoring Program.** Vegetation plots are being monitored by local school students in three communities. This program has been popular with local science teachers to have students collect, enter, analyze, and interpret real data. Datasheet, protocols, and lesson materials available [here](#).
5. **Cutthroat Trout Genetics.** Genetic sampling of westslope cutthroat trout populations was repeated after five years in the Swan Valley to monitor the effectiveness of stream restoration work and the status of hybridization with non-native brook trout. The results ([available here](#)) are used by a local working group and the Forest Service to set priorities for conservation and restoration of the remaining populations.
6. **Social Survey.** In FY17, we continued to move our survey application through the OMB approval process, with the help of the Washington Office CFLRP Coordinator.
7. **Local Contract Capture.** The baseline monitoring effort completed in 2012 to summarize how the CFLR funds have been allocated was repeated in 2016-17. The effort has been expanded slightly to summarize the allocation of funds that remain internally with Forests as well. The new report will soon be posted to our monitoring webpage.
8. **Integrated Forest Vegetation Plots.** Ten post-treatment monitoring vegetation plots were revisited in 2017 by a team consisting of a Forest Service Strike Team Crew Leader and a college student. The new data and data from an additional 65 plots from 2016 have been entered into FSVEG and we are currently waiting for it to be processed and summarized.
9. **Fuels monitoring at Cooney McKay.** Twenty-three vegetation plots (15 treatment, 8 control) were resampled 5-years post treatment at this fuel reductions project. The data has been entered into FSVEG and is currently being processed and summarized by the R1 office.

10. **Howell's Gumweed genetics.** FY17 funding for this project was used to evaluate each population for vigor/viability and threats and develop guidelines for avoiding, minimizing, or mitigating potential impacts from proposed CFLR management actions. In general, there was little evidence of low genetic diversity for this USFS sensitive species. The populations in Montana appear to be acting as a large metapopulation and inbreeding does not seem to be a problem. One population found along a road that is proposed for re-construction is not distinctly different from other nearby populations. However, it does have a private allele found in no other populations and is a large population (estimated 8,800 individuals) which may harbor additional genetic diversity. Consequently, it may be worth transplanting individuals and/or collecting seeds to add to the other populations before work is begun.
11. **Carnivore Monitoring.** This project team spent considerable time working on a final baseline report for 2012-2016 which will soon be posted to the SWCC monitoring webpage. Field work was conducted in conjunction with a distribution-wide survey for wolverines headed by MT Fish, Wildlife and Parks. Results from this effort are not yet available. We also continued to work with the Rocky Mountain Research Station on occupancy models and significance of the observed trends. **The data is being used in multiple planning documents.** The Rice Ridge Fire burned through a core area used by Canada lynx and the team is well-positioned to monitor the effects this event will have on meso-carnivores.
12. **SWCC Coordinator.** The coordinator, employed through a partnership agreement with the University of Montana, helps manage the Southwestern Crown Collaborative and its four multiparty monitoring working groups (i.e., Aquatics, Socioeconomics, Vegetation, and Wildlife). This entails planning meetings, maintaining the SWCC webpage, and completing documents such as meeting notes and annual reports for each group. FY17 work also included leading the collaborative in providing input on multiple restoration projects and budget coordination with Line Officers, Regional, Forest, and District staff. The coordinator also participates in the working meetings for the Blackfoot Swan Landscape Restoration Project, the large-scale planning effort being conducted for our landscape. The coordinator planned and coordinated a well-attended regional meso-carnivore workshop and works with student groups to monitor forest conditions.

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	824	\$535,600
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	320.5	\$89,740
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	1,385.9	\$180,167
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	87.49	Various
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-LAK	Acres	NA	NA

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost (\$) * (Contract Costs)
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	17.89	NA
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	15,852	\$3,170,400
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved RG-VEG-IMP	Acres	NA	NA
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance RD-HC-MAIN	Miles	18.46	\$222,000
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance RD-PC-MAINT	Miles	38.43	\$460,800
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	4.77	\$38,400
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles	NA	NA
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles	NA	NA
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage STRM-CROS-MTG-STD	Number	2	\$10,070*
Miles of system trail maintained to standard TL-MAINT-STD	Miles	440.14	\$110,000
Miles of system trail improved to standard TL-IMP-STD	Miles	19.38	\$388,000
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard LND-BL-MRK-MAINT	Miles	NA	NA
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC	Acres	NA	NA
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF	NA	NA
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	1,083.73	\$59,604
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons	3,031.68	Not known as this time.
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	4,589	\$688,350
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	2,455.5	\$368,325

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost (\$) * (Contract Costs)
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
TMBR-BRSH_DSPL	Acres	78	\$9,360
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	884 (SLRD)	\$200,000
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	167(SLRD)	\$22,000

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

* Costs were obtained using regional estimated costs per unit unless otherwise noted.

**Based on contract cost.

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.)

While the extreme wildfire season did impact our out-year program schedule, we were able to complete the obligation of, or actual implementation of, a majority of our planned 2017 CFLR program of work. In 2017, we exceeded our 10-year goal for 7 of our 20 targets (re-vegetation and reforestation; lake acres restored; wildlife habitat improvement; miles of stream restored; wildlife security acres; trail improvements; campsites rehabilitated). We are at least 60% of the way toward reaching another 6 targets. We are less than 50% of the way toward 7 of our targets (vegetation restoration outside the WUI, road BMP work and maintenance, road storage or decommissioning, stream crossings improved, trail decommissioning, annual job creation, and annual labor income). However, many units of these goals are included in projects that have been stalled in planning and which we plan to accomplish in the next several years. Projects are delayed because of the time SWCC Forest specialists are investing in objections and litigation, not only for projects within the Southwest Crown, but elsewhere on their Forests. In particular, the non-WUI acres goal has been delayed by litigation.

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?

The Estimate is accurate.

Fiscal Year	Footprint of Acres Treated (without counting an acre of treatment on the land in more than one treatment category)
FY 2017 Southwest Crown of the Continent CFLR001	27,234.03

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).

In general, progress towards meeting the SWCC 10 year goals and the intent of restoration implementation on the landscape has been met. Looking forward from the beginning of FY 2018, we anticipate meeting or exceeding 14 goals and potentially falling short on the remaining four goals. Ongoing litigation continues to impact virtually every restoration project that actively manages vegetation. This litigation will impact achieving goals related to Road BMPs, commercial wood products, and non-WUI restoration.

The fires of 2017 directly impacted the Center Horse project area and will change the FY 2018 and 2019 POW focus more towards salvage and less towards restoration in that area which was slated for final ROD and implementation. While this will change the work in that area, the intent is still to bring restoration projects to implementation in that area, perhaps using different tools and with a likely emphasis on transportation system related restoration goals.

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	619	\$340,450
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	NA	3700	\$481,000
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	NA	6	\$112,620
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	NA	1900	\$380,000
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	NA	51	\$408,000
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles	NA	36.2	\$434,400
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles	NA	11	\$136,800
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	NA	45,000	\$11,250,000

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	2,600	\$390,000
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	NA	3401	\$510,150
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	NA	5296	\$794,400

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.

11. Planned accomplishment narrative and justification if planned FY 2018/19 accomplishments and/or funding differs from CFLRP project work plan (no more than 1 page):

Summer 2017 brought significant fire activity in portions of several project areas. As of the beginning of FY 2018, we expect that this past summer's fires will impact FY 2018 and 2019 accomplishments to a degree that currently cannot be quantified. In the Center Horse Project area, the focus will largely be on salvage rather than on restoration. The urgent one or two year focus on salvage activities across numerous locations in Montana may also temporarily reduce the availability of Forest Service personnel, contractors or other resources needed to focus on restoration projects. Where appropriate, alternate projects and methods will be utilized to pursue restoration goals and try to minimize undesired impacts of the 2017 fires to achieving the SWCC project lifetime goals.

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.

Currently 14 individuals from 10 different entities (list [here](#)) are voting members of the Collaborative. Members are from the following groups: The Wilderness Society, Swan Valley Connections, University of Montana, Clearwater Resource Council, Blackfoot Challenge, Ecosystem Management Research Institute, Montana Wilderness Association, Vital Ground, Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation, Missoula County, and individual citizens. Many other participants remain informed or involved at some level through our email list. Forest Service staffs are not voting members of the collaborative nor do they manage or control the membership or mailing lists of the SWCC. Many other individuals and organizations are

involved with the SWCC monitoring program. Each of the four working groups communicates with over a dozen individuals each – and there is overlap with some individuals engaged in multiple groups.

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):

Multiple partners and the Forest Service Team Lead for the Blackfoot Swan Landscape Restoration Project jointly applied for a grant from the Great Northern Landscape Conservation Cooperative to provide support for collaboratively completing this large-scale planning project. Unfortunately, because of budget uncertainties the grants were not awarded in 2017. Multiple partners, with the Lolo National Forest, are also currently completing an application for the Citizen Science Competitive Funding Program to help support stream monitoring efforts with students and community members.

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.

[Seeley lake coming together as rice ridge fire winds down](http://www.kpax.com/story/36430643/seeley-lake-coming-together-as-rice-ridge-fire-winds-down), <http://www.kpax.com/story/36430643/seeley-lake-coming-together-as-rice-ridge-fire-winds-down>

[Nearly two months of fire taking its toll on seeley lake residents](http://www.ktvq.com/story/36290623/nearly-two-months-of-fire-taking-its-toll-on-seeley-lake-residents), <http://www.ktvq.com/story/36290623/nearly-two-months-of-fire-taking-its-toll-on-seeley-lake-residents>

[Montana wildfires environmental extremists](https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/montana-wildfires-environmental-extremists_us_599f328be4b05710aa5aefa8), https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/montana-wildfires-environmental-extremists_us_599f328be4b05710aa5aefa8

[Lawsuit halted fire mitigation work in area now burning](http://helenair.com/news/state-and-regional/lawsuit-halted-fire-mitigation-work-in-area-now-burning-near/article_1645162d-56f1-5ae5-b118-44e4ed7fffb9.html), http://helenair.com/news/state-and-regional/lawsuit-halted-fire-mitigation-work-in-area-now-burning-near/article_1645162d-56f1-5ae5-b118-44e4ed7fffb9.html

[Stonewall-project](http://mtpr.org/term/stonewall-project), <http://mtpr.org/term/stonewall-project>

[SW Crown](https://www.swcrown.org/), <https://www.swcrown.org/>

Signatures:

Recommended by (Project Coordinator(s)): _____

Approved by (Forest Supervisor(s)): _____

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

involved with the SWCC monitoring program. Each of the four working groups communicates with over a dozen individuals each – and there is overlap with some individuals engaged in multiple groups.

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):

Multiple partners and the Forest Service Team Lead for the Blackfoot Swan Landscape Restoration Project jointly applied for a grant from the Great Northern Landscape Conservation Cooperative to provide support for collaboratively completing this large-scale planning project. Unfortunately, because of budget uncertainties the grants were not awarded in 2017. Multiple partners, with the Lolo National Forest, are also currently completing an application for the Citizen Science Competitive Funding Program to help support stream monitoring efforts with students and community members.

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.

[Seeley lake coming together as rice ridge fire winds down](http://www.kpax.com/story/36430643/seeley-lake-coming-together-as-rice-ridge-fire-winds-down), <http://www.kpax.com/story/36430643/seeley-lake-coming-together-as-rice-ridge-fire-winds-down>

[Nearly two months of fire taking its toll on seeley lake residents](http://www.ktvq.com/story/36290623/nearly-two-months-of-fire-taking-its-toll-on-seeley-lake-residents), <http://www.ktvq.com/story/36290623/nearly-two-months-of-fire-taking-its-toll-on-seeley-lake-residents>

[Montana wildfires environmental extremists](https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/montana-wildfires-environmental-extremists_us_599f328be4b05710aa5aefa8), https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/montana-wildfires-environmental-extremists_us_599f328be4b05710aa5aefa8

[Lawsuit halted fire mitigation work in area now burning](http://helenair.com/news/state-and-regional/lawsuit-halted-fire-mitigation-work-in-area-now-burning-near/article_1645162d-56f1-5ae5-b118-44e4ed7fffb9.html), http://helenair.com/news/state-and-regional/lawsuit-halted-fire-mitigation-work-in-area-now-burning-near/article_1645162d-56f1-5ae5-b118-44e4ed7fffb9.html

[Stonewall-project](http://mtpr.org/term/stonewall-project), <http://mtpr.org/term/stonewall-project>

[SW Crown](https://www.swcrown.org/), <https://www.swcrown.org/>

Signatures

Recommended by (Project Coordinator(s)): _____

Approved by (Forest Supervisor(s)):

Flathead National Forest – Forest Supervisor: Chris Weber

Helena-Lewis and Clark National Forest – Forest Supervisor: [Signature]

Lolo National Forest – Forest Supervisor: [Signature]

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