CFLR Project (Name/Number): Selway-Middle Fork/CFLR002

National Forest(s): Nez Perce-Clearwater and Bitterroot

1. Match and Leveraged Funds:

a. **FY18 Matching Funds Documentation**

Fund Source – (CFLN/CFLR Funds Expended)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2018
CFLN18	$2,077,164.12

This amount should match the amount of CFLR/CFLN dollars obligated in the FMMI CFLRP 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 2018
NFHF18	$624,000.00
CMRD18	$190,000.00
NFRR16	$292,247.75
SSSS17	$242,639.74
SPFH	$343,269.73

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 2018
CMRD	$98,339.00[1]
CMTL	$100,161.78
CWF2	$38,822.06
NFHF	$57,625.77
NFTM	$120,028.41
NFVW	$63,726.57
NFWF	$31,477.98
SSCC	$197,398.00

This amount should match the amount of matching funds obligated in the FMMI CFLRP 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 2018
NFXN	$8,400.00

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 FMMI CFLRP 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.

[1] The WO final expenditure report did not include $8,719 CMRD funds spent by the Bitterroot National Forest. This amount reflects the total Selway-Middle Fork spent $288,339 in CMRD minus the $190,000 in CRMD of WO supplemental.

Fund Source – (Partner In-Kind Contributions)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2018
Idaho Fish and Game	$25,219.60
Selway Bitterroot Frank Church Foundation	$55,747.04
Clearwater RC&D	$53,729.56
Montana Conservation Corps	$329,467.00
Total	$464,163.20

Total partner in-kind contributions for implementation and monitoring of a CFLR project on NFS lands. 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 FY18)	Totals
Total revised non-monetary credit limit for contracts awarded in FY18	$0

Revised non-monetary credit limits for contracts awarded prior to FY18 were captured in previous reports (FY16 and FY15). 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 fill in the table describing leveraged funds in your landscape in FY2018. Leveraged funds refer to funds or in-kind services that help the project achieve proposed objectives but do not meet match qualifications.

Description of item	Where activity/item is located or impacted area	Estimated total amount	Forest Service or Partner Funds?	Source of funds
60.6 acres of fire mitigation/fuel reduction	Private lands within CFLRP area	$62,721	Partner Funds	Idaho County
320 acres of aerial weed treatments	Private lands within CFLRP area	$16,979.74	Partner	Private Landowners
225 acres of roadside invasive treatments	County roads within CFLRP area	$8,000	Partner	Idaho County
120 acres of eradication of new invaders	Private lands within CFRLRP area	$1,000	RAC	Title II

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***.

FY2018 Overview

FY18 Activity Description (Agency performance measures)	**Acres**
Number of acres treated by prescribed fire	603
Number of acres treated by mechanical thinning	0
Number of acres of natural ignitions that are allowed to burn under strategies that result in desired conditions	63
Number of acres treated to restore fire-adapted ecosystems which are maintained in desired condition	607
Number of acres mitigated to reduce fire risk	607

Please provide a narrative overview of treatments completed in FY18, including data on whether your project has expanded the pace and/or scale of treatments over time, and if so, how you've accomplished that – what were the key enabling factors?

The Selway-Middle Fork area contributes substantially to the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forests' (NPC) target attainment in timber, fuels and aquatic restoration. Over the past five years the Forest has quadrupled the timber volume sold with 2018 resulting in the highest volume sold on the Forests since 1991! During this same time of increasing timber production, the NPC has remained a leader in the Northern Region, and nation, in aquatic restoration projects. The NPC has also increased prescribed fire and managed natural fire acre accomplishments inside the CFLR area and across the forest. The CFLR projects contribute directly and indirectly to this overall forest achievement in accelerating pace and scale of restoration.

In addition, the relationships built through the CFLR project have opened the door for other collaborative ventures. In 2016, the Forests signed the first Supplemental Project Agreement for utilizing the Good Neighbor Authority in Idaho. This was a direct result of discussions between collaborative group members and the Forest Service. The NPC has also submitted three Joint Chiefs proposals over the past few years which are directly tied to CFLR projects and the shared stewardship concept. CFLR built the relationships upon which these other ventures have bloomed.

- **How was this area prioritized for treatment?**

  - All treatment areas for the Selway-Middle Fork project area, including FY18 accomplishments (described further in question 7), were originally conceived using the methodology outlined in the Region 1 Integrated Restoration and Protection Strategy (IRPS) and recommendations in the Selway and Middle Fork Clearwater Rivers Subbasin Assessment (SMFCRSA). Per Public Law 111-11 Sec. 4003 (c)(1)(A) and (B), the IRPS and SMFCRSA constituted the landscape restoration strategy that was *complete or sustainably complete* and that *identified and prioritized* areas in need of ecological restoration. From the IRPS and SMFCRSA, the Forests used an interdisciplinary process to develop site specific projects that met the intent of the CFLR program and addressed the current conditions and on-the-ground need for action. Projects have been documented in each year's annual reports and through various reporting mechanisms such as the PALS database and Forest's projects webpage.

  - Subsequent efforts that generated composite prioritization maps, such as the Idaho State Assessment of Forest Resources Report and assessments in the ongoing Forest Plan Revision and Forest's Restoration Action Strategy (RAS – publication pending) have validated the planning of priority treatment areas within the Selway-Middle Fork CFLRP area. Additionally, the large wildfires in 2014 and 2015, which impacted

communities and other high value resources within the CFLRP area, further reinforced the need to implement the landscape restoration treatments outlined in the CFLRP proposal.

- **Please tell us whether these treatments were in "high or very high wildfire hazard area** from the "wildfire hazard potential map" (Wildfire Hazard Potential Map)

  - All "active management" CFLRP treatments, (completed and ongoing) occur in "high" or "very high" wildfire hazard areas and are within WUI areas. Some projects (e.g. Clear Creek) are designed using a science based-collaborative approach to restoring resilient mosaic conditions across large landscapes, while others (Lowell WUI, Interface Fuels, Tinker Bugs) were/are specifically designed to reduce fuels adjacent to communities and high value resources.
  - The Selway Bitterroot wilderness has a long history of managed fire. In 2017 over 50,000 acres of wildfire were managed for resource benefit and to meet Forest Plan desired conditions.

- **What have you learned** about the interaction between treatment prioritization, scale, and cost reduction? What didn't work? Please provide data and further context here.

  - The Selway-Middle Fork Project area is unique in its landbase. As described in question 4 (pgs. 10-11) of the CFLR Proposal, wildfire ignitions in the Wilderness and backcountry areas are generally allowed to burn and are managed to achieve specific resource objectives. These fires typically cost a fraction of suppression fires. At the same time, fires in the "roaded- front country" have had negative social, ecologic and economic impacts, including mandatory evacuations, loss of timber value, landslides, dangerous air quality and disruption of public services. The Interface Fuels project (discussed in 2015 annual report) serves as a local example of how a fuel reduction can be planned, implemented and used to effectively protect communities. Each year the Forest brings groups to look at the treatments in this area so they can get a visual on what future planned fuel reduction treatments look like and demonstrate to our stakeholders their effectiveness. Most recently, this was the destination of a field trip with the Nez Perce Tribal Executive Committee to help build a better understanding of active management projects in relation to tribal treaty rights and trust responsibilities.
  - The forest learned greatly from the successes and failures of the Johnson Bar (J-Bar) salvage project. The Forest applied the same approach to prioritizing areas for treatment at a larger scale after the fires of 2015. In addition, the J-Bar method of prioritizing blocks of time for IDT work was again applied at a forest-wide scale in our 2016 post-fire projects. After the Northern Region's fires in 2016, a similar coarse filter/fine filter approach to prioritization and Incident Management Team for managing the project analyses and implementation was then used at a Regional level to address salvage after the 2017 Northern Region fire season. In this way, we applied lessons learned from project management at the Forest and Regional level, resulting highly successful salvage efforts. So while the J-Bar project suffered from setbacks, the information gained set the Forests up for success in future, larger-scale efforts.
  - The J-Bar lawsuits also promulgated the long needed update and consolidation of the Coordinated Resource Management Plan for the Middle Fork of the Clearwater Wild and Scenic River. This ongoing effort will insure that current and future projects adequately protect and enhance outstandingly remarkable values.

Expenditures

Category	**$**
FY2018 Wildfire Preparedness[2]	$950,000
FY2018 Wildfire Suppression[3]	$65,000
The cost of managing fires for resource benefit if appropriate (i.e. full suppression versus managing)	$10,000
FY2018 Hazardous Fuels Treatment Costs (CFLN)	Included in table 1
FY2018 Hazardous Fuels Treatment Costs (other BLIs)	Included in table 1

How may the treatments that were implemented contribute to reducing fire costs?
There has not yet been any documented reductions in firefighting costs, however it is anticipated that fully implemented treatments will result in the potential for lower fire costs over time, especially when considering the fire containment success that the Interface Fuels treatments provided during suppression of the Woodrat Fire in 2015.

Have there been any assessments or reports conducted within your CFLRP landscape that provide information on cost reduction, cost avoidance, and/or other cost related data as it relates to fuels treatment and fires?
There have not been any assessments documenting cost reduction due to the variability of fire locations and behavior across the CFLRP area. Wilderness fires managed for resource objectives are typically a fraction of suppression costs, but even those fires can incur substantial costs if management actions become necessary to protect resources at risk, such as pack bridges, historic structures, airfields, and heritage sites.

When a wildfire interacts with a previously treated area within the CFLR boundary:
If additional assessments have been completed since the FY2017 CFLRP annual report on fires within the CFLRP area, please note that and provide responses to the questions below.

- There have been no assessments completed since 2017 and there were no fires that burned into planned or previously treated areas.

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 copy/paste that entry here and respond to the following supplemental questions. Note that the intent of these questions is to understand progress as well as identify challenges and what didn't work as expected to promote learning and adaptation.**

There were no fires that burned into fuel treatment areas in FY18

When a wildfire occurs within the CFLR landscape on an area planned for treatment but not yet treated:
There were no fires that burned into planned treatment areas in FY18.

[2] Include base salaries, training, and resource costs borne by the unit(s) that sponsors the CFLRP project. If costs are directly applicable to the project landscape, describe full costs. If costs are borne at the unit level(s), describe what proportions of the costs apply to the project landscape. This may be as simple as Total Costs X (Landscape Acres/Unit Acres).
[3] Include emergency fire suppression and BAER within the project landscape. Describe acres of fires contained and not contained by initial attack. Describe acres of resource benefits achieved by unplanned ignitions within the landscape. Where existing fuel treatments within the landscape are tested by wildfire, summary and reference the fuel treatment effectiveness report.

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.

Please see table above.

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 2018 Jobs Supported/Maintained (FY18 CFLR/CFLN/ WO carryover funding):

FY 2018 Jobs Supported/Maintained	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Direct)	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Total)	Labor Income (Direct)	Labor Income (Total)
Timber harvesting component	32	46	$1,605,684	$2,044,198
Forest and watershed restoration component	30	35	$315,328	$468,280
Mill processing component	54	157	$3,012,680	$6,423,359
Implementation and monitoring	40	43	$418,471	$492,347
Other Project Activities	2	2	$65,778	$88,126
TOTALS:	**157**	**283**	**$5,417,941**	**$9,516,310**

FY 2018 Jobs Supported/Maintained (FY18 CFLR/CFLN/ WO carryover and matching funding):

FY 2018 Jobs Supported/Maintained	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Direct)	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Total)	Labor Income (Direct)	Labor Income (Total)
Timber harvesting component	32	46	$1,605,684	$2,044,198
Forest and watershed restoration component	38	46	$467,995	$679,135
Mill processing component	54	157	$3,012,680	$6,423,359
Implementation and monitoring	41	44	$496,941	$584,671
Other Project Activities	1	2	$41,660	$55,814
TOTALS:	**166**	**294**	**$5,624,961**	**$9,787,177**

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)
Job training opportunities	The Clearwater Basin Youth Conservation Corps (CBYCC) employed 32 youth (ages 16-18) for 8 weeks and 6 crew leaders for 9.5 weeks. The Forest also hosted a residential YCC program in 2018 which was partially supported by the CBC. Many former CBYCC youth are currently employed in the forest management industry in private, state or federal positions. (*see additional write up in monitoring section*)	Facebook Page Instagram Page
Project partnership composition	- Idaho Forest Group, Bennett Lumber Products, Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation, Selway Bitterroot Frank Church Foundation and Palouse Environmental Institute were added as contributing partners in support of the CBYCC this year. The Army Corps of Engineers sponsored an entire crew's work this year. - Muse Media and the Dog House Catering are new local contractors supporting the work of the CBYCC - Greenman Arborist and Restoration is a new local contractor that performed sediment monitoring as one of the MAC identified emphasis areas. The contract was awarded after competitive bids from four additional contractors.	Muse Media Project Gallery
Economic dependency/sectors impacted/expanding market development	In 2011 the economic report for the Iron Mountain Vegetation Management Project indicated that unemployment in Idaho County was 11.3%. In 2018, the economic report for the Red Moose Project indicates that Idaho County unemployment is 4.2%. Statewide figures for 2011 and 2018 are 8.8% and 2.2% respectively. Anecdotal evidence suggests that timber harvesting and wood products manufacturing in the area have reached capacity and purchasers are fully utilizing all available logging contractors. The increase in outputs associated with restoration treatments has befitted the community with out of area	

	loggers purchasing homes and utilizing (renting) vacant ware yards for sorting facilities. Additional information on the economic contribution of the Idaho forest products industry is available through the University of Idaho.	
Public input in political processes	Public meetings held for the Red Moose and Tinker Bugs projects used a slightly different format than previous "traditional" public meetings. Instead of presenting a proposed action for review and discussion, the Forests took the audience on a virtual field trip using Google Earth and videos to describe the existing conditions on the ground. Participants were presented with a range of options the Forest could use to achieve desired conditions, including an explanation of the different planning authorities and their relative implications (e.g. length of time for CE, vs. EA/EIS). The public was then able to provide their feedback on different planning authorities and options for project implementation and inform the Forest Service of their preferred options. This collaborative process helped identify areas of support as well as concerns about the projects. The majority of the public input favored expedited timelines and use of the new/expanded planning authorities under the amended Healthy Forest Restoration Act. The IDTs follwed up with video production to show how public comments are incorporated into project design. The methods used were successful in achieving actual collaboration on a project prior to scoping.	Red Moose Project Tinker Bugs Project
Community support for relevant initiatives	Public participation at meetings for projects in the CFLR area, such as Tinker Bugs and Red Moose, have been positive. For the examples listed above, both meetings were well attended with participants expressing ideas, concerns, and suggestions for each project proposal. Overall, the communities were highly supportive of the concepts for both projects and understood the purpose and need for each. They supported the Forest Service reducing fuels and decreasing	Red Moose Project Tinker Bugs Project

	insect and disease concerns within the project areas while contributing to local economies with the salvaged timber. While ideas about how to address the issue and how to shape the Proposed Action sometimes differed, there was consensus among meeting participants that supported the overall objective of the projects in the CFLR area. The public input changed both proposals prior to scoping in a meaningful way. In addition to the project discussion, feedback for the process was positive with members of the public saying "we feel like you are really listening to us" and "this was the best Forest Service meeting I have been to".	

5. Based on your project monitoring plan, describe the multiparty monitoring process.

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. All MAC-generated monitoring results and reports are posted on the Clearwater Basin Collaborative website here.

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 informs 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 2018, the MAC focused on three primary projects: valuing timber, recreation, and water as ecosystem services; continuing water quality monitoring on Clear Creek Integrated Restoration Project, and continuing to provide job training and citizen science opportunities through the Clearwater Basin Youth Conservation Corps.

Ecosystem Services Assessment – Ecosystem services was identified as a potentially viable methodology for assessing the value of a variety of benefits that the Forests provide and could help the MAC more consistently evaluate the positive or negative socioeconomic results of management activities within the CFLR. The MAC, working with the Forest Plan Revision team, determined to contract a preliminary analysis of three key ecosystem services within the Selway-Middle Fork CFLR; timber, water, and recreation. The preliminary report was completed in August 2018 with a final accounting of the average annual value of these services. The results will be discussed with the MAC at the November meeting for a final decision on the appropriateness of the methodology, overall accuracy of the findings, and potential relevance for future management planning.

Clear Creek Cross-Drain Culvert Data Collection – This project continued on the trajectory of establishing high quality, expedient baseline data prior to implementation of the Clear Creek Integrated Restoration Project. In July and August of

2018, approximately 33 miles of road were traversed to locate, GPS, and document the extent of sediment delivery at that location.

Socio-economic Data Collection – In 2018, we made an effort to update our socio-economic monitoring data collection. Continuing to build on the baseline report from 2012, we gathered data and information for FY2016-17. This will ultimately be helpful in establishing trends and summarizing this type of information for the final 10 year report.

Clearwater Basin Youth Conservation Corps – The CBYCC continues to gain momentum, growing geographically to include an additional crew based in Potlatch, but also in its diversity of partnerships and ability to reach the community. The CBYCC has worked diligently for the last several seasons to bring on additional funding partners that "hire" the crews to work on various types of land management projects. The youth work on projects that directly and indirectly improve forest conditions and provide customer service. This year, in addition to the work the CBYCC crews did for the federal agencies, they were also hired by Idaho Forest Group and Bennett Lumber Products to work at local mill facilities, work on a private timber sale, and help on a stewardship project. While the USFS continues to be the largest contributor, diversification of funding has grown our footprint, provided a more well-rounded experience for youth, and solidified 8 weeks of work for 6 crews (30 youth and 6 crew leaders), 2 frontliners, and 1 participant on a wilderness trail crew. In the small communities of the Clearwater Basin, the CBYCC has become a large employer of high school aged youth.

This year we also focused on a media campaign to reach out to local youth using social media (Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, etc) as well as writing press releases and gathering footage for a CBYCC documentary. The CBYCC social media campaign is continuing year-round which will set us up for continued success. We've spent considerable effort trying to track CBYCC alumni in order to get a sense of where former participants end up and how CBYCC has influenced that path. While not within the bounds of the Selway-Middle Fork CFLR, the USFS also piloted a resident YCC crew at the Kelly Forks Work Center targeting youth from a national pool. This was also very successful and will hopefully be a platform for establishing more crews in the area to help with restoration projects. Members of the CBC supported the resident YCC crew through staff support and providing weekend recreational experiences for the crew members.

What are the current weaknesses or shortcomings of the monitoring process? (Please limit answer to one page. Include a link to your monitoring plan if it is available).

The most significant weakness of the monitoring process is obtaining buy-in and assistance from Forest specialists, particularly in the project design phase of the project. This is critical to the development of a project that meets the objective of the monitoring and provides a tangible outcome or result for the users. The MAC has made significant strides in developing these relationships in some areas, but broader participation would be helpful.

The Forest needs to work on utilizing this monitoring information better to streamline processes. It has been used within the CFLR area but expansion to the rest of the Forests is lagging behind. The EADM process is a good catalyst for this.

Please provide a link to your most up-to-date multi-party monitoring plan and any available monitoring results from FY18.

- Clearwater RC&D Facebook: Facebook Page
- CBYCC Facebook: Facebook Page
  CBYCC Instagram: Instagram Page

6. FY 2018 Agency performance measure accomplishments:

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost ($) *(Contract Costs)*
Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres	928.00	$85,950
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	102.00	$12,000
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	4,063.40	$300,000 Partner
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC	Acres	N/A	N/A
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions. S&W-RSRC-IMP	Acres	114.00	Integrated
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-LAK	Acres	29.30	Partner (IDFG)
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	23.90	Integrated
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	2,957.00[4]	Integrated
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved RG-VEG-IMP	Acres	N/A	N/A
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance RD-HC-MAINT	Miles	50.68	$30,000
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance RD-PC-MAINT	Miles	139.03	$345,000
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	0	0
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles	(24.18)[5]	$340,000
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles	(27.45)[6]	$741,000
Road Storage *While this isn't tracked in the USFS Agency database, please provide road storage miles completed if this work is in support of your CFLRP restoration strategy for tracking at the program level.*	Miles	N/A	N/A
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage STRM-CROS-MTG-STD	Number	2.00[7]	$238,000

[4] Includes 1,830 acres accomplished on the Bitterroot National Forest and an additional 296.46 acres accomplished on the Nez-Perce Clearwater National Forest that were reported in WIT but not reflected in gPAS total of 830 acres due to reporting errors.

[5] These miles were entered into the database as "reconstruction" miles but the CFLRP template does not account for that performance measure. Actual on-the-ground accomplishments are virtually the same as the "improved" performance measure and have been included in the report to show work completed.

[6] Same as above

[7] Total reflects the 2 crossings reported in WIT that did not show up in gPAS due to a reporting error.

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost ($) *(Contract Costs)*
Miles of system trail maintained to standard TL-MAINT-STD	Miles	1,010.67	$360,910 CFLN, NFHF, NFRR, SPFH $64,800 CFTL $135,440 NFHF
Miles of system trail improved to standard TL-IMP-STD	Miles	22.25	$46,800 CFLN $43,200 CFTL $25,580 Partner in-kind)
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard LND-BL-MRK-MAINT	Miles	N/A	N/A
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC	Acres	575.00[8]	Associated with volume sold
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF	26,262.96	Associated with volume sold
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	7,381.25	$354,300
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons	14.26	Integrated
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	63.00	$8,500
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	4.00	$50,000
Acres mitigated FP-FUELS-ALL-MIT-NFS	Acres	67.00	$42,000
Please also include the acres of prescribed fire accomplished	Acres	603.00[9]	0
Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands SP-INVSPE-FED-AC	Acres	N/A	N/A
Number of priority acres treated annually for native pests on Federal lands SP-NATIVE-FED-AC	Acres	N/A	N/A

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

7. **FY 2018 accomplishment narrative** – Summarize key accomplishments and evaluate project progress *not already described elsewhere* in this report. (Please limit answer to three pages.)

The relationship between the Forests and CBC have operated under three broadly supported concepts since the start of the Selway-Middle Fork CFLR program. Those are:

[8] 4 acres reported in gPAS and with an additional 571 actual acres accomplished but not captured in database because they had not yet been accepted at the time of database closure by on the ground sale administrator.

[9] This value reflects the acres accomplished but not reported in the database of record.

- Work at the landscape scale – maximize efficiencies of larger planning efforts and consider each project's contribution towards the overall landscape restoration objectives.
- Do what's right for the land – consider ecological and fuel reduction objectives as the primary drivers (outcomes) of project development. Strategically planned, integrated and well-designed projects that achieve real results on the landscape are likely to result in the production of significant economic benefits (e.g. timber volume) that support local economies. This has been demonstrated repeatedly in the Clearwater Basin.
- Don't shy away from controversy – not all public land advocates and stakeholders are supportive of restoration activities, however working collaboratively can educate, build trust and diplomatically resolve differences. Public land management provides for consideration of all public input. Taking the time to solicit and understand critical input and concerns has resulted in improved project design.

These concepts provide a foundation from which the Selway-Middle Fork project has approached management of the program and from which many other forest wide projects outside the CFLRP area have been developed. The Central Zone of the Nez Perce-Clearwater Forests (in which the Selway-Middle Fork Project is located) achieved 100% of its expected project accomplishments despite a high level of turnover and numerous vacancies. Decisions moved forward on other non-CFLRP landscape scale projects (e.g. - Lolo Insect and Disease Project) and the Interdisciplinary Team sustained a high level of outputs. As mentioned above, this work has contributed significantly to the quadrupling of the Forests timber output over the past five years and, in 2018, achieving the highest timber volume sold since 1991.

In FY18 there were a number of notable achievements with substantial progress made towards furthering the objectives set forth in the Selway-Middle Fork CFLR Proposal. Highlighted examples are:

Johnson Bar Fire Salvage Project (J-Bar). Harvest activities are nearing completion and reforestation is ongoing for this project that was authorized on over 900 acres. Discussed at-length in previous year's annual reports, the J-Bar Salvage project is a product of the 13,000 acre Johnson Bar Fire which, in 2014, burned across an area where several CFLRP landscape restoration projects were being analyzed or developed. The project serves as an example of persevering through challenges including staff turnover, an adverse legal decision and widespread landslides after a historic rain even in the spring of 2017. Purchasers of the two project related sales (Idaho Forest Group and R&R Connor Aviation) exceeded expectations for product removal by finding non-traditional markets - such as house logs and cedar products - for timber that was expected to have limited or no value. Additionally, the project created opportunities for reforestation with early seral tree species that will create more resilient landscapes, particularly when viewed in the context of adjacent restoration treatments (Lodge Point, Interface Fuels, Lowell WUI, Iron Mtn., Clear Creek, Tinker Bugs, Red Moose, etc.). In combination, these projects, when completed will create a mosaic containing a diversity of age classes and species compositions that promote desired conditions across the landscape. Feedback from the public, employees and collaborative members indicate that the project is visually indistinguishable from the fire scar across much of the area due to project design and tree retention. This is notable since the visual impacts of the project adjacent to the Wild and Scenic River corridor were important considerations in the planning and subsequent lawsuit. See section 2 for other ways that the J-Bar project contributed to future successes.

Lowell WUI – A decision for the Lowell WUI project was signed in late FY17. Implementation of fuel reduction activities began this year on approximately 166 acres surrounding the community of Lowell. This was an important decision since the town had experienced multiple wildfire evacuations over the last several years. The project was one of the first on the Forests to use the amended HFRA ("Farm Bill") CE authority and notable since it included approximately 90 acres of harvest within the Rackliff-Gedney Roadless Area abutting the community. The Forests worked with the Idaho Roadless Commission and CBC to design the project so it was consistent with the Idaho Roadless Rule, the expanded HFRA CE

authority and the intent of the Selway-Middle Fork CFLR project. Similar to the J-Bar project directly across the Selway River, the visual impacts of the timber harvest were an important consideration in planning the fuel reduction activities. Design measures incorporated large tree retention in clumps across harvest units to break up the harvest patterns and make them less noticeable to the casual observer. Additionally, the value of the trees coupled with the availability of a helicopter being used to fly logs on the adjacent J-Bar project allowed the purchaser to subcontract with R&R Connor Aviation to fly logs that would have otherwise have been yarded using a line machine. This was a win-win situation that allowed for expedited removal of the trees and minimal impacts to the visual and Roadless Area resources. As with previous CFLR projects that produce a timber output, this project further demonstrates the importance of how local wood processing infrastructure contributes to local economies. Lowell WUI was modest in size at 3.7 million board feet of timber, but sold at auction under strong competition with 145 oral bids for $842,643.20 which was 274% above the advertised price. Sale administrators indicate there is sufficient value in the material, particularly the cedar, to utilize material that would otherwise not be merchantable and loggers are removing the butt sections of the trees for cedar products, the middle sections of the tree for lumber and the tops for cedar poles with each piece going to a different mill within the local area. Five different wood products came off this one small sale area.

Red Moose and Tinker Bugs Projects – Project development and scoping occurred for both the Red Moose and Tinker Bugs projects in FY 18. Both projects are located within the Selway-Middle Fork CFLR project area with a portion of the Red Moose Project on the adjacent Red River Ranger District to the south. Public meetings and field trips were held to solicit feedback on how the Forests might address the growing insect and disease problems occurring across much of the landscape. Feedback indicated widespread support for proposals and use of the expedited Healthy Forest Restoration Act planning authorities. The public was supportive of the forest's initiative to harvest marketable timber while decreasing insect and disease concerns in the area and reducing the risk of catastrophic wildfire. Attendees at public meetings for both projects came with valid questions and concerns regarding the project and were engaged in discussing different options for addressing the resource concerns associated with each project, consistent with the collaborative requirement of HFRA projects. The Decision Memo for the Red Moose project is ready to be signed, pending approval by the Regional and Washington office communication staff.

Iron Mountain – Reforestation occurred on approximately 120 acres of the Iron Mountain project, initiated as a forest restoration and fuels reduction project 2011. Planting whitebark pine was the final phase of the project with nearly 8,000 trees planted during favorable conditions in late September. The Iron Mountain project was unique in its opportunities – reducing fuels on over 450 acres, generating over 7 million board feet of timber and $742,000 in retained receipts that were reinvested in additional restoration work, as well as providing the right combination of site productivity and accessibility to successfully plant whitebark pine, a sensitive species. This area has also been used as a field trip site to discuss interpretation of the Selway Biological Opinion, particularly around the definition of roads.

Clear Creek – The Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (D-SEIS) for the Clear Creek Integrated Restoration Project was released for comment on September 21, 2018. Clear Creek has been considered the "cornerstone" project of the Selway-Middle Fork CFLR program since its beginnings. When implemented, the project will restore natural disturbance patterns, improve long-term resistance and resilience at the landscape level, reduce fuels, improve watershed conditions, improve elk habitat effectiveness, improve habitat for early seral species; and maintain habitat structure, function, and diversity. The Forests and Nez Perce Tribe have worked diligently through a Statement of Understanding (SOU) to improve project analyses and design and address concerns over the potential effects to aquatic resources and wildlife habitat. Final government-to-government consultation is scheduled for December 2018 and the final SEIS will be signed in 2019.

Watershed Restoration – The watershed restoration program has been an extremely important focus area of the Selway-Middle Fork Project. The Forests, with considerable partner involvement, have sustained a high level of accomplishment towards improving aquatic conditions as a result of the CFLR program and availability of funding. In 2018, restoration work continued on the O'Hara Road with culvert replacements and geotechnical road stabilization of slide-prone areas identified as "hot spots" (potential failure or chronic sediment delivery areas) in the GRAIP (Geomorphic Road Analysis and Inventory Package) survey conducted by the Nez Perce Tribe in 2012.

Wilderness Management – The Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness (SBW) is one of the Nation's oldest Wildernesses and by design, an important component of the Selway-Middle Fork CFLR Project. Over 800,000 acres of the project occur within the SBW and were included because of the opportunities to accomplish the project's restoration goals and objectives across the entire landscape. The SBW was the first place that fire managers intentionally allowed a lightning strike to burn and go out on its own in the early 1970s, resulting in policy changes to restore fire to the ecosystem. After nearly 50 years of allowing fire to play its natural role, much of the landscape has been transformed into a natural mosaic where fires can burn within their normal range of variation, are self-limiting and can be managed for a fraction of the cost of suppression fires. At the same time, the spread and effects of invasive plants have impacted habitat for native plant and animal species. Through the CFLR program, and with considerable partner support, the Forests have made huge strides with inventory and treatment of invasive plants. Noticeable reductions have occurred along trails, backcountry airstrips, and administrative sites, where native plants and habitats are reestablishing. These accomplishments are logistically challenging but hard-won and important investments that are well supported by partners. The availability of CFLR funding has provided the support necessary to keep the Wilderness management infrastructure operational.

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

EDW estimates were accurate and provided the same footprint acreage as the methodology used to calculate footprint acres in previous years. Results are included in the table below:

Fiscal Year	Footprint of Acres Treated (without counting an acre of treatment on the land in more than one treatment category)
FY 2018	6060
Estimated Cumulative Footprint of Acres (2010 or 2012 through 2018)	247,597

9. **Describe any reasons that the FY 2018 annual report does not reflect your project proposal, previously reported planned accomplishments, or work plan.**

This year the Forests completed and submitted a proposal revision which identified differences in previously projected accomplishments and what are expected to be the final outcomes of the project after 10 years. Changes were requested for approval where projections were significantly higher or lower than originally planned. No approval was requested for accomplishments that were generally in alignment with the original proposal and workplan. Performance areas that were below projections were generally due to unforeseen circumstances such as wildfire, litigation and changes in reporting mechanisms. Performance areas exceeding original projections were attributed to efficiencies

gained as a result of the program, increased partner capacity and reporting mechanisms. The revision was approved by the Washington Office in November of 2018.

10. Planned FY 2019 Accomplishments

Performance Measure Code	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment For 2019	Amount ($)
Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres	600	$6,500
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	3000	$30,000 CFLN
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	20	Integrated with roads and trails
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	1,200	Integrated
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	20	$200,000
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles	5	$285,000
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles	9	$350,000
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	16,200	
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons	TBD - Associated with volume sold	
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	700	$65,000
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	2,428	$170,000

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 2019 accomplishments and/or funding differs from CFLRP project work plan**

The Forests completed a proposal revision and submitted a draft Program of Work for FY 19. Accomplishment projections included in that document assumed full funding for FY 19.

12. **Please include an up to date list of the members of your collaborative if it has changed from previous years**.
Over the past year, guided by the Chief's Collaboration Cadre, Forests and the CBC have been in transition, reevaluating agreements, processes, and priorities. The following summary is from the leadership of the CBC:

The Clearwater Basin Collaborative (CBC) has been in a time of transition for the past few months. We are making this announcement to inform you that the CBC has completed a leadership transition election and a new slate of officers has been elected. The new officers representing a new organizational structure are shown below:

Officers:

Co-Chair	Bill Higgins	Idaho Forest Conservation, LLC
Co-Chair	Brad Smith	Idaho Conservation League
Vice-Chair	Greg Danly	Empire Lumber Company
Treasurer	Don Ebert	Clearwater County Commissioner
Secretary	Jerome Hansen	Citizen at Large
Projects	Robyn Miller	The Nature Conservancy
Chairman Emeritus	Alex Irby	Public Land Access Year Round (PLAY)

Membership:

Bill Warren	University of Idaho, Clearwater County extension
Brad Brooks	The Wilderness Society
Dale Harris	Great Burn Study Group
David Galantuomini	PLAY, Lewiston Chapter
David Cadwallader	Citizen at Large
J.J. Teare	Idaho Fish and Game
Jerome Hansen	Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation
Joyce Dearstyne	Framing Our Community
Leo Crane	Lake and Leather Outfitters
Norm Tomlinson	Associated Loggers
Randy Doman	Citizen at Large
Skip Brandt	Idaho County Commissioners

Pending Membership:

Mining interests
Backcountry Hunters and Anglers
Trout Unlimited
Idaho Department of Lands

The CBC recently reached its 10-year anniversary this past May. It has had an incredible track record of success but like all organizations with longevity, change is inevitable. We are proud of our work and track record of success. We are especially thankful for the years of service and leadership provided by our two past Co-chairs Alex Irby and Dale Harris who have stood up the organization for the past decade.

The CBC remains committed to the ideals we have worked towards which are to find collaborative solutions that promote active forest management, fish and wildlife habitat restoration, recreation opportunity, strong communities

and land and water protection. Immediate priorities beyond our normal program of work include ensuring stable funding sources for staff support that is so critical for the productivity of a citizen organization like the CBC. We look forward to the next decade of successful collaboration before us.

13. **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.

Figure 1 Screenshot from Senator Crapo's Twitter account congratulating the CBYCC on their 6th season.

Backing Collaborative Forest Management – Letter to the Editor by Senator Mike Crapo (ID-R), July 2018

Bipartisan Support for Expanded Collaborative Forest Work - Letter to the Editor by Senator Mike Crapo (ID-R), May 2018

Collaborative Supported Trails Work - "Some Idaho trails could be cleared in attempt to reduce maintenance backlog" – Idaho Statesman (originally appeared in the Lewiston Morning Tribune), by Eric Barker, February 2018

Collaborative Forest Management in Idaho – "Trump called for a 'truly representative process' for managing public land. One already exists in Idaho" – *Associated Press*, by Keith Schneider, January 2018

Fire season inspires shared stewardship – Description of Good Neighbor Authority work inspired through the CFLR program.

Signatures:

Drafted by: */s/ Mike Ward*

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

Approved by (Bitterroot Forest Supervisor): /s/Kurt Steele

Draft reviewed by (collaborative chair or representatives): */s/ Bill Higgins /s/ Brad Smith*