1. Describe the manner in which the proposal will be implemented to achieve ecological and community economic benefit, including capacity building to accomplish restoration.

The 2010 CFLRP projects on the Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forests (ARNF) were focused in areas of northern Boulder County. Future projects will continue in Boulder County and also expand into areas near Estes Park and Redfeather Lakes of Larimer County. The objective of the projects include accomplishment of Front Range Roundtable objectives by thinning lower montane ponderosa pine stands to restore ecological resilience and to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildfire effects on communities. The majority of treatments will be implemented through the Front Range Long-term Stewardship Contract (FRLTSC) to maximize potential use of wood products. The use of wood products reduces treatment costs, sustains wood supply for development of wood processing infrastructure, increases employment and the economic well being of Front Range communities.

To date two projects on the ARNF related to CFLRP have been awarded through the FRLTSC. These are: Taylor Task Order (391 acres) and Miller Task Order (412 acres, matching ARRA funding).

The Pike-San Isabel National Forest will initially focus on project areas on the Pike Ranger District in the Woodland Park Healthy Forest Initiative Area. Majority of the treatments are expected to be implemented via the Front Range Long Term Stewardship Contract (FRLTSC). In general treatments will be thinning from below in the lower montane ponderosa pine and mixed conifer zone. Treatments are expected to create a mosaic of residual density, structure, and age classes and reduce the threat of high-severity wildfire and subsequent post fire watershed damage and accomplish ecological restoration objectives.

Treatments will be implemented via mastication of understory vegetation such as oak, biomass trees, and pole sized trees (non-sawtimber) where they are present at moderate to high densities. Sawtimber material will also be treated via commercial ground based logging equipment with an emphasis on density reduction and removal of suppressed trees that have less potential for release and improved growth following treatment. Project areas will have a range of operable/inoperable ground and access, therefore the percentage of treatment without utilization and treatment with product removal will vary by project. Project areas that have above average access and moderate to high levels of operable ground will generally be analyzed and implemented during the first half of the ten year period. Consequently, the level of product utilization is expected to decrease during the life of CFLRP sponsored projects. This will result in an increase of treatments that have historically had lower unit cost such as chipping, mastication, and broadcast burning.

To date three projects related to CFLRP have been awarded through the FRLTSC: Phantom 1 (600 acres) was awarded in fiscal year 2010. This project was funded under CFLR authority. Two projects were awarded through matching funding, Fish Creek (648 ac) in 2010 and Indian Creek in 2011 (677 ac). Work is anticipated to start on all three projects this year.

A multi-party monitoring group has been formed and is in the process of identifying monitoring procedures which will be used to evaluate the ecological, economic and social results of treatments. It is anticipated that initial ecological monitoring data collection will occur in the summer of 2011. Monitoring results will be used to maximize benefits of treatments through adaptive management.

2. Anticipated unit treatment cost reduction over ten years:

Performance Measure Code	Average Historic Unit Cost	Cost Reduction per Unit	Assumptions
FP-FUELS-WUI (acres) FOR-VEG-IMP (acres)	$1,000	$50-200	1. The cost for similar treatments is not expected to decrease and may increase. 2. Savings will be realized from the decreased need for machine pile burning in product removal units. 3. Implementation via the FRLTSC has created new markets for a variety of wood products, increasing product value. This is expected to reduce treatment costs. The development of additional markets may further reduce treatment costs. 4. Inflation will offset some of the cost savings.

3. Anticipated costs for infrastructure needed to implement project:

Type of Infrastructure	Anticipated Cost	Funding Source (federal, private, etc)
Temporary road construction outside of units	TBD (none for AR in fy10 project)	Federal
Temporary road construction within units	$20,000 (AR – Taylor & Miller)	Contractor
New Equipment: harvesting hauling, and processing.	$7,000,000 (both forests)	Private
Colorado Springs Utilities – Biomass utilization plant	No estimate available at this time.	Private
New Markets for utilization of biomass.[1]	$4,000,000 ($500 to 1mm per small to mid-scale facility)	Private/Federal

[1]New markets may increase the value of products and reduce treatment costs (question #2, assumption #3). No specific projects have been identified to date for this category.

4. Projected sustainability of the supply of woody biomass and small diameter trees removed in ecological restoration treatments:

Fiscal Year	Number of acres to be treated[2]	Projected Green Tons Removed per Acre	Total Green Tons Available
2010	991	9.5	9,403
2011	2,500	10	25,000
2012	2,400	10	24,000
2013	2,400	10	24,000
2014	2,400	10	24,000
2015	2,400	10	24,000
2016	2,400	8	19,200
2017	2,400	8	19,200
2018	2,400	8	19,200
2019	2,400	8	19,200

[2]Based on a 70% funding level for the life of the project.

5. Projected local economic benefits:

Type of projects	Total direct jobs	Total indirect jobs	Total Direct Labor Income	Total Indirect Labor Income[1]
Commercial Forest Products	39	61	$1,395,000	$1,910,000
Other Project Activities	66	21	$2,120,000	$ 805,000
TOTALS:	105	82	$3,515,000	$2,715,000

6. Document the non-Federal investment in the priority landscape:

Source of Investment	Amount of Investment	Description of Use
CWFS	$124,793	Arbor Day: Hayman Reforestation
NFXN	$250,000	Vail Resorts/NFF

[1] *Values obtained from Treatment for Restoration Economic Analysis Tool (TREAT) spreadsheet, "Impacts-Jobs and Income" tab. Spreadsheet available at INSERT WEBSITE HERE*

7. Plans to decommission any temporary roads established to carry out the proposal:

Projected accomplishment year (fiscal)	Number of Miles to be Decommissioned[3]
2010	0
2011	1
2012	5
2013	5
2014	5
2015	5
2016	5
2017	5
2018	5
2019	5

[3]Projected temporary road closure distance, 2012-2019, is based on 1 mile per 500 acres.