

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

Following successful selection in the Collaborative Landscape Restoration Program, the Clearwater and Nez Perce National Forests and Clearwater Basin Collaborative (CBC) organized a “CFLRA Strategy Group” consisting of Line and Staff Officers from the Forests as well as technical representatives from the CBC. Group members were selected based on their expertise in the representative functional areas involved in the proposed restoration projects. The group is chartered to provide oversight to the CFLR program and ensure that implementation of the proposed restoration projects meets the schedules outlined in the Selway Middle Fork Collaborative Restoration Proposal (the Proposal). The group also provides recommendations to the Line Officers on prioritization of funding and has been instrumental in development and scheduling of projects across the ten year life of the program.

A dedicated planning team is assigned to develop and plan the out-year projects identified in the proposal. Their primary focus is development of landscape scale, integrated projects that not only meet the intent of the Act, but are appropriate for the land in time and place. The Selway Middle-Fork project was selected in part due to the numerous opportunities within the project are to achieve true ecological restoration while protecting communities from wildfire and utilizing the abundance of small diameter trees.

Collaboration on project design will be the most important factor towards minimizing the threat of appeals and/or litigation and implementing these projects in timely fashion. Representatives from the Forest routinely attend full working group CBC meetings and well as Landscape Health subcommittee meetings to keep the group apprised of progress, solicit input and concerns. Members of the planning team recently met with the collaborative to present and agree on the “process” – a vision of success – that will be used to describe “*why here, why now?*” The team and CBC are excited to be engaged early and feel the agreed upon approach will be the best way to develop landscape level projects that best meet the intent of the Act and accomplish restoration on a scale that will have meaningful and measureable difference.

The multiparty monitoring effort for the Selway-Middle Fork Clearwater Project is being developed by the Clearwater Basin Collaborative and the Forest Service in partnership with the Nez Perce Tribe, the University of Idaho, and the Rocky Mountain Research Station including the Moscow Forestry Sciences Lab and the Boise Aquatic Sciences Lab. A monitoring “summit” has been convened in early March, 2011 to develop a monitoring plan with indicators to assess ecological restoration, economic growth and overall community benefits. Our program will include at least three community indicator categories: Social (population, education, government performance, health, housing, and safety); Economic (income, employment, business development, and digital inclusion and connectivity); and Environmental.

Lessons learned from past collaborative / stewardship projects have been identified through Peer Learning sessions sponsored by the National Forest Foundation. This transferrable knowledge will be tailored and applied to our monitoring programs, project designs and implementation with the intent and expectation of maximizing efficiencies. It is our expectation that The Selway Middle-Fork Project will be a beneficial long term investment.

The continued implementation of the CFLRA program will result in positive impacts socially, economically and ecologically. Capacity building is an area of primary concern, both at the Forest and with the CBC. Every effort is being made to ensure that the program is “additive” and does not impact non-CFLRP Districts and programs on the Clearwater and Nez Perce Forests. The initial FY 10 request was obligated and has already generated additional contract opportunities for weed treatments, road decommissioning and watershed improvements. These opportunities would not have existed without the program. Additional restoration projects are ready to be implemented when funding becomes available and will generate substantial contract opportunities.

2. Anticipated unit treatment cost reduction over ten years:

Performance Measure Code	Average Historic Unit Cost	Cost Reduction per Unit	Assumptions
TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC	\$1,375/Ac	\$0/Ac	Assumption: unit cost considers both appropriated expenditures and implementation cost/revenue. Cost savings are expected with NEPA efficiencies, implementation costs (prep & admin) remain static, and sale/project value decreases with small diameter low value material and higher logging costs.
TMBR-VOL-SLD	\$55/CCF	\$0/CCF	Assumption: unit cost considers both appropriated expenditures and implementation cost/revenue. Cost savings are expected with NEPA efficiencies, implementation costs (prep & admin) remain static, and sale/project value decreases with small diameter low value material and higher logging costs.
BIO-NRG	\$35/Ton	\$0/Ton	Assumption: unit cost considers both appropriated expenditures and implementation cost/revenue. Bio-energy is a by-product that results from timber sale planning & implementation. Cost savings are expected with NEPA efficiencies, implementation costs (prep & admin) remain static, and sale/project value decreases with low value slash material and higher logging costs.
FP-FUELS-NON-WUI (Slash Burning)	\$450/ac	\$0-250/ac	Cost reduction potential is from bio-mass utilization. Cost may range from 0-\$17/green ton depending on location and market demand. Additional cost reduction offset can be attributed to average gross stumpage of \$10/green ton
FP-FUELS-NON-WUI (Natural Fuels Burning)	\$131/ac	\$0-50/ac	Cost reduction is based primarily on maintenance burning in previously treated areas. Fire resources needed for implementation may decrease due to modified fire behavior and

			reduced holding concerns.
FP-FUELS-NON-WUI (Fire for resource benefit)	\$81	\$0-50	Potential cost reduction near WUI areas from fuel treatments that modify fire behavior and the threat to values of concern.
FP-FUELS-WUI	\$550	\$0-250	Cost reduction potential is from bio-mass utilization. Costs may range from 0-\$17/green ton depending on location and market demand. Additional cost reduction offset can be attributed to average gross stumpage of \$10/green ton
INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	\$300	\$150	Assumptions for unit cost reductions are twofold. Substantial initial investment will allow treatments on a scale to maximize effectiveness. Invasive populations will be able to be subsequently managed at a lower "maintenance" level, reducing cost per acre for treatments. Initial investment has also created additional contract opportunities and competition.
RD-HC-MAIN	\$200-\$500/mi	\$0-\$200/mi.	One time investment up front to address accumulated deferred maintenance needs yields reduced annual maintenance needs.
RD-DECOM	\$5000-\$15000/mi.	\$5000-\$15000/mi.	Once decommissioned no further administration funding needed.
RD-PC-IMP	\$1000-\$30,000/mi.	\$1000-\$2000/mi.	One time investment up front to address accumulated deferred maintenance needs yields reduced annual maintenance needs.
RD-PC-MAIN	\$500-\$1500/mi.	\$0-\$500/mi.	One time investment up front to address accumulated deferred maintenance needs yields reduced annual maintenance needs.
RD-HC-IMP	\$50-\$10000/mi.	\$50-\$1000/mi.	One time investment up front to address accumulated deferred maintenance needs yields reduced annual maintenance needs.

3. Anticipated costs for infrastructure needed to implement project:

Type of Infrastructure	Anticipated Cost	Funding Source (federal, private, etc)
Framing Our Community has several investment projects outside the project area (small business incubator that uses small diameter and standing dead wood to make wholesale and retail products that have a higher margin).	Existing investment for Phase 1 is \$363,297; and for Phase 2 is \$535,230, \$898,527 total; projected investment through 2010 is \$642,500 for incubator expansion; \$4 million for a combined heat system 2012	50% federal and 50% state and private
Workforce training center in Kamiah for in-woods machinery operations.	\$600,000	Partnership with Lewis and Clark State College to acquire money; initial investment (1/2 private; 1/2 federal); City of Kamiah donating 10 acres of property for facility.
Workforce training center in Elk City to train people in bridge and dam construction in Wilderness; maintain and construct trails in Roadless and Wilderness areas	\$650,000 to build the facility \$550,000 for the curriculum, staff and instruction	50% federal and 50% state and private
10 Megawatt biomass power facility in Orofino	\$10,000,000 for construction	Funding is anticipated to be a mix of Federal, county and private. \$140,000 of federal funding has already been awarded for the second phase of a feasibility study.

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	Projected Green Tons Removed per Acre	Total Green Tons Available
2010	0	0	0
2011	510	70	35,750
2012	700	20	13,750
2013	450	54	24,250
2014	1,245	74	91,500
2015	1,245	74	91,500
2016	2,515	73	184,500
2017	2,245	79	176,500
2018	2,245	79	176,500
2019	1,000	85	85,000

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	47.5	93.3	\$2,929,580	\$2,652,096
Other Project Activities	47.9	20.6	\$2,066,457	\$670,837
TOTALS:	95.4	113.9	\$4,996,038	\$3,322,934

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

Source of Investment	Amount of Investment	Description of Use
Nez Perce Tribe	\$2,000,000 annually	Clear Creek and Selway hatchery operations; native and anadromous species restoration and monitoring.
Selway Bitterroot Foundation	\$200,000 annually	Trail maintenance and weed treatments
Outfitters	\$45,000 annually	Trail maintenance
Volunteers	\$80,000 annually	Trail maintenance and weed treatments
Clearwater Basin Collaborative	\$150,000 annually	Collaboration
Idaho County	\$200,000	Fuelbreaks on private lands
Idaho County	\$60k annually	Firewise work
Idaho County	\$629,000	FEMA work flood repair
Idaho County	\$175,000	Road Maintenance
Upper Clearwater Weed	\$152,000 annually	Weed program

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

Mgt Coop		
Bennett Forest Industries	\$660,000 annually	Vegetation management on private lands
Bennett Forest Industries	\$64,000 annually	Reforestation on private lands
Bennett Forest Industries	\$15,000 annually	Road Maintenance
Bennett Forest Industries	\$2,000 annually	Erosion Control
Bennett Forest Industries	\$8,000 annually	Slash disposal
Kidder Harris	\$50,000 annually	Road Maintenance
IDL (Id Dept of Lands)	\$220,000 annually for 3 yrs	Vegetation Management
IDL	\$250,000 annually for 3 yrs	Vegetation Management
Private landowners	\$90,000 annually	Defensible space (60 homes * \$1500/yr)
Idaho Fish and Game Dept	\$1,500,000 annually	Fisheries and Wildlife Management
Rural Volunteer Fire Depts	\$40,000 annually	Fire suppression and prevention

** These are 2010 dollars with no inflation – would need to inflate for outyears

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

Projected accomplishment year (fiscal)	Number of Miles to be Decommissioned
2010	-
2011	***
2012	8 (Lodge Point)*
2013	10 (Smith / Interface)*
2014	8**
2015	8**
2016	8**
2017	8**
2018	8**
2019	8**

*Figures derived from pending NEPA analysis

**Assumes approx 4 miles temp road per 10MMBF as estimated / averaged from previous timber sale information

***No temp roads built to carry out proposal will be decommissioned in 2011, however there will road decommissioning of existing roads in FY 11.