

**CFLR Project:** Front Range (CFLR004)

**National Forest(s):** Pike and San Isabel NFs and Arapaho and Roosevelt NFs

**Responses to the prompts on this annual report should be typed directly into this template:**

1. Designation of matching funds. Due to the fact that the system for recording matching funds in FFIS was new last year and not all matching funds were coded properly, we are asking for a re-tallying of FY10 matching funds in addition to FY11 matching funds. Since these numbers will be used as the matching funds totals for FY10 and FY11 going forward, there is a signature block for the Forest Supervisor (or Forest Supervisors if the project spans more than one national forest).

**FY10 Matching Funds Documentation**

Fund Source	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2010(\$)	
CFLR Funds Expended (this is different than the amount allocated) <sup>1</sup>	<b>\$930,459</b>	
FS Matching Funds (please include a new row for each BLI) <sup>2</sup>	WRHR	\$398,972
	CMRD	\$38,222
	CMLG	\$24,000
	WFHF	\$435,000
	RTRT	\$20,000
	NFVW	\$25,000
	NFTM	\$152,000
Funds contributed through agreements <sup>3</sup>	CO. SPRINGS UTILITIES	\$100,344
	CUSP	\$125,540
	CDW HPP	\$44,794
	ARBOR DAY	\$94,500
	CFRI	\$10,000
Partner In-Kind Contributions <sup>4</sup>	MILLER	\$4,292
	TAYLOR	\$1,872
	PHANTOM CREEK 1	\$10,405
Service work accomplishment through goods-for services funding within a stewardship contract <sup>5</sup>	FISH CREEK	\$14,600
	<b>TOTAL MATCHING</b>	<b>\$1,499,541</b>

<sup>1</sup> This amount should match the amount of CFLR/CFLN dollars obligated in the PAS report titled CFLR Job Code Listing and Expenditure Report – Detailed Analysis by Fiscal Year.

<sup>2</sup> This amount should match the amount of matching funds obligated in the PAS report titled CFLR Job Code Listing and Expenditure Report – Detailed Analysis by Fiscal Year. For FY10, this column should also include matching funds not in the PAS report. For FY11, all Forest Service matching funds should be documented in the PAS report.

<sup>3</sup> Please document any partner contributions to implementation and monitoring of the CFLR project through an agreement (this should only include funds that weren't already captured through the PAS job code structure for CFLR matching funds). Please list the partner organizations involved in the agreement.

<sup>4</sup> Total partner in-kind contributions for implementation and monitoring of a CFLR project. Please list the partner organizations that provided in-kind contributions. See "Annual Report instructions" for instructions on how to document in-kind contributions.

<sup>5</sup> This should be the amount in the "stewardship credits charged" column at the end of the fiscal year in the TSA report TSA90R-01.

**FY11 Matching Funds Documentation**

Fund Source	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2011(\$)	
CFLR Funds Expended <sup>1</sup>		<b>\$3,578,889</b>
FS Matching Funds (please include a new row for each BLI) <sup>2</sup>	WFHF	\$858,383
	RTRT	\$149,689
	NFVW	\$138,441
	NFTM	\$232,825
	NFXN (inc. Arbor Day)	\$11,634
	CWFS	\$16,968
Funds contributed through agreements <sup>3</sup>	DENVER WATER	\$960,817
	CO. SPRINGS UTILITIES	\$50,000
	CUSP (Pine Creek Restoration)	\$58,182
	CUSP-NFF (Hayman Restoration)	\$950,391
	ROCKY MOUNTAIN FIELD INT.	\$13,782
	NFF (Hayman Reforestation)	\$53,220
	Partner In-Kind Contributions <sup>4</sup>	CFRI
	ROUNDTABLE MEMBERS	\$64,000
	SOUTHERN ROCKIES LCC	\$35,000
Service work accomplishment through goods-for services funding within a stewardship contract <sup>5</sup> <small>Estimated based upon task orders</small>	ESTES VALLEY 5/ WALKER BLACK	\$9,503
	PHANTOM CREEK 2	\$4,723
	PHANTOM CREEK 3	\$5,912
	RYAN QUINLAN	\$8,726
	<b>TOTAL MATCHING</b>	<b>\$3,656,196</b>

Approved by :     /s/ Jerri Marr      
 Forest Supervisor  
 Pike and San Isabel NFs and  
 Cimarron and Comanche NGs

Approved by :     /s/ Dennis L. Jaeger      
 Acting Forest Supervisor  
 Arapaho and Roosevelt NFs and  
 Pawnee NG

2. Discuss how the CFLR project contributes to accomplishment of the performance measures in the *10 year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan*<sup>6</sup>, dated December 2006 (please limit answer to one page).

The CFLR accomplishments to date are primarily associated with performance measures for Goals 2 and 3 of the 10 year CSIP, reducing hazardous fuels and restoring fire adapted ecosystems. It is too early to determine the effect of completed treatments on Goal 1, the improvement of fire prevention and suppression, since no wildfires have occurred in CFLR treated areas (performance measures “percent change from the 10-year average for either wildfires controlled during initial attack” and “percent change for the number of unwanted human caused fires”). Prescribed fire treatments have also been limited to date. Significant use of prescribed fire is not planned until 2013-2014 and is dependent upon available and favorable burning conditions.

The most significant performance measures at this stage of the project are “the number and percent of acres treated by mechanical thinning, through collaboration consistent with the Implementation Plan” and “the number and percent of acres treated to restore fire adapted ecosystems which are moving toward desired conditions”. Due to the late distribution of funds in 2010, implementation of these projects did not begin until the summer of 2011. Through 2011, mechanical treatment contracts have been awarded on 5,069 acres (988 in 2010 and 4,081 acres in 2011). Approximately 50% of this area has been treated as of October, 2011. These treatments are consistent with the 10 year CSIP since they have reduced hazardous fuels in WUI and restored forest vegetation to a condition class 1. Completed and ongoing treatments have also achieved a restoration objective by reducing stand density to a condition more consistent with fire regime group 1. Silvicultural treatments include thinning through all crown classes, thinning from below, and patch cutting. Future treatments will further meet restoration and fuels reduction objectives by incorporating a greater percentage of patch cutting throughout treatment units (approximately 10-20% of the total treatment area).

3. **FY 2011 Jobs Created/Maintained** (FY11 CFLR/CFLN funding only):

Type of projects	Direct part and full-time jobs	Total part and full-time jobs	Direct Labor Income	Total Labor Income <sup>7</sup>
Commercial Forest Product Activities	31	61	\$991,000	\$2,144,000
Other Project Activities	44	51	\$1,306,000	\$1,596,000
<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>\$2,297,000</b>	<b>\$3,740,000</b>

**FY 2011 Jobs Created/Maintained** (FY11 CFLR/CFLN and matching funding):

Type of projects	Direct part and full-time jobs	Total part and full-time jobs	Direct Labor Income	Total Labor Income <sup>8</sup>
Commercial Forest Product Activities	42	84	\$1,359,000	\$2,940,000
Other Project Activities	70	84	\$2,270,000	\$2,880,000
<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>\$3,629,000</b>	<b>\$5,820,000</b>

<sup>6</sup> The 10-year Comprehensive Strategy was developed in response to the Conference Report for the Fiscal Year 2001, Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act (Public Law 106-291).

<sup>7</sup> Values obtained from Treatment for Restoration Economic Analysis Tool (TREAT) spreadsheet, “Impacts-Jobs and Income” tab. Spreadsheet and directions available at <http://www.fs.fed.us/restoration/CFLR/submittingproposals.shtml#tools>.

<sup>8</sup> Values obtained from Treatment for Restoration Economic Analysis Tool (TREAT) spreadsheet, “Impacts-Jobs and Income” tab. Spreadsheet and directions available at <http://www.fs.fed.us/restoration/CFLR/submittingproposals.shtml#tools>.

4. Describe other community benefits achieved and the methods used to gather information about these benefits (Please limit answer to two pages).

We have not yet gathered information about other community benefits as we are still in the process of finalizing social and economic monitoring processes. However, some general benefits to communities are clear and are discussed in the following paragraphs.

1. Leveraging of funds- the CFLR project has provided additional opportunities for communities to come together to leverage funds and obtain grants. Two examples are the Woodland Park Healthy Forest Initiative (HFI) and the West Boulder County HFI. The Woodland Park HFI has been in place for several years. The Front Range CFLR project has increased treatments on National Forest System (NFS) lands adjacent to the Woodland Park HFI area. The increased funding for treatments on NFS lands and being within the boundaries of the Front Range CFLR project has increased the ability of the Woodland Park HFI to compete for Colorado State Forest Service and other grants to increase treatments on private lands. The West Boulder County HFI was just formed in 2011. These communities came together to join forces to obtain grants for treatments on private lands in part because the Front Range CFLR project will provide increased funding for treatments on NFS lands. The West Boulder County HFI was selected as a focus project by the Front Range Roundtable in large part because their treatment objectives complemented the Front Range CFLR project.
2. Implementation of CWPPs- the Front Range CFLR project has allowed the Pike National Forest and Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forests to increase treatment within WUI identified in Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPPs). This increase in treatment has provided for more rapid cross boundary implementation of CWPPs. This has further reduced the risk of catastrophic wildfires occurring with the associated adverse effects to communities.
3. Complimentary cross boundary restoration treatments- the Front Range CFLR project has increased the opportunity for complimentary lower montane restoration treatments to occur in partnership with collaborators such as Boulder County and Teller County. The increase of strategic treatments with partners has reduced the risk of catastrophic wildfire to lower montane forests which are an important social and economic factor to the communities along the Front Range of Colorado. Additional complimentary cross boundary restoration treatments will take place on Colorado Springs Utilities land as well as other private land within the southern portion of the CFLR boundary, as funded by The Nature Conservancy "Promoting Ecosystem Resiliency through Collaboration". These treatments aren't planned for implementation until FY12.

5. Describe the multiparty monitoring, evaluation, and accountability process (please limit answer to two pages).

A subgroup of Front Range Roundtable (FRR), the Monitoring Working Group (MWG) was tasked with the creation of a CFLRP monitoring plan. The Monitoring Plan was successfully developed by June 2011. The CFLRP Monitoring Plan is the result of intense multiple stakeholder learning and deliberations by the Front Range Roundtable Monitoring Working Group. The multiple stakeholder group consisted of members of both the Pike and San Isabel and Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forests, USFS Region 2, Colorado State Forest Service, US Fish and Wildlife Service, Colorado Department of Wildlife, Natural Resource Conservation Service, The Nature Conservancy, The Wilderness Society, Colorado Wild, Rocky Mountain Research Station, University of Colorado, Colorado Forest Restoration Institute, Tree Ring Laboratory, Boulder County and the City of Boulder, and many other stakeholders.

The CFLRP is an endeavor that will take place over 10 years and the monitoring protocols take both this length of time and the large landscape scale into consideration. One uncertainty that the MWG had to embrace is the indeterminate amount of funding that will be available for treatments and monitoring from year to year. This uncertainty was addressed by identifying Tier 1 and Tier 2 variables that will be measured. The Tier 1 or core variables are measurements that will be conducted consistently at each CFLRP monitoring plot. Tier 2 variables will be measured if additional funds from partners, grants or other funding mechanisms are acquired.

### **Ecological Monitoring Program**

The monitoring plan outlines a comprehensive ecological monitoring program to assess success of CFLRP treatments for a minimum of 15 years after project implementation, and to guide future treatments through an adaptive management framework. Monitoring results will be used both to evaluate the rate and extent of achievement of individual project goals, and to incorporate data into analyses of cumulative effects at the landscape level. The monitoring protocols are designed to address specific Desired Conditions. Desired Conditions are expressed in broad, general terms, and have no specific date by which they are to be achieved. The group established Desired Ecological Conditions, based on the original CFLRP proposal, and which determined the group's choice of variables to measure and protocols to use. They are: establish a complex mosaic of forest density, size and age (at stand scales); establish a more favorable species composition favoring ponderosa pine over other conifers; establish a more characteristic fire regime; increase coverage of native understory plant communities; increase the occurrence of wildlife species that would be expected in a restored lower montane forest; establish a complex mosaic of forest density, size and age (at landscape scale).

The plan outlines a series of specific measurements that will be done in individual plots, largely based on existing Common Stand Exam (CSE) protocols that are part of standard inventory procedures. However, during the collaborative process to get to this point, we identified several gaps in trying to translate individual plot data to the landscape scale. For example, our first Desired Condition is to “establish a complex mosaic of forest density, size, and age”. The monitoring working group felt strongly that this Desired Condition should include some sort of spatial metric to define and assess that mosaic condition beyond simple averages and distributions of the identified monitoring variables as measured in the plots. However, we were not able at this time to come up with such a metric, nor how to measure it as part of the monitoring program. Some of these gaps may be overcome depending on funding available to implement the monitoring program.

### **Social and Economic Monitoring Program**

The social and economic monitoring protocols are in the final phases of deliberation. The MWG has identified collaboratively the variables they prefer to see measured in the 10-15 year lifetime of this CFLRP. Although ideas were presented for these methods, the final protocols are not yet determined. A meeting took place on June 13, 2011 where members of the MWG and other Front Range Roundtable stakeholders who represented communities and the business sector further discussed these variables. The outcome of this meeting was twofold: 1) a more industry and community oriented set of variables were agreed to base on the MWG's preferences and 2) it was decided that CFRI will convene another meeting late summer or early fall 2011 to determine the protocols to measure them.

**Future Steps**

Collection of data was initiated in summer of 2011 with the collection of Tier 1 information from over 600 CSE plots by the Forest Service and by collection of Tier 2 information by members of the MWG through a grant from the Southern Rockies LCC.

Landscape-scale assessment of whether restoration objectives are being met is an important question to the group. Various options to monitor at a landscape scale will be evaluated to determine a desired course of action.

The Plan is rooted in a consensus regarding the need to use adaptive management as a tool to reduce uncertainty over time through a structured, iterative process. Through adaptive management, the ensuing data will allow the FRR and the USFS to reduce uncertainty using the monitoring information.

**6. FY 2011 accomplishments**

<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Unit of measure</b>	<b>Total Units Accomplished<sup>9</sup></b>	<b>Total Treatment Cost (\$)</b>	<b>Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)<sup>10</sup></b>
Acres treated annually to sustain or restore watershed function and resilience	Acres			
Acres of forest vegetation established	Acres	1,047	\$406,352	RTRT, NFWW
Acres of forest vegetation improved	Acres	5,370	\$2,083,146	CFLN, NFXN (Denver Water) Also integrated hazardous fuels reduction.
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants	Acre	1,050	\$178,716	NFWW, R31303 (CUSP)
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands	Acres			
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions.	Acres	43	\$237,183	CFLN, NFWW, NFXN, National Forest Foundation, and CUSP
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced	Acres			
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced	Miles			
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced	Acres	1,407		Integrated forest vegetation improved.
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved	Acres		\$9,500	NFWW

<sup>9</sup> Units accomplished should reflect the accomplishments recorded in the Databases of Record.

<sup>10</sup> Please use a new line for each BLI or type of fund used. For example, you may have three lines with the same performance measure, but the type of funding might be two different BLIs and CFLR/CFLN.

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished <sup>9</sup>	Total Treatment Cost (\$)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match) <sup>10</sup>
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance	Miles	3.5	\$14,112	CMRD
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance	Miles	9	\$7,247	CMRD
Miles of road decommissioned	Miles	*		*3.8 miles of road decommissioned in database was an error.
Miles of passenger car system roads improved	Miles			
Miles of high clearance system road improved	Miles	16.5	\$148,112	CMRD, CWF2
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage	Number			
Miles of system trail maintained to standard	Miles			
Miles of system trail improved to standard	Miles	3.4	\$48,000	CUSP, NFF
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard	Miles	21.25	\$146,000	NFLM, WFHF, Colo. Springs Utilities (paid to BLM)
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales	Acres			
Volume of timber sold (CCF)	CCF	6,678		Integrated- forest vegetation improved and hazardous fuels reduction.
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production	Green tons	1,128		Integrated- forest vegetation improved and hazardous fuels reduction.
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire	Acre			
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire	Acres	8,291	\$2,055,000	CFLN, WFHF, NFXN Also integrated forest vegetation improved.
Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands	Acres			
Number of priority acres treated annually for native pests on Federal lands	Acres			

7. FY 2011 accomplishment narrative (summarize key accomplishments and evaluate project progress) (please limit answer to three pages).

2011 was a very successful year for the Colorado Front Range CFLR project. A key accomplishment of 2011 was the issuing of six task orders under the Front Range Long-term Stewardship contract. These task orders focused on restoration of the lower montane ecosystem, hazardous fuels reduction and forest health improvement on over 5,500 acres. These treatments are consistent with the goals of the Colorado Front Range CFLR project. Progress to date has been what was anticipated in the project proposal. The areas treated were completed in conjunction with the Woodland Park Healthy Forest Initiative, and in northern Boulder County near the community of Estes Park. All treatments are located in the Wildland Urban Interface.

Treatments accomplished in 2011 as part of the Colorado Front Range CFLR project also included over 1,000 acres of reforestation, approximately 1,100 acres of noxious weed treatment; 43 acres of watershed restoration. In addition, wildlife habitat improvement, road and trail maintenance, and rangeland vegetation treatments were accomplished. An area of focus with this CFLR project was utilization of biomass and community stability. In 2012, over 1,100 tons of biomass and almost 6,700 CCF were produced through the CFLR project. An estimated 112 part-time and fulltime jobs are directly related to 2011 CFLR project activities and another 56 jobs are indirectly related.

The treatments accomplished under the Colorado Front Range CFLR project have been additional to treatment acres that could have been completed with traditional funding. The CFLR project has also generated increased partnership contributions for treatments on National Forest Systems lands. Partners include: Denver Water, Vail Associates, the Coalition for the Upper South Platte, and Colorado Springs Utilities, which combined contributed over \$2,000,000 toward restoration and hazardous fuels reduction in the CFLR project area. The CFLR project funds have provided matching funds for partner contribution and partner funds have provide matching funds for CFLR project funds. Additionally it was envisioned that the major source of matching funds would be National Forest System funds; however, the availability of those funds has been less than originally anticipated. Partner contributions have made up the difference. In total partners contributed over 61 percent of 2011 matching funds.

Substantial progress has been made on developing the CFLR multi-party monitoring plan. A dedicated group of partners attended numerous meetings facilitated by the Colorado Forest Restoration Institute to develop the ecological portion of the monitoring plan. Implementation of the monitoring plan began during summer, 2011 with collection of common stand exam data by Forest Service crews and collection of wildlife and understory data by other members of the multi-party monitoring group. A sub-group of the multi-party monitoring group continues to develop and refine the social and economic monitoring process.

The following series of photos show forested areas in the area of the Phantom Creek task order before and after treatments. These photos are representative of restoration treatments in lower montane stands in the Colorado Front Range CFLR project on the Pike National Forest.



Untreated area in the Phantom Creek 1 task order

Post treatment Phantom Creek 1 task order



Untreated area in the Phantom Creek 1 task order

Post treatment Phantom Creek 1 task order



Post treatment Phantom Creek 1 task order

Post treatment aspen Phantom Creek 1 task order

8. Describe the total acres treated in the course of the CFLR project (cumulative footprint acres; not a cumulative total of performance accomplishments). What was the total number of acres treated?<sup>11</sup>

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Total number of acres treated (treatment footprint)</b>
FY10	988
FY10 and FY11	5,069

9. Describe other relevant fire management activities within the project area (hazardous fuel treatments are already documented in Question #6):

Both the Pike and San Isabel National Forests and Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forests maintain robust fire preparedness organizations. In FY 2011, the two Forests expended approximately \$2,394,000 in WFPF funds within the boundaries of the Colorado Front Range CFLR project area to be prepared to respond to wildfire ignitions.

During 2011 there were 111 wildland fire starts within the Colorado Front Range CFLR project area. There were 27 fires that were not contained during initial attack and went into extended attack. Of these fires 3 became larger than 100 acres, the 100 acre Beaver fire, the 622 acre Lefthand Canyon fire, and the 1,162 acre Crystal fire. A total of \$5,616,000 (WFSU) was expended on wildland fire suppression activities in 2011. Of this amount \$3,707,000 was expended on the three fires that exceeded 100 acres.

10. Temporary roads status

<b>Number of miles of temporary road constructed in Fiscal Year 2011</b>	<b>Number of miles of temporary road decommissioned in Fiscal Year 2011</b>
1.7	1.2

11. Describe any reasons that the FY 2011 annual report does not reflect your project proposal and work plan. Did you face any unexpected challenges this year that caused you to change what was outlined in your proposal? (please limit answer to two pages).

The FY 2011 annual report does generally reflect the project proposal. The major differences are that we were able to accomplish more acres than projected due to lower average contract costs and increased partner matching contributions. The lower cost was a result of less costly treatments being implemented this year rather than a reduction in treatment costs. The increased partner matching contributions is a positive development, but is likely not sustainable due to partner projects moving outside of the CFLR project area. This may result in challenges in the future.

The major challenges this year was uncertainty regarding final funding level and the late arrival of CFLRP funds. The uncertainty regarding final funding level made it difficult to establish contract and monitoring funding which created inefficiency in project implementation. The late arrival of funds caused timing problems with award of contracts and with execution of agreements. It also presented difficulties in preparation of FY 2012 projects.

<sup>11</sup> This metric is separate from the annual performance measurement reporting as recorded in the databases of record. Please see the instructions document for further clarification.

12. Planned FY 2012 accomplishment narrative:

The planned FY 2012 accomplishments are based upon full proposal funding. With full proposal funding 8 task orders/contracts would be issued or awarded to achieve ecosystem restoration and hazardous fuels reduction. Over 4,300 acres would be treated through these task orders or contracts. However, it is unlikely that full funding will be received if for no other reason than the assessment of cost pool funding against the CFLRP allocations and actual accomplishments may be less. Therefore, partnership contributions will again be critical in achieving overall project goals and meeting project accomplishments goals. Given the possibility of shrinking federal funding partnership contribution will be critical in achieving matching funding goals.

Wildland fires have played an important role in the lower montane ecosystem. Due to increasing amounts of Wildland Urban Interface in the lower montane ecosystem wildland fire use must occur within specific prescriptions. In 2012 it is hoped that we will be able to begin utilizing prescribed fire as a tool to achieve the goals of the CFLR project.

FY 2012 accomplishment will continue to emphasize restoration treatments in the ponderosa pine ecosystem and hazardous fuels reduction in WUI. However, it will continue to be possible to accomplish reforestation, noxious weed treatment, watershed restoration, and wildlife and fish habitat improvement within the CFLR project. It is anticipated that accomplishments in these areas will be similar to 2011 levels. While not the key focus of the Colorado Front Range CFLR project these projects are also important in achieving overall project goals.

13. **Planned FY 2013 Accomplishments**

<b>Performance Measure Code<sup>12</sup></b>	<b>Unit of measure</b>	<b>Planned Accomplishment</b>	<b>Amount (\$)</b>
Acres treated annually to sustain or restore watershed function and resilience	Acres		
Acres of forest vegetation established	Acres	1,000	\$500,000
Acres of forest vegetation improved	Acres	3,400	\$4,000,000
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants	Acre	1,500	\$300,000
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands	Acres		
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions.	Acres	3	\$30,000
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced	Acres		
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced	Miles		

<sup>12</sup> Please include all relevant planned accomplishments, assuming that funding specified in the CFLRP project proposal for FY 2013 is available. Use actual planned funding if quantity is less than specified in CFLRP project work plan, and justify deviation from project work plan in question 15.

Performance Measure Code <sup>12</sup>	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment	Amount (\$)
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced	Acres	1,000	Integrated forest vegetation improved
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved	Acres		
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance	Miles		
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance	Miles		
Miles of road decommissioned	Miles		
Miles of passenger car system roads improved	Miles		
Miles of high clearance system road improved	Miles		
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage	Number	1	\$30,000
Miles of system trail maintained to standard	Miles		
Miles of system trail improved to standard	Miles		
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard	Miles		
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales	Acres		
Volume of timber sold (CCF)	CCF	5,000	Integrated forest vegetation improved and hazardous fuels reduction
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production	Green tons		
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire	Acre		
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire	Acres	2,500	\$3,200,000 (does not include integrated acres)
Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands	Acres		
Number of priority acres treated annually for native pests on Federal lands	Acres		

14. Planned FY 2013 accomplishment narrative:

The planned FY 2013 accomplishments are based upon full proposal funding. It is unlikely that full funding will be received if for no other reason than the assessment of cost pool funding against the CFLRP allocations. Therefore, actual accomplishments will likely be less.

FY 2013 accomplishment will continue to emphasize restoration treatments in the ponderosa pine ecosystem and hazardous fuels reduction in WUI. However, it will continue to be possible to accomplish a small amount of noxious weed treatment, watershed restoration, and wildlife and fish habitat improvement within the CFLR project.

15. Describe and provide narrative justification if planned FY 2012/13 accomplishments and/or funding differs from CFLRP project work plan:

The FY 2012/13 estimated accomplishments generally do not differ from the project proposal. The accomplishments include noxious weed treatment, watershed improvement and wildlife habitat improvement that were addressed but not specified in the proposal.

It is likely that partner contributions to matching funds are not sustainable due to partner projects moving outside of the CFLR project area. This may result in challenges in the future.