

Responses to the prompts on this work plan should be typed directly into this template

1.

Fund Source	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year <b>2010</b> (\$)
CFLR Funds	\$1,000,000
Partner Matching Funds	\$1,048,920
FS Matching BLI (please include a new row for each BLI)	\$545,049

\*\*\*Please see attached FY 10 matching funds spreadsheet

**2. Report on the performance measures outlined in the plan entitled *10 year Comprehensive Strategy***

***Implementation Plan*<sup>1</sup>, dated December 2006:**

Performance Measure	Units	Value for Fiscal Year
Percent change from 10-year average for wildfires controlled during initial attack	Percent Change	There was 100% success of controlling wildfires during initial attack resulting in a 5% increase of success. This success is due to an abnormally wet fire season. The 10-year average success rate is approximately 95% of all wildfires are controlled during initial attack.
Percent change from 10 year average for number of unwanted human-caused wildfires	Percent Change	There were 2% fewer human caused fires. Typically 5% of fires that occur are human caused. This decline is most likely due to a wet fire season.
Percent of fires not contained in initial attack that exceed a stratified cost index	Percent of Fires	0, in 2010 there were no fires that were not contained in initial attack or exceeding the SCI.
Number and percent of WUI acres treated that are identified in CWPPS or other application collaboratively developed plans <sup>2</sup>	Number of Acres, Percent of Acres	298 acres, 0.0001788% of the 1,666,427.00 project area
Number and percent of non-WUI acres treated that are identified through collaboration consistent with the <i>Implementation Plan</i>	Number of Acres, Percent of Acres	40 acres, 0.000024%
Number of acres treated per million dollars gross investment in WUI and non-WUI areas <sup>3</sup>	Number of Acres	338 acres, with WFHF funding and 1715 acres with WFSU for a total 2053 acres. Total investment is \$183,279 (\$44,364 WFHF and 138,915 WFSU). <b><i>This question needs clarification.</i></b>
Percent of collaboratively identified high priority acres treated where fire management objectives are achieved as identified in applicable management plans or strategies	Percent of Acres	338 acres, 0.0002028%
Number and percent of acres treated by prescribed fire, through collaboration consistent with the <i>Implementation Plan</i> .	Number of Acres, Percent of Acres	317 acres, 0.0001902%
Number and percent of acres treated by mechanical thinning, through collaboration consistent with the <i>Implementation Plan</i> .	Number of Acres, Percent of Acres	21 acres, 0.0000126%

<sup>1</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). A copy of the plan is available at [HTTP://WWW.FS.FED.US/RESTORATION/CFLR/ANNUAL.SHTML](http://www.fs.fed.us/restoration/cflr/annual.shtml).

<sup>2</sup> This value should reflect only fuels treatments.

<sup>3</sup> This value should reflect both CFLR and Match funds

Number of acres and percent of the natural ignitions that are allowed to burn under strategies that result in desired conditions	Number of Acres, Percent of Ignitions	1,715 acres, 57% of natural ignitions were allowed to burn for resource benefit.
Number and percent of acres treated to restore fire-adapted ecosystems which are moved toward desired conditions	Number of Acres, Percent of Acres	A total of 2,053 acres, 0.001% were treated through mechanical, prescribed fire and fire for resource benefit in 2010.
Number and percent of acres treated to restore fire-adapted ecosystems which are maintained in desired conditions	Number of Acres, Percent of Acres	0, at this time all treatments are focused on high priority areas in ecosystems that need to be moved towards desired condition.
Number and percent of burned acres identified in approved post-wildfire recovery plans as needing treatments that actually receive treatments	Number of Acres, Percent of Acres	0, during the 2010 fire season no fires occurred that were identified as needing recovery planning or treatment.
Percent of burned acres treated for post-wildfire recovery that are trending towards desired conditions	Percent of Acres	0, during the 2010 fire season no fires occurred that were identified as needing recovery planning or treatment.
Number of green tons and/or volume of woody biomass from hazardous fuel reduction and restoration treatments on federal land that are made available for utilization through permits, contracts, grants, agreements or equivalent	Number of Green Tons	0, woody biomass was not made available this year due to lack of access. Future treatments do include potential woody biomass, but utilization is market dependant.

**3. Progress Evaluation - Selway Middle-Fork Collaborative Forest Restoration Project.**

Successful selection of the Selway Middle-Fork proposal marked an important turning point for public land management within the Clearwater Basin. Notable is the strength of the partnership between the Forests and Clearwater Basin Collaborative (CBC) and the commitment to achieving the following goals outlined in the project proposal: (see associated performance measures in the table below)

- Ensure adequate protection of rural communities, private land and Wild and Scenic River values
- Re-establish and perpetuate a landscape that has a diversity of vegetation communities that are resilient in the presence of wildfire, invasive species, insects, disease and climate change.
- Restore/maintain forest structure, function and ecologic processes that promote aquatic health and diverse aquatic native species habitat including bull trout, steelhead and westslope cutthroat trout.
- Restore/maintain forest structure, function and ecologic processes that promote habitat for a large variety of native terrestrial species including mule deer, elk and other big game.
- Eliminate or contain noxious weeds to the greatest extent possible.
- Promote landscape conditions that allow fire to function as the primary ecosystem restoration agent within the Middle and Upper Selway River watersheds.

Initial progress towards these goals was successful. The Forests and CBC were aligned to quickly capitalize on the ability to fund numerous restoration programs following the project's selection in August. The initial one million dollar request from the fund was obligated through existing partnership agreements and contracts to fund invasive species treatments, inventory and monitoring as well as procurement and release of biocontrol agents for the next three years. Additional funding was obligated to partnership agreement with the Nez Perce Tribe and through contracts to fund road/watershed improvement projects for the next two years. These efforts complement and enhance the fisheries restoration program within the CFLR project area. Among the CBC there was a close tie and sense of ownership to the funding secured through proposal selection. Their participation throughout the process was critical in prioritizing initial funding obligations.

Following the project selection the Forests appointed a full time coordinator to track and compile reporting data and serve as the primary point of contact for the CFLRA program with the CBC. Additionally, the Forests and CBC have created a CFLRA "strategy group" to provide program oversight and maximize efficiencies across all resource areas so that the accelerated program of work can be implemented as proposed. The Selway Middle-Fork restoration proposal does not encompass all of the Ranger Districts across the combined Clearwater and Nez Perce Forests, and it is the goal of the strategy group to ensure that other non-CFLRP districts, programs and projects are minimally affected and the CFLR program is additive and generates more on-the-ground accomplishment as intended by the legislation.

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.

The integrated landscape scale projects continue to be the focus for future planning efforts; however, the Forests and CBC have developed a program of work around the CFLR project that will provide yearly accomplishment towards restoration. Numerous, smaller scale restoration opportunities have been or are expected to soon be authorized through the NEPA process. While these projects are smaller in scale, their expected benefits towards restoration of water quality, wildlife

habitat, forest health and fuel reductions are significant. It is expected that as the CFLR program grows and funding becomes available that more restoration opportunities will be identified.

The following table of performance measures supplied in the *CFLRP Annual Report Template Instructions* will be used to report and quantify the relative success in achieving these goals.

Acres treated annually to sustain or restore watershed function and resilience	WTRSHD-RSTR-ANN
Acres of forest vegetation established	FOR-VEG-EST
Acres of forest vegetation improved	FOR-VEG-IMP
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants	INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands	INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions.	S&W-RSRC-IMP
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced	HBT-ENH-LAK
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced	HBT-ENH-STRM
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced	HBT-ENH-TERR
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved	RG-VEG-IMP
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance	RD-HC-MAIN
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance	RD-PC-MAINT
Miles of road decommissioned	RD-DECOM
Miles of passenger car system roads improved	RD-PC-IMP
Miles of high clearance system road improved	RD-HC-IMP
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage	STRM-CROS-MTG-STD
Miles of system trail maintained to standard	TL-MAINT-STD
Miles of system trail improved to standard	TL-IMP-STD
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard	LND-BL-MRK-MAINT
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales	TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC
Volume of timber sold (CCF)	TMBR-VOL-SLD
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production	BIO-NRG
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire	FP-FUELS-NON-WUI
Acres of hazardous fuels treated inside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire	FP-FUELS-NON-WUI
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire	FP-FUELS-WUI
Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands	SP-INVSPE-FED-AC
Number of priority acres treated annually for native pests on Federal lands	SP- NATIVE –FED-AC

As program direction matures it is desirable that additional performance measures be examined to more accurately capture the entire suite of restoration work that is being accomplished within the CFLR Project area. Current reporting mechanisms in the annual report do not allow for a way to “neatly” reflect or the entire scope of work being accomplished through partnerships and cooperation between the Forests, Nez Perce Tribe’s Watershed and Fisheries Department, and Idaho Fish and Game department to restore endangered species within the project area. These efforts clearly tier to intent of the legislation.

**4. Jobs Created:**

Type of projects	Total direct jobs	Total indirect jobs	Total Direct Labor Income	Total Indirect Labor Income <sup>4</sup>
Commercial Forest Products	20.3	39.9	\$1,253,661	\$1,134,917
Other Project Activities	47.6	20.4	\$2,051,573	\$666,006
<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>60.2</b>	<b>68.1</b>	<b>\$3,305,234</b>	<b>\$1,800,923</b>

*\*\*\*The annual report TREAT spreadsheet was generated using funding numbers from the original proposal with a 70% reduction in CFLR funds for FY 11 and 12. Refined budget (match and expected CFLR request) figures are still being determined at this time. Final results are expected to be available for the workplan.*

**5. Describe other community benefits achieved and the methods used to gather information about these benefits:**

The Clearwater Basin Collaborative (CBC) is a diverse group of individuals working collaboratively to enhance and protect the ecological and economic health of forests, rivers and communities within the Clearwater Basin. The CFLR Project has already illustrated numerous community benefits in the Clearwater Basin. For decades, natural resource management has been contentious with limited collaboration between stakeholders. The CBC’s Selway-Middle Fork Clearwater Project signifies a change in the way business is conducted in the Basin. It marks a departure from traditional public involvement processes to collaboration, paving the way for a new era of cooperation.

The CBC in partnership with the Forest Service and the University of Idaho has begun to develop a monitoring plan with indicators to assess 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.

The CBC and University of Idaho will conduct surveys and interviews to establish a baseline and track changes pertaining to socioeconomic conditions in the Clearwater Basin. Indicators and measures specific to the CFLRA program will be designed to evaluate changes in the following sectors:

1. Economic Vitality - business retention and growth, community sustainability, access to financial capital. Indicators might include the number of forestry and forest products businesses at beginning of project; types of services and products by individual businesses offered; number of new, related start-up businesses with business plans.
2. Local Industry and Workforce Capacity - workforce capacity, organizational capacity, value-added forest products industry, market for restoration/biomass products, supply of and access to forest resources, increased economic opportunities to low income and underserved, distribution of projects across communities, existing forest user values. Indicators might include size of local restoration workforce; training Levels and professional certification levels of local forest restoration workers; percent of project that used mechanical harvesting, skidding, loading equipment; percent of project for environmental biomass utilization (mulching, chipping, removal); number of people trained in using mechanical equipment and non-mechanized treatments.
3. Improved Quality of Life - employment conditions in restoration and related industries for local and mobile workforce, worker’s family and community life, community access to timber and non-timber

<sup>4</sup> Values obtained from Treatment for Restoration Economic Analysis Tool (TREAT) spreadsheet, “Impacts-Jobs and Income” tab. Spreadsheet available at [HTTP://WWW.FS.FED.US/RESTORATION/CFLR/ANNUAL.SHTML](http://www.fs.fed.us/restoration/cflr/annual.shtml)

resources, risk of catastrophic wildfire, and local quality of life values. Indicators for this might include the number of local operators that use and are trained to use appropriate safety gear; the number or percentage of homes to which the project provides fire wood; the number of families who have access to locally non-timber products; the number of restoration businesses operating at full production capacity, before, during project; and the number of acres of defensible space created.

The continued implementation of the CFLRA program will result in positive educational impacts, social program impacts, volunteer opportunities and other community benefits. Although it is too early to be able to observe these impacts, we anticipate the following community benefits in the years to come as a result of the CFLRA program:

1. **Educational Impacts: Improved Community Connection to the Forest.** This will result in an increased public understanding of the connection between community health and forest health; an increased public understanding of forest health issues and catastrophic wildfires; new educational and workforce training opportunities in forest restoration; additional opportunities within the community to utilize and appreciate a healthy forest for Recreation, employment and sustenance; and cultural ties to forest ecosystems and traditional lifestyles. Indicators might include documentation of any confirmed poaching of trees from a site; number of local residents who receive training in prescribed burning; number of local residents who receive training in thinning techniques for defensible space; hours of training or educational opportunities provided; types of training and educational opportunities provided; number of people attending community meetings about the project, number of permits issued for collecting firewood; number of people households who receive firewood within the community; number of community-based projects started or maintained since inception of CFLR project; diversity of stakeholders/groups contributing to the project; number of volunteers and in what capacity who have donated time to this project; record of technical or educational presentations by forest experts and others; hours spent with technical experts discussing restoration related issues; and number of sources used for education and technical trainings.
2. **Social Program Impacts: Increased Capacity for Collaboration.** This will result in improved communication skills and techniques; communications resources and funding; representation of diverse community perspectives and interests; extent of community participation in restoration-related activities; quality and timeliness of Forest Service communication; community involvement in decision-making; and community understanding of legal and policy issues around forest restoration. Indicators might include number of individuals (and their area of interest) that have participated in this project; availability of documents pertaining to project; percentage of project-related meetings per year attended by both agency and community leaders.
3. **Volunteer Opportunities.** The Selway-Middle Fork Clearwater Project will directly support additional volunteer positions in the Clearwater Basin by supporting the Student Conservation Association and Selway Bitterroot Foundation in future years' restoration projects. Additional volunteer and youth opportunities are expected in forest and watershed restoration activities with the Nez Perce Tribe.

Together with the University of Idaho, the Forest Service and the Clearwater Basin Collaborative will develop a comprehensive and rigorous monitoring program to assess the multitude of community benefits expected from the ongoing implementation of the CFLRA program in the Clearwater Basin.

**6. Describe the results of the multiparty monitoring, evaluation, and accountability process.**

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. Key partners include Steve Hollenhorst and Sandra Pinnell at University of Idaho, Research Scientist Terrie Jain in Moscow, Research Scientists Tom Black and Charlie Luce in Boise, and Mark Johnson with the Nez Perce Tribe watershed division.

The CBC, Forest Service, Nez Perce Tribe, University of Idaho, and Rocky Mountain Research Station will develop our protocols over the next few months in conjunction with the CFLRA Work Plan. We expect that initial results from the multiparty monitoring will be available beginning in FY11 and ongoing throughout the implementation of the CFLRA program. In the meantime, the Forest Service will continue to complete all routine effectiveness monitoring currently conducted as part of project implementation.

Ultimately, the desired outcome of this project is a measureable shift toward terrestrial and aquatic restoration that achieves the desired future conditions on a landscape scale while generating products to benefit local economies. Another goal is a positive shift in stakeholder perceptions of public land management within the Clearwater Basin. Development of this proposal has already led to significant improvement in the level of trust between public and private interests represented on the CBC. The new relationships that have been developed will help steer future projects and improve how federal land managers do business.

In addition to the social and economic indicators described in Question 5, we plan to focus on terrestrial and aquatic indicators and utilize emerging protocols and techniques to identify and evaluate priority areas for restoration. Key monitoring questions will evaluate the effectiveness of various restoration prescriptions in mixed severity fire regimes, watershed restoration treatments and the biological and ecological responses associated with fish barrier removal. Below are some examples of methods that could be used.

For aquatics monitoring program, we plan to utilize and apply the Geomorphic Road Analysis and Inventory Package (GRAIP) to analyze the impacts on roads in the subbasin and within project areas to determine priority areas for treatment. GRAIP combines a detailed road inventory with GIS tools to predict road sediment production and delivery, mass wasting risk from gullies and landslides, and road hydrologic connectivity.

For terrestrial monitoring, we will be working with Dr. Jain to establish study plots to evaluate the effects of different silvicultural techniques (i.e. prescribed fire, thinning, regeneration logging, etc.) on post-treatment fuel dynamics that can contribute to fire intensity and rate of spread. We will also develop protocols for evaluating effectiveness of restoration in moist forests, where little information is available. In addition to the direct effectiveness monitoring associated with the project, Dr. Jain also plans to establish more permanent study plots in the project area for longer term research into the dynamics of moist forest restoration and fuels reduction.

Furthermore, opportunities also exist to establish long-term climate change monitoring in the 7,000 acre O'Hara Research Natural Area and to build upon existing research sites at the Horse Creek research site.

The Clearwater Basin Collaborative and its partners are committed to the design and implementation of a comprehensive multiparty ecological, social, and economic monitoring program for the ongoing

implementation of the CLFRA in the Clearwater Basin.

**7. A summary of the costs of treatments**

Ecological restoration treatment	Unit of measurement	<a href="#">Total Units Accomplished</a> [1]	<a href="#">Total Units Completed</a> [2]	Range of Costs per Unit	Average Cost per Unit	Funds Utilized to Accomplish Treatment (\$)	<a href="#">Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)</a> [3]
(Performance Measure Code)							
WTRSHD-RSTR-ANN	Acres	19	19	240	240	4560	WFHF
FOR-VEG-EST	Acres	148	148	11.00-16.00	13.5	2073	CWKV
FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	19	19	240	240	4560	WFHF
INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acres	274	274	100-200	180	60000	Partnership
INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acres	7	7	200-300	250	2000	FDSD
INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acres	334	334	100-200	150	30000	NFVW
INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acres	1250	20	100-200	180	200000	CFLR
INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acres	160	160	100-150	120	16800	WFW3
INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acres	70	70	150-200	180	13000	Partnership
INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acres	10	10	150-200	180	1800	SRS2
INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acres	100	100	150-200	180	14000	NFVW
INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acres	392	392	17	17	6874	CCRD
INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC	Acres	4.5	4.5	85	85	382.5	CCRD
S&W-RSRC-IMP	Acres	5	5	1100	1100	5500	CCRD
HBT-ENH-LAK							
HBT-ENH-STRM							
HBT-ENH-TERR							
RG-VEG-IMP							
RD-HC-MAIN							
RD-PC-MAINT							

*Selway Middle-Fork CFLRP Annual Report Template* | **2010**

RD-DECOM		0	0				
RD-PC-IMP	Miles	125	125	200-1500	1000	67158	CMRD/Partnership
RD-HC-IMP	Miles	6	6	200-1500	1000	6000	CMRD
RD-PC-IMP	Miles	0.25	0.25		1000	200000	CRMD
RD-HC-IMP	Miles	0.1	0.1		1000	40000	CRMD
STRM-CROS-MTG-STD							
TL-MAINT-STD	Miles	700	664	90-400	350	222600	CMTL
TL-MAINT-STD	Miles	108	108	90-400	218	23560	Partnership
TL-IMP-STD	Miles	30	16.4	1800-100000	7800	234000	CMTL
TL-IMP-STD	Miles		13.6	1800-10000	15000	213442	Partnership
LND-BL-MRK-MAINT							
TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC	Acres	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BIO-NRG	Tons	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acres	40	40	230	230	9200	WFHF
FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acres	1715	1715	250-88650	81	138915	WFSU
FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	298	298	50-555	118	38280	WFHF
FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	19	19	240	240		WFHF
SP-INV-SPE-FED-AC							
SP- NATIVE –FED-AC							
<a href="#">[1] Units Accomplished should reflect the number of units designated through awarded contracts or force account implementation in progress</a>							
<a href="#">[2] Units Completed should reflect work actually done on the ground.</a>							
<a href="#">[3] Please use a new line for each 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.</a>							

**8. Describe other relevant fire management activities (hazardous fuel treatments will be covered in the above table):**

Approximately 51 fires were reported within the project area this year. Of these fires 29 were managed for resource benefits. Fire size ranged from 0.1 acres to 1,225 acres. A total of 1,715 acres were reported in FACTS as acres treated from natural ignitions that moved fire dependant ecosystems towards desired conditions. The majority of fires fell within fire regime condition class 2 (pre-fire). Although it was not feasible to visit each fire to measure FRCC conversion, it is assumed that similar fire effects occurred throughout the project area that moved these acres from FRCC2 towards FRCC1.

Wildfire preparedness expenses (WFPR) are primarily comprised of base salaries, training, supplies and fleet. The project area encompasses: portions of the Lochsa and Powell Ranger Districts on the Clearwater NF; the Moose Creek RD on the Nez Perce NF; and a portion of the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness area located on the Bitterroot NF. Combined total WFPR expenditures for 2010 is \$2,197,454.00 (excluding the Bitterroot NF). A proportionate WFPR cost to the project area is \$915,474.00.

Wildfire management expenses (WFSU) are described by two strategies: suppression and fire for resource benefit.

- Of the 51 fires, 22 fires within the project area were suppressed for a total cost of \$262,450.00. A total of 8.5 acres were reported at a cost of \$30,876.00 per acre. All fires were contained at initial attack.
- There were 29 fires managed for resource benefit at an estimated cost of \$139,573.00. A total of 1,715 acres were accomplished at a cost of \$81.38 per acre.
- There was no expenditure for BAER within the project landscape this year.
- There were no instances of a wildfire burning into an existing fuel treatment to test effectiveness within the project area.

Other hazardous fuels (WFHF) expenses not captured above:

- GS-09 Fuels Specialist time to prepare project proposal is estimated for 10-days for a total of \$2,980.00.
- GS-12 Deputy Fire Staff and GS-09 Fuels Specialist time on CFLRA Strategy Committee is estimated for 5-days for a total of \$3,610.00.
- Indian Hill NEPA estimated planning costs for 2010 is \$22,236.00

**9.**

Number of miles of temporary road constructed in Fiscal Year	Number of miles of temporary road decommissioned in Fiscal Year
No temporary road construction in CFLRA project area in FY 10	N/A

**10. Describe any reasons that the annual report does not reflect your work plan. Did you face any unexpected challenges this year that caused you to change what was outlined in your proposal?**

Uncertainties in program direction and funding are the biggest challenges faced by the Selway Middle-Fork CFLRA team. The continuing resolution and uncertainty surrounding if and when CFLR funds will be made available has been problematic for program managers to build their FY 11 program of work around. Without CFLR funds, much of the work programmed in the proposal will not be able to be accomplished as planned in the proposal.

Initial direction regarding matching funds provided in the proposal call letter and in the question and answer section of the ecological restoration website changed following project selection. This led to a reduction in funds that the forest was able to show for a match.

Uncertainty documenting the estimated forest product value is problematic to developing outyear budget estimations and CFLR funding requests. Clarification is needed in order to maximize the utilization of small diameter material and create corresponding markets.