

# **Appropriations Issue Paper:**

## **A National Approach towards Comprehensive Restoration and Stewardship**

It is time for the US Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to prioritize comprehensive restoration and long-term stewardship. The agencies need to change how they conduct business to create sustainable connections between rural people, the economy, and land.

Every year agency budgets direct billions of dollars to address all too familiar emergency situations such as uncharacteristically severe wildfire, insect and disease outbreaks, and soil erosion that threaten water supplies and fisheries while still failing to address underlying restoration needs. Rural communities face these environmental challenges while they struggle to create and maintain educational opportunity, local employment, access to health care and safe, affordable housing.

Increased federal investment paired with meaningful measures of accountability, focusing on comprehensive restoration and long-term stewardship, is an opportunity to:

- 1) improve environmental conditions,
- 2) enable cooperation between land management agencies, private land owners, and communities,
- 3) create and retain a rural workforce and business infrastructure necessary to accomplish land management goals, and
- 4) develop renewable energy technologies and reduce our nations global warming contributions.

### **Insufficient Investments**

Together, the Department of the Interior and Department of Agriculture control 96% of federally owned land nationwide.<sup>1</sup> Funding for programs in the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management that support comprehensive restoration and

<sup>1</sup> From "Overview of the United States Government's Owned and Leased Real Property: Federal Real Property Profile as of September 30, 2004," published by the General Services Administration.

### **Key Recommendations**

1. Create budget line items for comprehensive restoration and stewardship and collaboration.
2. Restructure agency allocation and accountability systems.
3. Establish and fund a capacity building program for rural communities and businesses.
4. Support reauthorization of county payments.

stewardship declined steadily over the last several years. The impact of these declines is especially severe in on-the-ground restoration and incentive/assistance programs for adjacent private landowners and communities. Recent cuts eliminated programs that stimulate business innovation and rural green collar job creation<sup>2</sup> in the Forest Service and the Department of Interior (FS -Economic Action Program (EAP) and BLM-Jobs-in-the Woods programs).

People living and working in communities adjacent to public lands provide many vital assets such as: a skilled labor pool; technical and historical knowledge of the land and its management history; businesses that purchase and add value to forest products; and an ability to leverage private sector funds. Local businesses also provide restoration services, treat noxious weeds, and perform other stewardship activities. Many of these rural communities, however, have experienced significant economic and social disruption over the last two decades and have yet to find opportunities that would result in quality jobs for local workers and bolster their economy. Without rural enterprises and workers we will not be able to restore or

<sup>2</sup> Green collar jobs are defined as jobs that help improve the environment. Although recent attention in the media and Congress has focused largely on urban green collar jobs; RVCC maintains that green collar jobs in rural areas can and should be a vital part of economic development in communities adjacent to public lands and that the development of these jobs will compliment and contribute to land management agency missions.

### **Who We Are**

The Rural Voices for Conservation Coalition is comprised of western rural and local, regional, and national organizations that have joined together to promote balanced conservation-based approaches to the ecological and economic problems facing the West. We are committed to finding and promoting solutions through collaborative, place-based work that recognizes the inextricable link between the long-term health of the land and well being of rural communities. We come from California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, New Mexico, Montana, Arizona and Colorado.

steward our public or private lands in an ecologically appropriate or cost effective manner. We need to invest in retaining and building the capacity of rural communities and workers to implement restoration and stewardship activities, as well as build local capacity to utilize material that is removed during these restorative treatments. Along with investments, comprehensive reform of the Forest Service budget structure, allocations and accountability systems are also urgently needed.

## Current Challenges

### *I. Outdated Budget Line-Item Systems<sup>3</sup>*

The Forest Service budget has many challenges, including:

- 1) The line-item structure is outdated and stove-pipes activities that should be integrated to achieve landscape scale restoration and stewardship objectives, leading to inefficiencies in administrative procedures and difficulty linking expenditures to outcomes.
- 2) There is a lack of adequate funding, accountability and performance measures for agencies to engage in collaboration and partnership<sup>4</sup> (and therefore to leverage private dollars), including funding for collaboration with adjacent private lands, and development and implementation of Community Wildfire Protection Plans.
- 3) There is a lack of direction and adequate funding to conduct project level monitoring and performance measurement.
- 4) The outdated operating structure focuses too narrowly on the timber sale program as the only link between the Forest Service and economic development failing to capture new opportunities provided by restoration and maintenance tasks, value added wood products sourced from small diameter material, bio-fuels and renewable energy, and non-timber forest products.

### *II. Ineffective Allocation and Accountability Structures*

Current allocation processes lack transparent decision-making structures, criteria tied to restoration and stewardship goals, and concentrate too heavily on old target models tied to outputs, such as timber volume. Further, agency budget structures, allocation systems, and performance measures, as well as contracting mechanisms, fail to recognize the interdependence between environmental, economic, and social conditions. Without clear

<sup>3</sup> Budget structure concerns discussed here relate only to the USFS. Our investigations indicate that DOI- BLM does not seem to experience the same difficulties in achieving allocations for project level restoration and stewardship.

<sup>4</sup> As required under the Executive Order on Cooperative Conservation and accompanying memorandum, and called for under the Healthy Forest Restoration Act and Stewardship Contracting authorities.

## Principles for Effective Change

RVCC believes there are four core principles that should guide change in the land management agencies. These are:

- 1) Adopt and prioritize landscape scale approaches to restoration and long-term stewardship;
- 2) Invest in and commit to collaboration between diverse stakeholders and land management agencies;
- 3) Focus on long-term environmental, social, and economic outcomes, not just outputs; and
- 4) Build and maintain the capacity of rural communities, workers, and businesses that work on public lands.

commitment, direction, and authority to the agency to design their program of work and budgets to accomplish interdependent goals of healthy forests and healthy communities, our nation will continue to make slow, inefficient progress in taking care of our public lands. Consideration of the agencies' impact on local economies should be integrated into the criteria used to disperse appropriated funds to the field, encouraging them to contribute to the development of a local workforce and enterprises that support comprehensive restoration and stewardship.

### *III. Lack of direct investment in community capacity*

Current Forest Service budgets and programs fail to support people living and working in communities adjacent to public lands in two significant ways: 1) There are insufficient programs or funds available to assist communities in developing their physical, financial, or human capital to perform restoration and stewardship work; and 2) Pressure on the agency to accomplish work at the lowest possible cost shortchanges the quality of work and the safety of workers.

## Recommendations

We need a national mandate from Congress and the Administration, together and across party boundaries, to commit funding and realign budget, allocation, and accountability systems for the federal land management agencies to accomplish comprehensive restoration and long-term stewardship. The components of this national mandate are:

### *I. Create effective budget line items*

- 1) *Establish a Comprehensive Restoration and Long-Term Stewardship line item* within the National Forest System, Forest Service Budget and consolidate funds used to

accomplish on-the-ground work into this line item. This will provide a clear source of integrated funding focused on comprehensive restoration and long-term stewardship of public lands. This line item should be tied to accountability measures including specific funding for on-the-ground and multiparty monitoring activities (including effectiveness monitoring).

- 2) *Establish a new Collaboration line item* within the Forest Service and the BLM that would provide clear funding to support both agency involvement in collaboration and non-governmental involvement in participatory planning and community collaboration; including community based hazardous fuels reduction programs and Community Wildfire Protection Plans.

**II. Restructure allocation and accountability systems** to monitor integrated, long-term outcomes on the degree to which agencies improve and maintain healthy functioning watershed conditions; contribute to economic systems that support their mission to the maximum extent possible; work collaboratively with rural communities, interest groups, tribes and local and state government, and; monitor the ecological impacts and economic benefits of forest restoration and long-term stewardship projects over time and ensure monitoring contributes to adaptive management approaches.

Congressional guidance and oversight should focus on:

- 1) Establishing consistent allocation criteria at the national and regional levels to guide funding decisions.
- 2) Requiring the agencies to measure and report outcome-oriented measures consistent with the allocation criteria.
- 3) Ensuring availability and maintenance of reliable, publicly accessible datasets to support these measurements.
- 3) Requiring the development of performance measures that measure the effectiveness and benefit of restoration work and assistance provided to low capacity communities.
- 4) Ensuring funding used for allocation system improvements is not diverted from ground-level projects.

**III. Establish and fund a distinct capacity building program** within the Forest Service and the BLM for technical assistance, grants and loans to support communities and natural resource based-businesses involved in restoration and long-term stewardship.

Now is the time for the Administration and Congress to work together to reinvigorate the land management agencies to enable them to effectively partner to achieve the best ecological conditions on the land and economic outcomes for rural communities, workers, and businesses.

### **Benefits of a Comprehensive Approach**

A commitment to comprehensive restoration and long-term stewardship will:

1. make communities and lands more fire and pest-resilient,
2. decrease suppression costs, thereby alleviating budget pressures,
3. increase economic vitality and self-sufficiency in rural communities,
4. contribute to ecosystem service values, such as sequestering carbon dioxide to mitigate the effects of climate change, and
5. contribute to new, cleaner energy systems.

## **Land Management Agency Budgets: Fiscal Year 2009 Priorities**

The President's proposed FY2009 Budget<sup>1</sup> lacks a commitment to restore and maintain the health and function of our nation's forestlands. Investing in comprehensive restoration and long-term stewardship will reduce wildfire suppression costs, stimulate rural economies, and contribute to ecosystem service values such as water system improvements and mitigating the effects of climate change. Across the U.S. public and private lands and neighboring communities, particularly in the West, face serious threats from uncharacteristically severe wildfire and insect and disease outbreaks. These conditions are caused by decades of under-investment, lack of priorities, short-sighted management decisions, and climate change. The longer these problems stand unaddressed, the more extenuating and costly the problems become. The President's proposed 18% cut in the discretionary budget for the Forest Service, if enacted, will exacerbate these existing problems and increase costs over the long-term.

### **Recommendations:**

- 1) Provide permanent authorization for the Forest Service to provide technical assistance and grants to rural communities for sustainable development purposes. Currently, programs under the National Forest System lack authority to fully partner with nongovernmental stakeholders and private landowners, even when these partnerships strengthen cross-boundary restoration efforts, landscape-scale planning and monitoring, and sustainable economic development (only State and Private Forestry programs have these permanent authorities). In lean budgetary times the ability to leverage funds is even more important. This fix requires inserting the words "and grants" in the language in the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations bill's General Provisions that authorize the agency to provide technical assistance to rural communities. Additionally, the new language (to restrict spending in this section) proposed in the President's FY2009 budget should be rejected.
- 2) Restore funding to critical restoration line items such as Wildlife and Fisheries Management, Vegetation and Watershed Management, and Roads and Trails.

<sup>1</sup> This paper addresses the Forest Service budget generally, and particular aspects of the DOI – BLM budget.

### **Reauthorize County Payments**

We support a long-term solution and permanent authorization for the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act. The payments under this successful program support rural schools and roads, collaborative restoration, and serve as one of the only sources of federal funds for assessment of high-risk communities and implementation of priority hazardous fuels reduction projects on public lands.

The President's '09 budget proposes more than a 25 % cumulative reduction for these line items from 2001 funding levels<sup>2</sup>. These line items address the current ecological crises on public lands. Integrated, long-term restoration and stewardship will reduce wildland fire suppression and insect and disease emergency costs by addressing the forest health issues that drive escalating costs.

- 3) Invest in Community Fire Assistance. The President's FY'09 budget cuts community fire assistance programs (in both the FS and DOI budgets) by 39% from 2001 funding levels<sup>3</sup> and proposes to eliminate language authorizing the use of Hazardous Fuels money on non-federal lands to restore landscapes and protect communities at risk. The federal government must continue to support communities in preparing and planning for wildland fire by taking the following actions:
  - A. Restore funding to Community Fire Assistance Programs. Community fire assistance programs help communities prepare for and reduce risk from wildfires through the collaborative development and implementation of community wildfire protection plans and programs such as Firewise that educate homeowners about making their property more resistant to fires, as well as provide training and equipment for local firefighters.

<sup>2</sup> Adjusted for inflation using 2008 Consumer Price Index estimates. FY2001 is used for comparative purposes for two reasons 1) it is the first year many of these line-items were established, thus making earlier trending difficult/impossible and 2) it is the first year of National Fire Plan implementation.

<sup>3</sup> Adjusted for inflation using 2008 Consumer Price Index estimates.

B. Restore authorization of the use Hazardous Fuels money on non-federal lands to protect communities. In the President's FY2009 Budget for the USDA Forest Service the \$15 million authorized for these purposes has been recommended for elimination; Congress should reject this proposal and retain this authorization.

- 4) Implement a solution to the mandated increase in wildfire suppression costs to eliminate impacts on the rest of the FS budget. Create a separate (or "partitioned") flexible suppression spending account for unanticipated large fire events for both the Forest Service and DOI. The partition should be based on large fires that escape initial attack -- the true cost-driver of suppression expenditures. Even with this partitioned account, the agencies' normal suppression budgets must remain robust, reflecting current suppression needs for the remainder of fires that are not "large events" and funds must be redistributed back into those agency programs that have been reduced severely because of increasing suppression costs. Funding for the partitioned account must not come out of current depleted agency budgets, so it should be designated as "emergency" funding. The partitioned account must be closely tied to appropriate sideboards, cost containment controls, line officer incentives and yearly Congressional reporting to ensure that the agencies continue momentum to streamline costs and better manage fire.

## For More Information

Maia Enzer  
Sustainable Northwest  
503-221-6911  
[menzer@sustainablenorthwest.org](mailto:menzer@sustainablenorthwest.org)

Wendy Gerlitz  
Sustainable Northwest  
503-449-0009  
[wgerlitz@nnfp.org](mailto:wgerlitz@nnfp.org)

Kathy Lynn  
Resource Innovations  
541-346-0687  
[kathy@uoregon.edu](mailto:kathy@uoregon.edu)

Learn more about the Rural Voices for Conservation Coalition:  
503-221-6911  
[issue@sustainablenorthwest.org](mailto:issue@sustainablenorthwest.org)  
[www.sustainablenorthwest.org/rvcc](http://www.sustainablenorthwest.org/rvcc)

## Coalition Partners

### *Arizona*

Forest Energy Corporation

### *California*

Alliance of Forest Workers and Harvesters  
Jefferson State Forest Products, LLC  
Sierra Forest Legacy  
Watershed Research and Training Center

### *Colorado*

Community Energy Systems, LLC

### *Montana*

Flathead Economic Policy Center  
Northwest Connections  
Swan Ecosystem Center  
Vander Meer's Wildland Conservation Services  
Watershed Consulting, LLC  
Wildlands CPR

### *New Mexico*

Center for Biological Diversity  
Forest Guild  
Gila WoodNet  
Restoration Technologies, LLC  
Santa Clara Woodworks  
SBS Wood Shavings

### *Oregon*

Applegate Partnership  
Central Oregon Intergovernmental Council  
Community Smallwood Solutions, LLC  
Ecosystem Workforce Program  
Grant County Judge and Commissioners  
Hells Canyon Preservation Council  
Institute for Culture and Ecology  
Klamath-Siskiyou Wildlands Center  
Lake County Resources Initiative  
Lomakatsi Restoration Project  
Oregon Trout  
Resource Innovations  
Siuslaw Institute, Inc.  
Sustainable Northwest  
Upstream 21  
Wallowa Resources

### *Idaho*

Framing Our Community  
Salmon Valley Stewardship

### *Washington*

Community Forestry Resources  
Conservation Northwest  
Gifford Pinchot Task Force  
Mt. Adams Resource Stewards  
Northeast Washington Forestry Coalition  
OCD/Methow Forest Resources  
Pinchot Partners  
ShoreBank Enterprise Cascadia

### *Washington, D.C.*

American Forests  
The Wilderness Society

# Appendix 1: Appropriations Recommendations Summary Table

(millions of dollars)

Budget Area	Expanded Budget Line Item	FY08 Enacted	FY09 President's Budget	FY09 CBF REQUEST <sup>1</sup>
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE - FOREST SERVICE				
State and Private Forestry (Forest Health Management)	Federal Lands	\$54.1	\$45	\$56.8 (+11.8)
	Cooperative Lands	\$44.5	\$10	\$46.7 (+36.7)
State and Private Forestry (Cooperative Fire Protection)	State Fire Assistance	\$32.6	\$25	\$34.2 (+9.2)
	Volunteer Fire Assistance	\$5.9	\$5	\$6.2 (+1.2)
State and Private Forestry (Cooperative Forestry)	Forest Stewardship	\$29.5	\$5	\$31 (+26)
	Economic Action Programs	\$4.2	0	\$40 (+40)
	Collaboration and Multiparty Monitoring <sup>2</sup>			\$20 (+20)
	Recreation, Wilderness and Heritage	\$262.6	\$237	\$275.7 (+38.7)
National Forest System	Wildlife & Fisheries Habitat Mgt.	\$132.4	\$117.6	\$139 (+21.4)
	Vegetation & Watershed Mgt.	\$177.4	\$165.3	\$186.3 (+21)
	Hazardous Fuels	\$301.1	\$297	\$316.2 (+19.2)
Wildland Fire Management	Rehabilitation & Restoration	\$10.8	\$0	\$11.3 (+11.3)
	Forest Health Mgt – Federal Lands	\$14	\$14.3	\$14.3 (=)
Wildland Fire Management (State & Private Forestry)	Forest Health Mgt – Coop Lands	\$9.9	\$10	\$10 (=)
	State Fire Assistance	\$48	\$35	\$50.4 (+15.4)
	Volunteer Fire Assistance	\$7.9	\$8	\$8 (=)
Capital Improvement & Maintenance	Roads	\$227.9	\$227	\$239.3 (+12.3)
	Trails	\$76.4	\$50	\$80.2 (+30.2)
Permanent Appropriations	SCS Payments to States	\$428.1	\$88.1	\$481.1 (+340)

Budget Area	Expanded Budget Line Item	FY08 Enacted	FY09 President's Budget	FY09 CBF REQUEST <sup>1</sup>
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE - NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE				
Resource Conservation & Develop.		\$51	\$0	\$51 (+51)
Farm Bill	Envirn. Quality Incentives Program	\$1000	\$1050	\$1050 (=)
	Wetland Reserve Program	\$455	\$181	\$478 (+297)
	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program	\$85	\$ <sup>-3</sup>	\$89.3 (NA)
	Farm & Ranch Land Protection Program	\$73	\$97	\$97 (=)
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR - BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT				
Wildland Fire Management <sup>4</sup>	Hazardous Fuels Reduction	\$199.6	\$202.8	\$209.6 (+6.8)
	Rural Fire Assistance	\$5.9	\$0	\$6.2 (+6.2)
	Burned Area Rehabilitation	\$24.2	\$24.3	\$25.4 (+1.1)
	Riparian Management	\$22.9	\$22.7	\$24 (+1.3)
	Wildlife Management	\$30.7	\$31.4	\$32.2 (+0.8)
	Fisheries Management	\$13.6	\$12.3	\$14.3 (+2)
Management of Land & Resources	Resource Management & Planning	\$47.5	\$43.4	\$49.9 (+6.5)
	Challenge Cost Share Program	\$9.3	\$9.2	\$9.2 (=)
Healthy Lands Initiative		\$4.9	\$14.9	\$14.9 (=)
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR - FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE				
Resource Management	Fish & Wildlife Management Program	\$100.9	\$97.2	\$100.9 (+13.7)
State & Tribal Wildlife Grants		\$73.8	\$73.8	\$77.5 (+3.7)

<sup>1</sup> This column represents the appropriations recommendations of RVCC, with changes from the President's FY09 budget in parenthesis.

<sup>2</sup> New (proposed) budget line item.

<sup>3</sup> Conservation activities that were in the 2002 Farm Bill, which expires at the end of fiscal year 2007, are subject to re-authorization in the 2007 Farm Bill. The 2008 budget includes \$157 million as a placeholder for these activities in the new Farm Bill. No amount specified for this line item.

<sup>4</sup> In FY09 the Wildland Fire Management budget is moved to the Office of the Secretary of Interior, Department-wide programs.

## Appendix 2: Linking Restoration Funding and Performance Measures

RVCC Goals	Related Forest Service Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives	Line Item	% Change in FY09 Pres. Budget	Existing Performance Measures <sup>4</sup>	Potential Performance Measures
<p><b>Goal 1.</b>  <b>Increase collaboration among public land communities and federal agencies.</b></p> <p><i>Objective:</i> Increase working relationships and accomplishments between agencies and public lands communities through effective collaboration so that both can actively participate in restoring and/or maintaining forest and watershed condition across ownership boundaries.</p>	<p><b>Goal 1.</b>                      Restore, sustain, and enhance the Nation's forests and grasslands</p>			<p>1.3.a % of acres treated in the WUI that have been identified in the CWPPs or equivalent plans (FSSP)</p>	<p>Number of restoration projects (on Federal and adjacent non-federal lands) implemented annually by the Forest Service and BLM based on the priorities in a community-based collaborative plan as compared to the total number of projects implemented by the forest or district.</p> <p>Number of restoration projects completed and percent completed through a collaborative process.</p> <p>Number and percentage of projects that “met rural community needs” as defined by the local collaborative group.</p> <p>Percent of community based wildfire and restoration plans that result in funding for implementation or projects implemented on federal and adjacent non-federal lands.</p> <p>Amount of federal and non-federal funds and in-kind contributions used to implement collaborative restoration or wildfire protection projects contained in community-based plans.</p> <p>Number and percent of commendations for agency personnel working collaboratively with communities.</p> <p>Percentage of agency personnel involved in collaborative/partnership work who are promoted in place.</p>

<sup>4</sup> Existing measures from FS Strategic Plan (FSSP) and PART

RVCC Goals	Related Forest Service Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives	Line Item	% Change in FY09 Pres. Budget	FS Strategic Plan (FSSP) PM and PART Measures	Potential Performance Measure
<p><b>Goal 2. Build and maintain capacity in public lands communities.</b></p> <p><i>Objective:</i> Build and maintain healthy economies in public lands communities, including strong, local natural resource-based businesses with a reliable/consistent supply of work and forest goods/services.</p>	<p><b>Goal 1.</b> Restore, sustain, and enhance the Nation's forests and grasslands</p> <p><b>Goal 2.</b> Provide and Sustain Benefits to the American People</p> <p><b>Obj. 2.1</b> Provide a reliable supply of forest products over time that is consistent with achieving desired conditions on NFS lands and helps maintain or create processing capacity and infrastructure in local communities.</p>	<p><b>Wildland Fire Management</b> Haz Fuels - Biomass language</p>	<p>= (\$5 million)</p>	<p>2.1.a Amount of wood fiber provided annually (FSSP)</p> <p>2.1.b # of green tons and/or volume of woody biomass from haz fuels (FSSP)</p>	<p>Amount of small diameter material, including biomass, and value-added products processed locally (as percent of total amount).</p> <p>Dollars invested (infrastructure investments, technical assistance, grants, etc.) in public lands communities for development of biomass utilization and local energy projects.</p> <p>Number of processing facilities utilizing wood products.</p> <p>Number of jobs/businesses created or supported utilizing forest products.</p> <p>Percentage of service and stewardship contracts that included non-monetary best value criteria and that these criteria are equal or more important than prices</p> <p>Number and percentage of contracts that were collaboratively reviewed by the Department of Labor and Forest Service for labor law compliance.</p> <p>Percentage of service and stewardship contracts that are awarded to local communities.</p> <p>Number and percentage of contracts awarded to local contractors and/or subcontractors</p> <p>% increase in the number of local contracts awarded and the number of high-skill, high wage jobs created and retained.</p> <p>Percent of NFS/SPF budget spent on financial and technical assistance to public lands communities, percent of those communities that are low capacity.</p> <p>Number and amount of business or community support grants awarded; percent of those communities that are low capacity.</p> <p>Number and percent of projects that included structured training of workers.</p>

RVCC Goals	Related Forest Service Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives	Line Item	% Change in FY09 Pres. Budget	FS Strategic Plan (FSSP) PM and PART Measures	Potential Performance Measure
<p><b>Goal 3. Improve forest and watershed condition.</b></p> <p><i>Objective:</i> Restore and maintain forests and watersheds to fully functioning conditions across ownership boundaries. Restoration and maintenance of public lands is a primary goal of the federal land management agencies.</p>	<p><b>Goal 1.</b> Restore, sustain, and enhance the Nation's forests and grasslands</p>	<p>NFS Vegetation &amp; Watershed Management</p> <p>NFS Wildlife and Fisheries Habitat</p> <p>SP&amp;F Forest Health Mgt – Fed Lands</p> <p>SP&amp;F Forest Health Mgt – Coop Lands</p> <p>SP&amp;F Coop Forestry – Forest Stewardship</p> <p>Capital Improvements Maintenance Roads</p>	<p>7% ▼</p> <p>11% ▼</p> <p>17% ▼</p> <p>78% ▼</p> <p>83% ▼</p> <p>=</p>	<p>1.5.a % of watershed in class 1 condition (FSSP)</p> <p>Acres of watershed improvement (PART)</p> <p>1.4.a % of priority acres restored and/or protected from invasive species on Federal lands and cooperative program lands (FSSP)</p> <p>Acres of non-industrial private forest land under approved stewardship mgmt plans (PART)</p>	<p>Percent of budget expended on projects that improve watershed condition.</p> <p>Number of projects that cross land tenure (public/private).</p> <p>Percent of stewardship contracts that include inventory and treatment of invasive species.</p> <p>Number and percentage of project that addressed multiple ecosystem needs.</p> <p>Acres or stream miles restored through road decommissioning.</p> <p>Percent of budget expended on road maintenance, upgrades and decommissioning projects.</p> <p>Percent of stewardship contracts that include road decommissioning and number of miles included.</p>

RVCC Goals	Related Forest Service Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives	Line Item	% Change in FY09 Pres. Budget	FS Strategic Plan (FSSP) PM and PART Measures	Potential Performance Measure
<p><b>Goal 4. Reduce risk from catastrophic wildfire.</b></p> <p><i>Objective:</i> Increase opportunities for agencies and public lands communities, including low capacity communities, to work together in reducing hazardous fuels. Ensure that public lands communities receive fire protection and preparedness assistance, especially those communities at highest risk.</p>	<p>Goal 1. Restore, sustain, and enhance the Nation's forests and grasslands</p>	<p><b>Wildland Fire Mgmt</b> Hazardous Fuels</p>	<p>1% ▼</p>	<p>1.1.a # and % of acres treated to restore fire-adapted ecosystems 1) moved toward desired conditions (# and %); and 2) maintained in desired condition (# and %) (FSSP)</p>	<p>Number and percent of acres treated, using a scientifically credible baseline that incorporates local knowledge, which are moved toward or maintained in a desired fire adapted condition.</p>
	<p>Obj. 1.1 Reduce the risk to communities and natural resources from wildfire</p>	<p><b>Wildland Fire Management</b> Rehabilitation and Restoration</p>	<p>100% ▼</p>	<p>% of total NFS land base for which fire risk is reduced through movement to a better condition class (PART)</p>	<p>Dollar value of contracts awarded to local businesses and workers.</p>
	<p>Obj. 1.2 Suppress wildfires efficiently and effectively</p>	<p><b>SP&amp;F</b> Forest Health Mgt – Fed Lands</p>	<p>=</p>	<p>Total acres treated in the WUI and non-WUI and acres treated for other veg mgmt activities that achieved fire objectives as a secondary benefit. PART</p>	<p>Number of jobs created for local businesses and workers.</p>
	<p>Obj. 1.3 Build community capacity to suppress and reduce losses from wildfire</p>	<p><b>SP&amp;F</b> Forest Health Mgt – Coop Lands</p>	<p>=</p>	<p>1.3.a % of acres treated in the WUI that have been identified in CWPPs or equivalent plans (FSSP)</p>	<p>Percent of fuels reduction work that is conducted using stewardship contracting.</p>
		<p><b>SP&amp;F</b> SEA</p>	<p>17% ▼</p>		<p>Number and percent of projects involving hazardous fuels reduction prioritized in a collaborative planning process as defined in the WGA 10-year implementation strategy.</p>
		<p><b>SP&amp;F</b> VFA</p>	<p>15% ▼</p>		<p>Percent of national, state, regional, and local wildfire risk assessments that identify low capacity communities.</p>