CFLR Project(Name/Number): Longleaf Pine Ecosystem Restoration & Hazardous Fuel Reduction _____HPRP03_____

National Forest(s): _National Forest of Mississippi, De Soto National Forest, De Soto Ranger District_

Responses to the prompts on this annual report should be typed directly into this template, including narratives and tables:

1. **Match and Leverage funds:**
   a. **FY12 Matching Funds Documentation**

Fund Source	**Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2012($)**
CFLR Funds Expended[1]	$0 *Our project funding was not CFLR.*
Carryover funds expended[2] (please include a new row for each BLI)	$2,084,134
HPHF03	$1,074,882
HPVW03	$221,577
HPWF03	$98,873
HPTM03	$275,713
HPK203	$116,000
HPLG03	$119,407
HPRD03	$112,155
HPKV03	$65,527
FS Matching Funds (please include a new row for each BLI)[3]	$2,084,134
WFHF	$1,074,883
NFVW	$221,578
NFWF	$98,873
NFTM	$275,713
CWK2	$116,000
CMLG	$119,406
CMRD	$112,155
CWKV	$65,526
Funds contributed through agreements[4]	$0 *This will increase in FY2013 through Challenge Cost Share Agreements.*
Partner In-Kind Contributions[5]	$1,317,947
Service work accomplishment through goods-for services funding	$0

[1] 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.
[2] This value should reflect the amount of carryover funds allocated to a project as indicated in the program direction, but does not necessarily need to be in the same BLIs as indicated in the program direction. These funds should total the matching funds obligated in the PAS report tited Listing and Expenditure Report – Detailed Analysis by Fiscal Year minus the below matching funds.
[3] 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 minus the above carryover/HPRP funds.
[4] 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.
[5] 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.

Fund Source	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2012($)
within a stewardship contract[6]	*Our stewardship contracting will provide accomplishments in FY2013 and beyond.*

b. Please provide a narrative or table describing leveraged funds in your landscape in FY2012 (one page maximum)

FY 2012 CFLRP LEVERAGED FUNDS

ORGANIZATION	ACTIVITY	ACRES	FUNDS LEVERAGED
MS Forestry Commission	Hazardous Fuel Reduction	5895	$176,940
MS Forestry Commission	SPB Thinning (public lands)	2302	$103,590
Camp Shelby/ DOD	LL Pine Restoration	322	$33,000
Camp Shelby /DOD	SPB Thinning	175	$7,875
Camp Shelby /DOD	Hazardous Fuel Reduction	720	$52,000
Camp Shelby /DOD	TSI, Release of LL Pine	342	$70,110
Camp Shelby /DOD	NNIS	32	$42,820
NRCS	LL Pine Restoration (Private Lands)	1470	$661,500
NFWF	Plant LL Pine Private Land	1180	$150,000
NFWF & TNC	RX Burn and Plant LL Pine	850	$90,744
Totals*		13,288	$1,388,579

***This is the actual acres & dollars accomplished on private and state lands by our partners for funds LEVERAGED.**

PARTNERSHIP MATCH

ORGANIZATION	ACTIVITY	ACRES	FUNDS Partner Match
Camp Shelby/DOD	Hazardous Fuel Reduction	7000	$170,000
Camp Shelby/DOD	Feral Pig Eradication	11,000	$8,300
TNC (117,000 Special Use Permit with Camp Shelby)	Resource Monitoring	117,000	$195,000
TNC (117,000 Special Use Permit with Camp Shelby)	NNIS Eradication	58	$64,200
Camp Shelby/DOD	Watershed Restoration	10,000	$815,447
South MS EPA	NNIS Eradication	10	$16,000
HEF Climate Change	Resource Monitoring	52	$33,000
MDOT	NNIS Eradication	10	$16,000
Totals*		145,130	$1,317,947

***This is the actual acres & dollars accomplished on Forest Service lands by our partners for PARTNERSHIP MATCH.**

Approved by : /s/Ron Smith_____
District Ranger
Approved by : /s/Margrett L. Boley_____

[6] This should be the amount in the "stewardship credits charged" column at the end of the fiscal year in the TSA report TSA90R-01.

Forest Supervisor

2. **Discuss how the CLFR project contributes to accomplishment of the performance measures in the 10 year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan**[7], dated December 2006. Please comment on the cumulative contributions over the life of the project if appropriate. This may also include a description of the fire year (fire activity that occurred in the project area) as a backdrop to your response (please limit answer to one page).

Performance Measure	Units
Percent change from 10-year average for wildfires controlled during initial attack	+ 1% *10 yr. avg. = 99%* *2012 = 100%*
Percent change from 10 year average for number of unwanted human-caused wildfires	- 70% *10 yr. avg. = 83* *2012 = 25*
Percent of fires not contained in initial attack that exceed a stratified cost index	0
Number and percent of WUI acres treated that are identified in CWPPS or other application collaboratively developed plans	100% *All counties have CWPPs & we count all our burns as in WUI.*
Number and percent of non-WUI acres treated that are identified through collaboration consistent with the *Implementation Plan*	0 acres *All acres are considered to be in WUI.*
Number of acres treated per million dollars gross investment in WUI and non-WUI areas	----------
Percent of collaboratively identified high priority acres treated where fire management objectives are achieved as identified in applicable management plans or strategies	*100% Our collaborators rate our fire dependent systems high across the landscape with special emphasis on T&E areas and high density or high vehicle traffic areas.*
Number and percent of acres treated by prescribed fire, through collaboration consistent with the *Implementation Plan*.	50,612 acres, 100%
Number and percent of acres treated by mechanical thinning, through collaboration consistent with the *Implementation Plan*.	710 acres
Number of acres and percent of the natural ignitions that are allowed to burn under strategies that result in desired conditions	0 acres, 0%
Number and percent of acres treated to restore fire-adapted ecosystems which are moved toward desired conditions	43,020, 85%
Number and percent of acres treated to restore fire-adapted ecosystems which are maintained in desired conditions	7,592, 15%
Number and percent of burned acres identified in approved post-wildfire recovery plans as needing treatments that actually receive treatments	0 acres, 0%
Percent of burned acres treated for post-wildfire recovery that are trending towards desired conditions	0%

Current Conditions and the 10 Year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan

A thorough description of the FY 2012 fire year on De Soto Ranger District and summary of our varied methods of hazardous fuel reduction are provided in the response to question # 9.

[7] 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).

The De Soto CFLRP collaborative process is rooted in information sharing and transparency. Our long-term landscape level program of work is dedicated to restoring and maintaining the fire adapted longleaf pine ecosystem. This overall approach is directly in line with the *10 Year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan*. Goals of the 10 year plan relative to our activities are discussed below.

The HFRA EA, *Ecosystem Restoration for Gopher Tortoise and Red-cockaded Woodpecker Habitat on the De Soto National Forest, De Soto Ranger District,* is the basis for our landscape scale management and reflects the goals proposed in the *10 Year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan*. One hundred percent of our wildfires were controlled with initial attack, improving our 10 year average and ultimately providing increased safety for fire personnel and the public (Goal 1). Our thinning, prescribed burning, and other hazardous fuel reduction treatments (discussed in question 9) reduce the risk of wildfire to communities and to the environment (Goal 2). Restoring and maintaining the fire resilient and fire dependent Longleaf Pine ecosystem is being accomplished, acres listed above (Goal 3) and in the accomplishments table for FY 2012. Multiple resource objectives are accomplished during work on De Soto Ranger District. Hazardous fuel reduction is maintaining or improving the longleaf pine ecosystem, including habitat for Red-Cockaded Woodpeckers and the gopher tortoise. All of our surrounding counties have Community Wildfire Protection Plans to help reduce risk from wildland fire and 6,400 green tons of biomass were removed and processed for energy production (Goal 4).

3. What assumptions were used in generating the numbers and/or percentages you plugged into the TREAT tool?

The assumptions were based on information provided by the local timber industry and mills that process timber products from timber harvested from National Forest lands, the number of employees at each facility, and the estimated jobs and contracting opportunities for the private sector to implement the service work identified in the CFLR Proposal.

FY 2012 Jobs Created/Maintained (FY12 CFLR/CFLN/HPRP/Carryover funding only):

Type of projects	Direct part and full-time jobs	Total part and full-time jobs	Direct Labor Income	Total Labor Income[8]
Commercial Forest Product Activities	**39.9**	**89.3**	**$2,087,664**	**$3,683,297**
Other Project Activities	**47.2**	**57**	**$1,175,807**	**$1,510,670**
TOTALS:	**87.1**	**146.3**	**$3,263,472**	**$5,193,967**

FY 2012 Jobs Created/Maintained (FY12 CFLR/CFLN/HPRP/Carryover and matching funding):

[8] *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.*

Type of projects	Direct part and full-time jobs	Total part and full-time jobs	Direct Labor Income	Total Labor Income[9]
Commercial Forest Product Activities	56.9	98.3	$1,959,690	$4,054,394
Other Project Activities	46.2	59.5	$1,476,430	$1,922,547
TOTALS:	103.1	157.7	$3,436,120	$5,976,940

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

Benefits to communities across the landscape range from direct financial benefits and increased safety to the long-term health of natural systems and continued impacts of ecosystem services.

Contract Information

Of the $2.7 million appropriated to De Soto Ranger District for high priority accelerated ecosystem restoration, *over $2 million* went to job creation and the private sector workforce. The jobs created or maintained by the project in FY 2012 are mostly technical and manual labor positions utilized in new and existing contracts. Small and large businesses in our area have benefitted from the implementation of the project. Almost all contractors are based in south Mississippi. The table below contains contract information for major projects on De Soto Ranger District utilized for high priority accelerated ecosystem restoration implementation.

Contract Description	Funding Obligated or Spent in FY 2012	Contractor Location
T&E Habitat Improvement/Hazardous Fuels Reduction with Herbicide	$613,000	Mississippi
Silvicultural Contract Layout and Inspection	$25,000	Mississippi
Timber Sale Preparation	$101,000	Mississippi
Timber Sale Preparation	$90,000	Texas
Roadside NNIS Eradication (Cogongrass)	$100,000	Mississippi
Native Herbaceous Understory Seed Collection & Processing	$52,000	Louisiana
Road Decommissioning/Maintenance	$475,000	Mississippi
Pitcher Plant Bog Restoration	$150,000	Mississippi
Helicopter for Prescribed Burning	$409,000	Louisiana

Jobs include tree harvesting, tree planting, heavy machinery operation, timber sale layout, timber cruising, native herbaceous seed collection, and herbicide application. Also, local fuel, food service, equipment supply, and lodging vendors benefit from these contracts.

Local Agreements

[9] *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.*

Challenge Cost Share Agreements are in now place with the University of Southern Mississippi and Mississippi State University Extension Service. Students at these schools will work on monitoring projects for CFLRP and high priority accelerated ecosystem restoration activities. This project work will serve as on the job training and will provide students with valuable technical skills in addition to a small amount of income. These agreements total $32,000.

Local Markets

Approximately 51,200 tons of green wood was sold to local in markets in FY 2012.

Impact on the Landscape of South Mississippi

The De Soto Ranger District occupies a large portion of the landscape in south Mississippi. In addition to basic ecosystem services such as providing clean air, clean water, carbon sequestration, and nutrient cycling, specific impacts of high priority accelerated ecosystem restoration on the landscape and surrounding communities are noteworthy.

Activity	Result	Benefit on the Landscape
Re-establish (restore) Longleaf Pine	Increased Forest Health = Longleaf are less susceptible to wind events (hurricanes, tornados), disease, insects (SPB outbreaks), & fire	Provide for a large part of the landscape to be less susceptible to widespread damage from natural disasters and outbreaks (SPB). Also supply wood to local markets during restoration operations.
Hazardous Fuel Reduction (PXB, Thinning, Herbicide)	Safer Fuel Condition Class, Improved Smoke Management	Defensible WUI, Protection of Resources on and off the Forest. Supply wood to local markets via thinning.
Wildlife Habitat Improvement	Provide healthy habitat for a diversity of plants and animals	Forest provides natural systems for forage, cover, cache, and dens as these areas become less common on adjacent lands.
NNIS Treatment	Eradication or control of invasive pests	Help prevent the spread of these plants and animals to adjacent state and private lands where treatment and effects of NNIS prove costly.
Pitcher Plant Bog Restoration	Maintenance or reclamation of unique and sensitive ecosystems.	Provide habitat for a diversity of rare plant and animals species including many host plants and pollinators. Very few of these unique ecosystems are found on adjacent lands due to modification of the landscape.
Native Herbaceous Understory Seed Collection and Utilization	Local genetic representation for herbaceous species utilized on openings created from management activities in the Forest.	Provide a locally diverse herbaceous cover for project work. Integral to restoring the complete longleaf pine ecosystem for long-term benefits to the surrounding landscape.
Road Decommissioning	Less roads to maintain. More Forest Area available for wildlife and recreation.	Provide better/more remote recreational experiences on the Forest.

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

Background

Extensive collaboration with partners, other agencies, and the public was conducted during the process of completing our Healthy Forest Restoration Act EA for Longleaf Pine Ecosystem Restoration and Hazardous Fuels Reduction. This EA authorizes most of our CFLRP and high priority accelerated ecosystem restoration activities. Many of the same collaborators were involved in the CFLRP proposal process. Accountability is essential to continue to do the work on the landscape. We strongly value our relationship with our collaborators and provide open access to our projects at any phase of development or implementation. Some of these relationships and associated monitoring are discussed below.

The Nature Conservancy and Camp Shelby

The De Soto Ranger District and the Mississippi Army National Guard (a member of our collaborative team) have a long history of working together to ensure protection of the Forest on the 117,000 acres of land utilized under special use permit for training troops. Collaboration between agencies has provided valuable data on federally threatened and endangered species as well as Forest Service sensitive species on the De Soto Ranger District. The Nature Conservancy Camp Shelby Conservation Program provides rare species and habitat monitoring services for the Mississippi Army National Guard on Forest Service, Department of Defense and State of Mississippi lands included within the Camp Shelby Joint Forces Training Center boundaries. CFLRP and high priority accelerated ecosystem restoration activities in the form of prescribed burning, NNIS eradication, thinning, longleaf re-establishment, native herbaceous understory seed collection, and more occur on these special use permit areas of the Forest.

The Nature Conservancy monitoring focuses on the following species and their habitat: Louisiana quillwort (federally listed as endangered), gopher tortoise (federally listed as threatened), black pine snake (candidate for federal listing), Camp Shelby burrowing crayfish (lives in pitcher plant bogs - monitoring required as part of US Fish and Wildlife Service agreement to remove from candidate status), and cogongrass and kudzu (invasive species). This monitoring is funded by the Department of Defense National Guard Bureau and annual reports are provided to De Soto Ranger District. This is valuable information for assessing effects of treatments on a large portion of our landscape.

Forest Service Monitoring across the Landscape of De Soto Ranger District

The De Soto Ranger District monitors RCW populations on our Forest. We also collect and review annual bird point data. Every 5 years, a district wide gopher tortoise survey on gopher tortoise priority soils is conducted via contract. Louisiana quillwort surveys and monitoring are done annually to ensure habitat and populations are stable. We also collect data on fuel loading and fuel reduction associated with prescribed burning. A description of our overall management and treatment effectiveness on the landscape can be extrapolated when all of the data from partners, contractors, and Forest Service work are gathered and reviewed.

Challenge Cost Share Agreements

The University of Southern Mississippi (USM) and Mississippi State University Extension Service (MSU) have entered into Challenge Cost Share Agreements with the De Soto Ranger District. These agreements will utilize the skill and expertise of these nearby institutions to monitor and study the effects of specific restoration efforts identified in our CFLR Proposal. USM and MSU were part of the collaborative team for the De Soto CFLRP proposal and now play a greater role in monitoring effects on the landscape. The monitoring of CFLRP and high priority accelerated ecosystem restoration activities in these agreements has been designed to provide descriptive data for tracking and analyses of project effectiveness.

Finalization of the agreements and establishment of monitoring points was delayed in 2012 because of the budget process, but beginning in December 2012, MSU and the USM will collect data from shared monitoring points on De Soto Ranger District. These monitoring points are in areas planned for or currently experiencing CFLRP and high priority accelerated ecosystem restoration activities. MSU will collect soil samples to conduct and provide analyses for organic matter, total nitrogen, extractable phosphorus, pH, moisture content, particle size, and other parameters requested by the Forest Service as the project progresses.

USM will collect and analyze data from monitoring sites with regard to vegetation structure and composition including but not limited to species identification, species diversity, species richness, canopy cover, litter type and depth, stem counts, and herbaceous understory cover. Photo points are also utilized as part of the monitoring process.

Results of this monitoring will be used to support or modify current and future treatments on the landscape based on observable changes through the longleaf ecosystem restoration process and associated hazardous fuel reduction.

Air Quality

Ozone monitoring was conducted in FY 2012 by a Forest Service Air Specialist. We have not received the results yet.

Local Sources of Technical Information

The Southern Research Station and Harrison Experimental Forest are conducting research related to Longleaf Pine Restoration, Carbon Sequestration, and Long Term Climate Change. The De Soto has facilitated timber sales, site preparations, and reforestation efforts for this project. Although these studies are not specifically monitoring our restoration efforts, the information provided from these local studies may inform decision making and management on De Soto Ranger District. This type of expertise is beneficial to have on our Forest.

6. FY 2012 accomplishments

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished [10]	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)[11]
Acres treated annually to sustain or restore watershed function and resilience	Acres	281	$287,000	CMRD & CMLG
Acres of forest vegetation established	Acres	0	N/A	N/A
Acres of forest vegetation improved	Acres	0	N/A	N/A
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants	Acre	150	$100,000 $50,000	NFXF HPVW
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands	Acres	0	N/A	N/A
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions.	Acres	0*	N/A	N/A (*We are showing 79 acres in FACTS data base, not sure why PAS did not pick it up.)
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced	Acres	0	N/A	N/A
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced	Miles	3	$13,000	NFVW
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced	Acres	86,851	$1,121,555	HPVW & HPHF
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved	Acres	0*	N/A	N/A (*We are showing 800 acres of Range in FACTS data base, not sure why PAS did not pick it up.)
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance	Miles	51.5	$73,760	CMRD
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance	Miles	58	$138,300	CMRD(*We are showing 150 miles of passenger car system roads maintained)
Miles of road decommissioned	Miles	6.5 & 109.5	$287,000	CMRD (17%) & CMLG (83%)
Miles of passenger car system roads improved	Miles	0	N/A	N/A
Miles of high clearance system road improved	Miles	0	N/A	N/A
Number of stream crossings constructed or	Number	0	N/A	N/A

[10] Units accomplished should match the accomplishments recorded in the Databases of Record.

[11] 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 [10]	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)[11]
reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage				
Miles of system trail maintained to standard	Miles	0*	N/A	(*We reported 110 miles to trail maintenance)
Miles of system trail improved to standard	Miles	0*	N/A	CFTL(*We reported 5 miles of trails improved)
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard	Miles	0	N/A	N/A
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales	Acres	851 & 295	$70,400	NFTM & SPFH
Volume of timber sold (CCF)	CCF	6,246*	$140,000	NFTM & HPTM(*We reported 10,099 CCF as CFLR volume sold)
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production	Green tons	178.4	$28,000	NFTM
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire	Acre	261 *All acres considered to be in WUI*	N/A	N/A
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire	Acres	51,442	$1,518,360	WFHF
Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands	Acres	0	N/A	N/A
Number of priority acres treated annually for native pests on Federal lands	Acres	0	N/A	N/A

7. **FY 2012 accomplishment narrative** (summarize key accomplishments and evaluate project progress) (please limit answer to three pages).

Despite receiving the budget very late in the year and despite the poor weather conditions during our burning season, we were able to accomplish quality work on the ground. Accomplishment numbers are provided in the table above.

What we are most proud of is the ability to work together and the ability to do good work on the land. De Soto Ranger District personnel work very well across disciplines and strive for integrated target accomplishments. The integration of hazardous fuel reduction and wildlife habitat improvement into our ecosystem restoration framework is a great example of getting more bang for the buck. Another by-

product of that type of integration is a safer WUI areas and less danger for wildland firefighters. In another practical example, integration occurs (but not always allowed to be counted) via treatment of NNIS plants such as cogongrass, an extremely volatile fuel. Treating this NNIS reduces hazardous fuels and provides for increased forest health and improved safety across the Forest and surrounding landscape.

This was our first year utilizing high priority accelerated ecosystem restoration funding. We accomplished work on much of our landscape and look forward to continuing high priority accelerated ecosystem restoration. The numbers speak well of where we are and where we are going.

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?[12]

Fiscal Year	Total number of acres treated (treatment footprint)
FY12	109,746 (Actual Acres Treated)
FY10, FY11, and FY12	

9. **In no more than two pages (large landscapes or very active fire seasons may need more space), describe other relevant fire management activities within the project area** (hazardous fuel treatments are already documented in Question #6):

Prescribed fire management activities on the De Soto ranger District during the 2012 fiscal year were hindered due to an unusually wet winter. January and February are typically very productive months for prescribed fire on the De Soto. During those two months in 2012, only 8 burn days were available due to wet weather and fog.

Even though a wet winter reduced the total number of acres accomplished, the spring weather allowed us to accomplish over 23,000 acres of growing season burning (46% of our total acres). The effectiveness of these warm season burns are often much greater in terms of restoring and maintaining the longleaf pine ecosystem. A total of 50,612 acres were burned in FY 2012.

Also, due to the wet weather, wildfire occurrence on the De Soto was at a 10 year low having only 25 wildfires. However, these wildfires burned 1,182 acres of Forest Service lands with the majority of these acres burned resulting in desirable outcomes by reducing fuel loads, maintaining longleaf pine ecosystem structure, or changing the landscape towards a longleaf pine favorable condition. These fires were in the CFLRP project area and met fuel reduction objectives already identified in approved NEPA documents.

In addition to prescribed fire and wildfire, 14,571 acres of mechanical treatments, and herbicide treatments were completed within the project area. Mechanical treatments included 8,079 acres of

[12] 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.

forestry brush-hogging/mastication, which targeted areas of high fire occurrence, fire dependent threatened and endangered species such as red-cockaded woodpecker colonies, and road corridors utilized for effective prescribed fire and wildfire breaks. Another 436 acres of fireline preparation was accomplished, by dozers, in dense, hazardous vegetation, in wildland-urban interface areas.

A more unique method was utilized to accomplish 5,471 acres of hazardous fuel reduction. The careful application of herbicides in this lower coastal plain southern rough fuel type has proven to be effective in the long term reduction of hazardous fuels. This treatment also benefits many fire dependent threatened and endangered species, reduces smoke produced from volatile live fuels during prescribed burns, and quickly changes the composition of the understory from brush to a more natural grass and herbaceous state. All of these treatments specifically targeted hazardous fuels and provide for more efficient prescribed fire treatments in the future of the project.

10. **Describe any reasons that the FY 2012 annual report does not reflect your project proposal, previously reported planned accomplishments, or 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 2012 annual report reflects accomplishments very similar to what was planned in our project proposal. The De Soto Ranger District has had NEPA in place to conduct landscape scale work since 2008. We have been doing what we can do across the landscape with our budget every year. We are now utilizing the opportunity to conduct our regular program of work at an accelerated pace.
Prescribed burning has been our main tool for landscape scale work for the past decade and we've accomplished over 100,000 acres of annual prescribed burning on several occasions. An aggressive NNIS eradication program, successful RCW population growth, increased gopher tortoise habitat improvement work, pitcher plant bog restoration, and excellent relationships with our partners and the public have been integral to our success. The timber shop is finally starting to rebound from Hurricane Katrina and the retirements that followed shortly thereafter. We have more personnel in place to make things happen, but we're still striving to become fully staffed. With the resurgence of our timber program, now utilized for longleaf pine re-establishment along with thinning, our ecosystem restoration efforts will continue to accelerate.

The biggest challenge to accomplishing work was receiving the budget so late in FY 2012. Also, year-end procurement deadlines made it challenging to obligate all of the funds, but we did it via contracts already in place for work on the landscape. Major contract types and funding utilized are listed in question #4.

11. Planned FY 2014 Accomplishments

Performance Measure Code[13]	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment	Amount ($)
Acres treated annually to sustain or restore watershed function and resilience	Acres	60	$60,000
Acres of forest vegetation established	Acres	1,000	$500,000
Acres of forest vegetation improved	Acres	100,000	Integrated
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants	Acre	75	$75,000
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	79	$79,000
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced	Acres		
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced	Miles	13	$13,000
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced	Acres	100,000	Integrated
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved	Acres	800	$24,000
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance	Miles	80	$80,000
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance	Miles	150	$150,000
Miles of road decommissioned	Miles	25	$50,000
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	----------	----------
Miles of system trail maintained to standard	Miles	100	$27,500

[13] Please include all relevant planned accomplishments, assuming that funding specified in the CFLRP project proposal for FY 2014 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 13 of this template.

Performance Measure Code[13]	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment	Amount ($)
Miles of system trail improved to standard	Miles		
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard	Miles	100	$100,000
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales	Acres	4,000	$250,000
Volume of timber sold (CCF)	CCF	30,000	$420,000
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production	Green tons	9,000	$54,000
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	100,000	$3,000,000
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	----------	----------

12. **Planned FY 2014 accomplishment narrative** (no more than 1 page):

In FY 2014, we are following our CFLR Plan as submitted. The numbers in the above table reflect our original plan for Ecosystem Restoration. This plan covers the high priority accelerated restoration activities and hazardous fuel reduction (RX Burning), Longleaf Pine Restoration, Pitcher Plant Bog Restoration, NNIS Cogongrass treatments, Road Decommissioning, and our normal plan of work for boundary line maintenance, trail maintenance, road maintenance, and watershed restoration for the District.

13. **Describe and provide narrative justification if planned FY 2013/14 accomplishments and/or funding differs from CFLRP project work plan** (no more than 1 page):

No big changes are expected. Of course, the amount of prescribed burning acres accomplished will be weather dependent.