CFLR Project: **CFLR023 Longleaf Pine Ecosystem Restoration & Hazardous Fuels Reduction**

National Forest(s): ***National Forest in Mississippi, De Soto Ranger District***

Responses to the prompts in this annual report should be typed directly into the template. Example information is included in red below. Please delete red text before submitting the final version.

1. Match and Leveraged funds:

a. FY15 Matching Funds Documentation

Fund Source – (CFLN/CFLR Funds Expended[1])	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2015($)
CFLN2315	$1,639,635
CFLR2313	$107,500

Fund Source – (Funds expended from Washington Office funds (in addition to CFLR/CFLN)[2] (please include a new row for each BLI))	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2015($)
(WFHF) CFHFH315 Supplemental	$1,399,129
Total CFLR & CFLN $ Supplemental funds	**$3,146,264**

Fund Source – (FS Matching Funds (please include a new row for each BLI)[3])	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2015($)
(CMRD) CFRD2315	$202,932
(NFTM) CFTMH315	$126,054
(CWK2) CFK2H315	$26,677
(CWKV) CFKV2313	$289,923
(NFLM) CFLMH315	$57,370
(NFMG) CFMGH315	$30,883
(NFVW) CFVWH315	$95,560
(NFWF) CFWFH315	$98,883
(RTRT) CFRTH315	$7,568
(WFHF) CFHFH315	$229,132
(SSCC) CFCCH314	$444,750
(SSCC) CFCC313	$40,000
Appropriated Match	$1,649,732
FNVW1315 (Joint Chiefs Watershed)	$500,000
FNHF1315 (Joint Chiefs Watershed)	$100,000
Total Match	**$2,249,732**
Total Match Shortfall	**($896,532)**

Fund Source – (Funds contributed through agreements[4])	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2015($)
n/a	n/a

[1] This amount should match the amount of CFLR/CFLN dollars obligated in the PAS expenditure report. Include prior year CFLN dollars expended in this Fiscal Year.
[2] This value (aka carryover funds or WO unobligated funds) should reflect the amount expended of the allocated funds as indicated in the FY15 program direction, but does not necessarily need to be in the same BLIs or budget fiscal year as indicated in the program direction.
[3] This amount should match the amount of matching funds obligated in the PAS expenditure report. These funds plus the Washington Office funds (unobligated funds) listed above should total the matching funds obligated in the PAS report.
[4] Please document any partner contributions to implementation and monitoring of the CFLR project through an income funds 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.

Fund Source – (Partner In-Kind Contributions[5])	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2015($)
n/a	n/a

Partnership Match

Organization	Activity	Acres	Funds Partner Match
Camp Shelby FS Land	Hazardous Fuel Reduction (Mowing and other reduction of woody fuels)	2485	$50,566
Camp Shelby FS Land	Feral Pig Eradication	n/a	n/a
TNC (117,000 ac Special Use Permit with Camp Shelby)	Resource Monitoring (Gopher Tortoise, LAQ, CSBC, etc.)	58,500	$268,976
TNC (117,000 Special Use Permit with Camp Shelby)	Invasive Species	171.3	$132,418
Camp Shelby FS Land	Watershed Restoration (Erosion Control)	n/a	n/a
Feral Pig Trapping	Invasive Species	6242	$5,000
Totals	n/a	67,398	$456,960

For Contracts Awarded in FY15

Service work accomplishment through goods-for services funding within a stewardship contract	Totals
Total amount of stewardship credits charged for contracts awarded in FY15[6]	$484,750 & 450 acres
Total revised credit limit for contracts awarded in FY15[7]	**n/a**

For Contracts Awarded Prior to FY15

Service work accomplishment through goods-for services funding within a stewardship contract	Totals
Total amount of stewardship credits charged in FY15[8]	**$ n/a**
Total revised credit limit for open and closed contracts awarded and previously reported prior to FY15[9]	$n/a

b. Please provide a narrative or table describing leveraged funds in your landscape in FY2015 (one page maximum). Leveraged funds refer to funds or in-kind services that help the project achieve proposed objectives but do not meet match qualifications. Examples include but are not limited to: investments within landscape on non-NFS lands, investments in restoration equipment, worker training for implementation and monitoring, and purchase of equipment for

5 Total partner in-kind contributions for implementation and monitoring of a CFLR project. Partner contributions for Fish, Wildlife, and Watershed work can be found in WIT database. Please list the partner organizations that provided in-kind contributions.
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.
7 This should be the amount in contract's "Progress Report for Stewardship Contracts, Integrated Resources Contracts or Agreements" in cell J46, the "Revised Credit Limit," as of September 30. Additional information on the Progress Reports is available in CFLR Annual Report Instructions document.
8 This should be the amount in the "stewardship credits charged" column at the end of the fiscal year in the TSA report TSA90R-01.
9 This should be the amount in each contract's "Progress Report for Stewardship Contracts, Integrated Resources Contracts or Agreements" in cell J46, the "Revised Credit Limit." *For open contracts*, this should be as of September 30. *For closed contracts*, this should be at the time of contract closure.

wood processing that will use restoration by-products from CFLR projects. See "Instructions" document for additional information.

Suggested Format
(Optional) Additional narrative about leverage on the landscape if needed
Leverage

Organization	**Activity**	**Acres**	**Funds Leveraged (Partner Funds)**	**n/a**	**n/a**
Camp Shelby DOD and State lands	LL Pine Restoration	15	$2,300	Site prep	n/a
Camp Shelby DOD and State lands	SPB Thinning	0	$0	n/a	n/a
Camp Shelby DOD and State lands	Hazardous Fuel Reduction (Mowing, herbicide, and other reduction of woody fuels)	1719	$52,000	Rx fire	n/a
Camp Shelby DOD and State lands	TSI, Release of LL Pine	41	$6,150	n/a	n/a
Camp Shelby DOD and State lands	Invasive Species	20	$23,521	Hack n squirt	n/a
Totals	**n/a**	**1,795**	**$83,971**	**n/a**	**n/a**

2a. Discuss how the CLFR project contributes to accomplishment of the wildland fire goals in the *10-Year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan* and describe the progress to date on restoring a more fire-adapted ecosystem, as identified in the project's desired conditions. This may also include a description of the current 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% 2015 = 100%
Percent change from 10 year average for number of unwanted human-caused wildfires	30% 10 yr. avg. = 83 2015 = 58
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	47,193 100% 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	n/a
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.	41,258 acres 55%

Performance Measure	Units
Number and percent of acres treated by mechanical thinning, through collaboration consistent with the Implementation Plan.	5158 acres 8%
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	29,923 331%
Number and percent of acres treated to restore fire-adapted ecosystems which are maintained in desired conditions	11,362 17%
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%

2b. **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 will be documented in Question #6):

Prescribed fire management activities, on the De Soto ranger District, during the 2015 fiscal year were delayed and hampered by administrative inefficiencies. January and February are typically very productive months for prescribed fire on the De Soto. The weather was favorable in January with 12 available burn days. Even with constraints in place, production was maximized. February started out productive as well but 22 wildfires kept our crews busy for most of the month. In March we were able to resolve administrative issues and produce excellent results completing 14 burn units. However, at the end of March a tragic helicopter accident ended our productive spring burn season.

In 2015 the De Soto Ranger District accomplished 41,285 acres of hazardous fuels prescribed burning. We were able to accomplish over 11,362 acres of growing season burning (28% of our total acres). The effectiveness of these warm season burns are often much greater in terms of restoring and maintaining the longleaf ecosystem.

In addition to prescribed fire, 5908 acres of mechanical treatments, and herbicide treatments were completed within the project area. Mechanical treatments included 4780 acres of 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 378 acres of firebreak preparation was accomplished, by dozers, in dense, hazardous vegetation, in wildland-urban interface areas.

A more unique method was utilized to accomplish 750 acres of hazardous fuel reduction. The careful application of herbicides in this lower coastal plain, southern rough fuel type has proven to be very effective in the long term reduction of hazardous fuels. This treatment also benefits many fire dependent threatened and endangered species, it facilitates prescribed fire by reducing smoke producing, and volatile, live fuels and it more quickly changes the composition of the understory from brush to a more natural grass and herbaceous state. All of these treatments were specifically targeting hazardous fuels or providing for more efficient prescribed fire treatments.

Wildfire occurrence on the De Soto continues to be below the 10 year average, at 58 fires for 2015. These wildfires burned about 4400 acres of Forest Service lands. Every fire in 2015 was contained at initial attack. Although no fires were managed for resource benefits, almost all of the wildfires produced desirable outcomes by reducing fuel loads, and maintaining a longleaf ecosystem, or by changing the ecology more towards a longleaf favorable condition. A typical yearly average for wildfire suppression cost would be around $290,000. In 2015 the suppression costs were down to around $200,000.

Fuel treatment effectiveness is documented in the FETM database. In FY 2015, twelve wildfires occurred within areas that had received fuels treatments within the previous three years. The average size of wildfires occurring within treatment areas for 2015 is 9 acres. The overall average size for wildfires on the De Soto Ranger District is 75 acres.

Fire behavior and control of the fires were positively affected on very wildfire that occurred within treatment areas.

One example is the Cone Dump fire, in November of 2014. This fire occurred on a high risk day with 90th percentile weather conditions. The fire quickly burned about 70 acres before spotting across a gravel road into an area that had been treated with prescribed fire the previous year. It was easily contained in the treatment area.

Another wildfire, the Buffalo fire, in March of 2015, started in an area that had been treated with herbicides to reduce the hazardous live fuels. This fire occurred on a day with extremely low relative humidity. Control of this fire, at 24 acres, was made easier due to lower rates of spread than what would have been expected in the normally dangerous live southern rough.

Clearly the hazardous fuel reduction work being done within this CFLRP project area is having a significant effect on the number of wildfires, the acres burned in wildfires, and the costs of suppression.

No BAER was required within the project scope.

3. What assumptions were used in generating the numbers and/or percentages you plugged into the TREAT tool? Information about Treatment for Restoration Economic Analysis Tool inputs and assumptions available here – http://www.fs.fed.us/restoration/documents/cflrp/R-CAT/TREATUserGuide10112011.pdf.

FY 2015 Jobs Created/Maintained (FY15 CFLR/CFLN/ WO carryover funding):

Type of projects	Direct part and full-time jobs	Total part and full-time jobs	Direct Labor Income	Total Labor Income[10]
Commercial Forest Product Activities	121	217	5,742,710	8,549,447
Other Project Activities	53	61	1,498,737	1,750,303
TOTALS:	**173**	**278**	**7,241,447**	**10,299,750**

FY 2015 Jobs Created/Maintained (FY15 CFLR/CFLN/ WO carryover and matching funding):

Type of projects	Direct part and full-time jobs	Total part and full-time jobs	Direct Labor Income	Total Labor Income[11]
Commercial Forest Product Activities	121	217	5,742,710	8,549,447
Other Project Activities	66	82	2,997,475	2,747,379
TOTALS:	**187**	**299**	**8,740,185**	**12,050,054**

4. Describe other community benefits achieved and the methods used to gather information about these benefits. How has CFLR and related activities benefitted your community from a social and/or economic standpoint? (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 $3 million appropriated to De Soto Ranger District for high priority accelerated ecosystem restoration, over $1.6 million went to job creation and the private sector workforce. The jobs created or maintained by the project in FY 2015 are mostly technical and manual labor positions utilized in new and existing contracts. Small and large businesses in

[10] 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.
[11] 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.

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. Also, approximately $300,000 went to private sector business for supplies to carry out the program (Fire ignition spheres, Tracer Paint, Forestry Suppliers, local businesses, Juniper Systems, Landmark Spatial, etc.)

Contract Description	Funding Obligated or Spent in FY 2015	Contractor Location
T&E Habitat Improvement/Hazardous Fuels Reduction with Herbicide	$110,000	Mississippi
Silvicultural Contract Layout and Inspection	$75,000	Mississippi
Timber Sale Preparation	$321,570	Mississippi
Roadside NNIS Eradication (Cogongrass)	$70,500	Mississippi
Landline Maintenance	$88,000	Alabama
Road Maintenance	$310,318	Mississippi
Trail Maintenance	$45,000	Mississippi
Helicopter for Prescribed Burning	$460,000	Louisiana
RCW Insert Install	$8,500	Mississippi
Challenge Cost Share Agreements (Universities)	$63,600	Mississippi
RCW Agreement with NF Florida	$40,000	Florida

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

Challenge Cost Share Agreements are now in 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 $63,600.

Local Markets

Approximately 166,000 tons of green wood was sold to local in markets in FY 2015.

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.

Activity	Result	Benefit on the Landscape
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 animal's 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	Fewer roads to maintain. More Forest Area available for wildlife and recreation.	Provide better/more remote recreational experiences on the Forest.

5. Based on your project monitoring plan, describe the multiparty monitoring process. What parties (who) are involved in monitoring, and how? What is being monitored? Please briefly share key broad monitoring results and how results received to date are informing subsequent management activities (e.g. adaptive management), if at all. **What are the current weaknesses or shortcomings of the monitoring process? (Please limit answer to two pages. Include a link to your monitoring plan if it is available).**

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 this 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) has entered into a Challenge Cost Share Agreement with the De Soto Ranger District. This agreement will utilize the skill and expertise of this nearby institution to monitor and study the effects of specific restoration efforts identified in our CFLR Proposal. USM 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.

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. USM 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 2015 accomplishments

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)
Acres treated annually to sustain or restore watershed function and resilience WTRSHD-RSTR-ANN	Acres	n/a	n/a	n/a
Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres	48	$2633	CFKV2313
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	982	$103,000	CFHFH315
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	948	$100,000	FNVW1315
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC	Acres	n/a	n/a	n/a
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions. S&W-RSRC-IMP	Acres	568.5	$100,000	FNVW1315
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-LAK	Acres	n/a	n/a	n/a
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	n/a	n/a	n/a
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	56,946	$521,300	CFHFH315
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved RG-VEG-IMP	Acres	n/a	n/a	n/a
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance RD-HC-MAIN	Miles	n/a	n/a	n/a
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance RD-PC-MAINT	Miles	n/a	n/a	n/a
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	n/a	n/a	n/a
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles	n/a	n/a	n/a

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost ($)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles	n/a	n/a	n/a
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage STRM-CROS-MTG-STD	Number	n/a	n/a	n/a
Miles of system trail maintained to standard TL-MAINT-STD	Miles	n/a	n/a	n/a
Miles of system trail improved to standard TL-IMP-STD	Miles	n/a	n/a	n/a
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard LND-BL-MRK-MAINT	Miles	n/a	n/a	n/a
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC	Acres	4539	$350,000	CFHFH315 & FNVW1315
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF	26,078	$350,000	CFHFH315 & FNVW1315
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	50,122	$350,000	CFHFH315 & FNVW1315
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons	n/a	n/a	n/a
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	n/a	n/a	n/a
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	45,824	$1,250,000	CFLN2315 & CFHFH315
Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands SP-INVSPE-FED-AC	Acres	n/a	n/a	n/a
Number of priority acres treated annually for native pests on Federal lands SP-NATIVE-FED-AC	Acres	n/a	n/a	n/a

7. **FY 2015 accomplishment narrative – Summarize key accomplishments and evaluate project progress.** (Please limit answer to three pages.)

Despite receiving the budget very late in the year 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 fourth 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)
Total in FY15	58,727 Acres
FY10, FY11, FY12, FY13, FY14, and FY15 (as applicable- projects selected in FY2012 may will not have data for FY10 and FY11; projects that were HPRP projects in FY12, please include one number for FY12 and one number for FY13 (same as above))	FY12 – 109,746 acres FY13 – 120,276 acres FY14 – 96,890 acres FY15 – 58,727 acres Cumulative – 385,639 acres

Please briefly describe how you arrived at the total number of footprint acres: what approach did you use to calculate the footprint?

Cumulative footprint acres are derived from a combination of data bases, including FACTS, WHIt, Infra, TESP, and other FS Data.

9. Describe any reasons that the FY 2015 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).

Prescribed fire management activities on the De Soto ranger District during the 2015 fiscal year were impacted by the 106 Compliance issues. Once the issue was resolved, the De Soto managed to accomplish 84,474 acres of prescribed burning, of which 32,786 acres were growing season burning (39% 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.

Also, due to the wet weather, wildfire occurrence on the De Soto was below normal with 55 wildfires. However, these wildfires burned 4,070 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.

[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.

In addition to prescribed fire and wildfire, 8,094 acres of mechanical treatments, and 750 acres of herbicide treatments were completed within the project area. Mechanical treatments included 7,000 acres of forestry brush-hogging/mastication, which targeted areas of high fire occurrence, fire dependent threatened and endangered species such as red-cockaded woodpecker colonies 320 acres, and road corridors (315 acres) utilized for effective prescribed fire and wildfire breaks. Another 459 acres of fire line preparation was accomplished, by dozers, in dense, hazardous vegetation, in wildland-urban interface areas.

A more unique method was utilized to accomplish 750 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. Planned FY 2017 Accomplishments[13]

Performance Measure Code[14]	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment	Amount ($)
Acres treated annually to sustain or restore watershed function and resilience WTRSHD-RSTR-ANN	Acres	n/a	n/a
Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres	500	$75,000
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	1,000	$100,000
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	150	$75,000
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC	Acres	n/a	n/a
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions. S&W-RSRC-IMP	Acres	n/a	n/a
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-LAK	Acres	n/a	n/a
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	n/a	n/a
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	90,000	$1,250,000
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved RG-VEG-IMP	Acres	n/a	n/a
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance RD-HC-MAIN	Miles	250	$250,000
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance RD-PC-MAINT	Miles	n/a	n/a
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	n/a	n/a
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles	n/a	n/a
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles	n/a	n/a

[13] Please note that planned accomplishments are aggregated across the projects to determine the proposed goals for the programs out year budget justification. These numbers should reflect what is in the CFLRP work plan, with deviations described in question 12.
[14] Please include all relevant planned accomplishments, assuming that funding specified in the CFLRP project proposal for FY 2017 is available. Use actual planned funding if quantity is less than specified in CFLRP project work plan.

Performance Measure Code[14]	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment	Amount ($)
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage STRM-CROS-MTG-STD	Number	n/a	n/a
Miles of system trail maintained to standard TL-MAINT-STD	Miles	45	$45,000
Miles of system trail improved to standard TL-IMP-STD	Miles	n/a	n/a
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard LND-BL-MRK-MAINT	Miles	100	$120,000
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC	Acres	4,000	$350,000
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF	45,000	$350,000
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	45,000	$350,000
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons	n/a	n/a
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	n/a	n/a
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	85,000	$1,250,000
Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands SP-INVSPE-FED-AC	Acres	n/a	n/a
Number of priority acres treated annually for native pests on Federal lands SP-NATIVE-FED-AC	Acres	n/a	n/a

11. Planned FY 2017 accomplishment narrative (no more than 1 page).

In FY 2017, 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, and our normal plan of work for boundary line maintenance, trail maintenance, road maintenance, and watershed restoration for the District.

12. Describe and provide narrative justification if planned FY 2016/17 accomplishments and/or funding differs from CFLRP project work plan (no more than 1 page):

N/A

13. Please include an up to date list of the members of your collaborative (name and affiliation, if there is one). **If the information is available online, you can simply include the hyperlink here. If you have engaged new collaborative members this year, please provide a brief description of their engagement.**

New collaborative members this year
Range Control Officer
Mississippi Forestry Commission
MS Nature Conservancy
Columbus Communities (Tradition)
Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fish, and Parks; Regional WMA Biologist
NWTF Regional Biologist Al/MS
Director Environmental Programs
Natural Capital Development
County Extension Agent, Stone and Pearl River County Forestry Club
Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fish, and Parks; Wild Turkey Program Leader
Mississippi DWFP, Private Lands Habitat Program
Mississippi Power, Environmental Affairs Specialist
Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fish, and Parks; Leaf River, Red Creek, and Little Biloxi WMA
Natural Resources Staff Officer, Supervisor's Office, National Forests in Mississippi
Senator Thad Cochran, Field Representative
USDI Fish and Wildlife Service
Senator Roger Wicker, South Field Representative
USFWS, Mississippi Sandhill Crane NWR
Mississippi Forestry Commission
Mississippi Forestry Commission
Georgia Pacific Environmental Monitoring
USFWS, Jackson, MS
Wild South
NRCS, Area Conservationist, Hattiesburg, MS
USFWS, Jackson, MS
National Wild Turkey Federation
Congressman Steven M. Palazzo, Deputy Chief of Staff
MS Nature Conservancy, Associate State Director
Lightscribe Photography
USFWS, Jackson, MS
USDA Forest Service R8 Forest Health
Mississippi Forestry Commission
Congressman Steven M. Palazzo, Field Representative District LEO
Project Leader/Research Geneticist, Forest Genetics and Ecosystems Biology, Harrison Experimental Forest, USFS
Sierra Club, Land Trust, Friends of Red Creek
MS Nature Conservancy, State Director
Conservation Programs Director MDWFP
Senator Roger Wicker, Constituent Liaison

New collaborative members this year
USDA FS Retiree
National Weather Service, Mobile AL
USFWS, Jackson, MS
Trust for Public Land
Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fish, and Parks, Non-Game Biologist
Wildlife Mississippi
Land Trust for the MS Coastal Plain
MS Nature Conservancy
Science Department Chair Perkinston Campus
MS Gopher Frog Field Biologist USFWS/MDWFP/Western Carolina University
Director of Plans, Training, Mobilization and Security
Executive Director Mississippi Wildlife Federation

14. How has your project increased support from partners in terms of in-kind contributions and funding? (no more than one page):

We have worked with the Success Community to build local support and a volunteer base. We have hosted several educational field trips, and attended their community meetings to make presentations. The Blues Rangers Band was invited to play at their spring community meeting and fish fry. The Group consists of about 60+ seniors and members that support the National Forest, Prescribed burning program, MS Dusty Gopher Frog recovery, and general forest management.

15. Media recap. Please share with us any hyperlinks to videos, newspaper articles, press releases, scholarly works, and photos of your project in the media that you have available.

WWW.MSmoments.org

Signatures

Recommended by (Project Coordinator(s)):____/s/James Mordica TMA/FSR_____

Approved by (Forest Supervisor(s))[15]:_____

(OPTIONAL) Reviewed by (collaborative chair or representative): _____

[15] If your project includes more than one National Forest, please include an additional line for each Forest Supervisor signature.