

CFLR Project (Name/Number): __ Longleaf Pine Ecosystem Restoration & Hazardous Fuels Reduction Project #CFLR023

National Forest(s): __ National Forest In Mississippi, De Soto Ranger District

1. Match and Leveraged funds:

a. FY16 Matching Funds Documentation

Fund Source – (CFLN/CFLR Funds Expended)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2016(\$)
CFLN13	\$44,660.67
CFLN16	\$1,467,423.39
Total CFLN	\$1,512,084.06

Fund Source – (Funds expended from Washington Office funds (in addition to CFLR/CFLN) (please include a new row for each BLI))	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2016(\$)
WFHF Supplemental	\$919,235
NFVW Supplemental	\$448,429.78
Total Supplemental	\$1,367,664.78
Grand Total from WO	\$2,879,748.84

Fund Source – (FS Matching Funds (please include a new row for each BLI))	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2016(\$)
CFCCH315 (Stewardship)	\$40,000
CFKV2313	\$311,608.95
CFVWH316	\$43,970.95
CFRD2316	\$187,227.05
CFLMH316	\$25,533.63
CFMGH316	\$31,748.61
CFTMH316	\$253,822.33
CFWFH316	\$137,051.73
CFHFH316	\$361,183.35
FNHF1316 (JOINT CHIEFS)	\$85,242.44
FNVW1316 (JOINT CHIEFS)	\$299,979.19
Total Matching	\$1,777,368.23

The two Joint Chiefs totals are not captured in the Agency's database of record for the initiative. Total WFHF in database of record is \$1,260,418

Fund Source – Partnership Match

ORGANIZATION	ACTIVITY	ACRES	FUNDS Partner Match
Camp Shelby FS Land	Hazardous Fuel Reduction (Mowing and other reduction of woody fuels)	2485	\$50,600
Camp Shelby FS Land	Feral Pig Eradication	6,252	\$20,000
TNC (117,000 ac Special Use Permit with Camp Shelby)	Resource Monitoring (Gopher Tortoise, LAQ, CSBC, etc.)	58,500	\$292,495
TNC (117,000 ac Special Use Permit with Camp Shelby)	Invasive Species	0	\$0
Camp Shelby FS Land	Watershed Restoration (Erosion Control)	NA	NA
Totals	Above	67,237	\$363,095

Service work accomplishment through goods-for services funding within a stewardship contract (for contracts awarded in FY16)	Totals
Total <u>revised non-monetary credit limit</u> for contracts awarded in FY16	\$

Note: revised non-monetary credit limits for contracts awarded prior to FY 16 were captured in the FY15 CFLR annual Report. This should be the amount in contract’s “Progress Report for Stewardship Credits, Integrated Resources Contracts or Agreements” in cell J46, the “Revised Non-Monetary Credit Limit,” as of *September 30*. Additional information on the Progress Reports is available in CFLR Annual Report Instructions document.

b. Please provide a narrative or table describing leveraged funds in your landscape in FY2016 (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, research conducted that helps project achieve proposed objectives, and purchase of equipment for wood processing that will use restoration by-products from CFLR projects. See “Instructions” document for additional information.

Leverage

ORGANIZATION	ACTIVITY	ACRES	FUNDS LEVERAGED
Camp Shelby DOD and State lands	LL Pine Restoration (site prep)	15	\$2,300
Camp Shelby DOD and State lands	SPB Thinning	0	\$0
Camp Shelby DOD and State lands	Hazardous Fuel Reduction (Mowing, herbicide, and other reduction of woody fuels) (Rx fire)	1719	\$52,000
Camp Shelby DOD and State lands	TSI, Release of LL Pine	41	\$6,150
Camp Shelby DOD and State lands	Invasive Species (Hack n squirt)	20	\$23,521
Totals	Above	1,795	\$83,971

2. Please tell us about the CFLR **project's progress to date in restoring a more fire-adapted ecosystem as described in the project proposal**, and how it has contributed to the wildland fire goals in the *10-Year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan*. This may also include a brief 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). ***Where existing fuel treatments within the landscape are tested by wildfire, please include a summary and reference the fuel treatment effectiveness report.***

Performance Measure	Progress Description
Percent change from 10-year average for wildfires controlled during initial attack	+ 1% <i>10 yr. avg. = 99%</i> <i>2016 = 100%</i>
Percent change from 10 year average for number of unwanted human-caused wildfires	- 30% <i>10 yr. avg. = 83</i> <i>2016 = 58</i>
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	48,821, 100% <i>All counties have CWPPs & we count all our burns as in WUI.</i>
Number and percent of non-WUI acres treated that are identified through collaboration consistent with the <i>Implementation Plan</i>	0 acres <i>All acres are considered to be in WUI.</i>
Number of acres treated per million dollars gross investment in WUI and non-WUI areas	0

Performance Measure	Acreage and Percent Change
Percent of collaboratively identified high priority acres treated where fire management objectives are achieved as identified in applicable management plans or strategies	100% <i>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.</i>
Number and percent of acres treated by prescribed fire, through collaboration consistent with the <i>Implementation Plan</i> .	44,359 acres, 52%
Number and percent of acres treated by mechanical thinning, through collaboration consistent with the <i>Implementation Plan</i> .	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	28,271, 58%
Number and percent of acres treated to restore fire-adapted ecosystems which are maintained in desired conditions	15,902, 32%
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):

In addition to prescribed fire, 945 acres of mechanical treatments were completed within the project area. Mechanical treatments included 752 acres of forestry brush-hogging/mastication, which targeted fire dependent threatened and endangered species such as red-cockaded woodpecker colonies, and road corridors utilized for effective prescribed fire and wildfire breaks. Another 193 acres of firebreak preparation was accomplished, by dozers, in dense, hazardous vegetation, in wildland-urban interface areas.

Wildfire occurrence on the De Soto continues to be below the 10 year average, at 46 fires for FY 2016. These wildfires burned about 5402 acres of Forest Service lands. Every fire in FY 2016 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 the 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 2016 the suppression costs were down to around \$180,000.

Fuel treatment effectiveness is documented in the FETM database. Wildfires occurring within areas that had received fuels treatments within the previous three years are evaluated for the effectiveness of the treatment. The average size of wildfires occurring within treatment areas, over the last 5 years is consistently less than fires occurring outside of treatment areas. The average size for fires within treatment areas is less than 10 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 every wildfire that occurred within treatment areas.

In 2016, as well as previous years, we have observed numerous examples of the fuel treatments making a significant positive difference in the size, complexity, severity, and risks to firefighters and the public when taking suppression actions.

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 – [Restoration documents CFLRP User Guide 2015](https://www.fs.fed.us/restoration/documents/cflrp/TREAT/TREATUserGuide20151005.pdf).

(<https://www.fs.fed.us/restoration/documents/cflrp/TREAT/TREATUserGuide20151005.pdf>)

FY 2016 Jobs Created/Maintained (FY16 CFLR/CFLN/ WO carryover funding):

FY 2016 Jobs Created/Maintained	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Direct)	Jobs (full and Part-Time) (Total)	Labor Income (Direct)	Labor Income (Total)
Timber harvesting component	28	38	\$1,393,702	\$1,741,422
Forest and watershed restoration component	11	13	\$224,300	\$311,553
Mill processing component	61	223	\$3,706,186	\$9,740,210
Implementation and monitoring	44	48	\$937,576	\$1,074,486
Other Project Activities	1	1	\$32,784	\$44,706
TOTALS:	144	323	\$6,294,548	\$12,912,377

FY 2016 Jobs Created/Maintained (FY16 CFLR/CFLN/ WO carryover and matching funding):

FY 2016 Jobs Created/Maintained	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Direct)	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Total)	Labor Income (Direct)	Labor Income (Total)
Timber harvesting component	28	38	\$1,393,702	\$1,741,422
Forest and watershed restoration component	17	21	\$362,736	\$503,842
Mill processing component	61	223	\$3,706,186	\$9,740,210
Implementation and monitoring	45	52	\$1,516,244	\$1,737,655
Other Project Activities	1	2	\$53,019	\$72,298
TOTALS:	153	335	\$7,031,887	\$13,795,427

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

4. Describe other community benefits achieved and the methods used to gather information about these benefits. How has CFLR and related activities benefitted your community from a social and/or economic standpoint? (Please limit answer to two pages). *If you have one story you could tell a member of Congress or other key stakeholder about the benefits in the community the project has helped achieve, what would it be?*

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 2016 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. 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	\$32,960	Mississippi
Silvicultural Contract Layout and Inspection	\$75,000	Mississippi
Timber Sale Preparation	\$321,078	Mississippi
Mechanical Site Prep (for planting LL Pine)	\$59,600	Mississippi
Tree Planting (Longleaf Pine)	\$50,000	Arkansas
TSI Release Longleaf Seedlings	\$35,000	Mississippi
Roadside NNIS Eradication (Cogongrass)	\$70,500	Mississippi
Landline Maintenance	\$109,150	Alabama
Road Maintenance	\$300,992	Mississippi
Trail Maintenance	\$59,080	Mississippi
Helicopter for Prescribed Burning	\$241,437	Louisiana
RCW Insert Install & Translocation	\$8,500	Mississippi
Challenge Cost Share Agreements (Universities)	\$64,000	Mississippi
RCW Agreement with NF Florida	\$40,000	Florida
Heritage Surveys (University of South Alabama)	\$100,000	Alabama
Total Contracts & Agreements	\$1,567,297	Above

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

Three Challenge Cost Share Agreements are now in place with the University of Southern Mississippi. Students and professors are working on monitoring and research projects that support CFLRP and high priority accelerated ecosystem restoration activities. This work serves as on the job training for students and provides them with valuable technical skills in addition to some income. These agreements total \$63,600.

Local Markets

Approximately 112,000 tons of green wood was sold to local in markets in FY 2016.

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	Provide a locally diverse herbaceous cover for project work. Integral to restoring the complete longleaf pine

Activity	Result	Benefit on the Landscape
	management activities in the Forest.	ecosystem for long-term benefits to the surrounding landscape.
Pollinator Habitat Maintenance and Improvement	Open, diverse herbaceous communities are restored and maintained.	Pollinator diversity and abundance is maintained and improved across the 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. 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 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 cogon grass 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. 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 3 Challenge Cost Share Agreements with the De Soto Ranger District. These agreements utilize the skill and expertise of this nearby institution to monitor and study the effects of specific restoration efforts identified in our CFLR Proposal. Several departments at USM were part of the collaborative team for the De Soto CFLR proposal and now play a greater role in monitoring effects on the landscape. The monitoring of CFLR and high priority accelerated ecosystem restoration activities in these agreements has been designed to provide descriptive data for tracking and analyses of project effectiveness. One of the agreements also consists of dendrochronology research and soil coring to document natural and human caused fire return intervals on the landscape to inform current prescribed burning efforts and ecosystem restoration techniques that would best mimic the processes that shaped the landscape over time.

USM biology and geology staff are collecting data from shared monitoring points on De Soto Ranger District. These monitoring points are in areas planned for or currently experiencing CFLR and high priority accelerated ecosystem restoration activities. USM is collecting 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 is also collecting and analyzing 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. The results indicated that levels were normal with no issues or concerns to address at this time.

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 2016 accomplishments.

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost (\$)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)
Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres	873	\$436,500	CFKV
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	376	\$75,200	CFLN
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	152	\$39,064	CFVW
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC	Acres	6253	\$468,975	CFLN
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions. S&W-RSRC-IMP	Acres	405	\$60,705	CFVW
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-LAK	Acres	Pull number from PAS report		
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	Pull number from PAS report		
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	56,065	\$560,065	CFHF
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved RG-VEG-IMP	Acres	Pull number from PAS report		

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 roads receiving maintenance RD-HC-MAIN	Miles	Pull number from PAS report		
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance RD-PC-MAINT	Miles	Pull number from PAS report		
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	Pull number from PAS report		
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles	Pull number from PAS report		
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles	Pull number from PAS report		
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage STRM-CROS-MTG-STD	Number	Pull number from PAS report		
Miles of system trail maintained to standard TL-MAINT-STD	Miles	Pull number from PAS report		
Miles of system trail improved to standard TL-IMP-STD	Miles	Pull number from PAS report		
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard LND-BL-MRK-MAINT	Miles	Pull number from PAS report		
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC	Acres	Pull number from PAS report		

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost (\$)	Type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match)
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF	Pull number from PAS report		
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	35,164	\$450,000	CFTM/CFLN
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons	Pull number from PAS report		
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	Pull number from PAS report		
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	48,821	\$1,464,630	CFHF/CFLN
Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands SP-INVSPE-FED-AC	Acres	Pull number from PAS report		
Number of priority acres treated annually for native pests on Federal lands SP-NATIVE-FED-AC	Acres	Pull number from PAS report		

Units accomplished should match the accomplishments recorded in the Databases of Record. Please include the type of Funds (CFLR, Specific FS BLI, Partner Match) if you have accurate information that is readily available. Please report each BLI on a separate line within a given performance measures' "Type of Funds" box.

7. FY 2016 accomplishment narrative – Summarize key accomplishments and evaluate project progress not already described elsewhere in this report. (Please limit answer to three pages.)

The District received the budget very late in the year, but we were able to accomplish quality work on the ground. Accomplishment numbers are provided in the table above. The District has also not received full matching funds through the life of the project (deficit of approximately \$2 million), but we do the best we can do with what we have to work with. Despite these challenges, the accomplishments are adding up.

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 absence of much needed positions requires employees to stretch into other areas to work toward our goals. 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 via treatment of NNIS plants such as cogongrass, an extremely volatile fuel. Treating this NNIS reduces hazardous fuels, improves wildlife habitat, provides for increased forest health, and improves safety across the Forest and surrounding landscape.

This was our fifth 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. *Review the gPAS spatial information sent to you by the Washington Office after gPAS closes out on October 31*

- If the footprint estimate from gPAS is consistent and accurate, please confirm and skip this question.
- If the gPAS spatial information does NOT appear accurate, describe the total acres treated in the course of the CFLR project below (cumulative footprint acres; not a cumulative total of performance accomplishments). What was the total number of acres treated?

Fiscal Year	Total number of acres treated (treatment footprint)
Total footprint of acres treated from start year through FY16.	56,065
FY10, FY11, FY12, FY13, FY14, FY15 and FY16 (as applicable- projects selected in FY2012 may will not have data for FY10 and FY11)	FY12 – 109,746 acres FY13 – 120,276 acres FY14 – 96,890 acres FY15 – 58,727 acres Cumulative – 441,704 acres

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

9. Describe any reasons that the FY 2016 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).

10. Planned FY 2017 Accomplishments¹

Performance Measure Code	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment	Amount (\$)
Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres	604	\$151,000
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	150	\$38,550
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles		
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	70,000	\$1,500,000
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles		
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles		
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles		
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	40,000	\$600,000
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons		
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre		
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres	70,000	\$2,250,000

¹ Please note that planned accomplishments are aggregated across the projects to determine the proposed goals for the program's outyear budget justification. These numbers should reflect what is in the CFLRP work plan, with deviations described in question 11.

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.

11. Planned FY 2017 accomplishment narrative and justification if planned FY 2017/18 accomplishments and/or funding differs from CFLRP project work plan (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. Please include an up to date list of the members of your collaborative if it has changed from the list you submitted in the FY15 report (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.

13. Did you project try any new approaches to increasing partner match funding in FY2016 (both in-kind contributions and through agreements)? (no more than one page):

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

CFLR partnerships and collaboration have continued to improve through the life of the project. In 2015, the first phase of an oral history project began with the University of Southern Mississippi Center for Oral History and Cultural Heritage focusing on Longleaf Pine Restoration Efforts in Mississippi. The aim of the project is to educate the public about the historical, cultural, and ecological significance of longleaf pine, encourage longleaf pine restoration across the landscape, and document ongoing restoration efforts. The first round of interviews included De Soto Ranger District personnel, The Nature Conservancy, an MSU Extension Service Forester, USM Researchers, NRCS staff, a USFWS biologist, and small private landowner currently restoring longleaf pine on his property. The second phase of the project will begin in 2016. An excerpt from one of the interviews is listed in the media recap section below.

4. 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. You are welcome to include links or to copy/paste.

[Mississippi Moments](#) = scroll down to MSM 455 – Monday 14 September 2015 – Thriffiley and Coursey – Longleaf Pines and Prescription Burns. This is one installment in a multi-party oral history project with the University of Southern Mississippi Center for Oral History and Cultural Heritage focusing on Longleaf Pine Restoration Efforts in Mississippi.

Signatures:

Recommended by (Project Coordinator(s)): _____

Approved by (Forest Supervisor(s))²: _____

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

² If your project includes more than one National Forest, please include an additional line for each Forest Supervisor signature.