CFLR Project (Name/Number): Longleaf Pine Ecosystem Restoration & Hazardous Fuels Reduction CFLN023
National Forest(s): National Forest in Mississippi, De Soto Ranger District

Reports are due to the Washington Office (via the Regional Forester through a submission to Leslie Weldon, cc'ing Lindsay Buchanan and Jessica Robertson) no later than December 4, 2017 for review.

1. Match and Leveraged Funds:

a. FY17 Matching Funds Documentation

Fund Source – (CFLN/CFLR Funds Expended)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2017
CFLN13	$13,878
CFLN17	$1,478,921
Total CFLN Funds	$1,492,799.76

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.

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 2017
WFHF17	$1,053,000

This value (aka carryover funds or WO unobligated funds) should reflect the amount expended of the allocated funds as indicated in the program direction, but does not necessarily need to be in the same BLIs or budget fiscal year as indicated in the program direction.

Fund Source – (FS Matching Funds (please include a new row for each BLI)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2017
SSCC Stewardship	$40,000
CMRD	$296,339
CWK2	$41,814
CWKV	$484,976
NFLM	$42,064
NFMG	$25,549
NFTM	$277,248
NFVW	$41,705
NFWF	$140,273
WFHF	$348,469
Total	$1,738,437

This amount should match the amount of matching funds obligated in the gPAS expenditure report, minus the Washington Office funds listed in the box above and any partner funds contributed through agreements (such as NFEX, SPEX, WFEX, CMEX, and CWFS) listed in the box below.

Fund Source – (Funds contributed through agreements)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2017
N/A	$0

Please document any partner contributions to implementation and monitoring of the CFLR project through an income funds agreement (this should include partner funds captured through the gPAS job reports such as NFEX, SPEX, WFEX, CMEX, and CWFS). Please list the partner organizations involved in the agreement. Partner contributions for Fish, Wildlife, Watershed work can be found in WIT database.

Fund Source – (Partner In-Kind Contributions)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2017
N/A	$0

Total partner in-kind contributions for implementation and monitoring of a CFLR project. Please list the partner organizations that provided in-kind contributions.

PARTNERSHIP MATCH

ORGANIZATION	ACTIVITY	ACRES	FUNDS Partner Match
Camp Shelby FS Land	Hazardous Fuel Reduction (Mowing and other reduction of woody fuels)	6499	$168,974
Camp Shelby FS Land	Feral Pig Eradication	6,252	$15,365
TNC (117,000 ac Special Use Permit with Camp Shelby)	Resource Monitoring (Gopher Tortoise, LAQ, CSBC, etc.)	58,500	$314,476
TNC (117,000 acSpecial Use Permit with Camp Shelby)	Invasive Species	50	$4363 (monitoring/mapping only and R41 treatment)
Camp Shelby FS Land	Watershed Restoration (Erosion Control)	62	$86,849

Totals $590,027

Revised non-monetary credit limits for contracts awarded prior to FY17 were captured in previous reports. 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.

Service work accomplishment through goods-for services funding within a stewardship contract (for contracts awarded in FY17)	**Totals**
Total revised non-monetary credit limit for contracts awarded in FY17	$N/A

b. Please provide a narrative or table describing leveraged funds in your landscape in FY2017 (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.

Description of item	**Where activity/item is located or impacted area**	**Estimated total amount**	**Forest Service or Partner Funds?**	**Source of funds**
NNIS Invasive Species control with Herbicide	**DOD Lands**	**$82,904**	**Partner Funds**	**DOD**

(Optional) Additional narrative about leverage on the landscape if needed:

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***.

Performance Measure	**Units**
Percent change from 10-year average for wildfires controlled during initial attack	+ 1% *10 yr. avg. = 99%* *2017 = 100%*
Percent change from 10 year average for number of unwanted human-caused wildfires	- 20% *10 yr. avg. = 83* *2017 = 66*
Percent of fires not contained in initial attack that exceed a stratified cost index	0

Performance Measure	Units
Number and percent of WUI acres treated that are identified in CWPPS or other application collaboratively developed plans	24,873 100% *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*.	24,873 acres, 58%
Number and percent of acres treated by mechanical thinning, through collaboration consistent with the *Implementation Plan*.	1088 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	24,873, 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%

In addition to prescribed fire, 1088 acres of mechanical treatments were completed within the project area. Mechanical treatments included 890 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 198 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 70 fires for 2017. These wildfires burned about 6717 acres of Forest Service lands. Every fire in 2017 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 $310,000. In 2017 the suppression costs were down to around $260,000.

Fuel treatment effectiveness is documented in the FETM database. In FY 2017, thirteen wildfires occurred within areas that had received fuels treatments within the previous three years. Fire behavior and control of the fires were positively affected on every wildfire that occurred within treatment areas.

Clearly the hazardous fuel reduction work being done within this CFLRP project area is reducing the costs of suppression and making suppression efforts safer for our firefighters and the public.

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.

FY 2017 Jobs Supported/Maintained (FY17 CFLR/CFLN/ WO carryover funding):

Copy/paste the totals from TREAT spreadsheet provided for each project from USFS EMC Economics Team:

FY 2017 Jobs Supported/Maintained	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Direct)	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Total)	Labor Income (Direct)	Labor Income (Total)
Timber harvesting component	**27**	**38**	$1,384,111	$1,703,531
Forest and watershed restoration component	**9**	**12**	$95,770	$196,332
Mill processing component	**45**	**199**	$3,022,289	$7,745,572
Implementation and monitoring	**37**	**42**	$1,063,259	$1,236,695
Other Project Activities	**0**	**1**	$20,589	$31,631
TOTALS:	**119**	**292**	$5,568,017	$10,913,761

FY 2017 Jobs Supported/Maintained (FY16 CFLR/CFLN/ WO carryover and matching funding):

Copy/paste the totals from TREAT spreadsheet provided for each project from USFS EMC Economics Team:

FY 2017 Jobs Supported/Maintained	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Direct)	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Total)	Labor Income (Direct)	Labor Income (Total)
Timber harvesting component	**27**	**38**	**$1,384,111**	**$1,703,531**
Forest and watershed restoration component	**16**	**20**	**$161,168**	**$330,401**
Mill processing component	**45**	**199**	**$3,022,289**	**$7,745,572**
Implementation and monitoring	**40**	**48**	**$1,789,320**	**$2,081,189**

FY 2017 Jobs Supported/Maintained	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Direct)	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Total)	Labor Income (Direct)	Labor Income (Total)
Other Project Activities	1	1	$34,649	$53,231
TOTALS:	**128**	**306**	**$6,391,537**	**$11,913,924**

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 2017 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 2017	Contractor Location
Louisiana Quillwort Surveys	**$16,250**	**Mississippi**
Silvicultural Contract Layout and Inspection	**$75,000**	**Mississippi**
Timber Sale Preparation	**$138,973**	**Mississippi**
Mechanical Site Prep (for planting LL Pine)	**$202,235**	**Mississippi**
Tree Planting (Longleaf Pine)	**$92,572**	**Arkansas**
Botanical, NNIS, T&E Surveys	**$118,325**	**Mississippi**
Landline Maintenance	**$110,000**	**Mississippi**
Road Maintenance	**$222,920**	**Mississippi**
Trail Maintenance	**$59,080**	**Mississippi**
Helicopter for Prescribed Burning	**$62,900**	**Georgia**
RCW Insert Install & Translocation	**$8,500**	**Mississippi**
Challenge Cost Share Agreements (Universities)	**$79,088**	**Mississippi**
RCW Agreement with NF Florida	**$40,000**	**Florida**
Heritage Surveys (University of South Alabama)	**$185,170**	**Alabama**
Total Contracts	**& Agreements**	**$1,374,289**

Jobs include tree harvesting, tree planting, heavy machinery operation, timber sale layout, timber cruising, and survey work in preparation for treatments. Also, local fuel, food service, equipment supply, and lodging vendors benefit from these contracts.

Local Agreements

Four Challenge Cost Share Agreements were utilized with University of Southern Mississippi (3) and Mississippi State University (1). Students and professors are working on monitoring and research projects that support CFLRP and high priority accelerated ecosystem restoration activities as well as conducting survey work to support treatments. 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 $79,088 for FY17.

Local Markets

Approximately 116,403 tons of green wood was sold to local in markets in FY 2017.

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.**

Activity	Result	Benefit on the Landscape
Pitcher Plant Bog Restoration	**Maintenance or reclamation of unique and sensitive ecosystems.**	**Provide habitat for a diversity of rare plant and animal species including many host plants and pollinators. Very few of these unique ecosystems are found on adjacent lands due to modification of the 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.**

(Optional) Additional narrative about leverage on the landscape:

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 (federally listed as threatened), 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. We also collect data on fuel loading and fuel reduction associated with prescribed burning. De Soto also began a black pine snake monitoring program on the southern portion of the District this year and surveyed 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.

This is the second year of a Challenge Cost Share Agreement between Mississippi State University and the De Soto Ranger District. The District hosted summer internships for three Wildlife Science undergraduate students. The students conducted T&E field surveys, monitoring, and management 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. The agreement cost the Forest Service $15,448 for FY 17.

The De Soto Ranger District entered into a Non-Funded Challenge Cost Share Agreement with the Longleaf Alliance (LLA). The Forest Service paid $1,239 for three weeks of housing to support 76 work days of the LLA Ecosystem Support Team. The LLA provided $65,000 worth of products and services to the District. The LLA paid $20,000 to purchase 100,000 longleaf pine seedlings to support the accelerated longleaf pine ecosystem restoration activities on the De Soto. The LLA also funded $45,000 for their Ecosystem Support Team to work on the De Soto and help with RCW cluster maintenance, RCW translocation, and T&E surveys prior to timber sales.

The Land Trust for the Mississippi Costal Plain entered into a Collection Agreement with the De Soto Ranger District to pay the Forest Service $6,425 to burn 257 acres of Forest Service property within Designated Critical Habitat for the dusky gopher frog. This project is in collaboration with the management of adjoining property owned by The Land Trust for the Mississippi Coastal Plain and also managed for the dusky gopher frog.

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 2017 accomplishments: * means blank cell**

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost ($) *(Contract Costs)*
Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres	604	$93,000
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP	Acres	*	*
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	4.7	$5,000
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC	Acres	*	*
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions. S&W-RSRC-IMP	Acres	1200	$180,000
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-LAK	Acres	*	*
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	*	*
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	28189	$750,000
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved RG-VEG-IMP	Acres	*	*
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance RD-HC-MAIN	Miles	*	*
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance RD-PC-MAINT	Miles	*	*
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	*	*
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage STRM-CROS-MTG-STD	Number	*	*
Miles of system trail maintained to standard TL-MAINT-STD	Miles	*	*
Miles of system trail improved to standard TL-IMP-STD	Miles	*	*
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard LND-BL-MRK-MAINT	Miles	94	$86,950
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC	Acres	581	$140,000

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost ($) *(Contract Costs)*
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF	*	*
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	33258	$500,000
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	35423	$1,250,000
Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands SP-INVSPE-FED-AC	Acres	*	*
Number of priority acres treated annually for native pests on Federal lands SP-NATIVE-FED-AC	Acres	*	*
Acres mitigated FP-FUELS-ALL-MIT-NFS *(note: this performance measure will not show up in the WO gPAS reports – please use your own records)*	Acres	*	*
Please also include the acres of prescribed fire accomplished *(note: this performance measure will not show up in the WO gPAS reports – please use your own records)*	Acres	*	*

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

7. **FY 2017 accomplishment narrative** – Summarize key accomplishments and evaluate project progress not already described elsewhere in this report. (Please limit answer to three pages.)

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 sixth 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.

The District also conducted 30 significant outreach activities during FY17. About half of these outreach events were tied specifically to communicating about the CFLR, sharing successes and challenges, as well as gathering additional input from collaborators.

8. **The WO will use spatial data provided in the databases of record close to estimate a treatment footprint for your review and verification**.

- **If the estimate is consistent and accurate**, please confirm that below 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 Estimated Cumulative Footprint of Acres (2010 or 2012 through 2017)	**Footprint of Acres Treated (without counting an acre of treatment on the land in more than one treatment category)**
FY 2017	37,683 acres
FY 2012	109,746 Acres
FY 2013	120,276 Acres
FY 2014	96,890 Acres
FY 2015	58,727 Acres
FY 2016	56,065 Acres
Cumulative	479,387 Acres

If you did not use the EDW estimate, 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 2017 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 2019 Accomplishments *means blank cell
(This table is NOT required for projects submitting updated lifetime goal proposals).

Performance Measure Code	Unit of measure	Work Plan 2019	Planned Accomplishment For 2019	Amount ($)
Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres	400	400	$140,000
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre	150	150	$37,500
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	*	*	*
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	35,000	35,000	$$1,050,000
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	*	*	*
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles	100	100	$200,000
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles	50	50	$100,000
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD	CCF	30,000	30,000	$500,000
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	65,000	65,000	$1,250,000

Please include all relevant planned accomplishments, assuming that funding specified in the CFLRP project proposal for FY 2019 is available. Use actual planned funding if quantity is less than specified in CFLRP project work plan.

11. **Planned accomplishment narrative and justification if planned FY 2018/19 accomplishments and/or funding differs from CFLRP project work plan** (no more than 1 page):

12. **Please include an up to date list of the members of your collaborative if it has changed from previous years**. 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 FY2017** (both In-Kind contributions and through agreements)? (No more than one page):

The De Soto RD applied for, and was awarded a NFWF grant (5 years - $3.9 million) for watershed restoration activities to be implemented on the south end of the district in the head waters of the Big Biloxi River, Little Biloxi River, Tuxachanie Creek, and Tchoutacabouffa River. Final agreement to be signed in FY 2018 to start project work.

14. **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.

Signatures:

Recommended by (Project Coordinator(s)):__*/s/ James Mordica*_____

Approved by (Forest Supervisor(s)): _____

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