CFLR Project (Name/Number): Missouri Pine-Oak Woodlands Restoration Project CFRLP20

National Forest(s): Mark Twain National Forest

1. CFLRP Expenditures, Match, and Leveraged Funds:

a. FY20 CFLN and Matching Funds Documentation

Fund Source- (CFLN Funds **Expended)**	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year **2020**
CFLN20	$1,221,299.09

This amount should match the amount of CFLN dollars obligated In the FMMI CFLRP expenditure report. Include prior year CFLN dollars expended In this Fiscal Year. CFLN funds can only be spent on NFS lands.

Fund Source - (FS Matching Funds)	Total Funds **Expended** in **Fiscal Year 2020**
CMRD	$21,787.18
WFHF	$27,514.6
CWKV	$60,430.75
NFTM	$191,032.06
NFVW	$72,459.67
NFWF	$55,439.64

This amount should match the amount of matching funds In the FMMI CFLRP expenditure report, *minus* any partner funds contributed through agreements (such as NFEX, SPEX, WFEX, CMEX, and CWFS) listed below. Per the updated Program Funding Guidance. federal dollars spent on non - NFS lands (for example, through Wyden authority) may be Included here if aligned with CFLRP proposal implementation within the CFLRP landscape. NOTE: In FY20, projects received their allocation only in CFLN -there are no "Washington Office funds" to report.

Fund Source - Partner Match	**In-Kind Contribution or Funding Provided?**	**Total Estimated Funds/Valuefor FY20**	**Description of CFLRP implementation or monitoring activity**	**Where activity/Itemis located or impacted area**
Northern Research Station	Funding Budget Line Item if Relevant [1]	$15,000	Songbird Survey	National Forest System Lands
Northern Research Station	Funding Budget Line Item if Relevant [1]	25,000 CFLN	Brown-headed Nuthatch Reintroduction	National Forest System Lands
Missouri Department of Conservation	In-Kind Contribution	$45,000 in agreements with MU and Tall Timber Research Station Plus $11,050 in salary	Brown-headed Nuthatch Reintroduction	National Forest System Lands

Fund Source - Partner Match	In-Kind Contribution or Funding Provided?	Total Estimated Funds/Valuefor FY20	Description of CFLRP implementation or monitoring activity	Where activity/Itemis located or impacted area
University of Missouri	In-Kind Contribution	$22,000	Songbird Survey And Brown-headed Nuthatch Reintroduction	National Forest System Lands
Oak Woodlands and Forest Fire Consortium	In-Kind Contribution, $500 Funding Budget Line Item if Relevant [1] $10,000 CFLN		Cane Ridge Interpretive Signs	National Forest System Lands
Missouri State University -Ozark Environmental and Water Resources Institute	In-Kind Contribution, $9,000 Funding Budget Line Item if Relevant [1] $30,000 CFLN		Big Barren Creek Watershed Monitoring Study	National Forest System Lands

Total Partner in-kind Contribution and monitoring of a CFLR project across all lands within the CFLRP landscape.

Service work accomplishment through goods-for services funding within a stewardship contract (for contracts awarded in FY20)	**Totals**
Total revised non-monetary credit limit for contracts awarded in FY20	$55,840.00
Revenue generated through Good Neighbor Agreements	**Totals**
NA	**NA**

revised non -monetary credit limit s 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. Information for contracts awarded prior to FY20 were captured in previous annual reports. Revenue generated from GNA should only be report ed for CFLRP match if the funds are intended to be spent within the CFLRP project area for work in line with the CFLRP project's proposed restoration strategies and in alignment with the CFLRP authorizing legislation

b. ***(If needed)*** **Describe additional leveraged funds** in **your landscape** in **FY2020.** Leveraged funds refer to funds or in-kind services that help the project achieve proposed objectives but do not meet match qualifications. *NOTE: Work on non-National Forest System lands previously reported in this section should now be reported under Partner Match*. Additional leverage might include investments in restoration equipment, research (not monitoring), and planning funds.

As an update to this question, the Missouri Department of Conservation has now provided us restoration activities since 2012 that have occurred on State owned lands. These were never previously accounted for as in-kind or leveraged contributions.

Non-FS Restoration Activities

FY	Unit	Prescribed Fire	Woodland/Forest Management
2012	Peck Ranch	6,336	NA
2012	Angeline	645	NA
2013	Peck Ranch	**864**	NA
2013	Sunklands	910	NA
2013	Rocky Creek	1,057	NA
2013	Angeline	173	NA
2014	Peck Ranch	2,977	NA
2014	Rocky Creek	1,307	NA
2014	Angeline	508	NA
2015	Peck Ranch	**2,832**	NA
2015	Rocky Creek	217	NA
2015	Twin Pines	45	NA
2016	Peck Ranch	4,802	NA
2016	Sunklands	420	NA
2016	Rocky Creek	760	420
2016	Angeline	42	898
2017	Peck Ranch	621	187
2017	Sunklands	NA	1,351
2017	Rocky Creek	NA	1,118
2017	Angeline	195	683
2018	Peck Ranch	2,832	122
2018	Sunklands	NA	970
2018	Rocky Creek	103	480
2018	Angeline	NA	661
2018	Twin Pines	NA	45
2019	Peck Ranch	2,660	13
2019	Sunklands	NA	230
2019	Angeline	NA	494

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.***

FY2020 Overview

FY20 Activity Description (Agency Performance measures)	**Acres**
Number of acres treated by prescribed fire	10,912.6
Number of acres treated by mechanical thinning	8,196
Number of acres of natural ignitions that are allowed to burn under strategies that result in desired conditions	0
Number of acres treated to restore fire-adapted ecosystems which are maintained in desired condition	19,108.6
Number of acres mitigated to reduce fire risk	19,108.6

Please provide a narrative overview of treatments completed in **FY20,** including data on whether your project has expanded the pace and/or scale of treatments over time, and if so, how you've accomplished that -what were the key enabling factors?

- **How was** this **area prioritized for treatment?** What kinds of information, input, and/or analyses were used to prioritize Please provide a summary or links to any quantitative analyses completed. *Priority landscape per Forest Plan l .l and 1.2 Ecosystem Restoration Areas and designated State Conservation Opportunity Area for Forest/ Woodlands and Glades.*
- **Please tell us whether these treatments were in "high or very high wildfire hazard area** from the "wildfirehazard potential map" wildfire hazard potential "
  Were the treatments in proximity to a highly valued resource like a community, a WUI area, communications site, campground, etc.? *No. Very Low/ Low Hazard area. Yes, in proximity* to *numerous identified WUl's and infrastructure.*
- What did you learned about the interaction between treatment prioritization, scale, and cost reduction? What didn't work? Please provide data and further context here. *The Forest, overall, has learned that larger scale burns are more cost effective, and this applies to the CFLR prescribed burn units. Majority of thefire on the Mark Twain are not extended attack* or *large scale due to the fuels and weather conditions in a normal fire season.*

Please provide visuals if available, including maps of the landscape and hazardous fuels treatments completed, before and after photos, and/or graphics from fire regime restoration analysis completed locally. You may copy and paste these below or provide a link to a website with these visuals

Expenditures

Category	$
FY2020 Wildfire Preparedness [1]	21,000
FY2020 Wildfire Suppression [2]	39,805
The cost of managing fires for resource benefit if appropriate (i.e. full suppression versus managing)	**NA**
FY2020 Hazardous Fuels Treatment Costs (CFLN)	196,763 from fy19
FV2020 Hazardous Fuels Treatment Costs (other BLIs)	**218,252**

[1] Include **base** salaries, training, and resource costs borne by the unit (s) that sponsors the CFLRP project. If costs are directly applicable to the project landscape, describe full costs. If costs are borne at the unit level(s), describe what proportions of the costs apply to the project landscape. This may be as simple as Total Costs X (Landscape Acres/ Unit Acres).

[2] Include emergency fire suppression and BAER within the project landscape. Describe acres of fires contained and not contained by initial attack. Describe acres of resource benefits achieved by unplanned ignitions within the landscape. Where existing fuel treatments within the landscape are tested by wildfire, summary and reference the fuel treatment effectiveness report.

When a wildfire interacts with a previously treated area within the CFLR boundary:

Each unit is required to complete and submit a standard fuels treatment effectiveness monitoring (FTEM) entry in the FTEM database (see FSM 5140) when a wildfire occurs within or enters into a fuel treatment area. **For fuel treatmentareas within the CFLR boundary, please copy/paste that entry here and respond to the following supplemental questions. Note that the intent of these questions is to understand progress as well as identify challenges and what didn't work as expected to promote learning and adaptation.**

- *Please describe if/how partners or community members engaged in the planning or implementation* of *the relevant fuels treatment. We were able to work with landowners through the Wyden Act* to *help treat adjacent private lands.*
- *Did treatments include coordinated efforts on other federal, tribal, state, private, etc. lands within or adjacent to the CFLR landscape? Yes*
- *What resource values were you and your partners concerned with protecting* or *enhancing? Did the treatments help to address these value concerns? Public and private property, and natural resources. The treatments that are being implemented will help decrease fire effects to natural resources and create fuel breaks that will aid suppression tactics.*
- *Did the treatments do what you expected them to do? Did they have the intended effect on fire behavior or outcomes? Please include a brief description. Many of the burn units have natural or mechanical containment lines that used to help minimize fire growth.*
- *What is your key takeaway from this event- what would you have done differently? What elements will you continue to apply in the future? Nothing to report*
- *What didn't work as expected, and why? What was learned? Nothing to report*
- *Please include the costs of the treatments listed in the fuels treatment effectiveness report: how much CFLR/CFLN was spent? How much in other BLI's were spent? If cost estimates are not available, please note and briefly explain.*

Pick Wildfire | Treatment List | Monitor | Complete

Single click a wildfire in the list to highlight on map. Icon color indicates the monitoring status of the wildfire as indicated on the Layer List. The table list is filtered to visible map extent. Select "Treatments" to see potential fuel treatment interactions with this wildfire.

Wildfire (Wildfire name search)	Acres	Discovery Date	Control Date	Monitor Status	Interactions
Big Hollow	224.14	Mar 8, 2020	Mar 27, 2020	Completed	10
Tram	77.93	Mar 6, 2020	Mar 12, 2020	Completed	2
Possum	31.21	Mar 8, 2020	Mar 27, 2020	Completed	2
Hog Cliff	0.5	Mar 7, 2020	Mar 27, 2020	Completed	1
Snider	19.47	Mar 8, 2020	Mar 15, 2020	Completed	1
Daylight	20.89	Mar 8, 2020	Mar 10, 2020	Completed	1
Horse	13.06	Apr 11, 2020	Apr 20, 2020	Completed	1
Harmony Church	10.85	Jul 15, 2020	Jul 22, 2020	Completed	1

Summary of 2020 Missouri Fuel Treatment Effectiveness on Wildfires
Number and Percentage of Treatments Tested By Wildfire

Agency	Fire	Treatments that changed fire behavior: No #	%	Yes #	%	Treatments that helped control wildfire: No #	%	Yes #	%	Treatments that changed fire behavior and/or helped control wildfire #	%	Total Records	Total Number of Fires
	Tram	2	100	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0	2	
	Hog Cliff	1	100	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	1	
	Possum	2	100	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0	2	
	Big Hollow	0	0	10	100	0	0	10	100	10	100	10	
	Sricar	1	100	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	1	
	Daylight	1	100	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	1	
	Horse	0	0	1	100	0	0	1	100	1	100	1	
	Harmony Church	0	0	1	100	0	0	1	100	1	100	1	
	Total	7	62.5	12	37.5	7	62.5	12	37.5	12	37.5	30	8

When a wildfire occurs within the CFLR landscape on an area planned for treatment but not yet treated:
Please include: Nothing to report

Please include acres of fires contained and not contained by initial attack and acres of resource benefits achieved by unplanned ignitions within the landscape, and costs. *All fires were contained. See table from above for cost*

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 2020 Jobs Supported/Maintained (CFLN and matching funding):
Copy/paste totals from the **All Funds tab** of the TREAT spreadsheet provided to each project from EMC Economist:

FY 2020Jobs Supported/Maintained	**Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Direct)**	**Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Total)**	**Labor Income (Direct)**	**Labor Income (Total)**
Timber harvesting component	**29**	**43**	**1,282,446**	**1,483,064**
Forest and watershed restoration component	7	**10**	**96,165**	**233,435**
Mill processing component	**68**	**119**	**2,913,560**	**4,430,136**
Implementation and monitoring	**6**	**8**	**312,455**	**350,470**
Other Project Activities	0	0	0	0
TOTALS:	**110**	NA	**4,604,646**	**6,497,105**

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).

The Missouri Pine-Oak Restoration Project is slated for implementation across 126 thousand acres within the Mark Twain National Forest (MTNF). This area corresponds to about 8% of M TNF. About $20 million will be invested to implement the project with one half funded through the CFLRP national fund and the other half through the Knutson- Vandenberg Fund and nongovernmental sources. The $20 million invested on MTNF-CFLRP implementation over the 2012-2019 period are expected to support an average of 141 jobs, generate $33.7 million in labor income and contribute
$44.2 million in added value to the regional 9-county economy. Merchantable tree volume at the end of this period is expected to exceed the initial amount by 14% although growth in timber volume will be lower than if the MTNF-CFLRP had not been implemented. Given the size and scope of the MTNF-CFLRP there were no sizeable or

discern able negativeeffects to the local wood products industry although impacts on industry segments will need further evaluation.

Highlights

- Lands managed under the Mark Twain National Forest Collaborative Forest Land Restoration Project (MTNF- CFLRP) represent about 0.8% of all Missouri forests and 8% of lands in the Mark Twain National Forest.

" Results from economic and vegetation models show that total MTNF-CFLRP investments and subsequent implementation activities from 2012 to 2019 will likely result in:

  - annual average of 141 jobs supported, $33.7 million in labor income, and $44.2 million in added economic value to the local economy (nine-county region where the project is expected to have its largest impact)
  - $2.2 dollars added to the local economy for every dollar invested
  - 9.2 million in tax revenues

" Merchantable tree volume by the end of 2019 is estimated to be 14% greater with the implementation of the MTNF-CFLRP as compared to initial conditions

Indicator	**Brief Description of Impacts, Successes, and Challenges**
# Cross-institutional agreements/policies	The Forest has a Challenge Cost Share Agreement with Missouri State University andhas financial arrangements with the Northern Research Station for assistance in monitoring.
% Locally retained contracts	All timber sales, timber marking contracts, invasive species treatment contracts have beento local contractors within the State.
Ease of doing business	CFLN and the required matching has allowed for more personal, flexibility in contracting and agreements.
Relationship building/collaborative work	The Forest has had over 20 executed Wyden Amendments Participating Agreements to conduct prescribed fire on private lands adjacent to Forest Service lands.

S. Based on your project monitoring plan, **describe the multiparty monitoring process.** (Please limit answer to two pages). *Consider:*

The Forest has a variety of collaborators assisting with multi-party monitoring with Central Hardwood Joint Ventures The Nature Conservancy Missouri State University Ozarks Environmental and Water Resources Institute University of Missouri naturecite Northern Research Station

Songbird surveys: The Northern Research Station, University of Missouri and Missouri Department of Conservation conducted songbird point counts at 246 points previously surveyed in 2012-2014 to monitor bird response to ongoingmanagement. We surveyed bird abundance at points between 3 June and 3 July 2020 and recorded a total of 1696 detections of 18 species. We also measured vegetation structure at all points from 11 June 2020 to 29 July 2020; this
included tallying all trees by diameter and estimating percent shrub, ground, and canopy cover. These data will be combined with **data** collected 2012-2014 to relate bird abundance to management activities and vegetation structure and com posit ion

The following table show the number of birds detected on 10-minute point counts at 246 points surveyed 3 June 2020 to 3 July 2020 on the Mark Twain National Forest Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Project.

Species	Detections
Acadian flycatcher	96
Black and white warbler	19
Blue-winged warbler	25
East ern towhee	55
Eastern wood pewee	179
Indigo bunting	224
Kentucky warbler	51
Northern bobwhite	2
Ovenbird	102
Pine warbler	336
Prairie warbler	91
Red-headed woodpecker	67
Summer tanager	89
White -breasted nuthatch	87
White -eyed vireo	60
Worm -eating warbler	32
Wood thrush	32
Yellow -breasted chat	14S

Brown-headed nuthatch reintroduction: In collaboration with the Missouri Department of Conservation, Northern Research Station Brown headed nuthatches were captured on the Ouachita National Forest and translocated to the Pineknot area of the Mark Twain National Forest to establish a population in restored pine woodlands. Birds were captured using playback calls and mist nets in Arkansas and transported to Missouri by plane by the Missouri

Department of Conservation. We captured and translocated 25 birds August 24-26 and then translocations were delayed due to Hurricane Laura and subsequent rainy weather. We made additional trips to Arkansas September 9-11 and September 24-26 to translocate birds back to Missouri and moved an additional 21 birds, resulting in a total of 46 brown headed nuthatches translocated to the Mark Twain National Forest. We will try and translocate an additional 50 birds in 2021. All released nuthatches were fitted with a federal numbered band on one leg and a unique color combination of 1-2 plastic color bands on the other. We obtained > 250 locations of the 24 radio tagged birds. One transmitter was tracked to the same tree for several days then stopped transmitting and likely represents either a radiotransmitter that fell off and malfunctioned or a mortality. There was no other evidence of mortalities and birds ranged up to 3.6 km from the release site and nearly all locations occurred in managed pine woodland stands. We will begin monthly resighting efforts on a grid of 80 points 250-m apart in November to monitor survival, habitat use, anddispersal.

Big Barren Creek Watershed Monitoring Study: In 2020 the conclusion and final of the Soils and Vegetation Monitoring to evaluate Hydrological Effects of Prescribed Burning in Big Barren Creek Watershed was completed. The four main conclusions from the study are;

1. Sites managed with prescribed burns had significantly less leaf litter but can recover to pre-burn conditions within one growing season.
2. Basal area and duff thickness were significantly different among stand types regardless of burn history.
3. Prescribed fires can improve soil physical properties such as increasing soil organic matter and lowering bulk density in the upper 5 cm of the soil profile
4. The 2015 to 2016 monitoring and the 2018 monitoring show no clear negative effects of prescribed burning.

The results of the monitoring study can be found at:

missouristate.edu/Assets

Assessing and Monitoring the **Ecological Integrity of** Terrestrial **Natural** Communities - **Natural** Community Health **Indices:** In collaboration with the Missouri Department of Conservation a methodology has been developed to assess the condition of acidic Ozark woodlands. This will allow us to assess ecological integrity and to track this through time restoration management efforts within the CFLRP landscape, as well as areas not under management. we have created a

basic Ozark Woodland community health index model that accounts for species found across a continuum of the following specific community types: dry and dry-mesic chert, sandstone, igneous, limestone/dolomite woodlands and upland flatwoods A natural community health index (CHI) is a methodology to assess and coarsely monitor the health or ecological integrity of terrestrial natural community types based on five components:

- • Landscape context and size of the natural community
- •Composition of the plant and animal species
- •Structure of vegetation and biomass
- •Invasive species

Vegetation structure and composition are the most heavily weighted factor (accounting for 75% of the possible score) in a CHI because:

- Vegetation influences most natural community functions.
- Vegetation structure and composition provides habitat for other taxonomic groups.
- Vegetation is the primary vector of energy flow through an ecosystem.
- Strong correlations exist between vegetation and soils.
- Plants are the most easily and practically measured variables of natural communities.
- Vegetation integrates spatially and temporally variable natural and management induced disturbances.

Landscape context (especially the size of the natura l community occurrence) and animal species information account for 15% and 10%, respectively, of the possible score in a terrestrial CHI model. The extensive bird monitoring mentioned above and that have been monitored throughout the CFLRP area in 2012-2014 and again this year will be added into the assessment.

The follow represents CHI sampling units that were completed this year as part of the development of the methodology.A detailed description and protocols for CHI is available upon request. Additional assessment work is planned for 2021.

CHI Sampl n1 Unil Su:,vey S, l_.		" Re'a1 ve-Sa, ,e (Ou! of 90un.al pcss ibre	" Stock **n1**	,• C..._ (DVit t	%Mid ,1ory	%Woody •n va'lhte llnduuarv	● Cansenr,Ulve Pl nt Spitde l M1 1em.-n., fle1ime
12	MTNF P{neKnal	***n***	48	**SS**	**IO**	**.31**	IS Thi"- Bum
8	MTNF PlneKno l	63	45	**60**	l5	NC	10 Thin, Bum
10	**MTNf** P,11<,K not	63	29	***19***	20	**63**	U Thin, Bu,n
II	MTNF PlneKnot	**62**	**56**	61	25	NC	11 Th n, , um
14E	MTNF Plne«no,	57	**54i**	S2	20	;38	10 T n , Bum
Vl<11Jn Pine	Planttr Fores1	56	**Si**	87	40	**l8**	22 Bum
7	Rocky Creek	54	55	87	6]	38	11 LUI bum >» yr, ptev h!n
lD	MTNF P neKnot	54	6	▮	lD	6]	12 Thit\&am
S	Rocky Creek	S2	44	91	75	**l l**	lO Last bum **>5** yr.. pre-v 1hln
6.1	RockyCn,ek	SJ	**61**	9\	6l	38	**e.** Us.tbum>S'lr,pre.v thin
1B	MTNF PlneKn01	46	30	*r:1*	40	63	lOTh n.8um
19	MrNF PlneMDI	44	ts	1S	lO	&l	**a** Thln. tkim
Rondo/ph Tra<1	Ploneu Fores,	44	5]	**BO**	63	76	20 Thln, Bum
9	MTNF P neKno	•2	B2	B2	40	NC	10 Control
14W	MTNF PlneKnot	4l	73	B2	25	12	6" Bum
61,	Ratlv Creek	40	83	9l	63	3B	8 Lau bum >S yr, pr.-v thin
I	MfNF Cane Rldce	38	22	l l	40	76	5 Tom- . WV•CC. bum,thin
1S	MTNF Pine Knol	31	98	78	63	38	8 Conl !O

n • 181tudr units

NC•nat CD 'ect• EI

• S1mJJed on Oct 28 1nd many s.pedes _.e ly went Llftdlet

6. FY 2020 Agency performance measure accomplishments:

Performance Measure	Unit of measure	Total Units Accomplished	Total Treatment Cost ($) *(Contract Costs)*
Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres	776	47,258 total or $435 @ 0.14/ac
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IM P	Acres	**2,212**	PCT $148/ac onPB, $165/ac onEP; Midstory $132/ac; Site Prep $135/ac
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants **INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC**	Acre	99	$34.54/ac
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles	0.25	NA
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhancedHBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	26,130	NA
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance **RD-HC-M AIN**	Miles	**2.78**	$612/mi
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance **RD-PC-M AINT**	Miles	**7.21**	$816/mi
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	NA	NA
Miles of passenger car system roads imp roved RD-PC-IMP	Miles	7.51	NA
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles	NA	NA
Acres of forest lands treated using timber sales TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC	Acres	**2,128**	Marking Paint $23,000 Marking: 722AC @$33.33/ AC= $24,065
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST	CCF	NA	NA
Volume of timber sold TM BR- VOL-SLD	CCF	16,003.41	NA
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removedfrom NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons	4,799	NA
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire**FP-FUELS-NON-WUI**	Acre	**4,463**	$15/AC
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS- WUI	Acres	9,453	$15/AC
Acres mitigated FP-FUELS-ALL-M IT-NFS	Acres	NA	NA
Please also include the acres of prescribed fire accomplished	Acres	**10,912.6**	NA

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

7. **FY 2020 accomplishment narrative** - Summarize key accomplishments and evaluate project progress *not already described elsewhere* in this report. What impact, if any, has Shared Stewardship in your region had on your CFLRP

work?

[3] Please include the costs associated with a contract to complete acres reported, if this level of detail is available, including partner funds

(This could be from a Shared Stewardship MOU or the general emphasis in your region on working cross-boundary on shared priorities at the scale needed to have your desired impact). (Please limit answer to two pages).

8. The WO (EOW) will use spatial data provided in the databases of record to **estimate a treatment footprint** for your review and verification. This information will be Posted hereon the internal SharePoint site for verification *after the databases of record close October 31.*

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	Footprint of acres treated (without continuing an acre of treatments on the land in more than one treatment category)
FY2020	45,024
Estimated Cumulative footprint of acres (2010 or 2012 through 2020)	138.223.95

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 2020 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 2021 Accomplishments

Performance Measure Code	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishmentfor 2021 (NationalForest System)	*Planned Accomplishment on non-NFS lands within the CFLRP landscape"*
Acre s of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres	NA	NA
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plant s INVPLTNXWO-FED-AC	Acre	1,400	NA
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced **HBT-ENH-STRM**	Miles		NA
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhancedHBT-ENH-TERR	Acres	18,000	NA
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM	Miles	13.6	NA
Miles of passenger car system roads improved **RD-PC-IMP**	Miles	NA	NA
Miles of high clearance system road improved **RD-HC-IM P**	Miles	**8.7**	NA
Volume of timber sold TMBR- VOL-SLD	CCF	18,000	NA

[4] As we shift to more emphasis on sharing results across all lands within the CFLRP projects -if relevant for your project area - please provide estimates for planned work on non-NFS lands within the CFLRP areas for work that generally corresponds with the Agency performance measure to the left and supports the CFLRP landscape strategy. Give your best estimate at this point: if It's unknown how much work will occur off NFS lands, simply state unknown

CFLRP Annual Report 2021

Performance Measure Code	***Unit f Measure***	***Planned Accomplishment for 2021 (National Forest System)***	***Planned Accomplishment on non-NFS lands within the CFLRP landscape***
Green tons form small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for Bio-energy production BIO-NRG	Green tons	NA	NA
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/ urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fore FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	16,839	917
Acres of wildland/ urban interface (WUI) high priority hazards fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acre	1,438	NA

Please include all relevant planned accomplishments, assuming that funding specified in the CFLRP project proposal for FY 2020 Is available.

11. Planned accomplishment narrative and justification if planned FY 2021accomplishments and/or funding differs from CFLRP project work plan (no more than 1 page): NA

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. No Changes

13. **Media recap.** Please share with us any hyper/inks 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.

Brown-Headed Nuthatches Return To Missouri

Missouri Department of conservation
Nature's soundtrack returns after century long absence

A Small Bird's Return to Missouri Stems from Forest Restoration Collaboration

Autumn 2020 National Woodlands Magazine, NWOA News.

Signatures:

Recommended by (Project Coordinator(s)):_____

Approved by (Forest Supervisor(s)): _____
Draft reviewed by (collaborative chair or representative): _

_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____