

Ozark Highlands Ecosystem Restoration (CFLR022)

Ozark-St. Francis National Forests

1. CFLRP Expenditures, Match, and Leveraged Funds:

a. FY21 CFLN and Matching Funds Documentation

Fund Source – (CFLN Funds Expended)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2021
CFLN2215	\$29,810
CFLN2220	\$216,155
<u>CFLN2221</u>	<u>\$673,209</u>
TOTAL	<u>\$919,174</u>

This amount should match the amount of CFLN dollars spent 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 – (Forest Service Salary and Expense Match Expended)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2021
<u>NSCF2221</u>	<u>\$1,157,078</u>
TOTAL	<u>\$1,157,078</u>

This amount should match the amount of matching funds in the FMMI CFLRP expenditure report for Salary and Expenses. Staff time spent on CFLRP proposal implementation and monitoring may be counted as CFLRP match – see [Program Funding Guidance](#) for details.

Fund Source – (Forest Service Discretionary Matching Funds)	Total Funds Expended in Fiscal Year 2021
CFKV2214	\$74,633
CFKV2215	\$9,145
<u>CFKV2216</u>	<u>\$239,341</u>
TOTAL	<u>\$323,119</u>

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) which should be reported in the partner contribution table below. Per the [Program Funding Guidance](#), federal dollars spent on non-NFS lands may be included if aligned with CFLRP proposal implementation within the landscape.

Fund Source – (Partner Match)	In-Kind Contribution or Funding Provided?	Total Estimated Funds/Value for FY21	Description of CFLRP implementation or monitoring activity	Where activity/item is located or impacted area
Arkansas Game and Fish Commission (AGFC) and National Wild Turkey Federation (NWTF)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In-kind contribution <input type="checkbox"/> Funding	\$10,000	Brush hogging to maintain open land conditions and reduce fuel loading for wildlife habitat and WSI activities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Forest System Lands <input type="checkbox"/> Other lands within CFLRP landscape:

Fund Source – (Partner Match)	In-Kind Contribution or Funding Provided?	Total Estimated Funds/Value for FY21	Description of CFLRP implementation or monitoring activity	Where activity/item is located or impacted area
Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation (RMEF) and NWTF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In-kind contribution <input type="checkbox"/> Funding	\$20,000	<i>Brush hogging to maintain open land conditions and reduce fuel loading for wildlife habitat and WSI activities</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Forest System Lands <input type="checkbox"/> Other lands within CFLRP landscape:
The Nature Conservancy (TNC)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In-kind contribution <input type="checkbox"/> Funding	\$18,000	Monitoring of vegetation plots, co-op prescribed burning, mechanical treatments, etc.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Forest System Lands <input type="checkbox"/> Other lands within CFLRP landscape:
USDA NRCS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In-kind contribution <input type="checkbox"/> Funding	\$646,762	Financial & Technical Assistance to Private Landowners for Various Habitat Improvement Work	<input type="checkbox"/> National Forest System Lands <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other lands within CFLRP landscape:
TOTALS	Total In-Kind Contributions: \$694,762 Total Funding: \$694,762			

Total partner in-kind contributions for implementation and monitoring of a CFLR project across **all lands** within the CFLRP landscape. For CFLRP projects under the CFLRP Common Monitoring Strategy, note that this table addresses the [core CFLRP common monitoring strategy question](#), “If and to what extent has CFLRP investments attracted partner investments across the landscapes?”

Service work accomplishment through goods-for services funding within a stewardship contract (for contracts awarded in FY21)	Totals
Total <u>revised non-monetary credit limit</u> for contracts awarded in FY21	\$0
Revenue generated through Good Neighbor Agreements	Totals
	\$0

Revised non-monetary credit limits should be the amount in contract’s [“Progress Report for Stewardship Credits, Integrated Resources Contracts or Agreements,”](#) the “Revised Non-Monetary Credit Limit,” as of September 30. Additional information on the Progress Reports is available in CFLR Annual Report Instructions document.

Revenue generated from GNA should only be reported 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. (OPTIONAL) Describe additional leveraged funds in your landscape in FY2021, if relevant. Leveraged funds refer to funds or in-kind services that help the project achieve proposed objectives *but do not meet match qualifications*- examples include research (not monitoring) and planning funds.

The Ozark-St. Francis National Forests, Ouachita National Forest, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) in Arkansas, and Arkansas Department of Agriculture – Forestry Division are currently working under two Joint Chiefs’ Landscape Restoration Partnerships. Other partners involved with this project include Arkansas Game and Fish Commission and The Nature Conservancy. The Joint Chiefs’ project overlapped with the following Arkansas counties in the CFLR project landscape: Benton, Conway, Crawford, Franklin, Johnson, Madison, Newton, Pope, Searcy, Van Buren, and Washington. NRCS funded conservation practices in the amount of \$646,762 for Joint Chiefs’ projects on private property within these counties.

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 wildfire risk reduction goals.

During fiscal year (FY) 2021, we treated a total of 35,231 acres of the landscape in the CFLR project area with prescribed fire (an increase of 12,261 acres treated in FY20). No wildfires occurred in, or burned into areas having received fuels treatment activities in the CFLRP project. As activities continue and the footprint of treatment areas within the project boundaries increase, we anticipate seeing changed conditions resulting in wildfires having lower fire behavior characteristics and being more easily controlled. Total acres of all fuels treatment in the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) account for approximately 93 percent (38,726 acres) and approximately 7 percent (3,049 acres) were Non WUI. All of the hazardous fuels treatments, including prescribed fire, mechanical, manual, and chemical methods, account for 41,775 acres of the landscape in FY21. To date, we have surpassed our life target requested in the 2012 proposal for acres of treatment in the WUI. All the treatments described herein are assisting in moving the project area towards desired conditions. The entire Ozark-St. Francis National Forests are considered to be within a fire-adapted ecosystem.

FY2021 Overview

FY21 Activity Description (Agency performance measures)	Acres
Number of acres treated by prescribed fire	35,231
Number of acres treated by mechanical thinning	3,474
Number of acres treated by chemical thinning	2,907
Number of acres treated by manual methods	163
Number of acres of natural ignitions that are allowed to burn under strategies that result in desired conditions	0
Number of acres mitigated to reduce fire risk	41,775

Please provide a narrative overview of treatments completed in FY21, 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.
 - The Ozark Highlands CFLR project area was originally chosen because there was a combined effort between multiple agencies to restore the oak-hickory and oak-pine ecosystems as far back as 2002. These ecosystems had been reduced to closed canopy stands with an understory dominated by shrubs, poison ivy, and Virginia creeper. Pre-treatment stem densities average 300-1,000 stems per acre as opposed to the 38-76 stems per acre recorded in Government Land Office (GLO) records in the 1800’s. Oak regeneration was lacking. Plant diversity had declined and wildlife habitat was degraded. The red

oak borer and oak decline had affected over a million acres in the Ozarks since 2000; 48,000 acres in the CFLR project area. In some areas, tree canopy had been severely reduced or eliminated. This had greatly impacted sustainability of our oak-hickory and oak-pine ecosystems.

- According to our vegetation monitoring results, which can be found below in this report, we are moving in the direction of our desired condition over much of the CFLR project area.
- The key enabling factors were collaboration with our partners to achieve results and to monitor those results, as well as funding to increase capacity attained through this CFLR project and our Joint Chiefs' Landscape Restoration Partnership - Western Arkansas and Southeastern Oklahoma Woodland Restoration Project.

- **Please tell us whether these treatments were in “high or very high wildfire hazard area from the “wildfire hazard potential map”** (<https://www.firelab.org/project/wildfire-hazard-potential>).
 - Were the treatments in **proximity to a highly valued resource** like a community, a WUI area, communications site, campground, etc.?
 - Most of the CFLR project area is not within high or very high wildfire potential areas; however, there are very small patches of high wildfire areas spaced across the treatment areas.
 - In FY 21, 93 percent of our hazardous fuels treatments were within a WUI area but that is just a small portion of the entire CFLR project area.
 - The Wedington Unit (Boston Mountain Ranger District) is considered the main public land in Northwest Arkansas and serves a population of over 350,000. This area is highly used for recreational activities such as hunting, horseback riding, bike riding, hiking, and nature viewing. The Wedington Unit has received multiple hazardous fuel reduction treatments during this CFLR project.
- **What did you learn** about the interaction between treatment prioritization, scale, and cost reduction? What didn't work? Please provide data and further context here.
 - Vegetation monitoring has indicated that combined treatments for the CFLR project have been effective at shifting the vegetation communities and increasing species diversity. Specifically, in areas where timber harvest or midstory removal is combined with multiple entries of prescribed fire, the treated vegetation community is meeting the project-scale objectives. Prescribed fire alone is slowly moving the vegetation conditions toward the desired condition, but it is not clear at this stage if multiple prescribed fire entries alone will completely return the stands to the desired condition or how long that may take. Data from our R8 bird surveys are clear that different species of migratory birds prefer different habitats throughout the year; thus, landscape scale treatments are important to support and create these mosaic habitat types.

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. You may copy and paste or provide a link.



Figures 1 & 2. Pine woodland restoration areas that have received tree thinning, opening creation, and multiple prescribed fire treatments on Griffin Mountain in the CFLR project area. These treatments have created open-forest conditions that support habitat for quail, sparrows, and other disturbance-dependent species.



Figures 3 & 4. Eastern red cedar thinning in woodlands on the Lee Creek Unit of the Boston Mountain Ranger District. Once the cedar has decayed to the appropriate level and the fuel volatility is reduced, prescribed fire will be used to consume the downed fuels. Removing cedar and reintroducing fire is all that is needed to restore these woodland stands to a productive ecological condition with increased plant diversity and wildlife value.



Figure 5. Doug Zolner, TNC Ecologist, records data from a long-term vegetation monitoring plot within the CFLR project. Timber thinning and prescribed fire in this area have resulted in reduced canopy closure and an open mid-story condition. Monitoring indicates these treatments have increased plant diversity and improved breeding habitat for many bird species.

Expenditures

Category	\$
FY21 Wildfire Preparedness ¹	\$92,175 (Unit) \$81,302 (Project)
FY21 Wildfire Suppression ²	\$0
The cost of managing fires for resource benefit if appropriate (i.e. full suppression versus managing)	\$0
FY21 Hazardous Fuels Treatment Costs (CFLN)	\$365,896
FY21 Hazardous Fuels Treatment Costs (other BLIs)	\$218,608

How may the treatments that were implemented contribute to reducing fire costs? If you have seen a reduction in fire suppression costs over time, please include that here.

All the treatments implemented within the CFLR project area are designed to create more open woodland desired conditions, thereby reducing fire suppression costs by reducing fuel loading through thinning, prescribed fire, and other chemical and mechanical means.

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.

Have there been any assessments or reports conducted within your CFLRP landscape that provide information on cost reduction, cost avoidance, and/or other cost related data as it relates to fuels treatment and fires? If so, please summarize or provide links here:

No reports have been conducted within the CFLR project area landscape on cost reduction, cost avoidance, and/or other cost related data as it relates to fuel treatment and fires. There have been vegetation surveys conducted within the CFLR project area which conveys approximate fuel loading and fuel modeling which could also be derived from this data. Please see the link in the report below for the vegetation monitoring data.

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.

- Include expenses in wildfire preparedness and suppression, where relevant
- Include summary of BAER requests and authorized levels within the project landscape, where relevant

If a wildfire interacted with a previously treated area within the CFLR boundary:

No wildfires occurred within the CFLR boundary in FY21.

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 treatment areas 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.**

- o *Please describe if/how partners or community members engaged in the planning or implementation of the relevant fuels treatment.*
- o *Did treatments include coordinated efforts on other federal, tribal, state, private, etc. lands within or adjacent to the CFLR landscape?*
- o *What resource values were you and your partners concerned with protecting or enhancing? Did the treatments help to address these value concerns?*
- o *Did the treatments do what you expected them to do? Did they have the intended effect on fire behavior or outcomes?*
- o *What is your key takeaway from this event – what would you have done differently? What elements will you continue to apply in the future?*

If a wildfire occurred within the CFLR landscape on an area planned for treatment but not yet treated:

- Please include:
 - o *Acres impacted and severity of impact*
 - o *Brief description of the planned treatment for the area*
 - o *Summary of next steps – will the project implement treatments elsewhere? Will they complete an assessment?*
 - o *Description of collaborative involvement in determining next steps.*

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 (TREAT) inputs and assumptions available [here](#).³

For the TREAT analysis, assumptions had to be made for direct full and part-time jobs directly supported.

³ For CFLRP projects under the CFLRP Common Monitoring Strategy this and the responses below address the [core CFLRP common monitoring strategy questions](#), “How have CFLRP activities supported local jobs and labor income?” and “How do sales, contracts, and agreements associated with the CFLRP affect local communities?”

Looking at your CFLRP project’s TREAT Data Entry “Full Project Details” Tab, what percent of funding was used for contracts within the local impact area? (see cell D13).⁴ If you have data on what percent of funding was used for agreements within the local impact area, please note.

Contract Funding Distributions (“Full Project Details” Tab):

Description	Project Percent
Equipment intensive work	22
Labor-intensive work	32
Material-intensive work	23
Technical services	20
Professional services	2
Contracted Monitoring	1
TOTALS:	100%

Please provide a brief description of the local businesses that benefited from CFLRP related contracts and agreements, if known. Consider characteristics such as tribally-owned firms, veteran-owned firms, women-owned firms, minority-owned firms, and business size.⁵

Most all of the contracting for this CFLR project is awarded locally to small businesses within rural Arkansas. All TSI, WSI, and herbicide application work is contracted with locally owned small businesses. Supplies for contract work, including herbicide, is also purchased through veteran-owned small businesses.

FY 2021 Modelled Jobs Supported/Maintained (CFLN and matching funding):

FY 2021 Jobs Supported/Maintained	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Direct)	Jobs (Full and Part-Time) (Total)	Labor Income (Direct)	Labor Income (Total)
Timber harvesting component	25	34	1,495,654	1,888,917
Forest and watershed restoration component	11	18	435,808	686,202
Mill processing component	35	88	2,355,910	5,544,184
Implementation and monitoring	32	35	964,186	1,095,952
Other Project Activities	0	0	6,579	9,154
TOTALS:	102	175	5,258,137	9,224,410

4. Briefly describe o community benefits that align with the CFLRP proposal and strategies socioeconomic goals. How has CFLR and related activities benefitted your community(ies) from a social and/or economic standpoint? Please link to monitoring reports or other relevant information if available.

The results of our economic analysis completed by the University of Arkansas at Monticello reported that commercial timber production used in support of restoration activities provided for 50 percent of the CFLR project’s benefits. Local contractors, collaborators, and partners with physical addresses within the Ozark Highlands Region were found to spend a significantly greater percentage of their project expenditures within the Ozark Highlands Region than those outside of the region. The CFLR project contributes to the community in several ways. Some of the contracts are directly awarded

⁴ If you would prefer to use other data collected locally, you may include that here. Do not include dollars that were contracted to firms outside of the local area.

⁵ This information is publicly available through usaspending.gov, there are other firm characteristics that may be more relevant for your CFLRP project or important for tracking over time.

to local contractors. Large and small purchases were made throughout the CFLR community area. The economic report can be found here: <https://usdagcc.sharepoint.com/sites/fs-fm-cflrp/Monitoring%20Documents/Forms/AllItems.aspx?viewid=00000000%2D0000%2D0000%2D0000%2D000000000000&id=%2Fsites%2Ffs%2Dfm%2Dcflrp%2FMonitoring%20Documents%2FOzark%20Highlands>

Indicator	Brief Description of Impacts, Successes, and Challenges	Links to reports or other published materials (if available)
Sustained jobs in the Ozark Highlands	Local direct spending and timber produced from the Ozark Highlands Region sustained 139 jobs in 2014.	See link in description above
Sustained jobs nationally	The Ozark Highlands CFLR Project supported 245 jobs nationally with an annual average employee compensation of \$42,584 which is 87% of the national average.	See link in description above
Local and national benefit-cost ratio	Every \$1 spent locally returned \$1.1 in the local economy in 2014. Every \$1 invested in the CFLR project created \$2.1 in the national economy in 2014.	See link in description above
Relationship building/collaborative work	The Ozark Ouachita Highlands Collaborative was formed consisting of 12 organizations and state and federal agencies all working to support forest and woodland restoration. The collaborative continues to grow and assist the two national forests (Ozark and Ouachita) with their CFLR and Joint Chiefs' projects.	

5. Based on your project monitoring plan, **describe the multiparty monitoring process.** Consider:

- *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 major positive and negative ecological, social and economic shifts observed through monitoring? Any modifications of subsequent treatment prescriptions and methods in response to these shifts?*
- *What are the current weaknesses or shortcomings of the monitoring process? How might the CFLRP monitoring process be improved? (Please limit answer to one page.)*
- *Please provide a link to your most up-to-date multi-party monitoring plan and any available monitoring results from FY21.*

Multiparty monitoring was accomplished through grants and agreements with Arkansas Game and Fish Commission (AGFC), Arkansas Wildlife Federation (AWF), National Wild Turkey Federation (NWTf), The University of Arkansas (U of A), Arkansas Tech University (ATU), and The Nature Conservancy (TNC). Established Forest Service protocol is being used to conduct all monitoring and evaluation of the CFLR project area. Site preparation activities within the CFLR project area are having a positive effect on the overall forest health of the area, by re-establishing new growth in forest stands in place of aging and overstocked stands. Timber harvest continues to have an overall positive effect on the local economy, by providing sources of employment and revenue to the local workforce.

R8 Bird Surveys were revisited in June by District personnel consisting of 49 total plots with 20 of them being within the CFLR project area. We are seeing some changes in species, but the monitoring program is still ongoing.

Ginseng monitoring is conducted annually by Forest Service personnel to assess population trends at given point locations.

Anabat surveys were conducted by Forest Service personnel to monitor bat populations over time. Anabat surveys and mist net surveys were conducted for Indiana bat by Forest Service, US Fish and Wildlife Service, and Arkansas State University personnel.

Christmas bird counts were done in early December/January with approximately five (5) groups consisting of ATU students and faculty volunteers, and Forest Service personnel conducting a one (1) day survey to assess population trends.

Monitoring consisted of game camera placement in key CFLR treatment areas by our partner AGFC. Cameras monitored wildlife habitat utilization in some of the treatment areas. The US Geological Survey Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit monitored effects of prescribed burning treatments to movement and nesting of female Eastern wild turkeys in the CFLR project area. The monitoring was completed August of 2014. The U of A has been monitoring effects of prescribed burning and wildlife stand improvement (WSI) treatments to wasps and dead and down old growth fossil chinquapin forests. Other monitoring activities have included vegetative photo points before and after WSI treatments through force account. The U of A has been evaluating colonization of macro invertebrates of area streams within the CFLR project area through habitat improvements such as addition of large woody debris. Photo points have indicated vegetative recovery of some of the areas in the Mill Creek Off Highway Vehicle trail area where watershed improvement fencing was constructed three (3) years ago. Aquatic monitoring by AGFC over time after several dredging treatments of Shores Lake will be able to evaluate change to fisheries in the lake.

Bearcat Bird Surveys were conducted by AWF and ATU consisting of 19 plots revisited in June of 2021. We are seeing some increases in early successional species.

In 2015, we collected plant community monitoring data from 63 permanent macroplots on the Big Piney and Pleasant Hill Ranger Districts in the Ozark-St. Francis National Forests. These data, along with data from 64 macroplots sampled in 2014 were included in the 2017 plant community monitoring report located here: <https://usdagcc.sharepoint.com/sites/fs-fm-cflrp/Monitoring%20Documents/Forms/AllItems.aspx?viewid=00000000%2D0000%2D0000%2D0000%2D000000000000&id=%2Fsites%2Ffs%2Dfm%2Dcflrp%2FMonitoring%20Documents%2FOzark%20Highlands>. Preliminary results of the plant community monitoring report shows that by 2014-2015 live tree cover (basal area) was reduced by 23 percent since the baseline (from 106 ft²/acre to 82 ft²/acre, on average). Within the tree layer, overstory (8"+ diameter at breast height (dbh) was less affected overall, decreasing from 83 ft²/acre to 72 ft²/acre (13 percent reduction); whereas, midstory cover was reduced by 57 percent. This change represents a shift towards desired tree layer structure. Shrub density was still much higher than desired in 2014-2015 and increased significantly since 2007-2009, from an average of 1,095 stems/acre to 1,721 stems/acre (57 percent increase). These results represent changes for the national forests as a whole. Future analyses will assess progress towards desired community composition within the national forests.

In June of 2021, vegetation data was collected from half of the established permanent monitoring plots. The other half of permanent monitoring plots will be surveyed in June of 2022 and that data will be analyzed by TNC and organized into another future plant community monitoring report.

6. FY 2021 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	197	
Acres of forest vegetation improved FOR-VEG-IMP©	Acres	2,031	
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC©	Acre	1,569	
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC©	Acres	11,814	\$10,000
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions. S&W-RSRC-IMP©	Acres	1,297	
Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-LAK	Acres	86	
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM©	Miles	1	
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR©	Acres	51,236	
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved RG-VEG-IMP©	Acres	1,413	
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance RD-HC-MAIN©	Miles	91	
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance RD-PC-MAINT	Miles	110	
Miles of road decommissioned RD-DECOM©	Miles	0	
Miles of passenger car system roads improved RD-PC-IMP	Miles	0	
Miles of high clearance system road improved RD-HC-IMP	Miles	0	
Road Storage <i>While this isn't tracked in the USFS Agency database, please provide road storage miles completed if this work is in support of your CFLRP restoration strategy for tracking at the program level.</i>	Miles	0	
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage STRM-CROS-MTG-STD©	Number	0	
Miles of system trail maintained to standard TL-MAINT-STD©	Miles	67	
Miles of system trail improved to standard TL-IMP-STD©	Miles	0	
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard LND-BL-MRK-MAINT	Miles	0	
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC	Acres	2,170	
Volume of Timber Harvested TMBR-VOL-HVST*	CCF	27,482	
Volume of timber sold TMBR-VOL-SLD*©	CCF	27,824	
Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production BIO-NRG*	Green tons	384	
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	Acre	3,049	
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI©	Acres	38,726	
Acres mitigated FP-FUELS-ALL-MIT-NFS	Acres	41,775	
Please also include the acres of prescribed fire accomplished	Acres	35,231	
<i>(Optional) Other performance measure not listed above</i>	Acres		
<i>(Optional) Other performance measure not listed above</i>	Acres		

Units accomplished should match the accomplishments recorded in the Databases of Record. For CFLRP projects under the CFLRP Common Monitoring Strategy, items marked with a * help to address the [core CFLRP common monitoring strategy question](#), “Did CFLRP increase economic utilization of restoration byproducts?”

©Life target accomplished for project.

7. The Washington Office (Enterprise Data Warehouse) will use spatial data provided in the databases of record to estimate a treatment footprint for each CFLRP project’s review and verification. This information will be [posted here](#) on 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**, note the total acres treated below.

Fiscal Year	Footprint of Acres Treated (without counting an acre of treatment on the land in more than one treatment category)
FY 2021	112,708
Estimated Cumulative Footprint of Acres (CFLRP start year through 2021)	200,000

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?

The EDW estimate is consistent and accurate.

8. Describe any reasons that the FY 2021 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?

No changes to the previously reported planned accomplishments have taken place.

Acres treated using timber sales is a target we struggle to accomplish due to the length of timber sale contracts, many of these sales that we are selling now may not receive treatment for several years, putting them outside the lifetime of this CFLR project. Prescribed fire acres outside the WUI is another target we struggle with. Most of our prescribed burning occurs within the WUI which is a life target that we have already accomplished and continue to exceed. Some projects and contracts were affected by COVID restrictions and lack of personnel which hindered our ability to obligate all the FY2021 CFLN funds allocated. We still managed to obligate \$919,174 out of the \$959,948 allocated.

(OPTIONAL) FY 2021 Additional accomplishment narrative – If desired, please use this space to describe additional accomplishments the CFLRP project participants are proud of from FY21 *not already described elsewhere* in this report.

Since 2014, the Ouachita and Ozark-St. Francis National Forests have been highly involved in multiple Joint Chiefs' projects that overlap with a portion of the Shortleaf Pine Bluestem and Ozark Highlands CFLR project areas. The goals of both projects are also similar in that they are designed to restore woodlands and glades even across boundaries onto adjoining private lands. Through shared stewardship, we've been able to successfully restore hundreds of thousands of acres through multiple partnerships including NGO's, state, federal, and private organizations. We have produced a series of videos to tell our restoration story and highlight our successes through this restoration partnership. These videos were produced through a partnership with The Nature Conservancy, The Ouachita National Forest, and a private contractor. Here is a link to our main video “Restoring the Interior Highlands”:

[FINE Restoration Overview.mp4 \(vimeo.com\)](#)

(OPTIONAL) FOR INTERNAL USE: The following responses are directed towards feedback on *internal* bottlenecks or issues that may impact your project. Please use this space to raise awareness on key internal issues, or opportunities to improve processes moving forward. Responses will be included in an internal document. What are the limiting factors to success or more success of the CFLR? How can the National Forest and its collaborators operate in a more integrated and synergized way?

Our forest has lost a significant amount of personnel in the last few years and given that loss, project accomplishment/monitoring and effectiveness has been affected. We have leaned heavily on our partners and contracting to compensate for this deficit. The positive side to leaning heavily on our partners to meet accomplishments is that it has allowed us to become more integrated and synergized. Every year we look for more ways to collaborate in reaching our goals with less funding and personnel.

9. Planned FY 2022 Accomplishments (for CFLRP projects with **known ongoing funding in FY22)⁶**

Performance Measure Code	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment for 2022 (National Forest System)	Planned Accomplishment on non-NFS lands within the CFLRP landscape⁷
Acres of forest vegetation established FOR-VEG-EST	Acres		
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	Acre		
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-STRM	Miles		
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced HBT-ENH-TERR	Acres		
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		
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		

⁶ Projects funded beginning in FY21, or extensions of 5 years or more, will be following the new Common Monitoring Strategy and will be asked to provide information on invasives, wildlife habitat, and reduction in fuels that go beyond acre tallies. Please work with your Regional CFLRP Coordinator as these are implemented.

⁷ 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

Performance Measure Code	Unit of measure	Planned Accomplishment for 2022 (National Forest System)	Planned Accomplishment on non-NFS lands within the CFLRP landscape ⁷
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire FP-FUELS-WUI	Acres		

Please include all relevant planned accomplishments, assuming that funding specified in the CFLRP project proposal for FY 2021 is available.

10. Planned accomplishment narrative and justification if planned FY 2022 accomplishments and/or funding differs from CFLRP project work plan (for CFLRP projects with known ongoing funding in FY22):

Ongoing funding is not known at this time. The Ozark Highlands Restoration Project began in 2012 and is a sunset project as of 2021. The new project “Restoring Resiliency of the Interior Highlands and Coastal Plain of Arkansas” is in the que for potential funding.

11. 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.⁸

No change.

(OPTIONAL) Media recap. Please share with us any hyperlinks to videos, newspaper articles, press releases, scholarly works, and photos of your project that you have available. You are welcome to include links or to copy/paste.

[FINE Restoration Overview.mp4 \(vimeo.com\)](#)

(OPTIONAL) For CFLRP Projects in the final year of their initial 10 year funding plans. Please use this space to provide any key reflections on lessons learned and opportunities for improvement for CFLRP moving forward – this could be bullets, a few brief paragraphs, or links to reports you would like to share on this topic.

One opportunity for improvement would be more defined goals and objectives for monitoring within the CFLR project areas and at the landscape level. Ways to measurably define desired condition achievements would help to ensure the success of restoration.

Funding for public outreach and education about CFLRP and specific projects would also help facilitate NEPA and partner involvement.

Signatures:

Recommended by (Project Coordinator(s)): _____

Approved by (Forest Supervisor(s)): _____

Draft reviewed by (collaborative chair or representative): _____

⁸ For CFLRP projects under the CFLRP Common Monitoring Strategy, this table addresses the [core CFLRP common monitoring strategy question](#), “Who is involved in the collaborative and if/how does that change over time?”