

Attachment A: Projected Accomplishments Table

Performance Measure	Code	Number of units to be treated over 10 years using CFLR funds	Number of units to be treated over 10 years using other FS funds	Number of units to be treated over 10 years using Partner Funds ¹	CFLR funds to be used over 10 years (\$)	Other FS funds to be used over 10 years ² (\$)	Partner funds to be used over 10 years
Acres treated annually to sustain or restore watershed function and resilience	WTRSHD-RSTR-ANN	250,000	250,000		5,000,000	5,000,000	0
Acres of forest vegetation established	FOR-VEG-EST	3,582	3,582	0	623,500	623,500	0
Acres of forest vegetation improved	FOR-VEG-IMP	31,238	31,238	0	4,498,000	4,498,000	0
Manage noxious weeds and invasive plants	INVPLT-NXWD-FED-AC	550	550	0	Included above	Included above	0
Highest priority acres treated for invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on NFS lands	INVSPE-TERR-FED-AC						
Acres of water or soil resources protected, maintained or improved to achieve desired watershed conditions.	S&W-RSRC-IMP	0	130	0	0	14,690	0

¹ These values should reflect only units treated on National Forest System Land

² **Matching Contributions:** The CFLR [Fund](#) may be used to pay for up to 50 percent of the cost of carrying out and monitoring [ecological restoration treatments](#) on National Forest System (NFS) lands. The following BLI's have been identified as appropriate for use as matching funds to meet the required minimum 50% match of non-CFLR funds: ARRA, BDBD, CMEX, CMII, CMLG, CMRD, CMTL, CWFS, CWKV, CWK2, NFEX, NFLM (Boundary), NFMG (ECAP/AML), NFN3, NFTM, NFVW, NFWF, PEPE, RBRB, RTRT, SFSF, SPFH, SPEG, SPS4, SSCC, SRS2, VCNP, VCVC, WFEX, WFW3, WFHF.

The following BLI's have been identified as **NOT** appropriate for use as matching funds to meet the required minimum 50% match of non-CFLR funds: ACAC, CWF2, EXEX, EXSL, EXSC, FDFD, FDRF, FRRE, LALW, LBLB, LBTV, LGCY, NFIM, NFLE, NFLM (non-boundary), NFMG (non-ECAP), NFPN, NFRG, NFRW, POOL, QMQM, RIRI, SMSM, SPCF, SPCH, SPIA, SPIF, SPS2, SPS3, SPS5, SPST, SPUF, SPVF, TPBP, TPTP, URUR, WFPR, WFSU.

Acres of lake habitat restored or enhanced	HBT-ENH-LAK		580			160,080	
Miles of stream habitat restored or enhanced	HBT-ENH-STRM		3			2,170	
Acres of terrestrial habitat restored or enhanced	HBT-ENH-TERR		1,879			767,570	
Acres of rangeland vegetation improved	RG-VEG-IMP						
Miles of high clearance system roads receiving maintenance	RD-HC-MAIN		30			30,000	
Miles of passenger car system roads receiving maintenance	RD-PC-MAINT		1480			148,000	
Miles of road decommissioned	RD-DECOM		5			10,000	
Miles of passenger car system roads improved	RD-PC-IMP		22			88,000	
Miles of high clearance system road improved	RD-HC-IMP		44			220,000	
Number of stream crossings constructed or reconstructed to provide for aquatic organism passage	STRM-CROS-MTG-STD		10			500,000	
Miles of system trail maintained to standard	TL-MAINT-STD		6			75,000	
Miles of system trail improved to standard	TL-IMP-STD		10			500,000	
Miles of property line marked/maintained to standard	LND-BL-MRK-MAINT		40			40,000	
Acres of forestlands treated using timber sales	TMBR-SALES-TRT-AC	33,029	33,029		Included above	Included above	
Volume of timber sold (CCF)	TMBR-VOL-SLD	396,348	396,348		Included above	Included above	

Green tons from small diameter and low value trees removed from NFS lands and made available for bio-energy production	BIO-NRG						
Acres of hazardous fuels treated outside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire	FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	25,000	25,000		500,000	500,000	
Acres of hazardous fuels treated inside the wildland/urban interface (WUI) to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire	FP-FUELS-NON-WUI	225,000	225,000		4,500,000	4,500,000	
Acres of wildland/urban interface (WUI) high priority hazardous fuels treated to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fire	FP-FUELS-WUI						
Number of priority acres treated annually for invasive species on Federal lands	SP-INVSPE-FED-AC		1,460			475,000	
Number of priority acres treated annually for native pests on Federal lands	SP- NATIVE –FED-AC						

Attachment B: Reduction of related wildfire management costs

Insert "Results- Cost Savings" of the R-CAT spreadsheet, available on the CFLRP website³

R-CAT Results

**Proposal Name: Texas Longleaf
Ridge Restoration Project**

Start Year	2011
End Year	2021
Total Treatment Acres	101,491
Average Treatment Duration	2
Discounted Anticipated Cost Savings - No Beneficial Use	186,280
Discounted Anticipated Cost Savings - Low Beneficial Use	24,000
Discounted Anticipated Cost Savings - Moderate Beneficial Use	23,100
Discounted Anticipated Cost Savings - High Beneficial Use	23,460

Documentation of data sources and assumptions utilized to populate the table.

Proposal Name: Texas Longleaf Ridge Restoration Project	Documentation Page
This page is intended to help you record and communicate the assumptions and calculations that feed the risk and cost analysis tool package spreadsheet	Response / Information Column
Was the analysis prospective (projecting activities, costs and revenues that are planned by the proposal) or retrospective (using actual acres, revenues and costs in an analysis looking back over the life of the project)?	Retrospective
Start year rationale:	Projects are underway in 2011
End year rationale:	The funding for the projects was projected for ten years though certainly projects will be completed after that time.
Duration of treatments rationale:	Through experience we have observed in the restoration stage, a 2-year prescribed burn interval is necessary to achieve the desired progress in controlling encroaching woody understory plants.
All dollar amounts entered should reflect undiscounted or nominal costs, as they are discounted automatically for you in the R-CAT spreadsheet tool? Did you provide undiscounted costs, and in what year data are your costs and revenues provided.	Yes, the 2008 year wildfire costs were used.
Average treatment cost per acre rationale:	Fire management treatment costs in 2010 averaged \$20/acre.
Rationale for actual costs per acre of treatment by year is used:	We used the estimate of \$20/acre treatment costs and increased the cost by 3% each year based on the experience of our forest FMO.
Average treatment revenue per acre rationale:	There is no expected revenue from prescribed burning treatments.
This tool is intended to be used to estimate Forest Service fire program costs only , did you conduct your analysis this way or have you taken an all lands approach?	Only Forest Service fire management costs were considered.

Total treatment acres calculations, assumptions:	Burning blocks are burned every other year to meet the structural objectives.
Treatment timing rationale with NEPA analysis considerations:	NEPA analyses has been completed for prescribed burning..
Annual Fire Season Suppression Cost Estimate Pre Treatment, Assumptions and Calculations	Numbers were based on 2000-2008 wildfire seasons on Angelina National Forest. We determined the average number of wildfire acres per year and we applied the average cost of wildfire suppression incurred in 2008.
Did you use basic Landfire Data for you Pretreatment Landscape?	No
Did you modify Landfire data to portray the pretreatment landscape and fuel models?	No
Did you use ArcFuels to help you plan fuel treatments?	No
Did you use other modeling to help plan fuel treatments, if so which modeling?	No
Did you model fire season costs with the Large Fire Simulator?	No
If, so who helped you with this modeling?	n/a
If not, how did you estimate costs, provide details here:	Costs were based on average suppression costs of three wildfires during the 2008 wildfire season. We average 12 fires per year at 20 acres per fire. The fires are primarily human-caused. Based on the 2008 season, the cost of wildfires outside of wilderness areas average approximately \$300 per acre. In wilderness areas, the cost is estimated to be at least \$3000 per acre.
Did you apply the stratified cost index (SCI) to your Fsim results?	No
Who helped you apply SCI to your FSIM results?	n/a
Did you filter to remove Fsim fires smaller than 300acres and larger than a reasonable threshold?	No
What is the upper threshold you used?	n/a.
Did you use median pre treatment costs per fire season?	No.
Did you use median post treatment costs per fire season?	No.

Did you test the statistical difference of the fire season cost distributions using a univariate test?	No
What were the results?	n/a
Did you estimate Burned Area Emergency Response (BAER) costs in you analysis?	No
Did you use H codes or some other approach to estimate these costs?	No
Did these cost change between pre and post treatment?	n/a
Did you estimate long term rehabilitation and reforestation costs in your analysis?	No
How did you develop these estimates, and did these cost change between pre and post treatment?	n/a
Did you include small fire cost estimates in your analysis?	Yes, small fires are typical here.
If so, how did you estimate these costs, what time period is used as a reference, and did these cost change between pre and post treatment?	We used a figure of \$260/ac based on average costs in 2008.
Did you include beneficial use fire as a cost savings mechanism in your analysis?	No because the area is too fragmented for monitoring response except in wilderness areas.
How did you estimate the percent of contiguous area where monitoring is an option for pretreatment landscape?	n/a
How did you estimate the percent of contiguous area where monitoring is an option for post treatment landscape, and why did you select the percentage of your landscape for low, moderate and high?	Beneficial use estimates would only be used in wilderness areas and that consists of 12% of the project area. After the project is completed we should be able to use beneficial use estimates,
How did you derive an estimate for the percentage of full suppression costs used in fire monitoring for beneficial use?	n/a
Did you ensure that you clicked on all the calculation buttons in cells in column E after entering your estimates?	Yes

Did you make any additional modifications that should be documented?	No
--	----

Attachment C: Members of the Collaborative:

Organization Name	Contact Name	Email Address	Phone	Role in Collaborative⁴
National Forests & Grasslands in Texas	Kent Evans	kevans@fs.fed.us	(936) 639-8512	Proposal Author
Texas Forest Service	Todd Nightingale	tnightingale@tfs.tamu.edu	(936) 875-4400	Taskforce Chair
Institute of Renewable Natural Resources	Roel Lopez	roel@tamu.edu		Taskforce Member
Big Thicket National Preserve	D.W. Ivans	dw_ivans@nps.gov		Taskforce Member
Campbell Group Inc.	Brian Gowin	bgowin@campbellgroup.com		Taskforce Member
Crosby Resources	Paul Stone	paulstone@crosbyresource.com		Taskforce Member
Forest Capital	Jim Tule	jtule@forestcap.com		Taskforce Member
Hancock Forest Management	Lee Wise	lwise@hnr.com		Taskforce Member
Louisiana Department of Agriculture & Forestry	Gus Rowland	growland@ldaf.la.gov		Taskforce Member
Louisiana Department of Wildlife & Fisheries	Fred Kimmel	fkimmel@wlf.la.gov		Taskforce Member
National Park Service	Deanna Boensch	deanna_boensch@nps.gov		Taskforce Member

⁴ Responses to this category should reflect the role the entity plays in the collaborative process, the interests they represent and/or any other function they serve in the collaborative. Responses could include descriptions such as “proposal author”, “Will participate in monitoring”, etc. If the collaborative member participated specifically in the development of this proposal, please be clear about what their participation in developing the proposal was.

National Wild Turkey Federation	Luke D. Lewis	llewis@nwtf.net		Taskforce Member
National Wild Turkey Federation	Scotty Parsons	sparsons@nwtf.net		Taskforce Member
Natural Resources Conservation Service	Jenna Childers	jeanna.childers@tx.usda.gov		Taskforce Member
Natural Resources Conservation Service	Terry Clason	terry.clason@la.usda.gov		Taskforce Member
Southern Company	Steve McInnis	samcinni@southernco.com		Taskforce Member
Stephen F. Austin State University	Hans Williams	hwilliams@sfasu.edu		Taskforce Member
Texas A&M University, Agrilife Research & Extension	Eric Taylor	eltaylor@tamu.edu		Taskforce Member
Texas A&M University, Institute of Renewable Natural Resources	Roel Lopez	roel@tamu.edu		Taskforce Member
Texas Forest Service, Forest Health Protection	Michael Murphry	mmurphry@tfs.tamu.edu		Taskforce Member
Texas Parks &	Ricky Maxey	ricky.maxey@tpwd.state.tx.us		Taskforce Member

Wildlife Department				
Texas Parks & Wildlife Department	Rusty Wood	rusty.wood@tpwd.state.tx.us		Taskforce Member
The Conservation Fund	Julie Shackelford	julieshackelford@conservationfund.org		Taskforce Member
The Conservation Fund	Ray Herndon	rherndon@conservationfund.org		Taskforce Member
The Nature Conservancy	David Bezanson	dbezanson@tnc.org		Taskforce Member
The Nature Conservancy	Wendy Jo Ledbetter	wledbetter@tnc.org		Taskforce Member
Trust for Public Lands	Niels Brown	niels.brown@tpl.org		Taskforce Member
US Army Corps of Engineers	Jeff Slaga	jeffrey.s.slaga@usace.army.mil		Taskforce Member
US Fish & Wildlife Service	Jeffrey A. Reid	jeffrey-reid@fws.gov		Taskforce Member
US Fish & Wildlife Service	Andy Dolan	andrew-dolan@fws.gov		Taskforce Member
USFS Forest Health Protection	Steve Clarke	sclarke@fs.fed.us		Taskforce Member
USFS Southern Research Station	Susana Sung	ssung@fs.fed.us		Taskforce Member

Attachment D



February 11, 2011

USDA Forest Service,
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program Proposal

We are writing this letter to support the proposal by the US Forest Service to restore longleaf to its historic range on the National Forest in Texas. The taskforce is working closely with the US Forest Service and over 150 interested landowners, agencies and NGO's to promote longleaf restoration to its former range. Our efforts are on a variety of land ownerships including industry, private land, tribal, and NGO lands in the western gulf coastal plain of Texas and Louisiana.

The mission of the Texas-Louisiana Longleaf Taskforce (i.e., local implementation team, <http://txlalongleaf.org/>) is to accelerate longleaf ecosystem restoration on private forestlands adjacent to public lands, and to support the larger, range-wide America's Longleaf Restoration Initiative. This project supports our mission by providing further support and resources to continue our efforts and compliments what we are already undertaking to facilitate conservation in this region.

Longleaf pine forests are some of the most biologically diverse and productive ecosystems. These forests are at extreme risk due to land conversion. Collaborative efforts are necessary to ensure their restoration. The Texas-Louisiana Longleaf Taskforce supports this proposal as it will help sustain this resource, and encourage you to consider it for funding.

If I can be of further assistance, please let me know. Thank you.

Sincerely,

/s/ *Jodd Nightingale*

Todd Nightingale

Texas Co-Chair, Texas-Louisiana Longleaf Taskforce



Attachment E: Predicted Jobs Table from TREAT Spreadsheet

	Employment (# Part and Full-time Jobs)			Labor Inc (2009 \$)		
	Direct	Indirect and Induced	Total	Direct	Indirect and Induced	Total
Commercial Forest Products						
Sawmills	49.0	105.1	154.1	2,794,905	3,985,979	6,780,884
Plywood and Veneer Softwood						
Plywood and Veneer Hardwood						
Oriented Strand Board (OSB)						
Mills Processing Roundwood Pulp Wood	27.0	116.1	143.1	2,662,947	4,833,344	7,496,290
Other Timber Products						
Facilities Processing Residue From Sawmills	24.5	98.1	122.5	2,159,700	3,867,172	6,026,871
Facilities Processing Residue From Plywood/Veneer						
Biomass--Cogen						
Total Commercial Forest Products	100.5	319.3	419.7	7,617,552	12,686,494	20,304,046
Other Project Activities						
Facilities, Watershed, Roads and Trails						
Abandoned Mine Lands						
Ecosystem Restoration, Hazardous Fuels, and Forest Health						
Thinning and Biomass						
Commercial Firewood						
Contracted Monitoring						
FS Implementation and Monitoring	26.5	15.7	42.2	\$1,790,324	\$666,461	\$2,456,785
Total Other Project Activities	26.5	15.7	42.2	\$1,790,324	\$666,461	\$2,456,785
Total All Impacts	127.0	334.9	461.9	\$9,407,876	\$13,352,955	\$22,760,831

Attachment F

Funding Estimate

(Copy table and provide the planned funding for each additional fiscal year). Funds to be used on NFS lands for ecological restoration treatments and monitoring that would be available in FY 2011 to match funding from the Collaborative Forested Landscape Restoration Fund

Fiscal Year 2011 Funding Type	Dollars/Value Planned
1. FY 2011 Funding for Implementation	\$1,621,000
2. FY 2011 Funding for Monitoring	\$55,000
3. USFS Appropriated Funds	\$1,445,000
4. USFS Permanent & Trust Funds	\$15,000
5. Partnership Funds	\$0
6. Partnership In-Kind Services Value	\$56,000
7. Estimated Forest Product Value	\$160,000
8. Other (specify)	\$0
9. FY 2011 Total (total of 1-6 above for matching CFLRP request)	\$1,676,000
10. FY 2011 CFLRP request (must be equal to or less than above total)	\$1,599,000
Funding off NFS lands associated with proposal in FY 2010 (does not count toward funding match from the Collaborative Forested Landscape Restoration Fund)	
Fiscal Year 2011 Funding Type	Dollars Planned
11. USDI BLM Funds	
12. USDI (other) Funds	
13. Other Public Funding	
Private Funding	

(Copy table and provide the planned funding for each additional fiscal year). Funds to be used on NFS lands for ecological restoration treatments and monitoring that would be available in FY 2011 to match funding from the Collaborative Forested Landscape Restoration Fund

Fiscal Year 2012 Funding Type	Dollars/Value Planned
1. FY 2012 Funding for Implementation	\$1,529,000
2. FY 2012 Funding for Monitoring	\$71,000
3. USFS Appropriated Funds	\$1,287,000
4. USFS Permanent & Trust Funds	\$84,000
5. Partnership Funds	\$0
6. Partnership In-Kind Services Value	\$0
7. Estimated Forest Product Value	\$229,000
8. Other (specify)	\$0
9. FY 2012 Total (total of 1-6 above for matching CFLRP request)	\$1,600,000
10. FY 2012 CFLRP request (must be equal to or less than above total)	\$1,572,000
Funding off NFS lands associated with proposal in FY 2010 (does not count toward funding match from the Collaborative Forested Landscape Restoration Fund)	
Fiscal Year 2012 Funding Type	Dollars Planned
11. USDI BLM Funds	
12. USDI (other) Funds	
13. Other Public Funding	
Private Funding	

(Copy table and provide the planned funding for each additional fiscal year). Funds to be used on NFS lands for ecological restoration treatments and monitoring that would be available in FY 2012 to match funding from the Collaborative Forested Landscape Restoration Fund

Fiscal Year 2013 Funding Type	Dollars/Value Planned
1. FY 2013 Funding for Implementation	\$1,926,000
2. FY 2013 Funding for Monitoring	\$74,000
3. USFS Appropriated Funds	\$1,500,000
4. USFS Permanent & Trust Funds	\$100,000
5. Partnership Funds	\$0
6. Partnership In-Kind Services Value	\$0
7. Estimated Forest Product Value	\$ 400,000
8. Other (specify)	\$0
9. FY 2013 Total (total of 1-6 above for matching CFLRP request)	\$2,000,000
10. FY 2013 CFLRP request (must be equal to or less than above total)	\$1,682,000
Funding off NFS lands associated with proposal in FY 2010 (does not count toward funding match from the Collaborative Forested Landscape Restoration Fund)	
Fiscal Year 2013 Funding Type	Dollars Planned
11. USDI BLM Funds	
12. USDI (other) Funds	
13. Other Public Funding	
Private Funding	

(Copy table and provide the planned funding for each additional fiscal year). Funds to be used on NFS lands for ecological restoration treatments and monitoring that would be available in FY 2013 to match funding from the Collaborative Forested Landscape Restoration Fund

Fiscal Year 2014 Funding Type	Dollars/Value Planned
1. FY 2014 Funding for Implementation	\$1,727,000
2. FY 2014 Funding for Monitoring	\$73,000
3. USFS Appropriated Funds	\$1,180,000
4. USFS Permanent & Trust Funds	\$116,000
5. Partnership Funds	\$0
6. Partnership In-Kind Services Value	\$0
7. Estimated Forest Product Value	\$504,000
8. Other (specify)	\$0
9. FY 2014 Total (total of 1-6 above for matching CFLRP request)	\$1,800,000
10. FY 2014 CFLRP request (must be equal to or less than above total)	\$1,745,000
Funding off NFS lands associated with proposal in FY 2010 (does not count toward funding match from the Collaborative Forested Landscape Restoration Fund)	
Fiscal Year 2014 Funding Type	Dollars Planned
11. USDI BLM Funds	
12. USDI (other) Funds	
13. Other Public Funding	
Private Funding	

(Copy table and provide the planned funding for each additional fiscal year). Funds to be used on NFS lands for ecological restoration treatments and monitoring that would be available in FY 2014 to match funding from the Collaborative Forested Landscape Restoration Fund

Fiscal Year 2015 Funding Type	Dollars/Value Planned
1. FY 2015 Funding for Implementation	\$2,030,000
2. FY 2015 Funding for Monitoring	\$87,000
3. USFS Appropriated Funds	\$1,438,000
4. USFS Permanent & Trust Funds	\$57,000
5. Partnership Funds	\$0
6. Partnership In-Kind Services Value	\$0
7. Estimated Forest Product Value	\$622,000
8. Other (specify)	\$0
9. FY 2015 Total (total of 1-6 above for matching CFLRP request)	\$2,117,000
10. FY 2015 CFLRP request (must be equal to or less than above total)	\$2,098,000
Funding off NFS lands associated with proposal in FY 2010 (does not count toward funding match from the Collaborative Forested Landscape Restoration Fund)	
Fiscal Year 2015 Funding Type	Dollars Planned
11. USDI BLM Funds	
12. USDI (other) Funds	
13. Other Public Funding	
Private Funding	

(Copy table and provide the planned funding for each additional fiscal year). Funds to be used on NFS lands for ecological restoration treatments and monitoring that would be available in FY 2015 to match funding from the Collaborative Forested Landscape Restoration Fund

Fiscal Year 2016 Funding Type	Dollars/Value Planned
1. FY 2016 Funding for Implementation	\$1,463,000
2. FY 2016 Funding for Monitoring	\$76,000
3. USFS Appropriated Funds	\$1,046,000
4. USFS Permanent & Trust Funds	\$42,000
5. Partnership Funds	\$0
6. Partnership In-Kind Services Value	\$0
7. Estimated Forest Product Value	\$451,000
8. Other (specify)	\$0
9. FY 2016 Total (total of 1-6 above for matching CFLRP request)	\$1,539,000
10. FY 2016 CFLRP request (must be equal to or less than above total)	\$1,521,000
Funding off NFS lands associated with proposal in FY 2010 (does not count toward funding match from the Collaborative Forested Landscape Restoration Fund)	
Fiscal Year 2016 Funding Type	Dollars Planned
11. USDI BLM Funds	
12. USDI (other) Funds	
13. Other Public Funding	
Private Funding	

(Copy table and provide the planned funding for each additional fiscal year). Funds to be used on NFS lands for ecological restoration treatments and monitoring that would be available in FY 2016 to match funding from the Collaborative Forested Landscape Restoration Fund

Fiscal Year 2017 Funding Type	Dollars/Value Planned
1. FY 2017 Funding for Implementation	\$1,362,000
2. FY 2017 Funding for Monitoring	\$73,000
3. USFS Appropriated Funds	\$1,000,000
4. USFS Permanent & Trust Funds	\$0
5. Partnership Funds	\$0
6. Partnership In-Kind Services Value	\$0
7. Estimated Forest Product Value	\$0
8. Other (specify)	\$435,000
9. FY 2017 Total (total of 1-6 above for matching CFLRP request)	\$1,435,000
10. FY 2017 CFLRP request (must be equal to or less than above total)	\$1,419,000
Funding off NFS lands associated with proposal in FY 2010 (does not count toward funding match from the Collaborative Forested Landscape Restoration Fund)	
Fiscal Year 2017 Funding Type	Dollars Planned
11. USDI BLM Funds	
12. USDI (other) Funds	
13. Other Public Funding	
Private Funding	

(Copy table and provide the planned funding for each additional fiscal year). Funds to be used on NFS lands for ecological restoration treatments and monitoring that would be available in FY 2017 to match funding from the Collaborative Forested Landscape Restoration Fund

Fiscal Year 2018 Funding Type	Dollars/Value Planned
1. FY 2018 Funding for Implementation	\$1,277,000
2. FY 2018 Funding for Monitoring	\$73,000
3. USFS Appropriated Funds	\$860,000
4. USFS Permanent & Trust Funds	\$110,000
5. Partnership Funds	\$0
6. Partnership In-Kind Services Value	\$0
7. Estimated Forest Product Value	\$380,000
8. Other (specify)	\$0
9. FY 2018 Total (total of 1-6 above for matching CFLRP request)	\$1,350,000
10. FY 2018 CFLRP request (must be equal to or less than above total)	\$1,280,000
Funding off NFS lands associated with proposal in FY 2010 (does not count toward funding match from the Collaborative Forested Landscape Restoration Fund)	
Fiscal Year 2018 Funding Type	Dollars Planned
11. USDI BLM Funds	
12. USDI (other) Funds	
13. Other Public Funding	
Private Funding	

(Copy table and provide the planned funding for each additional fiscal year). Funds to be used on NFS lands for ecological restoration treatments and monitoring that would be available in FY 2018 to match funding from the Collaborative Forested Landscape Restoration Fund

Fiscal Year 2019 Funding Type	Dollars/Value Planned
1. FY 2019 Funding for Implementation	\$1,480,000
2. FY 2019 Funding for Monitoring	\$80,000
3. USFS Appropriated Funds	\$1,017,000
4. USFS Permanent & Trust Funds	\$103,000
5. Partnership Funds	\$0
6. Partnership In-Kind Services Value	\$0
7. Estimated Forest Product Value	\$440,000
8. Other (specify)	\$0
9. FY 2019 Total (total of 1-6 above for matching CFLRP request)	\$1,560,000
10. FY 2019 CFLRP request (must be equal to or less than above total)	\$1,553,000
Funding off NFS lands associated with proposal in FY 2010 (does not count toward funding match from the Collaborative Forested Landscape Restoration Fund)	
Fiscal Year 2019 Funding Type	Dollars Planned
11. USDI BLM Funds	
12. USDI (other) Funds	
13. Other Public Funding	
Private Funding	

(Copy table and provide the planned funding for each additional fiscal year). Funds to be used on NFS lands for ecological restoration treatments and monitoring that would be available in FY 2019 to match funding from the Collaborative Forested Landscape Restoration Fund

Fiscal Year 2020 Funding Type	Dollars/Value Planned
1. FY 2020 Funding for Implementation	\$1,389,000
2. FY 2020 Funding for Monitoring	\$78,000
3. USFS Appropriated Funds	\$896,000
4. USFS Permanent & Trust Funds	\$131,000
5. Partnership Funds	\$0
6. Partnership In-Kind Services Value	\$0
7. Estimated Forest Product Value	\$440,000
8. Other (specify)	\$0
9. FY 2020 Total (total of 1-6 above for matching CFLRP request)	\$1,467,000
10. FY 2020 CFLRP request (must be equal to or less than above total)	\$1,464,000
Funding off NFS lands associated with proposal in FY 2010 (does not count toward funding match from the Collaborative Forested Landscape Restoration Fund)	
Fiscal Year 2020 Funding Type	Dollars Planned
11. USDI BLM Funds	
12. USDI (other) Funds	
13. Other Public Funding	
Private Funding	

Attachment G – Map

