

Objective 1-1: Maneuver Damage Control

Task#	Metric	Reporting Frequency	Performance Target Criteria		
			Green	Amber	Red
1-1.1	Percent of training exercises for which maneuver damage inspections were accomplished; and percent of training exercises for which adequate time was allocated on the training calendar for maneuver damage inspections.	Quarterly	Inspections were fully completed for 100% of training exercises (home station and rotational events).	Inspections were fully completed for 80 - 99% of training exercises (home station and rotational events).	Inspections were completed for < 80% of training exercises (home station and rotational events).
1-1.2A	Percent of repairs/corrective actions completed within 30 days from the date that damages were identified; and percent of required repairs for which adequate time was allocated on the training calendar.	Quarterly	>75% of corrective actions are completed in 30 days or less.	50% - 75% of corrective actions are completed in 30 days or less.	< 50% of corrective actions are completed in 30 days or less.
1-1.2B	Completion of biannual seeding and fertilization within Geronimo Drop Zone by 31 July and 30 November. (Approved 23 April 2015.)	Biannual (October and January)	Yes (seeding and fertilization completed on schedule)	N/A	No (seeding and fertilization not completed on schedule)
1-1.3	Revised metric (approved 24 April 14): Number of OCTs and Soldiers for each MSC receiving certification.	Annually	N/A	N/A	N/A
1-1.4	Trends for frequency, type and severity of maneuver damages.	Quarterly	N/A	N/A	N/A
1-1.5	Percent of corrective actions that were determined to be effective based on site re-inspections.	Quarterly	> 90 % of damage repairs are effective.	75-90% of damage repairs are effective	< 75 % of damage repairs are effective.
1-1.6	Trends for violations of range regulations/permit conditions for environmental protection.	Quarterly	N/A	N/A	N/A
1-1.7	Number of new Land Rehabilitation and Maintenance (LRAM) and/or DPW Work Request/4283 erosion control projects identified annually. (Approved April 2015.)	Annually	≤ 5 new LRAM and/or DPW Work Request/4283 erosion control projects identified	> 5 and ≤ 15 new LRAM and/or DPW Work Request/4283 erosion control projects identified	> 5 and ≤ 15 new LRAM and/or DPW Work Request/4283 erosion control projects identified
1-1.8	Number of new historic damage sites identified annually.	Annually	< 15 historic sites identified per year.	15-30 historic sites identified per year.	> 30 historic sites identified per year.

Objective 1-2 : Land Rehabilitation and Maintenance

Task#	Metric	Reporting Frequency	Performance Target Criteria		
			Green	Amber	Red
1-2.1	Percent of disturbed/degraded acres funded for land rehabilitation and maintenance (LRAM), based on requirements identified in Integrated Training Area Management (ITAM) Annual Work Plan.	Annual	≥ 90% of planned LRAM acres are funded.	< 90% and ≥ 70% of planned LRAM acres are funded.	< 70% of LRAM acres are funded.
1-2.2	Percent of funded LRAM project acres that are completed during the fiscal year.	Annual	≥ 90% of funded LRAM project acres are completed.	< 90% and ≥ 70% of funded LRAM project acres are completed.	< 70% of funded LRAM project acres are completed.
1-2.3	Percent of sub-watersheds for which current watershed management plans are in place. (Note: The term "current" denotes that an annual review has been conducted and the management plan has been updated or carried forward as appropriate.)	Annual	Current management plans are in place for ≥ 90% of sub-watersheds.	Current management plans are in place for < 90% and ≥ 70% of sub-watersheds.	Current management plans are in place for < 70% of sub-watersheds.
1-2.4	Annual prioritized list of LRAM projects cross-referenced to sub-watershed. (Prioritization of LRAM projects will include consideration of both site-specific factors such as safety, training use, and biological impacts; and the overall sub-watershed current to undisturbed (C:U) erosion rates, or other watershed condition factor. See tasks 1-2.6, 1-2.7 and 1-2.8.)	Annual	Project prioritization report is completed.	N/A	Project prioritization report is not completed.
1-2.5	Percent of LRAM projects that meet minimum project level objectives.	Annual	≥ 80% of LRAM projects meet minimum project level objectives.	< 80% and ≥ 60% of LRAM projects meet minimum project level objectives.	< 60% of LRAM projects meet minimum project level objectives.
1-2.6	Ratio of estimated current to undisturbed soil loss rate (tons/acre/year) across Fort Polk training lands (Main Post/Vernon Unit, Peason Ridge).	5 years	≥ 80 % of training lands have an current:undisturbed soil loss (C:U) ratio ≤ 1.20; and ≥ 90% of training lands have a C:U ratio ≤ 1.55	< 80 % of training lands have C:U ratio ≤ 1.20, or < 90% of training lands have a C:U ratio ≤ 1.55; and ≥ 60 % of training lands have C:U ratio ≤ 1.20, and ≥ 80 % of training lands have a C:U ≤ 1.55	< 60 % of training lands have a C:U ratio ≤ 1.20; or < 80 % of training lands have a C:U ratio ≤ 1.55
1-2.7	Multi-year change in total acres of bare or sparsely vegetated areas. (Bare or sparsely vegetated areas will be determined through processing of satellite imagery to classify land use/land cover classes across training lands.)	5 years	The net acreage of bare or sparsely vegetated areas is stable or decreasing in ≥ 90% of sub-watersheds.	The net acreage of bare or sparsely vegetated areas is stable or decreasing in < 90% of sub-watersheds and ≥ 80% of sub-watersheds.	The net acreage of bare or sparsely vegetated areas is stable or decreasing in < 80% of sub-watersheds.
1-2.8	Multi-year change in estimated soil loss rate (tons/acre/year) across Fort Polk training lands (Main Post/Vernon Unit, Peason Ridge)	5 years	Estimated soil loss rates are stable or decreasing over the multi-year period for ≥ 90% of training lands, relative to year 2000 soil loss rates.	Estimated soil loss rates are stable or decreasing over the multi-year period for < 90% and ≥ 80% of training lands, relative to year 2000 soil loss rates.	Estimated soil loss rates are stable or decreasing over the multi-year period for < 80% of training lands, relative to year 2000 soil loss rates.

Objective 1-3 Metrics and Performance Target Criteria

Task#	Metric	Reporting Frequency	Performance Target Criteria		
			Green	Amber	Red
1-3.1A	Percent of required stream/wetland crossing maintenance activities completed on time. (Note: For purposes of this monitoring task, stream and wetland crossing maintenance activities include tasks that are routine in nature and can be completed under a Direct Maintenance Order [DMO]).	July/August	100% of required maintenance activities for stream/wetland crossing structures are completed within 90 days of request.	≥80% and <100% of required maintenance activities for stream/wetland crossing structures are completed within 90 days of request.	<80% of required maintenance activities for stream/wetland crossing structures are completed within 90 days of request.
1-3.1B	Percent of major repair/new construction projects for stream and wetland crossing structures that were funded during the fiscal year, based on annual project list.	October/November	≥75% of major repair/new construction projects for stream and wetland crossing structures were funded during the fiscal year.	≥50% and <75% of major repair/new construction projects for stream and wetland crossing structures were funded during the fiscal year.	<50% of major repair/new construction projects for stream and wetland crossing structures were funded during the fiscal year.
1-3.2A	Are sediment basins inspected and maintained in a functional condition?	July/August and October/November	100% of required sediment basin maintenance activities are completed within 90 days of request.	≥80% and <100% of required sediment basin maintenance activities are completed within 90 days of request.	<80% of required sediment basin maintenance activities are completed within 90 days of request.
1-3.2B	Percent of major repair/new construction projects for sediment basins that were funded during the fiscal year, based on annual project list.	October/November	≥75% of major repair/new construction projects for sediment basins were funded during the fiscal year.	≥50% and <75% of major repair/new construction projects for sediment basins were funded during the fiscal year.	<50% of major repair/new construction projects for sediment basins were funded during the fiscal year.
1-3.3	Annual review and update of approved stream/wetland crossing location map(s) for use by JRTC rotational units (RTU) and home station units (HSU).	July/August	Stream and wetland crossing location map(s) for Fort Polk and KNF training lands was jointly reviewed and updated by ENRMD, DPW Engineering, and DPTMS.	N/A	Stream and wetland crossing location map(s) for Fort Polk and KNF training lands was NOT jointly reviewed and updated by ENRMD, DPW Engineering, and DPTMS.
1-3.4A	Number of stream/wetland crossings that show erosion at the approach(es), based on annual inspection.	April/May	N/A	N/A	N/A
1-3.4B	Number of stream/wetland crossings that show restricted flow, based on annual inspection.	April/May	N/A	N/A	N/A
1-3.4C	Number of stream/wetland crossings that require recurring maintenance ("recurring offenders") to correct either erosion problems at the approach(es) or flow restrictions, based on the results of an annual inspection and an unscheduled inspection event within the same fiscal year, or the results of two consecutive annual inspection events.	April/May	Less than/equal to 1 "recurring offender" crossing per year.	Greater than 1 and less than 5 "recurring offender" crossings.	Greater than or equal to 5 "recurring offender" crossings .
1-3.5A	Percent of sediment basins that are at or near sediment capacity, based on annual or semi-annual inspection. (Note: the sediment basins that are at or near capacity will be defined as those with a 9 or 10 rating on the "sediment contained" item on the ENRMD sediment basin impacts evaluation matrix).	April /May and July/August	No sediment basin is at or near sediment capacity (9 or 10 rating) based on annual or semi-annual inspection.	Greater than 0 and less than or equal to 5% of sediment basins are at or near sediment capacity (9 or 10 rating) based on annual or semi-annual inspection.	Greater than 5% of sediment basins are at or near sediment capacity (9 or 10 rating) based on annual or semi-annual inspection.
1-3.5B	Percent of sediment basins with a failed dam, or a dam at high risk of failure, based on annual or semi-annual inspection. (Note: the sediment basins with a failed dam or dam at high risk of failure will be defined as those with a 9 or 10 rating on the "dam or riser stability" item on the sediment basin impacts evaluation matrix).	April/May and July/August	No sediment basin has a failed dam or dam at high risk of failure (9 or 10 rating) based on annual or semi-annual inspection.	Greater than 0 and less than or equal to 5% of sediment basins have a failed dam or dam at high risk of failure (9 or 10 rating) based on annual inspection.	Greater than 5% of sediment basins have a failed dam or dam at high risk of failure (9 or 10 rating) based on annual or semi-annual inspection.
1-3.6	Trends for violation of Special Use Permit/Operating Plan and Range Safety SOP restrictions on crossing of streams and wetlands by military vehicles.	April/May	≤ 1 military vehicle crossing at unapproved locations annually.	> 1 and ≤ 3 military vehicle crossings at unapproved locations annually.	> 3 military vehicle crossings at unapproved locations annually.

Objective 2-1: Red-cockaded Woodpecker Population Recovery

Task#	Metric	Reporting Frequency	Performance Target Criteria		
			Green	Amber	Red
2-1.1	Percentage of critical JMP activities completed within prescribed time frames.	Annual	100% completion of critical JMP requirements in accordance with prescribed time frames.	≥85% completion of critical JMP requirements in accordance with prescribed time frames.	<85% completion of critical JMP requirements in accordance with prescribed time frames.
2-1.2	Revised metric (approved 24 April 14): Number of OCTs and Soldiers for each MSC receiving certification.	Annual	N/A	N/A	N/A
2-1.3	Percent of RCW clusters requiring painting, signing and/or fuel removal that received those maintenance activities on Fort Polk and KNF lands utilized by the Army for training.	Annual	Maintenance was accomplished for greater than or equal to 90 percent of clusters that required maintenance on Army and Forest Service land (IUA and LUA).	Maintenance was accomplished for 70-89 percent of clusters that required maintenance on Army and Forest Service land (IUA and LUA).	Maintenance was accomplished for <70 percent of clusters that required maintenance on Army and Forest Service land (IUA and LUA).
2-1.4	Trends for violation of range regulations for protection of the RCW.	Annual	N/A	N/A	N/A
2-1.6	Change in number of groups within the Vernon-Fort Polk RCW population	Annual	Population (number of groups) increased at a rate of ≥4.5% per year (annual λ) or over the past 5 years (multi-year λ).	Population (number of groups) changed at a rate of between <4.5% increase to <9.5 decrease per year (annual λ) and over the past 5 years (multi-year λ).	Population (number of groups) declined at a rate of ≥9.5 per year (annual λ) or over the past 5 years (multi-year λ) (Critical decline = 10% decline per RCW Recovery Plan).

Objective 2-2: Longleaf Pine Forest Management

Task#	Metric	Reporting Frequency	Performance Target Criteria		
			Green	Amber	Red
2-2.1	Percent of potential Red-cockaded Woodpecker (RCW) habitat acres (pine and pine-hardwood stands) for Fort Polk, Peason Ridge, Intensive Use Area (IUA) and Limited Use Area (LUA) that have been cruised for stand inventory within the 10-year entry cycle.	Annual	Inventories for pine and pine-hardwood stands have been completed for $\geq 90\%$ of the stand area in ≤ 10 years; and 100% of area in ≤ 15 years.	Inventories for pine and pine-hardwood stands have been completed for $< 90\%$ of the stand area in ≤ 10 years or $< 100\%$ of the area in ≤ 15 years; and inventories have been completed for $\geq 80\%$ of the area in ≤ 10 years and $\geq 95\%$ of the area in ≤ 15 years.	Inventories for pine and pine-hardwood stands have been completed for $< 80\%$ of the stand area in ≤ 10 years; or $< 95\%$ of the area in ≤ 15 years.
2-2.2A	Percent of pine and pine-hardwood forest acres that have received prescribed fire treatment within the 3 year target burning cycle.	Annual	Prescribed burning was completed for $\geq 90\%$ of pine and pine-hardwood forest acres in ≤ 3 years and 100% of these acres in ≤ 5 years.	Prescribed burning was completed for $< 90\%$ of pine and pine-hardwood forest acres in ≤ 3 years or $< 100\%$ of these acres in ≤ 5 years; and prescribed burning was completed for $\geq 80\%$ of the area in ≤ 3 years and $\geq 95\%$ of the area in ≤ 5 years.	Prescribed burning was completed for $< 80\%$ of the pine and pine-hardwood forest acres in ≤ 3 years; or $< 95\%$ of these acres in ≤ 5 years.
2-2.2B	Percent of planned prescribed burning accomplished within RCW HMU (total area planned/total area burned based on burning plan map published 1 October).	Annual	$\geq 75\%$ of planned burning within RCW HMU was accomplished during the fiscal year.	$< 75\%$ and $\geq 50\%$ of planned burning within RCW HMU was accomplished during the fiscal year.	$< 50\%$ of planned burning was accomplished within RCW HMU was accomplished during the fiscal year.
2-2.3	Percent of cumulative IUA sale inventory and thinning goals accomplished, based on cumulative acres inventoried and sold. <i>Note: this metric was eliminated as of April 2016 per Oversight Committee decision.</i>	Annual	$\geq 90\%$ of cumulative inventory for sale goal accomplished; and $\geq 90\%$ of cumulative sale goal accomplished.	$< 90\%$ of cumulative inventory for sale goal or cumulative sale goal accomplished; and $\geq 80\%$ of cumulative inventory for sale and cumulative sale goals accomplished.	$< 80\%$ of cumulative inventory for sale goal accomplished; or $< 80\%$ of cumulative sale goal accomplished.
2-2.4	Percent of potential RCW habitat required to support the Vernon-Fort Polk and Peason Ridge RCW populations at recovery that is currently available.	Annual	$\geq 105\%$ of RCW habitat required to support population and property recovery goals is currently available.	≥ 100 and $< 105\%$ of RCW habitat required to support population and property recovery goals is currently available.	$< 100\%$ of RCW habitat required to support population and property recovery goals is currently available.

Objective 2-3 Metrics and Performance Target Criteria

Task#	Metric	Reporting Frequency	Performance Target Criteria		
			Green	Amber	Red
2-3.1	Signature of US Fish and Wildlife Service approved CCA for the LPS on Fort Polk, Peason Ridge and the Vernon Unit.	Annual (CY)	USFWS approved CCA for the LPS is in place and current.	N/A	USFWS approved CCA for the LPS is not in place or is not current.
2-3.2A	Percent of LPS habitat management unit (HMU) that has received prescribed fire in ≤ 3 years and ≤ 5 years.	Annual (FY)	Prescribed burning was completed for ≥ 90% of LPS HMU acres in ≤ 3 years and 100% of these acres in ≤ 5 years.	Prescribed burning was completed for < 90% of LPS HMU acres in ≤ 3 years or < 100% of these acres in ≤ 5 years; and prescribed burning was completed for ≥ 80% of the area in ≤ 3 years and ≥ 95 % of the area in ≤ 5 years.	Prescribed burning was completed for < 80% of LPS HMU acres in ≤ 3 years; or < 95% of these acres in ≤ 5 years.
2-3.2B	Percent of planned prescribed burning accomplished within LPS HMU (total area planned/total area burned).	Annual (FY)	≥ 75% of planned burning within LPS HMU was accomplished during the fiscal year.	< 75% and > 50% of planned burning within LPS HMU was accomplished during the fiscal year.	< 50% of planned burning was accomplished within LPS HMU was accomplished during the fiscal year.
2-3.3A	Fort Polk and Peason Ridge: Total acres of timber harvested within the LPS HMU during the fiscal year.	Annual (FY)	N/A	N/A	N/A
2-3.3B	Vernon Unit: Forested acres thinned in the reporting year within LPS HMUs on the Vernon Unit to maintain sufficient light penetration for herbaceous understory vigor and "in accordance with accepted longleaf ecosystem management guidelines and Endangered Species management goals for RCW" (quoted from CCA).	Annual (FY)	N/A	N/A	N/A
2-3.4A	Percent of visitor kiosks and hunting check-in locations on Fort Polk, Peason Ridge and Vernon Unit with signage in place promoting LPS conservation.	Annual (CY)	Presence of signage promoting LPS conservation verified, and replaced if absent, at 100% of visitor kiosks and hunter check-in locations on Fort Polk, Peason Ridge and Vernon Unit.	Presence of signage promoting LPS conservation verified, and replaced if absent, at < 100% and ≥ 85% of visitor kiosks and hunter check-in locations on Fort Polk, Peason Ridge and Vernon Unit.	Presence of signage promoting LPS conservation verified, and replaced if absent, at < 85% of visitor kiosks and hunter check-in locations on Fort Polk, Peason Ridge and Vernon Unit.
2-3.4B	A total of at least five LPS public education/outreach events are conducted annually by Fort Polk and KNF. (Revised metric adopted 20 July 17)	Annual (CY)	Green: A total of ≥ 5 LPS public education/outreach events are conducted by Fort Polk and KNF.	Amber: A total of < 5 and ≥ 3 LPS public education/outreach events are conducted by Fort Polk and KNF.	Red: A total of < 3 LPS public education/outreach events are conducted by Fort Polk and KNF.
2-3.4C	Number of individuals attending LPS outreach events/booths sponsored by Fort Polk and Kisatchie National Forest, Vernon Unit, and change in number of attendees over time.	Annual (CY)	N/A	N/A	N/A
2-3.5	Instances of LPS mortality recorded on road and trail segments on Fort Polk, KNF Vernon Unit and Peason Ridge during field inspections or other surveys of convenience.	Annual (CY)	N/A	N/A	N/A
2-3.6	Mean number of trap days per LPS capture by and across administrative units (Fort Polk, Peason Ridge, Vernon Unit, Kisatchie Ranger District, etc.) and LPS populations within which trapping occurred.	Annual (CY)	N/A	N/A	N/A
2-3.7A	Number of OCTs and Soldiers for each MSC receiving SRAT certification.	Annual (FY)	N/A	N/A	N/A
2-3.7B	Percent of Environmental Compliance Officers (ECOs) that have completed the ECO training course.	Annual (FY)	The percent of ECOs completing the ECO training course is ≥90%.	The percent of ECOs completing the ECO training course is ≥75% and <90%	The percent of ECOs completing the ECO training course is <75%.
2-3.8	Percent of permanent and semi-permanent projects within LPS HMUs for which a survey was conducted for pocket gopher mounds prior to start of the project.	Annual (FY)	100% of "projects" within LPS HMUs are surveyed for pocket gopher mounds prior to start of the project.	≥ 80% and <100 % of "projects" within LPS HMUs are surveyed for pocket gopher mounds prior to start of the project.	< 80% of "projects" within LPS HMUs are surveyed for pocket gopher mounds prior to start of the project.
2-3.9A	Acres within LPS HMUs on Fort Polk and the Vernon Unit, combined, and within the Peason Ridge HMU that were converted to an unsuitable land use in the reporting year, and across years since HMU adoption.	Annual (FY)	N/A	N/A	N/A
2-3.9B	Total acres within LPS HMUs on Fort Polk and the Vernon Unit, combined, and within the Peason Ridge HMU remaining in a land use suitable for LPS use.	Annual (FY)	N/A	N/A	N/A
2-3.10	Number of Erosion Control Blanket (ECB) best management practices (BMPs) recommended annually within Fort Polk and Vernon Unit LPS HMUs combined, and the Peason Ridge LPS HMU. (Note: the metric will track recommendations made by Fort Polk ENRMD and Calcasieu District.)	Annual (FY)	N/A	N/A	N/A

Objective 2-4: Bog Management

Task#	Metric	Reporting Frequency	Performance Target Criteria		
			Green	Amber	Red
2-4.1	Reserved	Reserved	Reserved	Reserved	Reserved
2-4.2	Fort Polk, KNF Vernon Unit and Peason Ridge bog map layer(s) and data tables are updated annually to reflect monitoring results (see Tasks 2-4.1 and 2-4.3).	Annual	Annual update completed by 30 Sep.	Annual update completed by 30 Dec.	Annual update not completed by 30 Dec.
2-4.3	Annual percentage of “high quality” and potentially “at risk” bogs inspected for military impacts.	Annual	≥ 90% of high quality/at risk bogs are inspected annually for military impacts.	≥ 80 % and < 90% of high quality/at risk bogs are inspected annually for military impacts.	< 80 % of high quality/at risk bogs are inspected annually for military impacts.
2-4.4	Percent of “high quality” and potentially “at risk” bogs on Fort Polk, Peason Ridge and the Vernon Unit requiring signage that have adequate signage.	Annual	≥ 90% of “high quality/at risk” bogs requiring signage have adequate signage.	≥ 70% and < 90% of “high quality/at risk” bogs requiring signage have adequate signage.	< 70% of “high quality/at risk” bogs requiring signage have adequate signage.
2-4.5	Percent of “high quality” and potentially “at risk” bogs directly impacted by military activities. (See definition in Task 2-4.3)	Annual	≤ 5% of “high quality/at risk” bogs on Fort Polk, Peason Ridge and Vernon Unit are directly impacted by military activities.	> 5% and ≤ 10% of “high quality/at risk” bogs on are directly impacted by military activities.	> 10% of “high quality/at risk” bogs on Fort Polk, Peason Ridge and Vernon Unit are directly impacted by military activities.

Objective 3-1: Integration of Master Planning, Engineering and Environmental Concerns

Task#	Metric	Reporting Frequency	Performance Target Criteria		
			Green	Amber	Red
3-1.1	Screening/Alternatives Analysis for Siting of New Facilities A. Percent of MCA cantonment area facility siting decisions for which an environmental screening and site selection alternatives analysis was conducted. (Project siting approved by RPPB, excluding FMWR and Tenant projects) B. Percent of MCA Range Modernization and other range facility siting decisions for which an environmental screening and site selection alternatives analysis was conducted. (Project siting approved by RTLFB and/or USFS) C. Percent of minor construction (DPW Engineering) facility siting decisions for which an environmental screening and site selection alternatives analysis was conducted. (Project siting approved by DPWP and/or USFS, excluding FMWR and Tenant projects) D. Percent of NAF and Tenant (FMWR, Piceme, AAFES, Privatization) facility siting decisions for which an environmental screening and site selection alternatives analysis was conducted (Project siting approved/co-approved by FMWR or Tenant).	Annual	Environmental screening and site selection alternatives analyses are conducted for 100% of siting decisions for construction of new facilities or infrastructure.	Environmental screening and site selection alternatives analyses are conducted for ≥ 80% and < 100% of siting decisions for construction of new facilities or infrastructure.	Environmental screening and site selection alternatives analyses are conducted for < 80% of projects for construction of new facilities or infrastructure.
3-1.2A	Sustainable Site Credits for LEED-NC® Projects Percentage of candidate new construction and major renovation projects achieving LEED-NC® 2.2 Site Selection (SS) Credit 1. Note: For purposes of this task, "candidate" projects for new construction include all vertical construction projects with climate controlled facilities, regardless of funding source. Candidate projects for major renovations include renovation and repair projects that exceed the Garrison Command authority (\$3M) and have a repair to replacement ratio equal to or greater than 25 percent (see USACE Army LEED Implementation Guide, 15 Jan 2008, for additional criteria). The list of candidate projects under this task may differ from the list of projects under Task 3-1.1. For example, range projects may require an environmental screening and site selection analysis, but may not qualify as a candidate for LEED. Conversely, a major renovation project constructed within a previously developed footprint may be a candidate for LEED but may not require an environmental screening and site selection analysis.	Annual	≥90% of candidate new construction and major renovation projects achieve LEED-NC® 2.2 SS Credit 1.	≥ 75% and < 90% of candidate new construction and major renovation projects achieve LEED-NC® 2.2 SS Credit 1.	< 75% of candidate new construction and major renovation projects achieve LEED-NC® 2.2 SS Credit 1.
3-1.2B	Sustainable Site Credits for LEED-NC® Projects Percentage of candidate new construction and major renovation projects achieving LEED-NC® 2.2 Site Selection (SS) Credit 5.1. Note: See Task 3-1.2A for definition of "candidate" projects. Metric eliminated in May 2019 per Oversight Committee decision.	N/A - Omitted	≥90% of candidate new construction and major renovation projects achieve LEED-NC® 2.2 SS Credit 5.1.	≥ 75% and < 90% of candidate new construction and major renovation projects achieve LEED-NC® 2.2 SS Credit 5.1.	< 75% of candidate new construction and major renovation projects achieve LEED-NC® 2.2 SS Credit 5.1.
3-1.3A	MILCON Facilities Constructed to LEED-NC® Silver Percent of LEED-NC candidate MILCON (new construction and major renovation) projects that are certified to achieve LEED-NC® 2.2 Silver or higher standards. Note: Certification may be conducted by the USGBC or the project team, per Army guidance. See task 3-1.2 for definition of major renovation/repair projects.	Annual	100% of candidate MILCON projects are certified to achieve LEED-NC® Silver or higher standards.	≥80% and <100% of candidate MILCON projects are certified to achieve LEED-NC® Silver or higher standards; and 100% of these projects meet LEED-NC Certified or higher.	<80% of candidate MILCON projects are certified to achieve LEED-NC® Silver or higher standards; or < 100% of these projects meet LEED-NC Certified or higher.
3-1.4A	Green Building Energy Savings – New Construction Annual energy consumption (kWh/sf/yr and/or Btu/sf/yr) one year post-occupancy for candidate LEED-NC permanent new construction buildings, as compared to: (a) the energy consumption for standard construction (baseline) building of similar type, as modeled using ASHRAE 90.1-2004 (or most current accepted model), and (b) the predicted (design) energy consumption for the building. Note: this measure includes all MILCON and non-MILCON new construction with climate control, except for temporary buildings. Actual energy performance results will be reported separately for each building. Metric eliminated in October 2017 per Oversight Committee decision.	N/A - Omitted	The building uses at least 30% less energy (kW/sf and/or Btu/sf/yr) than baseline buildings modeled using ASHRAE 90.1 and does not exceed the design prediction for energy use.	The building uses at least 30% less energy (kW/sf and/or Btu/sf/yr) than baseline buildings modeled using ASHRAE 90.1 but exceeds the design prediction for energy use.	The building does not use at least 30% less energy (kW/sf and/or Btu/sf/yr) than baseline buildings modeled using ASHRAE 90.1 and exceeds the design prediction for energy use.
3-1.4B	Green Building Energy Savings – Major Renovation and Repair Annual energy consumption (kWh/sf/yr and/or Btu/sf/yr) one year post-occupancy for candidate LEED-NC major renovation/repair buildings, as compared to: (a) the energy consumption for standard construction (baseline) building of similar type, as modeled using ASHRAE 90.1-2004 (or most current accepted model), and (b) the predicted (design) energy consumption for the building. Note: This task includes MILCON major renovation/repair projects. See task 3-1.2 for definition of major renovation/repair projects. Actual energy performance results will be reported separately for each building. Metric eliminated in October 2017 per Oversight Committee decision.	N/A - Omitted	The building uses at least 20% less energy (kW/sf and/or Btu/sf/yr) than baseline buildings modeled using ASHRAE 90.1 and does not exceed the design prediction for energy use.	The building uses at least 20% less energy (kW/sf and/or Btu/sf/yr) than baseline buildings modeled using ASHRAE 90.1 but exceeds the design prediction for energy use.	The building does not use at least 20% less energy (kW/sf and/or Btu/sf/yr) than baseline buildings modeled using ASHRAE 90.1 and exceeds the design prediction for energy use.
3-1.5	Green Building Water Savings – New Const. & Major Renovation/Repair Actual total water use (gal/FTE/yr and/or gal/sf/yr) not including irrigation, one year post-occupancy for candidate LEED-NC permanent new construction and major renovation buildings, as compared to the water consumption baseline calculated for the building, based on EPA 1992 fixture flush/flow rate default values. Note: Actual water conservation performance results will be reported separately for each building. Metric eliminated in October 2017 per Oversight Committee decision.	N/A - Omitted	The building uses at least 30% less water (gal/FTE/yr and/or gal/sf/yr) than baseline buildings based on EPA 1992 fixture flush/flow rate default values.	The building uses between 20% and 30% less water (gal/FTE/yr and/or gal/sf/yr) than baseline buildings based on EPA 1992 fixture flush/flow rate default values.	The building does not use at least 20% less water (gal/FTE/yr and/or gal/sf/yr) than baseline buildings based on EPA 1992 fixture flush/flow rate default values.
3-1.6	Green Building Lifecycle Cost Savings – New Construction and Major Renovation/Repair Estimated payback period (increased first cost / energy cost savings per year for the building) for LEED-NC candidate new construction and major renovation buildings. Note: See Task 3-1.2 for definition of candidate LEED projects. Lifecycle cost performance results will be reported separately for each building. Metric eliminated in October 2017 per Oversight Committee decision.	N/A - Omitted	Payback period is ≤ 10 years.	Payback period is > 10 years and ≤ 20 years.	Payback period is > 20 years.

Objective 3-2: Environmental Compliance for Fort Polk Construction Projects on KNF Lands

Task#	Metric	Reporting Frequency	Performance Target Criteria		
			Green	Amber	Red
3-2.1	Percent of proposed Army new construction projects on KNF lands for which a review of environmental protection requirements was completed under NEPA.	Semi-annual (January and August)	100% of Army new construction projects on KNF lands are evaluated in accordance with Army/USFS NEPA procedures, prior to commencement.	≤ 100% and ≥ 90% of Army new construction projects on KNF lands are evaluated in accordance with Army/USFS NEPA procedures, prior to commencement	< 90% of Army new construction projects on KNF lands are evaluated in accordance with Army/USFS NEPA procedures, prior to commencement.
3-2.2	Percent of Army new construction activities that are ≥ 1 acre and located on/affecting KNF lands for which a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWP3) is in place prior to the start of work.	Semi-annual (January and August)	100% of JRTC-Fort Polk new construction activities ≥ 1 acre and located on/affecting KNF lands have a SWP3 in place prior to the start of work.	≤ 100% and ≥ 90% of Army new construction activities that are ≥ 1 acre and located on/affecting KNF lands have a SWP3 in place prior to the start of work.	< 90 % of JRTC-Fort Polk new construction activities ≥ 1 acre and located on/affecting KNF lands have a SWP3 in place prior to the start of work.
3-2.3A	Percent of required environmental monitoring tasks completed for each new JRTC-Fort Polk new construction project on KNF lands.	Semi-annual (January and August) with separate monitoring report for each applicable construction project.	For each new Army construction project on KNF lands, a monitoring report will be prepared by KNF to include a list of required monitoring tasks and date(s)/indicators of completion for each task; the total number of required monitoring tasks (denominator); total number of monitoring tasks completed (numerator); and the percentage completed. A summary of the monitoring report would be presented to the Oversight Committee.		
3-2.3B	Percent of required environmental monitoring tasks completed for each new JRTC-Fort Polk new construction project on KNF lands.	Semi-annual (January and August) with separate monitoring report for each applicable construction project.	For each new Army construction activity on KNF lands, a monitoring report will be prepared by DPW-ENRMD stormwater team to include a list of required stormwater pollution prevention inspections and dates/ indicator(s) of completion for each inspection; the total number of required stormwater inspections (denominator); total number of completed inspections (numerator); and the percentage of stormwater inspection tasks completed.		
3-2.4A	Number of deviations in violation of Biological Assessment/Biological Evaluation (BA/BE), Biological Opinion (BO) or other terms and conditions for protection of the RCW, LPS or their habitats specified in NEPA documents for Army new construction on KNF lands.	Semi-annual (January and August) with separate monitoring report for each applicable construction project.	0 deviations	N/A	1 or more deviations
3-2.4B	Number of deviations in violation of Clean Water Act, Section 401 Water Quality Certification/ Section 404 Permit requirements for Army new construction projects on KNF lands	Semi-annual (January and August) with separate monitoring report for each applicable construction project.	0 deviations	N/A	1 or more deviations
3-2.4C	Number of deviations in violation of National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106 requirements, as specified in letter of consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer and/or NEPA documents for Army new construction on KNF lands.	Semi-annual (January and August) with separate monitoring report for each applicable construction project.	0 deviations	N/A	1 or more deviations
3-2.4D	Number of deviations in violation of conditions for protection of the natural or human environment, as specified in NEPA documents for Army new construction on KNF lands.	Semi-annual (January and August) with separate monitoring report for each applicable construction project.	0 deviations	N/A	1 or more deviations
3-2.5	Number of deficiencies from the SWP3 for each JRTC-Fort Polk new construction activity on KNF lands, which were observed during stormwater inspections	Semi-annual (January and August) with separate monitoring report for each applicable construction project.	N/A; data only.	N/A; data only.	N/A; data only.

Objective 4-1: Hunting and Other Recreational Opportunities

Task#	Metric	Reporting Frequency	Performance Target Criteria		
			Green	Amber	Red
4-1.1A	Average percent of time per month that Fort Polk hunting website and Limited Use Area (LUA) and Special Limited Use Area (SLUA) website are operational.	Quarterly	Both the hunting website and LUA/SLUA website are operational for $\geq 97\%$ of the quarter.	The hunting website or the LUA/SLUA website is operational for $< 97\%$ of the quarter; and the hunting website and LUA/SLUA website are operational for $\geq 93\%$ of the quarter.	The hunting website and/or the LUA/SLUA website is operational for $< 93\%$ of the quarter.
4-1.1B	Date of last webmaster update to the hunting and LUA/SLUA websites.	Quarterly	Both the hunting and LUA/SLUA websites were updated by the site webmaster during the past quarter.	Only one of the two websites was updated.	Neither website was updated.
4-1.2	Percent of total hunting acre-day capacity that is open for hunting during periods of interest in the LUA and in the Fort Polk-Vernon and Peason Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs).	Annual	Total acre-day capacity open to hunting during periods of interest is $\geq 90\%$ in the LUA, $\geq 75\%$ in the Fort Polk-Vernon WMA, and $\geq 50\%$ in the Peason Ridge WMA.	Total acre-day capacity open to hunting during periods of interest is $< 90\%$ in the LUA, or $< 75\%$ in the Fort Polk-Vernon WMA, or $< 50\%$ in the Peason WMA; and $\geq 75\%$ in the LUA, and $\geq 50\%$ in the Fort Polk-Vernon WMA, and $\geq 25\%$ in the Peason WMA.	Total acre-day capacity open to hunting during periods of interest is $< 75\%$ in the LUA, or $< 50\%$ in the Fort Polk-Vernon WMA, or $< 25\%$ in the Peason Ridge WMA.
4-1.3	Percent of total commercial or non-commercial special use or group recreational events that were denied in the LUA/SLUA due to conflicts with military use.	Annual	No requests/applications for special use or group-use recreational events are denied due to conflicts with military use of the LUA or SLUA.	1 to 10% of requests/applications for special use or group-use recreational events are denied due to conflicts with military use of the LUA or SLUA.	$> 10\%$ of requests/applications for special use or group-use recreational events are denied due to conflicts with military use of the LUA or SLUA.
4-1.4	Revised metric (approved 24 April 14): Number of OCTs and Soldiers for each MSC receiving	Annual	N/A	N/A	N/A
4-1.5	Frequency of public feedback (positive/negative) on the availability and content of public information on training schedules in the LUA, SLUA, Fort Polk-Vernon and Peason WMAs.	Annual	N/A	N/A	N/A
4-1.6	Estimated rate of change in percent of total annual hunting acre-day capacity that is open for hunting ("percent open for hunting") over the past five year period, reported by area (LUA, Fort Polk-Vernon and Peason WMAs). Annual training utilization rate, by area.	Annual	The estimated rate of change over the past five years for "percent open for hunting" is stable or increasing ($\leq 5\%$ decline) for the LUA, Fort Polk-Vernon and Peason WMAs, at 90% confidence.	The estimated rate of change over the past five years for "percent open for hunting" is $> 5\%$ for the LUA, Fort Polk-Vernon WMA or Peason WMA, and is $\leq 10\%$ for the LUA, Fort Polk-Vernon and Peason WMAs, at 90% confidence.	The estimated rate of change over the past five years for "percent open for hunting" has declined by $> 10\%$ for the LUA, Fort Polk-Vernon WMA or Peason WMA, at 90% confidence.
4-1.7	Trends for violations of range regulations restricting military use of recreational facilities or maintained trails in the LUA and SLUA.	Annual	N/A	N/A	N/A
4-1.8	Weight of evidence of impacts (to hunting and other approved recreational uses of the WMAs, LUA and SLUA) based on annual results for the following tasks: 4-1.1, 4-1.2, 4-1.3, and 4-1.6.	Annual	Total points for Tasks 4-1.1, 4-1.2, 4-1.3 and 4-1.6 are ≥ 3 , where green tasks = 1 point, amber tasks = 0.5 points, and red tasks = 0 points. Total points for Tasks 4-1.1A and 4-1.1B = 1 point.	Total points for Tasks 4-1.1, 4-1.2, 4-1.3 and 4-1.6 are < 3 and ≥ 1.5 , where green tasks = 1 point, amber tasks = 0.5 points, and red tasks = 0 points. Total points for Tasks 4-1.1A and 4-1.1B = 1 point.	Total points for Tasks 4-1.1, 4-1.2, 4-1.3 and 4-1.6 are < 1.5 , where green tasks = 1 point, amber tasks = 0.5 points, and red tasks = 0 points. Total points for Tasks 4-1.1A and 4-1.1B = 1 point.

Objective 4-2: Quality of Life for Installation Neighbors - Noise, Wildfires and Road Conditions

Task#	Metric	Reporting Frequency	Performance Target Criteria		
			Green	Amber	Red
4-2.1	Number of operating days/year for LUA and Peason Ridge noise monitors (monitor-days/year).	Quarterly	LUA noise monitors were operational for $\geq 90\%$ of annual monitor-operating days/year; and Peason Ridge noise monitors were operational for $\geq 90\%$ of annual monitor-operating days/ year.	LUA or Peason Ridge noise monitors were operational for $< 90\%$ of annual monitor-operating days/year and LUA and Peason Ridge monitors were operational for $\geq 75\%$ and of annual monitor-operating days/year.	LUA or Peason Ridge noise monitors were operational for $< 75\%$ of annual monitor-operating days/year.
4-2.2	Number of validated noise complaints. Note: the term "validated" indicates that military activities were confirmed to be the cause of the noise resulting in the complaint.	Quarterly	No validated noise complaints	One validated noise complaint	More than one validated noise complaint
4-2.3	Percent of private land line miles in LUA maintained within 8 years and percent maintained within 10 years.	Annual	$\geq 90\%$ of private land line miles have been maintained in ≤ 8 years and 100% of land lines have been maintained in ≤ 10 years.	$< 90\%$ of private land line miles have been maintained in ≤ 8 years or $< 100\%$ of land lines have been maintained in ≤ 10 years; and $\geq 80\%$ of private land line miles have been maintained in ≤ 5 years and $\geq 95\%$ of land lines have been maintained in ≤ 8 years.	$< 80\%$ of private land line miles have been maintained in ≤ 8 years or $< 95\%$ of land lines have been maintained in ≤ 10 years.
4-2.4	Frequency of observed/reported incidents of trespass onto private lands in the LUA or SLUA based on Range Control clearance inspections and public complaints.	Annual	≤ 1 occurrence of trespass by troops onto private land in the LUA or SLUA.	2 - 5 total occurrences of trespass by troops onto private land in the LUA or SLUA.	> 5 total occurrences of trespass by troops onto private land in the LUA or SLUA.
4-2.5	Percent of fire lines (miles) maintained annually.	Annual	100 % of fire lines in the LUA are maintained annually.	$\geq 90\%$ and $< 100\%$ of fire lines in the LUA are maintained annually.	$< 90\%$ of fire lines in the LUA are maintained annually.
4-2.6A	Number of high risk (Amber/Red/Black) fire days.	Quarterly	N/A	N/A	N/A
4-2.6B	Number of wildfires reported to NRMB that are caused by military operations (live fire or use of other incendiary devices on range or maneuver training areas) during high risk fire days.	Quarterly	N/A	N/A	N/A
4-2.6C	Total acreage of wildfires reported to NRMB that are caused by military operations (live fire or use of other incendiary devices on range or maneuver training areas) during high risk fire days.	Quarterly	N/A	N/A	N/A
4-2.7	Completion of annual LUA fire drill.	Annual	Annual LUA fire drill was completed.	N/A	Annual LUA fire drill was not completed.
4-2.8	Number of wildfires on private property resulting from military activities.	Quarterly	No wildfires occurred on private property as a result of military activities.	N/A	One or more wildfires occurred on private property in the LUA as a result of military activities.

Objective 4-3: Limited Use Area Safety and Land Use Compatibility

Task#	Metric	Reporting Frequency	Performance Target Criteria		
			Green	Amber	Red
4-3.1	Number of incidents involving military vehicles and school buses/bus passengers in the LUA.	Annual	No incidents involving military vehicles and school buses/bus passengers.	One incident involving military vehicles and school buses/bus passengers.	More than one incident involving military vehicles and school buses/bus passengers.
4-3.2	Number of incidents involving military vehicles conducting blackout driving and civilians or civilian property in the LUA.	Annual	No incidents involving blackout driving and civilians/civilian property in the LUA.	One incidents involving blackout driving and civilians/civilian property in the LUA.	More than one incidents involving blackout driving and civilians/civilian property in the LUA.
4-3.3A	Annual review of pipelines and electrical transmission lines within the LUA, and update of Military Installation Maps (MIMs) as needed.	Annual	A review of LUA pipelines and electrical transmission lines was conducted during the fiscal year, and MIMs were updated where needed	N/A	A review of LUA pipelines and electrical transmission lines was not conducted, or pipeline/electrical alignments were not updated on MIMs where needed.
4-3.3B	Number of incidents involving military vehicles or other military activities and pipelines/utility lines or oil and gas operations in the LUA.	Annual	No recorded incidents involving military vehicles or other military activities and pipelines/utility lines or oil and gas operations in the LUA.	One recorded incident involving military vehicles or other military activities and pipelines/utility lines or oil and gas operations in the LUA.	More than one recorded incident involving military vehicles or other military activities and pipelines/utility lines or oil and gas operations in the LUA.
4-3.4A	A documented JRTC-Fort Polk procedure (e.g., Range and Training Land SOP, JRTC EXROE) and/or Soldier training program (e.g., Sustainable Range Awareness Training or special information when signing for TAs where active grazing allotments are located) for HSU and RTU regarding active cattle grazing allotments in the LUA, and associated restrictions.	Annually	A documented JRTC-Fort Polk procedure and/or Soldier training program is in place to address LUA grazing allotments and associated restrictions.	N/A	A documented JRTC-Fort Polk procedure and/or Soldier training program is NOT in place to address LUA grazing allotments and associated restrictions.
4-3.4B	Number of incidents involving military activities and active grazing allotments in the LUA.	Annual	No recorded incidents involving military activities and active grazing allotments in the LUA.	One recorded incident involving military activities and active grazing allotments in the LUA.	More than one recorded incident involving military activities and active grazing allotments in the LUA.
4-3.5	Annual number of civilian complaints/acre-days utilized in the LUA.	Annual	N/A	N/A	N/A

Objectives 5-1 and 5-2: Continual Improvement

Task#	Metric	Reporting Frequency	Performance Target Criteria		
			Green	Amber	Red
5-1.1	Publication of annual SEMP report.	Annual	SEMP annual report is published online by 30 March of the next FY.	SEMP annual report is published online after 30 March and before 30 September of the next FY.	SEMP annual report is not published by 30 September of the next FY.
5-2.1	Percent of quarterly/annual Red monitoring task performance results for which a root cause analysis was conducted and appropriate management actions were identified.	Annual	A root cause analysis was conducted and appropriate management actions were identified for 100% of monitoring task with Red performance results.	A root cause analysis was conducted and appropriate management actions were identified for < 100% and ≥ 80% of monitoring task with Red performance results.	A root cause analysis was conducted and appropriate management actions were identified for < 80% of monitoring task with Red performance results.
5-2.2	Percent of SEMP monitoring questions for which one or more metrics and associated performance target criteria have been approved by the Oversight Committee.	Annual	Metrics and performance target criteria have been developed for ≥ 90% of SEMP monitoring questions by end of May 2010.	Metrics and performance target criteria have been developed for <90% and ≥ 70% of SEMP monitoring questions by end of May 2010.	Metrics and performance target criteria have been developed for < 70% of SEMP monitoring questions by end of May 2010.
5-2.3	Percent of approved SEMP monitoring tasks for which results were reported on schedule.	Annual	Results were reported on schedule for 100% of approved SEMP monitoring tasks.	N/A	Results were reported on schedule for < 100% of approved SEMP monitoring tasks.
5-2.4	SEMP Oversight Committee reviews conducted at least once per quarter.	Annual	One or more SEMP Oversight Committee reviews conducted per quarter.	N/A	Less than one SEMP Oversight Committee review conducted per quarter.