

Objective 1-1 Metrics, Performance Target Criteria and Performance Results - FY 2009

| Task# | Metric | Reporting Frequency | Performance Target Criteria | | | Performance Results | | | |
|-------|--|---------------------|---|---|--|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|--|
| | | | Green | Amber | Red | 1 QTR 09 | 2 QTR 09 | 3 QTR 09 | 4 QTR 09 |
| 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). | Green (100%) | Green (100%) | Green (100%) | Green (100%) |
| 1-1.2 | 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. | Red (37%) | Amber (70%) | Red (46%) | Amber (64%) |
| 1-1.3 | Ratio of SRA certified soldiers to minimum number of required RSOs per MSC; ratio of SRA certified O/Cs to assigned O/Cs. | Annually | ≥ 1.0 for all units | < 1.0 for one or more units and ≥ 0.95 for all units | < 0.95 for one or more units | TBD (Annual) | TBD (Annual) | TBD (Annual) | Green (Ratio > 1) |
| 1-1.4 | Trends for frequency, type and severity of maneuver damages. | Quarterly | N/A | N/A | N/A | See trend (n=113) | See trend (n=95) | See trend (n=84) | See trend (n=66) |
| 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. | Green (100%) | Green (100%) | Green (100%) | Green (100%) |
| 1-1.6 | Trends for violations of range regulations/permit conditions for environmental protection. | Quarterly | N/A | N/A | N/A | See trend (n=1; tree violation) | See trend (n=1; no drive/no dig) | See trend (n=0) | See trend (n=0) |
| 1-1.7 | Percent bare ground for "sandbox" (SB) areas and forest maneuver (FM) areas | Annually | Upper 95% confidence limit of the median percent bare ground is < 20% SB / 5% FM | Upper 95% confidence limit (CL) of the median percent bare ground is ≥ 20% SB / 5% FM, and the median percent bare ground is ≤ 20% SB / 5% FM | Median percent bare ground is > 20% SB / 5% FM | TBD (Annual) | TBD (Annual) | TBD (Annual) | Green (FM: median = 0; SB: median = 1, CL = 5.6) |
| 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. | TBD (Annual) | TBD (Annual) | TBD (Annual) | Green (n=5) |

Objective 1-2 Metrics, Performance Target Criteria and Performance Results - FY 2009

| Task# | Metric | Reporting Frequency | Performance Target Criteria | | | Performance Results |
|-------|--|---------------------|---|--|---|---|
| | | | Green | Amber | Red | FY09 |
| 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. | Green (3.32 / 3.32= 100%) |
| 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. | Green (3.32 / 3.32= 100%; stream crossing also completed) |
| 1-2.3 | Percent of sub-watersheds for which current watershed management plans are in place. (Notes: 1. watershed management plans are not required for the LUA because the need for LRAM work is not expected in the LUA due to the low intensity of training. 2. 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. | Red (10 / 24 = 42%; Root cause analysis scheduled Feb 2010) |
| 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. | Green (Project prioritization report complete) |
| 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. | Green (4 / 5 = 80%) |
| 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 a 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 a 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 sub-watersheds 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 | N/A - Report in FY13 |
| 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. This task will be accomplished in connection with development of a C-factor layer by the RTLA program. The analysis will include the Fort Polk Main Post (Army land and IUA), LUA and Peason Ridge.) | 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. | N/A - Report in FY13; Root cause analysis scheduled Feb 2010 in connection with Task 1-2.3 |
| 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. | N/A - Report in FY13 |

Objective 2-1 Metrics, Performance Target Criteria and Performance Results - FY 2009

| Task# | Metric | Reporting Frequency | Performance Target Criteria | | | Performance Results |
|-------|--|---------------------|---|--|--|---|
| | | | Green | Amber | Red | 4 QTR 09 |
| 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. | Green (100%) |
| 2-1.2 | Ratio of SRA certified soldiers to minimum number of required RSOs per MSC; ratio of SRA certified O/Cs to assigned O/Cs. | Annual | ≥ 1.0 for all units. | < 1.0 for one or more units and ≥ 0.95 for all units. | < 0.95 for one or more units. | Green (See Report for Task 1-1.3) |
| 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). | Green (100%) |
| 2-1.4 | Trends for violation of range regulations for protection of the RCW. | Quarterly | N/A | N/A | N/A | No trend (n = 0) |
| 2-1.5 | WITHDRAWN | WITH-DRAWN | WITHDRAWN | WITHDRAWN | WITHDRAWN | |
| 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). | Green (2008 growth = 5%; 5-yr growth = 15%) |

Objective 2-2 Metrics, Performance Target Criteria and Performance Results - FY 2009

| Task# | Monitoring Question | Metric | Reporting Frequency | Performance Target Criteria | | | Performance Results |
|-------|--|---|---------------------|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | Green | Amber | | FY 09 |
| 2-2.1 | Are open, frequently burned longleaf pine forest conditions being maintained to provide suitable habitat for the RCW and other native species? | 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 | 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 | 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. | Red (Army totals = 99% in 10 years and 100% in 15 years; USFS totals = 59% in 10 years and 75% in 15 years; Overall totals = 78% in 10 years and 87% in 15 years.) |
| 2-2.2 | Are open, frequently burned longleaf pine forest conditions being maintained to provide suitable habitat for the RCW and other native species? | 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. | Red (Army totals = 80% in 3 years and 94% in 5 years; USFS totals = 85% in 3 years and 94% in 5 years; Overall totals = 83% in 10 years and 94% in 5 years.) |
| 2-2.3 | Are open, frequently burned longleaf pine forest conditions being maintained to provide suitable habitat for the RCW and other native species? | Percent of cumulative IUA sale inventory and thinning goals accomplished, based on cumulative acres inventoried and sold. | 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 $> 80\%$ of cumulative inventory for sale and cumulative sale goals accomplished. | $< 80\%$ of cumulative inventory for sale goal accomplished; or $< 80\%$ of annual sale goal accomplished. | Red (91% of cumulative inventory goal accomplished; 75% of cumulative sale goal accomplished.) |
| 2-2.4 | Are open, frequently burned longleaf pine forest conditions being maintained to provide suitable habitat for the RCW and other native species? | 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. | Red (Estimated percent of required RCW habitat available = 96% for Vernon-Fort Polk population and 96% for Peason Ridge population) |

Objective 3-1 Metrics, Performance Target Criteria and Performance Results - FY 2009

| Task# | Metric | Reporting Frequency | Performance Target Criteria | | | Status | Required for MILCON? | | Required for Non-MILCON? | | Performance Results |
|------------|---|---------------------|---|---|---|--|----------------------|------------------|--------------------------|------------------|--|
| | | | Green | Amber | Red | | New Const. | Major Renovation | New Const. | Major Renovation | |
| 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, Picerne, 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. | Approved 6 June 08 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Red (Based on NEPA documentation, 21 facilities were identified that appear to require an environmental screening/alternatives analysis. Of these, 2 appear to have followed the SEMP process for screening/alternatives analysis.) |
| 3-1.2 | 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 and SS Credit 5.1. 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 and SS Credit 5.1. | ≥ 75% and < 90% of candidate new construction and major renovation projects achieve LEED-NC® 2.2 SS Credit 1 and SS Credit 5.1. | < 75% of candidate new construction and major renovation projects achieve LEED-NC® 2.2 SS Credit 1 and SS Credit 5.1. | Approved 27 Aug 08 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Red (Based on NEPA documentation, 5 possible facilities were identified as "candidate" LEED-NC facilities; however, available NEPA documentation is not adequate to clearly identify candidate LEED-NC facilities. It appears that most candidate facilities did not earn both SS Credit 1 and Credit 5.1; however, the number of projects that achieved both credits cannot be reliably determined.) |
| 3-1.3 A | 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. | Approved 27 Mar 09 (original Task 3-1.3 approved 6 Jun 08; split into two metrics on 27 March 09, one for MILCON and one for non-MILCON) | Yes | Yes | No | No | N/A. Two MILCON facilities with climate control were reviewed under NEPA in FY09. No MILCON facilities with climate control were completed in FY09; therefore, no results are available. |
| 3-1.3 B | Non-MILCON Facilities Constructed to LEED® Silver Percent of LEED-NC candidate non-MILCON (new construction) 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. | Annual | 100% of candidate non-MILCON (new construction) projects are certified to achieve LEED-NC® Silver or higher standards. | ≥80% and < 100 % of candidate non-MILCON (new construction) 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 new construction and major renovation projects are certified to achieve LEED-NC® Silver or higher standards; or < 100% of these projects meet LEED- NC® Certified or higher. | Not yet approved; recommend deferral pending further ACSIM guidance. | No | No | Yes | Yes | N/A, metric not yet approved |
| 3-1.4 A | 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. | Annual | 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. | Approved 27 Mar 09 | Yes | No | Yes | No | N/A, No candidate LEED-NC projects ready for occupancy/energy monitoring as of end of FY09. |
| 3-1.4 B | 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. | Annual | 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. | Approved 24 Sep 09 | No | Yes | No | Yes | N/A, No candidate LEED-NC projects ready for occupancy/energy monitoring as of end of FY09. |
| 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 EPAAct 1992 fixture flush/flow rate default values. Note: Actual water conservation performance results will be reported separately for each building. | Annual | The building uses at least 30% less water (gal/FTE/yr and/or gal/sf/yr) than baseline buildings based on EPAAct 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 EPAAct 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 EPAAct 1992 fixture flush/flow rate default values. | Approved 24 Sep 09 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A, No candidate LEED-NC projects ready for occupancy/water monitoring as of end of FY09. |
| 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. | Annual | Payback period is ≤ 10 years. | Payback period is > 10 years and ≤ 20 years. | Payback period is > 20 years. | Approved 24 Sep 09 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A, begin implementation with FY10 projects. |

Objective 4-1 Metrics, Performance Target Criteria and Performance Results - FY 2009

| Task# | Metric | Reporting Frequency | Performance Target Criteria | | | Performance Results | | | |
|---------|---|---------------------|--|--|---|--|--|--|---|
| | | | Green | Amber | Red | 1 QTR 09 | 2 QTR 09 | 3 QTR 09 | 4 QTR 09 |
| 4-1.1 A | 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. | Green (98.75% uptime) | Green (100% uptime) | Green (100% uptime) | Green (99.9% uptime) |
| 4-1.1 B | 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. | Green (Content updated for both web sites) |
| 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 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 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 WMA, or $< 50\%$ in the Peason WMA; and $\geq 75\%$ in the LUA, and $\geq 50\%$ in the Fort Polk 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 WMA, or $< 25\%$ in the Peason Ridge WMA. | TBD (Annual) | TBD (Annual) | TBD (Annual) | Red 100% LUA, 43% Ft. Polk; 25% Peason Ridge) |
| 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. | TBD (Annual) | TBD (Annual) | TBD (Annual) | Green (LUA: no events cancelled/denied due to military conflicts. SLUA: no events cancelled/denied due to military conflicts) |
| 4-1.4 | Ratio of Sustainable Range Awareness (SRA) certified soldiers to minimum number of required Range Safety Officers per Major Subordinate Command; ratio of SRA certified Observer/Controllers (O/Cs) to assigned O/Cs. | Annual | ≥ 1.0 for all units | < 1.0 for one or more units and ≥ 0.95 for all units | < 0.95 for one or more units | TBD (Annual) | TBD (Annual) | TBD (Annual) | Green (See report for Task 1-1.3) |
| 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 and Peason WMAs. | Annual | N/A | N/A | N/A | TBD (Annual) | TBD (Annual) | TBD (Annual) | No trend (No comments received in FY09) |
| 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 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 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 WMA or Peason WMA, and is $\leq 10\%$ for the LUA, Fort Polk 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 WMA or Peason WMA, at 90% confidence. | TBD (Annual) | TBD (Annual) | TBD (Annual) | No trend; FY09 is base year. (100% open, LUA; 31% open, Fort Polk; 24% open Peason Ridge) |
| 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 | TBD (Annual) | TBD (Annual) | TBD (Annual) | N/A (No trend; n = 0) |
| 4-1.8 | Weight of evidence of impacts 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. | TBD (Annual) | TBD (Annual) | TBD (Annual) | Amber (2 points) |

Objective 1-2 Metrics, Performance Target Criteria and Performance Results - FY 2009

| Task# | Metric | Reporting Frequency | Performance Target Criteria | | | Performance Results |
|-------|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | | | Green | Amber | Red | FY09 |
| 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. | Green (Report published online 18 Sep 09) |
| 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 | Red RCA completed for 1 / 7 = 14% of FY08 tasks with red 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. | TBD. 4 QTR 09 status = 57% |
| 5-1.3 | 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. | Green 100% of results reported on time |
| 5-1.4 | 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. | Green (4 quarterly meetings and one special meeting held in FY09) |