

## **APPENDIX J**

### **NAVY NATURAL RESOURCES METRICS**



## NR Metrics 2012 NAVBASE Coronado - NAVBASE CORONADO (Main Site)

Note: Click on the links to the right to jump to a focus area. Please click "Save" to add your draft answers to the database. If you leave and are logged out of the system, your answers will be retained the next time you log in.

### Assignment Information

**Assigned To:** [Ann Marie Graham](#), [Bryan Munson](#), [Melissa Booker](#), [Tiffany Shepherd](#)  
 CAMP MICHAEL MONSOOR, CAMP MORENA, CLEV NF SURVIVAL TRA, CROWN COVE, FRMER PHIBASE

**Special Area(s):** CORONADO, HOLLY SQUARE HSG, IMPERIAL BEACH, LOFGREN TERRACE HSG, NAVBASE CORONADO (Main Site), PHIBASE SEAL SIDE, SILVER STRAND, SPCWARGRP#1 DROP ZONE

**Due Date:** **Status:** Reviewed

**Sent:** 9/24/2012 **Sent By:** [Matt Hawkins \(DoD\)](#)

**Modified:** 11/13/2012 **Modified By:** [Tammy Conkle](#)

**Completed:** 11/13/2012 **Completed By:** [Tiffany Shepherd](#)

**Reviewed:** 11/13/2012 **Reviewed By:** [Tammy Conkle](#)

Select "New Item" to add an attendee

### Attendees

Name	Organization	Phone	Email	Lead
Tiffany Shepherd	NAVFAC SW, NB Coronado	(619) 545-3703	<a href="mailto:tiffany.shepherd@navy.mil">tiffany.shepherd@navy.mil</a>	Yes
Bryan Munson	NAVFAC, NB Coronado	(619) 545-7186	<a href="mailto:bryan.munson@navy.mil">bryan.munson@navy.mil</a>	No
Shannon Shea	NAVFAC	(619) 532-4265	<a href="mailto:shannon.shea1@navy.mil">shannon.shea1@navy.mil</a>	No
Sandy Vissman	USFWS	(760) 431-9440	<a href="mailto:sandy_vissman@fws.gov">sandy_vissman@fws.gov</a>	No
Jessica Bredvik	NAVFAC	(619) 532-4182	<a href="mailto:jessica.bredvik@navy.mil">jessica.bredvik@navy.mil</a>	No
Summer Adleberg	HDR (INRMP contractor)		<a href="mailto:summer.adleberg@hdrinc.com">summer.adleberg@hdrinc.com</a>	No
Walt Wilson	CNRSW	(619) 532-2747	<a href="mailto:walter.l.wilson2@navy.mil">walter.l.wilson2@navy.mil</a>	No
Nancy Ferguson	USFWS	(760) 431-9440	<a href="mailto:Nancy_Ferguson@fws.gov">Nancy_Ferguson@fws.gov</a>	No
Jennifer Edwards	Cal Dept of Fish and Game	(858) 467-2717	<a href="mailto:JEdwards@dfg.ca.gov">JEdwards@dfg.ca.gov</a>	No

### Navy INRMP Status Check/Data Call

1. Has the site been surveyed to determine if significant natural resources exist?

**SIGNIFICANT** - sources identified as having special importance to an installation and/or its ecosystem. Natural resources may be significant on a local, regional, national, or international scale. All threatened, endangered and at-risk species are significant natural resources that normally will require an INRMP. Installations that actively manage or execute projects for fish and wildlife, forestry, vegetation and erosion control, agricultural outleasement or grazing, or wetlands protection should be evaluated for significance, but normally will require an INRMP. An evaluation for significance should also consider the degree of active management, special natural features, aesthetics, outdoor recreational opportunities, and the ecological context of the installation. (DoDI 4715.03)

Options: Yes, No

Yes

1a. If the site has been surveyed, were significant natural resources found?

Options: Yes, No

Yes

1b. If the site has not been surveyed, please explain why a survey has not been conducted.

N/A

2. If significant natural resources were found, is there a compliant INRMP that covers this site?

**COMPLIANT INRMP** - A complete plan that meets the purposes of the Sikes Act (§101(a)(3)(A-C)), contains the required plan elements (§101(b)(1)(A-J)), and has been reviewed for operation and effect within the past 5 years (§101(2)(b)(2)).

Options: Yes, No

Yes

**3. If there is a compliant INRMP for the site, then please enter the name and date of the INRMP that covers this site**

*Please upload the INRMP and Signature Page to the Conservation Website. Go to the Natural Resources Program Overview page and select the Documents tab.*

3a. Name of INRMP

Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan Naval Base Coronado

3b. Date of INRMP

4/30/2002

Comment:

NBC INRMP with signature page is uploaded to the Documents section.

**4. If there is no INRMP for the site, has funding been requested to develop an INRMP?**

Options: Yes, No

4a. If funding has been requested, what is the expected date to receive funding?

4b. If no funding has been requested, please explain.

N/A

**5. Has a 5-year INRMP review for operation and effect been completed for this INRMP?**

**REVIEW FOR OPERATION AND EFFECT** – A comprehensive review by the Parties, at least once every 5 years, to evaluate the extent to which the goals and objectives of the INRMP continue to meet the purpose of the Sikes Act, which is to carry out a program that provides for the conservation and rehabilitation of natural resources on military installations. The outcome of this review will assist in determining if the INRMP requires a revision (§101(f)(1)(A)). The annual review can qualify for the 5-year review for operation and effect, which is legally required by the Sikes Act, if mutually agreed upon by both partners (i.e. USFWS and State).

Options: Yes, No

Yes

Comment:

NBC sent letters to USFWS, CDFG, NMFS on 6 Aug 2012 requesting concurrence on the operation/effect of the 2002 INRMP. USFWS has provided written concurrence (signature of the concurrence page) and CDFG responded with a separate letter expressing their concurrence.

**5a. If a 5-year INRMP review for operation and effect been completed, did the review result in a revision of the INRMP?**

**REVISION** – A substantive change to an INRMP that requires coordination and mutual agreement by the Parties. [List examples of things that would trigger a revision – Navy needs to review current list.] A revision is not minor changes to the INRMP text, work plans, or projects. Rather, these changes are updates that should be made as a result of annual reviews per DoD policy, to ensure the INRMP reflects the current condition of the natural resources and program goals and objectives. (CNO-N45)

Options: Yes, No

Yes

Comment:

Our INRMP is currently undergoing major revision and the revised document is expected to be completed late spring or early summer 2013.

5b. If yes, when was State concurrence received?

9/21/2012

5c. If yes, when was USFWS regional concurrence received?

8/30/2012

5d. If yes, when was Installation Commanding Officer approval received?

8/6/2012

5e. If no, please explain why a review for operation and effect has not been completed.

NBC sent letters to USFWS, CDFG, NMFS on 6 Aug 2012 requesting concurrence on the operation/effect of the 2002 INRMP. USFWS has provided written concurrence (signature of the concurrence page) and CDFG responded with a separate letter expressing their concurrence. NMFS has not yet responded.

1. Ecosystem Integrity

*Focus Area Purpose: Evaluate the current status, management effectiveness, and trends of the ecosystems at the*

installation to support and maintain a community of organisms that have a species composition, diversity, and functional organization comparable to those in the respective region.

**Instructions:** The list below contains the ecosystems occurring on the site(s) that were selected during the FY11 NR Metrics data call. Please review the list and update as necessary. Select the red 'X' to delete an ecosystem from the list. Select "New Item" to add an ecosystem and begin answering questions. Select the name of the preloaded ecosystem to answer the questions for the current reporting period. Note: The "Comment on my response" option is available for each question and can be used to (1) provide supplemental information about how you answered a question for future reference or (2) provide feedback to HQ if you have any questions/concerns about a question.

**Assessment of ecosystem integrity**

<b>Ecosystem</b>	<b>Fragmentation</b>	<b>Stressors</b>	<b>Species Populations</b>	<b>Condition</b>
▫ Mediterranean California Southern Coastal Dune	No fragmentation	Highly Vulnerable to Stress	Moderately effective management	Condition is better on the installation
▫ Southern California Coast Ranges Cliff and Canyon	No fragmentation	Moderately Vulnerable to Stress	Moderately effective management	Condition is similar both on and off the installat...
▫ Mediterranean California Mixed Oak Woodland	Ecosystem fragmentation is the result of one (1) o...	Moderately Vulnerable to Stress	Moderately effective management	Condition is better on the installation
▫ California Central Valley and Southern Coastal Gra...	Ecosystem fragmentation is the result of five (5) ...	Highly Vulnerable to Stress	Moderately effective management	Condition is similar both on and off the installat...
▫ Mediterranean California Eelgrass Bed	Ecosystem fragmentation is the result of one (1) o...	Highly Vulnerable to Stress	Effectively managed	Condition is similar both on and off the installat...
▫ South Coastal California Vernal Pool	No fragmentation	Highly Vulnerable to Stress	Moderately effective management	Condition is better on the installation
▫ California Maritime Chaparral	No fragmentation	Highly Vulnerable to Stress	Moderately effective management	Condition is better on the installation
▫ Southern California Coastal Scrub	No fragmentation	Highly Vulnerable to Stress	Moderately effective management	Condition is better on the installation
▫ Southern California Dry-Mesic Chaparral	Ecosystem fragmentation is the result of one (1) o...	Moderately Vulnerable to Stress	Moderately effective management	Condition is better on the installation
▫ California Coastal Live Oak Woodland and Savanna	No fragmentation	Moderately Vulnerable to Stress	Moderately effective management	Condition is similar both on and off the installat...
▫ Emergent Wetland	No fragmentation	Highly Vulnerable to Stress	Moderately effective management	Condition is similar both on and off the installat...
▫ Marine Nearshore	No fragmentation	Slightly Vulnerable to Stress	Moderately effective management	Condition is similar both on and off the installat...
▫ Estaurine Tidal Riverine Shallow	No fragmentation	Highly Vulnerable to Stress	Minimally effective management	Condition is similar both on and off the installat...
▫ Riparian Woodland	No fragmentation	Moderately Vulnerable to Stress	Moderately effective management	Condition is similar both on and off the installat...
▫ Sandy Beach (Unvegetated)	No fragmentation	Severely Vulnerable to Stress	Moderately effective management	Condition is similar both on and off the installat...

Please enter Findings and Recommendations in the space provided below. Findings and Recommendations are

required if the score for this focus area results in a Yellow or Red score. You will be unable to proceed to the next focus area until Findings and Recommendations have been entered.

If your score is Green, Findings and Recommendations serve as additional clarification to the answers provided for this Focus Area, and they are encouraged in order to provide a better understanding of existing activities, issues to be addressed, and unique circumstances.

Are conservation easements, or buffers, in place to provide an ecosystem integrity benefit on the installation?

Options: Yes, No = opportunity exists, but easements/buffers have not been pursued, N/A = no opportunity, development is immediately adjacent to installation

Yes

Comment:

1. Approx. 300 acre buffer parcel in place south of Camp Michael Monsoor (was purchased with water conservation funds for the purposes of water conservation and is managed by The Nature Conservancy). 2. NBC is pursuing a Restrictive Use Easement on a 282 acres property north of Camp Michael Monsoor. Package was approved by Navy and we are currently waiting for escrow to close. Here are some details from NAVFAC Real Estate (Alex Elias): "The Restrictive Use Easement (RUE) that we propose to purchase with this action will provide important buffer land adjacent to existing training areas at Camp Michael Monsoor, but it also includes something we haven't done before: That is, the RUE reserves the right to any [future] mitigation credits generated on this property to be used or assigned by the Navy. We hope this will be of direct benefit to the base, in addition to protecting the area from encroachment." 3. NBC is pursuing multiple additional conservation easements around Camp Michael Monsoor and NOLF Imperial Beach. These proposed buffers are in the preliminary stages of development. At NOLF we are in the process of signing a multi-agency letter in support of cooperative conservation of the Tijuana River Valley.

Findings

N/A

Recommendations

N/A

## Section Score: 0.77

### 2. Listed Species & Critical Habitat

*Focus Area Purpose: Evaluate the extent to which federally listed species have been identified and the INRMP provides conservation benefits to these species and their habitats.*

*The list below contains the federally listed species occurring on the site(s) that were selected during the FY11 NR Metrics data call. Species that are not protected under the federal Endangered Species Act (e.g. marine mammals protected solely under MMPA, state listed species, Birds of Conservation Concern, etc.) have been removed from the list. INRMP coverage, status, management of non-federally listed species should be addressed or discussed in the Ecosystem Integrity and/or INRMP Implementation Focus Areas.*

*Instructions: Please review the list and ensure that it is correct. To ADD a species select "New Item" and search for the species list. Select the name of the preloaded species to answer the questions for the current reporting period. To ADD species that are not on the pre-populated list or to DELETE species from the list please contact Mr. Matt Hawkins (matt.hawkins@navy.mil). Note: The "Comment on my response" option is available for each question and can be used to (1) provide supplemental information about how you answered a question for future reference or (2) provide feedback to HQ if you have any questions/concerns about a question.*

**Status codes include:**

*E = endangered. A species in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range.*

*T = threatened. A species likely to become endangered within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range.*

#### Assessment of Federally Listed Species and Critical Habitat

Species	Beneficial Surveys (Habitat)	Beneficial Surveys (Population)	Goals	Critical Habitat	Exemption/Exclusion
Stephens' kangaroo rat (Dipodomys stephensi) (incl....	Yes	Yes	Good	N/A (Critical habitat designation was not proposed...	N/A
California least tern (Sterna antillarum browni)	Yes	Yes	Excellent	N/A (Critical habitat designation was not proposed...	N/A

Species	Beneficial Surveys (Habitat)	Beneficial Surveys (Population)	Goals	Critical Habitat	Exemption/Exclusion
Light-footed clapper rail (Rallus longirostris lev...	Yes	Yes	Moderate	N/A (Critical habitat designation was not proposed...	N/A
Least Bell's vireo (Vireo bellii pusillus)	Yes	Yes	Good	N/A (Critical habitat designation was not proposed...	N/A
Western snowy plover (Charadrius alexandrinus nivo...	Yes	Yes	Excellent	No	Yes
Green sea turtle (Chelonia mydas)	Yes	Yes	Good	N/A (Critical habitat designation was not proposed...	N/A
Arroyo (=arroyo southwestern) toad (Bufo californi...	Yes	Yes	Good	N/A (Critical habitat designation was not proposed...	Yes
Quino checkerspot butterfly (Euphydryas editha qui...	Yes	Yes	Moderate	N/A (Critical habitat designation was not proposed...	Yes
San Diego fairy shrimp (Branchinecta sandiegonensi...	Yes	Yes	Good	N/A (Critical habitat designation was not proposed...	Yes
Salt marsh bird's-beak (Cordylanthus maritimus ssp...	Yes	Yes	Moderate	N/A (Critical habitat designation was not proposed...	N/A

#### Unoccupied Critical Habitat Questions

1. Has unoccupied critical habitat for any federally listed species been designated on the installation?

Options: Yes, No, N/A

No

1a. For which species?

User selects from preloaded federal species list.

2. Have management projects addressing unoccupied critical habitat been clearly identified in the INRMP?

Options: Yes, No, N/A

N/A

3. Have management projects addressing unoccupied critical habitat been clearly identified in the EPRWeb?

Options: Yes, No, N/A

N/A

#### Candidate Species / Species of Special Concern

**Sub-Focus Area Purpose:** Evaluates the extent to which USFWS candidate species and NMFS species of special concern species have been identified and the INRMP addresses these species and their habitats or the ecosystems in which they are found.

**Instructions:** The list below should include all USFWS candidate species and NMFS species of special concern species, including USFWS Candidate Notice of Review (CNOR) and Work Plan (WP) lists, which have been documented or are likely to occur on your installation. Please add all species that have been documented or are likely to occur on your installation. To ADD a species select "New Item" and search for the species list. Select the name of the preloaded species to answer the question regarding which management approach benefits the species. To ADD species that are not on the pre-populated list or to DELETE species from the list please contact Mr. Matt Hawkins ([matt.hawkins@navy.mil](mailto:matt.hawkins@navy.mil)). Note: The "Comment on my response" option is available for each question and can be used to (1) provide supplemental information about how you answered a question for future reference or (2) provide feedback to HQ if you have any questions/concerns about a question.

Select "New Item" to add a candidate species and begin answering questions.

Candidate Species / Species of Special Concern

Candidate Species	Conservation Benefit
Brand's phacelia (Phacelia stellaris)	Yes

Please enter Findings and Recommendations in the space provided below. Findings and Recommendations are required if the score for this focus area results in a Yellow or Red score. You will be unable to proceed to the next focus area until Findings and Recommendations have been entered.

If your score is Green, Findings and Recommendations serve as additional clarification to the answers provided for this Focus Area, and they are encouraged in order to provide a better understanding of existing activities, issues to be addressed, and unique circumstances.

Findings

Note that habitat exists on NBC for Southwestern Willow Flycatcher at NOLF Imperial Beach and RTSWS (Clev NF Survival Tra). Surveys are conducted approx. every 3 years, but the species has not been found to date. In addition, there are historic records of Pacific Pocket Mouse in the Tijuana Estuary (near NOLF IB) but the species has not been found in this area since the 1930's. USFWS has not declared the species extirpated from the area.

Salt marsh bird's beak has a new scientific name: Chloropyron maritimum ssp. maritimum

Western Snowy Plover has a new scientific name: Charadrius nivosus nivosus

Recommendations

It is not clear how we should address species (like SW Willow Flycatcher and Pacific Pocket Mouse) that have not been documented on the installation but where suitable habitat exists.

**Section Score: 0.96**

3. Recreational Use and Access

*Focus Area Purpose: Evaluate the availability and adequacy of public recreational use opportunities, such as fishing and hunting, and access for handicapped and disabled persons, given security and safety requirements for the installation.*

1. Are recreational opportunities available on the installation?

Options: Yes, No, N/A: security constraints limit/prohibit recreational opportunities

Yes

2. If recreational opportunities are available, are they offered to the public?

Options: Yes, No, NA: Recreational opportunities are not available due to landscape or security constraints.

Yes

3. If recreational opportunities are available, are they offered to DoD civilian personnel?

Options: Yes, No, NA: Recreational opportunities are not available due to landscape or security constraints.

Yes

4. If recreational opportunities are available, are they accessible by disabled veterans/Americans?

Options: Yes, No, N/A: Recreational opportunities are not available due to landscape or security constraints.

Yes

Comment:

There are some areas where accessible features are in place (e.g. fishing pier on NASNI and boardwalks at Silver Strand (SSTC-S) and NOLF IB, but not all recreational trails and beaches are accessible due to terrain.

5. Are Sikes Act fees collected for outdoor recreational opportunities?

Options: Yes, No, N/A: Recreational opportunities do not include hunting and fishing.



No

6. Are recreational areas and facilities in good condition?

Options: Yes, No, NA: Recreational opportunities are not available due to landscape or security constraints.

Yes

7. Is there an active natural resources law enforcement program on the installation?

Options: Yes, No, N/A: recreational opportunities do not include hunting and fishing

Yes

Comment:

An agreement is in place for NR law enforcement with Cal Dept of Fish and Game Law Enforcement Division (Game Wardens). The enforcement patrols are conducted on the weekend and primarily during the nesting season (May through Aug).

8. Are sustainable harvest goals in the INRMP effective for the management of the species' population?

Options: Not effective, Minimal effectiveness, Moderate effectiveness, Effective, Highly effective, N/A: Recreational opportunities do not include hunting and fishing

N/A: Recreational opportunities do not include hunting and fishing

Comment:

sustainable harvest goals are not discussed in the current (2002) INRMP although there are a small number of fishing sites on NBC (e.g. fishing pier at NAS North Island)

9. To what extent did the installation develop and provide public outreach/educational awareness, e.g. environmental educational opportunities, natural resource field trips/tours, pamphlets?

Options: No public outreach provided, Low outreach, Moderate outreach, Good outreach, Excellent outreach, N/A

Good outreach

Comment:

outreach provided through twice monthly bird walks (led by Navy wildlife biologist), interpretive panels near Least Tern/Snowy Plover nesting sites, NR brochures and pamphlets, and outreach conducted by Cal Fish and Game Wardens during patrols.

Please enter Findings and Recommendations in the space provided below. Findings and Recommendations are required if the score for this focus area results in a Yellow or Red score. You will be unable to proceed to the next focus area until Findings and Recommendations have been entered.

If your score is Green, Findings and Recommendations serve as additional clarification to the answers provided for this Focus Area, and they are encouraged in order to provide a better understanding of existing activities, issues to be addressed, and unique circumstances.

Findings

N/A

Recommendations

N/A

## Section Score: 0.85

### 4. Sikes Act Cooperation (Partnership Effectiveness)

**Focus Area Purpose:** Determine to what degree USFWS, State Fish and Wildlife Agency, and when appropriate, NOAA Fisheries Service, partnerships are cooperative and result in effective INRMP development and review for operation and effect.

1. Was the USFWS invited to participate in the annual INRMP/Natural Resources Program review?

Options: Yes, No

Yes

1a. By what method was the USFWS invited to participate in the annual INRMP/Natural Resources Program review?

Options: Telephone call, Electronic mail, Official letter, Multiple methods, Other, NA (USFWS was not invited)

Multiple methods

1b. Did the USFWS respond to the invitation to participate in the annual INRMP/Natural Resources Program review?

Options: Yes, No, N/A

Yes

1c. How many attempts were made to invite the USFWS to participate in the annual INRMP/Natural Resources Program review?

*Options: 0-3, 4-6, 7-10, >10, NA (USFWS was not invited)*

0-3

1d. Did the USFWS participate in the annual INRMP/Natural Resources Program review?

*Options: Yes, No*

Yes

1e. If the USFWS participated in the annual INRMP/Natural Resources Program review, was it recognized as a review for operation and effect?

*Options: Yes, No*

Yes

1f. If the USFWS did not participate in the annual review, what type of correspondence was received from the USFWS to inform the installation that they were not able to participate?

*Options: Telephone call, Electronic mail, Official letter, Multiple methods, Other, NA (USFWS did participate)*

NA (USFWS did participate)

1g. If the USFWS did not participate in the annual INRMP/Natural Resources Program review, was a separate meeting held/correspondence sent as a review for operation and effect? When?

**When?** User enters date in comment text box below question.

*Options: Yes, No*

1h. Was a report of the previous year's annual review submitted to the USFWS during this reporting period?

*Options: Yes, No*

No

2. Was the State Fish and Wildlife Agency invited to participate in the annual INRMP/Natural Resources Program review?

*Options: Yes, No*

Yes

2a. By what method was the State Fish and Wildlife Agency invited to participate in the annual INRMP/Natural Resources Program review?

*Options: Telephone call, Electronic mail, Official Letter, Multiple methods, Other, NA (the State Fish and Wildlife Agency was not invited)*

Multiple methods

2b. Did the State Fish and Wildlife Agency respond to the invitation to participate in the annual INRMP/Natural Resources Program review?

*Options: Yes, No, N/A*

Yes

2c. How many attempts were made to invite the State Fish and Wildlife Agency to participate in the annual INRMP/Natural Resources Program review?

*Options: 0-3, 4-6, 7-10, >10, NA (the State Fish and Wildlife Agency was not invited)*

4-6

2d. Did the State Fish and Wildlife Agency participate in the annual INRMP/Natural Resources Program review?

*Options: Yes, No, N/A*

Yes

2e. If the State Fish and Wildlife Agency participated in the annual INRMP/Natural Resources Program review, was it recognized as a review for operation and effect?

*Options: Yes, No, N/A*

Yes

2f. If the State Fish and Wildlife Agency did not participate in the annual review, what type of correspondence was received from the State Fish and Wildlife Agency to inform the installation that they were not able to participate?

*Options: Telephone call, Electronic mail, Official letter, Multiple methods, Other, NA (State did participate)*

NA (State did participate)

2g. If the State Fish and Wildlife Agency did not participate in the annual INRMP/Natural Resources Program review, was a separate meeting held/correspondence sent as a review for operation and effect? When?

**When?** User enters date in comment text box below question.

*Options: Yes, No, N/A*

N/A

2h. Was a report of the previous year's annual review submitted to the State Fish and Wildlife Agency during this reporting period?

Options: Yes, No, N/A

No

3. Was NOAA Fisheries Service invited to participate in the annual INRMP/Natural Resources Program review, if applicable?

Options: Yes, No, N/A

Yes

3a. By what method was NOAA Fisheries Service invited to participate in the annual INRMP/Natural Resources Program review, if applicable?

Options: Telephone call, Electronic mail, Official letter, Multiple, Other, N/A

Electronic mail

3b. Did NOAA Fisheries Service respond to the invitation to participate in the annual INRMP/Natural Resources Program review, if applicable?

Options: Yes, No, N/A

Yes

3c. How many attempts were made to invite the NOAA Fisheries Service to participate in the annual INRMP/Natural Resources Program review, if applicable?

Options: 0-3, 4-6, 7-10, >10, N/A

0-3

3d. Did NOAA Fisheries Service participate in the annual INRMP/Natural Resources Program review, if applicable?

Options: Yes, No, N/A

No

3e. If NOAA Fisheries Service participated in the annual INRMP/Natural Resources Program review, was it recognized as a review for operation and effect, if applicable?

Options: Yes, No, N/A

3f. If the NOAA Fisheries Service did not participate in the annual review, what type of correspondence was received from the State Fish and Wildlife Agency to inform the installation that they were not able to participate? When?

**When?** User enters date in comment text box below question.

Options: Telephone call, Electronic mail, Official letter, Multiple methods, Other, NA (was not invited)

3g. If NOAA Fisheries Service did not participate in the annual INRMP/Natural Resources Program review, was a separate meeting held/correspondence sent as a review for operation and effect? When?

**When?** User enters date in comment text box below question.

Options: Yes, No, N/A

No

3h. Was a report of the previous year's annual review submitted to NOAA Fisheries Service during this reporting period, if applicable?

Options: Yes, No, N/A

No

4. What is the level of collaboration/cooperation between Sikes Act partners ?

**Sikes Act partners:** USFWS, State Fish and Wildlife Agency, and NOAA Fisheries Service, if applicable.

Options: None, Minimal collaboration/cooperation, Satisfactory collaboration/cooperation, Effective collaboration/cooperation, Highly effective collaboration/cooperation

Effective collaboration/cooperation

5. How well are installation natural resource management goals and objectives aligned with conservation goals of Sikes Act partners, e.g. USFWS/NOAA Fisheries Service regional goals and State Wildlife Action Plans (SWAPs)?

Options: Not aligned, Somewhat aligned, Completely aligned, N/A: Option for NOAA only

Somewhat aligned

Comment:

there should be a choice between "somewhat aligned" and "completely aligned." Suggest "well aligned"

Please enter Findings and Recommendations in the space provided below. Findings and Recommendations are required if the score for this focus area results in a Yellow or Red score. You will be unable to proceed to the next focus area until Findings and Recommendations have been entered.

If your score is Green, Findings and Recommendations serve as additional clarification to the answers provided for this Focus Area, and they are encouraged in order to provide a better understanding of existing activities, issues to be addressed, and unique circumstances.

Findings

N/A

Recommendations

N/A

## Section Score: 0.70

### 5. Team Adequacy

*Focus Area Purpose: Asses the adequacy of the natural resources team (the natural resource management professional and installation support staff) in accomplishing INRMP goals and objectives at each installation.*

1. Is there a Navy professional Natural Resources Manager designated by the Installation Commanding Officer?

COs of shore activities holding Class 1 plant accounts shall appoint, by letter, an installation Natural Resources Manager/Coordinator whose duties include ensuring that the CO is informed regarding: natural resources issues, conditions of natural resources, objectives of the INRMP, and potential or actual conflicts between mission requirements and natural resources mandates. Designated installation POC's are responsible for the inherently governmental decisions made on behalf of the installation and CO with regard to Sikes Act compliance. [OPNAVINST 5090.1C]

Options: Yes, No

Yes

2. Is there an on-site Navy professional Natural Resources Manager?

Options: Yes, No

Yes

2a. Please enter the GS grade level and job series code

Enter the GS grade level and job series code (i.e. GS-0401-12) of each on-site Natural Resources Manager

GS-0401-12, GS-0401-12

3. Is there adequate installation staff assigned or available to properly implement the INRMP goals and objectives?

**staff assigned or available:** Defined as NR staff or other reach back EV staff.

Options: Yes, No

No

3a. Please enter the GS grade level and job series code

Enter the GS grade level and job series code (i.e. GS-0401-12) of each installation staff member assigned or available to assist the Natural Resources Manager in implementing the INRMP goals and objectives.

4. How well do higher echelon offices support the installation natural resources program, e.g. reach back support for execution, policy support, etc.?)

Options: No support, Minimal support, Satisfactory support, Well supported, Very well supported

Satisfactory support

5. The team is enhanced by the use of contractors.

**Contractors:** Defined as supplemental staff to the onsite NR staff, not contractors working in support of contracted projects.

Options: Disagree, Somewhat agree, Neutral, Agree, Strongly agree, N/A

Disagree

Comment:

We are only considering governmental team contractors in this response. We are not considering contractors who support the program (e.g. those that conduct field surveys under specific EPR's).

6. The team is enhanced by the use of volunteers.

Options: Disagree, Somewhat agree, Neutral, Agree, Strongly agree, N/A

Somewhat agree

Comment:

In FY12, we utilized volunteers during an event in which we installed eight Burrowing Owl artificial burrows on NAS North Island. NBC NR staff also supported the Pacific Flyway Shorebird Survey by volunteering time to perform shorebird surveys and arranging access to the installation for other surveyors.

7. The Natural Resources team is adequately trained to implement the goals and objectives of the INRMP.

Options: Disagree, Somewhat agree, Neutral, Agree, Strongly agree

Disagree

Comment:

The NR team would like to participate in more training but time is so limited due to workload that training cannot be as high a priority as it should be.

Please enter Findings and Recommendations in the space provided below. Findings and Recommendations are required if the score for this focus area results in a Yellow or Red score. You will be unable to proceed to the next focus area until Findings and Recommendations have been entered.

If your score is Green, Findings and Recommendations serve as additional clarification to the answers provided for this Focus Area, and they are encouraged in order to provide a better understanding of existing activities, issues to be addressed, and unique circumstances.

**Findings**

The NR team which support NBC mainland is currently composed of a GS-12 biologist (for wildlife) and GS-12 biologist (for botany/land management). During the CNIC N1 staffing study conducted in 2010, the review team recommended that NBC NR program staff be increased by 1 FTE NR specialist. NBC ENV Program Manager is currently working with Region to implement.

**Recommendations**

Recommend implementation of the recommendations from the CNIC staffing study to ensure adequate staff to manage NR program.

**Section Score: 0.41**

6. INRMP Implementation

*Focus Area Purpose: Evaluate the execution of actions taken to meet goals and objectives outlined in the INRMP.*

*Supplemental Information: The intent of this Focus Area is to assess how well actions are being implemented to execute the goals and objectives of the INRMP. Actions can include projects submitted via EPRWeb, as well as activities executed with alternative funds, not programmed through EPRWeb, or carried out by the use of volunteers or cooperative partnerships with other entities. Only include actions that occurred fully or partially during the CURRENT REPORTING PERIOD, e.g. the PREVIOUS FISCAL YEAR.*

*Instructions: Select a project from the list below (imported from EPRWeb) to begin answering questions. Select the red 'X' to delete a project, if a preloaded project doesn't apply to the site (s) or is not a project that occurred during the current reporting period. In addition, any INRMP actions, e.g. emergent projects, non-funded actions, projects involving volunteers, etc., not preloaded in the table should be entered manually in order to be assessed. Select "New Item" to add additional INRMP actions or missing EPRWeb projects, and begin answering questions. Note: Conservation recommendations identified during regulatory consultations (e.g. ESA Section 7, EFH, etc.), over the past year, may have resulted in the development of emergent requirements. These projects should also be evaluated during this annual review.*

**Assessment of INRMP Implementation**

FY	Project #	Title	Obligated (\$)	Spent (\$)	Met INRMP Goals	On Schedule	Status	Ecosystem Benefited
(#12101) Flora, Fauna and Habitat								
0	2011 00242NR027	MBTA SW Metro Heron and Egret Surveys	\$0.00		Fully Agree	Yes	Now In-Progress	
0	2012 00246NR023	MBTA SW NBC NOLF Migratory Bird MAPS Monitoring	\$	\$	Fully Agree	Yes	Awarded/Executed	
0	2011 00242NR042	MBTA SW Migratory Bird Mitigation			Fully Agree	Yes	Now In-Progress	
0	2012 00246NR123	MBTA SW NBC RTSWS Migratory Bird MAPS Monitoring	\$	\$	Fully Agree	Yes	Awarded/Executed	
		X - INRMP -						

FY	Project #	Title	Met INRMP Goals	On Schedule	Status	Ecosystem Benefited
2010	00246NR033	Wetland Rehabilitation - NASNI	Fully Agree	No	On-Hold	Emergent Wetland
2012	00246NR021	SW NBC Erosion Control Plan and Implementations	Fully Agree	Yes	SOW Prepared	California Maritime Chaparral
2012	00246NR114	SW NBC - NR Inventory & Update for Various Install...	Fully Agree	Yes	Awarded/Executed	
2012	00246NR217	SW NBC NAB NR Inventory and Monitoring	Fully Agree	Yes	Awarded/Executed	
2008	00246NR036	NBC Camp Morena - NR Inventory	Fully Agree	Yes	Completed	
<i>(#12103) INRMP - Overarching</i>						
2012	00246NR000	CHE SW NBC INRMP	Fully Agree	Yes	Now In-Progress	
2012	0024298019	CHS SW CNRSW - Metro Area GIS and Data Management ...	Fully Agree	Yes	Now In-Progress	
<i>(#12104) Listed Species</i>						
2010	00246NR042	SW NBC RTSWS Stephen's K-Rat Monitoring	Fully Agree	Yes	Completed	
2012	00246NR004	SW F NBC Least Tern and Snowy Plover Mitigation Si...	Fully Agree	Yes	Now In-Progress	Mediterranean California Southern Coastal Dune
2010	00246NR107	1 CP SW RTS Warner Springs - Quino Checkerspot But...	Fully Agree	Yes	Now In-Progress	Southern California Dry-Mesic Chaparral
2010	00246NR026	1 S W NBC NOLF/NRRF Light Footed Clapper Rail Surv...	Fully Agree	No	Now In-Progress	
2012	00246NR108	1 CP SW RTS WARNER SPRINGS - Fire Management Plan ...	Strongly Agree	No	Awarded/Executed	Southern California Dry-Mesic Chaparral
2012	00246J100H	2 BO Naval Base Coronado CLT & WSP Predator Contro...	Fully Agree	Yes	Now In-Progress	
2012	00246NR031	NAB EIS Mitigation - Terrestrial	Fully Agree	Yes	Now In-Progress	
2012	00246NR034	3 SAR SW NBC Burrowing Owl Monitoring	Fully Agree	Yes	Now In-Progress	

FY	Project #	Title	Met INRMP Goals	On Schedule	Status	Ecosystem Benefited
2012	00246NR028	1 RP SW NBC NOLF Cowbird Trapping	Fully Agree	Yes	Now In-Progress	Riparian Woodland
2010	00246NR110	1 CP - SW La Posta MWTF - Fire Plan, Updates & Impl...	Strongly Agree	Yes	Now In-Progress	Southern California Dry-Mesic Chaparral
2012	00246NR035	1 S SW NBC NOLF Least Bell's Vireo and Willow Flyc...	Fully Agree	Yes	Now In-Progress	
2010	00246NR117	2 BO SW NBC - Endangered Fairy Shrimp Surveys - NR...	Strongly Agree	Yes	Now In-Progress	Emergent Wetland
2012	00246NR003	1 CP SW NBC - INRMP Implementation	Strongly Agree	Yes	Now In-Progress	Southern California Coastal Scrub
2012	00246NR109	2 BO SW NBC Camp Michael Monsoor (FKA La Posta) - ...	Fully Agree	Yes	Now In-Progress	Southern California Dry-Mesic Chaparral
2012	00242NR020	2 BO SW Metro Wildlife Assist Support	Fully Agree	Yes	Now In-Progress	
2012	00246J100G	2 BO NB CORONADO LEAST TERN & SNOWY PLOVER MONITOR...	Fully Agree	Yes	Now In-Progress	
2012	00242NR033	2 BO SW Project Wildlife Rehabilitation Support	Fully Agree	Yes	Awarded/Executed	
2012	00246NR043	2 BO SW NBC RTSWS Invasive Species (Bullfrog) Remo...	Fully Agree	Yes	Now In-Progress	Riparian Woodland
2012	00246NR101	2 BO - SW NBC - Invasive Plant Control in support ...	Strongly Agree	Yes	SOW Prepared	Southern California Coastal Scrub
2012	00246NR105	1 CP SW NOLFIB - Habitat Enhancement for Federally...	Fully Agree	Yes	Now In-Progress	Southern California Coastal Scrub
2012	0024688888	2 BO SW La Posta - Endangered Quino Checkerspot Bu...	Fully Agree	Yes	Completed	California Maritime Chaparral
2012	00246NR037	2 BO SW NAB North/South Delta Tern Mitigation Site... SW F NBC	Fully Agree	Yes	Awarded/Executed	

FY	Project #	Title	Met INRMP Goals	On Schedule	Status	Ecosystem Benefited	
2010	00246NR250	Least Tern & Snowy Plover BO	\$0.00	Fully Agree	Yes	Now In-Progress	
2012	00246NR112	2 BO SW Camp Michael Monsoor (FKA La Posta) - Inva...	\$	Fully Agree	Yes	Now In-Progress	Southern California Coastal Scrub
2012	00246NR024	1 CP SW NBC - Dune and Strand Restoration to Suppo...	\$	Strongly Agree	Yes	Now In-Progress	Mediterranean California Southern Coastal Dune
2012	00246nr113	2 BO Restoration of North and South Delta Vegetati...	\$	Strongly Agree	Yes	Now In-Progress	Mediterranean California Southern Coastal Dune
2012	00246NR115	2 BO SW RTS Warner Springs - Invasive Plant Contro...	\$	Fully Agree	Yes	Now In-Progress	Southern California Dry-Mesic Chaparral
2012	00246NR100	1 S - SW NBC Salt Marsh Bird's Beak and other Sens...	\$	Strongly Agree	Yes	Now In-Progress	Emergent Wetland
2011	00242SWC11	SW San Diego Bay Gull Billed Tern Management	\$0.00	Somewhat Agree	Yes	Now In-Progress	

For each INRMP action executed during the reporting period for the installation, provide the amount of funding spent on listed species related-actions. Note: If a single project benefitted multiple listed species, please break out the funding amount spent per species, e.g. add the same INRMP action for each listed species benefitted. Select "New Item" to add federally listed species that benefitted from various INRMP projects/actions.

#### Assessment of Listed Species Benefited by INRMP Implementation

Action	Species	Spent
--------	---------	-------

#### General INRMP Implementation Questions

1. Do the goals and objectives of the INRMP/Natural Resources Program support other conservation partnerships/initiatives?

Options: Yes, No

Yes

2. Which conservation partnerships/initiatives are supported?

Select all that apply

Partners in Amphibian and Reptile Conservation (PA...

3. To what level are Natural Resource program executions meeting USFWS conservation management expectations?

Options: Dissatisfied, Minimally satisfied, Somewhat satisfied, Completely satisfied, More than satisfied

Somewhat satisfied

Comment:

we would like a choice between completely or somewhat satisfied. "Very satisfied"

4. To what level are Natural Resource program executions meeting State Fish and Wildlife Agency conservation management expectations?



Options: Dissatisfied, Minimally satisfied, Somewhat satisfied, Completely satisfied, More than satisfied  
Somewhat satisfied

Comment:

we would like a choice between completely or somewhat satisfied. "Very satisfied"

5. To what level are Natural Resource program executions meeting NOAA Fisheries Service conservation management expectations, if applicable?

Options: N/A: Not supported, Minimally supported, Satisfactorily supported, Well supported, Very well supported

Comment:

NOAA did not attend INRMP meeting

6. To what extent has the INRMP/Natural Resources program successfully supported other mission areas? (e.g. encroachment, BASH, range support, port operations, air operations, facilities management, etc.)

Options: Not supported, Minimally supported, Satisfactorily supported, Well supported, Very well supported  
Very well supported

7. Are Cooperative Agreements used to execute natural resources program requirements?

Options: Yes, No

Yes

8. Describe any obstacles to INRMP implementation

1. At NAVFAC Southwest, cooperative agreements have become a very difficult tool to use, and take from 4-6 months to award. Because of this, NBC has moved away from using this formerly valuable tool.

2. Cooperative Research Agreements are no longer signed by the Public Works Office or Installation CO and therefore are not readily available to the installation. Each new agreement (MOU) must now be routed through Region and signed by the Regional Commander. This prevents the installation from pursuing these mutually beneficial agreements due to being understaffed.

*Please enter Findings and Recommendations in the space provided below. Findings and Recommendations are required if the score for this focus area results in a Yellow or Red score. You will be unable to proceed to the next focus area until Findings and Recommendations have been entered.*

*If your score is Green, Findings and Recommendations serve as additional clarification to the answers provided for this Focus Area, and they are encouraged in order to provide a better understanding of existing activities, issues to be addressed, and unique circumstances.*

Findings

N/A

Recommendations

N/A

## Section Score: 0.83

### 7. INRMP (Natural Resource Program) Support of the Installation Mission

*Focus Area Purpose: Evaluate the level to which existing natural resources requirements support the installation's ability to sustain the current operational mission, ensuring no net loss of mission capability.*

Mission statement

The NBC mission is to provide the highest quality logistical support and quality of life services to U.S. Navy operating forces and for assigned activities and other commands as needed, and to provide the right support, at the right time, in the right amount, enabling operating forces to produce the right level of combat readiness; that is, support the Fleet, Fighter and Family.

1. The Natural Resources program effectively considers current mission requirements.

Options: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, Strongly agree

Strongly agree

2. What is the level of coordination between natural resources personnel and other installation departments and military staff?

Options: No coordination, Minimal coordination, Satisfactory coordination, Effective coordination, Highly effective coordination

Effective coordination

3. To what extent has the INRMP successfully supported other mission areas? (e.g. encroachment, BASH, range support, port operations, air operations, facilities management, etc.)

Options: *Not supported, Minimally supported, Satisfactorily supported, Well supported, Very well supported*  
Well supported

4. To what extent has there been a net loss of training lands or mission-related operational/training activities?

Options: *Mission is fully impeded; training activities cannot be conducted due to regulatory requirements, Mission/Training activities are somewhat impeded with workarounds due to regulatory requirements, Neutral, No loss occurred, Mission has seen benefits*

Mission has seen benefits

*Please enter Findings and Recommendations in the space provided below. Findings and Recommendations are required if the score for this focus area results in a Yellow or Red score. You will be unable to proceed to the next focus area until Findings and Recommendations have been entered.*

*If your score is Green, Findings and Recommendations serve as additional clarification to the answers provided for this Focus Area, and they are encouraged in order to provide a better understanding of existing activities, issues to be addressed, and unique circumstances.*

**Findings**

Gull-billed tern predation has significantly reduced the effectiveness of the tern and plover management on SSTC-N and NASNI. Lack of support from USFWS has led to a situation where management is not as effective as it can be, and recovery of the species is impeded which could negatively affect training. Navy expends significant resources to recover the species, but USFWS's inaction on Gull-billed Tern management undermines Navy effort

**Recommendations**

Ensure USFWS goals are in agreement with the NR management requirements of the installation. NBC Command recommendation is to withhold funding for the tern and plover program including monitoring, predator control, game wardens, and others until the USFWS implements a solution.

**Commanding Officer Signature**

Name  
Gary Mayes  
Rank  
Captain

**Section Score: 0.90**

**Summary**

1. As a result of this year's annual review, have any additional actions, such as management recommendations related to regulatory drivers (ACOE permits, EFH Issues, etc.), been identified that should be considered for incorporation into the INRMP?

The purpose of this question is to assess whether the INRMP needs to be updated, either in content or projects to be implemented, as a result of the outcome of the annual review for operation and effect that was conducted.

Options: *Yes, No*

Yes

Comment:

During the INRMP Revision for NBC (underway), we are incorporating all required management changes related to recent regulator drivers (e.g. SSTC EIS ROD which was signed Aug 2012). Additional recommendations from USFWS and CDFG will come forth during their review of the draft NBC INRMP.

2. In addition to any findings submitted in the 7 Focus Areas please provide any additional or general findings?  
NBC needs additional staff to adequately meet the requirements of the INRMP and wildlife agencies.

3. In addition to any recommendations submitted in the 7 Focus Areas please provide any additional or general recommendations?  
Please ensure adequate staffing to meet the requirements of the INRMP and wildlife agencies.

4. *List the top three accomplishments for the Natural Resources Program during this reporting period.*

4a. [1st accomplishment]\*

In Sept 2012, the NBC NR program and PACFLT awarded a large-scale dune restoration project through the CESU agreement, which will implement mitigation requirements of the SSTC EIS (ROD signed Aug 2012). The project implements the Avian and Dune Management Plan (aka Long-term Site Enhancement Plan) required by the EIS and SSTC BO, and will include restoration of approx. 17 acres of coastal dunes at the SSTC-N/NAB oceanside and enhancement of approx. 20 acres of existing CA Least Tern/Snowy Plover nesting sites on the SSTC-N bayside/Delta

Beaches. Completion of this project will also contribute to range sustainability by removing invasive iceplant and restoring our CA coastal dune ecosystem. This ecosystem is an important habitat for sensitive species and the area is a vital resource for military training.

4b. [2nd accomplishment]\*

In FY12, NBC funded a second Monitoring Avian Productivity and Survivorship (MAPS) banding station at RTSWS, which brings our total number of MAPS stations to two. Each station will be run through an Economy Act Agreement with US Geological Survey Western Ecological Field Station. The RTSWS program will include an additional effort to look at migratory bird fall migration which will inform regional knowledge of migration in east San Diego County.

4c. [3rd accomplishment]\*

NBC implemented the first year of Quino Checkerspot Butterfly enhancement at Camp Michael Monsoor. Enhancement effort in FY12 included approximately 25 acres of QCB habitat.

## Scorecard

Focus Area	Final
1. Ecosystem Integrity	0.77
2. Listed Species & Critical Habitat	0.96
3. Recreational Use and Access	0.85
4. Sikes Act Cooperation (Partnership Effectiveness)	0.70
5. Team Adequacy	0.41
6. INRMP Implementation	0.83
7. INRMP (Natural Resource Program) Support of the Installation Mission	0.90
	<b>0.77</b>

*Legend: Green (1.00-0.67), Yellow (0.66-0.34), Red (0.33-0.0)*

To finalize your scorecard, please save this form, and then select the Submit button above.

***THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK***