

Installation Name		
ACUB PRIORITIZATION MATRIX		Page 1
CRITERIA	Score/ Measure	REMARKS
A. Encroachment Impacts/Issue H=3, M=2, L=1, N=0		
Urban sprawl		
Endangered Species		
Airspace		
Noise		
Air Quality		
Water		
Wetlands		
A. Sum points for Encroachment Impacts:		
B. Potential to Reverse or Prevent Encroachment Impacts above with ACUBs H=0, M=1, L=2, N=3		
Urban sprawl		
Endangered Species		
Airspace		
Noise		
Air Quality		
Water		
Wetlands		
B. Sum points for reversibility:		
Subtract point scores (A. - B.) Subtotal:		(If encroachment impacts to training are negligible or not avoidable with ACUBs, do not proceed.)
Availability of Land		
Large blocks of single ownership	3	
A large block of single ownership with numerous private land owners	2	
Numerous private land owners	1	
None apparent	0	
Time-Sensitive Window of Opportunity		
Less than two years	3	
Two - four years	2	
Five to nine years	1	
No sensitivity	0	
Level of Regulatory Support H=3, M=2, L=1, N=0		
High: Agencies actively encouraging or desire to partner with installation.		
Medium: Agencies acknowledge that an ACUB might help an encroachment problem.		
Low: Installation has not pursued ACUB discussions with regulatory agencies.		
None: Regulators do not support ACUB or are unwilling to grant relief.		
Level of Private Support H=3, M=2, L=1, N=0		
High: Off-post officials/landowners are actively encouraging ACUB effort.		

Installation Name

ACUB PRIORITIZATION MATRIX

CRITERIA	Score/ Measure	REMARKS
<u>Medium</u> : Off-post officials recognize that a problem exists, but not yet committed to ACUB effort.		
<u>Low</u> : Installation has not pursued ACUB discussions with off-post officials/landowners		
<u>None</u> : Off-post officials/landowners have no desire to partner with installation.		
Total:		
Adequate Human Resources are Present? YES or NO		

ARMY COMPATIBLE USE BUFFERS PRIORITIZATION MATRIX INSTRUCTIONS

REVERSIBLE OR PREVENTABLE ENCROACHMENT

This section addresses two encroachment questions as follows: A. How severely is encroachment degrading the military mission? B. How great is the potential for ACUBs to reverse or prevent that degradation? An installation with a severe (high) level of potential encroachment (e.g. approaching urban sprawl) and a great potential to reverse or prevent it with ACUBs (e.g. large available intervening tracts) will receive the highest score in this block. Use the Remarks block here and in other sections below to explain or highlight any issues, concerns, multiple scores, training impacts, etc.

A. Listed in this section are those encroachment issues that have or may impact the installation's military mission. The intent is to evaluate and rate the severity of each specific encroachment issue on training. Installations should be rated based on current encroachment and potential for encroachment to impact the military mission within the foreseeable future. For example, the installation may not be experiencing clean air encroachment problems, but when EPA starts enforcing 2.5 micron standards, the installation will fall into a non-attainment (air) and will experience encroachment due to the Clean Air Act (CAA). Another example involves water quantity. If its mission may be impacted by lack of water or water quality concerns, score that category high. Consequently, the installation should be scored based on the potential severity of the clean air encroachment or water shortage. For each encroachment category: H = High, M = Moderate, L = Low, and N = No impact to training. Score as follows: H=3, M=2, L=1, N=0

B. Only score areas in this section that have a H, M, or L rating in block A. No rating in this section can be higher than the score for that area in A above. This section scores the potential for ACUBs to reverse or prevent the category of mission degradation. The potential is based upon availability of land to meet the encroachment abatement goals. In the CAA example above, it is unlikely that there is enough land available for ACUBs to offset for this standard so the air quality category should receive a score of "L" or "N" (2 or 3). In the water example above; if the installation is able to acquire and retire an agricultural water right as mitigation for projected shortages (via ACUB) score the category "H" or "M" (0 or 1). If the installation got an "H" rating in the Endangered Species category (high mission impacts) and there are large tracts of private land with listed species in the vicinity that may be used as mitigation and the sellers are willing, there may be a high potential to reverse those mission impacts ("H" or 0 points). For each encroachment category: H = High, M = Moderate, L = Low,

and N = No potential to correct or prevent impacts to training with ACUBs. Score as follows: H=0, M=1, L=2, N=3.

If there are no current or potential encroachment impacts or existing or anticipated impacts are not reversible or preventable with ACUBs (e.g. surrounded by urban sprawl); there is no need to further complete a prioritization matrix for the installation.

A GUIDE TO ASSESSING LAND AVAILABILITY

The purpose of this block is to evaluate the availability of lands adjacent to the installation boundary for an ACUB or lands near the installation that could be used to mitigate a specific encroachment category. There are 4 categories listed.

Large Blocks of Single Ownership: This includes land beneficial to the installation is in mainly large blocks of single ownership. A large block could be an area that abuts a large (greater than 15 Km) linear portion of the installation boundary. These could be land holdings of federal, private, state, or NGO parties. For example, one private landowner owns the lands adjacent to the entire southern border of Ft. Carson and approximately 1/3 of the southeastern boundary. Score 3

A Large Block of Single Ownership with Numerous Private Land Owners: If there is a mix of one or two single landowners who own a large block of land beneficial to the installation and there are also numerous individual landowners with smaller tracts of land (1,000 acres or less), Score 2.

Numerous Private Land Owners: If lands beneficial to the installation are owned mainly by numerous landowners with small land holdings (1,000 acres or less) who may be willing to enter into an ACUB with the Army, Score 1.

None Apparent: In the event there is little to no opportunity for an ACUB, enter a score of 0.

In the remarks column note the approximate number of Km² and the approximate dimensions of the available land (e.g. 5Km x 13Km = 65 Km²). Similarly, if different encroachment areas should receive different scores, note this in the remarks column. For example, if there is land available to mitigate for endangered species impacts but not to mitigate noise impacts, so note.

TIME-SENSITIVE WINDOW OF OPPORTUNITY

The purpose of this block is to evaluate whether or not there is any time sensitivity to establishing an ACUB. For example, there may be a private landowner with large block of land adjacent to the installation that is willing to

enter into a conservation agreement, but only if done within the next two years due to financial constraints he is facing. Alternatively, the training restrictions are becoming so restrictive, that units are having difficulty training or cannot train certain required tasks.

Less than 2 years. In some cases, there may be willing partners for an ACUB that will require the Army to take action within 2 years or less or lose the opportunity to enter into an ACUB. For example, a willing private landowner who has a large block of land adjacent to the installation that due to financial considerations must either enter into an ACUB with the military or sell to land developers within two years. Alternatively, the training restrictions imposed due to encroachment is so severe that if not corrected within 2 years, units will report less than acceptable readiness standards in the USR. If either of these are the case, Score 3.

Two to Four Years: For this scoring, there is some time sensitivity to conducting an ACUB that if the Army does not act within 4 years, the opportunity to effect an ACUB with landowners may disappear. Or, the training restrictions being imposed due to encroachment are so severe that if not corrected potentially within 2 to 4 years, units may report less than acceptable readiness standards in the USR. If either of these are the case, Score 2.

Five to Nine Years: For this scoring, there is some time sensitivity to conducting an ACUB that if the Army does not act within 5 to 9 years, the opportunity to effect an ACUB with landowners may disappear. Or, the training restrictions being imposed due to encroachment are so severe that if not corrected potentially within 5 to 9 years, units may report less than acceptable readiness standards in the USR. If either of these are the case, Score 1.

No Sensitivity: If there is no time sensitivity to conducting an ACUB, Score 0.

LEVEL OF REGULATORY SUPPORT

The intent here is to evaluate the support for an ACUB that an installation may receive from regulatory agencies, both state and federal. The most significant factor in generating this support is the level of scientific understanding and consensus on a need for encroachment management. A strong indicator of this consensus is the existence of a final signed multi-agency cooperative agreement or management plan (such as a watershed management plan or endangered species implementation plan). It includes a numerical score and comments where appropriate.

High: Regulatory agencies are actively encouraging the installation to initiate an ACUB action. Regulatory agencies desire to collaborate with the installation in an ACUB or is offering relief from fines, NOVs, etc if an ACUB action is initiated. A signed agreement exists such as a population or regional recovery plan for

endangered species or watershed management plan has been completed and it identifies lands near the installation as targets for conservation to meet the plan's goals. Score 3.

Moderate: Regulatory agencies acknowledge that there is an encroachment problem that may be helped or mitigated by an ACUB but is vague about the extent of regulatory relief they may offer to the installation. Though a signed management plan to meet such management goals does not exist, there is a general agreement among the technical experts of the area as to the level of effort needed to meet encroachment management goals. Score 2.

Low: Installation has an encroachment issue that could be mitigated by an ACUB action, but has not pursued discussions with any regulatory agencies concerning collaborating with the installation in an ACUB action. A signed conservation plan does not exist there is little agreement among the technical experts of the area as to the level of effort needed to meet encroachment management goals. Score 1.

None: Regulatory agencies do not support an ACUB or are unwilling to grant regulatory relief were the installation to initiate an ACUB action. There is a high level of public controversy concerning encroachment management requirements to meet encroachment management goals. There is significant disagreement between scientists on how to meet conservation goals. Score 0.

LEVEL OF PRIVATE SUPPORT

The intent here is to evaluate the support or degree of participation the installation may receive for an ACUB action from local governments, community members, landowners, NGOs, etc., (off post officials). This includes a numerical score and comments where appropriate.

High: Off post officials are actively encouraging action by the installation to reduce encroachment. One or more off post officials have committed to partnering with the installation to include offering resources to assist in funding an ACUB action. Score 3.

Medium: Off post officials recognize the installation has an encroachment problem that could be mitigated by an ACUB action but have not yet committed to supporting such action nor have they agreed yet to providing funding in support of an ACUB. Score 2.

Low: Installation has an encroachment issue that could be mitigated by an ACUB action, but has not pursued discussions with off post officials concerning partnering with the installation for an ACUB. Score 1.

None: Off post officials do not desire to partner with the installation in an ACUB action. Score 0.

HUMAN RESOURCES

The purpose for including this question is to assess the capability of human resources at your installation to be successful in establishing ACUB(s). A highly qualified installation Point of Contact (POC) is the single most important factor in building a successful partnership and acquiring an ACUB(s). Installation POCs should be professionals with experience in working for or serving in the military. Professional environmental managers, master planners, range managers or other similar installation personnel with great people skills and a strong commitment to the mission are good candidates. A successful installation POC is a self-starter and willing to act in the face of ambiguity. This requires the confidence of the command staff and the delegated ability to acquire/commit resources for the installation.

They have the ability to understand motivations of people, institutions and communities and have the instinct and skill for working with partners to mutual advantage. They understand coordination. A highly trained POC can demonstrate tangible results of prior work at a similar level of complexity.

Further, an installation POC should be supported with adequate numbers of staff to handle an associated work-load. A simple ACUB may require no additional support. A complex ACUB may require the skills of a number of technical experts, such as a conservation biologist, a geographer with GIS skills, a cultural resource professional, etc.

YES: A highly qualified installation POC is available or has been assigned to develop partnerships and accomplish ACUB goals. Adequate numbers of highly trained professionals and other support staff are available handle associated work-loads.

NO: A highly qualified installation POC is not available or has not been assigned ACUB responsibility. Adequate numbers of highly trained professionals and other support staff are not currently available to handle associated work-loads.