

Baker Island National Wildlife Refuge

Draft Comprehensive Conservation Plan and Environmental Assessment

Prepared by:
Pacific Remote Islands National Wildlife Refuge Complex
Box 50167
Honolulu, Hawaii 96850
(800) 792-9550

August 2007

**Baker Island National Wildlife Refuge
Draft Comprehensive Conservation Plan
and
Environmental Assessment**

Unincorporated U.S. territory, Central Pacific Ocean

Type of Action: Administrative

Lead Agency: U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service

Responsible Official: Ren Lohofener, Regional Director

For Further Information: Donald Palawski, Refuge Manager
Pacific and Remote Islands NWR Complex
Box 50167
Honolulu, HI 96850
(808) 792-9550

Abstract: Baker Island National Wildlife Refuge (Baker) is located in an extremely remote area of the equatorial Central Pacific Ocean. This remote location creates extreme planning and management bottlenecks in terms of ship transportation availability to access Baker and the operational support needed to conduct comprehensive conservation. Four conservation plan alternatives, including a Preferred Alternative and a No Action Alternative, are described, compared, and assessed for Baker. Alternative A is the No Action Alternative, as required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The selection of Alternative A would adopt and continue current refuge management practices conducted during short staff visits (i.e., 1 to 2 days) at approximately 2-year intervals. Management activities described in Alternatives B, C, and D progressively increase the scale and scope of management activities described in the No Action Alternative. Alternatives C and D describe desired improvements over current management that enhances protection of wildlife through increased surveillance, enforcement, monitoring, restoration, and other measures. While Alternatives C and D outline measures that would be desirable from a comprehensive conservation perspective, it is beyond the current logistical realm of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) and financially unachievable during the lifespan of this plan (15 years). Therefore, Alternative B is the preferred alternative and describes improvements over current management that could be implemented until such time that management activities described in Alternatives C or D can be implemented. The four alternatives are summarized below:

Alternative A – No Action – This alternative assumes continuation of current management programs and is considered the base from which to compare the action alternatives.

Alternative B – Preferred Alternative -This alternative describes a modest increase in the frequency of staff visits to Baker but does not alter the scale or scope of the management activities.

Alternative C – This alternative provides increased frequency and duration of staff visits to Baker, and moderately increases scale and scope of management activities conducted during staff visits.

Alternative D – This alternative describes substantial increases to the scale, scope, and duration of management activities conducted during staff visits.

Public access to Baker will remain closed under all CCP alternatives. Specific requests to access Baker will be regulated on a case-by-case basis through issuance of Special Use Permits. There are no proposed changes to the refuge boundary under any of the alternatives. The selected alternative would be used to guide refuge management throughout the life of the CCP (15-year period).

Reader's Guide

Consistent with requirements of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 668dd-668ee), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) would manage Baker Island National Wildlife Refuge (Baker) in accordance with an approved Comprehensive Conservation Plan (CCP). The CCP provides long-range guidance for refuge management through its vision, goals, and objectives. No change in refuge size, boundaries, or public access and use is proposed for any alternative. The CCP also provides a basis for a long-term adaptive management process including implementation, monitoring progress, evaluating, adjusting and revising the CCP accordingly.

This document combines a Draft Comprehensive Conservation Plan and an Environmental Assessment (CCP/EA). The following summaries are provided to assist readers in locating and understanding the various components of this combined document.

Chapter 1: Introduction, Purpose, and Need for Action includes the regional context; establishment of and purposes for Baker; vision and goals for future management; major planning issues, concerns and opportunities identified by refuge staff, Federal, State and local agencies, and the general public; and policy for, guidance for, purpose of, and need for a CCP.

Chapter 2: Alternatives, Objectives, and Strategies describe four management alternatives including the Preferred Alternative. Each alternative represents a potential comprehensive conservation plan for the refuge. Alternative A (No Action) describes the current management of the refuge. Alternative B, the Preferred Alternative, is the proposed Draft CCP for Baker. Alternatives C and D describe progressively more intensive management activities if substantially greater financial resources were available for future implementation. This chapter identifies the objectives and strategies the refuge will use to meet overall goals. It also compares all alternatives and identifies those eliminated from detailed consideration.

Chapter 3: Affected Environment describes the existing physical and biological environment, public use, cultural resources, and socioeconomic conditions. This chapter represents the current baseline conditions for the comparisons and 15-year projections made in Chapters 2 and 4.

Chapter 4: Environmental Consequences assesses and projects, over the 15-year period, the effect of each alternative on the resources, programs, and conditions outlined in Chapter 3 at Baker. Most impacts would have a positive effect on refuge fish and wildlife populations and their habitats. Mitigation and other measures are evaluated for all other unavoidable consequences.

Chapter 5: Consultation and Coordination with Others provides details on public involvement and interagency coordination during the planning process.

Appendix A: Glossary of Terms and Acronyms contains a list of abbreviations, acronyms, and terms that may be unfamiliar to the reader.

Appendix B: Species Lists of Corals, Fish, Vegetation, and Birds lists wildlife observed in the refuge.

Appendix C: List of Cited References provides complete bibliographic references for the citations in this document.

Appendix D: Quarantine Protocol for Baker Island describes mandatory precautions for visitors to protect island and marine habitats from inadvertent introduction of alien and invasive species.

Appendix E: Plan Implementation and Costs includes the Refuge Operations Needs Summary (RONS) and Service Asset Maintenance Management System (SAMMS), which briefly describes projects and costs associated with the Preferred Alternative.

Appendix F: Wilderness Review for Baker Island NWR is required as part of this CCP. This appendix lists the criteria used in conducting the wilderness review. Portions of Baker appear to meet the criteria for wilderness designation as defined by the Wilderness Act of 1964.

Appendix G: Statement of Compliance for Implementation of the Baker Island National Wildlife Refuge Comprehensive Conservation Plan describes the Executive orders and legislative acts that apply to this CCP.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction, Purpose, and Need for Action	1-1
1.1 Introduction.....	1-1
1.2 Purpose and Need for the Comprehensive Conservation Plan	1-1
1.2.1 Proposed Action.....	1-1
1.2.2 Purpose and Need	1-1
1.3 Description of Planning Process	1-2
1.4 Legal and Policy Guidance	1-2
1.4.1 The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	1-2
1.4.2 National Wildlife Refuge System	1-3
1.4.3 National Wildlife Refuges in the Pacific	1-5
Figure 1.1	1-7
1.4.4 Refuge Establishment, Purpose, and Boundary	1-9
Figure 1.2	1-11
1.4.5 Regional and Ecosystem Conservation Plans	1-13
1.5 Planning Issues, Concerns and Opportunities.....	1-14
1.6 Refuge Vision Statement	1-16
1.7 Refuge Goals.....	1-17
Chapter 2: Alternatives, Objectives, and Strategies	2-1
2.1 Introduction to the Alternatives	2-1
2.1.1 Development of Alternatives	2-1
2.2 Similarities among Alternatives.....	2-2
2.2.1 Features Common to All Alternatives (A-D).....	2-2
2.2.2 Features Common to All Action Alternatives (B-D).....	2-4
2.3 Detailed Description of the Alternatives.....	2-4
2.3.1 Alternative A – No Action (Current Management)	2-5
2.3.2 Alternative B – (Preferred Alternative)	2-6
2.3.3 Alternative C.....	2-6
2.3.4 Alternative D.....	2-8
2.3.5 Summary	2-9
2.4 Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Study	2-10
Table 2.1	2-11
2.5 Comparison of Alternatives A-D Funding Requirements	2-16
Table 2.2	2-16
2.6 Refuge Goals, Objectives, Strategies, and Rationale.....	2-17
Chapter 3: Affected Environment	3-1
3.1 Geographic/Ecosystem Setting.....	3-1
3.2 Climate.....	3-1
3.3 Global Climate Change.....	3-3
3.4 Geology and Soils.....	3-5
3.5 Hydrology	3-7
3.6 Air and Water Quality.....	3-7
3.7 Environmental Contaminants.....	3-7
3.8 Terrestrial Vegetation and Habitats	3-8
3.9 Terrestrial Wildlife.....	3-9
3.9.1 Seabirds and Land Mammals.....	3-9

3.9.2 Shorebirds	3-10
3.9.3 Reptiles	3-10
3.9.4 Invertebrates.....	3-10
3.10 Marine Habitats, Fish, and Wildlife.....	3-10
3.10.1 Previous Surveys.....	3-10
3.10.2 Submergent Habitats.....	3-11
3.10.3 Reef Life	3-11
3.10.4 Corals.....	3-12
3.10.5 Nearshore Fish	3-12
3.10.6 Marine Mammals.....	3-13
3.10.7 Pelagic Wildlife	3-13
3.11 Threatened and Endangered Species	3-14
3.12 Invasive Species.....	3-14
3.13 Wilderness Resources.....	3-14
3.14 Archaeology and Paleontology	3-14
3.15 Recent Cultural History	3-15
3.16 Socioeconomics	3-17
Chapter 4: Environmental Consequences	4-1
4.1 Introduction.....	4-1
4.2 Geology and Soils.....	4-2
4.3 Air and Water Quality.....	4-2
4.3.1 Air Quality	4-2
4.3.2 Water Quality and Ocean Environment.....	4-3
4.4 Biological Resources	4-3
4.4.1 Terrestrial Habitats and Wildlife	4-3
4.4.2 Marine Habitats, Fish, and Wildlife.....	4-5
4.4.3 Threatened and Endangered Species	4-6
4.5 Wilderness Resources	4-7
4.6 Cultural Resources.....	4-7
4.7 Economic Effects.....	4-7
4.8 Environmental Justice.....	4-8
4.9 Cumulative Effects.....	4-8
Table 4.1 Summary of Effects under CCP Alternatives.....	4-9
Chapter 5: Consultation and Coordination with Others	5-1
5.1 Consultation and Coordination with Others	5-1
Appendix A	A-1
Glossary of Terms and Acronyms	A-1
Appendix B	B-1
Species Lists of Corals, Fish, Vegetation, and Birds.....	B-1
Table B-1	B-1
Table B-2	B-3
Table B-3	B-12
Table B-4	B-13
Appendix C	C-1
List of Cited References.....	C-1
Appendix D	D-1
Quarantine Protocol for Baker Island NWR.....	D-1
Appendix E	E-1

Plan Implementation and Costs	E-1
Appendix F	F-1
Wilderness Review for Baker Island NWR	F-1
Figure F-1. Wilderness Study Areas	F-7
Table F-1 Wilderness Inventory Summary	F-8
Appendix G	G-1
Statement of Compliance for Implementation of the Baker Island National Wildlife Refuge Comprehensive Conservation Plan	G-1
List of Figures	
Figure 1.1 National Wildlife Refuges in the Pacific	1-7
Figure 1.2 Baker Island National Wildlife Refuge: Geographic Location and Boundary... ..	1-11
List of Tables	
Table 2.1 Summary of CCP Actions by Alternatives	2-11
Table 2.2 Estimated Annual Cost Comparison of Various Field Camp Configurations	2-16
Table 4.1 Summary of Effects under CCP Alternatives	4-9

This page intentionally left blank.

Chapter 1: Introduction, Purpose, and Need for Action

1.1 Introduction

This document is a Draft Comprehensive Conservation Plan and Draft Environmental Assessment (CCP/EA) for Baker Island National Wildlife Refuge (Baker). Once approved, the CCP will guide management of refuge operations, site visitation, and habitat restoration for the 15-year life of the plan. Guidance within the CCP will be in the form of goals, objectives, strategies (Chapter 1.7 and 2.6), and wilderness study findings (Appendix F). An appropriate National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document will accompany the CCP. The Final CCP will incorporate appropriate public comments. The proposed action can be one of the alternatives in this Draft CCP/EA, a combination of the identified alternatives, or a new alternative derived from substantive public comment. This Draft CCP/EA evaluates and compares four alternatives containing programs for habitat management and restoration, ecological monitoring and research, and environmental education. It also identifies the effects of restoration and visitor use on key physical, biological, social, and cultural resources. The refuge manager of the Pacific Remote Islands National Wildlife Refuge Complex (Remotes Complex) in Honolulu, Hawaii, is responsible for implementing the approved CCP.

1.2 Purpose and Need for the Comprehensive Conservation Plan

1.2.1 Proposed Action

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) proposes to adopt and implement a CCP for Baker. This Draft CCP/EA evaluates and compares four alternatives and their effects on key physical, biological, social, and cultural resources. The Service has identified Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative because it achieves refuge purposes, vision, goals, and objectives; contributes to the National Wildlife Refuge System (System) mission; addresses issues and relevant mandates; and is consistent with sound principles of fish and wildlife management.

The alternative ultimately selected and described in the Final CCP will be determined, in part, by the comments received on the Draft CCP/EA. The proposed action in the Final CCP may or may not modify the proposed action presented in this Draft CCP/EA.

1.2.2 Purpose and Need

All refuges must comply with the System mission, goals, and policies, as described in or promulgated under the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. 668dd-668ee) (Act). The National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997 amended the Act. According to the Act, a CCP is required to identify and describe refuge purpose(s), habitats and wildlife, archaeological and cultural values, administrative and visitor facilities, management challenges and their solutions, and opportunities for compatible wildlife-dependent recreation. The recreational activities referenced in the Act as receiving special consideration during planning efforts include compatible hunting, recreational fishing, wildlife observation, interpretation, environmental education, and photography.

The purpose of this CCP is to develop a vision, goals, and objectives for Baker, which in turn provides guidance to identify and implement management activities, or strategies, during the next 15 years. Specifically, the CCP:

- sets a long term vision;
- establishes wildlife and habitat management goals and objectives;
- establishes goals and objectives for compatible wildlife-dependent uses;
- identifies strategies for habitat enhancement and restoration projects;
- describes the highest monitoring and research priorities; and
- describes and evaluates wilderness values.

1.3 Description of Planning Process

The CCP development process follows applicable policies contained within the Service's Fish and Wildlife Manual (Part 602 FW2.1, November 1996; Part 601 FW1, Part 603 FW1, and Part 605 FW1, June 2006), and the Wilderness Act of 1964 with respect to wilderness study and review. This Draft CCP/EA is intended to meet the dual requirements of compliance with the Act and NEPA. Both the Act and NEPA require the Service to actively seek public involvement in the preparation and adoption of environmental and conservation documents and policies. Furthermore, NEPA also requires the Service to consider a reasonable range of alternatives including its Preferred Alternative and the No Action Alternative; the latter defined as continuation of current management practices.

1.4 Legal and Policy Guidance

Baker and its management and administrative activities are managed as part of the System within a framework provided by legal and policy guidelines. The refuge is guided by the System mission and goals, the purpose(s) of the refuge as described in its acquisition authority, Service policy, Federal laws and Executive orders, and international treaties.

Supplemental guidance documents (e.g., resource plans) are also included in making management decisions but cannot replace or be in conflict with the purposes for which the refuge was established or the System mission. Following is a discussion of concepts and guidance for the System covered in the Act, Service policies, and relevant supplemental guidance documents.

1.4.1 The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Baker is managed by the Service, within the U.S. Department of the Interior. The Service is the primary Federal entity responsible for conserving and enhancing the Nation's fish and wildlife populations and their habitats. Although the Service shares this responsibility with other Federal, State, tribal, local, and private entities, the Service has specific trust resource responsibilities for migratory birds, threatened and endangered species, certain anadromous fish, certain marine mammals, coral reef ecosystems, wetlands, and other special aquatic habitats.

The Service also has similar trust responsibilities for the lands and waters it administers to support the conservation and enhancement of all fish and wildlife and their associated habitats.

1.4.2 National Wildlife Refuge System

President Theodore Roosevelt established Pelican Island, Florida as the first national wildlife refuge in 1903. Since that time, the number of refuges has expanded to include 547, totaling approximately 100 million acres. These refuges, found in every State and several U.S. Territories, are administered collectively as a national system of lands with the specific mandate of managing for “wildlife first”. This System is the largest collection of lands specifically managed for fish and wildlife conservation in the Nation and perhaps the world. The “wildlife first” mandate of the System means the needs of wildlife and their habitats take priority on refuges, in contrast to other public lands that are managed for multiple uses. The following is a description of some of the most relevant acts and policies that guide the management of the System.

National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966, as amended

This Act defines a unifying mission for all refuges, including a process for determining compatible uses on refuges, and requiring that each refuge be managed according to a CCP. The Act expressly states that wildlife conservation is the priority of System lands and that the Secretary shall ensure that the biological integrity, diversity, and environmental health of refuge lands are maintained. Each refuge must be managed to fulfill the specific purposes for which the refuge was established and the System mission. The first priority of each refuge is to conserve, manage, and if needed, restore fish and wildlife populations and habitats according to its purpose. The Service has statutory authority under the Act to regulate activities that occur on water bodies “within” a refuge. The Act requires a CCP be completed for each refuge and that the public has an opportunity for active involvement in plan development and revision in an open public process.

National Wildlife Refuge System Mission and Goals and Purposes (601 FW1)

In July 2006, the Service issued a policy (601 FW 1) which included the System mission statement and goals, and described how refuge purposes are determined.

The Act established the following statutory mission for the System:

“The mission of the System is to administer a national network of lands and waters for the conservation, management, and where appropriate, restoration of the fish, wildlife, and plant resources and their habitats within the United States for the benefit of present and future generations of Americans.”

The administration, management, and growth of the System are guided by the following goals (601 FW 1, July 2006):

- Conserve a diversity of fish, wildlife, and plants and their habitats, including species that are endangered or threatened with becoming endangered.

- Develop and maintain a network of habitats for migratory birds, anadromous and interjurisdictional fish, and marine mammal populations that is strategically distributed and carefully managed to meet important life history needs of these species across their ranges.
- Conserve those ecosystems, plant communities, wetlands of national or international significance, and landscapes and seascapes that are unique, rare, declining, or underrepresented in existing protection efforts.
- Provide and enhance opportunities to participate in compatible wildlife-dependent recreation (hunting, fishing, wildlife observation and photography, and environmental education and interpretation).
- Foster understanding and instill appreciation of the diversity and interconnectedness of fish, wildlife, plants, and their habitats.

Lastly, the Act describes refuge purposes and how these guiding principals for the refuge are located and documented.

Appropriate Refuge Uses (603 FW1)

This policy (603 FW 1), published in July 2006, provides a national framework for determining appropriate refuge uses. Serving as a “prescreening” for proposed uses of a national wildlife refuge prior to a compatibility determination (see below); this policy requires, for most uses, a written finding of appropriateness by the refuge manager based on 11 criteria. Findings of appropriateness require concurrence by the State for refuges located within state boundaries. These criteria include:

- Promotes safety of participants, other visitors, and facilities.
- Promotes compliance with applicable laws, regulations, and responsible behavior.
- Minimizes or eliminates conflicts with fish and wildlife populations or habitat goals or objectives in a plan approved after 1997.
- Minimizes or eliminates conflicts with other compatible wildlife-dependent recreation.
- Minimizes conflicts with neighboring landowners.
- Promotes accessibility and availability to a broad spectrum of the American people.
- Promotes resource stewardship and conservation.
- Promotes public understanding and increases public appreciation of America’s natural resources and our role in managing and protecting these resources.
- Provides reliable/reasonable opportunities to experience wildlife.
- Uses facilities that are accessible and blend into the natural setting.
- Uses visitor satisfaction to help define and evaluate programs.

Compatibility (603 FW2)

Lands within the System are different from other, multiple-use public lands in that, with few exceptions, they are closed to all public access and use unless specifically and legally opened (603 FW 2). No refuge use may be allowed unless it is determined to be compatible. A compatible use is one that, in the sound professional judgment of the refuge manager, would not materially interfere with or detract from the fulfillment of the mission of the System or the purpose of the refuge. The Act identifies six wildlife-dependent recreational uses: hunting, fishing, wildlife observation and photography, and environmental education and interpretation. When compatible, these six uses become priority uses of the System. As priority public uses, they receive special consideration over other general public uses in refuge planning and management.

Biological Integrity, Diversity, and Environmental Health (601 FW3)

The Act directs the Service to “ensure that the biological integrity, diversity, and environmental health of the System are maintained for the benefit of present and future generations of Americans....” This policy (601 FW 3) is an additional directive for refuge managers to follow while achieving refuge purpose(s) and the System mission. It provides for the consideration and protection of the broad spectrum of fish, wildlife, plants, and their habitat resources found on refuges and associated ecosystems. When evaluating the appropriate management direction for refuges, refuge managers use sound professional judgment to determine their refuges’ contribution to maintenance and, where possible, restoration of biological integrity, diversity, and environmental health) at multiple landscape scales. Sound professional judgment incorporates field experience, knowledge of refuge resources, refuge functions within an ecosystem, applicable laws, and best available science, including consultation with others both inside and outside the Service.

Wilderness (6 RM 8)

Service planning policy (602 FW 3) requires the conduct of a wilderness review in association with the development of a refuge CCP. The wilderness review process has three phases: inventory, study, and recommendation. After first identifying lands and waters that meet the minimum criteria for wilderness during the inventory phase, the resulting wilderness study areas are further evaluated to determine if they merit recommendation from the Service to the Secretary of the Interior (Secretary) for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System. A more complete discussion of wilderness inventory, study, and recommendation is included in Appendix F.

General Guidelines for Wildlife-Dependent Recreation (605 FW1)

This set of policies (605 FW 1-7), published in July 2006, defines the System’s wildlife-dependent recreation policy, provides guidelines used to manage wildlife-dependent recreation on refuge lands and identifies visitor service standards.

1.4.3 National Wildlife Refuges in the Pacific


Nineteen individual national wildlife refuges (NWRs) are scattered across the central and western Pacific Ocean, with 10 refuges located on the main Hawaiian Islands and 9 found from Guam to American Samoa (Figure 1.1). The Hawaiian and Pacific Islands NWR Complex

office, which provides administrative guidance and oversight for these 19 refuges, is located in Honolulu, Hawaii. This Complex also co-manages the newly established Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument along with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the State of Hawaii.

Within this administrative structure is a subset of seven refuges known as the Remotes Complex. The Remotes Complex straddles the Equator near the center of the Pacific Ocean. They are farther from human population centers than any other U.S. area and represent one of the last frontiers and havens for fish and wildlife in the World. These remote refuges are the most widespread collection of coral reef and seabird/shorebird protected areas on the planet under a single country's jurisdiction. Only one of these seven refuges, Palmyra Atoll NWR has on-island dedicated staff members. Remotes Complex staff, located within the complex office in Honolulu, manage all the remaining refuges, including Baker. Staff, funding, and logistical support are often shared among these remote refuges to help defray operational costs.

The Preferred Alternative for the Baker CCP identifies several management strategies that are dependent upon activities and staff support from the Remotes Complex office, ship transportation support from other Federal agencies, and the establishment of partnerships with other organizations. Because of the great distances involved in traveling to these remote refuges, most management activities, including the simple act of visiting a refuge, are sometimes planned to occur concurrently during the same voyage. For this reason, cost estimates for management activities at Baker are pro-rated amongst the seven Remotes Complex refuges in the analysis of the alternatives.

Figure 1.1 Map of National Wildlife Refuges in the Pacific.



This page left intentionally blank.

1.4.4 Refuge Establishment, Purpose, and Boundary

Refuge Establishment

Prior to refuge establishment, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed Executive Order 7368 on May 13, 1936, placing control and jurisdiction of Baker Island with the Secretary of the Interior (Secretary). Originally administered by the Office of Territorial Affairs, the Secretary, on June 27, 1974, designated Baker Island and its territorial sea extending to the 3 nautical mile (nmi) limit as a unit of the System (39 FR 27930).

Refuge Purpose

Refuge purposes are often times are based upon land acquisition documents and authorities. These statements give indications for the biological reason or justification for the acquisition or land transfer. Purposes listed in acquisition authorities, or legislative acts, are often general in scope. For Baker, this general purpose is:

“... for the development, advancement, management, conservation, and protection of fish and wildlife resources ...” (16 U.S.C. 742f (a) (4)), and “... for the benefit of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, in performing its activities and services. Such acceptance may be subject to the terms of any restrictive or affirmative covenant, or condition of servitude ...” (16 U.S.C. 742f (b) (1)) (Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956).

Acquisition documents often contain more specific purpose statements. The specific purpose statement for establishment of Baker identified in the biological ascertainment report at the time of transfer to the Service is (USFWS 1973):

“...the restoration and preservation of the complete ecosystem, terrestrial and marine. Priority must be given to allowing seabird nesting colonies to reestablish themselves on Baker so eventually they would eventually reach the great numbers which were present there prior to human occupancy and abuse of the island during the past 125 years.”

Refuge Boundary


Baker is located in the central equatorial Pacific Ocean (Figure 1.2). The boundary for Baker includes:

“...all of Baker island ... together with its territorial sea extending outward to the three-mile limit.” (39 F R 27930).

The emergent land area for Baker encompasses 531 acres and submerged lands and waters within the 3-mile limit encompass 31,378 acres, for a total of 31,909 acres.

This page left intentionally blank.

Figure 1.2 Baker Island National Wildlife Refuge: Geographic Location and Boundary.



This page left intentionally blank.

1.4.5 Regional and Ecosystem Conservation Plans

Regional and ecosystem conservation plans and initiatives are also important to evaluate and incorporate into developing each CCP. These plans typically address issues or concerns that are site specific or of regional concern, and address needs more current than when the refuge was established.

Remote Islands Ecosystem Plan: Howland Island, Baker Island, and Jarvis Island National Wildlife Refuges

The ecosystem plan for Howland, Baker, and Jarvis identifies Baker as “...a model of both the sensitivity of insular ecosystems and mechanisms by which they can recover following disturbance.” (USFWS 1998b). The plan further describes the refuge as being important to nesting seabirds due to the fact that other nearby islands have introduced mammals or human colonists present, thereby precluding survival of some vulnerable seabird species.

Coral Reef Initiative in the Pacific: Howland Island, Baker Island, and Jarvis Island National Wildlife Refuges

The Coral Reef Initiative for Howland, Baker, and Jarvis restates the wildlife and ecological values identified in the ecosystem plan (USFWS 1998a). This document identifies three important components of the three ecosystems: “They provide a breeding platform for pelagic birds using large areas of ocean surface, offer a migratory stopover for long distance migrating shorebirds, and furnish reef habitat for shallow water organisms.”

Recovery Plan for U.S. Pacific Populations of the Hawksbill Turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata*)

Although theoretically within the range for hawksbill turtle, little is known about their biology, foraging and nesting behavior, threats, and distribution surrounding Baker Island (NMFS and USFWS 1998a). Both the NOAA – National Marine Fishery Service (NMFS) and the Service share responsibility at the Federal level for the research, management, and recovery of Pacific marine turtle populations under U.S. jurisdiction.

Recovery Plan for U.S. Pacific Populations of the Green Turtle (*Celonia mydas*)

Few green turtles are known to forage in the waters surrounding Baker Island and nesting is not known to occur. However, data from the area are limited and use of Baker may be greater than currently documented (NMFS and USFWS 1998b). Both NMFS and the Service share responsibility at the Federal level for the research, management, and recovery of Pacific marine turtle populations under U.S. jurisdiction.

U.S. Pacific Island Regional Shorebird Conservation Plan

This regional shorebird plan identifies Baker as being within the Central Pacific Islands Subregion (Engilis and Naughton 2004). No natural wetlands are known from this subregion; however, not only the beaches on uninhabited islands are important for shorebirds, but the entire island. Population and habitat goals for this subregion state that determining population size and trends for bristle-thighed curlews and other shorebirds, and their habitats is a management priority.

United States Shorebird Conservation Plan

This nationwide shorebird plan identifies the U.S. Pacific islands being of “...critical importance for two species of Holarctic breeders, bristle-thighed curlew and Pacific golden-plover.” (Brown et al. 2000). Further, this plan notes that these islands provide wintering habitat essential to the maintenance of these species as well as several other migratory shorebird species.

Seabird Conservation Plan, Pacific Region

This plan provides an overarching review, discussion, and identification of conservation priorities for seabirds in the U.S Pacific islands; ranks seabirds for conservation priority; and includes specific species accounts including their conservation needs (USFWS 2005).

Central Pacific World Heritage Project

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) organized and convened meetings in Honolulu in June 2003, and Kiritimati Atoll in October 2004, to seek input for a proposed multi-national World Heritage project now referred to as the Central Pacific World Heritage Project (CPWHP) (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2003; 2004). Additional meetings and evaluations in the U.S. and Republic of Kiribati resulted in a total of 29 atolls, islands, and reefs belonging to four nations (United States, Cook Islands, Republic of Kiribati, and French Polynesia) being proposed for the multi-site, multi-jurisdictional CPWHP. To date, the Service has not acted on this proposal, but intends to do so in the future.

Regional and ecosystem conservation plans and initiatives are also important to evaluate and incorporate into developing each CCP. These plans typically address issues or concerns that are site specific or of regional concern, and address needs more current than when the refuge was established.

1.5 Planning Issues, Concerns and Opportunities

Issues, concerns, and opportunities were identified through discussions with key contacts, workshop participants, core team members, other refuge staff, and through the public scoping process. The following section summarizes issues, concerns, and opportunities from all public input received throughout the planning efforts. Six issues were identified and are described below.

Issue 1: Operational Limitations

Baker is located approximately 1,690 nmi from the management staff located in Honolulu, Hawaii. On average, it takes 6-7 days to reach Baker by ship, the only method of visiting the island. The key issues and concerns affecting planning and management implementation are:

- distance from refuge headquarters;
- lack of affordable and reliable transportation;
- lack of infrastructure to support field operations;
- extreme environmental conditions; and
- safety concerns and logistical capacity to land people and equipment on island from small boats.

Issue 2: Biological and Ecological Resources

Biological and ecological information sufficient for management or conservation purposes is lacking. Due to the infrequency and limited staff time spent on Baker, biological and ecological information is not sufficient to allow for a detailed assessment of resources. The collection of baseline and long-term monitoring information should be a primary concern and the focus of management objectives.

Issue 3: External Forces

The threat of the introduction of invasive species from unauthorized visits, marine debris washing ashore and onto coral reefs, and vessel groundings are beyond current management control. Distance, lack of funds and staff, and the inability to have a more consistent presence on this refuge opens the opportunity for invasive species introductions, limits the ability to remove marine debris, and delays in the response to vessel groundings.

While it is known that past human use of the island has led to contaminants and debris being left on the island and in the surrounding surf, the extent and impact of the contamination and debris are largely unknown.

Global climate change (see Chapter 3.3) may also affect refuge resources, but is beyond control of refuge management staff. It is anticipated that changes in the chemical composition of the atmosphere and oceans; surface temperatures of air, land, and sea; intensity and frequency of rainfall and storm waves; and changes in sea level would have impacts on refuge resources. However, the extent and nature of these impacts is being studied and the subject of considerable academic debate.

Issue 4: Public Use Resources

The key issues related to public use are:

- adverse ecological impacts (invasive species introductions, pollution, fuel spills, trash disposal, harassment of wildlife, damage to sensitive habitats such as coral reefs);
- whether any on-site public use should be allowed;
- to what extent the use should occur; and
- how the use should be managed.

Baker has never been formally opened to public access and use. Administratively, public access to Baker is managed through use of a refuge-issued Special Use Permits (SUP). Several recreational user groups such as amateur radio operators, bird watchers, history enthusiasts, destination tourists, and commercial cruise vessels have expressed interest in visiting various remote Pacific island refuges. However, only amateur radio operators have pursued and obtained a SUP after an initial inquiry.

Issue 5: Education and Outreach

In general, Pacific island refuges are poorly recognized by the public and our partner agencies. There are few entrance signs, no boundary signs, and little published information in popular literature. Refuge boundaries are rarely portrayed on nautical charts and other maps.

The remote location and isolation of Baker and other Pacific island refuges make it difficult to conduct on-site visits for educational or interpretative purposes. Thus, most educational and interpretative opportunities are necessarily delivered remotely through various media.

In addition, general interest by the public and requests to visit remote Pacific island refuges by a growing recreational yachting community has increased recently. This interest requires the public to be better informed regarding sensitive refuge habitats, species, and regulations.

Issue 6: Communication and Cooperation

Baker's remoteness compels a growing list of partners and cooperators to be kept informed of and included in planning and management activities at Baker. Activities that staff and partner agencies/organizations share include:

- expedition planning;
- collaborative research projects; and
- protection of trust resources.

Most access for refuge staff to Baker has only been possible through the cooperation and participation with partner agencies such as NOAA and the U.S. Coast Guard. Many research interests are shared between Service and NOAA scientists, and collaborative research projects have been conducted in the past. Additionally, NOAA and the Service share trust resource responsibilities for marine turtles.

1.6 Refuge Vision Statement

The refuge vision statement is a broad general statement that describes what the refuge staff perceives as Baker's fundamental attributes and contributions to a healthy world environment. This statement will guide management activities for the lifespan of this plan, as well into the near future. The draft vision statement for Baker is as follows.

Baker is one of the only places in the world where the terrestrial and marine tropical island ecosystems have been restored, conserved, and protected. Although signs of past human activities are still visible on the landscape, the island now offers the opportunity to serve as a living laboratory for measuring past human impacts and the ability of nature to recover. Natural, physical, and ecological processes unfold with limited human interference and support a diverse community of native marine organisms including seabirds, marine mammals, turtles, fish, plants, corals, and other invertebrates. Nesting and foraging seabirds dominate the landscape and seascape while sheer isolation and solitude help us see our place in the natural world.

1.7 Refuge Goals

Goal statements are succinct statements of a desired future condition of refuge resources. Goals comprise the whole of a refuge's effort in pursuit of its vision and lay the foundation from which all refuge activities arise. The goals for Baker are as follows, and will again be presented along with objectives and strategies in Chapter 2.6.

1. Conserve, restore, manage, and protect native terrestrial habitats that are representative of remote tropical Pacific islands, primarily for the benefit of seabirds.
2. Conserve, manage, and protect native marine communities that are representative of remote tropical Pacific islands.
3. Contribute to the recovery, protection, and management efforts for all native species with special consideration for seabirds, migratory shorebirds, federally listed threatened and endangered species, and species of management concern.
4. Restore the wilderness character of Baker's terrestrial community, and protect, maintain, enhance, and preserve the wilderness character of Baker's marine community.
5. Preserve Baker's cultural and historic resources.
6. Inform and educate the public to increase their understanding of remote Pacific island NWRs wilderness values, cultural and historical resources, and their ecosystems, with special emphasis on seabirds.

This page left intentionally blank.

Chapter 2: Alternatives, Objectives, and Strategies

2.1 Introduction to the Alternatives

This chapter describes the process used to develop alternatives, including a no action alternative that describes the current condition and three action alternatives that describe various proposed changes to current management programs. A preferred alternative is identified; however, the preferred alternative may be modified between the draft and final documents depending upon comments received from the public or other agencies and organizations. Similarities and differences among the alternatives are presented, as are detailed descriptions of each alternative. Summary tables comparing all alternatives are also included. Goals, objectives, strategies, and the rationale for these are presented following the description of alternatives.

2.1.1 Development of Alternatives

Comments received on the preliminary set of alternatives and throughout the public scoping process ultimately resulted in the four draft management alternatives presented in this Draft Comprehensive Conservation Plan and Draft Environmental Assessment (CCP/EA) for Baker Island National Wildlife Refuge (Baker). These include a no action alternative (as required under the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA)) and three “action” alternatives, each of which describes strategies for managing Baker over the 15-year life time of the plan that is intended to ultimately improve future conditions at the refuge. Each alternative describes a combination of wildlife and habitat management strategies designed to achieve the refuge goals and objectives. These alternatives provide different ways to address and respond to major issues, management concerns, and opportunities identified during the planning process. All of the major issues, activities, and management concerns were evaluated and addressed for each alternative. The four alternatives are summarized below:

- **Alternative A - No Action.** This alternative assumes no change from current management programs and is considered the baseline from which to compare the other alternatives. Specifically, the refuge would remain closed to public access, with compatible activities being allowed and administered through the refuge’s Special Use Permit (SUP) process. Wildlife and habitat management activities such as monitoring seabird populations, documenting the presence of invasive plant species, and monitoring and investigating contaminated sites would be restricted to the 1 to 2 day period that occur once every 2 years. Transportation to and from Baker would be provided by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) or other partners, at the discretion and capability of the partner.
- **Alternative B – Preferred Alternative.** This alternative describes an increase in the frequency of staff visits from once every 2 years to annually. Overall, wildlife and habitat management activities would be identical as those described in the No Action Alternative. The use of solar powered electronic calling devices to encourage seabird nesting activity would be implemented. Increased monitoring in the marine environment would be dependent upon partnership opportunities developed with NOAA, University of

Hawaii, or other partners. Transportation to and from the island would rely upon NOAA, or other partners providing arrangements similar to those provided in the No Action Alternative. Project funding proposals would be developed for transportation to the refuge and contaminants monitoring and remediation. Public use and access would remain closed and be administered as described in the No Action Alternative.

- **Alternative C.** This alternative describes an increase in the frequency and duration of staff visits, and increases the scale and scope of management activities conducted during those visits. Concurrently staffed seasonal field camps (approximately 4 months duration) would be established on Baker and two other nearby refuges. Increased monitoring of seabird populations would create greater understanding of migration and nesting chronologies of various seabird species. Seasonal field camps would allow adequate time to control invasive species, monitor and investigate contaminated sites, and provide basic maintenance of cultural and historical resources. Removal of marine debris from the island to protect seabirds and turtles from entanglement would also occur. Contaminant investigation and clean-up would also occur. Transportation to and from seasonal field camps would be provided by contract vessel. Public use and access would remain closed and be administered as described in the No Action Alternative.
- **Alternative D.** Management activities under this alternative are similar to those described in Alternative C. However, a greater level of detail and understanding of Baker’s wildlife resources would be possible. The primary difference between these two alternatives is that a single field camp would be established on only one mid-Pacific island refuge in a given year. Field camps would be rotated annually between these island refuges, and transportation would be provided by a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service)-owned vessel. Public use and access would remain closed and be administered as described in the No Action Alternative.

These four alternatives are described in more detail below starting with the similarities among the alternatives, followed by a detailed description of each alternative, and finally a summary that defines the rationale for selecting the Preferred Alternative.

2.2 Similarities among Alternatives

Although the alternatives differ in several ways, there are similarities (i.e., shared features or management components) among them as well. Following is a description of the features common to all the alternatives (A-D); and features common to all action alternatives (B-D).

2.2.1 Features Common to All Alternatives (A-D)

All alternatives contain some common features. These are presented below to reduce the length and redundancy of the individual alternative descriptions.

- *Baseline Monitoring of Wildlife Populations and Habitats.* At a minimum, staff visits to Baker requires baseline monitoring efforts to document species presence or absence, abundance, habitat condition, presence of invasive species and various other physical variables such as temperature, precipitation, wind, etc. This basic biophysical monitoring

would be constant throughout the alternatives. However, some alternatives would build upon this minimum level of visitation and monitoring.

- *Voyage Preparation.* The logistics of providing adequate field camp supplies such as water, food, first aid, and communications would also remain constant. However, some alternatives would require an additional volume or frequency of subsistence supplies to support greater numbers or staff-days on the refuge.
- *Use of extraneous unnatural lighting.* Nighttime operations of the support vessel and the use of light sources by staff in the camp would be carried out in order to minimize collision and disorientation of wildlife that can be caused by light hazards. This would include minimizing lighting on the vessel and in camp, shading windows, and limiting use of hand held lights.
- *Use of stringent quarantine protocols and when invasive species are discovered, use of Integrated Pest Management (IPM) to eradicate or control them.* Visitors to Baker would be required to wear new and frozen clothing and other quarantine precautions as outlined in quarantine protocols (Appendix D). Time permitting, the hand pulling of weeds would occur. The selective hand spray application of herbicides or pesticides, where appropriate, may also occur.
- *Scientific Information Exchange.* Refuge staff currently attends various professional meetings and conferences related to Pacific island and marine resources. Additionally, a minimal amount of staff time is devoted to the development of peer reviewed journal articles and contributing to NOAA and Service-sponsored Web sites. These activities would remain constant, although there may be opportunities to increase this involvement with some alternatives.
- *Preservation of Wilderness Values.* Since its establishment, Baker has been managed to preserve its wilderness values and characteristics even though it has never been proposed for wilderness designation. These values are intrinsic at this remote, uninhabited island and coral reef ecosystem. Management activities across all alternatives would not impinge on these values.
- *Public Access.* Since establishment, Baker has never been formally opened to public access and use. Access and public use remains closed across all alternatives. All individual opportunities for compatible use such as specific research projects would continue to be administered using individual SUPs.
- *Interpretation, Education, and Outreach.* Current opportunities for off-site education exist at the Maritime Museum, Honolulu, Hawaii. A hands-on exhibit representing a Pacific island refuge is maintained to educate school-aged students about seabirds, invasive species, marine debris, and the National Wildlife Refuge System (System). Interpretative displays are also used periodically at conventions and professional meetings.
- *Protection and Preservation of Cultural Resources.* Cultural resources remain intact and in situ across all alternatives. Field camps would be situated to avoid impacts to cultural resource sites. Archaeological reconnaissance and possible testing to avoid impacts to cultural resources would be required prior to management activity that would potentially disturb surface or subsurface resources.
- *Waste Disposal at Sea.* Disposal of waste in refuge waters is prohibited under all alternatives.

- *Waste Disposal on Island.* All waste from food products, equipment, and containers that is brought onto the island will be removed during demobilization. Depending upon the duration of the site visit, human excrement will be either bagged, stored in a chemical toilet, or decomposed using portable biodegradable toilets, all of which will subsequently be removed during field camp demobilization.
- *Refuge Boundary.* There are no changes being proposed to the refuge boundary under any alternative.
- *Baseline Contaminant Monitoring.* Refuge staff conduct baseline observations of known contaminated sites and record changes in condition since last site visit.

2.2.2 Features Common to All Action Alternatives (B-D)

These features are common to Alternatives B, C, and D but would not be implemented as part of the No Action Alternative.

- *Cultural Resources Inventory.* Baker would be re-evaluated for the presence and condition of cultural resources. Visits that are more frequent would provide the opportunity for on-site review and documentation of cultural resources. However, the duration of the site visit across the alternatives would determine the level of review.
- *Wilderness Study Area.* A recommendation for Wilderness Study Area (WSA) designation would apply to all action alternatives. However, wilderness recommendation would be postponed until a Legislative Environmental Impact Statement (LEIS) and wilderness proposal are developed for all other remote Pacific island national wildlife refuges (NWRs) as part of their CCP processes.
- *Marine ecosystem monitoring.* Funding will be sought for additional exploration of deep slope resources. Use of a ship equipped with a remotely operated vehicle (ROV) to operate at depths between 150 -300 feet may be possible across all action alternatives.
- *Seabird Nesting Restoration.* Electronic calls would be deployed and used as seabird nesting attraction devices designed to attract Phoenix petrels (*Pterodroma alba*) and Polynesian storm petrels (*Nesofregetta fuliginosa*). These electronic call devices consist of solar powered speakers broadcasting calls of both species in suitable areas of the island. Both of these small ground-nesting Procellariiforms are severely depleted or extirpated throughout much of their range. The mammal-free status of Baker Island makes it an ideal site within the species' original range to restore a breeding population of each species.
- *Contaminant Investigation Proposal.* Refuge staff would work cooperatively with Regional Office staff to develop funding and operational proposals to quantify contaminant concerns on Baker in preparation for remediation activities.

2.3 Detailed Description of the Alternatives

A narrative description outlining each alternative follows. Additionally, Table 2.1 contrasts how various themes/issues identified in this CCP are addressed by the alternatives. Table 2.2 compares the cost estimates for each alternative.

2.3.1 Alternative A – No Action (Current Management)

This alternative assumes no change from present management programs and is considered the base from which to compare the action alternatives (Table 2-1). The Service's Remotes Complex office would continue to maintain jurisdiction and management of Baker Island and the associated coral reefs and marine habitats out to 3 nautical miles (nmi) as a NWR. Site visits to Baker would occur approximately once every 2 years as they have for the past 6 years. Staff visits would be arranged through the cooperation of partner agencies such as NOAA, U.S. Coast Guard (Coast Guard), and other organizations providing berths for refuge staff. During these staff visits, two refuge staff would spend approximately 1 to 2 days on the island conducting baseline scientific data collection, inspecting boundary signs, inventorying for the presence of invasive species, visiting cultural resources, monitor and investigate contaminated sites, and collecting and destruction of bird entrapments caused by rusting drums and other debris. The brief and infrequent visits in this alternative preclude any habitat management other than monitoring and investigation of contaminated sites, and that may wash ashore or remain because of human habitation during the guano mining and military eras.

Marine vessels capable of traveling the open ocean for extended periods are the only opportunity for transportation to Baker. In the recent years, NOAA, Coast Guard, and private charter vessels have all provided transportation. A typical voyage originating from Honolulu, Hawaii will take approximately 6 to 7 days to arrive at Baker with intermediate stops at Rose or Palmyra Atoll NWRs, or Johnston, Howland, or Jarvis Island NWRs. Once on site, if wind and wave conditions warrant the launch of a landing vessel (typically a small outboard type inflatable boat), the marine vessel will anchor or remain stationary during the deployment of the field camp, only venturing away from the island to complete marine surveys. Conditions that allow biologists to land on the island occur during approximately 50% of the voyages to the island. The field camp itself generally consists of two individuals, typically biologists to carry out biological surveys and other duties, and camping gear consisting of tents, sleeping equipment, food, water, and needed survey equipment. Cooking gear is rarely deployed since staff are only on-island for 1 to 2 days with most of that time being engaged in work activities.

While on-island, the biologists will document all bird species present, count individuals, determine if any and the extent of nesting, casually observe vegetation and record species presence or absence, or the presence of any invasive species. Cultural sites will be visited with observations made about condition and deterioration. The only active management that occurs during these site visits is the monitoring of contaminated sites, collection and on-island stockpile of marine debris that washes ashore and poses a threat to seabirds and other wildlife that utilize Baker. Any evidence of illegal activity such as unauthorized access will also be documented. Photographs will record general habitat conditions; however, further habitat assessments do not occur. Although no specific activities occur with respect to wilderness values, the simple fact that a 1 to 2 day field camp consisting of temporary lodging arrangements and minimal activity is consistent with maintaining the wilderness values of the area.

During the period that the biologists are on Baker, marine scientists from NOAA, the Service, and other partner organizations such as the University of Hawaii conduct surveys and monitoring activities of the marine environment. Some monitoring activities occur on-board the vessel,

while others require the use of SCUBA equipment. All of the marine scientists, however, are based on the vessel awaiting the conclusion of terrestrial surveys and thus do not come ashore. Marine scientists typically collect information on currents, weather, temperature, chemical composition of the water, and the abundance and distribution of coral and fish species. Specific marine-based surveys known as Rapid Ecological Assessments (REA) are conducted and collect ecological data such as fish species, abundance, and predator prey relationships. Data are also collected from permanently marked coral transects which document coral species, age class, and percent coral cover. These data are collected over a 2-day period (six 1-hour dives). Following the voyage, data from marine scientists are provided to the Service and include a full range of oceanographic, bathymetric, and marine biological data.

Once field operations are complete, or the weather becomes increasingly inclement, the field camp is demobilized and all equipment and personnel are transported back to the research vessel. Typically, the other two equatorial refuges (Howland and Jarvis) are also visited in this same manner. Travel time between Howland and Baker is 5 hours, and Baker and Jarvis is 2 days. Once the three surveys are completed, or at least attempted, the voyage continues with approximately 6 to 7 days to travel back to Honolulu, again with intermediate stops at Palmyra Atoll or Johnston Island NWRs, or continuing on for 4 days to Rose Atoll NWR and American Samoa where voyage scientists and biologists can be exchanged and then fly back to Honolulu. In total, it is expected that in order to visit Baker, Howland, and Jarvis, for 1 to 2 days per refuge, a biologist or marine scientist needs to devote 20 to 26 days total travel. Trip reports are completed, distributed, and filed once field staff return to the Honolulu office.

2.3.2 Alternative B - (Preferred Alternative)

Management under Alternative B would increase the frequency of staff visits to Baker and would only alter the current management regime to incorporate the use of solar powered electronic calling devices to encourage additional seabird species to nest, and develop funding proposals for island transportation and contamination monitoring and remediation. Habitat assessments and wildlife and contaminant monitoring data would continue to be collected as described in the No Action Alternative. The travel to, establishment of, and conduct of field camps would also remain the same. The primary difference between Alternative A and Alternative B is the frequency of visitation from once every 2 years to annually respectively. Thus, at the end of the 15-year lifespan of the plan, it is anticipated that there will have been 15 visits to Baker. In order to meet the increase in the number of site visits, refuge staff in Honolulu would be administratively burdened to seek additional funding sources and develop partnerships for additional site visits and project proposals for contaminant monitoring and clean-up. This may take the form of producing internal project proposals, or seeking funding support through grants or partnerships with other agencies, research institutions, and non-government organizations. The scale and scope of marine surveys would also be maintained. At a minimum, marine scientists would resurvey REAs and other transects described in Alternative A.

2.3.3 Alternative C

Management activity on Baker would increase under this alternative. Seasonal field camps lasting approximately 4 months would be established concurrently on Baker and two other

remote Pacific Ocean refuges (Howland and Jarvis). Subsequent years would find the seasonal field camps deployed during alternating 4 month periods. Thus, the field camp would return to Baker annually during a different 4 month period. At the end of 3 years, it is expected that field camp staff would have spent 12 months on the island and have been present on the island during each month of the year. Due to the relatively short duration of each field camp, it would be possible to deploy and demobilize without any resupply trips. Thus, a contract vessel for two charter periods (deployment and demobilization) would be required. Yearly funding to charter a vessel would be required to implement this alternative. Aside from deployment and demobilization, no small vessels would be required during field camp operations.

Access provided by a charter vessel would substantially increase Service presence and ability to monitor, survey, restore, and otherwise manage refuge resources. Seabird species nesting at latitudes near the equator are extremely asynchronous and vary between years in their schedule of breeding. Longer periods of residency at Baker would foster a better understanding of breeding chronology of seabirds. Longer visits would enable the staff to map vegetation and detect rare species of all taxa that may be missed on shorter trips. Surveys of shorebirds and terrestrial invertebrates would also be conducted. By concurrently operating field camps on these three refuges it would be possible to compare wildlife use among the refuges, but it would not be able to provide a complete assessment of annual use on any one individual refuge. Nearshore surveys of the marine environment not requiring SCUBA could be increased, but due to safety concerns, most marine surveys would only occur during the period when the transport vessel was near the island during deployment and demobilization.

Terrestrial and marine invasive plant and invertebrate species and contaminants have the capacity to alter plant and animal communities, specifically posing a threat to seabird nesting habitat and coral reefs. Staff being present on the island each year would provide the opportunity to complete comprehensive surveys for both native and exotic species and effects of contamination. The extended duration of site visits will allow for the early detection of any exotic or invasive species, and provide for the rapid response and control before any invasive species has the ability to negatively affect refuge resources. Invasive species control would be in the form of hand-pulling plants and algae, hand spray applications of herbicide or insecticide or physical removal of invertebrates such as crown-of-thorns starfish. It should be noted again, however, that concerns for ocean safety during extended field camps without nearby vessel support would severely limit marine surveys and activities.

Marine debris poses an entanglement threat to seabirds and turtles. The extended field camp operations proposed in Alternative C would provide refuge staff the opportunity to not only collect and stockpile marine debris such as discarded fishing nets and plastic waste, but prepare the debris for off-site removal during demobilization activities.

Contamination and trash remaining from past human occupation will be quantified. The extended field camp operations would provide refuge staff and contaminant experts the opportunity to collect samples of soils and other suspect materials in order to quantify the extent and type of contamination. Baker is being evaluated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) (EPA ID HI6143690075) for inclusion on the National Priority List (NPL) as directed by the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act

(CERCLA). If so designated, the Service will work cooperatively with the responsible parties such as the U.S. Navy (Navy), U.S. Army (Army), and the Coast Guard to remediate the area. Alternative C will provide the opportunity to remediate contamination at Baker.

Additional time on the island would allow field camp staff to conduct visual surveys for sea turtle use of nearshore waters. Turtles are often found basking on shorelines, or foraging in shallow nearshore waters where they find plant growth to graze. Habitat use and behaviors of turtles found in the area would be documented in this alternative. While surveys could be conducted to document turtle use in the nearshore waters, the availability of a contract vessel only during deployment and demobilization would limit the ability to search for other sites of turtle or marine mammal use outside of nearshore waters.

Remotely operated cameras, hydrophones, listening devices, and satellite linkages may also be used to collect data and imagery primarily on seabird use, breeding chronology, habitat selection, seabird productivity, and other ecological attributes. These biotic and abiotic characteristics could be monitored during periods when field camps are not present on the island. These data would also be used for law enforcement purposes to detect trespass and for monitoring condition of vegetation, presence or absence of all avian species using the refuge, monitoring of invertebrate (land crab) population indices, and to detect invasive species. However, the level of implementation and the use of this technology would be dependent upon available funding.

A limited amount of time would be available for the maintenance of existing cultural and historical resources. For instance, it would be reasonable to assume that minor masonry repair or repainting of the Baker day beacon could be accomplished during one of the 4-month periods. Cultural resource surveys would need to be completed prior to any cultural resource restoration and maintenance, establishment of the field camp, or contaminant remediation.

Additional research opportunities would present themselves with a 4-month field camp. The primary increase would be in documenting the effects of a changing global environment. While it is certain that our climate is changing, it is uncertain how this change will affect mid-Pacific Ocean islands and their wildlife resources. Changes in sea level, current patterns, temperature, nutrients, and storm intensities could all have impacts on these areas, or the distribution of seabird food resources. Without the opportunity to monitor these parameters, it will be impossible to discuss their impacts, and ultimately to make any changes to management activities to minimize the impacts.

A regularly chartered vessel would also provide the opportunity to provide a law enforcement presence, better understand the equatorial Pacific island ecosystems, and increase opportunities for cooperation with partner institutions, organizations and agencies. A chartered vessel would allow refuge staff be more time efficient and independent of schedules and availability of other agencies and organizations for access to Baker and other refuges.

2.3.4 Alternative D

Alternative D proposes to establish a year-round field camp on Baker, with provisions to rotate the camp among Howland, Jarvis, Johnston Island NWRs and Rose Atoll NWR in subsequent

and alternating years. The purchase of a Service vessel for field camp safety and support, and to increase the ability to monitor and manage refuge resources of all remote Pacific island refuges is an integral component of this alternative. Interim staff change and resupply trips for a 12-month field camp would occur a minimum of three times per year. A Service-owned vessel could also be stationed and available on-site to complete additional surveys, especially of the marine system.

All wildlife populations, particularly seabirds, could be monitored in greater detail. Annual nesting chronology, seabird recruitment by species, nest site selection, and other biological and ecological parameters could be documented. Any invasive species that are detected could be controlled and eradicated in the same manner as described in Alternative C. Contaminant and debris remediation and removal would be similar to that described in Alternative C. A rotation among Pacific island refuges, also including Johnston Island, and Rose Atoll NWRs, would allow each island to host an annual field camp once every 5 years. Coordination with other agencies sponsoring vessel access and affording berths for Service personnel would continue under this alternative, including possible re-supply and staff change-outs. In addition, the Service would also be able to provide access to Baker and other refuges for visiting researchers, archeologists, and cultural resource specialists. The use and benefit of remotely operated cameras, hydrophones, listening devices, and satellite linkages are identical to those described in Alternative C.

Surveys and monitoring efforts under this alternative would provide the greatest understanding and most biologically effective management of refuge resources. Research and documentation beyond basic qualitative surveys and monitoring would be encouraged and enhanced, with the opportunity for Baker and other Pacific island refuges to serve as baseline sites for monitoring global climate change and locations where seabird foraging ecology as it relates to changing oceanographic conditions near the equator could be investigated.

2.3.5 Summary

The ability of the No Action and Preferred Alternatives to contribute to meeting the System mission, "...to administer a national network of lands and waters for the conservation, management, and where appropriate, restoration of the fish, wildlife, and plant resources and their habitats within the United States for the benefit of present and future generations of Americans" is limited. Likewise, the No Action and the Preferred Action provide a minimal benefit to meeting the refuge purpose of, "...the restoration and preservation of the complete ecosystem, terrestrial and marine. Priority must be given to allowing seabird nesting colonies to reestablish on Baker so eventually they would reach the great numbers which were present there prior to human occupancy and abuse of the island during the past 125 years." There would be no opportunity to remediate contaminated sites. A 1 to 2 day visit to the island once every 2 years or annually respectively does not provide the opportunity for refuge staff to complete anything other than basic biological surveys of species presence or absence. With the exception of establishing electronic calling devices in the Preferred Alternative, restoration, preservation, or protection of terrestrial and marine ecosystems, or nesting seabirds is not possible with the No Action or Preferred Alternative.

Alternative C and Alternative D both contribute to meeting the refuge purpose and System mission by providing the opportunity to actively work toward restoration of nesting seabird populations, potentially controlling invasive species (early detection, rapid response), removing entrapment hazards caused by debris, monitoring and remediating contaminated sites, and contributing to our general understanding of the implications and impacts of global climate change on seabird populations.

However, lack of projected budget and staffing preclude management staff from looking for increased management activity beyond Alternative B. It is for this reason that Alternative B has been selected as the Preferred Alternative. If, during the lifetime of this plan, budget and staffing become available to pursue Alternative C or D, then the CCP will be reevaluated with the potential selection of a new Preferred Alternative. Until that time, the Service is proposing Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative.

2.4 Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Study

The concept of placing Baker in custodial status, or in other words doing less than the No Action Alternative was considered but eliminated from further study. At present, refuge staff visit Baker once every 2 years, thereby managing the refuge just above a custodial or bare minimum level. Reducing the frequency of current staff visitation would not be sufficient to meet the purposes for which the refuge was established, or the obligations of several laws such as the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, Endangered Species Act, CERCLA, or the Act. Custodial status for Baker – not visiting – would reduce or eliminate any management activity to meet these obligations. In addition, the current limited visitation to the island ensures U.S. sovereignty. Eliminating visitation by placing the refuge in custodial status may jeopardize the U.S. claim of territorial ownership. Thus, custodial status as an alternative was not further evaluated.

Two Wilderness Study Areas were evaluated and one was determined to meet the minimum criteria for wilderness recommendation (Appendix F). Recommendation for wilderness designation as a component of any alternative was not considered at this time, but will be included in a LEIS at the completion of the CCP process for all other remote Pacific island refuges.

No other alternatives or components of alternatives were considered beyond those mentioned above.

Table 2.1 Summary of CCP Actions, by Alternative

Key Themes/Issues	Alternative A No Action (Current Management)	Alternative B Preferred Alternative	Alternative C	Alternative D
Access to Refuge				
Voyage Preparation and Administration	Logistic planning required for 1- to 2-day visit and a 20- to 26-day voyage. Funding required for passenger aboard partner vessel, one trip every 2 years.	Logistic planning required for 1 to 2 day visit and a 20- to 26-day voyage. Funding required for passenger aboard partner or charter vessel, one trip every year.	Logistic planning required for 4-month field camp. Funding required for two contract vessel trips per year, but is cost-shared with other NWRs.	Logistic planning for year long field camp. Funding required annually for vessel operation, but is cost-shared with other NWRs.
Method/Cost of Voyage Transportation	Transportation provided aboard partner vessels. No transportation cost to Service incurred. Least expensive of all alternatives.	Transportation provided aboard partner vessels with additional effort to charter and partner. No cost on partner vessel. Charter vessel would incur cost of one charter per year. Least expensive of all action alternatives.	Transportation provided aboard partner vessels on irregular basis. Chartered vessel required on regular basis would incur cost of two charters per year, pro-rated among 3 refuges. Most expensive of all alternatives.	Transportation provided aboard partner vessels. Service-owned vessel required would incur annual cost, with cost pro-rated among 7 refuges. Second most expensive alternative.
Frequency of Site Visit	1- to 2-day visit every 2 years.	1- to 2-day visit every year.	Annually host a 4-month per year field camp.	A 12-month long field camp hosted every 5 years.

Key Themes/Issues	Alternative A No Action (Current Management)	Alternative B Preferred Alternative	Alternative C	Alternative D
Field Camp Duration and Staff Required	1- to 2- persons overnight for 1 to 2 days.	1- to 2-persons overnight for 1 to 2 days.	2- to 3- person seasonal field camp established concurrently on Baker and 2 other nearby refuge islands.	2- to 3- person year-round field camp established on Baker and rotated annually with 4 other nearby refuge islands.
Quarantine Procedures	Standard, strict visitation and importation restrictions are in place across all alternatives to control threat for invasive species.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Seabirds, Other Wildlife, and Habitats				
Seabird Monitoring	Basic monitoring of seabird species, abundance, and nesting status occurs every other year with a 1- to 2-day monitoring period.	Basic monitoring of seabird species, abundance, and nesting status occurs annually with a 1- to 2-day monitoring period.	Fundamental monitoring of nesting chronology, seasonality as well as species presence and abundance occurs once every 8 months with up to a 4-month duration monitoring period.	Fundamental monitoring of nesting chronology, seasonality as well as species presence and abundance occurs once every 5 years with a 12-month duration monitoring period.

Key Themes/Issues	Alternative A No Action (Current Management)	Alternative B Preferred Alternative	Alternative C	Alternative D
Seabird Nesting Restoration	Seabird nest attraction devices (electronic bird calls) not currently on-island.	Seabird nest attraction devices (electronic bird calls) placed on-island. Maintenance of equipment occurs annually. Monitoring for seabird response occurs annually with a 1- to 2-day monitoring period.	Use of remote cameras, in addition to playback of recorded calls increases monitoring activity. Maintenance of equipment occurs annually. Monitoring for seabird response occurs once every 8 months during a 4-month monitoring period. Remote cameras allow continuous monitoring.	Use of remote cameras, in addition to playback of bird calls increases monitoring activity. Maintenance of equipment occurs annually. Monitoring for seabird response occurs once every 5 years during a 12-month monitoring period. Remote cameras allow continuous monitoring.
Other Wildlife and Habitat Monitoring	Each visit documents species presence or absence, presence of invasive species, and abiotic variables (e.g., temperature, wind speed).	Each visit documents species presence or absence, presence of invasive species, and abiotic variables (e.g., temperature, wind speed).	Each visit documents species presence or absence, abundance, habitat condition, presence and distribution of invasive species, and abiotic variables (e.g., temperature, wind speed).	Each visit documents species presence or absence, abundance, habitat condition, presence and distribution of invasive species, and abiotic variables (e.g., temperature, wind speed).
Vegetation Mapping	None.	None.	Mapping of vegetation will occur seasonally during field camps, but will only be capable of documenting seasonal growth patterns.	Mapping of vegetation will occur during field camps. Annual growth patterns documented, but not repeated for 5 years.

Key Themes/Issues	Alternative A No Action (Current Management)	Alternative B Preferred Alternative	Alternative C	Alternative D
Habitat Management Activities	No habitat management activities occur other than destruction of bird entrapments due to debris.	No habitat management activities occur other than collection and stockpile of marine and other debris.	Control invasive species as detected.	Control invasive species as detected.
Contaminants	Monitoring activities would occur.	Monitoring activities would occur. No remediation activities would occur. However, funding proposals to monitor/evaluate contaminants would be developed.	Monitoring activities would occur. Funding level may allow for remediation.	Monitoring activities would occur. Funding level may allow for remediation.
Wilderness				
Wilderness Resource Management	Refuge activities will continue to preserve wilderness resource values.	Management activities will continue to preserve wilderness resource values.	Management activities will continue to preserve wilderness resource values.	Management activities will continue to preserve wilderness resource values.
Wilderness Study Area	No current WSA.	WSA identified. Wilderness recommendation delayed until all Pacific island CCPs are complete.	WSA identified. Wilderness recommendation delayed until all Pacific island CCPs are complete.	WSA identified. Wilderness recommendation delayed until all Pacific island CCPs are complete.

Marine Monitoring				
Marine Exploration	No current activity.	Deep slope monitoring by ROV proposed, but dependent upon funding.	Deep slope monitoring by ROV proposed, but dependent upon funding.	Deep slope monitoring by ROV proposed, but dependent upon funding.
Marine Monitoring	Marine ecosystem monitored. REA and established surveys completed once every 2 years.	Marine ecosystem monitored. REA and established surveys completed annually. No new surveys.	Marine ecosystem monitored. REA and established surveys completed semiannually. No new surveys proposed.	Marine ecosystem monitored. REA and established surveys completed semiannually. Additional survey sites possible.
Cultural Resources				
Cultural Resource	Cultural resources preserved.	Cultural resources preserved. On-site cultural resource survey if funding allows.	Cultural resources preserved. On-site cultural resource survey required prior to establishment of seasonal field camp.	Cultural resources preserved. On-site cultural resource survey required prior to establishment of year-long field camp.
Recreational, Educational and Research Use				
Recreational, Educational, and Research Use	Public access would remain closed. Proposed uses by researchers and other visitors managed by issuance of SUPs on a case-by-case basis. Opportunities for environmental education exist off-site.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

2.5 Comparison of Alternatives A-D Funding Requirements

The costs associated with implementing each Alternative are shown in Table 2-2. For Alternative A (No Action), the costs incurred by the Service are associated with staff working on the island for 1 to 2 days once every 2 years and relies on the ability of refuge staff to be transported on a NOAA research or partner vessel to Baker. The costs associated with Alternative B include staff working on the island for 1 to 2 days and relies on the ability of refuge staff to be transported on a NOAA research vessel or another vessel provided through other partnerships, grant funding, or charter to facilitate yearly staff visits. Alternative C includes costs for two vessel charters per year to deploy and demobilize a seasonal field camp (4-month deployment of 2 personnel) to survey, restore and otherwise manage refuge resources. The adjusted annual personnel and operating costs for Alternative C reflect the prorated amount for the Baker portion of establishing concurrent field camps on Howland, Baker, and Jarvis. Alternative D includes the cost of acquiring and maintaining a vessel to facilitate the establishment of a year-round field camp that would be deployed once every 5 years in a rotational schedule that would include deployments at Howland, Baker, and Jarvis as well as Johnston Atoll and Rose Atoll, in the other years. The vessel purchase and operational costs in Alternative D represents costs that are distributed among all remote island refuges that would utilize this vessel to accomplish management activities throughout these central Pacific Ocean locations. The adjusted annual cost for Alternative D reflects the pro-rated amount it would cost to implement the alternative at Baker. Use of this vessel to support the two national wildlife refuges in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands would further decrease these prorated costs. Until such time that contaminant surveys occur, cost estimates for remediation will not be possible and are not part of this comparison.

Table 2.2 Estimated Annual Cost Comparison of Various Field Camp Configurations.

Field Camp Budget for Baker	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Staff	\$17,000 (0.3 FTE every 2 years)	\$34,000 (0.3 FTE per year)	\$66,000 (0.66 FTE per year)	\$200,000 (2 FTE once every 5 years)
Supplies	\$5,000	\$7,000	\$100,000	\$200,000
Remote Sensing equipment	N/A	N/A	\$100,000	N/A
Remote Sensing operations	N/A	N/A	\$20,000	\$20,000
Deep sea exploration	N/A	\$25,000 per submersible vessel dive	\$25,000 per submersible vessel dive	\$25,000 per submersible vessel dive
Seabird recolonization initiative	N/A	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000
Vessel Charter	N/A	N/A	\$12,000/day for 50 days = \$600,000 per	N/A

Field Camp Budget for Baker	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
			year	
Vessel Purchase (one time cost)	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$ 8 million
Vessel operation	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$200,000 once every 5 years
Adjusted annual personnel, supplies and equipment costs	\$22,000/yr	\$76,000/yr	\$256,000/yr	\$210,000/yr

2.6 Refuge Goals, Objectives, Strategies, and Rationale

Goals and objectives are the unifying elements of successful refuge management. They identify and focus management priorities, resolve issues, and link to refuge purposes, Service policy, and the System mission.

A CCP describes management actions that help bring a refuge closer to its vision. A vision broadly reflects the refuge purposes, the System mission and goals, other statutory requirements, and larger-scale plans as appropriate. Goals then define general targets in support of the vision, followed by objectives that direct effort into incremental and measurable steps toward achieving those goals. Finally, strategies identify specific tools and actions to accomplish objectives.

In the development of this CCP, the Service prepared an environmental assessment. The environmental assessment evaluates alternative sets of management actions derived from a variety of management goals, objectives and implementation strategies.

The goals for Baker over the next 15 years under the CCP are presented on the following pages. Each goal is followed by the objectives that pertain to that goal. The goal order does not imply any priority in this CCP. Some objectives pertain to multiple goals and have simply been placed in the most reasonable spot. Similarly, some strategies pertain to multiple objectives. Following the goals, objectives, and strategies is a brief rationale intended to provide further background information pertaining to importance of an objective relative to legal mandates for managing units of the System including refuge purpose, trust resource responsibilities (federally listed threatened and endangered species and migratory birds), and maintaining/restoring biological integrity, diversity, and environmental health.

Readers, please note the following:

The objective statement as written is the same that applies to the Service’s Preferred Alternative, Alternative B. If an objective is not in a particular alternative, a blank is used to indicate that this objective is not addressed in that alternative. Below each objective statement are the strategies that could be employed in order to accomplish the objectives. Check marks alongside each strategy show which alternatives include that strategy. If a column for a particular alternative does not include a check mark for a listed strategy, it means that strategy will not be used in that alternative.

Goal 1: Conserve, restore, manage, and protect native terrestrial habitats that are representative of remote tropical Pacific islands, primarily for the benefit of seabirds.

Objective 1a: Conserve, manage, and protect habitat for nesting seabirds.				
Upon CCP approval and throughout the life of the CCP, conserve, manage, and protect a mosaic of approximately 531 acres of terrestrial habitat consisting of 31 acres of beach and beach strand, 300 acres as short grass and forbs, and 200 acres as bare ground on Baker Island as nesting habitat for 11 seabird species.				
Alternatives	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Objective as written above applies to Alternatives (✓)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Strategies Applied to Achieve Objective	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Conduct and record incidental observations of invasive species.	✓	✓	✓	✓
Control and where possible, eradicate invasive species using IPM tools including hand pulling and selective application of pesticides.			✓	✓
Eradicate mammalian pests (e.g., mice) using IPM tools as needed to protect nesting seabirds.			✓	✓
Adhere to strict quarantine protocols for all island visitors (see Appendix D).	✓	✓	✓	✓
Monitor contaminated areas. Remove entrapment hazards due to marine and other human debris not considered to be historically important.	✓	✓	✓	✓
Remove stockpiled marine and other debris.			✓	✓
Rationale:				
<p>The 11 nesting seabird species on Baker use all island habitats (see Chapter 3.9.1 and Appendix B). Masked and brown boobies prefer to nest on bare, open ground. Gray-backed, sooty, and white tern; and brown and blue-grey noddy also nest on the surface, but are tolerant of vegetated areas. Lesser frigatebirds, typically known as a shrub nesting species, are found exclusively on the ground at Baker. Red-tailed tropicbirds prefer shaded areas and can be found nesting on the surface, under coral slabs, or in shrubs. Red-footed booby and great frigatebird are the only two exclusive shrub nesting species. However, due to the few shrubs on Baker, red-footed boobies have been seen to nest on the ground.</p> <p>The Seabird Conservation Plan (USFWS 2005) recognizes remote Pacific islands as providing important and varied breeding habitat, specifically Baker as being important for ground nesting species. Additionally, the plan recognizes that near-shore waters provide areas of upwelling currents with important food resources for seabirds.</p>				

Maintaining the island free of mammalian predators, invasive insects, and invasive plants is critical for seabird survival (USFWS 2005). Strict quarantine protocols have been previously established for all island visitors in order to eliminate the threat of introducing invasive plants, insects, and animals (see Appendix D).

Marine and other human generated debris poses an entrapment and entanglement threat for multiple wildlife species. Destruction of rusting drums and stockpiling debris can reduce the overall area impacted, thereby reducing the threat.

Objective 1b: Increase baseline information on terrestrial habitat.

Within 15 years of the CCP approval, conduct monitoring to determine vegetation species presence/absence and distribution on Baker Island.

Alternatives	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Objective as written above applies to Alternatives (✓)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Strategies Applied to Achieve Objective	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Document presence/absence island vegetation.	✓	✓	✓	✓
Conduct inventory of plant species distribution, including use of GPS and vegetation transects.			✓	✓
Coordinate with Regional Office GIS staff to assess and/or develop remote sensing capability to map and monitor island habitats.		✓	✓	✓

Rationale:

In general, insufficient time has been spent on Baker to adequately quantify the habitat, and how this habitat relates to seabird biology. Collection of baseline biological information is essential to adequately understand and manage the refuge. Although it is known that the 11 nesting seabird species use all habitats on Baker, this information has only been obtained from the short duration, infrequent visits (1 to 2 days every 2 years) to the island. There has been no quantitative assessment of breeding species habitat associations. The distribution and delineation of habitats itself has been estimated, but never been quantified. Remotely collected data may provide an option for data collection in the absence of being capable of visiting Baker.

Objective 1c: Survey and monitor refuge to document contamination.

Within 10 years of the CCP approval, monitor approximately 100 acres of known contamination and survey remainder of island to determine if contamination level is above the EPA threshold value for designation on the NPL under CERCLA.

Alternatives	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Objective as written above applies to Alternatives (✓)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Strategies Applied to Achieve Objective	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Document presence and extent of known contamination.	✓	✓	✓	✓

Conduct contaminant survey of entire island as a follow-up site investigation to address deficiencies listed by EPA in the Foster Wheeler 1998 report to determine if Baker meets criteria for EPA Superfund Site designation.			✓	✓
Coordinate with the responsible parties such as the Coast Guard to conduct the Site Investigation.		✓	✓	✓
If the responsible parties are not willing to conduct the Site Investigation, obtain Service funding through the Refuge Cleanup Fund.		✓	✓	✓
Coordinate with regional office contaminants staff to develop funding/operational package to conduct monitoring activity.	✓	✓	✓	✓
Coordinate and consult with EPA in design and conduct of follow-up Site Investigation.		✓	✓	✓
Rationale:				
In general, insufficient time has been spent on Baker to adequately quantify the extent of contamination on Baker. A Site Investigation is used by EPA to determine if areas of the island or surrounding waters are unacceptably contaminated. If so, the responsible parties for the contamination, i.e., Navy, Army, and the Coast Guard will have the responsibility to clean up the site. To date, the Site Investigation conducted by Foster Wheeler in 1998 was inconclusive and unacceptable to EPA and the Service. The Service now has the responsibility to determine if Baker meets CERCLA criteria. Further and follow up monitoring is required by the Service before NPL determination can be made.				

Objective 1d: Remediate contaminated areas of Baker				
Within 15 years of the CCP approval, begin remediation activities on all contaminated areas of Baker.				
Alternatives	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Objective as written above applies to Alternatives (✓)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Strategies Applied to Achieve Objective	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Cooperate and coordinate with the Coast Guard or Navy to remediate contaminated areas of Baker.			✓	✓
Institute long monitoring program of the remediation.			✓	✓
If required, develop Service funding request for cleanup through the Refuge Cleanup Fund.			✓	✓
Rationale:				
A Site Investigation is used by EPA to determine if areas of the island or waters are unacceptably contaminated. If so, the responsible parties for the contamination, i.e., the				

Navy, Army, and the Coast Guard have the responsibility to clean up the site. To date, the Site Investigation conducted by Foster Wheeler in 1998 was inconclusive and unacceptable to EPA and the Service to determine if Baker meets NPL criteria. If these criteria are met, then it will increase the priority for remediation by the responsible parties. For the Navy and Army, responsibility for Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) has been delegated through the Defense Environmental Restoration Act (DERA) to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE). Unfortunately, Baker can not meet the criteria used by FUDS to become a priority site. Therefore, the ACOE through FUDS will not be able to remediate contaminated lands or waters at Baker. Remediation will only be possible through the Coast Guard environmental program or if funding becomes available through the Service’s Refuge Cleanup Funds. It will be incumbent upon Service staff to work cooperatively with the responsible parties or their delegates and the EPA to coordinate and complete remediation activities.

Goal 2: Conserve, manage, and protect native marine communities that are representative of remote tropical Pacific islands.

Objective 2a: Conserve, manage, and protect marine habitat.				
Upon CCP approval, conserve, manage, and protect approximately 31,378 acres of submerged lands consisting of an estimated 3,000 acres coral reef and 28,378 acres of deep water/pelagic habitat on Baker.				
Alternatives	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Objective as written above applies to Alternatives (✓)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Strategies Applied to Achieve Objective	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Use IPM tools to control and where possible, eradicate invasive marine species (e.g., crown-of-thorns starfish).				✓
Collect, remove, and stockpile marine debris from shallow coral reefs.				✓
Continue and expand partnership with NOAA to manage coral reef ecosystems.	✓	✓	✓	✓
Rationale:				
The conservation and protection of the Nation’s coral reefs is becoming increasingly important for agencies with responsibility to manage and conserve those (Executive Orders 13089 and 13158). Because the refuge boundary for Baker extends to 3 nmi from the island shoreline, all coral reefs are contained within the refuge boundary. Threats to the coral reef system include invasive species such as crown-of-thorns starfish and marine debris (e.g., abandoned fishing gear, sunken landing craft) that collects on corals, smothering or breaking them. The responsibility for protecting, managing, and conserving coral reef ecosystems is shared with NOAA. The Service and NOAA often participate in joint management activities throughout the Pacific, however, no active management activities have occurred at Baker.				

Objective 2b: Increase baseline information on marine community.				
Within 15 years of CCP approval, monitor: coral species density, diversity, and distribution; fish species presence/absence and habitat associations; sea turtle species presence/absence; and marine mammal species presence/absence.				
Alternatives	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Objective as written above applies to Alternatives (✓)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Strategies Applied to Achieve Objective	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Conduct and record incidental observations of corals, fish, sea turtles, marine mammals, and their habitats.	✓	✓	✓	✓
Accompany NOAA or other scientific partners on marine surveys.	✓	✓	✓	✓
Conduct REA on all existing survey routes to document coral, fish and turtle density, diversity, distribution, and habitat associations.	✓	✓	✓	✓
Develop proposals and conduct deep slope marine surveys by ROV to document presence/absence of deep slope coral and fish species.		✓	✓	✓
Conduct comprehensive survey for invasive species.				✓
Increase level of REA and other marine habitat surveys by 20%.				✓
Conduct specific surveys for marine mammal presence/absence.				✓
Rationale:				
<p>Responsibility for managing marine resources is shared with NOAA, and has led to many cooperative studies. Unlike the logistic constraints of completing terrestrial surveys, marine surveys are conducted throughout the entire time that the marine transport vessel is at Baker. Additionally, since most site visits to Baker are aboard NOAA research vessels, the purpose of these voyages is to conduct marine surveys and studies. Consequently, a full compliment of up to 20 marine researchers and 40 support staff contribute to conducting marine surveys across all alternatives. As a result, marine surveys are more comprehensive than terrestrial surveys on Baker.</p> <p>REAs constitute baseline monitoring of the marine ecosystem, and are one component of all alternative strategies. Further expansion of REAs could be accomplished only as a component of Alternative D.</p> <p>Additional surveys (e.g., marine mammals, deep slope), as described beginning with Alternative B can be achieved as components of cooperative efforts with other agencies or research organizations. As an example, little is known of marine mammal use surrounding Baker, although it is known that some species are found in the vicinity.</p>				

The Marine Mammal Commission has encouraged the Service to generate partnerships with NOAA to help document baseline information. Developing additional partnerships with NOAA or other organizations may also assist in meeting terrestrial objectives by providing the opportunity for additional trips to Baker.

Goal 3: Contribute to the recovery, protection, and management efforts for all native species with special consideration for seabirds, migratory shorebirds, federally listed threatened and endangered species, and species of management concern.

Objective 3a: Develop baseline migratory bird and other species information.				
Within 10 years of CCP approval, conduct monitoring (in rank order) to determine: seabird species presence/absence, relative abundance, breeding chronology, distribution, and habitat use; presence/absence of shorebirds; presence/absence and distribution of sea turtles; and presence/absence of terrestrial invertebrates on Baker Island. The desired conditions by which this will be met is understanding of the complete annual chronology for 5 of 11 nesting seabird species; population trend data over the 10-year period for all 11 nesting seabird species; and the presence/absence and distribution of shorebirds, turtles and other terrestrial invertebrates.				
Alternatives	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Objective as written above applies to Alternatives (✓)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Strategies Applied to Achieve Objective	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Record incidental observations of all species presence/absence, relative abundance, and distribution.	✓	✓	✓	✓
Conduct seabird monitoring activities for breeding chronology, and habitat use.			✓	✓
Coordinate with Migratory Bird Office and Office of Refuge Biology, Region 1 Regional Office to develop specific monitoring needs and data collection protocols.			✓	✓
Rationale:				
<p>The Seabird Conservation Plan (USFWS 2005) repeatedly recognizes the importance of the U.S. Pacific Islands in providing predator-free seabird nesting and roosting environments. Their protected status, in concert with nearby marine forage resources contribute to their importance. The Seabird Conservation Plan further identifies population monitoring inventories as insufficient to accurately detect or monitor populations, suggesting instead that a rigorous collection of population data is needed.</p> <p>In addition to Baker being recognized as important habitat for seabirds, the U.S. Pacific Islands Regional Shorebird Conservation Plan (Engilis and Naughton 2004) lists determining baseline information for bristle-thighed curlews, and other species, as the goal of the Central Pacific Islands Subregion. The endangered species recovery plans for both</p>				

species of sea turtles indicate that little is known about their biology in the central Pacific. Data on other terrestrial wildlife species found on Baker Island are lacking.

Objective 3b: Restore breeding populations for 2 seabird species.				
Within 10 years of CCP approval, establish up to 5 nesting pairs each of Phoenix petrel (<i>Pterodroma alba</i>) and Polynesian storm-petrel (<i>Nesofregetta fuliginosa</i>) during a minimum of 3 consecutive years on Baker Island.				
Alternatives	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Objective as written above applies to Alternatives (✓)		✓	✓	✓
Strategies Applied to Achieve Objective	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Implement and maintain electronic calling devices to promote nesting.		✓	✓	✓
Coordinate with RO and develop capabilities for remote surveillance equipment.			✓	✓
Rationale:				
The Seabird Conservation Plan (USFWS 2005) recognizes the Polynesian storm-petrel may flourish on Baker, as well as Jarvis and Howland, due to the removal of predators from the islands. The Phoenix petrel is known from the Phoenix Islands, but does not currently inhabit Baker, though it is thought that they did historically. A recommendation of the Plan is expand efforts to assess habitat suitability and restore populations through translocation to predator-free U.S. islands such as Baker. While the physical translocation of species to Baker is not being suggested, electronic calling devices are designed and have been successful in attracting and establishing nesting seabird colonies to other islands.				

Objective 3c: Develop baseline data and understand sea turtle use of Baker.				
Upon CCP approval, monitor hawksbill and green sea turtles to document any nesting sites, all adjacent coral reef and nearshore water foraging sites, and overall population density and distributions.				
Alternatives	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Objective as written above applies to Alternatives (✓)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Strategies Applied to Achieve Objective	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Record incidental observations of nearshore turtle use.	✓	✓	✓	✓
Develop and conduct survey of nearshore turtle use.			✓	✓
Develop and conduct survey of other marine areas for turtle use.				✓
Develop partnership with NOAA for study of turtles at Baker.		✓	✓	✓
Rationale:				
There is currently little information related to use of Baker resources by sea turtles, though it is known that they do use refuge habitats. Sea turtles have been photographed in the water during joint Service/NOAA expeditions since 2000. Data collected over the life of				

this plan would help to establish a baseline understanding of sea turtle populations in the central Pacific.

Objective 3d: Expand baseline information on marine community.				
Upon CCP approval, monitor globally-depleted marine species populations such as giant clams (<i>Tridacna</i> sp.), bumphead parrotfish (<i>Bolbometapon muricatum</i>), Napoleon wrasses (<i>Cheilinus undulatus</i>), large groupers (e.g., <i>Cephalopholis</i> sp., <i>Epinephelus</i> sp., <i>Variola</i> sp.), sharks (e.g., <i>Carcharhinus</i> sp., <i>Triaenodon</i> sp., <i>Negaprion</i> sp., <i>Galeocerdo</i> sp.), and corals (Anthozoa, Hydrozoa) to document presence/absence and relative abundance on Baker.				
Alternatives	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Objective as written above applies to Alternatives (✓)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Strategies Applied to Achieve Objective	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Conduct marine surveys such as REA.	✓	✓	✓	✓
Solicit partnership for survey of deep slope habitat.		✓	✓	✓
Expand marine surveys (REA) efforts to other reef areas surrounding the island.				✓
Rationale:				
Many marine species of commercial importance have been globally depleted. Protected areas such as Baker still provide refugia. However, illegal fishing activity has been noted surrounding several Remotes refuges. Baker, as well as other remote island refuges provide the opportunity to study and protect the marine ecosystem.				

Objective 3e: Develop baseline scientific information on marine mammal use of Baker.				
Within 10 years of CCP approval, increase scientific understanding of marine mammal presence and use of Baker marine waters. The desired conditions by which this will be met will be to document all marine mammal use of nearshore waters.				
Alternatives	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Objective as written above applies to Alternatives (✓)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Strategies Applied to Achieve Objective	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Incidental observations of marine mammal	✓	✓	✓	✓
Solicit partnership for study of marine mammals at Baker.		✓	✓	✓
Rationale:				
NOAA, Service, Oceanic Institute, University of Hawaii, and Bishop Museum marine biologists have collected data on marine species of concern since 2000. Only anecdotal information exists on marine mammal use of the waters surrounding Baker Island. Studies elsewhere in the Pacific, however, indicate that waters surrounding small islands may support distinct local populations of marine mammals. It is also important to understand the threats human activity may pose to this important resource (Marine Mammal Commission. pers. comm.).				

Goal 4: Restore the wilderness character of Baker’s terrestrial community, and protect, maintain, enhance, and preserve the wilderness character of Baker’s marine communities.

Objective 4a: Protect, enhance, and maintain wilderness values.				
Upon CCP approval, continue to preserve and enhance the wilderness values (e.g., size, naturalness, solitude, supplemental values) of Baker. Achievement of this objective will be evaluated by assessing loss, degradation, or improvement of values that qualified or eliminated it for potential designation (see Appendix F).				
Alternatives	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Objective as written above applies to Alternatives (✓)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Strategies Applied to Achieve Objective	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Use minimum tools necessary to manage refuge resources.	✓	✓	✓	✓
Continue to manage Baker as wilderness.	✓	✓	✓	✓
Monitor values of naturalness and solitude.	✓	✓	✓	✓
Remove debris remaining from military or other past human use, not considered cultural resources.			✓	✓
Rationale:				
<p>Baker has been and is managed as a wild, natural area due to its remote location and limited human presence, even though the terrestrial portion of the refuge suffers from historic human impacts. Human generated debris, some containing contamination, remains from past occupations. Additionally, debris such as discarded fishing nets continuously washes ashore. This debris impinges upon the wilderness value of naturalness. A cultural resource review is required prior to removal of any human debris, identified as a component of Alternatives C and D, which may be considered a cultural resource.</p> <p>Marine areas of Baker have been identified as meeting the criteria for a Wilderness Study Area (Appendix F). Completion of the wilderness review process and as appropriate development of a LEIS will be pursued for all Pacific remote island refuges once their CCPs have been completed. In the interim, the area identified as a suitable WSA would continue to be managed as wilderness. All management activities would be conducted in such a manner as not to detract from the wilderness values identified in the Wilderness Inventory.</p>				

Goal 5: Preserve Baker’s cultural and historic resources.

Objective 5a: Protect cultural resources.				
Upon CCP approval, continue to protect existing cultural resources. The desired conditions by which this will be met will be to document any change in condition of the Baker day beacon, or other recognized cultural/historical resource.				
Alternatives	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Objective as written above applies to Alternatives (✓)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Strategies Applied to Achieve Objective	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Record incidental observations of condition of cultural resources.	✓	✓	✓	✓
Rationale:				
Restricting human use of Baker would maintain cultural resources by limiting the opportunity for invasive species establishment, and reducing the opportunity for unauthorized collection or disturbance. In order to keep cultural resource sites protected, the locations and descriptions of fragile cultural resources would not be made available to the public.				

Objective 5b: Enhance Knowledge of cultural resources.				
Within 10 years of CCP approval, undertake appropriate surveys to identify important cultural and historical resources.				
Alternatives	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Objective as written above applies to Alternatives (✓)			✓	✓
Strategies Applied to Achieve Objective	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Conduct cultural resource survey of island and marine habitat.			✓	✓
Conduct basic maintenance of cultural resources (paint, clean surfaces of avian excrement).			✓	✓
Coordinate with Regional Office cultural resource staff to develop funding package to conduct monitoring activity.		✓	✓	✓
Rationale:				
In order to keep cultural resource sites protected, the locations and descriptions of fragile cultural resources would not be made available to the public. Any maintenance activity and establishment of seasonal or annual field camps would require approval from appropriate archeological resource professional (e.g., Service Regional Archeologist).				

Goal 6: Inform and educate the public to increase their understanding of remote Pacific island NWRs wilderness values, cultural and historical resources, and their ecosystems, with special emphasis on seabirds.

Objective 6a: Provide off-site education and interpretation opportunities.				
Within 3 years of CCP approval, develop an off-site educational opportunity for the public to learn about Pacific Island refuge wilderness values, cultural and historical resources, tropical island ecosystems, seabirds, and coral reefs. The desired conditions by which this will be met will be through publications, educational programs, displays, or other media.				
Alternatives	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Objective as written above applies to Alternatives (✓)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Strategies Applied to Achieve Objective	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Develop, with External Affairs office, Honolulu, an interpretative brochure for all remote Pacific island refuges.		✓	✓	✓
Work with External Affairs office, Honolulu to develop outreach/interpretation strategy.			✓	✓
Rationale:				
While it is important for the public to understand and appreciate the resource values associated with remote island refuges, it is logistically difficult to do this on-site at Baker and still protect the island's wildlife, habitats, wilderness values, cultural and historical resources, and visitor's safety. For these reasons, interpretative or educational opportunities for the public to learn and appreciate the values of remote Pacific island refuges and resources will be provided primarily as off-site programs and interpretative brochures.				

Objective 6b: Increase understanding of impacts of global climate change.				
Within 15 years of CCP approval, increase scientific understanding of the impacts of global climate change on tropical island ecosystems, specifically as these impacts relate to seabird nesting and foraging sites. The desired conditions by which this will be met will be the development of one research project.				
Alternatives	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Objective as written above applies to Alternatives (✓)			✓	✓
Strategies Applied to Achieve Objective	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Develop partnership with agency or institution to conduct baseline global climate change investigations.			✓	✓
Rationale:				
It is increasingly important to understand the impacts that global climate change might have on central Pacific Ocean islands and the wildlife resources they provide such as seabird nesting habitat. In order to determine if management activities are necessary to offset the impacts of global climate change at Baker, refuge staff needs a baseline from which to measure future change.				

Chapter 3: Affected Environment

3.1 *Geographic/Ecosystem Setting*

Baker Island NWR (Baker), located 12 nmi north of the Equator at approximately latitude 0°13' N and longitude 176°31' W is a northwest outlier island of the Phoenix Island Archipelago. It is included in the central Pacific subregion of the Polynesian Region of the Pacific Basin. This subregion, the largest of four in the Polynesian Region, is the most remote part of the tropical Pacific and includes only low-lying reef islands, atolls, and submerged reefs. Vegetation patterns are determined by the highly variable but normally low rainfall levels found along the Equator in the central Pacific. In turn, the arid weather and ocean circulation patterns impose limits on floating seed plant dispersal strategies. Baker falls in the central Pacific dry zone with rainfall less than 40 inches per year, and thus "cannot support any forest or closed woody vegetation" (Mueller-Dombois and Fosberg 1998). The nearest landmasses are Howland Island 32 nautical miles (nmi) to the north, and McKean Island 350 nmi to the southeast. Both islands are also in the Phoenix Islands. The remaining eight Phoenix Islands under the jurisdiction of the Republic of Kiribati are the next closest neighbors to Baker, up to 480 nmi to the southeast. The next closest landmasses outside the Phoenix Islands are the Gilbert Islands with Beru Island closest to Baker at 420 nmi to the southwest. Tarawa Atoll, the capitol of the Republic of Kiribati, is 600 nmi to the west in the central Gilbert Island Archipelago.

3.2 *Climate*

General climate and related oceanographic conditions in the central Equatorial Pacific

The climate associated with Baker can be generalized as being arid, warm, and tropical with moderate breezes and light to moderate rainfall. Although differences in climate exist among the islands, climate-monitoring stations are not readily available in the equatorial Pacific. Consequently, current site-specific data are lacking for most central Pacific locations, or have only been collected for a short period of time. In order to describe the weather conditions on Baker Island, weather-monitoring data are taken from historic on-site weather data, or from the closest weather monitoring station.

There are several climatic factors that influence weather on Baker: trade winds, rainfall, and oceanic currents. Trade winds are surface winds that typically dominate airflow in tropical regions and predominate from the east at Baker between 13 to 16 miles per hour (mph). Atmospheric pressure gradients range from high pressure areas located near latitude 30° N. and latitude 30° S., to the low pressure band located near latitude 5° N., driving both the northeast and southeast trade winds. This area of low pressure located just north of the Equator is referred to as the 'doldrums' or the Intertropical Convergence Zone (ITCZ) and lacks these prevailing trade winds because they converge and rise upward.

Solar heating also allows the moist air mass of the ITCZ to rise, thus cooling the air mass and producing a band of heavy precipitation several degrees to either side of the ITCZ (Wallace and Hobbs 1977). Baker normally lies south of the ITCZ. Changes in these typical patterns occur seasonally along a north-south axis and during periodic events known as the El Niño Southern

Oscillation (ENSO) along an east-west axis. During an ENSO event, the ITCZ shifts east toward unusually warmer waters. This shift typically leads to lighter wind speeds and variability in rainfall depending upon geographic location in the central Pacific region (USFWS 2001, USFWS 1998a, Vitousek et al. 1980).

Prevailing ocean currents surrounding Baker also influence weather patterns on the island by moderating the surrounding surface air temperatures. These currents, except the Equatorial Undercurrent (EUC), and North Equatorial Countercurrent (NECC), also roughly mimic the direction of the trade winds. The eastward-flowing NECC is a relatively narrow surface current that seasonally meanders between latitude 5° and 10° N, flows counter to the major westward-flowing currents of the northern and southern hemispheres, and is situated just below the ITCZ (USFWS 2001). In a sense, the NECC is a return flow of surface seawater running down-slope back towards the eastern Pacific because of the lack of trade winds that would otherwise drag surface waters in the opposite direction. Baker lies south of the NECC and is rarely directly influenced by the current.

The westward-flowing current lying north of the NECC is known as the North Equatorial Current (NEC) and is not known to influence current and weather patterns near Baker. Just south of the NECC is the westward-flowing South Equatorial Current (SEC). Baker is most always within the flow regime of the SEC.

Baker also lies in the path of the subsurface easterly flowing Equatorial Undercurrent (EUC) also referred to as the Cromwell Current. As the EUC strikes the submerged western slopes of Baker Island, nutrient rich waters are deflected upward, enriching the primary productivity of the surface waters surrounding Baker. These upwelling waters from the EUC are slightly cooler than adjacent sea surface waters and may moderate the effects of localized and periodic sea surface warming events.

Baker climate and related oceanographic conditions

Baker's location on the Equator puts it squarely within the arid southeast trade wind belt except during an ENSO and other periodic fronts or storms when rainfall may be higher and winds more variable. Baker is also in an area with high probability of mesoscale eddy formation and intra-annual variation due to north-south movement of the ITCZ (Inter-tropical Convergence Zone) and inter-annual variation due to variation in strength of the ENSO (Longhurst and Pauly 1987).

There are very little weather data available from Baker. Weather observations were made during the military occupation of Baker and Howland Islands from 1935-1945 (USAEC 1963).

However, these military records could not be located. A single reconnaissance trip to Howland and Baker Islands by the Logistics Planning Group of Holmes & Narver INC, for the Atomic Energy Commission in October 1963, recorded seawater temperatures between 86°F and 87°F (USAEC 1963). Air temperatures during that time period ranged from 80°F to 94°F with an average of 85°F. Wind speeds during this visit averaged 13 mph with a range of 6 to 23 mph. In winter, the average daily range of air temperature is reported as 78°F to 88°F, and during summer the average daily range is 78°F to 90°F (NOAA 1991). Kanton Atoll (formerly Canton Island) is located in the Phoenix Islands at 02°46' South latitude and 171°43' West longitude, and is the nearest (370 nmi) historic weather station to Baker (NOAA 1991, USFWS 1998a). Weather data

at Kanton support the conclusions of arid conditions in the northern Phoenix Islands. The Kanton Atoll weather station reported total annual rainfall is approximately 30 inches annually (NOAA 1991) with precipitation consistent throughout the year. The trade winds, low rainfall, high equatorial sunshine and high evapo-transpiration levels all combine to produce a relatively arid climate at Baker, except during some anomalous storm and wind conditions.

3.3 Global Climate Change

Background

Recent decades have brought increased awareness of the changing global environment and the implications this may have on ecological processes. Global warming, sea level rise, and change in chemical concentrations in the world's oceans reflect this change. These changes are being brought about by three factors: increasing concentrations of carbon dioxide and other gasses in the atmosphere commonly referred to as the greenhouse effect; alterations in the biogeochemistry of the global nitrogen cycle; and ongoing land use and land cover change with change in land use being considered the single most important component of global change affecting ecological systems (Vitousek 1994). While there is considerable debate regarding the cause and the ultimate impact these changes will have on earth's environment, there are several areas of impact that have been well documented. The three areas of impact linked to global climate change that may have the greatest potential effect on Baker and other central Pacific islands are coral bleaching, sea level rise and oceanic chemical composition change.

Vitousek (1994) reported, “[c]hanges in both climate and biological diversity are known with less certainty than are changes in CO₂ concentrations, global biogeochemistry or land use”. Because temperature is more variable both spatially and temporally than CO₂ concentration, it is difficult to separate human-caused versus natural background variation. However, it is certain that increasing concentrations of CO₂ and other greenhouse gasses will cause increasing climate change (Vitousek 1994).

The equatorial locale for Baker places it near the path of anomalous water current and surface wind conditions during ENSO events, but the paucity of weather and oceanographic data at Baker renders it difficult to assess the impacts and trends of global climate change at the island. The upward deflection of cool subsurface waters into shallow water by the upwelling effects of the EUC further complicates an assessment of climate change effects, because this phenomenon has been rarely reported outside of the three equatorial refuges (Howland, Baker, Jarvis).

Coral Bleaching

Above-normal mean sea surface temperatures have been shown to cause bleaching and mortality in corals both in nature and in the laboratory with bleaching generally occurring in shallower waters (Floros et al. 2004). Other variables have also been implicated in bleaching and mortality events, including, extended periods of high temperatures, low wind velocity, clear skies, calm seas, low rainfall, high rainfall, salinity changes, high turbidity or acute pollution. Smith and Buddemeier (1992) state: “[r]eef damage from anthropogenic environmental degradation (nutrient runoff, siltation, overexploitation) is widespread, represents a much greater threat than climate change in the near future, and can reinforce the negative effects of climate change”. Floros and coworkers (2004) go on to note that, “[t]he causes of coral bleaching are debatable,

but widely thought to be the result of a variety of stresses, both natural and human-induced, that cause the degeneration and the loss of the colored zooxanthellae from the coral tissues.”

Field observation of corals at Baker during five separate expeditions from 2000-2006 indicate that corals appear to be recovering from a bleaching event that took place during the previous few years (1997-1998). Corals continued to recover based upon observations during all subsequent (post 2000) visits. Although coral bleaching was predicted to occur at Baker in 2003 based upon NOAA satellite based temperature and wind data, no evidence of bleaching was reported there during the early 2004 and 2006 visits (Maragos unpub. data 2000-2006). One possible explanation is that the cool upwelling waters of the EUC are buffering the effects of the otherwise warmer seawater temperatures at the island.

Analysis of cores obtained from large, old coral heads on the shallow reefs would help to track sea surface temperature and coral growth rates over several or more decades. Although large heads of the preferred coral (*Porites*) are not common at Baker, a 20-inch core was collected during the 2002 visit from a large *Porites australiensis* coral head at a depth of 11 meters off the south side of the island (Maragos unpublished data 2000-2006). However, the coral core has not yet been analyzed for its calcification temperature and growth records.

Sea Level Rise

While global temperature is projected to rise by 3.6°F to 9°F and sea level to rise by more than 31.5 inches during the next two centuries, sea levels have fluctuated by an order of 328 feet over the past 18,000 years as natural background variation and thawing out from the last ice age (Michener et al. 1997). Contributions to sea level rise by climate change are ice-sheet melting, alpine glacier melting and thermal expansion of the sea. Sea levels have risen by 4-8 inches during the past century (Michener et al. 1997). The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC 2001) predicted a sea level rise of 3.5 to 34.6 inches by the year 2100 unless greenhouse gas emissions were reduced substantially. They also suggested that continuing greenhouse gas emissions could trigger polar ice-cap melting after 2100 accompanied by sea level rise greater than 16 feet. More recent modeling indicates that melting could occur faster than the IPCC predicted (Overpeck et al. 2006).

Evidence also suggests that the world's oceans are regionally divisible with regard to historic fluctuations in sea level. Localized variations in subsidence and emergence of the sea floor and plate-tectonics activity prevent extrapolations in sea level fluctuations and trends between different regions. Thus, it may not be possible to discuss uniform changes in sea level on a global scale, or the magnitude of greenhouse gas-forced changes as these changes may vary regionally (Michener et al. 1997). As an example, tide gauge records on the Atlantic coast indicate a sea level rise of 0.06 to 0.16 inches/year over the past century, whereas, they have indicated a 0.35 to 0.39 inches/year increase along the Gulf coast of the United States (Michener et al. 1997).

Increases in sea level may also affect low-lying equatorial islands and atolls. Shoreline erosion and salt water intrusion into subsurface freshwater aquifers have been noted throughout the Pacific (Shea et al. 2001). Due to the deep marine slopes directly adjacent to Baker, increases in sea level could significantly erode shorelines and overall island surface area since opportunities

for accretion of lands do not exist. Data related to sea level near Baker Island currently do not exist or are not documented in the literature reviewed for this plan.

Oceanic Chemical Concentration Change

Glacial and interglacial periods during Earth's history, cycle repeatedly with low and high concentrations of carbon dioxide (as measured from deep Antarctic ice cores). However, recent increases fall outside the range of peak prehistoric carbon dioxide levels. The rate of increase is also 5 to 10 times more rapid than any of the sustained changes in the ice-core record (Vitousek 1994). Carbon dioxide levels have increased from 280 to 355 microliters/liter ($\mu\text{L/L}$) since 1800, a level of increase otherwise never reported during the past 160,000 years. Data suggest this increase is linked to fossil fuel combustion and not deforestation (Vitousek 1994).

Change in carbon dioxide levels will increase the partial pressure of carbon dioxide in seawater, thus reducing the oversaturation of aragonite, a form of calcium carbonate that is the major building block for coral reefs (Vitousek 1994). The result of this is uncertain but is thought to reduce the rate at which corals can deposit calcium carbonate, thus reducing the rate at which coral reefs will be able to keep up with any increases in sea level.

It should also be noted that chemical composition changes in the atmosphere might also affect terrestrial ecosystems. For instance, the quantity of nitrogen available to organisms affects species composition and productivity. Increase in nitrogen can alter species composition by favoring those plant species that respond to nitrogen increases (Vitousek 1994). Increased carbon dioxide can also affect photosynthetic rates in plants, change plant species composition, lower nutrient levels, and lower weight gain by herbivores.

Summary

Coral bleaching has not been documented at Baker but likely occurred in the late 1990s. The buffering effects of the EUC may contribute to corals being less susceptible to bleaching events. Sea level rise is well documented throughout the world's oceans, but local data are lacking. Thus, the magnitude of changes in sea level and the impact this may have on Baker ecosystems is currently speculative. The localized impact of changes in atmospheric and oceanic chemical concentrations is also unknown. While many of the impacts of global climate change currently cannot be documented at Baker, the opportunity exists for Baker, and other equatorial Pacific island refuges to contribute information to improve global predictions and provide a central Pacific baseline to document changes primarily not affected by human impacts such as land use and pollution.

3.4 Geology and Soils

Baker is a low-lying, nearly level island surrounded by a narrow shallow fringing reef and with a broader submerged reef terrace off the east side of the island. The submarine slopes descend steeply to great depths beyond the fringing reefs. Surface deposits on the island consist of calcareous sands and coral rock. A small ponded depression is likely the result of the combined effects of guano mining more than a century ago. The island was likely formed as a result of submarine volcanic activity and changes in the earth's crust caused by continental tectonic plate movement, including emergence of a high volcanic island, its later subsidence, reef accretion,

and its gradual northwesterly drift way from the East Pacific Rise over the past 50-80 million years. Although scientists since Darwin (1842) have been pondering seamount, island, and atoll formation in the Pacific since the mid-1800s, the specifics of how Baker Island was formed have not been specifically investigated although this is now being reviewed by Joyce Miller (in prep.). The specifics likely follow the general sequence first postulated by Darwin.

The dominant theory of atoll formation states that islands form in deep tropical oceans as a result of underwater volcanoes that grow to the surface to form high volcanic islands, giving coral polyps a foundation to grow upon and form reefs fringing the island. In time, the volcano becomes dormant, and its mass pushes down on the earth's crust causing it and its island to subside and shrink in size, while its fringing reefs continue to grow upward and maintain proximity to the sea surface. Coral reefs, originally fringing the edges of a large island, become a barrier reef around larger islands outlining the contour of the original coastline, with a lagoon occupying the space vacated by the shrinking island. Eventually, further subsidence causes the island to disappear completely from the lagoon leaving behind an atoll. However, for small islands such as Baker, lagoons may not have formed at latter stages, and continued subsidence has left only a small low reef island in its wake. Based upon deep drilling through the atolls in the Marshall Islands in the 1940s and 1950s, it is believed that these processes occurred well before the beginning of the last ice age (approximately 115,000 years ago) and encompassed more than 50-70 million years and up to several thousand feet of reef growth equal to the degree of subsidence over that time span. In addition, it is hypothesized that changes in sea level associated with the end of the last ice age and the deposition of highly permeable coralline limestone (calcium carbonate) derived from the remains of marine organisms likely contributed to the carbonate platform that characterizes the contemporary geologic structure of Baker Island.

The western (leeward) shoreline of the island is sandy, while all other sides are covered with coral rubble. There is no pronounced beach crest or central basin (dried up lagoon) typically found on some larger low-lying reef islands. A small borrow pit with an interior island is located near the eastern shore. Soils of low-lying atolls in the Pacific frequently consist of accumulations organic matter, guano, pumice or other transported material on top of a calcareous sand or limestone substratum (Morrison 1990). The soil of Baker Island is composed of coral fragments and light brown coral sand with a low percentage of organic matter.

Hutchinson (1950) concluded that phosphates accumulate preferentially on islands, such as Howland, Baker and Jarvis Islands, that are situated in climatic dry belts used by large populations of seabirds. Deposits of phosphate-rich soils have formed over time from guano deposited on the island by fish-eating seabirds. Mild acids formed from the decomposition of organic matter carry the guano downward in the soil to limestone soil layers where acids are neutralized and calcium phosphate accumulated from the chemical changes. In addition, when guano-beds are exposed to rain their soluble constituents are removed and the insoluble matter is left behind. The soluble phosphates washed out of the guano may also become fixed to the coral sand and limestone by the process described above. The calcium phosphate rocks and soil occur among the sedimentary strata and were the principal sources of phosphate targeted for commercial fertilizer and military use during the guano mining period between 1861 and 1891 (see Chapter 3.15). Even after the guano mining era, the soil profile still contained heavy guano deposits (Christophersen 1927).

3.5 Hydrology

No information is available on the subsurface hydrology of Baker Island. However, its small size and prevailing arid rainfall conditions would not likely result in the formation of a drinkable groundwater lens. During staff visits to Baker, potable water is carried in containers to the island for short visits, and could be produced on-site via reverse osmosis technology for prolonged visits, just as it is now produced for permanent field stations at other remote Pacific island NWRs.

3.6 Air and Water Quality

Due to the lack of human presence, oceanic and air quality are expected to be good and lacking in pollutants. Vapors from abandoned spilled fuel storage drums left behind during the World War II era are likely to be confined to the immediate vicinity of the drums and have probably all volatilized. However, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and other contaminants may have entered the groundwater or nearshore environment. The acoustic environment at Baker is completely natural without any anthropogenic noise except during periodic visits. On the island, dominant natural sounds include the wind, calls of seabird and shorebirds, and seawater lapping on the shoreline with wave action crashing further offshore on the outer reef margin. Underwater the dominant sounds are wave action and surge striking the reef slopes and the sounds of thousands of feeding and moving invertebrates and fish.

3.7 Environmental Contaminants

Debris from past human occupation is scattered throughout the island and in offshore waters. Most of this debris is left from the U.S. military and Coast Guard occupation of the island from 1942-46. The most noticeable remnant remaining from the military is the 150-foot wide, 5,400-foot long airstrip. At the northeast section, apparently the main camp area, are the remains of several buildings and heavy equipment. Five wooden antenna poles about 40 feet in height remain standing in the camp. Several crashed airplanes and large equipment such as bulldozers are scattered around the island. Numerous bulldozer excavations containing the remnants of metal, fuel, and water drums are scattered about the north central portion and northern edge of the island. The Navy reported the loss of 11 landing craft in the surf during World War II (WWII).

Thousands of fuel storage drums, cylinders of pressurized gases, piles of old batteries, cans of waste materials, paints, kerosene, oils, grease, and unidentified substances were left behind by the U.S. military and Coast Guard after occupation during the WWII era. In 1987, the ACOE, sponsored by funds from the Defense Environmental Restoration Program, organized an expedition to Howland and Baker to dispose of the fuel by burning it on-site while in the drums (ACOE 1987). However, ACOE efforts did not completely consume the fuel, and the burning left toxic residues in many of the drums and surrounding soils (Lee Ann Woodward, pers. comm.). Another large source of contamination is rusting steel and iron from various machine parts and drums.

Baker is slowly being evaluated by U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) (EPA ID HI6143690075) for inclusion on the National Priority List (NPL) as directed by the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) (42 U.S.C. s/s 9601 et seq.). The evaluation is due to the large amounts of fuel, debris, and dumps left behind by the military and the Coast Guard when they abandoned the island. While the Service is responsible for monitoring and reporting in a timely fashion, the EPA has allowed an extended evaluation period due to the remoteness of the site. A brief summary of activities relevant to this action follows.

Beginning in 1978, the Service and Coast Guard visited the island and reported several large ditches containing “hundreds” of corroded and leaking 55-gallon drums. Open, upright drums were reported to be fatal traps for red-footed boobies that fell in while roosting on the drum rims. An estimated 25% of the upright drums were reported to contain bird remains. By 1984, the Service filed a “Notification of Hazardous Waste Site” form with EPA. Another joint Service and Coast Guard expedition in 1986 identified 2,758 55-gallon drums of diesel fuel, kerosene, motor oil, and unidentified liquids, and hundreds of smaller containers of powders, grease, paint, and unidentified substances. Most of the drums and other containers had rusted through and spilled their contents, however, 640 55-gallon drums were found to be intact with their original contents (USCG 1986).

Again in 1986, this time with the Service and ACOE personnel, mounted an expedition resulting in burning, in situ, approximately one-third of the wastes identified in previous expeditions. No sampling or cleanup of the remaining ash was done following the waste/fuel burn (ACOE 1987).

In 1988, EPA published the “Federal Agency Hazardous Waste Compliance Docket” in the Federal Register listing Baker as a potential, uncontrolled, “federal facility” hazardous waste site requiring Preliminary Assessment (PA) and Site Investigation (SI) reports within 18 months of being placed on the docket. The EPA submitted a letter to the Service in 1991 requesting the PA and SI reports be completed for Baker. The Service conducted a SI in 1992 to further map and characterize trenches and drums identified from previous investigations. Samples were also collected to satisfy Service reporting requirements to EPA under the provisions of Section 107 of CERCLA. However, no report was filed with EPA. Further investigations by Service contractor, Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation (Foster Wheeler 1998) were deemed by EPA and the Service to be inconclusive.

3.8 Terrestrial Vegetation and Habitats

Baker Island is vegetated with grasses, herbaceous plants, and shrubs. Only strand species able to survive long periods of drought and irregular opportunities to reproduce during the infrequent wet years of the ENSO persist here. By 1924 when Christophersen (1927) did the first thorough survey of Baker Island’s vegetation, there had already been approximately a century of visits by Europeans and guano mining. Despite this traffic and the potential for introductions, Christophersen found 16 species, consisting of 8 native species (*Digitaria pacifica*, *Eragrostis whitneyi*, *Lepturus repens*, *Fimbristylus cymosa*, *Boerhavia* sp., *Portulaca lutea*, *Tribulus cistoides*, and *Triumfetta procumbens*) and 8 that had probably been accidentally introduced. Since then some species have been lost and new wave-carried adventives have resulted in a

modern day total of only 16 species (see Appendix B). Flint and Woodside found 16 species in 1993. It is likely that seeds of additional species are regularly washing up on the beach and then dying back as conditions become too dry or high surf washes the plant away. Table B-3, Appendix B, lists all the plant species of Baker Island, collections or first observations.

3.9 Terrestrial Wildlife

Seabirds, shorebirds, lizards, vegetation, insects, crabs, and alien rats, house mice, and cats have been observed and studied at Baker Island during the current century.

3.9.1 Seabirds and Land Mammals

There are no native land mammals at Baker Island. Numerically dominant vertebrates are seabirds and migratory shorebirds. Earliest ornithological surveys at Baker Island took place long after the introduction of the rat (*Rattus norvegicus*) so the composition of the avian community prior to human contact can only be surmised by looking at other islands in the Phoenix Archipelago that did not suffer the invasion of rats. The rats were present in the 1930s when the Panala'au colonists arrived but they were exterminated some time after 1937 when the colonists introduced cats (Clapp and Sibley 1965). House mice (*Mus musculus*) were not recorded by the Whippoorwill Expedition in 1924 but were mentioned by Rodman in 1935. They persist today and their population size fluctuates with rainfall levels. Cats were introduced in 1937 or 1938 by colonists to control the rats. Additional cats may have been brought during the military occupation. The scientists of the Pacific Ocean Biological Survey Program eradicated most of the cats in 1964 and the last sighting was in 1965. Dogs (*Canis lupus familiaris*) were used to guard the LORAN station, but were removed at the termination of operation (USCG 1946).

The findings of the ornithologist on the Whippoorwill Expedition of 1924, are the only ornithological records prior to 1963, when scientists from the Smithsonian Institution visited eight times between 1963 and 1965. Table B-4 in Appendix B lists species and estimates of numbers for seabird species on all visits since 1973. Munro (1924) found eight species of seabirds breeding in 1924. Cats were introduced during 1935-1942 and the numbers and kinds of seabirds breeding at Baker decreased to four species by 1963 (Sibley and Clapp 1965). After the cats were removed in 1965, the bird populations rebounded, and now 11 species breed there. The three most numerous breeding species at Baker are the lesser frigatebird (*Fregata ariel*), brown noddy (*Anous stolidus*), and sooty tern (*Onychoprion fuscatus*). Table B-4 also indicates the breeding seabird species at Baker.

Several species of concern exist or have the potential to exist on Baker. The Phoenix petrel (*Pterodroma alba*) is considered a bird of National Conservation Concern by the Service and is listed by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) as Vulnerable. The Polynesian storm-petrel (*Nesofregatta fuliginosa*) and blue noddy (*Procelsterna cerulea*) are Birds of Conservation Concern at the regional level (USFWS 2005). Both the Phoenix petrel and the Polynesian storm-petrel probably occurred at Baker Island prior to the introduction of rats.

3.9.2 Shorebirds

Species occurrence and counts of the nine migratory shorebird species recorded from Baker Island are displayed in Table B-4, Appendix B. The four most common migrants wintering at Baker are ruddy turnstone (*Arenaria interpres*), Pacific golden plover (*Pluvialis fulva*), bristle-thighed curlew (*Numenius tahitiensis*), and wandering tattler (*Heteroscelus incanus*). Of all shorebirds reported from Baker, the ruddy turnstone, bar-tailed godwit, sanderling, bristle-thighed curlew and the Pacific golden plover are considered species of High Concern in the national conservation priority scheme for shorebirds (Engilis and Naughton 2004). These islands provide crucial wintering habitat and may also serve as rest-stops for arctic-breeding shorebirds going to winter farther south in the Pacific islands. In addition, the bristle-thighed curlew and Pacific golden plover are recognized in the Birds of Conservation Concern, BCR 68 (USFWS 2002). These islands provide crucial wintering habitat and may serve as rest-stops for arctic-breeding shorebirds wintering farther south in the Pacific islands.

3.9.3 Reptiles

Only two species of terrestrial reptiles have been reported from Baker Island, the snake-eyed skink (*Cryptoblepharus poecilopleurus*) and the mourning gecko (*Leipidodactylus lugubris*). The skink was first reported by Hague in 1862, and the gecko by Bryan in 1935 (cited in Clapp and Sibley 1965). Both species were seen by Flint and Woodside (1993). The green sea turtle (*Chelonia mydas*) and the hawksbill turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata*) have been observed foraging at Baker.

3.9.4 Terrestrial Invertebrates

Baker Island is home to a large number of the land crab *Coenobita perlata*. Their large biomass plays a dominant role in terrestrial food webs on the island where they consume a wide variety of organic matter of all types. Other terrestrial arthropods and mollusks are very poorly known. The entomologist Edward L. Caum visited Baker Island in 1924 and a number of other naturalists collected insects on subsequent trips but there are no published accounts or lists. Recent observations and collections during visits by Service biologists include house flies, small ants, moths and millers, butterflies, spiders, and an earthworm.

3.10 Marine Habitats, Fish, and Wildlife

3.10.1 Previous surveys

Five sets of recent surveys from 2000-2006 have been accomplished in cooperation with the NOAA Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center (PIFSC) and their research vessels (*Townsend Cromwell*, *Oscar Elton Sette*, and *Hi'ialakai*), primarily through the sponsorship of the Center's Coral Reef Ecosystem Division (CRED) (R. Brainard, pers. comm.) The surveys since 2000, are of several types including oceanographic data collection, towed diver surveys, rapid ecological assessments (REA) at stationary sites, and collections of marine animals and plants for

identification and description in the lab. The Service, with assistance from CRED established three permanently marked transects to document trends in corals and some macro-invertebrates over time since 2000. Despite these intense efforts, several important habitats at Baker have not been adequately surveyed, especially below depths of 65 feet. The NOAA collected high resolution bathymetry of Baker from Multi-Beam™ surveys in 2006 (S. Ferguson, pers. comm.), and substantial oceanographic data have been collected since 2000 (R. Brainard, pers. comm.). Remotely operated vehicles (ROVs) have been launched to collect video- and camera-based data at depths greater than 65 feet.

Before 1998, Baker had not been surveyed for corals. About 30 specimens of corals were collected at Baker by Service biologist John Schmerfeld in 1998, and NOAA and the Service sponsored field studies at Baker in 2000, 2001, 2002, 2004, and 2006. Studies through 2002 focused on the collection of biodiversity information and the relative abundance of each coral species at the REA sites. During 2004 and 2006 coral surveys shifted to population censuses following the methodology described in Maragos and coworkers (2004). Maragos accomplished the censuses at eight sites in 2006 and the incidence of coral diseases were assessed at the same sites by Greta Aeby in 2004 and Bernardo Vargas in 2006. Coral population data has also been assessed at three permanently marked transect sites since 2000. In 2006, a deeper (90 feet.) area off the historic western anchorage was examined for metallic debris, including anchors and chains that appear to be degrading corals further upslope.

3.10.2 Submergent Habitats

Baker's shallow marine benthic habitats consist of fringing reef crests, shallow back reefs, steep fore reefs, spurs-and-grooves, and small reef terraces. The last two habitats are restricted to the windward (east side) of the island. In addition, a shallow short channel was blasted through the narrow fringing reef during the pre-World War II era to facilitate small boat access between the shoreline and ocean. Pelagic habitats occur further offshore beyond the influence of upwelling and nearshore oceanographic processes. Nearshore habitats include distinct nutrient-rich upwelling zones off the west side of the island and oligotrophic (nutrient-poor) waters off the windward reefs. The PIFSC is researching the differences between these zones.

3.10.3 Reef Life

The dominant reef life studied during the post-1997 expeditions includes benthic algae (Peter Vroom, Kim Paige pers. comm.) corals and anemones (John Schmerfeld, Jim Maragos, Greta Aeby and Jean Kenyon pers. comm.), other reef invertebrates (Scott Godwin, Dwayne Minton, and Robin Newbold pers. comm.), and reef fishes (Ed DeMartini, Bruce Mundy, Brian Zgliczynski, Brian Green, Richard Wass, Alan Friedlander, Stephanie Holzwarth, and others pers. comm.). Additionally extensive collections of reef fishes were accomplished by Fowler (1927), anon. (1950), Helfrich (1962), Wass (1966), Smithsonian Institution Pacific Ocean Biological Survey (SIPOBS), and others cited in Mundy et al (2002). At the time of this CCP, only data from coral (Table 3.1) and fish surveys (Appendix B) were available for review and compilation. The algae and non-coral invertebrate analyses are not complete enough to provide compilations.

3.10.4 Corals

A total of 91 species and 37 genera of corals and anemones have now been reported from Baker since surveys and collections through 2006, including 32 genera and 82 species of stony corals (Appendix B, Table B-1). One site off the eastern reef terrace demonstrated high coral cover of about 80% with the dominant staghorn coral *Acropora* monopolizing all substrates. An invasive anemone, tentatively identified as *Aptasia* sp. was abundant at most survey sites in 2004, but had totally disappeared by the time of the 2006 surveys. However, the invasive red corallimorph, *Rhodactis howseii*, is now increasing in abundance and expanding its distribution on the reefs at Baker. It appears to be stimulated by dissolved iron from metallic debris.

Coral population data at Baker in 2006 reveal characteristics similar to those reported for Howland in 2006. Coral frequencies (number of corals per square meter) at Baker in 2006 were substantially higher compared to 2004 frequencies at the same three sites in 2004. The largest corals at the same three Baker sites were comparable to 2004 levels, but there was nearly an order of magnitude increase in the numbers of corals for the four smallest size classes and total numbers of corals. The mean percent coral cover also increased at the three sites from 2004 levels averaging 49.8% to 2006 levels averaging 52.9% although the trends were not consistent at the individual site level.

The staghorn and table corals of *Acropora* were common at all research sites, and other corals seemed healthy except at the western anchorage. The bubble-tip anemone (*Entacmaea quadricolor*) was observed for the first time in 2006, and the stone snake coral (*Herpolitha* spp.) was also observed at three REA sites for the first time.

The red invasive corallimorph showed dramatic increases off the west and south coast at historical boat landing and anchorage locations. Corroding iron from anchors and chains may be stimulating the growth of this species as observed elsewhere at Palmyra Atoll adjacent to a shipwreck in 2005-2006, and also observed at the Howland landing site in 2006. The historic western anchorage site appears to be degraded, at both transect depths of 30 and 100 feet. It is the only site at either Howland or Baker that appeared “sick”. Wave action appeared to have fractured some corals, and *Rhodactis* is asserting its dominance, especially at depth. Non-coral substrates are dark and covered by cyanobacteria, also likely stimulated by dissolved iron from the numerous anchors and chains observed at all depths. Sediment samples were collected at the site for toxicological analyses, and photoquadrat data show a steady decline in corals over a 6-year period.

3.10.5 Nearshore Fish

There are approximately 247 species of reef fish known from Baker reefs (Mundy et al. 2002; Table B-2, Appendix B). This compares with 324 species from nearby Howland Island. Moreover, 10 families of fish reported at Howland Island have not been reported from Baker Island, and 6 minor families from Baker have not been reported from Howland Island. Of interest is the presence of several species of goby and scorpion fish families at Howland Island and the lack of these families at Baker Island. Possible explanations for these differences may be that sampling and survey intensities may be insufficient and different between the two islands, or

that geographic isolation may result in differential recruitment rates between the two islands. As noted earlier, not all habitats at Howland have been surveyed to the same degree as those at Baker.

Reef fish populations at Baker appeared healthy and diverse with little indication of unauthorized harvest (Maragos, pers. comm.). However, Maragos, during 2000 surveys noted that there were many small sharks and no larger sharks at both Howland and Baker. In contrast, there were numerous small and some large sharks at both locales by 2004 and 2006. Because “shark finning” (the catching of sharks only to remove their fins for sale) is a growing concern in the Pacific and other oceans, it is possible that the pre-2000 harvest of sharks at Baker resulted in the absence of larger adult sharks in 2000. Larger sharks and additional recruitment by 2004, and lack of subsequent shark fin harvest in the area may explain the more normal size distribution in sharks observed in 2004 and 2006.

The fact that the disparities for the coral genera did not track in the same direction as for the fish families (more coral genera at Baker vs. more fish families at Howland), reinforces the hypothesis of geographic isolation may lead to biodiversity heterogeneity based on chance and differential recruitment success. Geographic isolation would require both corals and reef fish to rely more on local recruitment vis-à-vis external recruitment. The latter would likely play a much larger role where reefs and islands are larger and closer together and result in similar biodiversity characteristics.

3.10.6 Marine Mammals

On most visits to Baker Island, a group of approximately 40 bottle-nosed dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) appears as the ship approaches the island. Formal quantitative surveys of marine mammal distribution and abundance have not been undertaken at the refuge.

3.10.7 Pelagic Wildlife

The estimated hundreds of thousands of seabirds breeding at Baker are primarily pelagic feeders that obtain the fish and squid they consume by associating with schools of large predatory fish such as tuna and billfish (Fefer et al. 1984). While both the predatory fish and the birds are capable of foraging throughout their pelagic ranges (which encompass the entire tropical ocean), the birds are most successful at feeding their young when they can find schools of predatory fish within easy commuting range of the breeding colonies. Recently fledged birds, inexperienced in this complex and demanding style of foraging, rely on abundant and local food resources to survive while they learn to locate and capture prey.

Ashmole and Ashmole (1967) and Boehlert (1993) suggest that the circulation cells and wake eddies found downstream of oceanic islands may concentrate plankton and therefore enhance productivity near islands. Higher productivity in turn results in greater abundance of baitfish, thus allowing higher tuna populations locally. Johannes (1981) describes the daily migrations of skipjack tuna and yellowfin tuna to and from the waters near islands and banks. Protection of these tunas near seabird colonies enhances the ability of birds to provide adequate food for their offspring. Wake eddies also concentrate the larvae of many reef fishes and other reef organisms

and serve to keep them close to reefs, enhancing survivorship of larvae and recruitment of juveniles and adults back to the reefs. For at least three of the nine seabird species breeding at Baker (brown noddy, white tern, and brown booby), significant proportions (33-56 %) of their diet originates from the surrounding coral reef ecosystem in other areas where their diet has been studied (Ashmole and Ashmole 1967; Harrison et al. 1983; King 1970; Diamond 1978).

3.11 Threatened and Endangered Species

Species listed under the Endangered Species Act documented to use Baker include the threatened green sea turtle (*Chelonia mydas*) and endangered hawksbill turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata*), although little information is available on sea turtle populations at Baker. However, both species have been observed and photographed foraging in the shallow water near the island.

3.12 Invasive Species

Human activities at Baker Island have resulted in various non-native species being introduced including the house cat, a rat species, house mouse, various ant and cockroach species, and plants such as coconut palm, tropical almond, ilima, *Portulaca oleracea*, and milo. The cats were introduced in 1937 and finally eliminated in 1965. The rats were documented as early as 1854 and in many accounts were described as extremely abundant.

3.13 Wilderness Resources

Portions of Baker remain in a wilderness state in terms of its biota, seascape, and landscape. However, the collection of abandoned fuel drums, excavations and pits left behind from the guano mining era, the airfield constructed during WWII, and remains from a Coast Guard Long Range Navigation (LORAN) station degrade the wilderness values of the terrestrial portion of Baker. The wilderness values of the marine portion of Baker are influenced by the small section of the reef blasted for a boat passage during the guano-mining era, the potential for 11 loaded LCMs (Marine Landing Craft) lost by the military while landing on the island in the 1940s to be present in the nearshore waters, and abandoned anchors and chain near the western shoreline. However, the collective contribution of these detractors to the marine portion of Baker is minor compared to the otherwise overwhelming wilderness character of the surrounding reefs. Additional wilderness information and evaluation are covered in greater detail in Appendix F.

3.14 Archaeology and Paleontology

Polynesians visited Baker Island prior to its discovery by European navigators (Hague 1862). However, Emory (1925) reported that no traces of Polynesian remains were found on Baker.

Baker has many visible signs and debris of human occupation. Most of the remaining debris is left from the military and Coast Guard occupation of the island from 1942-46. However, there are many remnants of earlier inhabitants. There is a burial ground on the southern portion of the western edge that dates from the guano mining days. A second cemetery, probably dating from WWII, is located on the western ridge north of the lighthouse. The most noticeable remnant

remaining from the military is the airstrip 150 feet wide and 5,400 feet long. At the northeast section, apparently the main camp area, there are the remains of several buildings and pieces of heavy equipment. Five wooden antenna poles about 40 feet in height remain standing in the camp. Several crashed airplanes and large equipment such as bulldozers are scattered around the island. Numerous bulldozer excavations containing the remnants of metal, fuel, and water drums are scattered about the north central portion and northern edge of the island.

An archaeological reconnaissance survey performed on September 18-20, 1987, and consisting of only surface reconnaissance and limited subsurface testing performed as part of a ACOE Defense Environmental Restoration project to inventory and burn fuel in abandoned WWII fuel drums on Baker and Howland Islands (ACOE 1987). The archaeological reconnaissance was conducted prior to the drum collection and burning to avoid possible damage to cultural resources (Shun 1987). This archaeological reconnaissance at Baker in 1987 (Shun 1987) resulted in the identification of 20 surface sites, all less than 200 years old. These include a lighthouse, the remains of the Meyerton settlement, a guano miner's stone structure, a cemetery, mounds, trenches, and runway matting.

Environmental conditions on Baker are inhospitable to lengthy human occupation. A lack of a constant supply of fresh water is the primary limiting factor for habitation by humans. It is conceivable that early prehistoric people could have used Baker Island as a stopping, resting, or gathering place during their voyages across the Pacific Ocean, including capture of nesting sea turtles kept alive for extended food supply during long ocean voyages. However, it is doubtful that voyagers would have willingly settled on this island. Landings in any vessel would have been difficult, although access gained by small canoe is possible. Due to its remoteness and lack of a sustainable freshwater supply, it is likely that Baker played a minimal role, if any, in the colonizing efforts of prehistoric people across the Pacific.

No records were found of paleontological surveys, although paleontological resources could exist in the form of fossilized coral or algae and other invertebrates. The chances of prehistoric indigenous terrestrial mammals inhabiting Baker are non-existent due to the geological forces that formed the island, and its remoteness and dry climate.

3.15 Recent Cultural History

The occupation and use of Baker after post-European contact, approximately AD 1800, can be divided into five distinctive time periods or eras based upon alternating periods of occupation, use, and abandonment. The eras are categorized as whaling, guano mining, colonizing, military, and post military.

Whaling Era: circa AD 1800—1870

Baker has also borne the names New Nantucket and Phoebe. The island was frequently visited by whaling vessels that used the island as a mail drop-off and provisioning station. While the first sighting of the island is unknown, the first name recorded for the island was New Nantucket. This name was given by either Captain Elisha Folger, of Nantucket, who visited the island in the whaler *Equator* in 1818, or by Captain Obed Starbuck on the ship *Loper* in 1825. Finally, in 1832, Michael Baker of New Bedford, Massachusetts gave the name 'Baker' to the island.

Guano Mining Era: 1850-1891

On February 5, 1857, Alfred G. Benson and Charles H. Judd on board the Hawaiian schooner *Liholiho* officially claimed the island under the “Guano Act” of 1856 for the American Guano Company (Bryan 1974). Guano mining on Baker Island was delayed because the ships sent to investigate the guano resources would not land at the island due to severe surf conditions (Clapp and Sibley 1965). While mining on Baker commenced in 1858 by the American Guano Company, formal recognition of their rights to the island did not occur until 1861 due to a mining rights dispute with the United States Guano Company. Mining on Baker Island peaked in the 1860s and 1870s. An estimated 200,000 to 240,000 tons of guano was removed from the island (Clapp and Sibley 1965). Evidence of this era of exploitation still remains as a large basin from mining excavation and mounds of low-grade guano mark the island landscape.

After 17 years of guano mining, Baker Island appears to have been uninhabited. Visits or very brief stopovers no doubt occurred during the interim. The Whippoorwill Expedition sponsored by Bishop Museum paid one such visit in September 1924. This scientific team spent only 1 day on Baker Island.

Colonizing Era: 1935-1942

The establishment of trans-Pacific air routes; territorial ownership disputes over several islands in the Pacific between the United States and the United Kingdom in the early 1900s and the threat of a second world war led to colonizing efforts by the United States on several Pacific islands including Baker Island. Colonizing efforts began in March 1935. Several military personnel and graduates of Kamehameha Schools, Hawaii established a colony on Baker Island (Brown et al. 2002). After initial establishment, the colonists were comprised of Kamehameha graduates and were supplied with enough food, water and other necessities to sustain them “for a period of from six weeks to several months” (Bryan 1974). Water and bulk food were supplied from Hawaii. During this colonizing era, at least 26 trips were made to Baker Island by various Coast Guard cutters.

The colonists erected Meyerton as their place of permanent settlement, with structures for water, food storage, radio equipment, and walls around the main settlement being constructed. Attempts to grow trees, flowers, and vegetables were tried but the conditions were unfavorable for cultivated crops. During this era, a beacon was constructed from the stone slabs from the guano mining houses (Bryan 1974).

Military Era: 1942-1944

The colony on Baker Island continued undisturbed except for routine Coast Guard visits until December 10, 1941. A Japanese submarine surfaced offshore and fired about 30 rounds into the colonists’ installations. A second round of 15 shells was fired later in the day. The shelling destroyed all the buildings except the rain shed and beacon. On December 28, a Japanese plane bombed and machine-gunned the island. The colonists were not injured by these raids and were removed by the destroyer *Helm* on January 31, 1942.

On July 30, 1943, engineer troops of the 7th Army Air Force (AAF) were landed on Baker with equipment and supplies to construct an airstrip to defend the central Pacific islands. In the landing of materials for construction of the base, 11 out of 23 LCMs were damaged or lost in the

surf (Morison 1951). The main portion of the base was constructed by October 1943, including the runway, 5,750 feet long and 150 feet wide, coved in a metal Marston mat, and a 50-foot wide taxi-way made of rolled coral. Approximately 2-3,000 men were stationed on Baker Island during peak operations. The base participated in the Tarawa-Makin operation from November through December of 1943, the airfield being used extensively by B-24s. Military operations ceased thereafter and the island was evacuated in March 1944 (Bryan 1974).

On February 5, 1944, the Coast Guard authorized the construction of the Phoenix LORAN station on Baker Island. Construction began in June 1944, and required 12,000 cubic yards of coral to level off the selected area. Seven Quonset huts left by the AAF were placed on cribbed sleds and hauled about a mile to the station location on the north shore. Sufficient fuel was delivered to the site for the operation of a water distillation unit for over a year. This was one of the first LORAN stations where sentry dogs were used (USCG 1946). Due to high winds, treacherous surf, and torrential rains, landing materials at Baker took 2 weeks. Equipment was aided ashore by lines attached from the LCM to a tractor on shore that would haul the boat onto the beach (Willoughby 1980). The Coast Guard administered the island and LORAN station until it was abandoned in May 1946 (Clapp and Sibley 1965).

Post War Era: 1944 to present

No attempt was made to re-colonize Baker Island after the departure of the Coast Guard, although the Department of the Interior thought of doing so. In 1948, the United States decided that the claim to Baker Island could be effectively maintained by annual Coast Guard visits. Most visits to Baker Island usually occurred in the first four months of the year with the ships' crews completing repairs to the day beacon and taking photographs to establish their presence on the island (Shun 1987).

In March 1963, and for the following 2 years, Smithsonian Institution employees made a number of visits to Baker Island as part of the SIPOBS (Sibley et al. 1965). During this period of investigation by the Smithsonian, a reconnaissance team of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) visited the island. This group arrived on Baker Island on October 18, 1963, conducted their survey for the following 3 days and departed. In addition, a survey by AEC was made of topographical, geological, and oceanographic features of the island (USAEC 1963).

In recent years, sporadic visits have occurred in the form of Coast Guard and NOAA patrols and scientific expeditions. The island and its territorial seas were transferred to the Service in 1974 from the Office of Insular Affairs. This area is now managed as a unit of the System. Refuge staff continue to participate in scientific expeditions, typically aboard NOAA vessels and occurring, on average, once every 2 years since 2000.

3.16 Socioeconomics

Historical Developments

Since whaling days, Baker Island has been used for a variety of commercial enterprises. During the whaling era, it appears that Baker Island served as a port-in-a-storm and possible gathering site for provisions by harvesting seabirds, sea turtles, and their eggs. Fishing for tuna and other

species may also have occurred. The guano-mining era provided the world with a nutrient-rich fertilizer. Baker and other central Pacific islands were exploited for their deep guano deposits.

After the guano mining period, Baker Island was retained by the U.S. Government to aid in transportation and commerce during the mid-1930s. A colony was established on Baker Island to assert U.S. possession by placing four to five men on Baker Island from 1935 to 1942 (Bryan 1974, Brown et al. 2002). Baker Island was used as an U.S. Army airfield from 1943-44. The Coast Guard constructed and staffed a LORAN station from 1944-46. After 1946, there was no further military use of the island, but Coast Guard vessels performed annual patrols to protect U.S. economic interests in the central Pacific.

In modern times, a proposal to use of the island for military/atomic testing was developed in 1963 (USAEC 1963), but the proposal did not materialize for Baker, moving instead to Johnston Island. In 1974, Baker Island and its territorial sea was transferred to the Service as a unit of the System to preserve and restore ecosystem values, focusing on nesting seabird populations

During the past decade, the government of Kiribati requested permission to allow their fishing fleets within Baker Island's 200-mile Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ). Subsequently, the Service working with the U.S. State Department have denied Kiribati's request. There are no current economic uses of Baker, and the island remains unpopulated.

Land Use

Baker has been uninhabited since the World War II era and will remain so except for occupation during periodic field camps. As such, the future "land use" for Baker will likely include designation of a preferred field camp site that will not conflict with important wildlife functions, habitat restoration, cultural sites, or wilderness values or be in a contaminated area. Site planning will also identify corridors for small boat access, footpaths for regular island patrols, study sites, areas designated for solar power and potable water production generation, waste and trash disposal areas, work areas, and other needs.

Public Access

Baker is closed to public access. There has never been, nor are there plans to formally open the refuge to recreational activities by publishing public notice in the Federal Register. However, limited public access of Baker has been authorized in the past. Refuge access is managed through the issuance of a SUP when the activity is deemed compatible and appropriate with the purposes of refuge establishment.

Commercial Fishing

Over the years commercial fishing vessels may have targeted uninhabited Baker for unauthorized and illegal fishing because of the lack of on-site surveillance and enforcement capacity. Baker is habitat to many commercially valuable fishery species including sharks, lobsters, groupers, giant clams, tuna, wahoo, swordfish, deepwater snappers, bumphead parrotfish, humphead wrasses, various aquarium fish, pearl oysters, sea cucumbers, and other species. The no-take mandate and establishment of the refuge predated the applicability of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1996 as amended (16 USC 1361 et seq.) to Baker. Neither the Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council (WESPAC) nor NOAA

Fisheries advocates commercial fishing within Baker, although both share commercial fishery management responsibilities for waters outside the refuge boundaries. The deep slope area outside the refuge is likely too small to support commercial bottomfish harvest especially in light of the long commuting distances between Baker and the home ports of the fishing vessels. However, foreign fishing vessels may target Baker for illegal commercial fishery harvest, and the economic pressure to pursue this option will likely increase in the future as commercial fishing stocks in Asia and the Pacific become more heavily fished and depleted.

This page left intentionally blank.

Chapter 4: Environmental Consequences

4.1 Introduction

All alternatives presented in this document describe varying levels of management activity on Baker Island National Wildlife Refuge (Baker). These range from establishing an overnight field camp once every 2 years and conducting basic biological surveys, to establishing a year-round field camp every 5 years, conducting additional biological and ecological surveys, and basic habitat management practices such as invasive species control and monitoring and remediation of contaminants. Other than infrequent field camps, Baker is unoccupied throughout the year. Permanent infrastructure development is not a component of any alternative. Field camps are temporary, mobile, low-impact, and removed at the end of each field camp season. The few potential adverse impacts are generally temporary, localized, and can be fully mitigated or avoided. As a result, most of the impacts of all alternatives are beneficial and designed to maintain Baker in a natural wilderness state driven by natural process, and to restore native species and habitats that may have been lost in the past.

Alternatives primarily differ in their degree of affording staff visitation and surveillance of the refuge, which in turn have varying degrees of effectiveness on reducing alien and invasive species, unauthorized visitation and harvest, monitoring the status of fish and wildlife, contaminant clean-up, and instituting restoration programs such as the reestablishment of extirpated nesting seabird species. All four alternatives would generally result in some positive impacts to the refuge. However, continuing the existing levels of visitation is not guaranteed and relies on partners being capable and willing to provide transportation for Service staff to Baker and other remote Pacific island refuges. Should partner support curtail or cease, the present level of visitation would be substantially reduced or eliminated along with corresponding increases in adverse effects to refuge fish and wildlife.

The world today is a smaller and more crowded place. In the past Baker and several other remote Pacific island refuges could “take care of themselves” without the need for human intervention. During many past centuries, they benefited from their marginal/inhospitable living conditions, small size, dangerous shore access, and isolation from human population settlements. However, this is no longer the case. During the past 2 centuries, all were visited and exploited for sea turtles and seabird guano, feathers, and eggs. This century found them modified in preparation for global conflict, and more recently disturbed by climate change, invasive species, poachers, anglers, adventurers, and other unauthorized visitors. The overriding management need for Baker, and the other Pacific island refuges is to provide adequate staff visitation and surveillance to mitigate and protect the refuge from these and other forces.

Alternative A, the No Action Alternative, describes the current limited staff visits and management activity on Baker. Alternatives B, C and D provide strategies to increase management activities and use electronic and remote sensing equipment at the refuge to varying degrees. However, a substantial increase in internal Service funding (most likely from Refuge Operating Needs System (RONS)) to implement either Alternative C or D would be required. These two alternatives (C, D) establish a temporary field camp lasting up to 1 year on Baker,

which could result in disturbances to wildlife. However, all possible effects can be mitigated through advanced planning and scientific surveys. Except for minor disturbance to possible historic sites that can be avoided through archaeological and cultural surveys, and minor wildlife disturbance during seasonal field camp missions including containment and removal of contaminants and debris, none of the alternative actions themselves would result in adverse impacts and most all of the remaining effects are positive, although more so for Alternatives C or D. The following sections evaluate the consequences of implementing all the alternatives. Table 4.1 summarizes the similarities among and differences between alternatives.

4.2 Geology and Soils

The geology and soils of Baker and surrounding coral reefs likely would not be affected by any of the alternatives. Field camps, whether overnight, or year-round would consist of temporary shelters (tents) which rest on the surface of the soil, only penetrating where a tent stake has to be driven into the soil in order to stabilize the shelter. Archeological and cultural resource surveys, required of Alternatives C and D before establishment of field camps will disturb soil surface at the location of the survey. Since these surveys will be localized and completed by a trained archeologist, impacts are thought to be minimal. Subsurface surveys will not be required for overnight field camps described in Alternatives A and B. The disturbance to soils from an overnight camp is thought to be minimal since soil texture is either coarse, being composed of sand, or already compacted and dense, being solidified by the soluble phosphates becoming fixed to the coral sand and limestone.

Field camps and biological surveys have a risk of soil compaction along well traveled trails and at campsites. This risk is greater for Alternatives C and D due to the longer length of time that biologists would be present on the island. However, this risk is thought to not have a long term or detrimental impact to the soils or geology of Baker since the soils are either resistant to compaction or already naturally compacted.

The containment and removal of contaminated soil will have a localized effect on already disturbed and degraded soils. Depending upon the results of contaminant surveys, and activities to remediate the contamination, it may be required to physically remove contaminated soils. Archeological and cultural surveys as described above will be conducted prior to any soil removal activities. While soils may be removed, contaminated soils pose a threat to human visitors and wildlife. Therefore, any effort to contain and remove contaminated soils and debris will have a beneficial effect on the integrity and environmental health of Baker.

4.3 Air and Water Quality

4.3.1 Air Quality

None of the alternatives (A-D) likely would have any measurable or long-term impact on air quality. Air quality over the ocean and on the island is pristine, and none of the alternatives would affect the pristine atmospheric character of Baker.

Indirectly, ship traffic to and from Baker and local boat traffic would generate noise, some exhaust emission and lights at night, which could disturb some light sensitive bird species, such as adult and fledgling petrels and boobies. These effects can be fully avoided or minimized by establishing night-time operating procedures for ships. Small boats and skiffs operating during the field camps will use outboard engines generating low noise levels and emissions (e.g., four-stroke engines with properly fitted cowlings), regularly maintained and complying with appropriate air quality emission guidelines.

4.3.2 Water Quality and Ocean Environment

Marine water quality and ambient currents, swells, waves, and tidal fluctuations will not be affected by any of the alternatives. No disposal of waste in the ocean is required for any alternative. No physical modifications of the shoreline are proposed as part of any alternative. To the contrary, more frequent marine debris and shoreline flotsam collections during field camp operations, and the removal of contaminants from the environment for Alternatives C and D will result in beneficial effects to coastal and marine environments. Only minor effects to the non-potable groundwater of Baker are expected during temporary field camp operations from human waste disposal. These effects could be mitigated by using composting toilets, or removing human waste via sealable chemical toilets.

4.4 Biological Resources

4.4.1 Terrestrial Habitats and Wildlife

General

All alternatives impacts would have net benefits to terrestrial and marine wildlife including vegetation, insects, crabs, insects, reptiles, seabirds, shorebirds, fish, and corals. However, Alternatives C and D would result in comparatively more benefits than Alternatives A and B. Alternative B would be similar in scope to Alternative A, but occur more frequently. More frequent and thorough staff visits would improve detection rates of, and response to invasive plants and animals. All action alternatives (B-D) propose to re-establish breeding populations of two rare petrel species. Remote sensing capacity under Alternatives C and D would allow rapid detection of unauthorized trespassers and discourage others from visiting Baker without prior permission from the Service. In turn, these added capabilities would reduce the threat of invasive species introductions via the clothing, shoes, supplies, and vessels of possible trespassers.

Two of the alternatives (C and D) would increase the human presence on and management of Baker, especially the terrestrial environment. Wildlife disturbance would increase as staff and scientists move about on patrols, conduct research, monitor contaminated sites, remove possible invasive species, erect tents and other camp facilities, gather and dispose of waste, collect accumulated floating and emergent marine debris, and restore some habitats. Removal of contaminants would disturb the soils, vegetation, and wildlife in the immediate vicinity. However, human visitors and wildlife would ultimately benefit from the removing contaminated soils. These activities would be scheduled and located on the island where disturbance would be temporary and localized. Even under any possible scenario, the degree of detrimental effects

would be minor and outweighed by the benefits of having a fully functional field camp on the island.

Habitat

With the potential exception of contaminant remediation activities, there will be minor and temporary disturbance to terrestrial habitats under all alternatives. All field camps, regardless of duration, will create a 'footprint', or disturbed area surrounding the camping and cooking area. Impacts may be trampling of vegetation or covering vegetation with tents or tarps. These impacts can be reduced or eliminated by selecting field camp sites with limited or no vegetation. The footprint of the field camp described in Alternative A and B has less chance of impacting habitat due to the shorter time period that biologist would be on-site. Since there will be little to no soil surface disturbance, vegetation will fully recover once field camp is demobilized.

In the event that a suitable funding source is secured, and contaminant remediation activities occur, localized habitat will be negatively impacted by the removal of soils. Site restoration of vegetation and soil structure will be a component of any contaminant remediation activity. Thus, the benefits of the removal of contaminated soil and debris will outweigh the localized and temporary disturbance to habitat.

Seabirds

Alternatives A and B would have a temporary (1 to 2 days per year or every other year) disturbance to nesting seabirds due to biologists conducting surveys and establishing a field camp. These disturbances will be minimized by locating field camps away from nesting colonies, and only approaching nesting colonies to collect scientific data such as species presence, population numbers, and nesting activity. Alternatives C and D, seasonal and year-long field camps respectively would have increasingly more potential disturbance simply from staff being present on the island. However, these disturbances will be minimized in the same manner as for Alternatives A and B. The additional survey components of Alternatives C and D of nesting success and nesting chronology will require biologists to enter the seabird breeding colony. Precautions such as limited time spent in the colony, and collecting/observing a representative sample instead of the entire colony will limit disturbances. Under all alternatives, these minor disturbances are temporary in nature and will not affect Baker's resources once the field camps are demobilized.

Seabird nest attraction devices, if successful in attracting Phoenix petrel and Polynesian storm-petrel to Baker, will provide these populations with an additional nesting location free from mammalian predators. It is difficult to predict the overall impact that reestablishment of nesting by these species on Baker will have on their overall population status. However, since predator-free islands in the Pacific are rare, predator-free islands such as Baker are becoming more important to ground nesting seabird species such as the Phoenix petrel and Polynesian storm-petrel.

Shorebirds

All alternatives will have minimal impact to shorebird resources. Biological surveys and field campsites have the potential to displace or disturb shorebird loafing and foraging sites.

However, the relative impact of human activity and imprint of the field camp to areas that shorebirds utilize is minimal.

Reptiles

Management activities such as biological surveys and campsites described in all the alternatives will have minimal impact to reptile resources since the estimated area of the field camp and survey routes (approximately 1 acre) is a minor percent (approximately 0.15%) of the overall habitat available to reptiles on the island. While biological surveys and campsites have the potential to displace or disturb reptiles, there are ample other areas of suitable habitat.

Invertebrates

Management activities such as biological surveys and campsites described in all the alternatives will have minimal impact to the land invertebrates resources, specifically land hermit crabs, since the estimated area of the field camp and survey routes (approximately 1 acre) is a minor percent (approximately 0.15%) of the overall habitat available to land hermit crabs on the island. While biological surveys and field camp sites have the potential to displace or disturb invertebrates, there are ample other areas of suitable habitat.

4.4.2 Marine Habitats, Fish, and Wildlife

General

Marine fish, wildlife, and submergent habitats would not be adversely affected by any of the alternatives. The increased on-site visitation proposed for Alternatives B, C, and D would discourage poaching and unauthorized harvest of sharks, giant clams, other reef fish, corals and other invertebrates, sea turtles, and other species used in the aquarium trade. All alternatives would maintain Baker as closed to recreational and commercial fishing and harvesting, except for those activities authorized by a Special Use Permit (SUP). Greater presence and enhanced monitoring of selected marine species during field camp operations would result in better understanding and protection of corals and other key marine species. Enhanced marine assessment and monitoring would also allow early detection and control of marine invasive species. Therefore, the net result of the proposed action would be slightly beneficial for marine fish and wildlife while the other action alternatives would have greater benefit.

Corals

All alternatives have potential to disturb corals during field camp deployment and demobilization. Small boat operations will necessarily cross shallow water reef areas to reach the shoreline of the island. During periods of calm seas, natural and manmade cuts in the reef allow safe passage of small boats. However, the potential exists for strong currents, surf, or wind to push boats onto the reef. Boats will not be allowed to land on the island during unsafe conditions, thereby limiting the threat of reef damage. Anchorage of transport vessel also poses a threat to corals. To the extent possible, transport vessels are requested not to anchor, but rather stay stationary during deployment and demobilization. If anchoring is required, anchors will be placed in deep water areas devoid of coral cover. Thus, impacts to coral are expected to be minimal.

Marine surveys also have the potential to disturb corals. Inattentive snorkel and SCUBA activities have the risk of equipment contacting coral. Alternatives C and D, with their increased marine surveys have a greater risk than Alternatives A and B. However, this threat is minimal since trained scientists will conduct all marine surveys.

Fish

All alternatives will have minimal opportunity to impact fish resources. Recreational, sustenance, and commercial fishing activity is prohibited on the refuge, and will continue to be prohibited across all alternatives.

Marine Mammals

Marine mammals are found in the nearshore waters of Baker. Encounters with vessels are only possible during transport to island or conduct of marine surveys. While this threat increases for Alternatives C and D, this threat is minimal due to the very limited amount of time vessels would have the opportunity to disturb marine mammals. Having full-time access to a vessel, as described in Alternative D would provide the opportunity to conduct specific surveys for marine mammals and would add to the baseline of scientific information on their use of Baker. All other alternatives utilize vessels strictly for transport and do not appreciably add to our baseline of scientific information.

Marine Turtles

Impacts to marine turtles are reported in the following section, 4.4.3 Threatened and Endangered Species.

4.4.3 Threatened and Endangered Species

The threatened green sea turtle and endangered hawksbill sea turtle will not be negatively affected by any of the proposed alternatives. During the infrequent visits to Baker, these species may encounter small boats during field camp deployment and demobilization, or larger vessels during arrivals and departures. The probability of a sea turtle being struck by a boat during these infrequent events, roughly semiannually, is very low. Small boat operations will be limited to minimum safe operating speeds to minimize any risk that may exist. There would be no effect to sea turtles caused by monitoring activities on the island. Any turtles found to be loafing on exposed shoreline are easily avoided. Those seen during marine surveys are equally easy to avoid. Alternatives A and B provide limited opportunity to improve our understanding of the turtles habitat use. The short length of time of these field camps allow for only casual observations of turtles. Longer term field camps described in Alternatives C and D would provide more opportunity for observing turtles. Additionally, full-time access to a vessel as described in Alternative D would increase the opportunity to survey for turtles. Even so, the anticipated amount of survey data would not considerably increase our knowledge base of turtle use of Baker. No specific surveys are planned. Remote sensing or the physical presence of the field camp would help to discourage any potential illegal take. Unauthorized harvest would be especially unlikely during the 1-year-long field camp established every fifth year at Baker under Alternative D. None of the actions described in any of these alternatives will have impacts to the two listed turtle species. Therefore, formal consultation with National Oceanic and Atmospheric

Administration- National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA-NMFS), in accordance with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 is not required and will not be initiated.

4.5 Wilderness Resources

The wilderness values of Baker would not be adversely affected by any of the alternatives. Although wilderness is not being proposed for the terrestrial component of Baker, no permanent structures, roads, or other features would be constructed. The proposed field camp under all alternatives would be temporary, dismantled, and removed after each field camp. This temporary field camp and the activities associated with its operation would be considered the “minimum tool”, as defined in the Draft Wilderness Stewardship Policy pursuant to the Wilderness Act of 1964 (66 FR 3708). Alternatives C or D may also improve the wilderness character of the island by removing contaminated soils and other debris that currently limits the terrestrial component of meeting wilderness criteria, as defined in the Wilderness Act.

4.6 Cultural Resources

Cultural resources at Baker may include archaeological and historic sites. The Baker day beacon, cemeteries, guano mining borrow pits, and ruins of colonization era occupations are apparent on the surface but many of the archaeological sites may be subsurface or in the marine environment and not apparent except to trained archeologists. Deployment of field camps has limited potential to impact subsurface archeological or historical resources. Alternatives A and B would have the least potential to disturb archeological or cultural resources due to the limited staff time on-island and transient nature of the field camps. Prior to establishment of field camps, or conduct of contaminant remediation activities for Alternative C or Alternative D, archaeological reconnaissance surveys with limited sub-surface testing will be used to identify the precise locations of all sites and afford preliminary assessment of their nature, function, and significance of any cultural sites. Field campsites would be situated to avoid effecting any identified sites. Consequently all alternatives would have minimal to no long-term effects. Other management activities such as biological surveys, invasive species control, or marine debris collection and removal would likewise have limited potential to impact cultural resources. In this manner, impacts to cultural resources would be very unlikely for Alternatives A and B, and minor and avoidable for Alternatives C and D. Under Alternatives C and D, only trained archeologists will complete archeological and cultural surveys. Surveys will only be used to document the presence or absence of artifacts.

4.7 Economic Effects

Baker is currently managed with a portion of several Pacific Remote Island National Wildlife Refuge Complex employees staff time. Taken collectively under Alternative A, staff time devoted to Baker is approximately 0.2 permanent position in a given year. Alternative B increases this amount to approximately 0.3 permanent position. Implementing Alternatives C and D would increase the staffing needs by approximately two additional annual permanent salaries. None of the positions or portions of positions, beyond the current 0.2 permanent position is funded. It would be possible to adjust position duties of existing staff to cover the increase

needed to implement Alternative B. Additional funding would be required to implement Alternatives C or D.

4.8 Environmental Justice

Executive Order 12898 requires all Federal agencies to address and identify, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations, low-income populations, and Indian Tribes in the United States. There are no populations, minority, low-income, or otherwise, in the vicinity of Baker. The nearest inhabited land mass to Baker is Kiritimati Island, 184 nmi to the north. The nearest inhabited U.S. landmass is Hawaii at 1,690 nmi. Due to the extensive distances between human populations and Baker, no adverse human health or environmental effects were identified for minority or low-income populations, Indian Tribes, or anyone else.

4.9 Cumulative Effects

Overall, there are minimal long-term adverse impacts to the terrestrial or marine resources of Baker. Vegetation disturbed during field camp operations will fully recover during subsequent seasons when field camps are not present. Precautions will limit disturbance to seabird colonies. There will be no permanent facilities or survey markers erected. All trash will be collected and removed from the island at the end of all field camp seasons. Contaminant remediation activities will benefit the overall integrity and environmental health of the ecosystem. Aside from the potential establishment of nesting seabird species, there will be no physical sign that any of these alternatives has been implemented. The only other beneficial affects or impacts will be knowledge gained through the collection and dissemination of scientific information. Considered in their totality, the adverse or beneficial impacts of any alternative to the physical, observable resources of Baker will not be noticeable and thus insignificant.

Table 4.1 Summary of Effects under CCP Alternatives

	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Physical Environment Effects				
Geology and Soils	Neutral effect. Coarse soils and infrequent site visits preclude effects of disturbance.	Neutral effect. Although frequency of site visits increases, the level of visitation still precludes the effects of disturbance.	Minor but temporary negative effect due to soil compaction and disturbance along established trails.	Minor but temporary negative effect due to soil compaction and disturbance along established trails.
Air and Water Quality	Minor but temporary negative effect from noise and exhaust emission of transport and local boat traffic.	Minor but temporary negative effect from noise and exhaust emission of transport and local boat traffic.	Slight negative effect due to field camp operations and limited use of gas-powered generator. Minor but temporary negative effect from transport and local boat traffic remain constant with other alternatives.	Slight negative effect due to field camp operations and limited use of gas-powered generator increases slightly over Alternative C. Minor but temporary negative effect from transport and local boat traffic remain constant with other alternatives.
Environmental Contaminants	Neutral effect. Known contamination exists, but minimal action taken to monitor or remediate. Potential exists for fuel spills during deployment and demobilization of field camp.	Neutral effect. Known contamination exists, but minimal action taken to monitor or remediate. Potential exists for fuel spills during deployment and demobilization of field camp.	Potential positive benefit (funding dependent) to survey, monitor, and remediate known and unknown contaminated sites. Potential exists for fuel spills during deployment/demobilization of field camp.	Potential positive benefit (funding dependent) to survey, monitor, and remediate known and unknown contaminated sites. Potential exists for fuel spills during deployment/demobilization of field camp.

	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Effects to Wildlife and Habitat				
Terrestrial Habitats	Neutral to slightly positive effect. Habitat management limited to eliminate entrapment hazards due to debris.	Neutral to slightly positive effect. Habitat management limited to eliminate entrapment hazards due to debris.	Moderately positive effect. Habitat management includes elimination of entrapment hazards and removal of marine debris.	Moderately positive effect. Habitat management includes elimination of entrapment hazards and removal of marine debris.
Invasive Species	Neutral effect. Invasive species documentation occurs during course of other duties. Potential negative effect exists for invasive species to become established during 2-year staff absence between visits.	Neutral effect. Invasive species documentation occurs during course of other duties. Potential negative effect reduced for invasive species to become established during 1- year staff absence between visits.	Moderately positive effect. Surveys and control activities of invasive species occur annually during the 4-month field camp.	Slightly positive effect. Surveys and control activities of invasive species occur every fifth year. Duration of field camp (12-month) compensates for increased time between field camps.
Seabirds	Neutral effect. Basic monitoring of species presence/absence occurs biannually.	Slightly positive effect. Basic monitoring of species presence/absence occurs annually. Electronic calls have potential positive effect to restore 2 nesting seabird species.	Moderate positive effect. Expanded monitoring activities increase scientific understanding of seabird biology. Electronic calls have potential positive effect to restore 2 nesting seabird species.	Moderate positive effect. Expanded monitoring activities increase scientific understanding of seabird biology. Electronic calls have potential positive effect to restore 2 nesting seabird species.
Shorebirds	Neutral effect. No change from current condition.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Other Wildlife	Neutral effect. No change from current condition.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Marine Habitats	Neutral effect. No change from current condition.	Neutral to minor positive effect. Potential positive effect of deep water surveys to increase understanding of marine ecosystem.	Neutral to minor positive effect. Potential positive effect of deep water surveys to increase understanding of marine ecosystem.	Neutral to minor positive effect. Potential positive effect of deep water surveys to increase understanding of marine ecosystem.
Corals	Potential slight negative effect by grounding during deployment and demobilization of field camps. Standardized surveys conducted.	Potential slight negative effect by grounding during deployment and demobilization of field camps. Standardized surveys conducted.	Potential slight negative effect by grounding during deployment and demobilization of field camps. Positive effect of increased surveys to increase understanding of corals, but potential slight negative effect from observer disturbance/ damage to corals.	Potential slight negative effect by grounding during deployment and demobilization of field camps. Positive effect of increased surveys to increase understanding of corals, but potential slight negative effect from observer disturbance/ damage to corals.
Fish	Neutral effect. No change from current condition.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Marine Mammals	Neutral effect. No change from current condition.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Moderate positive effect. Full time access to vessel allows for additional surveys.
Threatened and Endangered Species	Neutral effect. No change from current condition.	Same as Alternative A.	Slight positive effect. Increased opportunity to survey.	Moderate positive effect. Increased opportunity to survey.
Social and Other Effects				
Wilderness Resources	Neutral effect. No change from current condition.	Neutral effect. Wilderness Study Areas	Neutral effect. Wilderness Study Areas identified for	Neutral effect. Wilderness Study Areas identified for

	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
	Wilderness values exist, but no wilderness designation.	identified for both terrestrial and marine areas of refuge.	both terrestrial and marine areas of refuge.	both terrestrial and marine areas of refuge.
Historic and Cultural Resources	Neutral effect. No change from current condition.	Same as Alternative A.	Minor positive effect. Cultural resource survey required prior to field camp establishment. Maintenance of historical structures possible.	Minor positive effect. Cultural resource survey required prior to field camp establishment. Maintenance of historical structures possible.
Socio-Economic	Neutral effect. No change from current condition.	Neutral to slight positive effect due to increased operational expenditures.	Moderate positive effect due to increased operational expenditures.	Moderate positive effect due to increased operational expenditures.
Environmental Justice	Neutral effect.	Neutral effect.	Neutral effect.	Neutral effect.
Cumulative Effects	Neutral effect.	Slight positive effect. Scale and scope of most management activities do not change from Alternative A.	Moderate positive effect. Greater scientific understanding of marine and terrestrial ecosystems is achieved. No long-term changes in habitat occur.	Moderate positive effect. Greater scientific understanding of marine and terrestrial ecosystems is achieved. No long-term changes in habitat occur.

Chapter 5: Consultation and Coordination with Others

5.1 Consultation and Coordination with Others

This section describes consultation and coordination efforts with the public, interested groups, and other agencies.

Planning Updates

The first Planning Update was mailed to 249 private individuals; nongovernmental organizations; local, state, Federal and international governments; and members of the media throughout the Pacific on October 12, 2005. The comment period identified in the Planning Update closed on November 14, 2005. This update announced the intent of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) to produce a Comprehensive Conservation Plan (CCP) for Baker Island National Wildlife Refuge (Baker), and invited comments on issues and concerns and interest in attending public meetings. A total of five responses were received.

A second planning update was mailed on May 17, 2006. This update announced the development of a list of alternatives and solicited comments on the draft alternatives. This update was mailed to 253 private individuals; non-governmental organizations; local, state, Federal and international governments; and members of the media throughout the Pacific. To date, no responses have been received.

Agency and Interest Group Consultation/Coordination

Members of the planning team met with National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) staff and the Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR) on May 31, 2005. Refuge staff also met with members of The Nature Conservancy on June 2, 2005. Both NOAA and DLNR informally indicated that they were interested in the process, wished to be kept informed of planning progress and would review the draft plan when it became available.

A second meeting between State, NOAA, and Service staff was held on May 19, 2006, to discuss issues of mutual interest, which included their potential involvement in the Service's CCP process. A follow-up formal request was sent to the agencies on June 7, 2006. To date, neither DLNR nor NOAA has formally responded.

Federal Register Notices

The Notice of Intent to prepare a CCP for these refuges was published in the Federal Register on September 14, 2005. Public involvement was sought throughout the planning process using meetings, newsletters, and other communication tools.

Baker is uninhabited and an unincorporated U.S. territory far removed and beyond the jurisdiction of any State, insular area, or foreign nation. Other parties involved in correspondence related to this document included multiple nongovernmental organizations, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; National Park Service; U.S. Geological Survey; U.S. Department of Defense; President's Advisory Council on Historic Preservation; NOAA; Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council; Hawaii Department of Land and Natural

Resources; Hawaii Office of Hawaiian Affairs; Governor of Hawaii; the Honorary Consulate-General of the Republic of Kiribati; and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

Appendix A

Glossary of Terms and Acronyms

ACOE. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

AEC. Atomic Energy Commission

Alien species. Non-native species intentionally or accidentally introduced into habitats of the refuge.

Atoll. A tropical reef formation with a shallow water lagoon, surrounding perimeter reef, and reef islet(s).

Baker. Used alone in this report, it refers to the Baker Island National Wildlife Refuge.

CCP. Comprehensive Conservation Plan.

CCP/EA. A document that combines a Comprehensive Conservation Plan and an Environmental Assessment.

CERCLA. Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act

CFR. Code of Federal Regulations. A comprehensive directory of all Federal regulations.

CITES. Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora.

Comprehensive Conservation Plan. A document that describes the desired future conditions of the refuge, and provides long-range guidance and management direction for the refuge manager to accomplish the purposes of the refuge, contribute to the mission of the System, and to meet other relevant mandates (Service Manual 602 FW 1.5).

CPWHP. Central Pacific World Heritage Project.

CRED. The Coral Reef Ecosystem Division of NOAA's Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

DERA. Defense Environmental Restoration Act

DERP. Defense Environmental Restoration Program.

DLNR. Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources.

DMA. Defense Mapping Agency.

EEZ. Exclusive Economic Zone.

EIS. Environmental Impact Statement. NEPA documentation that assesses the impacts of major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.

Environmental Assessment. A concise public document, prepared in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act, that briefly discusses the purpose and need for an action, alternatives to such action, and provides sufficient evidence and analysis of impacts to determine whether to prepare an environmental impact statement or finding of no significant impact (40 CFR 1508.9).

ENSO. El Niño Southern Oscillation; a periodic ocean warming anomaly in the tropics.

EPA. Environmental Protection Agency

EUC. Equatorial Undercurrent; a subsurface ocean current flowing east at the Equator.

Federal Register (FR). Official bulletin publicizing notices of Federal actions.

FUDS. Formerly Used Defense Site

FMPs. Fishery Management Plans for commercial fisheries in Federal waters.

FONSI. Finding of No Significant Impact; a Federal agency notice and preliminary decision that its proposed action would not require preparation of an EIS.

GIS. Geographic information system; a database integrating tabular and geographic data.

GPS. Global Positioning System; satellite-based for accurate geographic/site positioning.

Howland. Used alone in this report, it refers to the Howland Island National Wildlife Refuge.

Hydrophone. Underwater microphone or listening device.

Improvement Act. The National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997 amendment to the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966.

Insular Area. The current generic term used to refer to a United States possession, territory, Territory, freely associated state, or commonwealth under United States sovereignty.

Invasive Species. Either an alien or native species that spreads, or achieves dominance quickly, resulting in undesirable effects on native species and their habitats

ITCZ. Inter-tropical Convergence Zone; approximately along 5° N Latitude where the northeast and southeast tradewinds collide, rise, and create a zone of heavy rainfall and low winds; also known as the doldrums.

IUCN. International Union for the Conservation of Nature.

Jarvis. Used alone in this report, it refers to the Jarvis Island National Wildlife Refuge.

LEIS. Legislative Environmental Impact Statement. See EIS.

LORAN. Long Range Aid to Navigation

MBTA. Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

Mesoscale Eddy. A circular flow of water near an island or reef, roughly 10 to 100 nm in diameter caused by the wake of currents passing the reef or island.

μ L. Micro liter, or one-millionth of a liter.

NEC. North Equatorial Current, west-flowing surface current between 5-30°N Latitude.

NECC. North Equatorial Countercurrent; east-flowing surface current under the ITCZ.

NEPA. National Environmental Policy Act; establishes procedures requiring all Federal agencies to assess the environmental consequences of their actions.

NMI. Nautical mile; the equivalent of 1.15 statute (land) mile.

NMFS. The National Marine Fisheries Service of NOAA.

NOAA. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

NPS. National Park Service.

NWR. National Wildlife Refuge.

NWRS. National Wildlife Refuge System.

Oligotrophic. Waters having low levels of the mineral nutrients required by green plants. At Howland, this refers to the transparent zone of nutrient-poor shallow tropical waters, bounded by a thermocline serving as a barrier against exchange with deeper nutrient-rich waters.

Phenology. The study of periodic biological phenomena, such as breeding, flowering, and migrations, especially as related to climate.

Preferred Alternative. This is the alternative determined [by the decision maker] to best achieve the refuge purpose(s), vision, and goals; contributes to the System mission, addresses the issues; and is consistent with principles of sound fish and wildlife management.

Proposed Action. Preferred Alternative among several evaluated to comply with NEPA.

Quadrat. A rigid frame used by ecologists to facilitate unit area estimates of the size and density of surface-dwelling plants and animals; **Photo-quadrat.** A photograph of the area inside the quadrat to allow office data analysis after field staff visits.

PIFSC. NOAA's Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.

REA. Rapid ecological assessments.

Reef Island. Low tropical islet resting on a coral reef and consisting of reef rock and sand.

RO. Reverse Osmosis

RONS. Refuge Operating Needs System; Service program for NWR operating funds.

ROV. Remotely operated vehicle; mobile un-manned device for collecting deep-sea data.

SAMMS. Service Asset Maintenance Management System; Service program to provide funds to maintain refuge property.

SEC. South Equatorial Current; westward-flowing ocean current driven by the southeast tradewinds between Latitudes 5° N and 30° S.

Secretary. The Secretary of the Interior.

Service. Used alone in this report, it refers to the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

SI. Site Investigation

SIPOBS. Smithsonian Institution Pacific Ocean Biological Survey.

SUP. Special Use Permit; written Service approval and conditions for conducting an activity in a refuge.

System. Used alone in this report, it refers to the National Wildlife Refuge System.

Thermocline. In oceans, it is a depth zone of rapid density and temperature change serving as a barrier between mixing of shallow warmer surface and deeper subsurface waters.

Transect. A linear scientific field survey sampling design or area to facilitate repeatability, standard units of measurement, and future site relocation and resurvey.

UNESCO. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

USCG. United States Coast Guard.

U.S. Possession. Equivalent to *U.S. territory*. It is no longer current colloquial usage.

U.S. Territory. An incorporated United States insular area, of which only one currently exists, Palmyra Atoll, in which the United States Congress has applied the full body of the United States Constitution.

U.S. territory. A United States insular area in which the United States Congress has determined that only selected parts of the United States Constitution apply.

WESPAC. Western Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Council.

WSA. Wilderness Study Area.

World Heritage Property. A protected and inscribed natural and/or cultural site with “outstanding universal value” and meeting one or more of the eligibility criteria of the International Convention on World Heritage.

This page left intentionally blank.

Appendix B

Species Lists of Corals, Fish, Vegetation and Birds

Table B-1: FAMILIES, *genera*, common names, and number of species/genus for corals and other cnidarians reported from Baker Island NWR 1998-2006. After Maragos (2000-2003, 2004, 2006), and Maragos & Schmerfeld (1998).

Scientific Name	Common Name	Number of Species
MILLEPORIDAE		
<i>Millepora</i>	fire coral	1
POCILLOPORIDAE		
<i>Pocillopora</i>	antler coral and cauliflower corals	3
ACROPORIDAE		
<i>Acropora</i>	table and staghorn corals	23
<i>Astreopora</i>	crater coral	1
<i>Montipora</i>	rice and plate corals	10
PORITIDAE		
<i>Porites annae</i>	lobe corals	5
AGARICIIDAE		
<i>Gardineroseris</i>	honeycomb coral	1
<i>Leptoseris</i>	deep encrusting coral	1
<i>Pachyseris</i>	combed plate coral	1
<i>Pavona</i>	star and corrugated corals	4
FUNGIIDAE		
<i>Cycloseris</i>	small mushroom coral	1
<i>Fungia</i>	mushroom coral	4
<i>Halomitra</i>	giant basket coral	1
<i>Herpolitha</i>	stone snake coral	1
<i>Sandalolitha</i>	oval mushroom coral	1
MUSSIDAE		
<i>Acanthastrea</i>	spiny encrusting coral	1
<i>Lobophyllia</i>	spiny lobe coral	1
<i>Symphyllia</i>	spiny brain coral	1
MERULINIDAE		
<i>Hydnophora</i>	pedestal coral	1
FAVIIDAE		
<i>Cyphastrea</i> sp.	small walled brain coral	1
<i>Diploastrea</i>	star brain coral	1
<i>Echinopora</i>	encrusting brain coral	1
<i>Favia</i>	circular brain corals	3
<i>Favites</i>	honeycomb brain coral	2

Scientific Name	Common Name	Number of Species
<i>Leptastrea bewickensis</i>	incrusting brain coral	2
<i>Montastrea</i>	large walled brain corals	2
<i>Platygyra</i>	true brain corals	2
DENDROPHYLLIIDAE		
<i>Cladopsammia</i>	slender yellow tube coral	1
<i>Tubastraea</i>	common tube coral	1
<i>Turbinaria</i>	cabbage coral	1
<i>Rhizopsammia</i>	rhizome tube corals	1
DISCOSOMATIDAE		
<i>Rhodactis</i>	skeleton-less corals	1
SIDERASTREIDAE		
<i>Coscinaraea</i>	sandpaper corals	2
<i>Psammocora</i>	granulated corals	4
ACTINARIA		
<i>Aptasia</i>	stalked anemone	1
<i>Entacmaea</i>	bubble-tip anemone	1
<i>Heteractis</i>	magnificent anemone	1
ZOANTHIDEA		
<i>Palythoa tuberculosa</i>	rubber coral	1

Table B-2: Fish species and genera collected from or observed at Baker Island from 1927-2002. Collected or compiled by Mundy et al. (2002).

Scientific Name	Common Name
CARCHARHINIDAE	Requiem Sharks
<i>Carcharhinus amblyrhynchos</i> (Bleeker 1856)	grey reef shark
<i>Carcharhinus melanopterus</i> (Quoy & Gaimard 1824)	reef black-tip shark
HEMIGALEIDAE	Weasel Sharks, White-tip Reef Sharks
<i>Triaenodon obesus</i> (Rüppell 1837)	white-tip reef shark
SPHYRNIDAE	Hammerhead Sharks
<i>Sphyrna mokarran</i> (Rüppell 1837)	great hammerhead shark
<i>Sphyrna</i> sp.	unidentified <i>Sphyrna</i> species
DASYATIDAE	Sand Rays
<i>Taeniura meyeri</i> (Müller & Henle 1841)	giant sand ray
MYLIOBATIDAE	Eagle Rays
<i>Manta</i> sp.	unidentified <i>Manta</i> species
MURAENIDAE	Moray Eels
<i>Echidna nebulosa</i> (Ahl 1789)	snowflake moray
<i>Gymnomuraena zebra</i> (Shaw in Shaw & Nodder 1797)	zebra moray
<i>Gymnothorax bredini</i> (McCosker & Randall 1977)	Breeden's moray
<i>Gymnothorax flavimarginatus</i> (Rüppell 1830)	yellow-margined moray
<i>Gymnothorax rueppelliae</i> (McClelland 1844)	yellow-headed moray
<i>Gymnothorax</i> sp.	unidentified <i>Gymnothorax</i> species.
<i>Uropterygius marmoratus</i>	marbled snake moray
<i>Uropterygius micropterus</i>	tide pool snake moray
<i>Uropterygius</i> sp.	unidentified <i>Uropterygius</i> species
MUGILIDAE	Mulletts
<i>Chaenomugil leuciscus</i>	acute-jawed mullet
<i>Crenimugil crenilabrus</i>	fringelip mullet
<i>Valamugil engeli</i>	Engel's mullet
HOLOCENTRIDAE	Squirrelfishes and Soldierfishes
<i>Myripristis berndti</i> (Jordan & Evermann 1903)	bigscale soldierfish
<i>Neoniphon opercularis</i>	blackfin squirrelfish
<i>Sargocentron caudimaculatum</i> (Rüppell 1838)	tailspot squirrelfish
<i>Sargocentrum punctatissimum</i>	speckled squirrelfish
<i>Sargocentrum tiere</i>	blue-lined squirrelfish

Scientific Name	Common Name
(Cuvier in Cuvier & Valenciennes 1829)	
<i>Pseudanthias cooperi</i>	red-bar fairy basslet
<i>Pseudanthias pascalus</i>	fairy basslet
<i>Pseudanthias pleurotaenia</i>	fairy basslet
CARACANTHIDAE	Orbicular Velvetfishes
<i>Caracanthus maculatus</i> (Gray 1831)	spotted coral croucher
SERRANIDAE	Sea Basses, Fairy Basslets & Groupers
<i>Aethaloperca rogaea</i>	redmouth grouper
<i>Cephalopholis argus</i> (Bloch & Schneider 1801)	peacock grouper
<i>Cephalopholis miniatus</i> (Forsskål 1775)	coral grouper
<i>Cephalopholis urodeta</i> (Forster in Bloch & Schneider 1801)	flagtail grouper
<i>Epinephelus fasciatus</i> (Forsskål 1775)	black-tipped grouper
<i>Epinephelus hexagonatus</i> (Forster in Bloch & Schneider 1801)	hexagon grouper
<i>Epinephelus howlandi</i> (Günther 1873)	Howland Island grouper
<i>Epinephelus macrospilos</i> (Bleeker 1855)	black-spotted grouper
<i>Epinephelus melanostigmus</i> (Schultz in Schultz et al. 1953)	blackspot honeycomb grouper
<i>Epinephelus merra</i> (Bloch 1793)	honeycomb grouper
<i>Epinephelus spilotoceps</i> (Schultz in Schultz et al. 1953)	four-saddle grouper
<i>Gracila albomarginata</i> (Fowler & Bean 1930)	white-margined grouper
<i>Luzonichthys whitleyi</i> (Smith 1955)	Whitley's slender basslet
<i>Pseudanthias bartlettorum</i> (Randall & Lubbock 1981)	Bartlett's fairy basslet
<i>Pseudanthias bartlettorum</i> var. "red spot" (Randall & Lubbock 1981)	Bartlett's "red spot" basslet
<i>Pseudanthias cooperi</i>	red-bar fairy basslet
<i>Pseudanthias olivaceus</i> (Randall & McCosker 1982)	fairy basslet
<i>Pseudanthias pascalus</i>	fairy basslet
<i>Pseudanthias pleurotaenia</i>	fairy basslet
<i>Pseudanthias</i> sp.	unidentified <i>Pseudanthias</i> sp.
<i>Variola louti</i> (Forsskål 1775)	lyretail grouper
BELONIDAE	Needlefishes
<i>Platybelone argulus platyura</i>	keeled needlefish
<i>Tylosurus crocodilus</i> (Peron & Lesueur in Lesueur 1821)	crocodile needlefish
EXOCOETIDAE	Flying Fish

Scientific Name	Common Name
Exocoetidae sp.	unidentified flyingfish species
HEMIRAMPHIDAE	Halfbeaks
Hemiramphidae sp.	unidentified halfbeak species
APOGONIDAE	Cardinalfishes
<i>Apogon angustatus</i> (Smith & Radcliffe in Radcliffe 1911)	broad-striped cardinalfish
<i>Apogon apogonides</i> (Bleeker 1856)	cardinalfish
<i>Apogon taeniophorus</i> (Regan 1908)	cardinalfish
ECHENEIDAE	Remoras
<i>Remora remora</i>	remora
CARANGIDAE	Jacks and Trevallys
<i>Carangoides ferdau</i> (Forsskål 1775)	bar jack
<i>Carangoides orthogrammus</i> (Jordan & Gilbert 1882)	yellow-spotted trevally
<i>Caranx ignobilis</i> (Forsskål 1775)	giant trevally
<i>Caranx lugubris</i> (Poey 1860)	black jack
<i>Carnax melampygus</i> (Cuvier in Cuvier & Valenciennes 1833)	bluefin trevally
<i>Caranx sexfasciatus</i> (Quoy & Gaimard 1825)	bigeye trevally
<i>Elegatis bipinnulata</i> (Quoy & Gaimard 1825)	rainbow runner
<i>Trachinotus bailloni</i>	pompano
LUTJANIDAE	Snappers
<i>Aphareus furca</i> (Lacepède 1801)	blue small-tooth jobfish
<i>Aphareus rutilans</i>	jobfish
<i>Aprion virescens</i>	jobfish, uku
<i>Lutjanus bohar</i> (Forsskål 1775)	twinspot snapper, redspot snapper
<i>Lutjanus fulvus</i> (Forster in Bloch & Schneider, 1801)	flametail snapper
<i>Lutjanus gibbus</i> (Forsskål 1775)	humpback snapper
<i>Lutjanus monostigma</i> (Cuvier in Cuvier & Valenciennes 1828)	one-spot snapper
<i>Macolor niger</i>	black snapper
<i>Pristipomoides filamentosus</i>	snapper
CAESIONIDAE	Fusiliers
<i>Caesio teres</i> (Seale 1906)	yellow-back fusilier
<i>Pterocaesio tile</i>	bluestreak fusilier
LETHRINIDAE	Emperors
<i>Gnathodentex aureolineatus</i> (Lacepède 1802)	yellowspot emperor
<i>Monotaxis grandoculis</i> (Forsskål 1775)	bigeye emperor
<i>Lethrinus</i> sp.	unidentified emperor species
MULLIDAE	Goatfishes
<i>Mulloides mimicus</i> (Randall & Guézé 1980)	mimic goatfish

Scientific Name	Common Name
<i>Mulloides vanicolensis</i>	yellowfin goatfish
<i>Parupeneus bifasciatus</i> (Lacepède 1801)	two-barred goatfish
<i>Parupeneus multifasciatus</i>	multibarred goatfish
PEMPHERIDAE	Sweepers
<i>Pempheris oualensis</i> (Cuvier in Cuvier & Valenciennes 1831)	bronze sweeper
KYPHOSIDAE	Rudderfishes & Sea Chubs
<i>Kyphosus cinerascens</i> (Forsskål 1775)	highfin rudderfish, snubnose rudderfish
<i>Kyphosus vaigiensis</i> (Quoy & Gaimard 1825)	lowfin rudderfish, brassy chub
<i>Sectator ocyurus</i>	rudderfish
CHAETODONTIDAE	Butterflyfishes
<i>Chaetodon auriga</i> (Forsskål 1775)	threadfin butterflyfish
<i>Chaetodon citrinellus</i>	speckled butterflyfish
<i>Chaetodon lineolatus</i> (Cuvier (ex Quoy & Gaimard) in Cuvier & Valenciennes 1831)	lined butterflyfish
<i>Chaetodon lunula</i> (Lacépède 1802)	racoon butterflyfish
<i>Chaetodon meyeri</i> (Bloch & Schneider 1801)	Meyer's butterflyfish
<i>Chaetodon ornatissimus</i> (Cuvier (ex Solander) in Cuvier & Valenciennes 1831)	ornate butterflyfish
<i>Chaetodon quadrimaculatus</i> (Gray 1831)	fourspot butterflyfish
<i>Chaetodon reticulatus</i>	reticulated butterflyfish
<i>Chaetodon semeion</i>	dotted butterflyfish
<i>Chaetodon trifascialis</i>	chevroned butterflyfish
<i>Chaetodon unimaculatus</i> (Bloch 1787)	teardrop butterflyfish
<i>Forcipiger flavissimus</i> (Jordan & McGregor in Jordan & Evermann 1898)	long-nosed butterflyfish
POMACANTHIDAE	Angelfishes
<i>Apolemichthys griffisi</i> (Carlson & Taylor 1981)	Griffith's angelfish
<i>Apolemichthys xanthopunctatus</i> (Burgess 1973)	golden-spotted angelfish
<i>Centropyge bicolor</i>	Bicolor angelfish
<i>Centropyge flavissima</i> (Cuvier in Cuvier & Valenciennes 1831)	lemon-peel angelfish
<i>Centropyge loricula</i> (Günther 1874)	flame angelfish
<i>Centropyge vrolikii</i>	Pearlscale angelfish
<i>Pygoplites diacanthus</i>	Regal angelfish
POMACENTRIDAE	Damselfishes
<i>Abudefduf sordidus</i> (Forsskål 1775)	black-spot sergeant
<i>Abudefduf vaigiensis</i>	sergeant
<i>Abudefduf</i> species	unidentified sergeant species
<i>Amblyglyphidodon aureus</i>	golden damsel

Scientific Name	Common Name
<i>Amphiprion chrysopterus</i>	orange-fin Anemonefish
<i>Chromis acares</i> (Randall & Swerdloff 1973)	midget chromis
<i>Chromis caudalis</i>	blue axil chromis
<i>Chromis margaritifer</i> (Fowler 1946)	bicolor chromis
<i>Chromis xanthurus</i> (Bleeker 1854)	black chromis
<i>Chrysiptera brownriggi</i>	Brownrugg's damoiselle
<i>Chrysiptera glauca</i> (Cuvier in Cuvier & Valenciennes 1830)	gray demoiselle
<i>Dascyllus auripinnis</i>	yellow-fin dascyllus
<i>Lepidozygus tapeinosoma</i> (Bleeker 1856)	fusilier damsel
<i>Plectroglyphidodon phoenixensis</i> (Schultz 1943)	Phoenix Islands damsel
<i>Plectroglyphidodon dickii</i> (Liénard 1839)	Dick's damsel
<i>Plectroglyphidodon imparipennis</i> (Vaillant & Sauvage 1875)	bright-eye damsel
<i>Plectroglyphidodon johnstonianus</i> (Fowler & Ball 1924)	Johnston Island damsel
<i>Plectroglyphidodon lacrymatus</i>	jewel damsel
<i>Plectroglyphidodon leucozonus</i>	white-band damsel
<i>Stegastes albifasciatus</i>	white-bar gregory
<i>Stegastes aureus</i> (Fowler 1927)	golden gregory
<i>Stegastes fasciatus</i> (Ogilby 1889)	Pacific gregory
<i>Stegastes nigricans</i> (Lacepède 1802)	dusky farmfish
<i>Stegastes</i> sp. or <i>Pomacentrus</i> sp.	unidentified damselfish species
KUHLIIDAE	Flagtails
<i>Kuhlia sandvicensis</i> (Steindachner 1876)	Hawaiian flagtail
CIRRHITIDAE	Hawkfishes
<i>Cirrhichthys oxycephalus</i> (Bleeker 1855)	pixy hawkfish
<i>Cirrhitops hubbardi</i>	Hubbard's hawkfish
<i>Neocirrhites armatus</i> (Castelnau 1873)	flame hawkfish
<i>Paracirrhites arcatus</i> (Cuvier in Cuvier & Valenciennes 1829)	arc-eye hawkfish
<i>Paracirrhites forsteri</i> (Schneider in Bloch & Schneider 1801)	freckled hawkfish, blackside hawkfish
<i>Paracirrhites hemistictus</i> (Günther 1874)	whitespot hawkfish
<i>Paracirrhites xanthus</i> (Randall 1963)	yellow hawkfish
SPHYRAENIDAE	Barracudas
<i>Sphyraena</i> sp.	unidentified <i>Sphyraena</i> species
<i>Sphyraena barracuda</i> (Walbaum, 1792)	great barracuda
LABRIDAE	Wrasses
<i>Anampses caeruleopunctatus</i> (Rüppell 1829)	blue-spotted wrasse
<i>Anampses meleagrides</i> (Valenciennes in	yellowtail wrasse

Scientific Name	Common Name
Cuvier & Valenciennes 1840)	
<i>Bodianus axillaries</i> (Bennett 1832)	axilspot hogfish
<i>Bodianus prognathus</i> (Lobel 1981)	hogfish
<i>Cheilinus oxycephalus</i>	snooty wrasse
<i>Cheilinus trilobatus</i> (Lacepède 1801)	tripletail wrasse
<i>Cheilinus undulatus</i> (Rüppell 1835)	humphead wrasse, Napoleonfish, Napoleon wrasse
<i>Coris aygula</i> (Lacepède 1801)	clown coris
<i>Coris centralis</i> (Randall 1999)	coris
<i>Coris gaimard</i> (Quoy & Gaimard 1824)	yellowtail coris
<i>Dioroctacanthus xanthurus</i>	wandering cleaner wrasse
<i>Gomphosus varius</i> (Lacepède 1801)	bird wrasse
<i>Halichoeres ornatissinus</i> (Garrett 1863)	ornate wrasse fish
<i>Hemigymnus fasciatus</i> (Bloch 1792)	barred thicklip wrasse
<i>Labrichthys unilineatus</i>	tubelip wrasse
<i>Labroides bicolor</i> (Fowler & Bean 1928)	bicolor cleaner wrasse
<i>Labroides dimidiatus</i> (Valenciennes in Cuvier & Valenciennes, 1839)	bluestreak cleaner wrasse
<i>Labroides rubrolabiatu</i> s (Randall, 1958)	cleaner wrasse
<i>Labropsis xanthonota</i> (Randall, 1981)	wedge-tailed wrasse
<i>Macropharyngodon meleagris</i> (Valenciennes in Cuvier & Valenciennes 1839)	leopard wrasse
<i>Novaculichthys taeniourus</i>	dragon wrasse, rockmover wrasse
<i>Oxycheilinus unifasciatus</i> (Streets 1877)	wrasse
<i>Pseudocheilinus hexataenia</i> (Bleeker 1857)	sixline wrasse
<i>Pseudocheilinus octotaenia</i> (Jenkins 1901)	eightline wrasse
<i>Pseudocheilinus tetrataenia</i> (Schultz in Schultz et al. 1960)	fourline wrasse
<i>Pseudocoris heteroptera</i> (Bleeker 1857)	wrasse
<i>Pseudodax mollucanus</i> (Valenciennes in Cuvier & Valenciennes 1840)	wrasse
<i>Stethojulis bandanensis</i> (Bleeker 1851)	redshoulder wrasse
<i>Thalassoma amblycephalum</i> (Bleeker 1856)	twotone wrasse
<i>Thalassoma hardwicke</i>	sixbar wrasse
<i>Thalassoma lutescens</i> (Lay & Bennett (ex Solander) 1839)	sunset wrasse
<i>Thalassoma purpureum</i> (Forsskål 1775)	surge wrasse
<i>Thalassoma quinquevittatum</i> (Lay & Bennett 1839)	fivestripe surge wrasse
<i>Thalassoma trilobatum</i> (Lacepède 1801)	Christmas wrasse
SCARIDAE	Parrotfishes
<i>Calatomus carolinus</i> (Valenciennes 1840)	bucktooth parrotfish, stareye parrotfish

Scientific Name	Common Name
<i>Chlorurus frontalis</i> (Valenciennes in Cuvier & Valenciennes 1840)	tan-faced parrotfish
<i>Chlorurus microrhinus</i> (Bleeker 1854)	parrotfish
<i>Scarus niger</i>	black parrotfish
<i>Scarus frenatus</i> (Lacepède 1802)	vermiculate parrotfish
<i>Scarus oviceps</i> (Valenciennes in Cuvier & Valenciennes 1840)	dark-capped parrotfish
<i>Scarus rubroviolaceus</i> (Bleeker 1847)	red and violet parrotfish, redlip parrotfish
<i>Scarus tricolor</i> (Bleeker 1847)	tricolor parrotfish
BLENNIIDAE	Blennies
<i>Blenniella gibbifrons</i> (Quoy & Gaimard 1824)	blenny
<i>Cirripectes quagga</i> (Fowler & Ball 1924)	squiggly blenny
<i>Cirripectes</i> sp.	unidentified <i>Cirripectes</i> species
<i>Cirripectes variolosus</i> (Valenciennes in Cuvier & Valenciennes 1836)	red-speckled blenny
<i>Istiblennius edentulous</i> (Schneider in Bloch & Schneider 1801)	rippled rockskipper
<i>Meiacanthus atrodorsalis</i>	poison-fang blenny
<i>Plagiotremus laudandus</i>	poison-fang blenny mimic
<i>Plagiotremus rhynorhynchus</i> (Bleeker 1852)	blue-striped blenny
<i>Plagiotremus tapeinosoma</i> (Bleeker 1857)	piano blenny, scale-eating blenny
<i>Rhabdoblennius snowi</i>	Snow's rockskipper
PTERELEOTRIDAE	Dartfishes, Hovergobies, & Wormfishes
<i>Ptereleotris zebra</i>	zebra dartfish
ACANTHURIDAE	Surgeonfishes & Unicornfishes
<i>Acanthurus achilles</i> (Shaw 1803)	Achilles tang
<i>Acanthurus blochii</i> (Valenciennes in Cuvier & Valenciennes 1835)	ringtail surgeonfish
<i>Acanthurus guttatus</i> (Forster in Bloch & Schneider 1801)	spotted surgeonfish
<i>Acanthurus lineatus</i> (Linnaeus 1758)	blue-banded surgeonfish
<i>Acanthurus maculiceps</i>	White-freckled surgeonfish
<i>Acanthurus mata</i> (Cuvier 1829)	elongate surgeonfish
<i>Acanthurus nigricans</i> (Linnaeus 1758)	whitecheek surgeonfish
<i>Acanthurus nigricauda</i> (Duncker & Mohr 1929)	epaulette surgeonfish
<i>Acanthurus nigrofuscus</i> (Forsskål 1775)	brown surgeonfish
<i>Acanthurus nigroris</i> (Valenciennes in Cuvier & Valenciennes 1835)	blue-lined surgeonfish
<i>Acanthurus olivaceus</i> (Bloch & Schneider (ex Forster) 1801)	orangeband surgeonfish

Scientific Name	Common Name
<i>Acanthurus pyroferus</i>	chocolate surgeonfish
<i>Acanthurus rackliffei</i> (<i>A. achilles</i> x <i>A. nigricans</i>)(Schultz 1943)	hybrid surgeonfish
<i>Acanthurus thompsoni</i> (Fowler 1923)	Thompson's surgeonfish
<i>Acanthurus triostegus</i> (Linnaeus 1758)	convict tang
<i>Acanthurus xanthopterus</i> (Valenciennes in Cuvier & Valenciennes 1835)	yellow-finned surgeonfish
<i>Ctenochaetus cyanocheilus</i> (Randall & Clements 2001)	surgeonfish
<i>Ctenochaetus flavicaudis</i> (Fowler 1938)	surgeonfish
<i>Ctenochaetus hawaiiensis</i> (Randall 1955)	chevron tang, black surgeonfish
<i>Ctenochaetus marginatus</i> (Valenciennes in Cuvier & Valenciennes 1835)	blue-spotted bristletooth
<i>Ctenochaetus striatus</i> (Quoy & Gaimard 1825)	striped bristletooth
<i>Naso caesius</i>	unicornfish
<i>Naso hexacanthus</i> (Bleeker 1855)	black-tongue unicornfish, sleek unicornfish
<i>Naso lituratus</i> (Forster in Bloch & Schneider 1801)	literate surgeonfish
<i>Naso unicornis</i>	bluespine unicornfish
<i>Naso vlamingii</i> (Valenciennes in Cuvier & Valenciennes 1835)	bignose unicornfish
<i>Paracanthurus hepatus</i>	Palette surgeonfish, Hepatus tang
<i>Zebrasoma rostratum</i> (Günther 1873)	tang
<i>Zebrasoma scopas</i> (Cuvier 1829)	brown tang
<i>Zebrasoma veliferum</i>	sailfin tang
EPHIPPIDAE	Batfishes
<i>Platax orbicularis</i>	circular spadefish, batfish
ZANCLIDAE	Moorish Idol
<i>Zanclus cornutus</i> (Linnaeus 1758)	moorish idol
SCOMBRIDAE	Tunas
<i>Euthynnus affinis</i> (Cantor 1849)	kawakawa, bonito
<i>Gymnosarda unicolor</i> (Rüppell 1836)	dogtooth tuna
<i>Scomber japonicus</i>	Japanese mackerel, saba
BALISTIDAE	Triggerfishes
<i>Balistapus undulatus</i> (Park 1797)	orangestriped triggerfish
<i>Balistoides viridescens</i> (Bloch & Schneider 1801)	mustache triggerfish, titan triggerfish
<i>Melichtys niger</i> (Bloch 1786)	black triggerfish
<i>Melichtys vidua</i> (Richardson (ex Solander) 1845)	pinktail triggerfish

Scientific Name	Common Name
<i>Odonus niger</i> (Rüppell 1836)	redtooth triggerfish
<i>Pseudobalistes flavimarginatus</i> (Rüppell 1829)	yellowmargin triggerfish
<i>Rhinecanthus rectangulus</i> (Bloch & Schneider 1801)	wedge picassofish, humunukunukuapua'a
<i>Sufflamen bursa</i> (Bloch & Schneider 1801)	scythe triggerfish, boomerang triggerfish
<i>Sufflamen chrysopterus</i> (Bloch & Schneider 1801)	halfmoon triggerfish
<i>Sufflamen frenatus</i>	bridle triggerfish
<i>Xanthichthys caeruleolineatus</i> (Randall et al. 1978)	bluelined triggerfish
MONACANTHIDAE	Filefishes & Leatherjackets
<i>Aluterus scriptus</i> (Osbeck 1765)	scribbled filefish
<i>Amanses scopas</i> (Cuvier 1829)	broom filefish
<i>Cantherhines dumerilii</i> (Hollard 1854)	barred filefish
<i>Cantherhines pardalis</i> (Rüppell 1837)	wire-net filefish
<i>Pervagor janthinosoma</i>	blackbar filefish
OSTRACIIDAE	Trunkfishes
<i>Ostracion meleagris meleagris</i> (Shaw in Shaw & Nodder 1796)	spotted trunkfish
TETRAODONTIDAE	Puffers
<i>Arothron meleagris</i> (Lacepède (ex Commerson) 1798)	guineafowl puffer
<i>Arothron nigropunctatus</i>	blackspotted puffer
<i>Canthigaster amboinensis</i> (Bleeker 1865)	Ambon sharpnose puffer
<i>Canthigaster solandri</i> (Richardson (ex Solander) 1845)	spotted sharpnose puffer
DIODONTIDAE	Porcupinefishes
<i>Diodon hystrix</i> (Linnaeus 1758)	porcupinefish

Table B-3: Vegetation of Baker Island NWR. Compiled from unpublished Service trip reports and literature

Scientific Name	Common Name, (Hawaiian Name)	Source*	Observed by**
<i>Cocos nucifera</i>	coconut, niu	I	h
<i>Cordia subcordata</i>	cordia, kou	N	a,c,d,e
<i>Terminalia catappa</i>	tropical almond	I	b
<i>Ipomoea macrantha</i>		W	a,b
<i>Ipomoea pes-caprae</i>	beach morning glory	W	d,e
<i>Fimbristylis cymosa</i>	mauu akiaki	N	a,e
<i>Euphorbia hirta</i>	asthra weed	A	a,b,d,e
<i>Phyllanthus amarus</i>		A	a,d,e
<i>Sophora tomentosa</i>	yellow neclacepod	W	e
<i>Scaevola taccada</i>	naupaka	W	f
<i>Cassytha filiformia</i>		N	i
<i>Barringtonia asiatica</i>	fish poison tree	W	i
<i>Sida fallax</i>	‘ilima	A	a,b,d,e
<i>Thespesia populnea</i>	milo	I	b
<i>Abutilon indicum</i>	abutilon	I	a,e
<i>Boerhavia sp.</i>	alena	N	a,b,c,d,e
<i>Cenchrus echinatus</i>	sandbur	A	e
<i>Cynodon dactylon</i>	Bermuda grass	A	e
<i>Digitaria pacifica</i>	Pacific crabgrass	N	d,e
<i>Lepturus repens</i>	Pacific island thintail	N	a,b,c,d,e
<i>Eragrostis tenela</i>	love grass		
<i>Eragrostis whitneyi</i>	love grass	N	a
<i>Setaria verticillata</i>	hooked bristle grass	A	e
<i>Portulaca lutea</i>	portulaca, ‘ihi	N	a,,b,d,e
<i>Portulaca oleracea</i>	portulaca, ‘ihi	A	a,,b,d,e
<i>Suriana maritime</i>	bay cedar	W	f
<i>Triumfetta procumbens</i>		N	a,b,e
<i>Vitex negundo</i>	five leaved chaste tree	I	e
<i>Tribulus cistoides</i>	puncturevine, nohu	N	a,b,c,d,e

*Source: N = native, I = introduced, A = accidentally introduced, W = wave carried

** Collectors and Observers:

a -Christophersen 1924

b - Bryan 1938

c - Sibley 1963

d - Marshall 1963

e -Long 1964

f - Rauzon & Woodside 1998

g - Depkin & Newton 1995

h - Rodman 1935

i - Forsell & Bauer 1988

j - Flint & Woodside 1993

Table B-4: Birds of Baker Island NWR. Numbers are counts of adult birds only and compiled from unpublished Service trip reports. Note: No bird species found on Baker are listed under to the Endangered Species Act.

Scientific Name	Common Name	Highest count since 1973	Birds of Conservation Concern Status ^b	National Shorebird Prioritization Category ^a	Regional Seabird Conservation Category ^c
<i>Phaethon rubricauda</i>	red-tailed tropicbird*	72			Moderate
<i>Sula dactylatra</i>	masked booby*	3,134			Moderate
<i>Sula leucogaster</i>	brown booby*	375			Moderate
<i>Sula sula</i>	red-footed booby*	714			Currently not at Risk
<i>Fregata minor</i>	great frigatebird*	900			Moderate
<i>Fregata ariel</i>	lesser frigatebird*	16,200	BCC 68		High Concern
<i>Onychoprion lunatus</i>	gray-backed tern*	2,000			Moderate
<i>Onychoprion fuscatus</i>	sooty tern*	1,600,000			Moderate
<i>Anous stolidus</i>	brown noddy*	3,600			Currently not at Risk
<i>Procelsterna cerulea</i>	blue-grey noddy*	26	BCC 68		High Concern
<i>Gygis Alba</i>	white tern*	38			Moderate
<i>Pluvianlis dominica</i>	Pacific golden-plover	512	BCC 68	High Concern	
<i>Tringa incana</i>	Wandering tattler	70		Moderate Concern	

Scientific Name	Common Name	Highest count since 1973	Birds of Conservation Concern Status ^b	National Shorebird Prioritization Category ^a	Regional Seabird Conservation Category ^c
<i>Numenius tahitiensis</i>	bristle-thighed curlew	26	BCC 68	High Concern	
<i>Arenaria interpres</i>	ruddy turnstone	391		High Concern	
<i>Limosa lapponica</i>	bar-tailed godwit	2		High Concern	
<i>Calidris acuminata</i>	sharp-tailed sandpiper	6		Not Listed	
<i>Calidris melanotos</i>	pectoral sandpiper	2		Low Concern	
<i>Calidris alba</i>	sanderling	4		High Concern	
<i>Charadrius semipalmatus</i>	Semipalmated Plover	2		Low Concern	
<i>Larus atricilla</i>	Laughing Gull	1			

*indicates documented breeding species on Baker.

^aSpecies prioritization categories according to United States Shorebird Conservation Plan (Brown et al. 2000).

^bBirds of Conservation Concern (BCC) status according to Birds of Conservation Concern 2002 (USFWS 2002).

^cConservation classification according to Seabird Conservation Plan, Pacific Region (Englis and Naughton 2004)

Appendix C

List of Cited References

- Ashmole, N.P. and M.J. Ashmole. 1967. Comparative Feeding Ecology of Sea Birds of a Tropical Oceanic Island. Peabody Museum of Natural History, Yale University Bulletin 24.
- Boehlert, G., editor. 1993. Fisheries of Hawaii and the U.S. associated Pacific Islands. Marine Fisheries Review 55:1-138.
- Brown, D, N. M. K. Y. Kahanu, S.K. Kikiloi, T.K. Tengan and J. Zisk. 2002. Hui Panalā'au. Bishop Museum, Honolulu, published pamphlet, 16 pp.
- Brown, S. C. Hickey, and B. Harrington eds. 2000. The U.S. Shorebird Conservation Plan. Manomet Center for Conservation Sciences, Manomet, MA.
- Browne, A.C. 1940. Proc. Hawaiian Ent. Soc. 10(3):369.
- Bryan, E.H., Jr. 1974. Panalā'au Memoirs. Pacific Scientific Information Center. Bernice P. Bishop Museum, Honolulu, HI.
- Christophersen, E. 1927. Vegetation of Pacific Equatorial Islands. Bernice P. Bishop Museum Bulletin 44: No. 2. 79 p.
- Citta, John and Michelle H. Reynolds. 2006. Draft Seabird Monitoring Assessment for Hawaii and the Pacific Islands. Migratory Birds and Habitat Programs USFWS. USGS-BRD 183 pp.
- Clapp, R. B. and F. C. Sibley. 1965. Biological Survey of Baker Island, March 1963 – May 1965. Unpublished Report. Smithsonian Institution, Washington D. C.
- Darwin, C. 1842. The structure and distribution of coral reefs. Smith Elder, London. 214 pp., 2 pls.
- Depkin, C. and C. Newton. 1995. Howland Island Trip Report 22-25 March 1995. Administrative Report. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Honolulu, HI.96850.
- Diamond, A.W. 1978. Feeding strategies and population size in tropical seabirds. American Naturalist 112:215-223.
- Emory, K. P., 1939. Archaeology of the Phoenix Islands. Hawaii Academy of Science Proceedings. Special Publication 34. Bishop Museum, Honolulu, Hawaii.
- Engilis, Jr., A. and M. Naughton. 2004. U.S. Pacific Islands Regional Shorebird Conservation Plan. U.S. Shorebird Conservation Plan. U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service. Portland, Oregon.

- Fefer, S.I., C.S. Harrison, M.B. Naughton, and R.J. Shallenberger. 1984. Synopsis of results of recent seabird research conducted in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands. Proc. Res. Inv. NWHI UNIIHI-SEAGRANT-MR-84-01
- Flint, E. and D. Woodside. 1993. Howland and Baker Islands Trip Report, 19 January to 15 February, 1993. Administrative Report, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Honolulu, HI 96850.
- Flint, E. and C. Eggleston. 2004. Draft Equatorial Refuges Trip Report. January 8-31, 2004. Administrative Report. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Honolulu, HI
- Floros, C. D., M. J. Samways, and B. Armstrong. 2004. Taxonomic patterns of bleaching within a South African coral assemblage. *Biodiversity and Conservation*. 13: 1175-1194.
- Fowler. 1927. Hague, J.D. 1862. On phosphatic guano islands of the Pacific Ocean. *Amer. Jour. Sci.*, 84: 224-243, 1862.
- Fosberg, F.R. and D. R. Stoddart. 1994. Flora of the Phoenix Islands, Central Pacific. Atoll Research Bulletin No. 393.
- Foster Wheeler. 1998. CERCLA Site Inspection. Baker Island National Wildlife Refuge. Central Pacific Ocean. Final Report. Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation, Lakewood, CO. UFSWS Contract No. 14-48-0010-93-004. Task Order 98-Y006
- Hague, J.D. 1862. On phosphatic guano islands of the Pacific. *Am. Jour. Sci., Ser. II*, 84:224-243.
- Harrison, C.S., T. S. Hida, M.P. Seki. 1983. Hawaiian Seabird Feeding Ecology. *Wildlife Monographs* 85:1-71.
- Hutchinson, G.E. 1950. The Biochemistry of Vertebrate Excretion. *Bull. Amer. Museum Nat. Hist.* 96. 554 p.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), Ed., 2001. *Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis, Contribution of Working Group I to the Third Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, UK, 881 pp.
- Johannes, R.E. 1981. *Words of the Lagoon: Fishing and marine lore in the Palau District of Micronesia*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- King, W.B. 1970. The trade wind zone oceanography pilot study. Part VII: observations of seabirds March 1964 to June 1965. U.S. Fish and Wildl. Ser. Spec. Sci. Rep. - Fish. 586. 136pp.
- Kirkpatrick R.D. and M.J. Rauzon. 1986. Foods of Feral Cats *Felis catus* on Jarvis and Howland Islands, Central Pacific Ocean. *Biotropica* 18 (1): 72-75.

- Longhurst, A.R. and D. Pauly. 1987. Ecology of Tropical Oceans. Academic Press, San Diego. 407 pp.
- Maude, H. E. 1961. Post-Spanish discoveries in the central Pacific. Jour. Pol. Soc. 70(1):67-111.
- Maragos, J.E., and P.L. Jokiel 1978. Reef Corals of Canton Atoll: I. Zoogeography. In: Naval Undersea Center Technical Publication 395:55-70, and *Atoll Research Bulletin* 221:55-70 (Sept 1978)
- Michener, W. K., E. R. Blood, K. L. Bildstein, M. M. Brinson, and L. R. Gardner. 1997. Climate change, hurricanes and tropical storms and rising sea level in coastal wetlands. *Ecological Applications*. 7:770-801.
- Mueller-Dombois, D. and F. R. Fosberg. 1998. Vegetation of the Tropical Island Pacific. Springer-Verlag, New York (Book in collection of H. Freifeld, 3-122 Federal Building).
- Morison, S.E. 1951. History of United States Naval Operations in World War II. Volume Seven. Aleutians, Gilberts and Marshalls. June 1942-April 1944. First Illinois paperback, 2002. 374 pp.
- Morrison, R.J. 1990. Pacific Atoll Soils: Chemistry, Mineralogy and Classification. *Atoll Research Bulletin*. No. 339: 25p.
- Mundy, B., R. Wass, E. DeMartini, B. Greene, B. Zgliczynski, and R. Schroeder. 2002. Inshore fishes of Howland Island, Baker Island, Jarvis Island, Palmyra Atoll, and Kingman Reef. Unpublished ms. Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center, Honolulu, 80 pp.
- Munro, G.C. 1924. (unpublished) Report of the ornithologist on the USS Whippoorwill expedition trip "B" to Howland and Baker Islands. Sept. 15 to Oct. 7, 1924. (Extracted Aug. 4, 1965, by Roger Clapp)
- National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (NMFS and USFWS). 1998a. Recovery Plan for U.S. Pacific Populations of the Hawksbill Turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricate*). National Marine Fisheries Service, Silver Springs, MD.
- National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (NMFS and USFWS). 1998b. Recovery Plan for U.S. Pacific Populations of the Green Turtle (*Chelonia mydas*). National Marine Fisheries Service, Silver Springs, MD.
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) 1991. Climates of the World. Historical Climatology Series 6-4. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Climatic Data Center, Asheville, N.C. p. 26.
- Overpeck, J.T., B.L. Otto-Bliesner, G.H. Miller, D.R. Muhs, R.B. Alley, and J.T. Kiehl. 2006. Paleoclimatic Evidence for Future Ice-Sheet Instability and Rapid Sea-Level Rise. *Science* 311:1747-1750.

- Rodman, J. 1935. Unpublished Diary kept on Baker Island in files of Hui Panala'au in Bishop Museum, Honolulu. Cited in Sibley and Clapp, 1965.
- Rauzon, M. J. 1990. Expedition Report: Jarvis Island National Wildlife Refuge. Administrative Report. US Fish and Wildlife Service, Honolulu, Hawaii 96850.
- Rauzon, M.J. and D.H. Woodside. 1998. Howland Island Trip Report 26 4-9 March 1998. Administrative Report. US Fish and Wildlife Service, Honolulu, Hawaii 96850.
- Shun, Kanalei. 1987. Archaeological Reconnaissance Site Survey and Limited Subsurface of Baker and Howland Islands Final Report: Prepared for US Army Engineer District, Honolulu Corps of Engineers, Fort Shafter, Hawaii.
- Shea, E. L, G. Dolcemascolo, C. L. Anderson, A. Barnston, C. P. Guard, M. P. Hamnett, S. T. Kubota, N. Lewis, J. Loschnigg, and G. Meehl. 2001. Preparing for a Changing Climate: The potential Consequences of Climate Variability and Change. Published Report. East-West Center, Honolulu, Hawaii. 100 pp.
- Sibley, F.C. R.B. Clapp, and C.R. Long. 1965. Biological Survey of Howland Island, March 1963 – May 1965. Unpublished Report of Pacific Ocean Biological Survey Program, Division of Birds Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C.
- Skaggs, J. M., 1994. The Great Guano Rush. Entrepreneurs and American Overseas Expansion. St. Martin's Griffin. New York.
- Smith, S.V and R. M. Buddemeier. 1992. Global Change and Coral Reef Ecosystems. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics. 23:89-118.
- Starbuck, A., 1878. History of the American whale fishery from its earliest inception to the year 1876. In Report of the Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries for 1875-1876. Washington, Government Printing Office. Pp. 1-779.
- Townsend, C.H. 1935. The distribution of certain whales as shown by logbook records of American whaleships. *Zoolologica* 19:3-50.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) World Heritage Centre. 2003. Central Pacific World Heritage Project International Workshop Report, 2-6 June 2003, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA. Paris, 44pp.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) World Heritage Centre. 2004. Central Pacific World Heritage Project, National Workshop Report, 5-11 October 2004, Kiritimati Island, the Republic of Kiribati. Paris, 11pp.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE). 1987. Defense Environmental Restoration Program for Formerly Used Sites, Inventory Project Report, Baker Island National Wildlife Refuge (Baker Island Military Reservation) Baker Island, USA.

U.S. Atomic Energy Commission (USAEC). 1963. Reconnaissance Survey Report. Howland, Baker & Canton Islands. October, 1963. U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Nevada Operations Office. Prepared by: Holmes & Narver Inc. Logistics Planning Group. Las Vegas, Nevada.

U.S. Coast Guard (USCG). 1986. Memorandum to the USFWS Baker and Howland Island Surveys. April 1986.

U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 1973. Baker Island, Howland Island, and Jarvis Island National Wildlife Refuges, Biological Ascertainment Reports.

U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 1975. Baker Island, Howland Island, and Jarvis Island National Wildlife Refuges, Narrative Report, FY 1975. Kailua, HI

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 1981. Refuge Manual. Wash., D.C.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 1998a. Coral Reef Initiative in the Pacific: Howland Island, Baker Island, and Jarvis Island National Wildlife Refuges. Honolulu, HI.

U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 1998b. Remote islands ecosystem plan: Howland Island, Baker Island, and Jarvis Island National Wildlife Refuges. Honolulu, HI. 16 pp.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2000. Pacific Remote Islands National Wildlife Refuge Complex Special Conditions & Rules for Moving Between Islands and Atolls and Packing for Field Camps. Honolulu, HI.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2001. Environmental Assessment: Proposed Palmyra Atoll National Wildlife Refuge, Line Islands, Central Pacific Ocean. Portland, OR.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2002. Birds of Conservation Concern. Arlington, Va.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2005. Regional Seabird Conservation Plan, Pacific Region. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Migratory Birds and Habitat Programs, Pacific Region, Portland, Oregon.

Vitousek, M. J., Kilonsky, B, and W. G. Leslie. 1980. Meteorological Observations in the Line Islands, 1972-1980. Honolulu, HI. 74 pp.

Vitousek, P. M. 1994. Beyond global warming: ecology and global change. *Ecology*. 75:1861-1876.

Wallace, J.M. and P.V. Hobbs. 1977. Atmospheric Science: An Introductory Survey. Academic Press. 467 pp.

Willoughby, M.F. 1980. The U.S. Coast Guard in World War II. Arno Press. New York. 347 pp.

Appendix D

Quarantine Protocol for Baker Island NWR

The following protocol was developed to maintain consistency in quarantine procedures for all national wildlife refuges (NWRs) in the Pacific. Thus, these provisions apply to all of the remote island national wildlife refuges. Some refuges, including Baker, may have additional restrictions and requirements.

Pacific Remote Islands National Wildlife Refuge Complex Special Conditions and Rules for Moving Between Islands and Atolls and Packing for Field Camps

The islands and atolls of the Pacific Remote Islands National Wildlife Refuge Complex (Remotes Complex) are special places providing habitat for many rare, endemic plants and animals. Many of these species are formally listed as federally threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act of 1973. Endemic plants and insects, and the predators they support, are especially vulnerable to the introduction of competing or consuming, non-native species. Such introductions may cause the extinction of island endemics, or even the destruction of entire island ecological communities. Notable local examples include: the introduction of rabbits to Laysan Island in 1902 which caused the extinction of numerous plant and insect species and 3 endemic landbird species; the introduction of rats to many Pacific islands causing the elimination of many burrowing seabird colonies; the introduction of the annual grass, sandbur, to Laysan Island where it has out competed native bunch grass and eliminated nesting habitat for the endangered Laysan finch; and the introduction and proliferation of numerous ant species throughout the Pacific Islands to the widespread detriment of endemic plant and insect species (Remotes Complex files).

Several of the islands within the Remotes Complex are especially pristine, and, as a result, are diverse in terms of rare and special declining native plants and animals. Nihoa Island has 13 potential candidate endangered insect species, numerous endangered plants, and 2 endangered birds. Necker Island has endangered plants and 7 endemic insects that are candidates for the Endangered Species List. Laysan Island has endangered plants, five potential candidate endangered insect species and the endangered Laysan finch and Laysan duck. Other islands in the Remotes Complex such as Lisianski, Howland, Baker, and Jarvis and islets in atolls such as Rose, Pearl and Hermes Reef and French Frigate Shoals are inhabited by a variety of endemic and/or endangered species and require special protection from invasive species.

Other Pacific island such as Kure and the “high islands” (e.g., Oahu, Hawaii, Maui, Kauai) as well as, certain islands within Midway Atoll, Pearl and Hermes Reef, and French Frigate Shoals have native plants and/or animals that are at high risk from introduction to the relatively pristine islands discussed above. Of special concerns are introductions of non-native snakes, rats, ants and a variety of other insect and plant species. Invasive plants of highest concern are *Verbesina encelioides*, *Cenchrus echinatus*, and *Setaria verticillata*.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) is responsible for the management and protection of the fish, wildlife, plants, and their habitats associated with islands of the Remotes Complex. No one is permitted to access any of the Refuge's islands without the express written permission of the refuge manager in the form of a Special Use Permit. Because of the above concerns, the following restrictions on the movement of personnel and materials to the islands of the Remotes Complex exist. Note: Kure Island and Midway Atoll are not part of this refuge Complex.

With the exception of Johnston Island NWR, Palmyra Atoll NWR, and Tern Island, French Frigate Shoals, the following rules apply:

Clothing and Soft Gear:

- Any personnel landing boats at any island should have clean clothes and shoes, meaning that they are free of dirt and seeds.
- Any personnel going ashore at any island and moving inshore from the immediate area in which waves are breaking at the time of landing must have new footwear, new or island-specific clothes and new or island-specific soft gear that have been frozen (<4° C) for at least 48 hours.
- Otherwise, any personnel entering any vegetated area, regardless of how sparse the vegetation, must have new footwear, new clothes and new soft gear all frozen for at least 48 hours.

Definitions:

- "new" means off the shelf and never used anywhere but the island in question.
- "clothing" is all apparel, shoes, socks, over and under garments.
- "soft gear" is all gear such as daypacks, fanny packs, camera bags, camera/binocular straps, microphone covers, nets, holding or weighing bags, bedding, tents, luggage, or any fabric or material capable of harboring seeds or insects.

Clothing or gear coming off Kure and Midway should never be moved to any of the other refuge islands.

During transit, clothing and gear coming off Kure and Midway must be carefully sequestered to avoid contamination of gear bound for other remote islands. Special care must be taken to avoid contaminating gear storage areas and quarters aboard transporting vessels with seeds or insects from these islands.

General Rules:

- Regardless of origin or destination, inspect and clean all equipment and supplies, immediately prior to any trip to the refuge. Carefully clean all clothing, footwear and soft gear following use to minimize risk of cross contamination of materials between islands.

- Pack supplies in plastic buckets with fitted lids or other sealable metal or plastic containers so they can be thoroughly cleaned inside and out. **Cardboard is not permitted on islands.** Cardboard boxes disintegrate in a short time and harbor seeds, animals, etc., which cannot be easily found or removed. **Wood is not permitted unless sealed on all surfaces.**

Wooden boxes can also harbor insects and seeds and, therefore, are only allowed if well constructed (tight fitting seams are required). All wood must be treated, and inside and outside surfaces must be painted or varnished to provide a smooth, cleanable finish that seals all holes.

- Freeze or tarp and fumigate then seal all equipment (clothes, books, tents) immediately prior to departure. Food and cooking items need not be fumigated but should be cleaned and frozen, if freezable. Cameras, binoculars, radios, and other electronic equipment must be thoroughly cleaned, including internal inspection whenever possible, but they do not need to be frozen or fumigated. Such equipment can only be packed in wooden crates if treated as in #2 above. Any containers must contain new, clean packing materials and be frozen or fumigated.
- At present, Tern Island, Palmyra Atoll, and Johnston Atoll are the exceptions to the above rule having less stringent rules due to the large number of previously established invasive species. Careful inspection of all materials and containers is still required. However, it is acceptable to use wooden and cardboard containers for transporting supplies to Tern Island and Johnston Atoll. In addition, there is no requirement for freezing or fumigating items disembarked at Tern. Although requirements for Palmyra Atoll, Johnston Atoll and Tern Island are more lax, the Remotes Complex is still concerned about the possibilities of new introductions.

Additional Special Conditions for Restricted Access to Nihoa Island:

Nihoa is one of the most pristine locations in the Remotes Complex. It is also inhabited by the highest number of federally listed endangered species. It is a small rugged island with many inaccessible areas. Introduction of any invasive species could have immediate, disastrous effects to natural resources. It would be almost impossible to mount any kind of control or eradication program on this island should an invasive species become established. Because of these reasons, access to Nihoa is strictly limited and rules governing entry are more stringent.

- Access to Nihoa by permittees would only be allowed under the direct supervision of a refuge representative. The person, who shall be appointed by the refuge manager, would work with permittees to assure careful adherence with all rules for inspection, handling, and preparation of equipment. The refuge representative would have the authority to control and limit access to various parts of the island to protect animals, plants (especially endangered species), and archaeological sites. The refuge representative would have the authority to revoke access to the island or order an immediate departure from the island if conditions for working on the island are not fully met or are violated in some way.

- All field equipment made out of fabric material or wood must be new and never previously used in the northwestern or main Hawaiian Islands. Equipment previously purchased or made for use on Nihoa that has been carefully sealed and stored while away from Nihoa, and not used elsewhere, may also be brought onto the island. Rules for freezing and/or fumigating are as described for other sites in the Refuge (see above).
- Clothing and personal effects must be cleaned and thoroughly inspected. All footwear (shoes, slippers, socks, etc.) must be new, unused, or previously only used on Nihoa and carefully sealed and stored while off of the island.

Rules Regarding Food:

Fresh foods that are typically transported to island field camps (e.g., potatoes, onions, cabbage, apples, oranges) are not likely to become established and flourish on the Refuge Complex and are allowed. However, other food items such as tomatoes could easily become established. Soil can contain many seeds, eggs, larvae, etc., and cannot be transported to or among islands.

Other food species such as alfalfa, mustard and cress, commonly used for sprouted greens, could potentially become established and cannot be brought to the islands. Other species such as mung beans, soybeans, and radishes would not likely survive on the islands and can be used for fresh greens. A list of fresh foods and seeds that are prohibited is provided below. Permittees should contact the Refuge Manager for more information or for questions about items not included on this list.

Strictly Prohibited:

Tomatoes (any variety), ray sunflower seeds, alfalfa seeds, mustard seeds.

Bulk dried fruits are allowed but should be frozen solid for at least one day to kill any insects.

Appendix E

Plan Implementation and Costs

Introduction

Following public review and comment on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA), public notification of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (Service) decision, and Comprehensive Conservation Plan (CCP) approval, refuge staff would begin to implement the CCP. This appendix describes the various partnerships, management plans, staffing and projects required to implement the plan over the next 15 years.

Partnerships

Partnerships are a critical component of implementation of the Baker Island National Wildlife Refuge (Baker) CCP. Refuge staff would strengthen existing partnerships with the U.S. Coast Guard, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the University of Hawaii Undersea Research Laboratory to implement enhanced law enforcement coverage at this remote location and facilitate inventory and monitoring of marine resources. In addition, the refuge staff would seek to enhance its volunteer program. Volunteers are critically important in providing the logistical support in the Honolulu office and field support required to effectively manage and operate year-round field camps at remote locations.

Step-Down Management Plans

The CCP is one of several plans necessary for refuge management. The CCP provides guidance in the form of goals, objectives, and strategies for several refuge program areas but may lack some of the specifics need for implementation. Given the abbreviated and qualitative once-a-year management activities identified in the preferred alternative, step-down plans would not be developed for individual program areas after CCP completion. The Draft Seabird Monitoring Assessment for Hawaii and the Pacific islands (Citta and Reynolds 2006), U.S. Pacific Islands Regional Shorebird Conservation Plan (Engilis and Naughton 2004), Seabird Conservation Plan for the Pacific Region (USFWS 2005), and U.S. Coral Reef Task Force planning efforts would be applied to refuge operations described in the preferred alternative.

Staffing

The proportion of current staffing and proposed staffing within the Pacific Remote Islands National Wildlife Refuge (NWR) Complex dedicated to Baker are shown in the following tables. The proposed staffing indicates a 0.16 full-time-equivalent increase over current levels. This represents the difference in staffing needs from visiting Baker biannually to annually.

Current Staffing for Baker Island NWR

Staff	Employment Status and Proportion of Time¹	Salary Rating
Project Leader	PFT (0.01 FTE)	GS 13
Supervisory Wildlife Biologist	PFT (0.07 FTE)	GS 12
Resource Contaminant Specialist	PFT (0.07 FTE)	GS 12
Coral Reef Biologist	PFT (0.07 FTE)	GS 12
Administrative Officer	PFT (0.01 FTE)	GS 9

¹ PFT = Permanent Full Time; FTE = Full Time Equivalent where 1.0 equals one staff year.

Proposed Staffing for Baker Island NWR

Staff	Employment Status and Proportion of Time¹	Salary Rating
Project Leader	PFT (0.02 FTE)	GS 13
Supervisory Wildlife Biologist	PFT (0.14 FTE)	GS 12
Resource Contaminant Specialist	PFT (0.07 FTE)	GS 12
Coral Reef Biologist	PFT (0.14 FTE)	GS 12
Administrative Officer	PFT (0.02 FTE)	GS 9

¹ PFT = Permanent Full Time; FTE = Full Time Equivalent where 1.0 equals one staff year.

Projects

The table below contains projects developed as part of the Refuge Operating Needs System (RONS) and Service Asset Maintenance Management System (SAMMS). Brief project descriptions and their associated costs are provided. Funding of these projects would assist refuge staff in achieving the goals, objectives, and strategies of the CCP for Baker Island NWR.

Projects: RONS and SAMMS List

Project No.	Title and Description	Cost Estimate (Thousands)	Station Rank
97003	Inventory and Monitor Terrestrial Resources: Provide a wildlife biologist to inventory and monitor terrestrial plants, invertebrates and nesting seabirds. Remote Pacific islands provide the only secure habitat for nesting	325.25	9

Project No.	Title and Description	Cost Estimate (Thousands)	Station Rank
	seabirds, sea turtles and marine life within thousands of square miles of ocean.		
00001	Eliminate Exotic Rodent Species on Remote Pacific Islands: Provide biological technicians and transportation expenses to restore habitat for pelagic seabirds and terrestrial plant and animal species on Howland, Baker and Jarvis NWRs.	194.0	10
980002	Eliminate Exotic Rodent Species on Remote Pacific Islands: Provide Wildlife Refuge Specialist to supervise biological technicians and transportation expenses to restore habitat for pelagic seabirds and terrestrial plant and animal species on Howland, Baker, and Jarvis NWRs.	174.75	10
98002	Develop Interpretative Program, Remote Island NWRs: Develop a brochure for Baker, Howland and Jarvis Island NWRs and host 3 special outreach events every year in Hawaii.	77.875	999
00006	Staff and Maintain a New Vessel to Accomplish Basic Refuge Operations: This vessel will provide basic logistical support for 16 islands and remote field stations on 9 different national wildlife refuges across the Pacific Ocean. The vessel will be similar in size and capability to the M/V Tiglax at the Alaska Maritime NWR	204.8	3
00018	Inventory and Monitor Coral Reef Resources: Remote refuges contain some of the most valuable and spectacular marine and coralline resources in the National Wildlife Refuge System. Baker Island NWR is so remote that basic knowledge of marine resources is lacking. There is a need to perform biennial monitoring of the marine resources at this refuge.	137.0	4
98004	Install Remote Surveillance System: Acquire camera equipment and service contract with a satellite communications provider to detect incursion by unauthorized visitors, such as poachers and commercial fishing vessels to assist the Coast Guard and Refuge Law Enforcement Officers in investigating illegal activities within the Refuge.	241.2	14
90100411	Replace Broken, Rotten, and Vandalized Signs: Replace degraded entrance signs to deter trespass and prevent introduction of invasive species.	190.0	6
02121744	Rehabilitate Historic Day Beacon: This beacon not only has historic significance, it is also used as a landmark by	355.0	999

Project No.	Title and Description	Cost Estimate (Thousands)	Station Rank
	mariners. The beacon requires structural repairs and painting.		
00018	Establish Refuge Contaminants Abatement and Remediation Program Environmental Toxicologist	183.75	2

Appendix F

Wilderness Review for Baker Island National Wildlife Refuge

I. General Information on Wilderness Reviews

Wilderness review is the process used to determine whether or not to recommend lands or waters in the National Wildlife Refuge System (System) to the United States Congress for designation as wilderness. Planning policy for the System (602 FW 3) mandates conducting wilderness reviews every 15 years through the Comprehensive Conservation Planning (CCP) process.

The wilderness review process has three phases: inventory, study, and recommendation. After first identifying lands and waters that meet the minimum criteria for wilderness, the resulting wilderness study areas (WSA) are further evaluated to determine if they merit recommendation from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) to the Secretary of the Interior (Secretary) for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System (NWPS). Areas recommended for designation are managed to maintain wilderness character in accordance with management goals, objectives, and strategies outlined in the Final CCP until Congress makes a decision or the CCP is amended to modify or remove the wilderness proposal. A brief discussion of wilderness inventory, study, and recommendation follows.

Wilderness Inventory

The wilderness inventory consists of identifying areas that minimally meet the requirements for of wilderness as defined in the Wilderness Act of 1964 (Wilderness Act). Wilderness is defined as an area which:

- Has at least 5 thousand acres of land or is of sufficient size as to make practicable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition, or be capable of restoration to wilderness character through appropriate management at the time of review, or be a roadless island;
- Generally appears to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprint of man's work substantially unnoticeable;
- Has outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation; and
- May also contain ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value. These features and values, though desirable, are not necessary for an area to qualify as a wilderness.

Wilderness Study

During the study phase, lands and waters qualifying for wilderness as a result of the inventory are studied to analyze values (ecological, recreational, cultural, spiritual), resources (e.g., wildlife, water, vegetation, minerals, soils), and uses (habitat management, public use) within the area. The findings of the study help determine whether to recommend the area for designation as wilderness.

Wilderness Recommendation

Once a wilderness study determines that a WSA meets the requirements for inclusion in the NWPS, a wilderness study report that presents the results of the wilderness review, accompanied by a Legislative Environmental Impact Statement (LEIS), is prepared. The wilderness study report and LEIS that support wilderness designation are then transmitted through the Secretary of Interior to the President of United States, and ultimately to Congress for approval.

The following sections summarize the inventory and study phases of the wilderness review for Baker Island National Wildlife Refuge (Baker).

II. Wilderness Inventory

The wilderness inventory is a broad look at the planning area to identify WSAs. These WSAs are roadless areas within refuge boundaries, including submerged lands and their associated water column, that meet the minimum criteria for wilderness identified in Sect. 2(c) of the Wilderness Act. A WSA must meet the minimum size criteria (or be a roadless island), appear natural, and provide outstanding opportunities for solitude or primitive recreation. Other supplemental values are evaluated, but not required. In order to identify WSAs, Baker was divided into two inventory units based upon the differences between the terrestrial and marine ecological resources. Inventory Unit A is the 531-acre roadless island known as Baker Island, and Inventory Unit B is composed of the 31,378 combined acres of coral reefs, submergent lands and their associated water column lying within 3 nautical miles (nmi) from the shoreline at the mean high water mark of Baker Island. The inventory of roadless areas, submerged lands, and associated water column of Baker and application of the wilderness criteria is described in the following sections and summarized in Table F-1.

Evaluation of Size Criteria for Roadless Areas, Roadless Islands, and Submergent Lands and Associated Water Column

Identification of roadless areas, roadless islands, and submerged lands and associated water column, required gathering land status maps, land use and road inventory data, satellite imagery, aerial photographs, and personal observations of areas within refuge boundaries. “Roadless” refers to the absence of improved roads suitable and maintained for public travel by means of motorized vehicles primarily intended for highway use. Wilderness inventory units currently owned by the Service in fee title were evaluated. These units include Baker Island and the submergent lands and waters lying within 3 nmi of shore.

Inventory units meet the size criteria for a WSA if any one of the following standards applies.

- An area with over 5,000 contiguous acres. State and private lands are not included in making this acreage determination.
- A roadless island of any size. A roadless island is defined as an area surrounded by permanent waters or that is markedly distinguished from the surrounding lands by topographical or ecological features.
- An area of less than 5,000 contiguous Federal acres that is of sufficient size as to make practicable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition, and of a size suitable for wilderness management.

- An area of less than 5,000 contiguous Federal acres that is contiguous with a designated wilderness, recommended wilderness, or area under wilderness review by another Federal wilderness managing agency such as the Forest Service, National Park Service, or Bureau of Land Management.

There are no roads on Baker Island, and the submerged lands and associated water column meet the minimum acreage criteria, thus both inventory units within the refuge boundary meet one or more of the size criteria for wilderness study areas. The physical features of these units are described in detail in the Draft Baker CCP/Environmental Assessment (CCP/EA), Chapter 3.

Evaluation of the Naturalness Criteria

A WSA must meet the naturalness criteria. Section 2(c) of the Wilderness Act defines wilderness as an area that "...generally appears to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature with the imprint of man's work substantially unnoticeable." The area must appear natural to the average visitor rather than "pristine." The presence of ecologically accurate, historic landscape conditions is not required. An area may include some man-made features and human impacts provided they are substantially unnoticeable in the unit as a whole. Human-caused hazards, such as the presence of unexploded ordnance from military activity, and the physical impacts of refuge management facilities and activities are also considered in the evaluation of the naturalness criteria. An area may not be considered unnatural in appearance solely on the basis of "sights and sounds" of human impacts and activities outside the boundary of the unit. The cumulative effects of these factors were considered in the evaluation of naturalness for each wilderness inventory unit.

In the wilderness inventory, specific man-made features and other human impacts need to be identified that affect the overall apparent naturalness of the tract. Based upon the Preferred Alternative contained in the Draft Baker CCP/EA, the following factors were primary considerations in evaluating the naturalness of the inventory units:

Man-made Features:

- abandoned metal airstrip;
- day beacon (aid to navigation);
- derelict airplanes (World War II (WWII) vintage);
- refuge boundary sign;
- marine debris, including 11 marine landing crafts (LCMs);
- abandoned rock building foundations;
- abandoned military machinery;
- five wooden poles (long range navigation (LORAN) and communications);
- trenches filled with rusting remains of hundreds of barrels;
- contamination from burning thousands of gallons of fuel and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs);
- electrical debris contaminated with PCBs;
- batteries, paint, other unidentified contaminants;
- unidentified large human-made mounds;
- abandoned military village;

- airplane revetments;
- un-located ammunition dump;
- two graveyards;
- cuts in berm to channel and runway approach;
- mining activity including small ponded area.

Management Activities:

- refuge boundary sign;
- field camp;
- generators;
- contaminant remediation activities;
- invasive species control;
- collect and stockpile marine debris;
- migratory bird surveys;
- marine surveys (including SCUBA); and
- boat transportation.

A 4 x 8 foot boundary sign announcing the name and ownership of the island is maintained on Baker. The sign is informational in nature, identifying the sanctuary status the island enjoys. The primary management intrusion to the naturalness of Baker is during the deployment and demobilization of field camps. Transportation from Honolulu, Hawaii across 1,690 nmi of open ocean to Baker is only safely and reliably possible with motorized ocean-going marine vessels. Once the marine transport vessel arrives at Baker, small boats with outboard motors are deployed to transport two biologists and their field camp gear to the island. Once on the island, biologists set up tents, sleeping gear, food, and other supplies. Walking surveys occur across the island to document bird species presence, potentially hand pull or hand spray invasive plant species, inventory cultural sites, and monitor contaminated areas. Marine surveys also occur. They are based from the marine vessel primarily using SCUBA. Field camps are planned to last for 2 days and typically occur once every two years. Occasional field camps with 5-8 individuals staying for up to 2 weeks have occurred in the past. During these extended field camps, diesel-powered generators have been used to operate communication equipment. All other mechanical equipment such as air compressors for SCUBA equipment remain on the marine transport vessel. Upon demobilization of the field camp, all equipment and debris are removed. An indirect human impact to the naturalness of Baker is the presence of marine debris that washes onto coral reefs and beaches. Attempts to remove and stockpile this debris for eventual removal occur during field camps. Otherwise, Baker is an isolated, uninhabited island in the middle of the Pacific Ocean for the vast majority of time.

The terrestrial tract does not meet the naturalness criteria. Considerable evidence of human activities and abuse of the island exists. The metal airstrip is plainly evident, as are derelict vehicles, airplanes, and buildings. Fuel and other liquid filled drums are in various stages of decay, most having released their contents and thereby contaminating the associated soils. At present, these man-made features act collectively for the terrestrial portion of Baker not meet the naturalness criteria. If at some point in the future funding becomes available to clean up the contamination and debris, the terrestrial portion would need to be reevaluated for the naturalness criteria.

The submerged tract meets the naturalness criteria. There is a small channel cut in the coral reef to aid navigation, and there are scattered sections of chain and anchor, but these do not detract from Baker's submerged lands meeting the naturalness criteria. Being over 60 years old, new coral growth along the channel has made it indistinguishable from adjoining coral reef areas. Although the U.S. Navy documented the loss of 11 LCMs in the nearshore waters, their presence has yet to be confirmed. Taken collectively, these impacts to naturalness in the marine environment are a minor component of the overall marine area.

Evaluation of Outstanding Opportunities for Solitude or Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

In addition to meeting the size and naturalness criteria, a WSA must provide outstanding opportunities for solitude or primitive recreation. The area does not have to possess outstanding opportunities for both solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation, and does not need to have outstanding opportunities on every acre. Further, an area does not have to be open to public use and access to qualify under these criteria. Congress has designated a number of wilderness areas in the NWPS that are closed to public access to protect ecological resource values.

Opportunities for solitude refers to the ability of a visitor to be alone and secluded from other visitors in the area. Primitive and unconfined recreation means non-motorized, dispersed outdoor recreation activities that do not require developed facilities or mechanical transport. These primitive recreation activities may provide opportunities to experience challenge and risk, self reliance, and adventure.

These two opportunity "elements" are not well defined by the Wilderness Act but in most cases can be expected to occur together. However, an outstanding opportunity for solitude may be present in an area offering only limited primitive recreation potential. Conversely, an area may be so attractive for recreation use that experiencing solitude is not an option.

The following factors and their cumulative effects were the primary considerations in evaluating the availability of outstanding opportunities for solitude or primitive unconfined recreation at Baker:

- island size, vegetation, and terrain;
- distance to habitation, whether mainland or an inhabited island;
- presence of day beacon or aid to navigation and associated structures; and
- viewshed within and from refuge boundary.

Solitude is the overwhelming force that visitors experience on Baker. The island is separated by over 1,690 nautical miles from Hawaii, and approximately 1110 nmi from Kiritimati Island Atoll, the nearest inhabited island. Expanses of open ocean with no other landform are visible from every angle. The island itself, with the exception of a few historical features, is a mixture of short grass and shrubs, bare ground, and shoreline beaches and cobble. In the past, field camps have been temporary, with only 2 individuals spending 2 days every 2 years. However, the Preferred Alternative in the Draft Baker CCP/EA proposes to visit the refuge every year with the same number of individuals for the same duration. Underwater, coral reefs are pristine and the open-water depths are devoid of human presence.

Since establishment, Baker has been and will remain closed to general public access in order to protect the valuable seabird and marine resource values. Thus, there are no outdoor recreational opportunities.

Both Baker inventory units meet the solitude criteria, but do not meet the primitive unconfined recreation criteria.

Evaluation of Supplemental Values

Supplemental values are defined by the Wilderness Act as “ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historic value.” Baker Island and its surrounding coral reefs and deep water areas compose a complete and functioning ecosystem. Isolated, predator-free islands are valuable and often required for successful seabird nesting. Nearshore waters, coral reefs, and associated currents combine and provide food resources for foraging seabirds and coral reef communities. The position and underwater gradient of Baker in deep ocean currents allows these currents to reach the surface, thereby increasing rates of productivity for plants, corals and vertebrate species. These rich ecological resources in a relatively pristine and unaltered environment provide unique opportunities for scientific study and environmental education. There are no known archaeological resources on Baker. Historically, Baker Island was important to early colonization efforts during the guano mining and WWII eras. Historical artifacts such as the day beacon, building ruins, and guano mining excavations are present but eroded and are distinguishable from the natural environment. One landmark, the Baker day beacon, contrasts vividly with the overall expansive vistas of open ocean and island habitats. These values are not required for wilderness but their presence compliments the requirements for wilderness designation. Please see Chapter 3 of the Draft CCP/EA for a more complete description of these supplemental values.

Inventory Findings and Wilderness Study Areas

Only the marine Inventory Unit B meets the minimum criteria for consideration as WSA (Figure F-1), and is identified as:

- WSA-A: Coral reefs, submergent lands, and associated water column of the Baker Island WSA.

Figure F-1. Wilderness Study Areas




Table F-1 Wilderness Inventory Summary

	Inventory Unit A: Baker Island (531 acres)	Inventory Unit B: Submerged lands and waters to 3 nmi (31,378 acres)
Required Components		
(1) Has at least 5000 acres of land or is of sufficient size to make practicable its preservation and use in an unconfined condition, or is a roadless island.	Yes. Is a 531-acre roadless island.	Yes. Approximately 31,378 acres contained within the territorial sea from mean high tide to 3 nmi.
(2) Generally appears to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprint of man's work substantially unnoticeable.	No. The imprint of man's work is substantially noticeable.	Yes. Coral reefs and other underwater features untouched by humans.
(3a) Has outstanding opportunities for solitude.	Yes. Uninhabited island 1,690 nmi from Hawaii.	Yes. Isolation from habitation both on surface and below.
(3b) Has outstanding opportunities for a primitive and unconfined type of recreation.	No. Refuge is closed to all recreational activities.	No. Refuge is closed to all recreational activities.
Other Components		
(4) Contains ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value.	Baker day beacon, guano mining, colonization ruins, WWII military ruins, and nesting seabirds.	Nearly pristine coral reefs and associated marine fish, mammals, and turtles abound.
Summary		
Parcel qualifies as a wilderness study area (meets criteria 1, 2 & 3a or 3b).	No	Yes

III. Wilderness Study

The WSA identified in the Wilderness Inventory was further evaluated to determine suitability for designation, management, and preservation as wilderness. Considerations in this evaluation included:

- quality of wilderness values; and,
- capability for management of refuge as wilderness (or manageability) and minimum requirements/tools analysis.

This information provides a basis to compare the impacts of a range of management alternatives and determine the most appropriate management direction for each WSA.

Evaluation of Wilderness Values

The following information considers the quality of the WSAs' mandatory and supplemental wilderness characteristics.

Size

WSA-A meets the minimum size criteria, being a 31,378-acre marine ecosystem.

Naturalness

WSA-A generally appears to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprint of human uses and activities substantially unnoticeable. Except for the boat channel and potential presence of LCMs mentioned in the Wilderness Inventory, all submerged features were entirely created by the natural processes of volcanism; wind erosion; wave erosion; water erosion; geological subsidence; and reef growth and consolidation from coral, coralline algae, and giant clam calcification during the past 50 to 80 million years. Except the boat channel, no substantial features were constructed or modified by humans in the marine environment during the island's entire geological history. The impacts of past human presence (boat channel) are barely apparent. See Chapter 3 of the Draft Baker CCP/EA for a more detailed description of natural and cultural features. Management activities will temporarily disturb the naturalness of the area. Temporary field camps on adjacent Baker Island and marine research activities in the WSA will require boat access as the only safe, practical and reliable means of transportation.

Outstanding Opportunities for Solitude and Primitive Recreation

WSA-A offers outstanding opportunity for solitude. Solitude overwhelms the human spirit at Baker. The only noise on the island is from pounding surf, winds, buzzing insects, and the calls of birds. Underwater, all that is heard is one's own breath, the surf, and the sound of fish feeding on coral. The blue of the sky and sea and the brightness of the stark landscape saturate the visual character; and birds, winds, and surf saturate the acoustic character of the refuge. It is hard to image a more remote, isolated, and truly more wilderness experience in the entire equatorial Pacific than when standing on the island or diving on adjacent reefs.

There are no permanent improvements of any kind to accommodate visitors to Baker. The capacity to reach Baker without substantial investment, preplanning, and permission is considerable and further restricts the capability of individuals from reaching the island and intruding on the opportunity for solitude. The nearest humans live 330 nmi to the southeast

where less than 100 Kiribati people inhabit Kanton Atoll where there is an airfield and dock. There are no other inhabitants elsewhere in the Phoenix Islands. These logistical constraints contribute to the maintenance of solitude.

Supplemental Values

WSA-A offers outstanding ecological values with features of scientific, educational, scenic interest, and historical value. Nearly pristine coral reefs, reef fish, giant clams, beaches, native terrestrial vegetation, unexplored deep slopes, localized upwelling currents, migratory shorebirds, and large populations and variety of seabirds are among the strong ecological values. The lack of current human impact provides a rare opportunity to study unaltered marine ecosystems, and the impact that global climate change may have on these systems. The sheer vastness of the ocean landscape, punctuated by a small dot of land, and the multitude of bird and marine life attracted to it, provide a sense of awe and spectacular beauty to the landscape.

Evaluation of Manageability and Minimum Requirements/Tools Analysis

Originally administered by the U.S. Department of Interior's Office of Territorial Affairs, the Secretary, on June 27, 1974, designated Baker Island and its territorial sea extending to the 3 nmi limit as a unit of the System (39 FR 27930). The Service administers all units of the System pursuant to the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966, as amended. The acquisition authority for establishing the refuge is found in the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (16 U.S.C. 742f(b)(1)). It states the general purpose for establishing the refuge is "... for the development, advancement, management, conservation, and protection of fish and wildlife resources ...", and "... for the benefit of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, in performing its activities and services" (16 U.S.C. 742f (a)(4)). The specific purpose for establishing Baker is (USFWS 1973), "...the restoration and preservation of the complete ecosystem, terrestrial and marine. Priority must be given to allowing seabird nesting colonies to reestablish on Baker so eventually they would eventually reach the great numbers which were present there prior to human occupancy and abuse of the island during the past 125 years."

There are no valid existing private rights, including mineral rights, associated with this WSA.

Several management activities are required for the Service to meet responsibilities for managing Baker Island and its associated marine waters as a national wildlife refuge as specified in relevant legislation and policies. A complete description of management activities can be found in Chapter 2 of the Draft Baker CCP/EA. The following is a brief description of management activities as they relate to minimum requirement determinations of activities occurring within designated wilderness.

Section 4(c) of the Wilderness Act of 1964 lists several generally prohibited uses including no temporary roads, no use of motor vehicles, no motorized equipment or motorboats, no aircraft landings, no other forms of mechanical transport, and no structure or installation. However, Section 4(c) also states an exception to these general prohibitions: "...as necessary to meet minimum requirements for the administration of the area for the purpose of this Act..." Examples of actions that may satisfy this exception include recreational developments such as trails, bridges, and signs.

WSA-A on Baker can be managed to preserve its wilderness character in perpetuity, recognizing that using a “minimum requirements” approach would be required for all activities. Existing refuge management activities within the WSA is consistent with management direction in the Wilderness Act and current Service wilderness stewardship policy in the Refuge Manual (6 RM 8). These management activities include: motorized marine vessel transportation to and from Baker; small motorboat operations used in deployment and demobilization of field camp operations; survey and monitoring of marine habitat including the use of SCUBA equipment; and control of invasive species. None of the current or expected refuge management activities would permanently diminish the wilderness character of WSA-A. Additionally, there are no plans to construct permanent facilities or structures to accommodate these uses or activities.

Located in the central Pacific Ocean, transportation to Baker can only occur with the use of ocean-going marine vessels. The only practical and safe mode of vessel propulsion is gas or diesel powered engine. While it is possible to use sail power to navigate to the island, the reliability of mechanical engines provides a margin of safety to escape extreme weather hazards, or proceed on course and on time in the absence of wind. For the same reasons of safety and practicality, small motorized vessels are used to transport equipment and personnel from the transport vessel to the island to establish field camps and conduct biological survey and monitoring activities. Rough surf, shallow coral reefs, and strong winds preclude the use of non-motorized craft to safely navigate these hazards.

Monitoring of the marine ecosystem occurs from scientists based aboard the marine transportation vessel. Small motorboats often provide safe transportation to specific research sites near Baker. SCUBA equipment is often used to complete marine surveys and is the only safe and practical method of conducting underwater marine surveys.

In summary, safety, practicality, and effectiveness require the occasional use of management programs and associated tools (some of which are generally prohibited by the Wilderness Act) to pursue achievement of refuge purposes, goals and objectives. Current and proposed refuge management would be consistent with wilderness designation and management of both WSAs. Although occasionally diminished, none of the resource values identified above would be permanently impacted because of wilderness designation and the management described herein.

IV. Development of Alternatives

After evaluating the quality of wilderness values, manageability, minimum management requirements, the following alternatives were developed and analyzed for wilderness designation.

Alternative A (No Action)

Under this alternative, no WSAs would be recommended as suitable for wilderness designation. The refuge lands and waters would be managed as they have been in the past to accomplish refuge purposes in accordance with legal and policy guidance for the System.

Alternative B

WSA-A, which includes the submerged lands and associated water column would be immediately recommended for inclusion in the NWPS. Selection of this alternative would require the completion of an Legislative Environmental Impact Statement (LEIS).

Alternative C (Preferred Alternative)

WSA-A, which includes the submerged lands and associated water column of Baker would be recommended for inclusion in the NWPS. The wilderness study area would be managed to ensure that its wilderness character was not adversely impacted. However, the recommendation to include this area in the NWPS would be postponed until such time that CCPs and their associated wilderness inventories and studies for remote Pacific Island NWRs were completed. At such a time, a wilderness study report and associated LEIS that encompasses remote Pacific island refuges would be prepared. Alternative D is identified here as the Preferred Alternative for the Wilderness Review of Baker, and is a component of the Preferred Alternative in the Draft Baker CCP/EA.

Alternatives considered but eliminated from detailed study

Federal agencies are required by National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) to rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives and to briefly discuss the reasons for eliminating any alternatives that were not developed in detail (40 CFR 1502.14). It was determined that there was no benefit in analyzing partial wilderness alternatives. There are no feasible or practical boundary adjustments that would improve the manageability of this WSA.

Appendix G

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE for Implementation of the Baker Island National Wildlife Refuge Comprehensive Conservation Plan

The following executive orders and legislative acts have been reviewed as they apply to implementation of the Comprehensive Conservation Plan (CCP) for Baker Island NWR.

National Environmental Policy Act (1969) (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.). The CCP planning process is conducted in accordance with National Environmental Policy Act implementing procedures, Department of Interior (Interior) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) procedures, and is performed in coordination with the affected public. Procedures used to reach this decision meet the requirements of the Act and its implementing regulations in 40 CFR Parts 1500-1508. These procedures include: the development of a range of alternatives for the Baker CCP; analysis of the likely effects of each alternative; and public involvement throughout the planning process.

The CCP management objectives and alternatives are integrated into an environmental assessment (EA) document and process, including the release of a Draft CCP/EA for a 30-day public comment period. Public notices of availability of the Draft CCP/EA include a Federal Register notice, news releases to local media outlets, the Service's refuge planning website, and planning updates. Copies of the Draft CCP/EA and planning updates were distributed to an extensive mailing list. In addition, the Service met with staff from the Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). Revisions in the Final CCP are based on public comments received from the Draft CCP/EA. Comment letters and Service response to comments can be found as an Appendix in the Final CCP.

National Historic Preservation Act (1966) (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.). This act requires Federal agencies to consult with the President's Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), State or Territorial Historic Preservation Officers, and the National Park Service (NPS) for any proposed actions that may affect cultural resources eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Consultation has occurred with the ACHP and NPS for their input. Consultation with a State Historic Preservation Officer is not required for this proposal because Baker Island NWR lies outside any state jurisdiction. No Territorial Historic Preservation Officer is assigned to Baker Island NWR. Rather territories/possessions lie in the jurisdiction of the ACHP.

The management of archaeological and cultural resources of Baker Island NWR complies with the regulations of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. No historic properties listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places have been identified on Baker Island NWR. No historic properties are known to be affected by the proposed action based on the criteria of an effect or adverse effect as an undertaking defined in 36 CFR 800.9 and Service Manual 614 FW 2. Determining whether a particular action has

a potential to affect cultural resources is an ongoing process that occurs as step-down and site-specific project plans are developed. Should historic properties be identified in the future, the Service will comply with the National Historic Preservation Act if any management actions have the potential to affect any these properties.

Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), Secretarial Order 3127, and Section 211 of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) of 1986 (10 U.S.C. 2701-2706, 2810-2811). Contamination resulting from military occupation is required to be mitigated as a Formerly Used Defense Site (FUDS). Any FUDS is part of the Defense Environmental Restoration Program (DERP), administered by the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE). The ACOE is responsible for the identification, investigation, research and development, and cleanup of contamination from hazardous substances, and pollutants and contaminants; correction of environmental damage such as detection and disposal of unexploded ordnance; and demolition and removal of unsafe buildings and structures at former Department of Defense sites. In 1986, the ACOE maintain they have completed their responsibilities under DERP.

Executive Order 13175. Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments. As required under Secretary of the Interior Order 3206 American Indian Tribal Rights, Federal-Tribal Responsibilities, and the Endangered Species Act, the refuge manager determined that there are no tribal governments associated with Baker Island NWR. Thus, there was no coordination with any American Indian tribe.

Executive Order 12372. Intergovernmental Review. Coordination and consultation with other affected Federal agencies has been completed through personal contact by Service planners, refuge managers, and supervisors. In addition, the refuge manager determined there are no local, state or tribal governments associated with Baker Island NWR.

Executive Order 12898. Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations. All Federal actions must address and identify, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations, low-income populations, and Indian Tribes in the United States. The CCP was evaluated and no adverse human health or environmental effects were identified for minority or low-income populations, Indian Tribes, or anyone else.

Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA)(16 U.S.C. 703-712). Baker Island NWR is an important site for migratory shorebirds and nesting seabirds. Protecting nesting seabird habitat is the major purpose of the refuge, and is consistent with the provisions of MBTA. All of the proposed alternatives would be consistent with the refuge purpose and the MBTA in protecting of these birds, although the proposed action would afford more benefits. This planning effort is being coordinated with other offices of the Service and Interior that have responsibilities pertaining to the MBTA.

Executive Order 13186. Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds. This Order directs departments and agencies to take certain actions to further

implement the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. A provision of the Order directs Federal agencies to consider the impacts of their activities, especially in reference to birds on the Fish and Wildlife Service's list of Birds of Conservation Concern (BCC). It also directs agencies to incorporate conservation recommendations and objectives found within the North American Waterbird Conservation Plan and bird conservation plans developed by Partners in Flight (PIF) into agency planning. Species selected as focal conservation targets in the CCP were identified from multiple sources including pertinent BCC lists, applicable Flyway Management Plans, and regional seabird and shorebird conservation plans. The effects of all alternatives on focal conservation targets were assessed during this planning process.

Endangered Species Act (ESA)(16 U.S.C. 1531-1544). The ESA provides for the conservation of threatened and endangered species of fish, wildlife, and plants by Federal action and by encouraging the establishment of state programs. It provides for the determination and listing of endangered and threatened species and the designation of critical habitats. Section 7 of the ESA requires refuge managers to perform consultation before initiating projects that affect or may affect endangered species.

Baker Island NWR provides feeding and potential nesting habitat for two listed species of endangered sea turtle: the endangered hawksbill turtle, *Eretmochelys imbricata* and the threatened green turtle *Chelonia mydas*. In accordance with section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et. Seq.), the Service, as a component of this CCP/EA, evaluated potential impacts to the two listed turtle species. It was determined that undertaking any action as part of any alternative in this CCP will have no effect on either of the two turtle species. Therefore, formal consultation with NOAA-National Marine Fisheries Service is not required and will not be initiated.

National Wildlife Administration Act of 1966, as amended by The National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997 (16 U.S.C. 668dd-668ee). The National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act requires the Service to develop and implement a comprehensive conservation plan for each refuge. These conservation plans identify and describe a refuge purpose; refuge vision and goals; fish, wildlife, and plant populations and related habitats; archaeological and cultural values of the refuge; issues that may affect populations and habitats of fish, wildlife, and plants; actions necessary to restore and improve biological diversity of the refuge; and opportunities for wildlife-dependent recreation.

Wilderness Preservation Act of 1964 (Wilderness Act). The Wilderness Act requires the Service to evaluate the suitability of Baker for wilderness designation (Appendix F) and has found that the marine wilderness inventory unit met wilderness study area criteria. Recommendation for portions of Baker to be included in the Wilderness Preservation System is deferred until such time that other remote Pacific island refuges are evaluated for wilderness designation and a combined proposal as part of a larger comprehensive Legislative Environmental Impact Statement is prepared.

Magnuson-Stevens Fisheries Management and Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 1801-1882). This act provides the guidance for sustainable management of commercial fisheries in

Federal waters by NOAA in consultation with Regional Fisheries Management Councils that develop fisheries management plans (FMPS) subject to NOAA approval, monitoring and implementation. The Western Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Council (WESPAC) and NOAA have implemented and approved several FMPS that apply to U.S. insular Pacific waters. The FMPS were all implemented after Baker Island NWR was established in 1974 and include plans for: 1) pelagic fish; 2) bottom fish including some reef species; 3) crustaceans including lobsters; and, 4) precious corals. Commercial activities including commercial fishing are prohibited in surrounding marine water and benthic habitat out to the 3 nautical mile (nmi) limit because Baker Island is established as a no-take marine protected area and a National Wildlife Refuge. Moreover, the Service retains jurisdiction and management for any fisheries within the refuge. Available information indicates commercial fishing under the auspices of any of the FMPS is not being pursued outside the 3 nmi boundary of the refuge. Informal consultation also indicates that WESPAC continues to honor Service jurisdiction and authorities within the 3 nmi offshore boundary of the refuge (K. Simonds, pers. comm. with J. Maragos 2006).

Executive Order 13089, Coral Reef Protection (June 11, 1998). The purpose of this Executive order is "...to preserve and protect the biodiversity, health, heritage, and social and economic value of U.S. coral reef ecosystems and the marine environment..." It directs all Federal agencies to identify actions that may affect U.S. coral reefs; utilize their programs and authorities to protect and enhance coral reef ecosystems; and assure their actions would not degrade those ecosystems. Federal agencies whose actions affect U.S. coral reef ecosystems are further directed to implement measures needed to research, monitor, manage, and restore affected ecosystems, including, but not limited to, measures reducing impacts from pollution, sedimentation, and fishing. This Executive Order also initially established the U.S. Coral Reef Task Force, co-chaired by the Secretaries of the Interior and Commerce, through the Administrator of NOAA. The Task Force has oversight responsibility for implementation of policy and Federal agency responsibilities found in this order, and support activities under the U.S. Coral Reef Initiative. In addition, this order directs the Task Force to work cooperatively with State, territory, commonwealth, and local government partners to map, monitor, conserve, mitigate, and restore coral reef ecosystems.

The Proposed Action and other alternatives are fully consistent with the spirit and intent of the Executive order. Copies of the Draft CCP/EA would be provided to the Directorate of the Coral Reef Task Force for coordination.

Coral Reef Conservation Act and Executive Order 13158, Marine Protected Areas (16 U.S.C. 6401-6409)(May 26, 2000). These statutes collectively direct Federal agencies to coordinate among themselves and State and Territorial governments via the Coral Reef Task Force to protect and enhance coral reefs and avoid actions that degrade reefs, promote marine protected area development and reef restoration, and provide conservation grants and cooperative agreements (including States and institutions) to conduct research and development of existing and candidate marine protected areas located on coral reefs. The Coral Reef Conservation Act of 2000 is scheduled for reauthorization in 2007.

The Proposed Action and other alternatives are consistent with the spirit and intent of these policies. Baker Island NWR is one of only a few Federal no-take marine protected areas in the equatorial Pacific. Implementation of the Proposed Action would materially improve surveillance and enforcement and discourage unauthorized take of fish and wildlife within the refuge and improve the capacity of the Service to monitor fish and wildlife and manage their protection within the refuge.

Chief, Branch of Refuge Planning

Date

This page left intentionally blank.