

## ***HCP 6-MONTH REVIEW MEETING***

April 24, 2008

10:00 p.m. to 12:00 p.m.

### **MINUTES**

***Attending:*** Louise Clemency (USFWS), Cathy Carnes (USFWS), Darrell Zastrow (WDNR-FR), Rebecca Schroeder (WDNR-ER), Matt Krumenauer (WDNR-FR, recorder), Bob Hess (WDNR-ER/FR), Dave Lentz (WDNR-FR), Quinn Williams (WDNR-LS)

- 1. Permit Renewal Preparation -- *Give overview, discuss, decide, plan time table to deal with issues as appropriate:*** FWS has the goal of addressing all remaining issues before renewal. FWS would like to prioritize the objectives and tasks for the time remaining before renewal.

**Action:** DNR to develop and present to FWS a timeline for permit renewal

Documents submitted with renewal:

- FWS ITP renewal application
  - HCP Document (the new testament)
  - IA
  - Articles of Partnership??-(need to determine if these are necessary; may be able to incorporate AOP components into the SHCA and IA; others into the new HCP)
  - SCHAs Template (and any new or revised partner SHCAs)
  - ITP – DNR to work with GBFO on our draft changes
- 
- IOC is redrafting Articles of Partnership – These no longer reflect the issues that are facing the partnership today. FWS agrees that it is important to revisit these. It will be important to determine if these are necessary moving forward.
  - IOC is considering redrafting SHCA template to be commensurate with the needs of the program, consistent with the many changes that have occurred, many of which remove the need for custom SHCAs as was the case with the original SHCAs. This will streamline HCP administration processes for the Service, the DNR and the partners by making conservation agreements simple, uniform and efficient to administer. – FWS agrees that the SHCAs could be standardized and simplified.
  - IOC is considering redesigning the HCP organization and modifying how they operate, e.g. IOC role, IOC meetings, partner meetings, etc. – The IOC and HCP Partners are determining how to document the partnership protocols and operating processes.

- NNLOH goal: revisit the HCP's primary goal. Is this appropriate for the future? – The HCP may not need to speak to that. We no longer need to continue to have this discussion. NNLOH is in fact achieved. By the very nature of beneficial disturbance while implementing the HCP, NNLOH will continue to be achieved. This is still a valid HCP goal.

Cathy wrote: Without a baseline it has been very hard to quantify and demonstrate a NNLOH goal. It could be retained in the old HCP (which can be used as a reference document). Other HCP goals that may be more pertinent are insuring the persistence of KBB habitat, encouragement of beneficial disturbance and implementation of conservation measures to avoid and minimize take of KBBs as partners conduct their land management activities.

Dave responded that NNLOH was a valid goal, just not realistically measurable; and it is still a valid goal. We need not consider other goals.

**Action: DNR to look into and analyze the forest recon data for– county and state lands.**

Cathy suggested that, while this is not necessary, the Service believes this would be a worthwhile exercise. It would compare how much land was early successional (< 20 years old stands) at the start of the HCP (1999) and in its renewal year (2009). It may be a way to show how the HCP has maintained KBB habitat, and promoted beneficial disturbance and persistence of KBBs, and thus demonstrate its success.

- Update the IA to reflect a much greater understanding of the HCP program and DNR responsibilities and commitments that are based on more certainty of what we are doing and what are commensurate with the species and Service's needs as we understand them today. – This can be made simpler, but will still need to reflect a commitment to the ITP conditions.
- Need to amend HCP may mean re-writing it. Is this what we need to do? How about an addendum added to the front of the HCP explaining that many of the adaptive management improvements are now current and maintained in the User's Guide and the Amendment/Revision/Clarification table and log? The active document may be better described as an "operational manual". – There was extended discussion on this topic.

A new document (new HCP) would be more operational in nature and reflect the learning and adaptive management that has occurred during the first permit period. This would replace the current HCP and will be very simple. It will act as a much clearer guide to implementing the HCP and would not have all the added dialog and extensive descriptions as the original HCP. The original HCP will provide a valuable reference. The Service will need a document that clearly identifies what the new HCP is and partner responsibilities associated with it. It was recommended that text of the HCP be kept general and that specifics (e.g., protocols and procedures) be put in appendices as they are subject to change.

**Action:** DNR will draft a new document to address this and provide to the FWS for comment and further discussion. At least a draft outline should be completed by September 2008 (for the fall HCP review meeting).

Cathy suggested considering modeling the draft outline after pertinent sections of the HCP that address its operational program. From a timing standpoint, there will need to be a public comment period, so DNR will develop a draft within the next year.

Cathy noted that the hyperlinks in the DNR's on-line version of the HCP that contain edited sections based on amendments or clarifications (highlighted in blue) were not working - the links should be connecting you to the information used that support the text changes.

**Action:** DNR will correct hyperlinks.

- 3<sup>rd</sup> party audits? – The FWS does not believe this is necessary. The FWS believes the current audit process works well and the other indicators of other measures such as annual reports indicate the success. The FWS is comfortable with the status quo.
2. New Partner Inclusions, company sales/transfers, name changes, land transfers, SHCA amendments, withdrawals, etc.
- Domtar outreach & education commitment is no longer viable within the HCP. Plum Creek Timber (original partner was Georgia Pacific) through a variety of businesses transactions no longer has a connections to Domtar's tree farm family program. A connection still exists, but no longer with one of the HCP partners. Juris Repsa, formerly of Domtar, continues to coordinate a tree farm group and likely is aware of educ/outreach to that group on KBBs. This is no longer linked with Domtar.
  - SENA has been sold to New Page. A draft SHCA is being worked on, which will formally transfer the HCP responsibilities to New Page. There are no internal or operational changes that will affect the HCP.
  - WPSC and WRPCO are both owned under a new company Integrys. Both still operate as separate entities; therefore no changes will need to be made other than to be aware that our HCP partners now have Integrys as a part of their contact information.
  - Dairyland Power wants to be a partner. They have hired a consulting firm to help with the workload related to HCP inclusion in order to hasten becoming a full partner.
3. Annual Report format change.  
*Proposal: Discontinue publishing all the appendices, e.g. line item lists of what all partners did. Instead, copy all individual partner annual reports and attach to the annual report summary.*
- Action:** FWS will review the 2007 annual report and provide input.

4. HCP implementation monitoring (compliance audits) is shifting more than ever to 1-to-1 training; consider FWS doing fewer formal, for-the-record Audits (random sample?); DNR might assist.
  - FWS comfortable with the audit process as implemented by the DNR with Service oversight. Consider the amending the current HCP audit requirement to add flexibility per our discussion. Example is "...once every five years or as more frequently as needed..." This could address staff turnover and need for more frequent audits by those partners.

**Action:** DNR to provide a proposal to the Service.

5. Partner support for recovery (DNR-FR the partner): **update progress and plans**

**Do as response to "pledge" issue in action items.**

- Partners KBB fund for recovery statistician
- Recovery Implementation Group contribution
- Morainal Sands R.U. BRZ phase 2 research project (UW Madison)

Dave described the many things the DNR HCP program in forestry and the HCP external partners have been doing and are committing to do. A "pledge" concept is not timely; as recovery needs are identified; someone will step up to help. Louise clarified that when we discussed the pledge idea, that it was to secure firm commitments of future contributions in a formal way so the commitment could be used as a match for a grant, e.g. NF&WF. Rebecca stated that state stewardship money could be used to match NF&WF grants. Per Rebecca, Bob Hess, the KBB Recovery Coordinator has been supported by \$30,000 of gift monies, S6 Funds, and Service discretionary monies.

6. One-time-permittee process: (refer to draft process)

- Dave has put together a number of steps on this, which look good to the Service. The agreement is to wait until we can determine what the process will turn out to be with any various items etc.
- The Service would be agreeable to WDNR working directly w/ 1x permittees on mitigation plans for projects that resulted in the loss of less than 5 or 10 acres to KBB habitat (size thresholds to be determined as yet). Cathy stated that DNR staff would likely be involved in the development of the mitigation, and that she would need to coordinate w/ WDNR on recovery needs on state properties. DNR's involvement in mitigation development (including having approval authority) would streamline development of mitigation plans. The mitigation could be tailored to recovery needs. The Service would provide mitigation sideboards or guidelines for use by the DNR and would not have to approve a final mitigation plan (for projects that fall under the threshold acre limit). Quinn was concerned about the Service's ability to step down mitigation approval to the state. The Service believes they can do this. Darrell suggested considering the pros and cons of stepping down this task.

**Action:** Use future application as a trial run on the process. Cathy and Dave will update protocol as appropriate.

7. HCP “Review” meetings: *Re-visit purpose and format* (see issue paper)  
HCP Review meetings will focus on big picture issues; the HCP Working Group format will be used to work on detailed issues.  
Specific recovery issues will be handled in recovery coordination meetings, which for now can be scheduled along with HCP 6-month review meetings.  
The Service advised not developing separate permits for the KBB recovery and HCP programs - rather consider separating out recovery and HCP reporting and monitoring requirements which can be tailored to meet the needs of each program.

**Action:** DNR will address how to sort out HCP and recovery issues and responsibilities within the DNR’s Land and Forestry Divisions, under a single ITP.

**NEXT MEETINGS:**

- May 15, 2008            DNR/FWS Work Group Meeting on HCP issues  
October 22, 2008      HCP/Recovery 6-mo. Meeting in Green Bay

HCP 6-month review Minutes 4-24-08 Draft 3.doc