

**Karner Blue HCP
Implementation Oversight Committee (IOC) Meeting
October 10, 2007
9:30 a.m. - 2:30 p.m.
Schmeekle Nature Reserve
Stevens Point**

MINUTES

Attending: Jim Heap, Ursula Petersen, Gray Birch (Chair), Dave Lentz, Bob Hess, Joel Aanensen, Jim Zahasky, Kozue Nogami (recorder)

1. Anti-Trust Statement

- Dave Lentz delivered the anti-trust statement

2. Approve minutes from 8-23-07

- The minutes were approved as written. Motion to accept by Jim Heap and Joel Aanensen seconded. All approved.

3. Review action items from previous meetings

- Jody accepted the IOC alternate for the County Forest group.
- Construction Projects: Major vs. Minor
Gary Birch and Jim Heap worked on this project. Next step is for DNR to prepare draft documents for the construction guideline and associated protocols.
Action Item: Matt and Dave will be preparing documents on construction guideline to share with the IOC.
- Communication/ Outreach and Education.
IOC members reviewed the draft communication plan (8/23 version). Matt gathered all the comments into new draft communication plan (9/12 version). **Action Item: Review the new communication plan and finalizing the plan in the next meeting.** (Discussed in agenda item #5)
- Document distribution system
DNR is in the process of re-constructing the information distribution system. There are ongoing internal discussions but no final decisions have been made yet. **Action Item: Dave and Kozue will develop a proposal to share when we find some resolution.**
- Update lands included for the expansion areas (bump outs) in the new High Potential Range (HPR).
Gary and Kozue worked on this. Kozue sent out message to all the HCP partners. They all are aware of the change and if they need to update their lands they were instructed to contact Dave or Kozue.
Regarding decreasing lands included due to reduction in HPR, Dave re-explained previous action item for Gray and Jim Heap to develop mapping examples for partners to redefine their lands included; this can wait until the winter meeting. **Carryover Action Item: Gary and Jim to develop mapping example for the winter meeting. Kozue and Dave to determine best way to document lands included. This may not be necessary to redefine until permit renewal.**

4. A. Presentation on Distance Sampling by Bob Hess, WI KBB Recovery Coordinator

Distance Sampling has been endorsed by the FWS and the Federal Recovery Team and monitoring sub-team as the official survey method for estimating Karner populations. This is the sampling that will be implemented on Recovery properties in WI.

- Bob Hess presented Kbb recovery effort in WI and distance sampling method to estimate Kbb population (see presentation).
- Distance sampling methods have been primarily used to measure mammal populations, but have recently been used to estimate Karner blue populations in New York, Michigan and Indiana. Three books have been published on this method. Most of the recovery units in Wisconsin are planning to do population estimates for 2008 season. Fort McCoy is already doing this.
- How does distance sampling differ from Level 3 relative abundance monitoring the HCP partners have done? The difference between the two is the statistical power; Level 3 survey is an index tool, and distance sampling is population estimation tool. Federal recovery plan recovery goals are in population numbers. Application of Level 3 indices is not sufficient for estimating populations. FWS supports distance sampling method to estimate population.

B. Funding for the distance sampling

- Dave explained the reasoning why a statistician is needed to develop transect sampling strategies for distance sampling; why achieving recovery in WI is in the partners best interest; and that providing support for this is the in the critical path toward hastening recovery.

The IOC previously agreed to invest the Natural Resource Foundation (NRF) fund in support of Kbb recovery in WI. Dave said supporting the development of sampling strategies for WI recovery properties would be a critical, timely investment for HCP partners. There was a brief discussion to test this proposal against alternative exit strategies.

- As an option, supporting recovery team and gaining HCP flexibility was seen as the best choice.
- The IOC still sees the need to clearly state that there is a distinction in the HCP partners' role in supporting recovery as opposed to being responsible for achieving recovery. Dave said this would be a topic on the November 9th HCP 6-month review agenda.

DECISION: IOC unanimously agreed to use the NRF fund to support a statistician to design sampling strategies for Distance Sampling survey transects for Kbb recovery in Wisconsin as matching funds pending approval of the NFWF for Kbb recovery. A motion to accept was made by Jim Heap; motion seconded Ursula Petersen. All were in favor.

5. Strategic Communication Plan – Purpose to gain get any additional comments from IOC and gain approval to implement this updated plan. There was some discussion on how to roll out the new plan. Discussion items include, how this changes partners' O&E focus, how to provide training/clarification on O&E requirements and when/how to best communicate this to the partnership.

- O&E should emphasize a focus directly toward landowners in the Biological Recovery Zones (BRZ); and specifically in the BRZs where additional support is necessary to secure sustainable metapopulations where the recovery property per se cannot assure recovery.
- O&E should apply to other agencies and organizations that have opportunities to approach landowners in BRZs.

- Should IOC form a communication team to help achieve the goals of this updated plan? Initially, Matt Krumenauer can assess this; work with a small core group as needed and then advise the IOC if a formal Communication Team needs to be assembled.
- The focus on BRZs is not intended to discourage O&E to others, e.g. school children, local conservation groups, etc., but these activities should be done as a normal role in their organization where this applies, and not seen as an SHCA/IA requirement under the HCP.
- Bob said that each of the partner's O&E effort, especially in BRZ, could also be calculated for matching effort for the NFWF grant if we receive funding.

6. Articles of Partnership – Continue discussion started last meeting. Discuss suggested improvements to the Articles of Partnership consistent with the new HCP focus (5 Point Plan) and in preparation for permit renewal/extension.

Section 1. Mission:

- This is clearly about developing an HCP. The HCP has been implemented since 1999 and is at the stage of “plan implement/maintenance”.
- Where does exit strategy fit in here? Alternate goals?
- Mission statement should be simple:
 - Proposed change to “The ongoing Implementation and maintenance of the HCP”

Section 2. Goals:

- Action Item: Dave will rewrite: 1st paragraph on the Goal: Key concepts to be included are; Adaptive management and use 5-point plan until we don't need do HCP; when HCP is not necessary is when Kbb is recovered.
- Focus (from 5-point plan)
 - Emphasize recovery areas and deemphasize non-recovery areas
- Adaptive management (from 5-point plan)
 - Stream lining processes: reduce cost, redirect resources, and simplify training and orientation
- Stated as what Partners are “not to do”... (from 5-poin plan)
 - O&E/Reporting (pre/post management survey, random survey,), no need to do inventory/Voluntary category

Action Item for Dave: Make this list into positive things to re-place them.

Action Item for Dave: Send out 5-point plan to IOC members.

Action Item for Dave and Matt: reconstruct and incorporate 5-point plan into “goals” section of Articles of Partnership.

- Go through the section of Goals
 - Remove “Develop an ecologically and...” because we've done it already.
 - Remove “Encourage multiple species...” because it does not follow with our goal/mission
 - “Assure, on a landscape bases, no-net-loss of...”
 - We cannot assure no-net-loss of habitat literally.
 - Change to **“Continue to identify and develop appropriate indicators of no-net-loss of habitat”**
 - Remove “Use the most current scientific...” because Ted's modeled map (new HPR map) is satisfactory for this goal. Yes, we've achieved this.
 - “Ensure the planning team communicates with the...”
 - Need clarification of “its”. Is this the WI recovery working group or IOC?

Change to “**Ensure the planning team communicates with Karner blue recovery team pertaining to recovery activities.**”

- Cross out “Develop a mitigation strategy...” because it is not a goal.
- “Provide for individual landowner participation...”
Re-write and place adaptive management
- Cross out “Develop a legally binding agreement...” Jimmy C. had done this already.
- Cross out “Provide for Karner blue metapopulation dynamic...”

Action DNR: Jim H. suggested writing down “ACHIEVED” after the all the goals that are completed, and then share with the partners at the winter meeting to recognize all the accomplishments.

Sections 3, 4, 5, and 6:

- All are achieved. All should be rewritten by changing the tense (present) and place under, e.g.
 - “Primes and intent of HCP”
 - “Under the primes we will...”
 - “Guiding principals”

Section 7 - Description of Partnership:

- Replace a, b, c, and d with the “Letter of Subscription” criteria:
 - Action Item for Dave to rewrite this.
- “The status as a Partner will be determined...”
 - Action Item for Dave, rewrite to something like “inclusion and exclusion decision made by IOC”

Section 8 – Decision-making:

Note; this is for partners not IOC. IOC adopted this, and IOC can change separately.

- Keep it as is but one change; for consensus, keep 3/4 and remove “plus one”

Section 9 – Participant’s (non-partner) role:

Is it necessary? There are participants, so good to keep this but will be covered in 16.

- Take out because described other places (see 16).

Section 10 – Non-compliance:

Do we need to defined non-compliance? There already is section that explains non-compliance.

- Keep as is.

Section 11 – Description of administrator:

- Keep it as is but add the followings. “...consistent with the direction of the Partnership and IOC and approval of the Natural Resources Board and **Gov. Legislature**”.

Section 12 – FWS’ role:

- Keep as is

Sections 13-23 - Rules of Procedure:

- 13 – Public Notice
 - Keep as is
- 14 - Quorum
 - Keep as is
- 15 – Meeting notice and coordination responsibility
 - Keep as is
- 16 a. - Minutes
 - Add “...and approved at the following **IOC** meeting”
- 16 b. – Comment periods
 - Keep as is

- 16 c. – Participants (non-partners) right to participate
c.-3 is not who they are, but what they will do, so:
 - Change: to describe those, replace those with person/organization
 - Remove c-3 and add into the sentence in “c.”, “...persons or organizations that:”
- 17 – Amendment of Articles of Partnership
 - Keep as is
- 18 – cooling off period before action
 - Eliminate “proposed” or all?
 - Depending on the situation/circumstances, this may not be applicable, maybe but IOC is now in the driver of the decision. It is not cut and dry. Dave explained 30 day review was KEY part of this during the HCP development.
 - Jim Z. questioned if 18 (proposed HCP) and 20 (policies/documents) could be referring to the same thing at this point. They are similar but not exactly the same.
 - Combine 18 and 20 (see 20)
- 19 – communications and public records
 - Keep as is
- 20 – similar to 18.
 - Add **HCP, or any portions of it, including modifications, and SHCA**
- 21 – meeting cancellation
 - Remove; because there is no need for this. 30day notice (see 20) will cover this.
- 22 – Calling special meetings
 - Remove; because this is not relevant.
- 23 – Agenda development
 - Change to “**Administrator develop agenda and agenda items may be added to or dropped by agreement at the beginning of the meeting which the proposed agenda applies**” because our meeting is stretched out every other month now and we have email to communicate now.

Sections 24-29 – Conservation Plan Formulation:

- Dave will write all the components related to Plan implementation under Goal, Operate under Adaptive management system; can delete these sections.

Section 30 – Ongoing Land Management:

- Delete

Section 31 - Data Sharing:

- Change word; “**implementation and maintenance of HCP**”, (remove “**development of**”).

b. Role of IOC and Partners

- Role of Partners is described well in the Articles of Partnership; the role of IOC is not.
- As long as intent (oversight) of IOC is spelled out (in the HCP) it does not need to be further articulated in the Articles.

Action Matt K.: (1) Review HCP language on IOC to assure the IOC’s role is well described; (2) identify topics for which a guideline or protocol should be developed. Drafting guidelines and protocols for IOC guidance is not a high priority right now.

- 7. **Permit Renewal** – Review issues briefs and begin to discuss proposal options for renewal. Discuss ITP and conditions, SHCA implications/improvements and process for renewal planning.

- Dave described what is required by law for us to renew the permit. The Service has guidance on the subject. In order to allow for approval process, we should submit a request to amend the ITP by September 2009 or sooner.
- There are two basic approaches that we can take (1) Develop improvements and work on amendments one issue at a time (incrementally) before the renewal; (2) Develop a “packaged” proposal and submit all proposed improvements to the Service at one time. Knowing the current situation that we are in right now is beneficial for us to start change incrementally. Also if we start now, we could figure out what works and what does not. It would not be fair or easy for the Service if we dumped a comprehensive package on the Service all at once. The HCP was developed one issue at a time. We should do the same now.

Issues can be developed and move through to amendment and implementation using the HCP 6-month Review meeting schedule as incremental check points:

Time line (6-month meetings with FWS)

Nov. 9, 2007; Permit renewal process steps discussion is on the agenda

Spring 2008

Fall 2008

Spring 2009

Then, Submit renewal request by Sep. 2009

All agreed on making improvements to the ITP incrementally, prior to requesting an extension to the permit period (renewal/extension). This will be the major topic at the HCP Team’s 2008 winter meeting.

- 8. Winter Meeting** – review draft winter meeting agenda, discuss meeting objectives and process. Review/assign roles and responsibilities.
 - LOCATION; Wisconsin Dells.
 - Time; mid Feb.
 - Topics:
 - Permit renewal; what partners would like to see for the next incidental take permit period
 - Propose the questions to partners, including ITP for ten years or more?
 - On the morning of day 1: Each entity group will breakout to discuss issues relative to permit renewal.
 - Lunch time, recognition for the partners/story telling/ceremony
 - In the afternoon of the day 1: Present accomplishments of HCP partners, e.g. for one: Jim H’s suggestion to check off the accomplishments in the Articles of Partnership. Then present new proposal for “Articles of Partnership” and decide. (Homework will need to be distributed to the partners ahead of time.)
 - Day 2: IOC meeting to discuss what they gathered from each group meeting (day 1 morning) for issues and opinions on improvements to work on leading up to permit renewal.
 - Preliminary information to be developed up through the December 5th IOC meeting.

- 9. Partner Logo**

Which is the preferred logo?

Decision: IOC preferred the female Kbb with black and white background.

10. Closing:

- Decisions, Action Items and Assignments were summarized
- Next scheduled IOC meeting: Dec. 5, 2007 at Schmeeckle Reserve in Stevens Point
- Evaluate meeting: Accomplished a great deal. Good meeting.

IOC Minutes 10-10-07.doc