The Wisconsin Statewide Karner Blue Butterfly HCP Team
2009 WINTER MEETING
Moving Beyond the Successes of the HCP 5-Point Plan
The Year of Renewal
February 24, 2009, 9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Stevens Point Holiday Inn

**Minutes**

**Attending (27 of 29 Full Partners were represented = quorum):**
Gary Birch (IOC Chair), Michael Antes, Duran Bjorklund, Monty Brink, Scott Brookman, Chris Burke, Cathy Carnes, Jimmy Christenson, Louise Clemency, Rick Dailey, Tony Dalsveen, Nancy Dotson, Jody Gindt, Mike Grisar, Wayne Hall, Anna Hess, Bob Hess, Joy Hess, Darren Johnson, Richard Kelly, Brad Kildow, Ben Knaack, Rick Kosloski, Sarah Kraszewski, Amy Lee, Dave Lentz, Lynda Lynch, Alan Madsen, Lisa Mandell, Kent Mickelson, Jake Nichols, Jamie Nuthals, Ursula Petersen, Sarah Pratt, Bob Radspinner, Gary Rast, Kevin Schilling, Fritz Schubert, Gregor Schuurman, Andy Sorenson, Scott Swengel, Chuck Thompson, Michael Warwick, Todd Watson, Bob Weirouch, Tim Wilder, Quinn Williams, Shane Yokum, Kyle Young, Jim Zahasky, Darrell Zastrow, Dave Ziarnik, Chad Ziegler, Bernie Williams (recorder)

Full Partners not present: TNC, Wausau Paper

1. Anti Trust statement was read by Quinn Williams
2. Gary Birch, the IOC Chair led introductions
3. Ursula Petersen distributed list of herbicides that partners reported to her that they are currently using. Ursula asked that anyone who had additions to this list should inform her. Ursula will be updating the Pesticide Guideline prior to permit renewal.

4. **Progress Report on the HCP**
   Dave Lentz provided a progress report on improvements made to the HCP from 1999 when the incidental take permit was issued to the present.
   - The HCP 5-Point Plan authorized the Partners in 2006 is a structured approach to adaptive management. Point 1: Focus on what is important; Point 2: Streamlining processes; Point 3: Improve HCP guidelines; Point 4: Recover the KBB in WI; Point 5: Renew the permit. Many improvements have been made: (1) focusing the HCP on what is important, e.g. Kbb probability model, new reduced High Potential Range and Biological Recovery Zones. (2) Likewise, many processes have been streamlined, most notably the monitoring systems. (3) All HCP monitoring and management guidelines have been refined, formatted and are available on the HCP User's Guide on the HCP webpage.
   - With the exception of completing the Construction Guideline and protocols, Points 1, 2 and 3 are about as good as they can be for now. After the construction guidelines are finalized, only points 4 and 5 need our attention. This is the focus

of our work today: construction guideline, turning attention to recovery and preparing to submit a permit renewal.

***<u>Point 1 - Focus on What Is Important</u>***

5. **Updated High Potential Range (HPR)**
   Sarah Pratt from UW Madison presented an updated HPR map. In 2007 DNR checked 14 potential Kbb sights, which were old (pre-listing) NHI Element Occurrences (EO) and stood out from the rest of the range due to their outlying locations or were in low probability areas. Out of the 14 sights just 1 sight was found to have Karners. The other 13 sites did not have Kbb and were found not to be suitable habitat types for Karner. These sites were outside the apparent range, no lupines were found, surveys were old and it is possible the observer likely mistook what they saw for a Karner. These omissions do make a change to the High Potential Range map. They can be found on line and CDs are available from Dave with pdf maps and shape files.

   Ursula asked if other Kbb sites should be checked to see if Kbb are still present. Dave commented that some of these odd EOs were from the 1920's and 1950's; others were outliers that seemed out of place. This update to the HPR cleans up the sketchy areas on the map. This doesn't change the model for now. These 14 sites influenced the model due to Kbb presence data, but we won't rerun the model right now. This new HPR does eliminate a very small amount of very low probability areas. I mostly did it to clean up the map. As to Ursula's question, we should leave the HPR where it is for a while. Karners do shift around even among POH sites. The remaining HPR is where we would expect to find Karners. I think this HPR is manageable.

***<u>Point 2 - Streamline HCP Processes</u>***

6. **Participation Strategy Adjustments**
   Gary touched a bit on streamlining of processes. In the last 2 to 3 years we have been streamlining HCP implementation processes. What we have is mostly a new group of people (implementing the HCP) from the original HCP Team that drafted the HCP and began implementing it in 1999. At that time, HCP requirements were fairly onerous. Five years ago DOT considered dropping out of the HCP. Since that time we have managed to narrow the focus and make implementing the HCP more manageable.

   With much of the streamlining behind us, what do we as group want to focus on for the next 10 years? Should we have a summer meeting? Should we have a winter meeting? What activities do you see that would have value for you. Any ideas on what we should be doing? Every month for 5 years we spent writing the plan; the last several years streamlining the HCP processes. But we came together and by the greatest part - designed by you. You and your organizations' came together to get

this HCP developed and working. We have accomplished much of what we set out to do. Now we need to refocus to keep this HCP working for the next 10 years; and to see what we can do to help get this species recovered here in Wisconsin.
No suggestions were forthcoming. Gary asked that partners give consideration to these questions and offer suggestions to either himself or Dave L.

Louise Clemency (FWS) said the partners should continue at least the winter meeting to share experiences and ideas, even if it is only for a half day. Dave offered that the winter meetings could serve as an opportunity for tutorials to train new staff or new partners in implementing the HCP.

**7. Articles of Partnership – updated proposal**

Quinn noted that all of the partners would be signing this as a group and that they would be taking this to their CEO's.
He noted the reoccurring theme that we are standing on the shoulders of those that came before this. He pointed out that many people in the room were not here when the AOP were originally drafted. They set forth the goals of what the HCP is getting through.

Dave and Quinn have gone through and removed the articles that are outdated or where objectives have been completed and no longer apply.

Quinn asked the group to read out loud the provisions of the draft AOP. *Reading through as a group the following partners participated:*

- Jody Gindt read the *Mission Statement*
- Bob Radspinner read the *Guiding Principles and Precepts*
- Tim Wilder, Linda Lynch, Mike Warwick, Lisa Mandell, Jim Zahasky, Jake Nichols Darrin Johnson, Mike Grisar and Andy Sorenson read the *Goals*
- Ursula Peterson, Gregor Schuurman and Dave Lentz read the *Strategic Intent*

Quinn asked what everyone thought about the new AOP.

Gary Birch pointed out that some of the provisions in the AOP were new.

Dave stated that some of the new provisions are about updated goals that are pertinent for the next ten years and reflect the restated Mission Statement. The real changes are the GOALS and the MISSION. The operating procedures are the same as originally drafted. The IOC did a great job updated or removing the obsolete articles and updating the mission and goals to reflect where we are and what we will be doing for at least the next ten years. Now we need input from the rest of the partners.

Quinn asked if there anyone that has a concern about this?

Gary – question on #10. We would have to look at the status of the recovery goals. Question on the statement for as long as the species needs are assistance?

The incidental take permit is available as long as we need it, and in a 10 year increment.

Questions on the timeframe? - A 10 year commitment. The species still needs our partnership.

Bob Hess – pointed out that this hinges on the recovery plan for the state and others. In the next 10 years we (DNR) will be working on the recovery plan.

Quinn asked the group to take a look at sub (8) under the goals and to make sure that they consider this.

Dave asked if anyone had problems with the mission statement.

Linda Lynch – What does affected stake holders mean? Dave L: It means who is affected by the listing of the Kbb and who has an interest in the species; it is primarily partners who need incidental take authority.
Linda Lynch - You say affected stake holders? Dave L- we could remove "affected" and just say *"partners and participants"*. This seemed acceptable to all.
**Action Item:** Dave will make this adjustment in the draft AOP.

Quinn pointed out that the AOP is a nice document to bring to your upper management, and a well functioning document.

Dave discussed the guiding principles. When we wrote this there was an agreement, we use formal conservation agreements. Dave asked if there were any questions.

Linda L – Comments on 5 and 6 – would like to see number 5 and 6 read:

> *5. Provide sound barrens/savanna ecosystem management ~~as an end result of partner management activities on the working landscape.~~*

Linda L. wanted this out, but Bob and Joy Hess both thought it should stay.

> *6. Encourage multiple species consideration in management planning ~~for those ownerships where such measures are desirable and feasible and acceptable by the landowners.~~*

Linda L. wanted this out, but Bob and Joy Hess both thought it should stay.

Quinn- Any comments Article 8? How do we know when the Karner is recovered? We'll know when Fish and Wildlife tell us it is. We know that we have a high number of Karners in the state we just need to demonstrate recovery in the state.

Quinn – Number 9? How does it work when it is a federally listed species?
Cathy Carnes - It is federally listed. In WI we are looking at recovering about 12 recovery sights. In WI we only have to worry about our recovery goals. Don't worry about the other states where it is listed if it is viable here.

Dave L - the greatest point in our favor with regulatory relief is that we have so many Karners and others don't. We don't want to eliminate, we need to reconfigure that word for number 9. We have potential options on no reporting requirements. The better off the species is in Wisconsin; it would appear that it is unlisted, though it wouldn't be. It all has to do with different options that would be given out by Fish and Wildlife.
Quinn – Remember flexibility of language within the articles.

Quinn – Number 10 – Ursula has questions on 10 about non-recovery. Does it mean that partners would slip into a more of the Ag setting (Voluntary Category)?
Dave L – remember these are goals that we will try to achieve. It isn't certain how things will end up.

Quinn – remember that we want your comments. This is your document, and we are more then willing to listen to your comments and suggestions.

Dave L - We would like your feedback within a month.
**Action Item:** Dave will make the edits to the draft AOP as discussed and send to all partners for final comments.

**8. The HCP Biological Goal for the Next 10 Years**

Gary began discussion of the proposed biological goal for the next ten-year permit period. The basic goal is the same as the first ten years, i.e., "No net loss of habitat would occur…" with some further definitions. The Service addressed the uncertainty of plant succession through the phrase "…as a result of partner activities", which was included to define the difference between partner actions and ordinary succession. Partners are not held responsible for natural succession. No net loss was a noble goal for the first ten years but we were never able to find an easy or apparent way to measure this, e.g., partly of the definition of "habitat", and plant succession added more uncertainty to what habitat is lost. And partly of the un-manageable size of the High Potential Range.

The High Potential Range was significantly reduced through Ted Sickley's efforts at the UW and this gave us the ability to focus on a smaller area. The IOC and the

Recently we identified three expected outcomes, which were added to the biological goal as measurable indicators of the prime goal. Outcome #1 addresses the balance of habitat lost and then replaced related to construction projects, and the means to measure them. Construction protocols will address how we measure this outcome. Expected outcome #2 addresses beneficial disturbances such as mowing and burning. Expected outcome three, partners will seek out opportunities to create and manage a shifting mosaic of habitat for KBB. The key words are "seek out", not "required". The remaining question is how we measure this. The Shifting Mosaic breakout session will try to answer this question by identifying measurable indicators.

Tim Wilder asked, is it no net loss by partner, or how do we measure it?
Dave L. – It is still a very large landscape and it is still very difficult to do. The natural rotation of habitat succession is shorter than the time it would take to measure NNLOH. Measuring the habitat lost due to construction, then offsetting those acres with habitat replacement is easiest to see and measure. The other two objectives are less easy and rely on surrogate indicators as opposed to a hard mathematical formula using acres. In objective #2 we are measuring how well partners perform conservation measures when doing the all important beneficial disturbance Kbb need. Shifting mosaic measurements are again across a very large landscape, and involve a much longer rotation. In this case, again we need to find indicators which can be measured in a shorter time span than 70 or 80 years. The Service will have to look at the collective effort and make a judgment call every 5 years or so, like they did with the 3-year review of the partners O&E efforts in support of the voluntary participation strategy.

**9. Communication Plan and Outreach & Education Strategy**

Dave gave a PowerPoint presentation that recapped partner O&E efforts over the last 10 years; clarified Partner O&E Requirements and reaffirmed O&E priorities for the next 10 years.

The O&E strategy as defined in the HCP has 4 priority areas:

- "significant butterfly population areas," then
- "areas of conservation emphasis," then
- "high potential area," and, finally, the
- "remainder of the state."

In reality what likely happened was that Partners did O&E where they had opportunities; opportunities were most abundant with non-landowners anywhere they happened to be; the most O&E went to the lowest priorities; and the least to the highest priority.

In 1999 the voluntary participation strategy was a stretch for its time. The primary objective of O&E was to demonstrate within the first three years that the “voluntary participation strategy” would work. To jump start this effort, partners committed in their SHCAs, MOU and IA to provide a broad suite of outreach and education to many audiences. By all counts the voluntary participation strategy was deemed successful. Due to this aggressive start, O&E was assumed to be mandatory and annual for all partners. In fact, it is not mandatory for a partner to include anything in their SHCA for O&E commitments.

Much valuable O&E occurred – The 3-year review of the participation strategy was approved and the voluntary category continued. The downside is that the highest priority area, (e.g. landowners and land managers in BRZs) did not get sufficient attention. There were likely a number of reasons why landowners in recovery areas were not more actively pursued: Many partners did not have opportunities to outreach

to landowners in BRZs; it was not clear where recovery help was needed; it was not clear what help was needed.

**Outreach & Education -- The 2nd Decade 2009 through 2019**
Landowners and managers in BRZs are both voluntary and non-voluntary, e.g. private landowners (voluntary category) and municipalities like county and town road authorities. The Wisconsin KBB Recovery Program needs to take the lead and show HCP partners, which recovery properties need help from neighbors; and how partners can help. In some BRZs, local landowner support may hold the greatest opportunity to achieve recovery.

How can Partners help? Dave suggested that a natural fit for HCP partners would be to get involved on the WI Recovery Working Group's Communication Team. He believes that BRZ focused O&E is the best way that the HCP partners can support recovery. This may not be for everyone, but if you see on opportunity to help, step up. Dave suggested that partners could consider a commitment to assist with Kbb Recovery through your SHCA:

- It can be as specific as: "We will participate directly or indirectly on the WI RWG Communication Team."
- Or as general as: "We will seek out opportunities to provide outreach and education with a priority emphasis on helping to support conservation and recovery of the Karner blue butterfly in the Biological Recovery Zones (BRZ)."

The take home message is that we have all done a great job with our outreach and education. Now we need to regain our focus on the highest priority in the O&E strategy; that is O&E directed toward landowners and land managers in the BRZs. With Points 1-3 mostly accomplished, it's time to work on Point 4 of the 5-Point Plan – Recover the KBB in WI.

***Point 3 – Improve HCP Guidelines***

**10. HCP User's Guide: A Comprehensive Guide for Implementing the HCP**
DL - Users guide, management guidelines, and protocols in the next year. HCP implementation reports, easy online filing… I want to streamline and have a 3rd phase in the user guide to do all this. Essentially you'll have a one stop shop to get things covered. A view to the future - We will also be adding the construction guidelines once we get them finalized. The WDNR needs some restructuring, though hopefully it will be worked on this year.

**********

Jimmy Christenson announced the DNR Bureau of Legal Services has named Dave Lentz as the 2009 recipient of the Jimmy Christenson Award. Jimmy thanked Dave for all his years of service and his role in the success of the Karner Blue HCP.

**********

## 11. Permanency of Habitat Breakout Session

**The objective of this session was for partners to comment and discuss the proposed Construction Guideline and associated protocols.**

Scott Swengel commented that there was no mention on the incidental take permit about consideration of other species during routine maintenance and rights-of-way. Dave commented that consideration of associated species is a part of this program, but not a part of the federal permit, since the other species are not federally listed. However, it is a good point that we should look into further.

Mike Grisar asked what to do about a small occupied site with just a few lupine plants on it in the middle of a huge area with no other lupine. What do you do? I'm dealing with the Butler's and again this is a huge impact, and these have minutia regulations that must be followed. What do we do about Karners in this situation? Dave said that it is hard to say how to react, until this happens. There are a number of circumstances to consider. Major projects need pre-approval, so when this comes up we can talk about it and consider alternatives. If you are asking if there is a small enough population that it can be ignored, the answer is no. If in a level 1 survey you find less than 25 plants or clumps, you don't need to do a level 2 survey. However, if you see a Karner anyway, you can't ignore that the site is occupied no matter how few lupine are there.

STEP 4 A (Monitoring: Measures of success/determination of completion) – Does this conflict with no take permits? Dave L. – After 5 years, if the measures of success are not met, there would be an assessment to determine the cause and see if there is any need to continue remedial actions. Maybe the mitigation plan was flawed and success could not be achieved. A 5-year assessment of the mitigation plan would be like a time out; otherwise a partner could remediate over and over forever.

(In a pre-construction survey) if it is determining that Karners are not present, but lupine is there, who is the one that backs this up? Dave L. – This is why we have monitoring protocols, like the pre-management survey protocol. The partners committed to follow these protocols. As long as the partner follows the protocols and documents their findings, the partner makes the call. There are other things that support a partner's claim of "no Kbb", e.g. compliance audits, annual report monitoring QA checks, etc.

Linda Lynch asked how long partners would have to consider the guideline and comment. Dave suggested one month.
**Action Item:** Dave Lentz will edit the guideline and protocols per comments made 2/24 and email to all POH full partners with a 1-month comment period from the date of the email.

Occupied Lupine – what does this mean (for mitigation)? – Do we do mitigation?

If you a have a pasture that you are working, and your projects are working, sub populations. This can be used when you have a minor or major population, and your activity will fall on your protocol sheets.
Rick Kosloski – A valid population is 25 plants; right?
Dave L – Yes. Karner habitat on corridors is generally patchy rather than spread out. We need to address impacts on populations at the sub population level. That is where the 500 meters separates one subpopulation from another. When you are mowing and you mow a Kbb occupied lupine area you are taking occupied habitat. You report this as incidental take on your annual report. This type of take is a form of beneficial disturbance. However, complete habitat destruction like in a construction project does not provide benefit by its nature; the benefit comes later with mitigation. Construction can destroy adjacent non-lupine areas that the Kbb rely on. Even though this is not "incidental take"; the kind you report, these areas are negatively impacted and not in a beneficial way. That is why we would include this impact when determining the total acres of impact, which needs to be mitigated.
Incidental take is the occupied lupine areas (yellow on the diagram) and the surrounding area (nectar/no lupine) is also destroyed habitat. Short term take on a linear area actually increases the habitat, because partners generally replace more habitat than was disrupted.

Mike Grisar – Why is the mitigation for permanent take 3 to 1, but only 1 to 1 for short-term take? Cathy Carnes: Because if you permanently take the habitat, it will take 1 to 2 seasons for replacement and for the habitat to mature; because you lose one or more years of Kbb reproduction and given time for the restoration to take place, addressing perennial plants and pollen and nectar flow. Permanent take is the biggest concern, because you are removing habitat, and replacing it with habitat that did not currently exist so with your coverage you plan for this as well. There are different tiers of seed mixes that can address how restoration takes place. A 5-year assessment of mitigation success is still being worked on.

Mitigation – If a construction project impacts Kbb habitat, and the habitat is replaced on the impact area within 5 years, it is short term take.
Measures of Success – Habitat is reseeded. Measures of Success are the criteria of successful habitat replacement. A definition and criteria need to be added to the protocol. Also a post-mitigation survey needs to be included. This will be very similar to the Cause-Effect Level 1 post-management survey.
Cathy and Dave are still working on measures of success, and would like input from partners. What would you consider good measures of success? No additional comments were offered.

Linda Lynch asked, what is our obligation to inform a land owner that they have Karner Blues on there land? Anytime that we would identify populations? What specifics do we share with the land owner?
Dave L – I think it would be a good thing to let them know; and assure them that they have no reason to fear regulation; and explain the HCP voluntary category to them. This is a prime opportunity for outreach and education. It is our job as partners to

take this opportunity to share the information with them. Remind them that whatever they would like to do for the Kbb is completely voluntary.

**12. Shifting Mosaic Breakout Session**
**Biological Goal -- No Net Loss of Habitat**
***Expected Outcome #3:*** *Partners will seek out opportunities to create and manage a shifting mosaic of habitat for Kbb.*

**Objective of Breakout Exercise:** To develop a proposed method of measuring the HCP Biological Goal (Expected Outcome #3 above)

We had a good discussion of how to measure "no net loss of habitat" during the Shifting Mosaic Breakout Session.

Some of the concerns that arose from the session:

- no good base line to start with
- could result in added post management surveys (cause and effect surveys on harvested sites)
- measure collectively or by individual partners

We ended with the following list of items in which we thought could become part of the SHCA, in that partners would choose on what they would want to report on as a measure of no net loss:

- Current Land Use / Report any changes that will/did result in any loss of habitat. (i.e. woodland turned to a parking lot)
- Measure of known KBB sites on property now
- Report on acres within the HPR
- Average Harvest - Is harvesting sustaining the right age classes to result in no net loss?
- Allowable cut of the next 10 years
- Breakdown of age classes - are we keeping the right type of age class to be suitable habitat (ages 3 through 15)

***<u>Point 4 – Recover the KBB in Wisconsin</u>***

**13.** Bob Hess – Karner Blue recovery Program Progress Report

The overall goal for Kbb recovery in Wisconsin is to establish 12 recovery properties statewide. Seven populations will be located in four recovery units that include 9 state-owned or managed properties in Central and Northwest Wisconsin. The other five populations are located on federal properties.

**2008 Goals:**

- Conduct a statewide population census on state properties
- Use the emergence model to guide census efforts

- Conduct habitat assessment on all recovery sites
- Conduct phenology sampling on all recovery populations
- Secure grant or gift funding for the recovery efforts

**2008 accomplishments and results:**

Population census

- Identified 32 recovery sites
- Surveyed most sites during first flight. Dropped unoccupied or weak population sites for second flight surveys
- Populations generally low, probably due to recent summer droughts
- Only one population exceeded recovery goal (Sandhill), while two others were just below goals (Emmons Creek and White River Marsh)

Emergence model

- Model worked well. Predicted start/peak dates fell within error limits.

Habitat assessment

- Established a formal survey method and protocol to be conducted on all recovery sites
- Only a few sites were surveyed on three properties due to time and staff constraints

Phenology sampling

- Developed a survey method to document population curves for comparison with emergence model predictions
- Unable to implement this survey due to time and staff constraints

**Funding**

- A $275,000 grant proposal to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation was not successful
- A donation from HCP helped fund statistician services
- Received grants from Natural Resource Foundation (ATC gift grant) and federal Section 6 funds for recovery staff
- Received much-appreciated and substantial staff and funding support from the Office of Forest Science (Dave Lentz's shop)

**Conclusions:**

- Kbb populations are generally low across the range
- Both robust and weak populations have been identified
- It is not feasible to conduct intensive population sampling annually
- Focus of recovery program must shift to restoring the barrens ecosystem and stop focusing on a single species. This will benefit many other species of plants and animals that are endangered or of great conservation need.
- Recovery is still possible by 2019 if we all work together

**Strategy for 2009 and beyond:**

- Limit population estimate surveys to one reference site per recovery property each year

- Conduct population trend sampling on other developing Kbb recovery sites annually
- Conduct intensive population estimates for recovery units only as their populations appear to approach recovery goals
- Encourage implementation of at least one habitat restoration project on each recovery property in 2009

**Goals for 2009**

- Use Americorps volunteers for population estimate and trend surveys
- Secure additional grants for staffing (NRF grant) and for at least one habitat restoration project (Section 6 federal grant)
- Encourage the use of State Wildlife Grants for barrens restoration on Kbb recovery sites
- Conduct training as needed for Kbb surveys and habitat assessment
- Complete habitat assessments on all recovery sites in 2009
- Develop recovery implementation plans for each recovery property in 2009. Plans must go through a formal DNR review/approval process to justify non-traditional management practices on forested lands.
- Encourage the cooperation of volunteers and neighboring HCP partners

**How HCP partners can contribute**

- Continue to maintain Kbb habitat by following management guidelines
- When operating within Biological Recovery Zones around recovery sites, contact local property managers to see if there are special needs or activities that can support recovery populations
- Seek ways to engage in cooperative management activities with recovery properties to bolster recovery populations (leverage your efforts)
- Engage in dialogue (IOC or individual partners) with the State Recovery Working Group to identify areas of cooperation Next RWG meeting is April 14. HCP partners will be invited to participate.

The recovery program has taken leaps and bounds since Bob has taken over. Thanks for all your hard work.

***<u>Point 5 – Renew the Permit</u>***

**14. ITP Renewal Steps & Timetable**

Dave shared the permit renewal schedule. The target date to submit an application for renewal is September 1, 2009. Major items that need to be completed by partners:

- Agree on a final update to the Articles of Partnership by the end of April
- Agree on the methods to measure the HCP Biological Goal of No Net Loss of Habitat by the end of March.
- Update all partners' conservation agreements (SHCAs, DATCP's MOU and DNR's Implementing Agreement) including Appendix A, Lands Included.

Begin discussions with DNR (Dave & Quinn) by mid-April; submit signed copies to the DNR by the end of June.

- Redraft an updated HCP (EIS/HCP document Chapter 2 and Appendix F) that more accurately and clearly reflects what it is partners do today. Draft (Dave) of all sections by the end of June; final agreement (partners & FWS) by the end of August.

**15. The Need for an Updated Habitat Conservation Plan**

(Chap. 2 and App. F of HCP/EIS)

Dave shared that nothing like this had been done when the HCP was written. The original HCP was necessarily complex, often vague and full of uncertainties of a strategy never tested. Over the last 9 plus years we have put it to the test; and have done much adaptive management and streamlining. Due to the difficulty of amending the HCP while making so many changes, many of the improvements are not in the current HCP. These changes and clearer descriptions of how we implement the plan will be included in a broad amendment to the HCP; redrafting Chapter 2.

In addition to all the improvements to the HCP over the last several years, the decisions and final products from work done today will also be included in the updated HCP. The final result will be a document that accurately and clearly reflects what partners are doing now and will be doing into the next 10 years.

The question is: How would partners like to review and comment?

1) We can have a meeting early this summer after the drafts are out.

2) Partners can comment on draft sections as they are completed.

No one wanted another meeting, so Dave will distribute sections to all partners as they are ready. The IOC members will work with Dave to complete the documents; all others can comment if they care to.

Linda Lynch asked that Dave use track changes in the chapter revisions so partners can see what has changed. Good idea!

**Action Dave:** Include track changes in draft HCP documents.

**16. Update Conservation Agreements**

Jimmy Christenson shared the need to update conservation agreements prior to permit renewal. The Karner Blue program is based on all the efforts of partners, which are based on the conservation agreements from all the partners. We now have about 10 years of experience. The SHCA's were for designed for a 10-year period; the most obvious is the permit period in the SHCAs. Many things have changed; for the better. We need to amend the SHCAs. The new one has the same basic elements that it took 3 years to come up; in occurrence with the solicitor's office of the Interior Dept.

One thing to consider is that we are not proposing any problematic changes to your agreements. If you choose to amend your existing agreement it may make it simpler for your organization to understand that this is not a difficult thing. Those who need to sign the amendment will only look at the amendment, not the entire document. If

you look through them you'll understand them. The SCHA will be what you agree with. We know what the commitments are; the most important thing is timeline First week of April – gives us a timeline. We have 41 agreements to work with now. We don't have much time as it seems to resolve these changes.

- Minimum updates to SHCAs include a change to the permit period, the addition of Data Sharing and adherence to the Articles of Partnership. Other changes you may choose are to delete special conditions you included early on, which are no longer necessary or create greater restriction for you than the streamlining of the HCP provides. You can make these changes by using a simple amendment form or adopting the template to be used for new partners in the future. Check your current SHCA against the template to assure you have all the minimum elements. In your handouts is a sample amendment template Jimmy created with 10 options. There is no magic in the sample it can be done by amendment. This will not be as difficult as the first time. Consider whether you want to do a simple amendment to your existing agreement or start fresh with the new template.

**Action all partners:** Get back to Quinn, Jimmy or Dave with any questions and your decision the middle of April. Final signed agreements will be due by the end of June.

- Updating Appendix A, Lands Included to reflect the reduction in the HPR in 2007 IOC has suggested that look at the new high potential range. Partners can update their Appendix A, Lands Included by submitting a map indicating the land in the new HPR they want covered by the permit, along with a total acreage estimate. The map needs sufficient information to identify where the land is. In addition, to revise the Risk Assessment, partners will need to identify the acres of land included, which are in each BRZ with an estimate of those acres by BRZ.

**Action all partners:** submit above lands included updates no later than the end of June to Dave.

For most of partners (all but one), your SHCAs will expire at the end of 2009 unless you update them. This is the easiest way to get this thing amended. If you don't have coverage you may be in violation of the Endangered Species Act.

**17. Closing**

Summer field trip? Ursula - We had a few field trips in the past to look at nectar plants is there anyone new to the program that would be interested in doing this again? The IOC will come up with a few suggestions. If anyone has any suggestions or requests, forward them to Gary or Dave.

***Meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.***