

**12/13/06 CONTINUATION MEETING
of 11/8/06 HCP REVIEW**

Attending: Cathy Carnes, Matt Krumenauer, Bob Hess, Joe Henry, Dave Lentz; Louise Clemency (briefly at beginning).

MINUTES

1. Minutes from 11/8/06 Review meeting: approve final draft.

- Review action items
- Review select comments. There were many comments and additions. Some were contradictory; some were afterthoughts that did not occur 11/8, but we can continue the discussion. We can discuss these and document the results to the 11/13 minutes.
 - Recovery responsibility for Jackson County land purchased with Section 6 funds (120 acres)
 - What are the regulatory responsibilities for partners and non-partners (non-voluntary category) outside of the new HPR?
 - And others....

Clarifications and corrections were made directly to the 11/08/06 minutes (draft 2) to make that record more complete and useable as a comprehensive action plan.

- 2. Responsibility Table related to KBB HPR (regulatory range) update.** This needs our review, completion and approval. (Refer to \model applic.table.doc)
Eliminate DR columns, re-describe HPR to include EOs + 10 mile areas outside of H-probability.
Inventories HPR not SPA, consider dropping mandatory requirements.
Changes made directly to the table.

Action: Bob will consult FR IOC members.

Action: Bob to ask Kirsten if Distance conversion will work with straight line transects as well as Pollard-Yates? Also, will this be a satisfactory way to estimate populations (confidence factor).

Action: Dave to develop an issue paper.

- 3. HCP Goal (NNLOH) Measurement Process – DNR/IOC proposal** (Refer to \NNLOH Measurable Indicators.doc)

Carry over: Will review Jan. 10 as part of the next draft of the responsibility table.

- 4. HCP Monitoring in 2007 – confirm direction** (Refer to /2007 HCP Monitoring proposal 11-8-06.doc); **discuss implications for MIT, i.e. trends monitoring (distance) in context of Recovery monitoring, other?**

- Monitoring changes and 2007 strategy
- If no trends monitoring on the majority of partners' lands, do we need a site pool with sites no larger than 40 acres or 250 meters long for ROWs?
- Do we need to schedule a MIT meeting?

- 5. Reporting Incidental Take** (see annual report issue brief & IOC minutes 10/24/06)

Action: Dave to develop a proposal to measure management activities on occupied sites that provide beneficial disturbance. Apply to populations. Add maximum take per year. How close to occupied sites?

; also other Annual Report improvements (Refer to \Annual Report Form 2005.doc:

- o O&E: Delete ACE: Yes
- o Assoc. Spp.: Delete section: Yes.
- o Proactive Conservation reporting: discuss what if anything merits documentation and reporting. Consider partner assurances. Yes.
- o Permanent/Temporary Take: Delete Temporary. On hold until >1/10/07 meeting.
- o Post management surveys for C-E study reporting only.
- o Replace post-management surveys with post-mitigation assessments: Leave for C-E and SPAs. (in instruction clarify where post mgt surveys are required.)
- o If no site pool, may need to redefine site identification under activities, i.e. locator information for auditing. Add a survey form number for tracking site and site splits.

6. NEPA implications for current HCP changes?

Action Item: Dave to draft a list of changes so DNR and FWS can determine and document the need or lack of need to amend NEPA and/or WEPA.

7. Approval Process Table: Confirm direction; review progress. (Refer to \HCP approval process 8-25-06 Draft.doc

No discussion or action taken.

8. Another agenda item from April 11, 2006 HCP review meeting notes): What activities quality for major vs. minor amendments. This relates to what would be considered a "substantive" vs. non-substantive change to the HCP conservation program. We can discuss this at the meeting if you like, or wait until we actually have an amendment issue in front of us to consider. There's guidance relative to this topic on pp. 173-175 of the HCP.

No discussion or action taken.

9. Kbb specimens: Should we bother to mount these worn specimens? If not, what should be done with current specimens? Can we collect quality m/f specimens in 2007?

Decision: Yes. The cost to mount the specimens is negligible. Joe suggested they can be examples of worn specimens. If they are not of use as educational specimens, DNR should send them to the Milwaukee Public Museum with appropriate documentation.

10. In the meeting notes from 4-11-06 it was noted that we verbally agreed that FWS pre-approval was not needed for activities resulting in short term take. Time permitting, let's discuss; if this is so, then I think we should officially document our decision on this.

No discussion or action taken.

11. Demonstrating Shifting Mosaic. What do we do about this into the future? Within SPA's? Outside SPA's?

No discussion or action taken.

For JANUARY 10, 2007 MEETING

(Items below and items from above not completed will be carried over to 1/10/07)

The following group of items can best be discussed as a whole. Dave suggested we schedule an additional meeting in early January. Cathy and Dave have worked on this over the last couple of years. The work the GRIT team has done on restructuring the guidelines and protocols suggests a different way to organize the guidance; other discussions have led us to rethink the concept of “temporary take”. On 12/13 we can frame up our thoughts and expectations for how to approach this management guidance.

12. Construction and Ditch Repair & Maintenance Guideline
13. Habitat Restoration Protocol (in principle; discuss content in next meeting)
14. Egg Salvage Protocol (in principle; discuss content in next meeting)

Carry over specific amendment language to the same January meeting as above:

15. Amend ITP: Partner names, Scott Hassett as principle officer, and other updates.
16. Changed Circumstances amendment proposal

Decision 12/13: Cathy suggested that we consider keeping the Changed Circumstances section of the HCP and just change the Conservation Measures section (refer to p. 177) to read something like: *Prior to a management action on lands impacted by the changed circumstance, the land manager will assess any necessary changes in management that may be needed to further the conservation of the Kbb and incorporate those measures into the management plan (e.g., burn management on lands impacted by a forest fires or other wildfire may have to be adjusted (e.g., postponed) . There are no specific reporting requirements above and beyond normal annual reporting.*

Action: Dave Draft a minor amendment proposal consistent with decision above.

17. Proposed amendment to HCP/ITP to allow DNR to do audits on DNR lands (rather than FWS as it currently states).

Action: Dave Draft a minor amendment proposal consistent with decision that Service is comfortable with current policy.

A 3rd meeting was scheduled for January 10, 2007 to continue with remaining items.

\\Minutes Carry Over meeting 12-13-06 draft 1.doc