

**Wildlife Advisory Committee
HEP Subcommittee
July 9, 2014
Portland, OR**

DRAFT Meeting Notes

Attendees: Philip Key (BPA), Sandra Fife (BPA), Paul Ashley (PSMFC), Chris Wheaton (PSMFC), Tom O’Neill (NHI), Peter Paquet (NPCC), and Neil Ward (QW Consulting)

By Phone: Loren Kronemann (NPT), Aren Eddingsaas (SBT), BJ Kiefer (STOI)

Item 1	Introductions and Approval of Agenda
Item 2	Adoption of Minutes
	Because several subcommittee participants were involved in formal consultation with the NPCC regarding the amendment process, the attendance for the meeting was lower than usual. As a result, Peter Paquet indicated that he would send an email to all of the WAC participants requesting that they submit their corrections/comments directly to him. Participants inquired about whether the UCUT letter would be posted to the website and when the archives would be available. Peter and Neil Ward informed the participants that the archives are now available via the WAC website and that the UCUT letter would be uploaded by the end of the week.
Item 3	Group Discussion: Review of Approaches and Strategies for Addressing Issues
	During the May 28, 2014 HEP Subcommittee and June 12, 2014 Wildlife Advisory Committee meetings, participants evaluated the merits of HEP. From those efforts, a list of issues and associated pros and cons were identified by the participants (Attachment 1). Participants reviewed the issues and associated pros and cons identified during the May and June meetings. Attachment 1 includes the additional items of concern that were identified by the participants.
Item 4	Workplan and Schedule for Completing HEP Recommendations
	Peter Paquet informed the participants that he and Paul Ashley will identify the potential tasks that will be required to address the issues described in Attachment 1. Peter indicated that the tasks will be available in August for review by the HEP Subcommittee.
Item 5	Next Steps and Other Issues
	See Item 4.
Item 6	Next WAC Meeting
	WAC Meeting August 9, 2014 1:30 p.m. - 4:30 p.m. (Pacific) August 10, 2014 9:00 a.m. - 3:00 p.m. (Pacific) Spokane, WA

ATTACHMENT 1

HEP Subgroup Issues

I. ISSUES

A. Continue to use HEP

1. No changes from existing
2. Use full version of HEP
 - a) *Including monitoring component*
3. Do we need HU crediting?
4. Pros
 - a) *Provides useful information*
To whom and for what?
b) Good for crediting and identifying values as applied to target species
Is it preventing us to get the work done on the ground.
Can be the problem not the solution
How long in future do we want to continue?
5. Cons
 - a) *Is not a monitoring tool*
 - b) *Outdated*
 - c) *Lack of regional support*
 - d) *Does not tell us anything about biological responses of species and populations*
Never designed to do this.
 - e) *Not agreement on its application*
 - f) *Crediting Process*
Right Dams
 - g) *Lack of consistency throughout the process?*
How does it affect projects not done?
 - h) *Inertia factor*

B. Get rid of HEP

1. If not HEP, then what?
 - a) *CHAP*
 - b) *CHAT*
 - c) *KROME*
 - d) *Acres/RVI*
Dollars & Acres?
See also: [Settlements](#)

- e) *Settlements*
 - f) *Other existing tools: FERC projects?*
- 2. Equity issues with new projects
 - a) *evenness*
 - b) *HEP models*
 - c) *What HUs remain on the table?*
 Unresolved issues
- 3. Do away with need for crediting
 - a) *Agreements/Settlements*
 Regional
 Individual
 Capitalization?
 See Willamette agreement
 How to address projects with multiple entities involved
 Equity
 Timing for settlements
bow wave
 O&M
 Stewardship Agreements
Use of acres and dollars
 See Willamette
- 4. Pros
 - a) *Provides useful information*
 - b) *Good for crediting and identifying values as applied to target species*
- 5. Cons
 - a) *Is not a monitoring tool*
 - b) *Outdated*
 - c) *Lack of regional support*
 - d) *Does not tell us anything about biological responses of species and populations*
 - e) *Stacking*
- C. Modified HEP
 - 1. Regional Habitat values
 - 2. Ocular HEP example
- D. Crediting v. Monitoring
 - 1. Is it a good crediting tool?
- E. Do we need a monitoring tool?
 - 1. What do we need it for?
 - 2. Example from F&W, state & tribal refuges
 - a) *What kind of monitoring do they do?*
 - 3. What are BPAs/Council needs?
 - a) *Compliance monitoring?*
 - 4. What type of monitoring is needed?
- F. Funding M&E
 - 1. New tools for effectiveness monitoring
 - a) *CHAP*

can be used for crediting

b) Western Govs CHAT

c) KROME

d) UMEP

2. Regional monitoring tool?
3. Replacement for HEP funding?
4. Who pays and how much?