|  |
| --- |
| [Meeting Title] |
| 5.7.2015 | Wildlife Advisory Committee | NPCC Offices |
| Attendees | Peter Paquet, Kelly Singer, Chris Wheaton, Mark Fritsch, Kerry Berg, Philip Key, Paul Dahmer, Norm Merz, Robert.Stephens, Bob Austin, Aren Eddingsaas, Sandra Fife, Matthew Berger, Laura Robinson, John Shurts, Scot Soults |
| Approval of minutes from February 12th & March 12th Meetings |
| Discussion | The Committee unanimously approved the minutes from the April Meeting. The minutes are posted on the WAC website (<http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/wac/>).  |
| Transmission Lines & Other Council Issues |
|  John Shurts – General Counsel NPPC |
| Discussion | John Shurts, NPCC General Counsel, provided the committee with the history and background on how the Council has dealt with transmission lines as part of the Fish & Wildlife Program and Power Plan. He explained that in early iterations of the Fish & Wildlife Program that the Council had recommended that transmission siting issues be resolved through MOUs developed between the individual states and Bonneville. MOUs were developed and those will be circulated to WAC members and posted to the WAC website. John explained that in developing the new Power Plan that Council staff is analyzing environmental issues and impacts of resources quantifying costs and benefits. Although, the Council does not do planning for transmission lines there impacts are included when analyzing the costs and effects of new energy resources. John indicated that comments from the managers to the Council on their view of impacts and the current regulatory process would be welcome. |
| Circulate MOUs to WAC members | Peter Paquet | 5/9/15 |
| MOUs will be posted to the WAC website.  |  |  |
| Operational and Secondary Losses – Prioritize options for Operational & Secondary Losses

|  |
| --- |
| **Operational and Secondary Losses Definitions** |
| Feedback from presentation to Council F&W Committee |

 |
|  |
| Discussion | The chair presented an outline for developing options for making recommendations to the Council on how to address these losses in the future. (See attachment 1).There was a short discussion among the members and there appeared to be consensus that these were the general set of options to present to the Council. The Chair was tasked with providing a fleshed out version of the outline prior to the next meeting. |

|  |
| --- |
| Other Issues |
| HEP |
| Discussion | Scot Soults stated that we needed to address the HEP issue and the future use of HEP sooner than later. There was an ensuing discussion of how do we evaluate wildlife mitigation projects absent HEP as the primary monitoring and evaluation tool. |

Attachment 1

**Draft Outline – Wildlife Operational and Secondary Losses Options**

**I. Program Direction**

1. Mitigation agreements should be considered to settle operational losses in lieu of precise assessments of impacts.

2. The need for new methods to assess operational losses that incorporate the results of ongoing pilot projects. This could include technical testing and evaluation of operational loss models and methodologies, or other alternative habitat evaluation methods

**II. Technical Approach**

**A. Issues**

1. Timing

2. Flathead

3. 1 year bird data

4. Transferability

5. Other systems

6. Other systems with bird data/hydrological data

7. ID potential projects

8. CHAP approach??

9. Side by side comparison with IBI

10. Can they be combined?

11. Webinar

12. How do you translate to mitigation?

13. Currently working on how to do it

14. Land ownership issues

15. Relationship to fish mitigation

16. Offsite mitigation

17. Look at the entire system?

18. RFP to characterize the hydrosystem

B. Pros

1. (Reason and Score)

2. Totals

C. Cons

1. (Reason and Score)

2. Total

**III. Agreements**

**A. Issues**

1. Timing

2. Financial Availability

3. Relationship to fish mitigation

4. Flexibility

5. Lack of Assessment

**B. Pros**

1. (Reason and Score)

2. Totals

**C. Cons**

1. (Reason and Score)

2. Total

**IV. Combination**

**A. Issues**

1. Timing

2. Financial Availability

3. Relationship to fish mitigation

4. Flexibility

**B. Pros**

1. (Reason and Score)

2. Totals

**C. Cons**

1. (Reason and Score)

2. Total

**VI. Decision**

**A. Final**