

---

# Springflow Habitat Protection Work Group

Meeting 14 Agenda  
Friday, February 26, 2021  
9:00am-11:00am

1. **Confirm attendance**  
Eight of eleven Work Group members were present; Adam Yablonski, Doris Cooksey, and Ryan Kelso did not attend.
2. **Meeting logistics**  
Jamie Childers provided an overview of virtual meeting logistics and meeting points of contact.
3. **Public comment**  
There was no public comment.
4. **Approve Meeting Minutes**  
Tom Arsuffi made a motion, seconded by Charlie Kreidler, to approve the meeting minutes from the February 5, 2021 meeting. In the absence of objection, the minutes were approved by consensus.
5. ***Continue the discussion of and potential decision on comments and revisions to Draft Work Group Part 1 Report and Proposed Part 2 Charge***  
Work Group members continued to discuss comments received on, and potential revisions to the *December draft Work Group Part 1 Report and Proposed Part 2 Charge*. The group began with continued discussion of questions under Issue 4 and of the accompanying draft parenthetical statements Myron Hess provided for each question.

The draft parenthetical for Question 4-1 was updated to clarify that *further review of existing Modflow model predictions will be undertaken to identify other such flow levels which will be assessed using the ecological model and other appropriate tools for potential benefits to the Covered Species, including through consideration of new insights gained through inquiries pursuant to other questions*. The change was made in response to concerns expressed by Patrick Shriver that the statement may be interpreted as being focused primarily on the Modflow modeling aspects instead of on species impacts based on the biological goals set in our current permit.

---

Question 4-2 was deleted upon agreement that sufficient analysis and validation is documented in the ecomodel report, *Final Report: Fountain Darter Modeling System for the Comal and San Marcos Rivers*.

Following brief discussion of Question 4-3, now renumbered as 4-2, the draft parenthetical was revised, in response to a request by Kimberly Meitzen, to add a reference to San Marcos salamander habitat downstream of Spring Lake Dam.

The Work Group also briefly discussed the Part 2 Process and report Table 1. No changes were made to the schedule in the current draft. Jamie Childers updated the group on revisions made, to limit workload and potential delays, providing that scopes of work would be provided for review by Work Group members, including the three Science Committee members on the Work Group, but not all Science Committee members. Patrick Shriver questioned if there was interest in involving Science Committee members to bridge gaps in knowledge. Chad Furl clarified that expertise on specific topics would be sought out in the development of scopes of work if that expertise exists outside the Work Group members. Patrick Shriver deferred to Chad's recommendation and there was no further discussion of Table 1.

The Work Group then quickly moved through review of the draft parentheticals for each question under Issues 1, 2, and 3. Because of the deletion of the original Question 4-2, the reference to that question under the Issue 1 topic was deleted. In response to a suggestion by Kimberly Meitzen, Question 3-5 was revised to add a reference to ongoing data collection. Charlie Kreidler asked for closure from the group that they were happy with the inclusion of the parentheticals and their intent. Myron Hess and Patrick Shriver agreed. In response to a comment by Patrick Shriver, a statement confirming the focus of the studies on informing management decisions, which is found in the Part 2 Charge section of the draft, was repeated in the Part 2 Process section.

**6. *If unresolved issues remain regarding Draft Work Group Part 1 Report and Proposed Part 2 Charge, discussion and decision on next steps for approving final version for presentation to Implementing Committee***

Work Group members agreed to review a final clean version of the report and to provide everyone the opportunity to weigh-in. Myron Hess offered an approach to moving forward. Patrick Shriver asked that a document be circulated and that the group plan for a 30-minute meeting to check-in for all the members to say they are good with the report moving forward. Jamie Childers indicated she would send the group a clean version and a track-changes version on February 26 and members were asked to provide a written response, including any proposed edits, by 3:00 pm on March 3. Jamie indicated she would quickly turn around an updated document, reflecting the responses, for final review and, based on the results of a Doodle Poll, schedule a meeting time for assessing final consensus prior to delivery to the Implementing Committee.

---

7. **Public comment**

There was no public comment.

8. **Future meetings**

The next meeting of the Work Group will be scheduled for 30 minutes the afternoon of Friday, March 5 or Monday, March 8. This meeting will be held to consider confirming the final *Work Group Part 1 Report and Proposed Part 2 Charge* to be delivered to the Implementing Committee at their March 18, 2021 meeting.