
Springflow Habitat Protection Work Group

Meeting 16 Minutes
Wednesday June 23, 2021
2:00pm-4:00pm

1. **Confirm attendance**

10 of 12 Work Group members were present; Adam Yablonski and Charlie Kreitler were not in attendance.

2. **Meeting logistics**

Jamie Childers provided an overview of virtual meeting logistics and meeting points of contact.

3. **Public comment**

There were no public comments.

4. ***Update on the Implementing Committee's review of the Springflow Habitat Protection Work Group Part 1 Report and Proposed Part 2 Charge***

Scott Storrent, EAHCP Program Manager, gave an update on the response of the Implementing Committee (IC) to the Work Group's Part 1 Report and Proposed Part 2 Charge. The May IC discussion resulted in a request for the Work Group to take the lead on the prioritization process which led to this meeting. The initial prioritization of this Work Group will be presented to the IC at their August meeting. They are expected to determine the next step at that time.

5. ***Discuss Part 1 Technical Evaluation Prioritization Scheme Draft Proposal to Work Group Members and Work Group comments and consider approval***

Myron Hess, Springflow Habitat Protection (SHP) Work Group Chair, introduced the focus of meeting. The purpose of this meeting is to come to agreement on an approach to prioritization. After there is agreement on the prioritization approach, the group will move forward with prioritization. Myron talked through the major steps of the proposed process shared with the members before the meeting and indicated that the overall goal is to present the IC with an initial prioritization list at their August meeting.

Patrick Shriver reminded work group members that they (Work Group members) had received SAWS' (San Antonio Water Systems) position on the Work Group's Part 1 Report and Proposed Part 2 Charge that was provided to the IC. He expressed concern about the Work Group taking an approach to prioritization that might contradict SAWS' IC comments and offered ideas on an alternative prioritization approach that would allow each Work Group member the opportunity to document their position in prioritizing, or not, each of the 15 questions for the IC. Patrick also noted concerns about the schedule set out in the Proposed Part 2 Charge interfering with studies already budgeted and scheduled. Tom Arsuffi indicated that he did not believe it was clear that any studies would supersede otherwise scheduled tasks or studies. Myron noted the intent of the Proposed Part 2 Charge to reflect flexibility in scheduling.

Colette Barron Bradsby then recommended the group go through an initial sorting (e.g., high, medium, low ranking) to allow all members the opportunity to weigh in and to provide an initial focus on things the group agrees on to see if there is a natural sorting. She also questioned if there is enough information to provide a cost for each question and indicated that if there was not, that should be communicated to the IC given their emphasis on cost. Chuck Ahrens expressed his interest in better understanding costs to inform the rankings but acknowledged the difficulty of assigning specific costs at this stage.

Kimberly Meitzen reminded the group that the ultimate decision makers are the IC and that Work Group members were charged with prioritizing the questions presented in the *Part 1 Report and Proposed Part 2 Charge*. She indicated concern that the discussion was getting ahead of what the group was charged with undertaking. There was some discussion on the prioritization criteria between Myron, Patrick, and Jamie. Jamie noted that EAA staff is not in position to assign costs at this stage but could perhaps categorize broadly. Colette agreed with Kimberly and suggested the group focus on the prioritization and, specifically, on trying to identify areas of agreement.

Myron summarized a new potential approach to ranking based on the discussion: use a spreadsheet with the three ranking criteria and the option for assigning a high, medium, or low for each criterion for each question (or pairing) and a column in which each member could provide discussion of the rationale underlying the responses, or lack thereof, for each question. The discussion continued to focus on cost and the prioritization criteria.

Kimberly questioned the wording of "need" in the first prioritization criterion and Myron explained his rationale for the language. Patrick suggested that for a first pass the criteria be simplified to what gives the best value in managing the HCP? No changes were made to the proposed prioritization criteria from the discussion.

Chad Furl also recommended adding a column on the feasibility of conducting studies. Jacquelyn Duke suggested not adding columns but, instead, providing the opportunity for that input in the comment space. Ultimately, a decision was made to request each member to include any insight they might offer on likely cost and the feasibility of performing the study in the spreadsheet with their ranking. The group also agreed to list the 15 questions separately for the ranking exercise.

The steps in the process are that Myron and Jamie will develop a draft of the spreadsheet to be used for the ranking exercise and share it for review and feedback by the members. The spreadsheet will then be finalized based on any feedback and circulated to the members for completion in advance of the next meeting. Jamie proposed dates for next steps (draft to be circulated by June 25, member feedback on draft by June 29, and members will have July 6 through July 16 to complete and submit individual rankings). Results will be summarized and circulated to members in advance of the July 21 work group meeting.

6. Public comment

There were no public comments.

7. Future meetings

The work group is scheduled to meet July 21 (2:00-4:00 pm) and July 29 (2:00-4:00 pm). Access information and agendas will be distributed one week before each meeting.
