

**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (“CAC”)
to the
Comal County
Regional Habitat Conservation Plan (“RHCP”)**

MEETING MINUTES

A meeting of the CAC to the Comal County RHCP was held as follows:

WHEN: December 1, 2008

TIME: 10:00 a.m.

**WHERE: Comal County Courthouse, Commissioners Court Board Room
199 Main Plaza, New Braunfels, Texas 78130**

In Attendance:

CAC Members:

- Judy Meyers
- Travis Wuest
- Ben Appleby
- Jensie Madden
- Curtis Bremer
- Carroll Lindeman
- David Welsch
- Alan Stahlman
- Jack Ohlrich
- Terry Turney
- Mike Norris
- Roy Linnartz
- Linda Laack

Comal County Representatives:

- Commissioner Jay Millikin

RHCP Consultant Team:

- Smith|Robertson: Alan Glen, Rebecca Hays
- SWCA Environmental Consultants: Dr. Steve Carothers, Gary Galbraith

Others

- Star Carey

1. Call to Order. Chair Travis Wuest called the meeting to order.
2. Approve Minutes from October 13, 2008 Meeting. Upon motion and second, the minutes were approved unanimously.
3. Citizens' Comments. There were no citizens' comments.

4. Receive Update on National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Process. Gary Galbraith discussed the NEPA Scoping Meeting scheduled for 6-8 p.m. on Thursday, December 4th in the Commissioners Courtroom. He noted that the purpose of the meeting is to receive public comments on what issues should be considered in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to be prepared by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. There was some discussion about whether the County should give more publicity to the meeting, such as placing an ad in the Herald-Zeitung. Commissioner Milliken stated that the Commissioners Court would try to get some media to attend the scoping meeting. David Welsch noted that the County should invite potentially interested organizations such as the New Braunfels Chamber of Commerce Natural Resource Committee. Mr. Wuest noted that the scoping meeting may not be the most informative of meetings to invite individuals and organization to, as the focus of the meeting is on the EIS rather than the RHCP itself. There was some discussion regarding who was responsible for preparing the EIS and whether the Comal County EIS would be different from the Williamson County EIS. Mr. Galbraith explained that the grant proposal and work plan included preparing the EIS and that U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) had indicated that an EIS, rather than an environmental assessment (EA), would be required. Mr. Galbraith stated that the Comal County EIS would be different from the Williamson County EIS for a number of reasons, but that the lack of listed karst invertebrates in Comal County would be the major difference. Mr. Welsch asked for a copy of any USFWS correspondence indicating an EIS, rather than an EA, would be required.

5. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Funding Plan. Dr. Carothers reviewed the revised funding plan with the CAC. Dr. Carothers noted that after the consultants took a harder look at potential countywide tax increment financing, the consultants realized that the result was really a County budget contribution. Dr. Carothers informed the CAC that Smith|Robertson and SWCA visited with County staff about this, and that staff was comfortable with the funding plan, subject to policy direction from the Commissioners Court. He also pointed out that the funding plan was a conservative plan that assumed no creative partnerships, no grants, no donations, and no other creative funding mechanisms. There was some discussion regarding the County's budget, the cost of preserve acquisition, and other funding-related items. There were questions and discussion concerning whether the County would really need the ultimate 6,600+ acre preserve if no one complies with the law and the County had no control over whether developers would participate in the RHCP. Alan Glen noted that that plan is set up so that if no one participates, the County is not being obligated to purchase land in addition to the initial preserve. Mr. Galbraith suggested that the County make presentations to potential participating entities (e.g., school districts). The CAC members agreed that presentations were a good idea – as was a workshop for people who may want to develop conservation banks. Commissioner Milliken noted that, given the current economic situation, local governments would likely struggle in the near future. The consultants noted that preserve acquisition and, thus, mitigation credit generation, could be delayed. There was discussion regarding the best timing for purchase of preserve acquisition and generation of credits. Mr. Glen noted that, as written, the RHCP assumed that preserve

acquisition would be a rolling obligation only. Jensie Madden noted a typo on p. 7-7 of the funding plan.

6. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Draft RHCP. The CAC gave positive comments on the executive summary and, upon motion and second, unanimously approved the third draft RHCP for further processing with the Commissioners Court and USFWS.

7. Other Business. Mr. Glen noted that the CAC may become involved in the RHCP process again should the public or USFWS see major issues with the plan. Mr. Appleby asked the consultants to include publicity recommendations to the Commissioners Court. Dr. Carothers the consultants could do that, but that it would be more powerful coming from the CAC. The CAC unanimously approved a request to the Commissioners Court that the Court take any measures it deems appropriate to publicize the June 2009 public meeting regarding the RHCP. The CAC also agreed to give Mr. Wuest the authority to approve the CAC minutes from the December 1, 2008 meeting, so long as the CAC had an opportunity to provide comments on the same prior to approval. Commissioner Milliken thanked everyone for their input on the plan, as did Mr. Wuest, and the consultants.

8. Adjourn. Mr. Wuest adjourned the meeting.