

Workshop Summary

**Southern Edwards Plateau Habitat Conservation Plan
Citizens Advisory Committee
June 15, 2011
Helotes Ag Center, 12132 Leslie Road, Helotes, TX 78023**

Members and Designated Alternates: Lottie Millsaps, Kirby Brown, Delmar Cain, Ian Cude, Ann Dietert, Bebe Fenstermaker, Mary Fenstermaker, Bob Fitzgerald, Charles “Frosty” Forster, Tom Hornseth, Eric Lautzenheiser, Randy Johnson, Myfe Moore, Jonathan Letz, Michael Moore, Jennifer Nottingham, Annalisa Peace, Gary Schott, Jenna Terrez, and Susan Wright.

Project Agency Staff and Consultants: Andy Winter (Bexar Co.), Christopher Allison (ME Allison & Co.), Megan Bluntzer (Jackson – Walker), Kristen Bettis (COSA), Ashley Parsons (COSA), Charlotte Kucera (USFWS), Clifton Ladd (Loomis), Jerry Webberman (Jackson – Walker), Bob Brach (Bexar Co.), Kyle Cunningham (COSA), Sonia Jimenez (Ximenes & Assoc.), Linda Ximenes (Ximenes & Assoc.), and Christina Williams (USFWS).

BAT Members and Public: Richard Heilbrun (BAT Chair – TPWD), Mary Kennedy (Bexar Audubon Society), Ken Diehl (SAWS), Mike Barr (SAWS), Julie Groce (BAT member - Texas A&M), Jayne Neal (BAT member –COSA), and Eleanor Crow (Clear Creek Refuge).

Desired Outcomes

- Each stakeholder subgroup will identify a preferred scenario that balances four variables: amount of take authorization needed; mitigation ratios; preserve land distribution; and participation fees.
- The CAC, as a whole, will identify a preferred scenario that they will support as a viable alternative moving forward.
- The CAC will gain a better understanding of its role in the development of the Habitat Conservation Plan.
- Bexar County and Loomis will have a better understanding of the CAC’s issues and concerns.

Workshop Setup

Co-Chair Kirby Brown called the meeting to order and asked for public comment. There were no public comments, so he asked Sonia Jimenez with Ximenes & Associates, Inc. to begin the workshop. Ms. Jimenez asked Andy Winter with Bexar County to briefly tell the CAC members about the HCP public meetings conducted by the USFWS and to explain the County’s position regarding today’s workshop.

Mr. Winter explained the public scoping meetings were well attended and he felt as if the public had a good opportunity to get questions answered. He went on to explain that Bexar County will endorse, in the next draft, the CAC’s consensus recommendation coming out of today’s workshop, provided it makes fiscal sense to the County.

Ms. Jimenez then asked the group to add to the list of guidelines for working together and state their Expectations for the Workshop. The Expectations that were not expected to be met during the workshop were noted as such (e.g. *Fish and Wildlife will enforce the Act.*) (Note: for the list of guidelines and expectations, please see the attached transcripts.)

Filling in the Information Gaps

Once the guidelines for working together were established and expectations were listed, Ms. Jimenez turned the meeting over to Clif Ladd with Loomis Partners to present information on funding options and other information requested by the CAC at their May 9 meeting.

Mr. Ladd, with assistance from Christopher Allison (ME Allison & Co.), presented the various funding option and scenarios using a combination of options. There was stated opposition from Annalisa Peace to using already designated funds to protect the Edwards Aquifer to leverage money for this plan. Additionally, CAC members asked for more information related to the definition of participant. Mr. Ladd stated the [funding option] that included leveraging the Aquifer funds was included because, at previous meetings, members requested identification of sources that could be leveraged. He also pointed out that the definition of “participant” is listed in the glossary of the draft plan.

Mr. Ladd also reviewed a matrix titled “Comparison of Committee Recommendations and the First Draft SEP-HCP.” There had been some concerns at the May 9 meeting that certain recommendations of the CAC had not been included in the First Draft. The comparison showed the various Plan Components, the related BAT Recommendation/Action, the related CAC Recommendation/Action, and a summary of the relevant provisions and language in the First Draft HCP. In summary, the First Draft includes the recommendations of the CAC for plan components that had been decided by the CAC.

Mr. Ladd also reviewed a comparison of the Highlands Dominion/Camp Bullis Biological Opinion and the First Draft SEP-HCP, including GCW mitigation ratios, GCW mitigation lands, and karst invertebrate conservation measures.

Once Mr. Ladd completed his presentation, Ms. Jimenez asked Richard Heilbrun (SEP-HCP Biological Advisory Team (BAT) Chair) to present the BAT’s comments to the First Draft. Mr. Heilbrun stated the BAT has met twice to discuss comments to the plan. The result was several recommendations but not a clear consensus on an alternative. Mr. Heilbrun reminded the CAC that it is not the BAT’s role to determine an alternative but to provide scientific guidance for the process. The CAC is charged with determining a recommended alternative. He went on to explain that BAT members would like to see the word “shall” replace the word “may” in several instances throughout the document. The group also expressed concern over Bexar County administrating the plan. Additionally, the BAT disagreed with the proposed methodology to allow for abbreviated biological surveys. They understand this approach may be necessary in exceptional circumstances but, in instances when a full survey cannot be conducted, they prefer the use of a map system that illustrates modeled habitat rather than hiring a biologist to conduct an abbreviated survey.

Furthermore, the BAT could not agree on how much mitigation needed to be in Bexar County, but they agreed that if the habitat “take” occurred within the County, then “something” must be preserved in the County. The BAT did not make a recommendation as to how much that “something” should be and instead deferred to the CAC to make that recommendation. Finally, as a preliminary alternative to the current draft and not entirely vetted by them, the BAT would recommend a tiered approach to mitigation ratios within Bexar County. This approach would be based on the area experiencing the degradation of habitat. If the “take” occurred in an area that is denser in habitat, then the ratio would be 3:1 and if less dense, then the ratio could be less than 3:1 but not less than 1:1. Using this approach, roughly 75% of Bexar County would be 3:1 with the remaining 25% set lower, but not less than 1:1. Mr. Heilbrun concluded by stating that the BAT has not fully considered the implications of the other counties opting out. He expects the BAT will provide a recommendation for the total amount of take allowed while Bexar County is the only participating county with some guidance for additional take in the event the other counties in the plan area decide to opt in.

Mr. Winter briefly reiterated to the group that Bexar County does not want to administer to the plan. The County would like to see a representative group of developers and landowners oversee the implementation and administration of the plan.

Christina Williams with the USFWS reminded the group that the purpose behind a regional habitat conservation plan is to increase the potential for large preserves rather than smaller preserves dotted across the recovery area. The larger preserves promote better protection for the species.

Following a short break, Linda Ximenes (Ximenes & Associates) explained to the group the consensus method for decision-making. She explained that consensus allows for support by the entire group to

recommend one alternative. The alternative is determined through a series of inquiry to allow for opinions and thought processes to be shared across factions. Factions are asked to be open to other positions and not get defensive during explanations. The recommended plan alternative reflects the goal of an agreement that all CAC members can accept and/or support and does not leave any faction feeling like a winner/loser. The alternative meets the purpose and goal of the CAC's charge to represent their interests and deliver a recommendation to Bexar County in a timely manner.

Stakeholder Work Groups

Once the guidelines were set, the funding options were presented, and the group was briefed on what it means to use a consensus based process, the stakeholder groups were asked to work among themselves to determine a consensus-based alternative for their respective group. The groups were asked to use the various alternatives listed on Table 23 of the Draft Plan as a starting point for discussion. They were asked to come to general agreement on the variables that go into an alternative as well as how their group would be willing to negotiate with the other groups in order to arrive at a CAC recommended alternative.

After a couple of hours of deliberating in their groups, they were asked to present their results to the other groups. The groups presented their progress and were asked what common elements and what challenges lay ahead for the entire CAC to come to consensus on an alternative. All groups thought they needed more information on karst to be able to make a decision and that the plan should in clear language, early in the document state the plan, as written, does not allow for "take" in other counties and other counties must take affirmative action (through commissioners court) in order to participate.

Common elements among the stakeholder alternatives, as identified by the full group, that could possibly result in consensus included preserve size (if all counties are included), cost per mitigation credit, and the balance between participation fees and public contribution to fund the plan. Challenges to reaching consensus included coming to agreement on mitigation ratios, different stakeholders seeing different uses for the land (aquifer protected land being included as mitigation for species protection), and development costs. To review each of the group alternatives, please see the transcripts below.

Coming to Consensus for a CAC Recommendation

After the stakeholder groups presented their alternatives, the group came together and Ms. Jimenez facilitated them through each element of an alternative. The modified consensus process involved discussing each element and allowing all members to explain their position. After a certain amount of dialogue, any member could suggest a proposal. Once a proposal was presented, each CAC voting member used a green, yellow, or red card to illustrate their position on the proposal. If a green card was raised, then the proposal was acceptable. The yellow card indicated a concern with potential support if slightly modified and the red card indicated too much concern and no support for the proposal. When a CAC voting member raised a yellow or red card, he/she was asked to state their concern and if they wanted to make another proposal. If the proposal did not garner full support, then the process ended when the last proposal was presented and a 2/3 majority of the group showed full support. The concerns of those opposed to the proposal are carried forward with the proposal. This process continued until the group came to consensus on the plan area, amount preserved, and the mitigation ratio for the golden-cheeked warbler.

The workshop consisted of approximately 8 ½ hours with members working through lunch. The workshop was extended beyond the anticipated 4 p.m. finish for the first day and the second day option was not available because too few members were available for the proposed second day.

The following represents the proposals that garnered support through the modified consensus process; these are not formally approved items:

Plan Area. The plan administrator shall only be authorized for take in Bexar County and shall not expand their authority to other counties unless the county officially chooses to participate. The plan is designed for take only in Bexar County until other counties opt in.

Take Authorization. Authorized take should be 7,500 acres for GCW and 2,400 acres for BCV in Bexar County only. If other counties opt in, then take authorization in other counties outside of Bexar County should be 4,300 acres GCW and 1,400 acres BCV.

Mitigation Ratio and Preserve Land Distribution. Consensus with concerns (10 members approve and 4 members had concerns): GCW - 2:1 direct, 0.5:1 indirect, \$4,000/credit, 5,000 new acres in Bexar County with some preserve in Bexar County and may include improving on what's already in Bexar County by placing Edwards Aquifer protected land in a perpetual conservation easement.
Concerns: 1) Cost – too much public funding needed; 2) More than 5,000 new acres in Bexar County needs to be preserved.

Next Steps

The CAC is anticipated to meet sometime in July and at that time the group will determine if these consensus items will be formally ratified.

TRANSCRIPTS OF FLIP-CHARTS

WORKSHOP SETUP

Guidelines for Working Together

- Silence your cell phone.
- Listen to understand.
- Give everyone an opportunity to express his/her opinion.
- Look for ways in which you can come to agreement.
- Only CAC members or alternates participate in the work today.

Expectations (*=considered, but unlikely to be met during today's workshop)

- Consensus on mitigation ratios.
- Consensus as close to BAT recommendations as possible.
- Willingness to compromise.
- Step back and look at the plan to be sure it meets the purpose.
- Look at the plan as a holistic, long-term event that either accomplishes its purpose or not.
- Fish & Wildlife will actually enforce the Act.*
- Plan that's economically feasible from a taxpayer perspective and developers.
- Plan will be feasible for the endangered species.
- Even though all aren't happy, it's a compromise that is better than what we have.
- Reign in destructive developers and reward constructive developers.*

FILLING IN THE INFORMATION GAPS

Comments regarding Funding (*italics indicate response from consultants*)

- Participation Fees
 - Add examples of the kind of participants – developers, property owners, government utility, etc.
 - Maybe just say “user”.
 - *Definition of “participant” is the plan, in the glossary.*
 - Include something to clarify what “seeking to take” means – “seeking to destroy habitat”
 - Remove item #3 – contradicts the intent of the preservation of Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone (Prop. 1)
 - *Specifically included item #3 because the CAC asked to leverage other available resources.*
 - *Seeking specificity on what that money can be used for – can be used to augment the funds, but not for the preservation itself(?).*

BAT Comments on Draft Plan in a Nutshell (*Italics indicate CAC comments*)

- Collective comments will be sent to the group as soon as consolidated and formalized.
- Use “shall” instead of “may” in many cases.
- Concerns about administrator of the plan.
- Don't like abbreviated surveys as a methodology as indicated and approved by USFWS – except in certain circumstances.
 - Using a map instead of hiring a biologist – for projects that have the time.
- Mitigation ratios – if take habitat in Bexar County, need to protect *something* in Bexar County – CAC decide what that *something* will be.
- *If CAC decides that something is 10,000 acres, don't need to have a conservation easement; the “double-dipping” [Prop. 1] lands can't be used as mitigation.*
- *Have additional mitigation in another place, not protected lands already.*
- Certain parts of Bexar County are 3:1, some are 2:1, and others are 1:1 – based on quality of location – 75% is 3:1; 25% would be 2:1 or less.
- *Who determines which is which?* Use map – consultants suggest and CAC recommends the ratio.

- Landowners not affected unless they want to do a “take”.
- BAT estimates for take based on participation assumption of all the counties – since only one county is now participating in the take, need to reduce the amount allowed. Can add to take later if other counties “opt in”. Would give USFWS the total amount, but activate it when it when other counties come in.

STAKEHOLDER GROUP ALTERNATIVES (*=No consensus)

Environmental & Conservation Groups

Plan Area: Take in Bexar County only with a total preserve size of 30,000+ acres
Amount Preserved: Bexar County: 18,000+
Other counties: 12,000+
Authorized Loss: Take in Bexar County only
Mitigation Ratios*: GCW: 2:1 and 3:1
BCV: n/a
Karst: not ready, need more information
Total Cost*: Cost per credit was not discussed.
Balance between Participation Fees/Public Contribution: 1 & 2) Participation fees and tax (TID) as proposed; 3) Modified to remove land protected for Edwards Aquifer.

Governmental Entities & Utility Providers

Plan Area: Should remain the same with one dissenter suggesting Kerr and Blanco Counties be removed.
Amount Preserved: Bexar County: 5,000 (new)
Other counties: 14,000
Authorized Loss: GCW: 15,000 acres; BCV: 4,000 acres
Mitigation Ratios: GCW: 1/1 (indirect .5/1)
BCV: 1/1 (indirect .5/1)
Karst: same as current draft alternative
Total Cost: 1 credit = \$7,500 for 1/1; 1 credit = \$5,000 for BCV.
Balance between Participation Fees/Public Contribution: Whatever the calculations are based on the 1/1 with the above stated cost per credit. If ratio changes, then balance should be participation fees set at twice as much as public contribution.

Landowners

Plan Area: Ok as stated.
Amount Preserved: Bexar County: 25,000 acres (if BC only)
Other Counties: 15,000 acres
Total Preserve: 40,000 acres (BC 15,000 other counties in)
Authorized Loss: 7,500 acres (12,000 if other counties opt in)
Mitigation Ratios: GCW: 75% at 3:1
25% at 2:1 or 1:1 depending on habitat
BCV: 2:1 where possible
Karst: Need more information
Total Cost: 1 credit = \$7,500
Balance between Participation Fees/Public Contribution: 50/50

Real Estate & Business

Plan Area: 30,000 acres – all counties
Amount Preserved: Bexar County: 18,000
Other: 12,000
Authorized Loss: GCW: 12,000
BCV: 4,000
Mitigation Ratios: GCW: 1:1
BCV: 1:1
Karst: not discussed

Total Cost: 1 credit - \$7,500 and if 2:1, then 1 credit = \$3,800
Balance between Participation Fees/Public Contribution: 45% part./55% public

ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

- Not enough information on karst yet – current karst recommendation are for recovery, not conservation.

POSSIBLE AGREEMENT

- Need language that says something about protecting participation by counties. Clearly written and up front that counties that are not currently participating must take affirmative action to be part of the take area.
- Blanco County has only a limited amount of habitat for recovery and maybe should not have been included in the recovery area.
- Could get a ratio that USFWS would okay and can get a bigger preserve.

COMMON ELEMENTS FROM STAKEHOLDER GROUP ALTERNATIVES

- Preserve size – if all counties are included
- Credit cost
- Balance between Participation Fees/Public Contribution
- Challenges
 - Mitigation ratios
 - Different uses for the land
 - Development costs

COMING TO CONSENSUS

Plan Area

- Plan administrator has NO AUTHORITY in all counties with regard to take – make it stronger/clearer in the plan – only contractual responsibilities.
- Blanco County habitat is limited.
- Proposal – include all counties with the above caveats.

Consensus: The plan administrator shall only be authorized for take in Bexar County and shall not expand their authority to other counties unless the county officially chooses to participate. The plan is designed for take only in Bexar County until other counties opt in.

Amount Preserved

- If other counties opt in, the preserve size changes
- Create a minimum with Bexar County only
- How does the existing preserve count?
 - 17,000 acres already protected
 - 26,000 undevelopable (15,000 with mitigation in NW quadrant)
 - 59,000 acres of GCW habitat in Bexar County
- Amount in other counties would be decided by the county when they opt in.
- Estimated total loss is 14,000 in Bexar County for GCW.

Proposal – Authorized take is 2,400 acres for BCV and 7,500 for GCW

Consensus: Authorized take is 2,400 acres for BCV and 7,500 for GCW in Bexar County only.

Take if other counties opt in:

- Percentage recommended by BAT by county
- 4,500 acres in other counties GCW; 1,600 BCV in other counties
- Additional take in those counties
- 13,104 GCW and 4,296 BCV estimated projected loss in other counties.

Proposal – Endorse what is in the plan for take in other counties outside of Bexar County with 50% in Bexar County and 33% in other counties.

Consensus: Take in other counties outside of Bexar County shall be 4,300 GCW and 1,400 in BCV.

Mitigation Ratios and Preserve Land Distribution

- Direct and indirect needs to be determined on a case-by-case basis
- Determination of the ratio should function the same way – determined by analysis; not done by anyone yet.
- Somebody needs to visit the property – no matter what.
- ...as per current USFWS protocols – nothing now to capture the quality of the habitat through a model.

Proposal – 2:1 ratio for GCW and 1.5/1 for BCV with no indirect mitigation – all areas treated the same.

Proposal – 3:1 with the cost going down per credit

Proposal – 3:1 with the cost at \$2,500/credit with participation to cover purchase and public money to keep up maintenance.

Consensus with concerns (10 members approve and 4 members had concerns) : GCW - 2:1 direct, 0.5:1 indirect, \$4,000/credit, 5,000 new acres in Bexar County with some preserve in Bexar County and may include improving on what's already in Bexar County by placing Edwards Aquifer protected land in a perpetual conservation easement. *Concerns:* Cost – too much public funding needed. More than 5,000 new acres in Bexar County needs to be preserved.

Comparison of SEP-HCP Alternatives

revised July 6, 2011

Category	CAC Workshop Alternative (with same karst program as First Draft SEP-HCP)	Minimal Participation Alternative (10% coverage GCW/BCV / 5% coverage Karst)	CAC "Group 1 Alternative" (with same karst program as First Draft SEP-HCP)	First Draft SEP-HCP	No Action Alternative <i>(some individual ESA compliance actions may occur in the region)</i>	Bexar County Plan Area Alternative	Category 1 Karst Coverage Alternative	Biological Need Alternative
PLAN AREA								
Conservation Actions	7counties: Bexar, Medina, Bandera, Kerr, Kendall, Blanco, and Comal	7counties: Bexar, Medina, Bandera, Kerr, Kendall, Blanco, and Comal	7counties: Bexar, Medina, Bandera, Kerr, Kendall, Blanco, and Comal	7counties: Bexar, Medina, Bandera, Kerr, Kendall, Blanco, and Comal	None	Bexar County and adjacent sectors	7counties: Bexar, Medina, Bandera, Kerr, Kendall, Blanco, and Comal	7counties: Bexar, Medina, Bandera, Kerr, Kendall, Blanco, and Comal
Take Authorization	6 counties: Bexar, Medina, Bandera, Kerr, Kendall, and Blanco (initially limited to Bexar County only until other counties opt in)	6 counties: Bexar, Medina, Bandera, Kerr, Kendall, and Blanco	6 counties: Bexar, Medina, Bandera, Kerr, Kendall, and Blanco	6 counties: Bexar, Medina, Bandera, Kerr, Kendall, and Blanco	None	Bexar County only	6 counties: Bexar, Medina, Bandera, Kerr, Kendall, and Blanco	6 counties: Bexar, Medina, Bandera, Kerr, Kendall, and Blanco
COVERED SPECIES								
	GCW, BCV, and 9 Listed Karst Invertebrates	GCW, BCV, and 9 Listed Karst Invertebrates	GCW, BCV, and 9 Listed Karst Invertebrates	GCW, BCV, and 9 Listed Karst Invertebrates	None	GCW, BCV, and 9 Listed Karst Invertebrates	GCW, BCV, and 3 "Category 1" Listed Karst Invertebrates	GCW, BCV, and 9 Listed Karst Invertebrates
INCIDENTAL TAKE REQUEST								
GCW <i>(acres of habitat loss or degradation)</i>	11,800 ac total (Bexar County capped at 7,500 ac)	3,000 ac	6,900 ac	12,000 ac	None	7,500 ac	12,000 ac	28,000 ac
BCV <i>(acres of habitat loss or degradation)</i>	3,800 ac (Bexar County capped at 2,400 ac)	1,000 ac	2,300 ac	4,000 ac	None	2,500 ac	4,000 ac	9,400 ac
Listed Karst <i>(acres of impact over Karst Zone 1 or 2 and estimated number of affected species-occupied caves)</i>	7,800 ac (Z1&2) 8,700 ac (Z3&4) 37 caves	2,600 ac (Z1&2) 2,900 ac (Z3&4) 13 caves	7,800 ac (Z1&2) 8,700 ac (Z3&4) 37 caves	7,800 ac (Z1&2) 8,700 ac (Z3&4) 37 caves	None	7,100 ac (Z1&2) 7,700 ac (Z3&4) 34 caves	7,700 ac(Z1&2) 8,100 ac (Z3&4) 31 caves	52,000 ac (Z1&2) 57,500 ac (Z3&4) 249 caves
MITIGATION MEASURES								
GCW								
Mitigation Ratio	2 : 1 direct impact 0.5 : 1 indirect impact	2 : 1 direct impact 0.5 : 1 indirect impact	3 : 1 direct impact in Bexar County 2 : 1 direct impact outside Bexar County 0.5 : 1 indirect impact (all areas)	2 : 1 direct impact 0.5 : 1 indirect impact	None	1 : 1 direct impact 0.5 : 1 indirect impact	2 : 1 direct impact 0.5 : 1 indirect impact	3 : 1 direct impact (Bexar County) 2 : 1 direct impact (rural counties) 0.5 : 1 indirect impact
Preserve Size	29,500 ac	7,500 ac	23,300 ac	30,000 ac	None	9,400 ac	30,000 ac	89,000 ac
Preserve Distribution	Require 5,000 ac in Bexar County (17%) with remaining 24,500 ac in rural areas	Goal for 1,500 ac in/adjacent to Bexar County (20%) with the remaining 6,000 ac in rural areas	Commitment to acquire at least 60% in/adjacent to Bexar County (14,000 ac) with no more than 40% in rural counties (9,300 ac)	Goal for 5,000 ac in/adjacent to Bexar County (17%) with the remaining 25,000 in rural areas	None	100% in/adjacent to Bexar County	Goal for 5,000 ac in/adjacent to Bexar County with the remaining 25,000 in rural areas	Commitment to acquire at least 60% in/adjacent to Bexar County (53,400 ac) with no more than 40% in rural counties (35,600 ac)
Credit Fee	\$4,000 per credit (calculates to \$8,000 per acre of direct loss)	\$5,000 per credit (calculates to \$10,000 per acre of direct loss)	\$5,500 per credit (calculates to \$16,500 per acre of direct loss in Bexar County and \$11,000 per acre of direct loss outside Bexar County)	\$5,000 per credit (calculates to \$10,000 per acre of direct loss)	None	\$10,000 per credit (calculates to \$10,000 per acre of direct loss)	\$5,000 per credit (calculates to \$10,000 per acre of direct loss)	\$5,000 per credit (calculates to \$15,000 per acre of direct loss in Bexar County and \$10,000 per acre of direct loss outside Bexar County)
BCV								
Mitigation Ratio	2 : 1 direct impact 0.5 : 1 indirect impact	1 : 1 direct impact 0.5 : 1 indirect impact	2 : 1 direct impact 0.5 : 1 indirect impact	1 : 1 direct impact 0.5 : 1 indirect impact	None	1 : 1 direct impact 0.5 : 1 indirect impact	1 : 1 direct impact 0.5 : 1 indirect impact	2 : 1 direct impact 0.5 : 1 indirect impact
Preserve Size	9,500 ac	1,250 ac	5,800 ac	5,000 ac	None	3,100 ac	5,000 ac	23,400 ac
Preserve Distribution	Anticipated to be mostly in rural areas	Anticipated to be mostly in rural areas	Anticipated to be mostly in rural areas	Anticipated to be mostly in rural areas	None	100% in/adjacent to Bexar County	Anticipated to be mostly in rural areas	Anticipated to be mostly in rural areas
Credit Fee	\$4,000 per credit (calculates to \$8,000 per acre of direct loss)	\$5,000 per credit (calculates to \$5,000 per acre of direct loss)	\$5,500 per credit (calculates to \$11,000 per acre of direct loss)	\$5,000 per credit (calculates to \$5,000 per acre of direct loss)	None	\$10,000 per credit (calculates to \$10,000 per acre of direct loss)	\$5,000 per credit (calculates to \$5,000 per acre of direct loss)	\$5,000 per credit (calculates to \$10,000 per acre of direct loss)
Listed Karst Invertebrates								
Conservation Goal	2x of preserves needed to achieve draft downlisting criteria for most species	1x of preserves needed to achieve draft downlisting criteria for most species	2x of preserves needed to achieve draft downlisting criteria for most species	2x of preserves needed to achieve draft downlisting criteria for most species	None	2x of preserves needed to achieve draft downlisting criteria for most species	2x of preserves needed to achieve draft downlisting criteria for the 3 Category 1 species	2x of preserves needed to achieve draft downlisting criteria for all species
Preserve Size	Approx. 2,400 acres of new preserves; based on acquisition of 6 new karst preserves in each KFR	Approx. 1,200 acres of new preserves; based on acquisition of 3 new karst preserves in each KFR	Approx. 2,400 acres of new preserves; based on acquisition of 6 new karst preserves in each KFR	Approx. 2,400 acres of new preserves; based on acquisition of 6 new karst preserves in each KFR	None	Approx. 2,400 acres of new preserves; based on acquisition of 6 new karst preserves in each KFR	Approx. 1,000 acres of new preserves; based on acquisition of 3 new karst preserves in 5 of 6 KFRs	Approx. 4,800 acres of new preserves; based on acquisition of 12 new karst preserves in each KFR

Category	CAC Workshop Alternative (with same karst program as First Draft SEP-HCP)	Minimal Participation Alternative (10% coverage GCW/BCV / 5% coverage Karst)	CAC "Group 1 Alternative" (with same karst program as First Draft SEP-HCP)	First Draft SEP-HCP	No Action Alternative <i>(some individual ESA compliance actions may occur in the region)</i>	Bexar County Plan Area Alternative	Category 1 Karst Coverage Alternative	Biological Need Alternative
Preserve Distribution	Distributed across Bexar County KFRs	Distributed across Bexar County KFRs	Distributed across Bexar County KFRs	Distributed across Bexar County KFRs	None	Distributed across Bexar County KFRs	Distributed across Bexar County KFRs, excluding the Alamo Heights KFR	Distributed across Bexar County KFRs
ESTIMATED BUDGET (alternatives rounded to nearest \$10,000)								
Program Costs	n/a							
Preserve Acquisitions	n/a							
GCW and BCV	\$ 267,950,000	\$ 71,750,000	\$ 473,260,000	\$ 255,597,295		\$ 395,290,000	\$ 255,600,000	\$ 1,800,500,000
Karst	\$ 127,440,000	\$ 62,720,000	\$ 127,440,000	\$ 127,436,574		\$ 127,440,000	\$ 53,970,000	\$ 271,760,000
Plan Administration	\$ 8,880,000	\$ 2,790,000	\$ 8,830,000	\$ 8,449,671		\$ 5,030,000	\$ 8,390,000	\$ 28,930,000
Preserve Mgt. and Monitoring	\$ 35,910,000	\$ 14,500,000	\$ 39,630,000	\$ 35,610,506		\$ 25,300,000	\$ 35,480,000	\$ 102,790,000
Other Conservation Measures	\$ 1,710,000	\$ 700,000	\$ 1,710,000	\$ 1,641,582		\$ 1,070,000	\$ 1,630,000	\$ 5,060,000
Contingency Fund	\$ 1,320,000	\$ 850,000	\$ 1,370,000	\$ 1,318,167		\$ 1,160,000	\$ 1,320,000	\$ 1,510,000
Total Estimated Costs	\$ 443,210,000	\$ 153,310,000	\$ 652,240,000	\$ 430,053,796		\$ 555,300,000	\$ 356,390,000	\$ 2,210,560,000
Program Funding	n/a							
Participation Fees	n/a							
Application Fees	\$ 340,000	\$ 140,000	\$ 280,000	\$ 317,958		\$ 160,000	\$ 310,000	\$ 410,000
GCW/BCV Credit Sales	\$ 208,730,000	\$ 58,800,000	\$ 215,470,000	\$ 235,457,774		\$ 168,240,000	\$ 235,460,000	\$ 332,280,000
Karst Participation Fees	\$ 13,130,000	\$ 11,850,000	\$ 13,130,000	\$ 13,127,891		\$ 12,320,000	\$ 12,340,000	\$ 13,130,000
Public Funding ²	\$ 367,810,000	\$ 129,950,000	\$ 575,460,000	\$ 338,498,158		\$ 488,650,000	\$ 258,060,000	\$ 2,169,390,000
Tax Increment Diversion from New Development in SEP-HCP Sectors	7.5% for Bexar County and 6% for COSA for 30 years	2% for both jurisdictions for 30 years	for both jurisdictions, 60% to 15% for the first 10 years and 10% for remaining years	7.5% for Bexar County and 5% for COSA for 30 years		9% for both jurisdictions for 30 years	4.5% for both jurisdictions for 30 years	40% for both jurisdictions for 30 years
Total Estimated Revenue	\$ 590,010,000	\$ 200,740,000	\$ 804,340,000	\$ 587,401,781		\$ 669,370,000	\$ 506,170,000	\$ 2,515,220,000
Management Endowment	\$ 146,800,000	\$ 47,430,000	\$ 152,100,000	\$ 157,347,985		\$ 114,070,000	\$ 149,780,000	\$ 304,660,000
Participation : Public Revenue Ratio	38% : 62%	35% : 65%	28% : 72%	42% : 58%		n/a	27% : 73%	49% : 51%
								14% : 86%

1 Each alternative assumes that the plan is fully utilized, with 100% of the requested take authorization used by plan participants and all of the corresponding preserve land acquired.

2 Public funding for alternatives was adjusted to fully address estimated plan costs and establish a non-wasting endowment for perpetual management and monitoring.