

The National Academies of
SCIENCES • ENGINEERING • MEDICINE

Water Science and Technology Board

Division on Earth and Life Studies

Study Announcement

Review of the Edwards Aquifer Habitat Conservation Program—Phase 3

The committee of the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine that has been conducting a study to review the many different scientific initiatives underway to support the Edwards Aquifer Habitat Conservation Plan (EAHCP) is entering its third and final phase. The Committee's first report (2015) focused on hydrologic modeling, ecological modeling, water quality monitoring and biomonitoring, and the Applied Research Program. The Committee wrote an interim report on the ecological model in June 2016, and a second full report on the entire program in December 2016. The third and final report will focus on the relationships among proposed conservation measures (including flow protection and habitat restoration), biological objectives (such as water quality criteria, habitat condition, and specified spring flow rates), and biological goals (such as maintaining populations of the Covered Species). (The Biological Goals, which were agreed upon by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, are considered fixed for the purposes of this study.) In particular, the Committee will determine, for each Covered Species in the EAHCP:

1. Whether the biological objectives in the EAHCP are highly likely, somewhat likely, or unlikely to achieve the related biological goals. If "highly likely," is the full complement of biological objectives necessary to meet the biological goals? If the biological objectives are "unlikely" to achieve the biological goals, recommend how the amounts/types of habitat and water quality objectives could be amended to achieve the biological goals.
2. Whether the conservation measures in the EAHCP are adequate to meet the biological objectives. Is the full suite of conservation measures necessary to meet the biological objectives? Additionally, if the conservation measures are not adequate, would the presumptive Phase II conservation measure or simple manipulation of a Phase I conservation measure achieve the biological objectives? If neither the Phase I conservation measures nor the presumptive Phase II conservation measure are likely to achieve the biological objectives, the committee will explain the extent to which the objectives are not likely to be achieved, and why.

The committee is chaired by Danny D. Reible, Texas Tech University, and a member of the National Academy of Engineering. Dr. Laura Ehlers of the Academies' Water Science and Technology Board serves as the study director (lehlers@nas.edu). The committee members are:

Danny D. Reible, *Chair*, Texas Tech University, Lubbock
Jonathan D. Arthur, Florida Geological Survey, Tallahassee
M. Eric Benbow, Michigan State University, East Lansing
Stuart E. G. Findlay, Carey Institute of Ecosystem Studies, Millbrook, New York
K. David Hambright, University of Oklahoma, Norman
Lora Harris, University of Maryland, Solomons
Steve A. Johnson, University of Florida, Gainesville
James A. Rice, North Carolina State University, Raleigh
Kenneth A. Rose, University of Maryland, Horn Point
J. Court Stevenson, University of Maryland (retired)
Laura Toran, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA