

CALIFORNIA CENTER  
FOR  
PUBLIC DISPUTE RESOLUTION

A Joint Program of  
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO  
MCGEORGE SCHOOL OF LAW,  
UNIVERSITY OF THE PACIFIC

PRINCIPALS

Susan Sherry  
Executive Director  
CSU, Sacramento

Edwin Villmoare  
General Counsel/  
Mediator  
McGeorge School of Law

Eugenia Laychak  
Program Manager/  
Mediator  
CSU, Sacramento

DATE: May 2, 1997

TO: Frank Piccola, CALFED Bay-Delta Program

FROM: Eugenia Laychak, CCPDR Program Manager

SUBJECT: Outcomes from the Approach to Impact Analysis Workshop

As we wrap up this workshop and the Program plans a follow-up workshop, reviewing accomplishments and considering improvements may be useful for you and other staff.

MEETING WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

ASSOCIATES

Susan Carpenter  
Mediator/Author  
Riverside, California

Larry Hoover  
Mediator  
Davis, California

Larry Norton  
Mediator  
San Rafael, California

Betsy Watson  
Mediator/Professor  
Director of the Institute  
for the Study of  
Alternative Dispute  
Resolution (ISADR) at  
Humboldt State University

The purpose of the workshop, as stated in the packet, was to:

- provide up-to-date information on the impact analysis process,
- receive comments from participants,
- discuss questions with CALFED staff,
- provide a brief update on the status of alternative development.

The workshop successfully met the first three goals. I was impressed with the thoughtful and thorough staff responses to many of the questions. I believe the discussions put participants at ease and helped to open the Program to the public. Many speakers asked several questions at once which required staff to provide lengthy responses. Also, we received several questions from the same speakers on the same topics, i.e. groundwater, area of origin, and agriculture. However, except for the Hydrology discussion, everyone who raised their hand had a chance to speak.

We received more comments on the Hydrology/Water Management and Economic Impact Analysis topics than we did on the other three presented topics. Perhaps the high level of interest and questions on the two workshop topics is explained by the recent discussions on water allocation and continual focus of stakeholders on finance/land use issues. Also, prior discussions with Metropolitan Water District personnel lessened the need for expression of their concerns on the Vegetation and Wildlife Impact topic.

CENTER OFFICES

CSU, Sacramento  
980 Ninth Street  
Suite 300  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Phone: (916) 445-2079  
Fax: (916) 445-2087

McGeorge School of Law  
3200 Fifth Avenue  
Sacramento, CA 95817

Phone: (916) 739-7049  
Fax: (916) 739-7066

We did not meet the last objective, due to Lester's absence. This last minute change on the agenda caused some confusion and concern on the part of a few participants. In particular, one participant was quite frustrated with the Program not following through on its commitments and thought he should consider "dropping out" of the process and concentrate on preparing for a lawsuit. Admittedly, his frustrations were compounded by the Ecosystem Restoration Program delaying release of the ERPP, but he perceived the agenda change as another example of CALFED holding back on information. Others also expressed disappointment on the deletion from the agenda.

### **Recommendations**

- When several people want to speak, consider asking them to limit their questions to one, continue the discussion with someone who has not spoken, and if there is enough time, call on the people who want to follow-up on their original questions.
- Stick to the agenda, if at all possible. Have someone substitute for an absent speaker, apologize for the absence, and then continue with the presentation, even if it is not as complete as originally planned. This shows an effort is being made to address a stated purpose of the workshop.

### **PRESENTATIONS**

The presentations were polished and invited questions from the participants. The graphics were, for the most part, well done and aided in conveying information on a fairly dry topic. Questions on the substance of the presentations, offered at the rehearsals, helped to refine the presentations.

After the rehearsal on April 25, it was clear more preparation of the presentations was necessary and it was difficult to schedule the time on the following Monday.

### **Recommendations**

- Limit the number of bullet slides and substitute schematics, maps, or other graphics to illustrate the concepts, as Zach suggested at a rehearsal and as illustrated by Lynn O'Leary's use of a levee profile to explain variables. Use text slides as speakers notes.
- Continue with one to two pre-workshop rehearsals, scheduled enough in advance to allow time for changing presentations and graphics.
- Schedule a final rehearsal, when developing the workshop planning and rehearsal schedule, to serve as an "emergency" or back-up meeting to address last minute issues and presentation needs.

### **LOGISTICS**

Most of the logistics went very well. Sight lines in the workshop room were good and the computer aided equipment was set up on time and operated very efficiently. Set-up of equipment for the April 25 rehearsal delayed the meeting by about 30 minutes. This delay reminded us that ample preparation time would be needed at the workshop site.

The workshop question and answer periods were aided by encouraging participants to write their questions and comments on 3x5 cards. The cards helped in at least a couple ways: 1) with recording of the questions on the flip charts, 2) with addressing questions that were posed out of sequence by people who missed an agenda item or were too uncomfortable with speaking up in the group. The cards should also help with

summarizing the workshop. Be aware, though, that use of this technique may unnecessarily shut down information exchange and dialogue in smaller groups with participants who are comfortable with expressing their concerns.

**Recommendations**

- Ensure the schedule for the rehearsal rooms includes ample time for set-up before the rehearsal and break-down of equipment after the meeting.
- Consider asking people to write their questions down and submit them to the staff when conducting large group discussions and when it is anticipated people may not feel comfortable speaking up in public.

**NEXT STEPS**

The Program, I understand, is still planning a follow-up workshop in late summer. Provided below are additional recommendations for future planning.

**Recommendations**

- Continue to use the equipment checklist, developed by the CALFED support staff.
- Begin planning workshops eight to ten weeks ahead of the date to ensure staff and consultants will be available when they are needed.
- Consider the positive and negative aspects of combining the workshop with other parts of the CALFED program, such as presentation of the "short list" of alternative configurations.
- Schedule one to two pre-workshop meetings with Lester to: 1) facilitate his participation with finalizing the agenda, and preparing the packet and presentations and 2) incorporate his ideas on Program integration, when appropriate.

Feel free to contact me with any questions or comments at 916/444-2161 (voice) and 916/444-2162 (fax). Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this workshop.

cc: Wendy Halverson Martin, CALFED Bay-Delta Program