

Robert Gulley
Program Manager
Edwards Aquifer Recovery Implementation Program
Texas A&M University IRNR
3355 Cherry Ridge Dr, Suite 212
San Antonio, Texas 78230

May 29, 2008

Re: Proposal for a Decision Sketch Workshop for the Edwards Aquifer Recovery Implementation Program

Dear Mr. Gulley,

In follow-up to our conversation two weeks ago, I am pleased to submit a proposal to design and facilitate a Decision Sketching workshop for the Steering Committee of the Edwards Aquifer Recover Implementation Program (EARIP). The workshop will be based on the principles of Structured Decision Making (SDM). SDM is a systematic way to approach complex decision problems, with emphasis on identifying and evaluating management or policy options (see www.StructuredDecisionMaking.org).

The goals of the workshop are to understand the nature of the choices that will need to be made in order to prepare the EARIP and to identify key data and analysis needs for ensuring that these choices are informed. To this end, the workshop is designed to take participants “once-around-the-SDM-track” at a scoping level. Specifically, the workshop is designed to:

- clarify the objectives and measures (sometimes called endpoints and attributes) that will be used to identify and evaluate possible management actions;
- identify a preliminary range of management actions;
- identify the uncertainties and potential trade-offs that are likely to be central to decisions;
- identify the nature of the data, analysis and modeling/gaming tools that will be needed to inform the Steering Committee, in recognition of fixed timelines and budgets.

As a result of the workshop, we would anticipate that the work of the EARIP and its subcommittees will have more focus and clear steps forward related to:

- practical and timely methods and tools to evaluate the implications of proposed alternatives;
- the development of a full set of creative but practical alternatives with the potential to meet multiple interests;
- methods for dealing productively with key uncertainties.

The work will be done by myself and Dr. Robin Gregory, of Value Scope Research. Additional support for preparation and report writing may be provided by my

colleagues at Compass, Michael Harstone or Graham Long. Both Compass and Value Scope have extensive experience with decision analysis and facilitation for multi-objective, multi-stakeholder planning processes for water resources management (see attached corporate profiles and CVs).

We propose the following five tasks.

1. **Workshop Design.** We propose a conference call with yourself and/or a small subgroup of the Steering Committee to discuss the details of the workshop to discuss any feedback from the group, and to refine the project approach. At this point, we will prepare a detailed draft workshop agenda.
2. **Interviews.** To get the most out of a two-day workshop, we propose to conduct a series of short interviews with members of the Steering Committee. These interviews will give us a starting point for understanding objectives and alternatives. We may also contact technical resources to gain a better understanding of the availability of data and analysis in support of the decision process (e.g., outcomes of the NCTC workshop, other completed or on-going analysis).
3. **Preliminary Structuring.** We will organize the objectives and alternatives into draft objectives hierarchy, and organize the range of alternatives into a format that will allow discussion of various strategies.
4. **Facilitation.** We will facilitate a two-day Decision Sketching workshop. To ensure that the group has optimal opportunity for sharing and deliberation, the majority of the session will be in plenary (assuming 25-30 participants). As we will have two facilitators, the possibility of subgroups exists.
5. **Synthesis and Reporting.** We will synthesize the results of the workshop and prepare a summary report. This report will be in a format that will serve to guide subsequent stages of the decision process. It will summarize: objectives, potential measures, key uncertainties and potential trade-offs, and modeling and data needs in support of the decision process.

The workshop will be designed for a core group of 25-30 participants (the Steering Committee). We understand that there may be up to twenty additional interested stakeholders who will wish to observe. As the workshop will be an excellent way to bring all stakeholders up to speed on the approach to developing the EARIP, we encourage their participation as observers to the process. The workshop will be designed to facilitate input from and discussion with observers at key points.

Fees and expenses are summarized in Table 1. The budget is based on an hourly rate of \$150, and 8 hours per day. In terms of timeline, we propose to do the interview work in late August and early September, with a workshop to be held in late September or early October.

Table 1 Summary of Fees and Expenses

	<u>Days</u>	<u>Cost</u>
Task 1: Workshop Design	2	\$ 2,400
Review Background Material		
Project Initiation Meeting (teleconference)		
Workshop Agenda		
Task 2: Interviews	2	\$ 2,400
30 x 1/2 hour Interviews		
Task 3: Preliminary Structuring	5	\$ 6,000
Objectives Hierarchy		
Alternatives Structuring		
Detailed Workshop Design		
Task 4: Workshop Facilitation	4	\$ 4,800
Two day workshop in San Antonio, TX		
Task 5: Documentation	5	\$ 6,000
Final Structuring		
Report		
	18	\$ 21,600
Expenses		\$ 3,400
Flights		
Meals and Accommodation		
Long Distance Charges		
Total		\$ 25,000

Our proposal assumes that the client will provide: a) all logistics for the meeting (e.g., invitations, venue, food, audio-visual equipment, etc.); b) a note-taker for the meeting; c) access to key resources (e.g., documentation, people, etc.).

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me (604-641-2875), or Dr. Robin Gregory (250-539-5701), at any time.

Yours Truly,



Lee Failing
Partner, Compass Resource Management

Encl