

- 1) Given the short timeframe to prepare a winning proposal, each stakeholder meeting needs to be a working meeting with clearly defined deliverables and decisions that move the proposal preparation process forwards. That will require a fair amount of pre-meeting preparation and one-on-one interaction with the key stakeholders prior to and after each formal stakeholder meeting. Sending out a blast email a few days prior to the meeting will be inadequate. Or somehow imagining that meeting minutes will suffice to keep everyone up-to-speed may be unwarranted. That is, what happens between meetings among stakeholders to elicit participation, buy-in, and communicate issues and concerns may be as much or more important than what occurs in the formal meetings themselves.
- 2) Given the great distances among potential stakeholders from different communities in the region, some mechanism other than a formal physical all-hands meeting structure should be investigated. For example, why should Canebrake, etc. spend 3-4 hours of travel time to attend a 1.5 hour meeting of which 10-minutes might be devoted to their specific problem of interest? Likewise, if the Borrego Chamber of Commerce supports the proposal submission and is willing to write a letter to that effect from their organization and that can be accomplished off-line, why would we require them to attend a “stakeholder’s meeting” that they might consider a waste of time? The “call-in” process alone to facilitate distance participation has limited usefulness in that it is appropriate for only select stakeholders and technical resource input.
- 3) It was clear that RMC is in charge of the physical proposal preparation process and has the management of this process under control. What was entirely not clear is that an IRWM stakeholder management and administrative process is under control, the management resources to successfully accomplish this activity have been identified and how accountability for getting things done outside the physical proposal process that RMC is responsible for will be applied.
- 4) I liked the work plan focus that I heard at this first stakeholder meeting: (a) planning necessary to establish a managed Borrego Valley groundwater basin; (b) planning necessary to manage storm water runoff to alleviate the 5-foot FEMA flood management requirements that has placed a barrier on new development in the Valley; and (c) planning necessary to solve the specific water supply and water quality issues of the smaller communities in the region. I would love to start the next stakeholder meeting with a discussion of a draft work

plan to accomplish these practical objectives to focus the decisions that this stakeholder process must accomplish by the end of the year.

- 5) I have a deep and abiding concern that the work plan does not become a long laundry list of nice-to-have projects that even if DWR was kind enough to provide funding for would be unable to be managed successfully given the very limited availability of local regional management resources. My own perspective is that the work plan should be limited to a few critical projects that otherwise would be unaffordable but are absolutely necessary to accomplish the most important and immediate implementation projects for managing water resources in this region that without timely implementation place the region at severe economic risk.
- 6) Governance, decision-making process, who is a “stakeholder” (and what level of “stakeholder” i.e. those who have skin in the game vs. those who only have an “interest” in the outcome) vs. a “participant” and what is being asked of them really needs to be addressed and written down. The question is: “What is the glue that will hold together this stakeholder group during the planning process and during the implementation phase?”