

DRD-Steering Committee (DRD-SC) Meeting
May 18, 2010
Meeting Summary -- Location: DWCD Board Room

Present: Adam Bergeron, The Nature Conservancy (by phone); Randy Carver, MVIC; David Graf, CDOW; Meghan Maloney, SJCA; and Don Schwindt, DWCD.

The **agenda** was approved with two changes: Meghan asked that a proposal by Chester Anderson regarding the SLOWs project be reviewed and David requested that the role of the Science Committee be discussed.

Minutes: The minutes from the April 2010 meeting were approved with no changes. Marsha noted she will get the meeting notes done sooner next time. In the future, minutes will go on the Web site after the DRD-SC approves them.

Lower Dolores: This agenda item was informational in nature. Don said he felt the current draft of the parameters of the legislation were over-reaching in terms of prioritizing native fish, and that he felt some elements of the water language could create a water right. It was suggested by David that the DRD Framework questions should be used as a resource in the process to work through key issues being discussed in the Legislation Sub Committee mainly around water and a potential prioritization of the native fish. Don later reiterated that he is not against the concept of legislation as an alternative but just feels the language around water needs to continue to be worked out. Meghan noted that we need to let the Lower Dolores process play out. Marsha said that everyone on the DRD-SC is a member of or an alternate of the Lower Dolores Working Group -- and in these roles, opportunities exist for the DRD-SC members to give full input and shape the parameters of legislation. It was noted that if the native fish prioritization does not make it in the legislation, that it could be a proposal submitted to the DRD as it's obviously a very important topic and affects almost everyone involved in the DRD in some way. One idea discussed was a proposal that would require the BoR to do environmental compliance to manage spills for native fish. Randy noted that Rep. DeGette's bill could pass someday, and maybe sooner rather than later and thus, getting this legislation introduced has urgency to it.

Framework Process: The DRD-SC spent a considerable amount of time finalizing a process by which DRD proposals will be discussed, evaluated and potentially acted upon. Their final work is reflected below in two documents (final Framework questions and Framework Process steps). Meghan noted that basic education about the workings of the dam and the contracts is essential and was identified as an outcome at the retreat. Marsha noted that it was later articulated that this education should come about in the context of proposals being submitted. Everyone agreed that education was crucial but should not slow down the process of the DRD-SC and DRD accepting and acting up on proposals.

MVIC Lease: A question was asked about where the MVIC lease stands. Randy reported that he would like the two boards to talk and that the CWCB will not act on the proposal without DWCD support.

Staffing: A staffing plan was agreed to make sense after a draft was presented by Marsha (see 2nd draft below in green). The only caveat is that the group wanted more time to flesh out the role of the coordination of the Framework Project though the concept of budgeting for this position was approved. There was discussion about who would serve in this position and agreement that this needs to be a future item of discussion. Marsha will continue as the facilitator and Ann Oliver as the Science Coordinator. This staffing plan will be evaluated at the one-year mark for effectiveness (and before then, if necessary).

Funding: The DRD funding recommendations presented by Marsha were approved. The total amount needed for one year (see green document below) is \$30,000. The Nature Conservancy and the San Juan Citizens Alliance said they could give funding. Randy agreed it was a good concept and said MVIC will discuss it. Don said DWCD's board would discuss it as well. Each entity will be asked to give a set amount in operating dollars and these dollars would not be tied to any outcome or project. The \$30,000 would be split four ways (\$7,500/each). David said the CDOW said it cannot give money to fund operations. These dollars are for funding the basic work/facilitation/operation of the DRD and the new Framework Project. A decision was made to expand the request to DRD members and interested persons with the idea being that anyone wishing to support the DRD should be able to contribute. This idea became known as a "subscription concept." It was also noted that giving money was not a requirement to serve on the DRD-SC or the DRD. David said that the CDOW could possibly help with projects but probably not give general operating funding. The same was thought to be true for the BofR but Vern was not present. The CDOW and BofR can be called up for technical assistance such as what is happening already. SWCD will be approached to help contribute in the fall of 2010. Don said SWCD could be asked to match what is raised.

March 23rd Meeting Write Up: A meeting summary was handed out of the March 23rd meeting. Everyone was asked to email changes to Marsha by May 25th.

6/9 CFWE Tour: Marsha will email out the latest schedule. The DRD and LD efforts will be the focus of a lunch time presentations. Marsha said she wished the DRD and LD could start the day when everyone was fresh and present at the Anasazi Heritage Center theatre -- but that isn't the way the CFWE staff planned the tour.

Science Committee: Ann had provided meeting notes from the last meeting. The next meeting will focus on the Big Gyp project and specifically the peer review process the Science Committee would like to use for the final Big Gyp report. As part of this discussion, the role of the science committee will be discussed.

Hydrology Committee: Don reported that Ken Curtis will help get this started this summer. Anyone interested in serving should contact Ken. The committee is open to anyone. It's purpose and role need further defined.

Spill Committee: The reservoir likely will not fill this year, it was noted.

Biology Committee: David said the committee is deciding how to use the fish clock in relation to this year's run off (or lack thereof).

Other: The DRD-SC decided that in order to promote communication and transparency, that meetings are open to anyone as guests. Time will be made available for guests' comments with the facilitator using discretion about when that occurs along with a set of brief ground rules. The group wants people to feel welcome.

SLOWS: A proposal was sent by Chester to Meghan for funding the SLOWS effort. Meghan said that she wanted to discuss this w/the group because she needs to make decisions about how grant money that SJCA currently has available for Lower Dolores efforts should be allocated. It was decided that CDOW, DWCD and MVIC will be asked to help contribute a small amount of money to hopefully fulfill Chester's request. TNC and SJCA have already committed dollars. Don, David and Randy said they would take requests to their organizations. The concept emerged that if all the partners could share the costs, the amount given would be reduced. An example was given as follows:

3 partners participating = \$ 3,595.92
4 partners = \$ 2,696.94
5 partners = \$ 2,157.55

Submitted by Marsha Porter-Norton, Facilitator, DRD and Lower Dolores Plan Working Group

Dolores River Dialogue **Framework Proposal Outline for** **Considering Actions to Improve the Downstream Environment**

Names of Person(s) Developing this Proposal: _____

Main Contact Person's Phone Number, Cell and Email: _____

Date: _____

Please complete a proposal that addresses the questions below. Please be concise and attach any maps, hydrographs or supporting documentation. The process by which the proposal will be evaluated by the DRD-Steering Committee and the full DRD is on the Web site or available by request, and should be reviewed before starting.

Overview of the Proposal

- What is the specific proposal and how would it be implemented? Details and/or brief examples are helpful.
- What is the geographic area of focus including which DRD reach or reaches that would be involved?
- Who are the partners involved? Please describe their roles and responsibilities. Do you propose a role(s) for the DRD? If so, please be specific.
- What is a proposed timeline for implementing this proposal?
- If implemented, how would "success" be defined and monitored?
- Why do you believe this proposal is "do-able"?
- Are there communication plans or agreements that need to be in place among key entities to make this proposal work? If so, please describe.

Costs

- How much would this proposal cost (please provide a basis for the estimate)?
- What source(s) of funding are proposed?
- Would you be requesting any money or resources from the DRD?

Ecology and Science

- Please describe the anticipated ecological benefits (note: these might be from comparable situations elsewhere). Please be specific about any anticipated outcomes for: native fish, trout, riparian health, river mechanics and/or other.
- Please describe any key technical or scientific assumptions you are making including an overview of scientific information relating to the proposal.
- Are there any anticipated unintended or negative ecological consequences or costs?

Economic and Social

- What are the anticipated economic and/or social benefits and outcomes?

Hydrology

- Would the proposal affect water supplies in the reservoir and water rights in the Dolores drainage? If so, describe.
- Would the proposal affect operations of McPhee Dam? If so, describe.
- Would the proposal affect the hydrology downstream of the reservoir? If so, describe.

Sideboard/Constraints

- What are the current sideboards (i.e., constraints) and/or challenges that would need to be addressed (e.g., operational, contractual, legal, political, or other)?

Other Questions

- Are there additional questions that need to be answered to “flesh out” this proposal?
- What is not known at the current time? Can it be known?
- Is there anything else you would like to share?

Dolores River Dialogue Purpose Statement (Revised 11/09)

The DRD is a coalition of diverse interests, whose purpose is to explore management opportunities, build support for and take action to improve the ecological conditions downstream of McPhee Reservoir while honoring water rights, protecting agricultural and municipal water supplies, and the continued enjoyment of rafting and fishing.

There is no deadline for submitting proposals through the DRD. When completed, please submit eight copies of this proposal and any attachments to the Dolores River Dialogue - Steering Committee through the facilitator, Marsha Porter-Norton: porternorton@animas.net - 970-247-8306. The process by which the proposal will be evaluated by the DRD-Steering Committee and the full DRD is on the Web site or available by request.

DRD Framework Process

The following steps describe how proposals for meeting the DRD’s purpose statement are discussed and evaluated for action by the DRD-Steering Committee and eventually, the full DRD itself. This process is designed to be flexible, iterative, interactive and collaborative. The DRD-Steering Committee will serve as the central point for accepting and evaluating proposals, and will make recommendations to the full DRD related to each proposal submitted.

DRD Purpose Statement: The Dolores River Dialogue (DRD) is a coalition of diverse interests, whose purpose is to explore management opportunities, build support for and take action to improve the ecological conditions downstream of McPhee Reservoir while honoring water rights, protecting agricultural and municipal water supplies, and the continued enjoyment of rafting and fishing.

Phase 1: Initial Discussion with DRD-Steering Committee

Proposals are discussed in concept at a meeting with the proposal developer(s) and the DRD-Steering Committee. Two ground rules will be used: no proposal is rejected outright and no decision is made in this phase. The purpose of this initial meeting is for the entity/person developing the proposal to have a conversation and exchange with the DRD-Steering Committee

stakeholders; to receive and give initial information/feedback; and to learn where resources might be available for proposal development and information gathering.

Phase 2: Proposal Development

The proposal developer uses the “Framework” questions (available on the Web site or by emailing the facilitator) and completes a proposal, and then submits it electronically to the DRD-Steering Committee. Proposals can be generated from many sources including:

- The community
- DRD members
- DRD - Steering, Science or Hydrology Committee Members
- Other

There is no deadline for submitting proposals.

Phase 3: Education and Common Understanding

The DRD-Steering Committee works with the proposal developer(s) to hold an educational process or event. The goal is to have all parties involved learn about the proposal *together* in a detailed fashion. The outcome is a common understanding of what exactly is being proposed. This education step will include adequate meeting time for understanding complex information and may include a facilitated dialogue or debate about the proposal. There will be a write up of this education meeting(s) using a consistent outline so the process is transparent.

The educational step could take the shape of a “forum” or “symposia” or could be an expanded meeting between the DRD-Steering Committee with the proposal developer(s) and/or members of the Science and Hydrology Committees, and any other relevant stakeholders.

The exact format of this educational step will be designed based on what is necessary and helpful and of course, in partnership with the proposal developer. Again in this phase, the ground rules are: no proposal is rejected and no decisions are made.

Phase 4: DRD- Steering Committee Review and Recommendation-Setting Phase

The DRD - Steering Committee then further discusses the proposal and makes a recommendation using consensus-based decision making. The DRD-Steering Committee takes their recommendation(s) to the larger DRD. Their recommendations could include any of following:

- a) The DRD should support the proposal and actively work to implement it.
- b) The DRD supports the proposal but it will be implemented by a combination of partners. (In other words, it’s not a DRD-led project but is supported by the DRD.)
- c) Some other action should be taken to be defined.
- d) There should be no action on the proposal at the present time by the DRD.

Phase 5: Full DRD Review and Recommendation Phase

Then, at the next scheduled full DRD meeting, the DRD-Steering Committee presents their recommendations and requests the DRD evaluate and act on those recommendations. The full DRD aims to operate with a full consensus but will establish a super majority threshold for

voting. The DRD contract staff will produce transparent meeting summaries and information related to each proposal. If the DRD-Steering Committee does not recommend a proposal be supported, the full DRD will be fully briefed as to the reasons.

If the DRD support a proposal, plans will then be made for implementation.

Approved by the DRD Steering Committee on 5/18/10

Additional Information:

- 1) Each of the above steps will be fully documented through meetings summaries and/or production of other documents so that the process is transparent.
 - 2) Contract staff with a background in relevant issues will be hired to help with the Framework Project.
 - 3) These process steps can be reviewed for “do-ability” and the DRD-Steering Committee is open to feedback.
 - 4) It is intended that the DRD Science and Hydrology Committees be intimately involved as the proposals are developed and evaluated.
-

DRD Contract Staffing Recommendations to the DRD Steering Committee
(final draft, 5/26/10)

Overview of Recommendations from the DRD Facilitator:

- Three on-going staff functions are necessary (facilitation and coordination of the DRD; Science Committee and project coordination; Framework Process technical assistance and coordination). The staff functions cost \$30,000/year (see below for the staff position descriptions and amounts).
- The DRD immediately needs to raise money to continue. Budget recommendation: raise \$30,000 to cover this cost for one year (June 2010 to May 2010). This money should be raise money from “subscriptions.” TNC and SJCA have committed dollars. Subscriptions are to support the DRD process and are not tied to a desired outcome. Other subscriptions should be solicited from other DRD members and SWCD, and perhaps other entities. By key stakeholders providing smaller amounts of money in the range of \$5,000 to \$10,000, no one entity is burdened with funding the DRD. Also, by using a “subscription” model, the DRD can be assured that the core functions are funded.
- The need for these staff positions should be assessed at the one-year mark and the contracts should be written as a “not to exceed” figure. Depending on the DRD’s progress after one year, this structure could be modified.
- Consultants, scientists and other experts may be hired as projects arise and grants are secured.
- Each DRD staff or consultant positions are not considered employees of the DRD or any of the DRD stakeholders.
- A fiscal agent fee should be assessed on all funds raised to cover DWCD’s costs in providing this service to the DRD (their duties are: funds management and disbursement; making copies and other clerical/administrative help; handling logistics for most DRD meetings; grant reporting; and other duties as they arise).

Coordination and Facilitation of DRD (\$7,500/year includes Project Assistant)

- Organizing and facilitating meetings (monthly DRD-Steering Committee and full DRD 2-x-year) plus producing meeting notes

- Organizing and possibly facilitating additional DRD meetings, symposia, retreats, etc.
- Staffing the DRD-Steering Committee and completing follow up assignments as necessary
- Assisting with grant writing and resource development for the DRD
- Keeping all parts of the DRD “coordinated” and communication lines open between all the DRD “layers”
- Linking with administrative staff re: Web site upkeep, meeting announcements, logistics, billing, grants reports, etc., etc.
- Coordination of special projects as they arise (e.g.: Lower Dolores Plan Working Group) (*note: In some cases, the DRD may hire additional staff to take on special projects*)
- Acting as a spokesperson for the DRD when necessary (?)
- Media work, emails, extra meetings, lots of phone work, some administration and clerical tasks
(Skills: Ability to coordinate a complex project; facilitate meetings effectively including remaining neutral; strong organizational, communication and writing skills; team building and background in consensus-building and conflict resolution; and basic understanding of DRD issues and projects)

Coordination of Science Committee (15,000/year (“not to exceed”))

- Organize and facilitate Science Committee meetings and producing meeting notes
- Compile, analyze and summarize all scientific information pertinent to Dolores River ecology and management.
- Develop annual workplan, working in the DRD – Steering Committee, and engage and coordinate among partners to focus research/monitoring on addressing or continuing to address high priority questions.
- Work with the DRD-Steering Committee to obtain funding (grant writing etc.) for high priority science-based DRD initiatives and for the Science Coordinator position; and ensure that all grant tracking and reporting is handled
- Maintain data and facilitate report production for research/monitoring completed by DRD
- Facilitate communication between DRD partners on science-based needs, priorities, efforts and products
- Work with website manager to maintain website up to date, user friendly and accurate
- Support effective communication of science-based findings to larger DRD and to the community
- Emails, meetings, phone work & some administration and clerical
(Skills: Scientific knowledge related to the DRD areas; communication, Writing and strong organizational skills; ability to collaboratively work across many interests and organizations; background in producing scientific publications, and carrying out science based projects, studies and field work)

Coordination of the Framework Project (\$7,500/year (“not to exceed”))

- Provide staff work and technical assistance to the DRD and all relevant committees in organizing the Framework project and helping to ensure it moves forward so that the DRD can make recommendation related to “do-able” alternatives; Provide technical assistance and carry out detailed work as the proposals move through the DRD
- Assist with guiding and advising proposal developers with their proposals
- Meeting with necessary entities to gather information as proposals are developed including the DRD Science and Hydrology Committees as well as any other relevant entities
- Help the DRD understand each proposal and gather educational information as necessary (to inform recommendation-setting process); Identify gaps in information and assist the DRD in filling those gaps
- Emails, meetings, phone work & some administration and clerical

(Skills: Technical knowledge of the DRD topics; ability to analyze complex scenarios related to DRD topics and use "matrix"-type tool(s) in synthesizing proposals and alternatives; communication, writing, and strong organizational skills; experience in working collaboratively across many water and natural resource interests and organizations to reach an outcome or a set of recommendations; knowledge of the water and scientific issues the DRD deals with)