

## Appendix D

### Guidance to Focus group and Workshop Members

Dear Evaluator

Thank you for taking the time out of your busy schedule to assist us in the very important task of providing a preliminary evaluation of a proposal for establishing wetland impoundments at the Salton Sea. We have sought your assistance because of your knowledge and because we feel you can objectively apply that knowledge to the task at hand of providing a highly focused evaluation.

The process you are involved with is a first level evaluation leading to the integration of various ecosystem components into a holistic understanding of the probable outcomes associated with the proposed project if built as currently described. That integration will take place during a January 8, 2002 workshop open to the public. The potential for that workshop to achieve its goal of providing a defined understanding of the probable project outcomes is highly dependent upon how well the various small working groups are able to define their subject area outcomes.

The following guidance is provided for your task:

1. Make assumptions during your evaluations to avoid bogging down in unknowns. Assumptions should be reasonable and have a basis for the situation in question. Document the assumptions and basis for them. That will facilitate appropriate adjustments if the integration workshop or additional information at a later time suggests that adjustments should be made.
2. If Michael Cohen is available by telephone, contacts with him may clarify the intent of statements in question within the proposal.
3. Using the project and physical environment descriptive information provided as a basic foundation, evaluate the function and outcomes of the wetland enclosures from a perspective of your working group area (e.g., hydrology, biology, etc.). In doing so focus on the following key aspects:
  - a) Develop detail relative to the results of wetland environments that are created (may differ for the different areas) and for the area of the Sea outside of the wetland enclosures. These evaluations are restricted to your group area (e.g., biology-the following groups of birds will...). In doing so, it may be useful to include a comparison with present conditions.
  - b) Identify major benefits that may result (e.g., biology-the invertebrate diversity will...).
  - c) Identify issues deemed to be important (e.g., water quality-water temperatures will...).
  - d) Identify unknowns that may result in significant changes (positive and negative) in project outcomes.
4. Prepare separate lists as key points for each of the categories identified in item 3 above. For each key point, highlight (as additional key points) why the item identified is a key point.

5. Separate lists should also be developed for questions/issues that arise relative to the interface of your work group subject area with that for other subject areas and for items considered, but discarded.
6. An especially difficult area to deal with is the transitions that will occur between current conditions and the proposal being in place if built. The best that can probably be done is to offer general comments of what needs to be considered during that interim period.
7. No formal report will be developed by the working groups. The critical key point lists for each group will serve as the record of discussions. Those same lists will be used by each group presenter as the primary presentation points for the January 8 workshop.
8. Initial thoughts for the January 8 workshop agenda are provided with the enclosed draft. Initial thoughts for the working group presentations at the January 8 workshop are:
  - a. Maximum 15-20 minute presentation per group.
  - b. Start presentation with identification of the subject area and who the evaluators were. Provide very brief highlights of their specific areas of expertise relative to the subject matter being evaluated.
  - c. Follow with a brief overview of the process used by the group.
  - d. Identify items considered but discarded, and why.
  - e. Conclude by posting pre-prepared flip chart key point lists. Provide handouts for the audience of the same lists. Comment on items that need explanation and to provide additional highlights for specific items but do not comment on items that can be read from the list that do not need further explanation.
9. No questions will be allowed during the presentations or following them. Each group will complete their presentation to provide a posting (and handouts) of all the pieces to provide a framework for the discussions that will follow.
10. Following a break, the panel will begin internal dialogue to interface the information and make adjustments needed. The facilitator will keep the dialogue focused and use his/her discretion when to call upon others known to be in the audience or when to open dialogue on any aspect of the discussion to the general audience.
11. The basic objective of the workshop is to obtain general agreement that the key points identified or as adjusted provide a reasonable representation of the likely outcomes if the proposed project is completed to identify any major areas of disagreements, and to identify and include additional key points that may have been missed during the small working group evaluations.
12. A preselected individual will transform the dialogue of the workshop into a report of findings. That person will also provide a summary of highlights from the day to conclude the workshop. The panel and the Science Advisory Committee will be provided with the report of findings for review. They will provide their comments directly to the preparer of the report who will consider those comments and provide a final report to the Science Office within 45 days following the workshop. The Science Office will post the report on the Bureau of Reclamation website within 10 working days following receipt. The additional time is needed for the Science Office to resolve any questions or seek clarity on statements.