

TRANS-TEXAS WATER PROGRAM

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION/
STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT PROCESS**

**West Central
Study Area**



Technical Memorandum

San Antonio River
Authority

San Antonio Water
System

Edwards Underground
Water District

Guadalupe-Blanco
River Authority

Lower Colorado River
Authority

Bexar Metropolitan
Water District

Nueces River
Authority

Texas Water
Development Board

January, 1996



Robert Aguirre Consultants, L.C.

In Association With:

Katz and Associates, Inc.

Robert R. Ashcroft, AICP

Dethman and Associates, Inc.

Ximenes and Associates, Inc.

Nancy Scott Jones and Associates, Inc.

TRANS-TEXAS WATER PROGRAM
WEST CENTRAL STUDY AREA

TABLE OF CONTENTS



SECTION

Introduction	1
PART I	
The Trans-Texas Water Program	2
General Background	2
The Public Participation Component	3
The Public/Stakeholder Participation Process - Tasks 1 and 2	3
The Project Administrative Plan	4
Survey of Advisory Committee	4
Issues Briefing	6
Analysis of Past Public Participation Efforts	6
PMC Interviews	8
PMC Workshop	8
Conclusion - PART I	9
The Public's Shaping of the Decision Making Process	9
The Principles of Participation	10
PART II	
Situational Analysis	13
Critical Components	13
Program Strengths and Weaknesses	13
The Next Steps - Strategy Formulation	14

**TRANS-TEXAS WATER PROGRAM
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION/STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT
TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM
JANUARY, 1996**

INTRODUCTION

Public and stakeholder participation in long range water planning is a relatively recent development in natural resource planning. In today's major planning projects "participation" means that the public and stakeholders have real opportunities to affect the decision making process and its outcomes. The Trans-Texas Water Program, West Central Study Area, proposes to have a significant public participation/stakeholder involvement process in its Phase 2 study effort.

The terms "public" and "stakeholders," together, mean *all interested and affected parties* to a planning effort. In Trans-Texas, "public" refers to any member or group of members of the citizenry who is a water consumer or who has an interest in water resources in the region. "Stakeholders" refers to organized entities having an economic or other interest in water such as governments, businesses, or organized citizens/special interest groups. Any successful water resource planning effort must fully involve all of these groups who collectively pay for, or otherwise make possible, water development projects.

This Technical Memorandum documents the critical beginnings of a public process in connection with this major planning effort and defines the commitment of the sponsoring agencies to that process. This Memorandum outlines the initial steps taken and their outcomes, including the:

- ◆ Policy Management Committee's (PMC) two-day workshop on public and stakeholder involvement
- ◆ Specific goals and objectives of the public process
- ◆ Adopted Principles of Participation, and
- ◆ The critical program issues identified by the contractor

As a future navigational point of reference for process design and decision making, this Memorandum will be frequently re-visited. As a vision for the future, this Memorandum can be used by any interested person from a PMC member to a concerned citizen.

This report is divided into the following sections:

- ◆ An Overview of the Trans-Texas Water Program
- ◆ The Public Participation/Stakeholder Involvement Process
- ◆ A Situational Analysis
- ◆ The Next Steps - Strategy Formulation

PART I**THE TRANS-TEXAS WATER PROGRAM****GENERAL BACKGROUND**

The Trans-Texas Water Program is a cooperative effort among Texas' local, regional, and state water resource agencies. The program is divided into four distinct geographic study areas: North Central, Southeast, South Central, and West Central. These study areas include the major water demand centers of Houston, Austin, Corpus Christi, San Antonio, and western Williamson County.

The overall goal of the Trans-Texas Water Program is to identify the most cost-effective and environmentally-sensitive strategies for meeting the current and future (50 years) water needs of the study area. This is to be accomplished by providing for a full and meaningful participation by affected constituents (the public), and entities (stakeholders), in the development of state water resources planning which minimizes inequities and disproportionate effects.

The 33 county West Central study area, which is the subject of this public participation/stakeholder involvement effort, encompasses all or parts of the Nueces, San Antonio, Guadalupe, and Lower Colorado river basins. It also includes the City of San Antonio and agricultural, municipal, and industrial users that rely upon the Edwards Aquifer for their water supply.

The West Central study is sponsored locally by the San Antonio Water System, Edwards Underground Water District, Bexar Metropolitan Water District, Nueces River Authority, Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority, Lower Colorado River Authority and the San Antonio River Authority, with the latter acting as lead administrative agency. State sponsors include the Texas Water Development Board, in cooperation with the Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission, the Coastal Coordination Council, and the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department. These state and local agencies comprise the Policy Management Committee (PMC) for the West Central study area.

The PMC has established an Advisory Committee for Public and Technical Input to provide a forum for involvement and input by all parties interested in, or potentially affected by, this study. More than 140 people representing federal, state, regional, civic, business, environmental, and public interest groups make up the committee.

The Trans-Texas Water Program has three phases.

PHASE 1	Conceptual Planning - Identifying the alternatives
PHASE 2	Feasibility Studies
PHASE 3	Implementation

Currently, the program is in the early stages of Phase 2.

THE PHASE 2 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION COMPONENT

To proceed into Phase 2 feasibility studies, decisions have to be made about which water supply alternatives deserve further study. The project sponsors are committed to a high degree of public and stakeholder participation to achieve their acceptance of the results of the technical study and the alternative(s) selected for implementation.

Through a competitive process, the project sponsors selected Robert Aguirre Consultants, L.C. (RAC) to plan and implement public participation activities for the West Central region.

Robert Aguirre Consultants outlined the following public process approach:

TASK 1	Project Initiation/Management
TASK 2	PMC Workshop and Determination of Desired Project Outcomes
TASK 3	Public Process Strategy Formulation
TASK 4	Commencement of Field Work
TASK 5	Input Compilation and Synthesis
TASK 6	Gaining Public Acceptance

An explanation of the tasks performed to date appears in the section which follows.

Currently, the public process is at the point of concluding Task 2.

THE PUBLIC/STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION PROCESS - TASKS 1 AND 2

Tasks 1 and 2 of the public participation/stakeholder involvement effort will constitute the foundation for the entire public process to come. The goals of these first steps were:

- 1) To seek early input from the Advisory Committee for Public and Technical Input on issues basic to the success of Trans-Texas;
- 2) To develop a (public process) project administrative plan;
- 3) To begin a process by which decision analysis criteria will be established;
- 4) To clearly identify the PMC's expectations for public process;
- 5) To set forth the PMC's level of commitment for a public process (Principles of Participation);
- 6) To identify the end "product" desired;
- 7) To identify the roles of the participants; and,
- 8) To identify the essential characteristics of the public participation/stakeholder involvement process.

Each of these goals is essential to the success of a meaningful public participation effort.

To meet these goals, the following steps were taken:

- ◆ Development of the Project Administrative Plan
- ◆ Advisory Committee Surveys
- ◆ Issues Briefing
- ◆ Analysis of Past Public Participation Efforts
- ◆ PMC Workshop on Public Participation
- ◆ PMC Interviews (one-on-one)
- ◆ Preparation of this Technical Memorandum

The Project Administrative Plan

In the first month of the project, an administrative plan was developed. This plan outlines the policies and procedures which govern project issues such as contractor's team members' responsibilities, budget, cost and quality controls, documentation standards, media and data process protocols, and agency invoicing procedures.

Survey of Advisory Committee

The first activity was to survey the Advisory Committee for Public and Technical Input. The committee was asked for its comments on four fundamental questions:

- 1) Why does this region continue to have problems defining "water needs?"
- 2) What basic criteria must be met by any acceptable water strategy?
- 3) What does "stakeholder acceptance" mean to you?
- 4) What practical barriers/hurdles must be overcome in order to carry out a successful public participation process during Phase 2?

The questions were completely open-ended by design.

An initial mailing of the survey was sent to 147 people on the committee list, of which 49 (33%) responded. A second survey was sent to the 98 non-respondents, from which 20 additional responses were received, for a total response rate of 47%.

Overall the survey responses were thoughtful and helpful in understanding the perspectives and attitudes of the committee members. Indeed, the lists below clearly show diverse and often conflicting views. This information will be central to designing an effective public process.

The most frequent answers to the survey questions (repeated here verbatim) were:

- 1) Why does this region continue to have problems defining "water needs?"
 - a. Because "needs" are difficult to define
 - b. Lack of long-term thinking by some
 - c. Public impression that there is an endless supply of water
 - d. Difficulty in explaining the complexity to the public
 - e. Basic mistrust between rural and urban users
 - f. Differing goals and needs in the region
 - g. Misinformation abounds
 - h. "Protectionism" attitudes
 - i. Inability of urban users to accept discipline and conserve

- 2) What basic criteria must be met by any acceptable water strategy?
 - a. Cost effective
 - b. Reliability/firm yield
 - c. Protect/maintain high quality
 - d. Environmentally sensitive
 - e. Costs should be allocated proportionately/fairness
 - f. Must satisfy spring-flow requirements
 - g. Urban area conservation
 - h. Must facilitate economic development
 - i. Public acceptance

- 3) What does "stakeholder acceptance" mean to you?
 - a. Broad based public understanding of the logic and rationale
 - b. General public acceptance of the decision made
 - c. A belief that their (public's) concerns have been heard and incorporated into the final outcome
 - d. It does not mean 100% concurrence
 - e. Willingness and ability to pay cost

- 4) What practical barriers/hurdles must be overcome in order to carry out a successful public participation process during Phase 2?
 - a. Complexity of the issues and the alternatives
 - b. General paranoia
 - c. Apathy
 - d. The organizer(s) must have credibility
 - e. Special interest groups must not dominate
 - f. The media must be educated
 - g. False fears
 - h. The public must trust the outcomes

- i. Most players have already made up their minds
- j. Public meetings which are convenient as to time and place
- k. Lack of trust in the process
- l. Apathy, especially by city people

Issues Briefing

A one day issues briefing session was conducted for the contractor's team members by the project administrative agency, San Antonio River Authority, in conjunction with a representative of the Texas Water Development Board. The briefing began with a review of the history and origins of the Trans-Texas Water Program, the interagency Letter of Intent, and a review of current litigation and other pending legal questions. Also defined were the roles of the PMC, the various state agencies, the staff, and the Advisory Committee.

Analysis of Past Public Participation Efforts

Critical to a design for a future public participation process is a thorough understanding of the past experiences of the region. The Edwards area has seen a number of important public participation initiatives and these experiences, and the lessons they offer, are important to consider in the Trans-Texas Water Program effort.

Within this region there has been fairly extensive use of a variety of mechanisms for promoting and getting citizen participation in water issues. These have been, in broad general terms:

- 1) Citizen review committees appointed by elected officials
- 2) Participation by invitation of a select few
- 3) Open discussions and forums seeking a broad level of information about people's concerns and perspectives
- 4) Serving as moderator of discussions about a particular, narrowly defined issue

The perspective on public involvement by the people interviewed was that it was generally beneficial, but at times painful. Some criteria for success they expressed were:

- 1) The process must involve a broad base of constituencies, even if they are perceived as negative and oppositional.
- 2) There needs to be a focus for the participation, and a clear delineation of what is possible to do, and what is not, for consideration because of the legal, engineering or other requirements.
- 3) Ways have to be sought to get the "real public" involved so that it is not just the same people who claim to represent the public.
- 4) Publicity by itself is not enough to create support for a plan.
- 5) Ways need to be developed to "translate" the difficulties and complexities of the water issue into more easily understandable language.
- 6) There needs to be a balance between the role of staff and the role of the citizens.

- 7) A focus on the study area as a whole is required, rather than on specific or limited geographical areas.
- 8) A focus needs to be developed that takes us past the problem and into solutions.

Public participation has been a key element in a number of water related activities, but there is still the perception that there has been little involvement of the public. This seems to be partially because it is seen as "the same people" involved, and because of the complexity of the issue. Where public participation has been open, and there is no set agenda that is being promoted, it is a positive experience with positive outcomes.

The rest of this section describes a chronology of previous efforts, and analyzes how well those efforts worked.

The first public involvement efforts in the region began in 1976 and lasted until 1979 with the creation of the Regional Water Advisory Task Force. The Edwards Underground Water District (EUWD) served as the vehicle for regional forums for discussion of the issues related to water management. From 1980 through 1982 the EUWD held meetings/hearings in the five-county region that was its jurisdiction. These meetings took the form of open discussions of what should be done for water management. The recommendation was to have a Memo of Understanding establishing a joint study.

In order to consider this Memo of Understanding, the City of San Antonio (COSA) created an ad hoc committee to look at the Task Force's recommendation, but did not act on it at that time. Later, the COSA undertook the effort by developing a scope of work that was presented to the public for reaction, and hired a consultant to conduct a study. A series of public meetings were held from the spring through late 1986. From that effort came the mechanisms for implementing the study, and an Implementation Advisory Task Force was established for that purpose.

The Implementation Advisory Task Force was a body composed of citizens appointed by the San Antonio City Council and the board of the EUWD; each official appointed one representative. This group met to debate and formulate policy, and ultimately to come up with consensus policy for implementation of the study. They attempted to create a ground swell of support for the implementation using extensive publicity, but there was no clear objective to the media campaign which ultimately proved ineffective in creating support.

Policy recommendations were made in December of 1986 and another joint committee was formed by the EUWD and the COSA to concur with the policy recommendations. In January 1987, the committee met and argued over the various aspects of the policy recommendations. The conclusion, after much debate, was that a drought management plan was necessary and should be proposed for passage in the upcoming session of the legislature. There was an impasse concerning representation and the group decided not to pursue the legislation. But they did continue to meet weekly through October, 1987. At that time San Antonio Mayor

Henry Cisneros reconstituted the joint committee and discussions about water policy regulation issues continued with a different group of people. In June 1988, a regional report was submitted and accepted by the San Antonio City Council.

One aspect of the report was a drought management plan that was developed with input and feedback from the public. The public involvement effort was fairly successful and the plan was approved in August 1988. There was a desire to have additional meetings on the regional water plan relating to management and legislation. A series of public meetings was held seeking review and comment. Drought management was one aspect of the plan, and was clearly intended to be a component of an overall water management plan.

In 1989 the EUWD board was reconstituted with twelve members instead of fifteen. What followed was a series of efforts typically involving the same people. After the first Applewhite defeat City Council Member Weir Labatt formed another citizen's committee. The committee's activities were not well structured and were promoting a particular position in relation to water management. There was public involvement, but it was by invitation only.

In the spring of 1994 the citizen's committee for the 2050 Plan was formed, but was viewed by some as not representing all concerned constituents. The group was charged by then San Antonio Mayor Nelson Wolff with developing a water plan for the next fifty years; Applewhite was only one aspect of the overall plan. The initial motivation for the establishment of the committee was the eminent expiration of the permit for Applewhite as well as the need for a water management plan. One outcome of this committee's activities was the second Applewhite vote and its subsequent defeat.

POLICY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE INTERVIEWS

Each member of the PMC was individually interviewed at least once during this initial process. The purpose of these interviews was to allow each member to give their own key objectives and desired outcomes for the public participation/stakeholder involvement process. Additionally, each member was asked for their views on a variety of key issues. Information gathered from the issues briefing session, as well as from other sources, was further explored in an effort to identify any additional issues critical to the public participation effort.

The interviews conducted were frank, open, and reflected an eagerness for a meaningful public process. The level of commitment of the members appeared to be high, although not without some trepidation about the uncertainties of the process and its outcomes.

Information gathered in the PMC interviews was also used, along with other data, to develop the agenda of the PMC workshop.

THE PMC WORKSHOP

An intensive two-day workshop was conducted with PMC members and their senior staff. The

general goal of the workshop was:

To reach a common understanding of public participation/stakeholder involvement for the Trans-Texas Water Program, focusing on its purpose, outcomes, and general operation.

Collateral issues associated with the Trans-Texas Water Program included questions such as:

- ◆ Who is the "client?"
- ◆ Why are we doing Trans-Texas now?
- ◆ What is the product we want?

Collateral issues associated with the public participation/stakeholder involvement process included questions such as:

- ◆ What are the desired results?
- ◆ What is everyone's role?
- ◆ What are the essential characteristics?
- ◆ What does the decision making process look like?

Facilitated by the contractor, the workshop format was informal and highly interactive. Communication was open, honest, and candid about individual views and positions concerning Trans-Texas generally, and public participation specifically.

CONCLUSION - PART I

All of the activities undertaken to date have concentrated "in-house" on matters necessary to conduct a focused, organized project. From the information gathered and the work performed to date, the public process goal would be articulated as follows:

To conduct a public participation/stakeholder involvement process which leads to publicly acceptable options that will meet the long-term water needs for the study area.

The question then becomes: How is "publicly acceptable" achieved?

THE PUBLIC'S SHAPING OF THE DECISION MAKING PROCESS

In order for any long-term plan to achieve public acceptability, the public/stakeholders must know they have been given the opportunity to give input and have an impact on the process which produced the plan. There can be no public acceptability unless such input and impact is achieved in fact *and in perception*.

It is through their active participation that the public "shapes" the decisions which affect them.

But in order for this “shaping” to occur, a number of essential elements must first be understood.

In today’s planning environment the shaping of public decisions by the public and stakeholders is a pragmatic reality. The public and stakeholders will be involved in, and will shape, the decisions which affect them in one way or another. The overall responsibility of the sponsors is to ensure that the participation is broad based, meaningful, and constructive.

Public participation is, at its best, a working partnership which builds trust between the public/stakeholders and the sponsors. This trust must begin by:

- ◆ Establishing constructive lines of communication
- ◆ Identifying what the issues are
- ◆ Determining who the affected publics and stakeholders are
- ◆ Defining the best ways for all parties to communicate (with special attention given to hard to reach and historically under-represented groups)
- ◆ Establishing ground rules for the respective roles of publics, stakeholders, and sponsors

Once basic trust and communication avenues are established, the public and stakeholders shape the process by:

- 1) Providing their views about the issues
- 2) Being informed and concerned about the issues
- 3) Communicating constructively with sponsors by asking questions, expressing concerns, giving advice, and making their preferences clear
- 4) Having a real voice in the decisions which are made (by participating in determining the criteria by which alternatives are evaluated and selected)
- 5) Supporting the decisions which they have helped to shape

The responsibilities of the sponsors are to:

- 1) Solicit and understand the viewpoints of the public and stakeholders
- 2) Communicate in an ongoing and interactive manner with the public and stakeholders about the issues
- 3) Provide an avenue for the public and stakeholders to have their opinions and preferences heard
- 4) Factor-in public and stakeholder preferences into the decision making criteria

THE PRINCIPLES OF PARTICIPATION

All of the discussion and work to this point comes down to one critical question: To what extent are the sponsors willing to commit to a public process which shapes their decisions? In order to codify a commitment to a defined and structured process, the Principles of Participation are drafted and adopted prior to the commencement of field work (Task 3).

The Principles of Participation serve as a formal expression of the PMC's commitment to the public participation/stakeholder involvement process and to the general methodology by which such participation will be achieved. As such, it becomes the foundation piece for the development of the entire process and the basis upon which input will be evaluated and decisions made.

From the work performed to date, and as a direct consequence of the PMC's workshop and interviews, a draft of the Principles of Participation appears on the following page.

- Public/stakeholder communication must be timely, truthful, consistent, and two-way.
- The Policy Management Committee, as the responsible decision-making body, must be accountable for the integrity of the public/stakeholder participation process and the manner in which the public's input shapes the final outcomes of the program.

In this effort we recognize that the overall quality and depth of public/stakeholder participation can only be as good as our ability to effectively communicate the complex issues associated with water planning alternatives.

These Principles of Participation recognize that no present or long-term water strategy can be implemented without the general support and consent of the public and stakeholders.

The Policy Management Committee
Trans-Texas Water Program
West Central Region

PART II

SITUATIONAL ANALYSIS

This section offers a brief analysis, from the perspective of the contractor, of the critical components of the Trans-Texas project as well as their strengths and weaknesses. It is included here as a record of the point of program origin, as a reference for future comparisons, and as a focal point for periodic project adjustment as necessary.

A situational analysis is a snapshot view at a given point in time which is to be revisited periodically. The two primary parts of the analysis are:

- ◆ Identifying the critical program components; and,
- ◆ Identifying program strengths and weaknesses.

As a base line reference point, these issues are important in designing a strategy for the future.

CRITICAL COMPONENTS

A natural resource planning program of this magnitude has many issues, sub-issues, and operational details. All are important to the success of the process, however certain basic components are essential and uncompromising.

From the perspective of the contractor, there appear to be four critical components to Trans-Texas. These are:

- ◆ Credibility (of the sponsoring agencies *and* of the process)
- ◆ Commitment (of the sponsoring agencies)
- ◆ Communication (with/between public/stakeholders)
- ◆ Equal Treatment (of public/stakeholders)

Each of these essential components is distinct from the other and each is necessary to a successful process. Each is driven by circumstances, real and perceived. A deficiency in establishing or maintaining any one will far outweigh the effectiveness of the remaining three.

PROGRAM STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

Among the more difficult items to analyze is a program's strengths and weaknesses. One reason this is so difficult is because it must deal with perception as much as with fact. An understanding of a program's strengths and weaknesses is essential in designing a public process, for the process must respond to these characteristics.

An analysis of strengths and weaknesses in no way implies an evaluation of any agency or function. It is simply looking at the entire program reality and assessing the assets (strengths) and liabilities (weaknesses) of the circumstances as they exist at this point in time.

From the work performed to date, the strengths and weaknesses of the program identified by the contractor are:

STRENGTHS

- ◆ There is a strong sense of cooperation and general agreement among the sponsoring agencies for the direction of Trans-Texas.
- ◆ The work performed to-date within the Trans-Texas program appears to be widely accepted as being credible.
- ◆ The Trans-Texas program, unlike previous planning efforts, is designed to consider environmental impacts up-front, rather than at the time of permitting.
- ◆ The Trans-Texas program is uniquely organized as a joint local, regional, and state planning approach.

WEAKNESSES

- ◆ The ongoing and unresolved legal issues associated with the Edwards Aquifer make planning more difficult.
- ◆ A history of recent unsuccessful efforts on major planning initiatives will be difficult to overcome.
- ◆ The complexity of long term water planning makes public communication of the issues very difficult.
- ◆ There appears to be sizable previously unidentified and unreached constituency groups in the study area which must be brought into the process.
- ◆ There is a very large diversity of water needs/interests in the region.
- ◆ The size of the region makes for difficult challenges in establishing two-way communications with constituency groups.
- ◆ The efforts of individual sponsor agencies to develop alternative water supplies outside of Trans-Texas may pose a threat to the program.

There are surely many off-shoot issues associated with each of these factors, but those listed here appear to make up the core around which a public process can be designed.

THE NEXT STEP - STRATEGY FORMULATION

Once the Principles of Participation are formally adopted, the foundation for a public participation/stakeholder involvement process will be in place. The next step is strategy formulation.

In order to formulate a public process strategy it is necessary to seek the input from the public and stakeholders for whom the process is intended. Typically referred to as constituent data gathering, it involves going into the community - all facets of the community - asking those who will be impacted by the outcomes of this process for their thoughts and opinions as to how to design such a process. The underlying premise is that neither the public nor the stakeholders can be expected to accept a process which they had no part in designing. If the process itself is unacceptable, the results of that process will logically be deemed unacceptable as well.

This strategy formulation, which is identified as Task 3 of this public participation/stakeholder involvement process, is envisioned to include the following scope of work items:

<u>TASK NO.</u>	<u>TASK</u>
3.1	Identifying Constituents and Potential Constituents
3.2	Develop Preliminary Institutional Plan
3.3	Public Issues Survey
3.4	Develop Preliminary Decision Making Criteria and Criteria Weights
3.5	Develop Public/Focus Group Interview Agenda
3.6	Public/Stakeholder Interviews and Focus Groups
3.7	Issues Document
3.8	Development of Specific Public Participation/Stakeholder Involvement Plan
3.9	Assist in RFP Process for Technical Contractor
3.10	Contract Administration

Each of these tasks include a number of operational items, a summary of which is offered here for a better understanding of the strategy development process.

- | | |
|-----|---|
| 3.1 | <p>Identifying Constituents and Potential Constituents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Advisory committee interviews ◆ Staff interviews (sponsoring agencies) ◆ General research on under-represented constituent groups ◆ General research on potential constituent groups |
| 3.2 | <p>Develop Preliminary Institutional (agency) Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Define potential (short-term) institutional requirements to support on-going public input ◆ Interface with sponsoring agency "Resource" and "Communication" sub-committees ◆ Media/Agency protocol |
| 3.3 | <p>Public Issues Survey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Gauge publics'/stakeholders' level of understanding of issues |

- ◆ Gauge publics'/stakeholders' general trust level
 - ◆ Develop base-line of constituent issues and perceptions
- 3.4 Develop Preliminary Decision Making Criteria and Criteria Weights
- 3.5 Develop Public/Focus Group Agenda
- ◆ Issues characterization
 - ◆ Development of standard interview questions
 - ◆ Design presentation graphics and materials
- 3.6 Public/Stakeholder Interviews and Focus Groups
- ◆ Identify basic format model
 - ◆ Conduct personal interviews
 - ◆ Conduct focus groups
 - ◆ Conduct "public" focus groups
 - ◆ Refine decision making criteria and criteria weights
 - ◆ Develop constituent mailing list (data base)
- 3.7 Issues Document
- 3.8 Development of Specific Public Participation Plan
- ◆ Identify public process model
 - ◆ Identify Advisory Committee's role
 - ◆ Identify non-participating constituents
 - ◆ Design communication methods
 - ◆ Define a media plan
- 3.9 Assist in RFP Process for Technical Contractor
- ◆ Drafting public participation portion of RFP
 - ◆ Assist in review of proposals
- 3.10 Contract Administration

These steps occur in a very specific order, each building upon the previous. All are driven by the Principles of Participation. Additionally, it is important to note that every step will be properly documented under the standard set in the Project Administrative Plan. This documentation is an important accountability record of the process, the proceedings, and the outcomes of this public process.

The final outcome of Task 3 is a specific proactive strategy or plan which, after consultation with the impacted public/stakeholders and staff, will be presented for consideration to the

PMC. Whether or not this process will take an Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) approach, a modified IRP approach, or a more traditional public process approach is subject to determination within this Task 3 and ultimate PMC decision.

TRANS-TEXAS WATER PROGRAM

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION/ STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT PLAN



West Central Study Area

San Antonio River
Authority

San Antonio Water
System

Edwards Aquifer Authority

Guadalupe-Blañco
River Authority

Lower Colorado River
Authority

Bexar Metropolitan
Water District

Nueces River
Authority

Canyon Lake Water
Supply Corporation

Bexar-Medina-Atascosa
Counties Water Control
and Improvement Dist. #1

Texas Water
Development Board

February, 1997



Robert Aguirre Consultants, L.C.

In Association With:

Katz and Associates, Inc.

Robert R. Ashcroft, AICP

Dethman and Associates, Inc.

Ximenes and Associates, Inc.

Nancy Scott Jones and Associates, Inc.

**TRANS-TEXAS WATER PROGRAM
WEST CENTRAL REGION**

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION/
STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT PLAN**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
Introduction	1
PART I - Background	1
Principles of Participation	2
PART II - The Public Participation Plan Description	4
Constitution of the Plan	4
Characteristics of the Plan	5
Elements of the Plan	6
PART III - Plan Recommendation	7
Summary of Public Participation Plan	8
PART IV - Time Line	16

PART I - BACKGROUND

On October 17, 1995 the Policy Management Committee authorized the commencement of a public participation/stakeholder involvement process for the West Central Region. Hired for this purpose was the firm of Robert Aguirre Consultants, L.C. with whom a contract was entered into on October 23, 1995.

The project was designed to be carried out in phases, with the first effort consisting of Tasks 1 and 2, Project Definition. The major components of these tasks included Surveys of the Advisory Committee for Public and Technical Input, a two-day public participation workshop for members of the Policy Management Committee (PMC) and senior staff, and issues identification. This first effort had two important results. The most notable of these was the drafting and subsequent unanimous adoption by the PMC of the Principles of Participation. This document outlines, in explicit constitutional

Illustration 1 - Principles of Participation

This declaration formally expresses our commitment to a comprehensive public participation/stakeholder involvement process. By adopting and implementing the principles embodied in this declaration, the public's input will play a critical role in evaluating the water planning strategies to be considered for this region.

While each participating agency is responsible to its respective constituents, our collective regional responsibility is "to identify the most cost-effective and environmentally sensitive strategies for meeting the current and future water needs of the West Central Region." In addition, we must ensure that the public and stakeholders significantly participate in deciding which strategies will be implemented.

By unanimous adoption of this statement, the West Central Policy Management Committee of the Trans-Texas Water Program commits itself to the following principles of public and stakeholder participation:

- The public/stakeholder's participation must be broadly based and inclusive of all constituencies.
- It is the responsibility of the Trans-Texas Water Program and its sponsors to be proactive in its commitment to seek public/stakeholder participation and input.
- Public/stakeholder communication must be timely, truthful, consistent, and two-way.
- The Policy Management Committee, as the responsible decision-making body, must be accountable for the integrity of the public/stakeholder participation process and the manner in which the public's input shapes the final outcomes of the project.

In this effort we recognize that the overall quality and depth of public/stakeholder participation can only be as good as our ability to effectively communicate the complex issues associated with water planning strategies.

These Principles of Participation recognize that no present or long-term water strategy can be implemented without the general support and consent of the public and stakeholders.

Policy Management Committee
Trans-Texas Water Program
West Central Region

terms, the commitment of the PMC to a meaningful public participation process. These Principles of Participation appear in Illustration 1 and are the foundation upon which the public involvement goals are based.

The second result of the initial effort was the Technical Memorandum dated January, 1996. This document outlined the results of the efforts performed to that date and offered a situational analysis which outlined an initial assessment of the components thought to be critical to a successful public participation program. These were:

- ◆ Credibility (of the sponsoring agencies *and of the public process*)
- ◆ Commitment to the public process (by the sponsor agencies)
- ◆ Communication (with and between the public and stakeholders)
- ◆ Equal Treatment (of public and stakeholders)

The Technical Memorandum concluded with a strategy for the formulation of a public process, which became Task 3 of this effort (Public Process Strategy Formulation).

Task 3 began on February 7, 1996 and was based on the premise that in order to formulate a public process it was necessary to seek input from the public and stakeholders for whom the process was intended. This involved gathering data from all sectors of the impacted public regarding their thoughts and opinions as to how a public process should be designed. The underlying premise of this Task 3 was that the public and the stakeholders would be more likely to accept a process which they had a part in designing.

Task 3 included a wide range of data gathering measures which began with a survey of the members of the Advisory Committee for Public and Technical Input, and included the following additional measures:

- ◆ PMC member interviews
- ◆ A random public issues survey of the study region (a)
- ◆ An analysis of under-represented groups
- ◆ Focus Groups
- ◆ Public Workshops
- ◆ Development of a mailing list/data base
- ◆ Development of public process models
- ◆ Identification of the public's top criterion on water issues (decision analysis criteria)

(a) Report entitled Trans-Texas Water Issues Survey dated September, 1996.

The results of this Task 3 were published in a report entitled Issues Document dated February, 1997. This report recaps the results of these extensive data gathering efforts and identifies the key issues around which a public participation plan should be built.

Key to the planning approach outlined here is an understanding of the six "mind set" areas identified in Task 3 and discussed in the Issues Document. These are:

- ◆ Agricultural
- ◆ Urban Flighters
- ◆ Metropolitan Areas
- ◆ Highland Lakes and Springs
- ◆ Downstream Interests
- ◆ Bays and Estuaries

Communication methods proposed in the public participation plan are designed to address each of these mind sets as key constituent groups.

The Issues Document report also identifies the public's decision analysis criteria as it applies to water resource planning. These criteria, and the order of their importance expressed by the public, are:

- ◆ Water Quantity
- ◆ Water Quality
- ◆ Water Cost

Additionally, the document outlines ten core issues which were identified from the public's input. These core issues, around which the proposed public participation plan is built, are:

- ◆ Trust in Decision Makers
- ◆ Equity/Economic Impact
- ◆ Conservation
- ◆ Local Elected Officials (importance of)
- ◆ Environmental Implications
- ◆ Political Will (of the decision makers *and* the public)
- ◆ Property Rights
- ◆ Communication/Information
- ◆ Complexity of Water Issues
- ◆ Population Growth

The Issues Document concludes with a recommendation to continue the broad public participation process to help facilitate and ensure that the public is informed about water resource planning issues and that their input is incorporated into the planning process.

PART II THE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN DESCRIPTION

Constitution of the Plan

The investment made by the PMC in this effort has been extraordinary. With the adoption of the Principles of Participation the PMC embarked on a public process like no other seen in this region in terms of its extent and scope.

To this point the public data gathering and analysis process has been conducted on the basis that *the entire range of public and technical issues are fully integrated in, and integral to, a successful water resource planning picture*. This characterization - a process dealing with integrated issues - is the cornerstone of this proposed plan.

The public participation plan recommended here reflects a continuation of the uniqueness which has characterized this effort to date. The plan is a bold one and much different than the more traditional planning method of:

- ◆ Decide
- ◆ Announce
- ◆ Defend

In contrast to this more traditional method, the proposed public participation plan is designed as an integrated resource planning process (known as "IRP"), a planning method which:

- ◆ Investigates
- ◆ Educates
- ◆ Involves
- ◆ Evaluates (Input)
- ◆ Incorporates (Input)
- ◆ Decides

The two methods are *constitutionally* different. The biggest difference is the method and timing of the decision by the decision makers - who are the same under either method. In an integrated resource plan the emphasis is on providing public input and involvement into *the process* of decision making on the theory that there can be no general public agreement on water resource planning unless that public has a voice in the method upon which that plan was developed.

Characteristics of the Plan

Integrated Resource Planning is much more of a conceptual approach or a way of thinking than it is a set of specific formulas or measures. It is a non-traditional approach to long-term water resource planning which takes into account a wide range of interconnecting (integrated) issues that affect, and are affected by, water resource planning. These include balancing the trade-offs of various water resource options such as conservation, supply, and facilities. IRP also factors public input and

environmental impacts into the decision making process. It is extremely comprehensive, and begins with a premise that a wide-range of traditional and non-traditional supply-side and demand-side resources should be considered. What's more, its design is such that it is capable of producing a result which considers a set of options rather than a single project - a key goal considering the regional, multi-agency aspect of the Trans-Texas Water Program.

The interdisciplinary IRP approach was outlined in the previous section. Some key operational differences are that IRP includes:

- ◆ A strong focus on water conservation as a resource
- ◆ Careful consideration and public discussion of planning uncertainties and risks
- ◆ Explicit treatment of conflicting objectives and resulting trade-offs
- ◆ The treatment of the public/stakeholders as participants, rather than disputants

In order for this plan to be successful, there must be a strong commitment to the following message points:

- ◆ Conservation
- ◆ Communication
- ◆ Confidence

Conservation: It is strikingly clear that, in the minds of the public, any true water resource planning effort must begin with conservation. This is especially true in Trans-Texas as a regional effort.

Communication: The importance of adequate, meaningful communication can not be over emphasized. This is true as it applies not just to the public, but to the sponsoring agencies as well. Since dealing with conflicts and competing interests in explicit ways is a part of this proposed process, good communication will be key.

Confidence: Closely related to (and a product of) communication is public confidence. By conducting a fair, honest, and equitable process, and through maintaining good lines of communication, the public's confidence in the decision makers can be elevated.

No opportunity will be missed to emphasize these three important points.

Finally, the measures which have been designed for this proposed plan are specifically designed to address the issues and the concerns expressed by the public as well as the sponsoring agencies.

Elements of the Plan

The design of the public participation plan is based upon input from the public, stakeholders, and water agencies (including the sponsor agencies) which was gathered in phase one. A large quantity of information has been assembled and analyzed, resulting in the following key findings used in the plan design:

- ◆ Residents chose having a reliable supply as the highest priority, followed closely by water quality and more distantly by keeping the cost of water low.
- ◆ One-third of the region's residents are *not* concerned about future water shortages.
- ◆ Conservation is most often mentioned as the single most important thing to do to ensure water for the future, and is the most well known and supported water management strategy.
- ◆ Except for conservation, citizens are generally not familiar with other water supply options.
- ◆ One-third of the residents do not feel they are informed on water issues.
- ◆ Residents want to be kept informed on water issues.
- ◆ When seeking reliable information on water issues, three-fourths of the residents turn to either their local water/utility department, city or county government, water districts or authority.
- ◆ Residents most frequently state they trust elected local/state officials and local water officials to make decisions about meeting future water needs, however one-third either trust nobody or do not know who to trust.
- ◆ Three-quarters of residents in the study region strongly agree that elected and water utility officials should involve the public in water planning issues.

The plan outlined in this report is centered around these key issues as each represents an important issue to be addressed or capitalized upon.

PART III PLAN RECOMMENDATION

The recommended plan is designed to address the issues as well as the opportunities which exist throughout the study region within the framework set forth above. A summary of these specific measures appears in Illustration 2.

Each of these measures is explained below.

Illustration 2 - Summary of Public Participation Plan

- ⇒ Integrated Resource Planning Workshop (Task 4-1)
- ⇒ Elected and Water Officials Briefings/Updates (Task 4.2)
- ⇒ Implementation of Media Plan (Task 4-3)
- ⇒ Assist in Development of Phase 2 Technical Scope of Work (Task 4-4)
- ⇒ Define and Implement IRP Organizational Requirements with Sponsor Agencies (Task 4-5)
- ⇒ Identify Planning Policy Objectives With Each Sponsor Agency (Task 4-6)
- ⇒ Re-Structure of Advisory Committees (Task 4-7)
- ⇒ Advisory Committee Meetings (Task 4-8)
- ⇒ Informational Materials Development and Production (Task 4-9)
- ⇒ Materials Distribution (Task 4-10)
- ⇒ Develop Public Information and Involvement Opportunities Through Outreach Efforts (Task 4-11)
- ⇒ Refine and Expand the Public's Evaluation Criteria (Task 4-12)
- ⇒ Advisory Committee's Interim IRP Report (Task 4-13)
- ⇒ Coordinate With Technical Contractor to Evaluate Resource Options (Task 4-14)
- ⇒ Assist in Characterizing Resource Options (Task 4-15)
- ⇒ Identify and Define Future Uncertainties and Potential Outcomes (Task 4-16)
- ⇒ Selection of Water Resource Scenarios (Task 4-17)
- ⇒ Advisory Committee's Final IRP Report (Task 4-18)

Task 4.1

Integrated Resource Planning Workshop - Two one-half day workshops are planned for the PMC members and senior agency staff. The purpose of the first session is to reaffirm the public involvement goals, to fine-tune the public participation plan, and to put that plan in the context of an IRP process. Organizational impacts will be assessed as well as each agency's role in the plan. The workshop will ensure that all sponsors are in agreement with the process and expectations for its outcomes.

The second session will be held after the technical contractor is engaged. This session will concentrate on the integration of the technical components with the public participation aspects, and vice versa. Key milestones will be identified including recommendation and public involvement points. Additionally a process will be established by which complex technical components will be translated into common terms of understanding.

Task 4.2

Elected and Water Official Briefings/Updates -

The current data base of elected officials will be expanded in preparation for briefings and updates. Since local elected officials are key to the success of this project, much emphasis will be spent on identifying these officials and to set in place a process by which they can be briefed and regularly updated. This task includes conducting briefings for groups of elected officials as warranted, and the distribution of a monthly status report letter to officials on the data base. In many cases elected officials (particularly state officials) will be asked to appoint a specific staff person to serve as liaison between their office and the Trans-Texas Water Program - West Central Region.

Task 4.3

Implementation of Media Plan - The media plan is divided into two parts: planned and unplanned media events.

Planned media events consist primarily of press releases at specific, predefined milestones. The media plan calls for seven general press releases and six "targeted" press releases. General press releases are distributed throughout the entire study region while targeted releases are restricted to a certain geographic area. Planned media events also include editorial board meetings.

Unplanned media events are more generally known as issues or crisis management. These are events which can not be specifically predicted but require media interaction. Unplanned media events are reactionary in nature and are in response to some event or circumstance.

Task 4.4

Assist in Development of Phase 2 Technical Scope of Work - The public participation contractor shall assist in the development of the Phase 2 Technical Scope of Work. Since that scope of work will set forth the parameters upon which an initial screening of water resource planning options will be conducted, it is essential that the public's criteria be a stated part of the screening parameters. The intent is that the resulting technical scope of work will be a reflection of both good science and public sensitivities.

In addition to the above, a unique partnership must be formed between the public and technical contractors. The success of each shall be dependent upon the other, and this interdependency must be reflected in the scope of work as a cooperative and coordinated effort.

Task 4.5

Define and Implement IRP Organizational Requirements with Sponsor Agencies - This unique planning method is much more of a way of thinking and attitude than it is a set of formulas. Additionally it views the public and stakeholders as participants in the process rather than disputants. Because of these characteristics it will be necessary to work with each sponsor agency to assess how this commitment to public participation impacts organizational demands. Not all participating agencies have public information departments and/or media spokespersons, yet all must be in a position to respond to the needs of the public for communication and information. Within the context of standards developed under the Trans-Texas umbrella, each agency must set its own policy and procedures on how the demands of the process will be responded to. This response often has organizational implications and it is necessary that each agency be properly situated to respond to the needs of the program in a reliable, standardized way.

Task 4.6

Identify Planning Policy Objectives of Each Sponsor Agency - A careful identification of each agency's planning policy objectives will be an essential element in this process. This is especially important considering the multi-agency nature of the Trans-Texas Program and the fact that each agency has their individual planning and technical analysis in progress. Each agency's planning policy objectives will form the basis of the criteria against which resource scenarios will be evaluated. Since these planning policy objectives form the very basis of that evaluation criteria, their importance can not be overemphasized.

The public participation contractor will work with the staff technical work group and the technical contractor (HDR) to ensure the infusion of the public's concerns in these planning objectives.

It is certain that objectives will differ between agencies. Explicitly addressing these differences through a process of constrained trade-offs will be an important part of this process.

Task 4.7

Re-Structure of Advisory Committees - It is recommended that the current Advisory Committee for Public and Technical Input be reconstituted and re-commissioned giving it a more focused role in the Trans-Texas process.

The Public Participation Component

While still functioning as an advisory body only, it is recommended that the public involvement component be a free standing committee comprised strictly of citizen advisors. While membership to the committee will continue to be self-selecting as it has been in the past, a conscious effort will be made to balance the representation in terms of geography, gender, race, water position, socioeconomic status, etc., in order to guarantee equal representation and participation.

A key factor in this committee makeup will be that it is comprised *solely* of citizen representatives of the public. The committee *will not* include water professionals, agency/government personnel, elected officials, political candidates, scientists, technical/professionals, etc. The intent is to protect the right of the ordinary citizen to full participation in the process without interference or over-shadow.

Membership to the committee will be promoted region-wide and elected officials will be invited to nominate citizens for membership within the set criteria. Any citizen expressing an interest in serving will be given briefing materials which will explain the project, the role of the committee, expectations of membership, and anticipated time demands of service. A recruitment effort will be conducted in geographic areas from which little citizen response is received.

In the event there is a large enrollment response, it may be necessary to organize the efforts of the advisory committee into smaller, regional groups (possibly task forces) in order to more efficiently gain their involvement and input. In this event the regional groups shall be sub-sets of the advisory committee, to which each regional group shall appoint an equal number of representatives. This method makes the process available to those impacted, calls upon citizens to represent citizens, and balances potentially skewed regional representation.

First on the public participation committee's agenda will be to develop and adopt the constitutional documents necessary to give its efforts focus and control. These documents will include the mission statement given to it by the PMC in their initial commission, a draft of which is presented in Illustration 3 for PMC consideration. The second part of the committee's agenda will be to gain a basic understanding of the Trans-Texas Water Program and its current status, to begin a process of assisting the program in materials distribution, assist in strategy development of public outreach efforts, and to begin the process of refining the decision and evaluation criteria. *Most*

importantly, the role of the advisory committee will be to provide ongoing, educated public input to the technical analysis as it progresses and within the planning constraints yet to be determined by this process.

The recommended new name of this committee is: Citizens Advisory Committee for Public Participation.

The Technical Component

It is also recommended that the technical component of the current Advisory Committee for Public and Technical Input be likewise reconfigured as a parallel advisory committee in this effort. Its mission and configuration will be determined in conjunction with the Project Manager, the technical work group, and the technical contractor.

It will be important for these two advisory committees understand and respect the essential role each must play in this process.

**Illustration 2 Trans-Texas Water Program - West Central Region
Citizens Advisory Committee for Public Participation:
Proposed Mission Statement**

The mission of the Citizens Advisory Committee for Public Participation is to provide ongoing, educated public input into the technical evaluation of water resource alternatives and scenarios by providing a diverse set of community perspectives and inputs. Based upon the committee's work in providing public feedback on various water resource issues, the committee is expected to offer input to the Policy Management Committee through the Advisory Committee for Technical Input regarding the most viable and the most publicly desirable set of options for the future of the entire study region.

Task 4.8

Advisory Committee Meetings - Throughout this process there will be meetings of the Citizens Advisory Committee for Public Participation. It will also be necessary to have public participation representation at the technical advisory committee meetings. This task includes the planning, arranging, conducting, documentation, and follow-up of the Citizens Advisory Committee for Public Participation meetings based upon the committee's tasks to be performed (tasks 4-10 through 4-17). Public participation team members will also attend the technical advisory committee meetings.

Task 4.9

Informational Materials Development and Production - Since communication will be such a large part of this process, informational materials are critical. This task includes the development of the following:

Brochures: Working with the sponsoring agencies, English and Spanish information brochures on the Trans-Texas Water Program - West Central Region will be developed, designed, and produced. These brochures will be available for general information purposes and will explain the program as well as public involvement opportunities. It will be made available to citizens, sponsoring agencies, civic and fraternal organizations, businesses, and elected officials for constituent distribution when requested. The brochure will be a tri-fold piece capable of accommodating a regional or issues specific insert as needed. The anticipated first run is 20,000 brochures.

Newsletter: Working with the sponsoring agencies, a Trans-Texas Water Program - West Central Region newsletter will be produced quarterly over the anticipated eighteen month project. This information piece is intended to inform the public and others of the progress of the study, the issues at stake, and the opportunities for public involvement. Additionally it is an opportunity to speak to current circumstances and events as needed. The content is intended to include messages from key local elected officials as well as a Spanish language section. The newsletter will be a fold-over piece capable of accommodating a regional or issues specific insert as needed. The anticipated run per issue is 10,000 pieces.

Envelope Stuffers: Three English/Spanish envelope stuffer pieces will be designed for use at key juncture points throughout the study process. These informational pieces will be designed to address current events or circumstances and can be utilized by those sponsoring agencies who have regular envelope mail outs such as monthly bills.

Informational Video: An informational video tape will be produced which explains the need for water planning, the purpose, goals, and methodology of the Trans-Texas Water Program, the role of public involvement, general water planning alternatives, and the decision making process. Two videos will be produced: a ten minute and a twenty minute version. Additionally, there will be both an English and Spanish language version. The exact content and format of the video will be determined by a joint effort between the Policy Management Committee's Public Information Committee and the contractor team. The video tape will be distributed to schools, public libraries, civic groups, elected officials, public television, agencies, special interest groups, etc.

World Wide Web Page: A home page domain will be established on the World Wide Web under the name of the Trans-Texas Water Program - West Central Region. The home page will contain an explanation of the project, the

importance of water planning, the specific goals of Trans-Texas, specific information on the study sponsors, frequently asked questions, current information on water alternatives, E-mail reception, current events, project status, and opportunities for public involvement. This web site, which will be updated monthly, will be noted in all materials published about the program.

The development of all materials will be based upon the input received from the public over the past year in addition to input on drafts received in the first months of this Task 4.

Task 4.10

Materials Distribution - This task includes the distribution of the brochure and the newsletter in a mass mailing to agencies, elected officials, and individuals on the existing data base. In addition to an initial mass mailing, individual requests received by the study team will also be responded to. Additionally this includes the distribution of the video tape to targeted individuals and groups throughout the project period.

Task 4.11

Develop Public Information and Involvement Opportunities Through Outreach Efforts - Throughout the course of this implementation process the study team will continually develop opportunities, with and through the advisory committees, to distribute information materials and to seek new ways to enhance public involvement and outreach efforts. This includes taking advantage of opportunities to involve and inform the public. This task also includes the need to respond to circumstances which are not currently identifiable in terms of issues management or crises control.

Task 4.12

Refine and Expand the Public's Evaluation and Decision Criteria - Working with the Citizens Advisory Committee for Public Participation, the technical contractor, and the Advisory Committee for Technical Input, the study team will continue to collect public input on the preliminary decision analysis criteria identified earlier in this process. At this stage it will be necessary to refine that criteria with greater specificity, constantly comparing it as it develops to the stated planning policy objectives.

Task 4.13

Advisory Committee's Interim IRP Report - The Citizens Advisory Committee for Public Participation will draft a preliminary report to be submitted to the PMC. This will include a record of the committee's mission statement, a record of the operative groundrules adopted, composition of membership, minutes of meetings held, evaluative criteria considered or adopted, and recommendations made, if any, to the Advisory Committee for Technical Input.

Task 4.14

Coordinate With Technical Contractor to Evaluate Resource Options - Public participation input must be reflected throughout the technical contractor's resource

evaluation process. The study team will be responsible for representing the public's interest in this evaluation, and will ensure that it is an integral part of the technical process. The results of these efforts with the technical component will be reported to, and considered by, the advisory committees.

Task 4.15

Assist in Characterizing Resource Options - Part of the process of option evaluation is the analysis of each such option utilizing the criteria and planning objectives which are reflective of the public's input. The public participation contractor will assist the technical contractor in this option analysis and in determining how well various options, and/or combinations of options, meet policy planning objectives and public criteria. Consultations on this issue will also be conducted with the technical work group as well as both advisory committees. Once done, resource options are then characterized and explained in terms understandable by the public.

Task 4.16

Identify and Define Future Uncertainties and Potential Outcomes - In keeping with the tenets of an IRP approach, the contractor will give explicit treatment to uncertainties and potential outcomes. It is a basic premise that the public interprets uncertainties as risks, which can rapidly transform themselves into moral, emotional, and justice issues. This phenomenon is often hastened by those who seek to create and promote controversy. Therefore these are risks which must be managed. This process is designed to carefully identify these uncertainties and potential outcomes and to make them explicit. The goal of the methodology is to produce an appropriate level of public concern and, hopefully, action. These uncertainties and their potential outcomes must be reflected throughout the process and must be taken into careful consideration when making recommendations to the decision makers.

Task 4.17

Selection of Water Resource Scenarios - The ultimate goal of Trans-Texas is to review a variety of water resource alternatives or strategies for the purpose of selecting a "menu" of options for the entire region which are both technically feasible as well as publicly acceptable, *and which best meets the stated policy objectives*. This will be accomplished only through a partnership effort between the public, the technical evaluation component, and the decision makers. The Citizens Advisory Committee for Public Participation will work through a process of criteria refinement and assessment, information dissemination, public involvement, as participants in the decision making process.

Task 4.18

Advisory Committee's Final IRP Report - At the conclusion of the public participation process a final report will be submitted by the Citizens Advisory Committee for Public Participation to the PMC. This report will detail the various steps undertaken by the committee, public participation initiatives employed and their results, minutes of meetings held, and final comments and conclusions for water resource planning

scenarios for the region. The committee's report shall then serve to shape the final decisions to be made by the decision makers.

PART IV TIME LINE

The time line for the proposed public participation plan is shown in Illustration 4.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION/STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT PLAN

Illustration 4 - TASK 4 ESTIMATED TIME LINE

TASK NO.	TASK	MONTH NO:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
4.1	IRP Workshop		x			x														
4.2	Elected Officials Briefings/Updates		x	x	x						x	x	x				x	x	x	
4.3	Implement Media Plan		x	x	x	x	x		x		x		x		x		x		x	x
4.4	Phase 2 Technical Scope of Work		x	x	x												x			
4.5	IRP Organizational requirements		x	x	x															
4.6	Define Planning Policy Objectives		x	x	x															
4.7	Re-Structure of Advisory Committees		x	x	x	x														
4.8	Advisory Committee Meetings			x	x	x		x		x		x		x		x		x	x	x
4.9	Materials Development and Production		x	x	x															
4.10	Materials Distribution		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
4.11	Develop Public Information and Involvement Opportunities		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
4.12	Refine and Expand Evaluation Criteria					x	x	x						x	x	x				
4.13	Interim IRP Report								x	x										
4.14	Evaluate Resource Options					x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
4.15	Characterizing Resource Options													x	x	x	x	x		
4.16	ID and Define Uncertainties/Outcomes					x		x		x		x		x		x		x		x
4.17	Select Water Resource Scenarios															x	x	x	x	x
4.18	Final IRP Report																	x	x	x

wfile:TTW:ppplan3