Attachment 5
Engagement Record

CENTRAL VALLEY
FLOOD MANAGEMENT
PLANNING PROGRAM

FloodSAFE
CALIFORNIA

Public Draft

2012 Central Valley Flood Protection Plan

Attachment 5: Engagement Record

December 2011

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
THE NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY
DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

This page left blank intentionally.

Table of Contents

1.0 Introduction 1-1
- 1.1 Legislative Direction 1-1
- 1.2 Commitment to Engagement 1-2
- 1.3 Report Organization 1-2

2.0 Communications and Engagement Approaches 2-1
- 2.1 Research and Needs 2-1
  - 2.1.1 Stakeholder Research Interviews 2-2
  - 2.1.2 Communications and Engagement Framework 2-6
- 2.2 Types of Engagement 2-10
  - 2.2.1 Forums 2-10
  - 2.2.2 Work Groups 2-10
  - 2.2.3 Workshops 2-10
  - 2.2.4 Briefings 2-10
- 2.3 Public Information 2-11
  - 2.3.1 Visual Identity 2-11
  - 2.3.2 Web Site 2-11
  - 2.3.3 E-Mail Subscriber List 2-11
  - 2.3.4 Videos and Multimedia 2-11
  - 2.3.5 Publications 2-11
  - 2.3.6 Media Relations 2-12
  - 2.3.7 Advertising 2-12
- 2.4 Continuous Improvement 2-12
  - 2.4.1 External Assessments 2-12
  - 2.4.2 Presentation and Media Training 2-13

3.0 Summary of Engagement Activities 3-1
- 3.1 Record of Engagement Activities 3-1
- 3.2 Stakeholder Representation 3-7

4.0 Plan Development Support 4-1
- 4.1 Phased Process 4-1
- 4.2 Regional Conditions (Phase 1) 4-1
  - 4.2.1 Regional and Valleywide Forums 4-1

4.2.2 Work Groups 4-2
4.2.3 Workshops 4-2
4.2.4 Briefings and Coordination 4-2
4.2.5 Legislative Outreach 4-3
4.2.6 California Native American and Environmental Justice Outreach 4-3
4.2.7 Phase 1 Public Information 4-4
4.3 Phase 1 External Assessment 4-6
4.4 Management Actions (Phase 2) 4-7
4.4.1 Regional and Valleywide Forums 4-7
4.4.2 Work Groups 4-7
4.4.3 Workshops 4-8
4.4.4 Briefings and Coordination 4-9
4.4.5 Legislative Outreach 4-9
4.4.6 California Native American and Environmental Justice Outreach 4-9
4.4.7 Phase 2 Public Information 4-10
4.5 Phase 2 External Assessment 4-11
4.6 Systemwide Investment Formulation (Phase 3/4) 4-12
4.6.1 Regional and Valleywide Forums 4-12
4.6.2 Work Groups 4-12
4.6.3 Workshops 4-12
4.6.4 Briefings and Coordination 4-13
4.6.5 Legislative Outreach 4-13
4.6.6 Native American and Environmental Justice Outreach 4-13
4.6.7 Phase 3/4 Public Information 4-13
4.7 CVFPP Phase 3/4 Assessment and Stakeholder Assessment Executive Summary 4-15
4.8 CVFPP Adoption Process 4-15

5.0 Plan Companion Efforts 5-1
5.1 State Plan of Flood Control Descriptive Document 5-1
5.2 Flood Control System Status Report 5-1

6.0 Other Related FloodSAFE Efforts 6-1

6.1 Building Standards Code Amendments 6-1
6.2 Local Land Use Planning Handbook 6-3
6.3 Flood Risk Notification 6-4
6.4 Flood Protection Criteria 6-4
6.4.1 Urban Level of Flood Protection Work Group 6-5
6.4.2 Interim Levee Design Criteria 6-6
6.4.3 Urban Levee Design Criteria 6-6
6.4.4 Special ULDC Session on Levee Vegetation 6-7
6.5 Urban and Nonurban Levee Evaluations 6-7
6.6 Vegetation on Levees 6-8
6.6.1 Roundtable 6-9
6.7 Delta Programs 6-9

7.0 Coordination Activities 7-1
7.1 External Partners 7-1
7.1.1 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 7-1
7.1.2 Central Valley Flood Protection Board 7-2
7.1.3 Maintenance Agencies 7-2
7.1.4 State and Federal Legislature 7-2
7.1.5 Local Jurisdictions 7-3
7.1.6 Native American Tribes 7-4
7.2 Internal Partners 7-6
7.2.1 Intradepartmental 7-6

8.0 References 8-1

9.0 Acronyms and Abbreviations 9-1

List of Tables

Table 2-1. Organizations and Interests Interviewed for Communications and Engagement Framework Development 2-3

Table 3-1. Record of Engagement Activities 3-1

Table 3-2. Use of Other Communications Tools 3-3

Table 4-1. Phase 1 In-Person and Phone Briefings 4-3

Table 4-2. Phase 1 Briefings for California Native American Tribes and Tribal Organizations 4-3

Table 4-3. Phase 2 In-Person and Phone Briefings and Coordination 4-9

Table 4-4. Phase 2 Briefings for California Native American Tribes and Tribal Organizations 4-10

Table 7-1. CVFMP and CVFPP Briefings for California Native American Tribes and Tribal Organizations 7-5

List of Figures

Figure 2-1. Planning Process for 2012 Central Valley Flood Protection Plan Development 2-7

Figure 2-2. International Association for Public Participation's "Spectrum of Public Participation" 2-8

Figure 4-1. Five Central Valley Flood Protection Plan Engagement Regions 4-2

List of Appendices

Appendix A – Central Valley Flood Management Planning Program Questions for Interviews with Partners and Interested Parties

Appendix B – Comprehensive List of Stakeholders

This page left blank intentionally.

1.0 Introduction

This document catalogues and describes the approaches and accomplishments of communication and engagement activities to support and complement technical planning processes implemented through the Central Valley Flood Management Planning (CVFMP) Program. The CVFMP Program is an element of the FloodSAFE California (FloodSAFE) initiative. While the document's central focus is on the CVFMP Program's activities to complete the draft 2012 Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP) and its key related documents – the *State Plan of Flood Control Descriptive Document* (DWR, 2010a) and the *Flood Control System Status Report* (DWR, 2011a) – it further describes communication and engagement efforts provided to other related FloodSAFE programs and studies.

This document includes a comprehensive list of all events, meetings, and other activities that supporting gaining the input and participation necessary to produce a plan that reflects the needs and desires of those affected by and responsible for managing flood risk in the Sacramento and San Joaquin valleys of California's Central Valley.

Finally, this document summarizes the engagement record and provides a potential framework for the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) to consider as it updates the CVFPP every 5 years.

1.1 Legislative Direction

As authorized by Senate Bill (SB) 5 of 2007, also known as the Central Valley Flood Protection Act of 2008, DWR has prepared a sustainable, integrated flood management plan called the CVFPP by January 1, 2012, for adoption by the Central Valley Flood Protection Board (Board). The 2012 CVFPP provides a systemwide approach to protecting lands currently protected from flooding by the existing State Plan of Flood Control (SPFC) and will be updated every 5 years.

In addition to the direction given above, SB 5 added sections to the California Water Code that further instructed DWR to engage with federal, local, and other public agencies to produce the 2012 CVFPP and achieve other related flood risk management goals. California Water Code Sections 9615 and 9616 note, in part, the following:

> *For the purposes of preparing the plan, the department shall collaborate with the United States Army Corps of Engineers and the owners and operators of flood management facilities… The plan shall…increase the engagement of local agencies willing to participate in improving flood protection, ensuring a better connection between state flood protection decisions and local land use decisions.*

1.2 Commitment to Engagement

The legislation directing development of the CVFPP includes requirements for DWR to actively engage partner agencies and stakeholders in plan formulation. In response to this direction, DWR committed to a broad and comprehensive engagement process that exceeded statute requirements. This additional effort was made because once adopted, the CVFPP will affect not only agencies charged with operating and maintaining SPFC facilities, but also agencies with decision-making authorities over land use, public safety, the environment, and economic development. DWR has previously found that enhanced engagement efforts ultimately result in a wider acceptance of plans and activities. To that end, DWR sought the involvement of Central Valley communities, interest-based groups, tribes and California Native American organizations, and other parties from the beginning of the planning process through final document preparation.

Engaging both technical experts and interested members of the public also contributed to a FloodSAFE goal of helping residents and businesses in the Central Valley to understand the flood risks they may face.

1.3 Report Organization

The organization of this document is as follows:

- Section 1 introduces and describes the purpose of this document and DWR's commitment to engagement.
- Section 2 describes DWR's overall approaches for engaging partners, stakeholders, and the public to produce the 2012 CVFPP and other technical supporting documents. The section also contains a comprehensive list of all outreach and engagement activities and communication tools.
- Section 3 provides a comprehensive list of all outreach and engagement activities and communication tools.

- Section 4 describes the approach, activities and measurements implemented for the four planning phases.
- Section 5 describes the engagement process implemented in support of development of the *State Plan of Flood Control Descriptive Document* (DWR, 2010a) and the *Flood Control System Status Report* (DWR, 2011a).
- Section 6 describes other outreach, engagement and coordination activities that occurred as part of FloodSAFE but also supported development of the 2012 CVFPP.
- Section 7 identifies the many coordination activities implemented with external partners such as USACE, CVFPB, maintaining agencies, local jurisdictions, Native American Tribes and Tribal Organizations, as well as the internal coordination activities through Functional Area Cross Coordination Teams.
- Section 8 lists abbreviations and acronyms used in this document.

This page left blank intentionally.

2.0 Communications and Engagement Approaches

Development of the CVFPP, which the California Legislature directed DWR to undertake, represents one of the largest and most complex planning efforts ever led by DWR on behalf of the residents, environment, visitors, and businesses in the State of California (State). Drawing from experiences in prior planning efforts, and the legislative direction, DWR placed major emphasis on developing communication and engagement approaches that would foster and sustain an open, transparent, and inclusive planning environment. Rather than independently defining the components of communication and engagement approaches, DWR conducted extensive research and evaluation of similar planning efforts and consulted with a wide array of experts and flood management stakeholders responsible for improving flood protection and ecosystem preservation, and implementing risk-informed land use decisions.

2.1 Research and Needs

Led by DWR's Central Valley Flood Planning Office (CVFPO), the research sought to meet multiple functions and needs. As mentioned above, research focused on review of similar planning efforts and consultation with numerous stakeholders.

The principal purpose of the research was to identify, measure, and consider the range of communication preferences among stakeholders and related audiences. Preferences were then aligned with researched communication and engagement best practices. Secondary research objectives were to measure stakeholder awareness of flood management issues; identify key flood management topics of interest among stakeholders; and identify additional stakeholders for participation.

As part of this research, DWR evaluated the communication and engagement approaches deployed for the *California Water Plan* (DWR, 2009a), CALFED Bay-Delta Program, Water Forum, *Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins Comprehensive Study* (USACE, 2002), the San Joaquin River Restoration Program, and other efforts. This review promulgated a list of potential outreach strategies and tactics to be considered for inclusion in a communications and engagement plan. These potential strategies and tactics were elicited as part of in-depth stakeholder research interviews performed by DWR.

2.1.1 Stakeholder Research Interviews

As noted previously, DWR determined that effective outreach would require more substantial stakeholder engagement than minimally required by law. To that end, more than 100 experts and other flood management stakeholders were interviewed over a 30-day period beginning in mid-January 2009. These individuals represented a wide array of organizations and interests directly applicable to the CVFPP and its companion products. Organizations represented during these interviews[1] are listed in Table 2-1. Referral requests for other stakeholders during these interviews expanded the stakeholder audience significantly for the interview process and for subsequent engagement activities.

These interviews provided foundational guidance for identifying, developing, and implementing potential communications and engagement strategies. The survey also brought forth stakeholder issues related to Central Valley flood management. This early stakeholder input assisted the technical team in framing the approach to be used for presenting technical processes in subsequent meetings and briefings.

A team of communications specialists and facilitators conducted 45- to 60-minute phone interviews using a prepared script and predefined questions. All interviewers attended a training session in advance to promote consistency.

Interviews were conducted in a conversational style rather than in a formal poll or market survey. The approach encouraged elaboration by stakeholders. Interviewees were also advised interviews would be reported in the aggregate to allow individual comments to remain confidential unless participants provided permission otherwise. See Attachment 1 for a copy of the interview questionnaire and interviewer script.

The interviews solicited stakeholder responses in four general areas:

- Identify stakeholder participation in prior studies and collaborative efforts and elicit recommended best practices for communication and engagement strategies.

- Elicit input on potential components of communications and engagement approaches for the 2012 CVFPP specifically and identify communications preferences of potential stakeholders.

[1] In certain instances, more than one representative was interviewed in a given organization or interest-based group.

- Measure flood management system awareness and understanding among stakeholders, and identify any initial disconnects between DWR and stakeholders.
- Understand key areas of interest and expected level of participation among stakeholders and solicit their nomination of additional participants.

Table 2-1. Organizations and Interests Interviewed for Communications and Engagement Framework Development

American Rivers	City of Folsom	Landowners, farmers, and other citizens in the Central Valley and Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta
American River Flood Control District	City of Rio Vista	Levee District 1, San Luis Canal
American River Watershed Institute	City of Sacramento	Low Flow Alliance
Building Industry Association	City of Stockton	Lower San Joaquin Levee District
CALFED Bay-Delta Program	City of West Sacramento	Lower Yolo Planning Forum
California Central Valley Flood Control Association	City of Yuba	MBK Engineers
California Chamber of Commerce	Colusa County	Natomas Basin Conservancy
California Department of Boating and Waterways	Delta Protection Commission	Natural Heritage Institute
California Department of Conservation	Ducks Unlimited	Natural Resources Defense Council
California Department of Food and Agriculture	East Bay Municipal Utility District	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries
California Department of Parks and Recreation	El Dorado County and Georgetown Divide Regional Conservation District	Northern California Water Association
California Department of Transportation	Elliott Homes	Pacific Gas and Electric Company
California Emergency Management Agency	Environmental Justice Coalition for Water	Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
California Farm Bureau Federation	Family Water Alliance	Planning and Conservation League
California Manufacturers and Technology Association	Federal Emergency Management Agency	Reclamation District 1001
California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley	Floodplain Management Association	Recreational Boaters of California
California Sport Fishing Protection Alliance	Friant Water Users	River Islands

Table 2-1. Organizations and Interests Interviewed for Communications and Engagement Framework Development (contd.)

California State Association of Counties	Solano County	U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation
California State Water Resources Control Board	Friends of the River	Sacramento Area Council of Governments
California Truckers Association	Glenn County Planning and Public Works	Sacramento Area Flood Control Association
CalTrout	Glenn County Farm Bureau	Sacramento City Council
Central Valley Flood Protection Board	Glenn/Colusa Water District	Sacramento County Board of Supervisors
Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board	Great Valley Center	Sacramento County Water Resources
CH2M Hill	Hospital Council of Northern and Central California	Sacramento Metro Chamber of Commerce
Citizen Feather	Kjeldsen, Sinnock, and Neudeck	Sacramento River Conservation Area Forum
Sacramento Valley Landowners Association	Knights Landing Ridge Drainage District	Sacramento River Preservation Trust
San Joaquin County	Stockton East Water District	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Sacramento National Wildlife Refuge Center
San Joaquin County Public Works	Sutter County	U.S. Geological Survey
San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors Water Authority	Sutter County Public Works	Office of U.S. Rep. Doris Matsui
San Joaquin River Parkway and Trust	Tehama Colusa Canal Authority	Yolo Basin Foundation
San Joaquin River Resource Management Coalition	The Nature Conservancy	Yolo County
San Luis Delta	Turlock Irrigation District	Yolo County Farm Bureau
Save the American River Association	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
City of Sacramento Public Works		

Key Findings Regarding Communications and Engagement

The industry expert research interviews yielded the findings summarized below:

- Respondents overwhelmingly supported using a combination of valleywide, regional, and topical engagement opportunities, but gave their strongest support to the regional scale for substantive participation.
- Most respondents supported a structure that would include venues of broad geographic scope, regional work groups that would allow more

detailed discussions and direct collaboration with DWR, and technical work groups that would be devoted to specific topics.

- Many respondents requested opportunities for substantive involvement and responsibilities, and also requested some resource support.

- Most respondents recommended that DWR staff, or their representatives vested with authority for decision making and continuity of the process, be present in work group meetings, which should be professionally facilitated to maintain momentum and support openness and accountability.

- Respondents stated that they would like evidence throughout of an open process with no predetermined or preconceived outcomes, and would also like evidence that DWR heard and considered their input.

- Respondents felt that many stakeholders were already engaged in a variety of public planning efforts; thus, it would be important that the engagement process be efficient.

- Many respondents indicated a willingness to share information about the process through their organizations' communications venues.

- Many respondents were confused about the implications of the State's budget problems for development of the CVFPP.

- At least one major group of respondents recommended convening a valleywide, broad-based task force or committee to consider all recommendations from a big-picture perspective, and to provide input to DWR accordingly.

Research Implications for Communications and Engagement

Research implications for determining elements of the approaches to communications and engagement strategies and tactics were as follows:

- The process should include a variety of options for public engagement, such as a venue for broad information sharing; regional work groups offering venues for direct collaboration about regional issues; and technical work groups devoted to specific topics.

- Content development should be collaborative, and there should be two-way interaction between the communications and engagement process and technical and planning work.

- Work groups should each be charged with specific activities within defined time frames, and it should be made clear how feedback obtained in these discussions would be used in planning.
- DWR staff or their designated representatives should be present at topic and regional work groups.
- Professional facilitators should provide continuity, consistency, and structure to public engagement venues.
- The engagement process should have built-in review and feedback mechanisms at regular intervals throughout so that DWR could show clear evidence of listening to input and provide responses.
- The process should proceed along a publicly available timeline, and decision-making processes should be explained to partners and interested parties in advance.
- The communication and engagement approaches should identify existing venues that could play a role in CVFPP development, to maximize the time and energy invested by partners and interested parties.

2.1.2 Communications and Engagement Framework

The results of these interviews were significant contributors in development of the *Communications and Engagement Framework* (Framework) (DWR, 2009b) by DWR. The Framework provides guidance for DWR when working with stakeholders and other interested parties with vested interests in development of a sustainable and integrated flood management plan for areas currently protected by facilities of the SPFC.

DWR adopted the communications and engagement approaches under a "framework" rather than a "plan," recognizing that stakeholders sought to share, receive, and co-create content. This emergent approach resulted in an open, transparent and inclusive planning environment that built on the feedback collected during stakeholder interviews.

This adaptive communications approach was paired with four generalized planning "phases" (see Figure 2-1). Each phase was anticipated to have content developed through iterative planning. In each phase, plan developers informed, consulted, and/or collaborated with diverse interest groups and stakeholders in various engagement settings. The flexible engagement framework supported, rather than directed, plan development and stakeholder participation.

Figure 2-1. Planning Process for 2012 Central Valley Flood Protection Plan Development

A major structural foundation of the Framework is DWR's application of the International Association of Public Participation (IAP2) *Spectrum of Public Participation* (see Figure 2-2) (IAP2, 2007). The IAP2 identifies five basic approaches to public engagement:

1. **Inform** – Agencies distribute information to the public about ongoing activities on a regular basis.

2. **Consult** – Agencies ask the public for input into decisions.

3. **Involve** – Agencies commit to actively consider public input in decisions and, in some instances, present responses to public input in writing.

4. **Collaborate** – Agencies allow the public to participate in decisions as partners, but the agencies retain final decision-making authority.

5. **Empower** – Agencies agree to implement decisions made by the public.

IAP2 Spectrum of Public Participation

International Association for Public Participation

Increasing Level of Public Impact

	Inform	Consult	Involve	Collaborate	Empower
Public participation goal	To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problem, alternatives, opportunities and/or solutions.	To obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or decisions.	To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered.	To partner with the public in each aspect of the decision including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution.	To place final decision-making in the hands of the public.
Promise to the public	We will keep you informed.	We will keep you informed, listen to and acknowledge concerns and aspirations, and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.	We will work with you to ensure that your concerns and aspirations are directly reflected in the alternatives developed and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.	We will look to you for advice and innovation in formulating solutions and incorporate your advice and recommendations into the decisions to the maximum extent possible.	We will implement what you decide.
Example techniques	▪ Fact sheets ▪ Web sites ▪ Open houses	▪ Public comment ▪ Focus groups ▪ Surveys ▪ Public meetings	▪ Workshops ▪ Deliberative polling	▪ Citizen advisory committees ▪ Consensus-building ▪ Participatory decision-making	▪ Citizen juries ▪ Ballots ▪ Delegated decision

© 2007 International Association for Public Participation

Figure 2-2. International Association for Public Participation's "Spectrum of Public Participation"

The CVFPP team blended IAP2 outreach approaches to inform, consult, involve, and collaborate to achieve overall plan development goals and respond to the stakeholders' level of interest. DWR believed that ultimately the level of partnership and collaboration required to implement

the CVFPP was unlikely to occur unless stakeholders played a substantive role in creating the CVFPP.

Outreach methods furthered DWR and the stakeholders' understanding of localized conditions, challenges, and objectives essential to identifying improvements in integrated flood management. The outreach effort also explored the implications flood management actions requiring partnerships and cost-sharing among State, federal and local agencies.

The IAP2 also describes an "empower" approach. However, because of DWR's legal obligation to develop the CVFPP and the Board's legal obligation to adopt the CVFPP, the "empower" quadrant was not suitable for this process.

The application of the IAP2 approaches contributed to developing a variety of engagement venues for CVFPP technical planning processes. Engagement venues were selected based on the ability each offered to achieve the following accomplishments:

- Motivating ongoing participation by local partners and other interested parties.
- Developing common understanding among partners and interested parties about flood risk in the Central Valley.
- Developing common understanding among target audiences about CVFPP goals, guiding principles, and legislative mandates.
- Creating ongoing dialogue between and among agencies, partners, and other interested parties.
- Effectively linking technical planning to public engagement.
- Helping meet the letter and spirit of regulatory and legislative requirements, including consideration of disadvantaged community issues, environmental justice, and engagement with California Native American Tribes.
- Helping foster support for the CVFPP.

2.2 Types of Engagement

2.2.1 Forums

Conference-style forums were major outreach events designed to convene a variety of perspectives at significant milestones in the CVFPP development process. Each event focused on sharing information and promoting interaction with the broader public. DWR implemented two types of public forums during the planning process: (1) a Valleywide Forum when content applied to all locations within the Systemwide Planning Area, and (2) a Regional Forum when content presented was "place-based."

2.2.2 Work Groups

Work groups were convened to engage subject matter experts and community leaders in assisting with developing information and material to inform the CVFPP. The two main types of work groups were Regional and Topic. Regional Work Groups focused on place-based topics, such as assessing water-related and other conditions in the region, while Topic Work Groups focused on category-based topics such as climate change and operations and maintenance. A subset of the work groups was the Joint Subcommittee, which included membership from Regional or Topic work groups, or both. The subcommittees focused on discrete topics that were then shared with their full work groups. Each work group and subcommittee operated from a charter with defined deliverables and a specified time period (typically 2 to 6 months).

2.2.3 Workshops

A number of workshops were conducted to enable the team to receive highly focused, technical feedback on given subjects in a single meeting. These sessions convened multiple subject matter and interest-based groups, as well as the interested public. Workshop topics ranged from review of major planning milestones, to specific issues such as small community protection, floodplain management, and permitting.

2.2.4 Briefings

Periodic, standardized briefings for elected officials and local jurisdictions were conducted to for consistency and coordination of information among key stakeholders. In addition, coordination with specific interest-based groups allowed for focused discussions of content.

2.3 Public Information

2.3.1 Visual Identity

To visually orient stakeholders to a task or activity for the CVFPP, DWR developed a visual identity, or "brand," for the CVFMP Program, which was responsible for developing the CVFPP. This visual cue included a program logo, color palette, report template, PowerPoint template, signage, posters, and other event materials. This visual identity was created to complement and support the FloodSAFE visual identity.

2.3.2 Web Site

A program Web site provided stakeholders access to a variety of static and interactive tools, each designed to provide information and engage visitors in the planning process.

2.3.3 E-Mail Subscriber List

An e-mail subscriber list was created to allow interested parties to choose to receive CVFMP notifications and related information.

2.3.4 Videos and Multimedia

Videos and multimedia activities supported stakeholder recruitment during the planning phase, raised stakeholder and public awareness of flood management issues and opportunities, and functioned as a reference for completed engagement activities. DWR's activities included the following:

- **Videos** were used as outreach tools to help local partners and the public understand the context for development of the CVFPP, including the history of flood management in the Central Valley and the new State requirements enacted in the 2007 flood legislation.

- **Webcasts and webinars** of forums and briefings provided accessibility to a larger number of stakeholders by allowing remote attendance. Copies of the sessions also permitted viewing at a later date.

2.3.5 Publications

Publications supported development of the CVFPP, raised awareness of ongoing efforts and key deliverables, and encouraged stakeholder and public interaction in work groups and workshops. CVFPP publications included the following:

- **Newsletters** periodically provided updates on progress and highlighted opportunities for engagement.

- **Fact sheets** focused on a specific topic or issue to inform readers and raise awareness.
- **Informational flyers** promoted meetings or events in a simple format.
- **Public Notices** are one- to-two page documents used to comply with statutory noticing requirements for a government action.
- **Reader's Guides** assisted stakeholders in reviewing documents and processes.
- **Posters** provided information in a large format at engagement venues.
- **Reports** documented either (1) accomplishments of a planning phase, technical work, and/or next steps, or (2) stakeholder opinions and perceptions of participation in a prior planning phase.

2.3.6 Media Relations

Broadcast, print, and online media served as partners in development of the CVFPP by raising public awareness of flood management goals and objectives. Targeted press releases and other interactions with the media resulted in third party reporting of CVFMP Program accomplishments, and explanations of where and how DWR is investing funding from public-approved bonds. Media relations included a combination of proactive and response activities. Proactive activities included direct contact with the media following a news release, coordinated briefings for reporters, and development of specialized media materials. DWR also responded to inquiries generated by the media.

2.3.7 Advertising

Advertising supported CVFPP planning activities by reinforcing public awareness of flood management issues and the visual identities of FloodSAFE and the CVFMP Program.

2.4 Continuous Improvement

In support of the iterative planning processes for the 2012 CVFPP, DWR conducted continuous improvement activities aimed at evaluating and improving outreach and engagement.

2.4.1 External Assessments

As part of adapting the CVFPP communications and engagement process for future phases of work, process assessments were conducted at the end

of the first two phases of engagement. The goals of these evaluations were to summarize efforts to date, assess outcomes, extract key lessons learned, and provide recommended modifications.

Participant feedback was gathered through meeting discussions, interviews, and surveys. Participants offered constructive suggestions for improvement that were used in designing future public communications and engagement efforts during CVFPP development.

2.4.2 Presentation and Media Training

Two categories of communications training were identified to support technical development processes: presentation and media.

Presentation training sessions enhanced staff skills in displaying and discussing technical information with the public and stakeholders. Such training encouraged positive interaction and improved collaboration during work group and workshop sessions.

Media training fostered effective staff communications that would meet reporters' editorial interests and deadlines, and provided DWR a vehicle for increasing public awareness and understanding of flood management planning.

This page left blank intentionally.

3.0 Summary of Engagement Activities

This section describes communications and engagement accomplishments used to help develop the 2012 CVFPP and related documents, as guided by the Framework.

3.1 Record of Engagement Activities

Engagement activities to date are summarized in Table 3-1, and other communication tools used are summarized in Table 3-2.

Table 3-1. Record of Engagement Activities

Activity or Event Types	No. of Events	Phases			CVFPP Companion Effort	FloodSAFE Related Effort	Dates
		1	2	3/4			
Research							
Organization/Interest Interviews	113	Pre-Phases					January 2009 – February 2009
Forums							
Regional Forums	5	X					June 2009
Valleywide Forums	2	X	X				June 2010, December 2010
Work Groups							
Regional Conditions Work Groups							
Upper Sacramento	8	X					August 2009 – April 2010
Lower Sacramento	8	X					August 2009 – May 2010
Upper San Joaquin	8	X					August 2009 – April 2010
Lower San Joaquin	8	X					August 2009 – April 2010
Delta	8	X					August 2009 – May 2010
Regional Management Actions Work Groups							
Upper Sacramento	3		X				July 2010 – November 2010
Lower Sacramento	3		X				June 2010 – November 2010
Upper San Joaquin	3		X				June 2010 – November 2010
Lower San Joaquin	3		X				June 2010 – November 2010
Delta	3		X				June 2010 – November 2010

Table 3-1. Record of Engagement Activities (contd.)

Activity or Event Types	No. of Events	Phases			CVFPP Companion Effort	FloodSAFE Related Effort	Dates
		1	2	3/4			
Topic Work Groups							
Levee Performance Scope Definition	4	X					August 2009 – October 2009
Operations and Maintenance Scope Definition	4	X					August 2009 – October 2009
Climate Change Scope Definition	4	X					August 2009 – October 2009
Environmental Stewardship Scope Definition	4	X					August 2009 – October 2009
Climate Change Threshold Analysis	2		X				August 2010 – August 2010
Interim Levee Design Criteria	9	X	X		X	X	December 2009 – September 2010
Urban Levee Design Criteria	5			X	X	X	March 2011 – July 2011
Urban Level of Flood Protection Criteria	4			X	X	X	May 2011 – October/November 2011
Subcommittees							
Agricultural Stewardship Scope Definition Joint Subcommittee	4	X					October 2009 – April 2010
Regional Management Actions Objectives	7		X				October 2010
Workshops							
Management Actions	15		X				July 2010 – September 2010
Technical Analyses	2			X			June 2011
Interim Levee Design Criteria	1			X	X	X	January 2011
Urban Levee Design Criteria	1			X	X	X	September 2011
Urban Level of Flood Protection Criteria	1			X	X	X	September 2011
2012 Central Valley Flood Protection Plan – Working Draft for Work Group Member Review	1			X	X	X	November 2011
Briefings and Coordination							
In-Person and Phone Briefings to Local Governments	31	X	X		X	X	September 2009 – November 2010
Coordination Meetings	7	X	X				May 2010 – September 2010
Media Briefings	5	X	X				June 2010, August 2010
Regional Work Groups	2			X			May 2011
Legislative Outreach							
Briefings	1	X			X	X	January 2010

Table 3-1. Record of Engagement Activities (contd.)

Activity or Event Types	No. of Events	Phases			CVFPP Companion Effort	FloodSAFE Related Effort	Dates
		1	2	3/4			
California Native American Tribe and Environmental Justice Outreach							
Tribe and Tribal organization briefings	17	X	X	X	X	X	October 2009 – February 2011
Environmental Justice outreach	None[2]	X	X				

Key:
CVFPP = Central Valley Flood Protection Plan
FloodSAFE = FloodSAFE California

Table 3-2. Use of Other Communications Tools

Tool Types	Phases			CVFPP Companion Documents	FloodSAFE Related Documents	Publication Dates
	1	2	3/4			
Publications						
Newsletters						
FloodSAFE Focus, Vol. 1, Issue 1	X				X	May 2010
FloodSAFE Focus, Vol. 1, Issue 2		X			X	July 2010
FloodSAFE Focus, Vol. 1, Issue 3		X			X	August 2010
FloodSAFE Focus, Vol. 1, Issue 4		X			X	October 2010
FloodSAFE Focus, Vol. 1, Issue 5		X			X	December 2010
FloodSAFE Focus, Vol. 2, Issue 1			X		X	March 2011
FloodSAFE Focus, Vol. 2, Issue 2			X		X	April 2011
FloodSAFE Focus, Vol. 2, Issue 3			X		X	July 2011
FloodSAFE Focus, Vol. 2, Issue 4			X		X	October 2011
Fact Sheets						
Central Valley Flood Management Planning Program	X					June 16, 2010
CVFMP Program: How to Get Involved	X					June 16, 2010
Central Valley Floodplain Evaluation and Delineation Program	X				X	June 1, 2009
Improving Flood Management in the Central Valley	X					June 17, 2010
Levee Evaluation Program	X				X	June 1, 2009

[2] Environmental justice organizations deferred briefings in favor of participation in workgroups and workshops.

Table 3-2. Use of Other Communication Tools (contd.)

Tool Types	Phases			CVFPP Companion Documents	FloodSAFE Related Efforts	Publication Dates
	1	2	3/4			
Central Valley Integrated Flood Management Study[1]	X			X		June 1, 2009
Invitation to Tribal Governments and Communities to Be Involved in Development of the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan	X					March 8, 2010
Central Valley Flood Protection Plan Progress Report		X				January 2011
Flyers						
June 2009 Regional Forums	X					May 2009
June 2010 Valleywide Forum	X					May 2010
Management Actions Workshops (Round 1)		X				July 2010
Management Actions Workshops (Round 2)		X				August 2010
Guides						
Reader's Guide to the Interim Progress Summary No. 1 and Regional Conditions Report – A Working Document	X					April 2010
Attendee's Guide to Phase 2 Workshops		X				July 2010 (updated August 2010)
Posters						
Understanding the Challenge: Flood-Related Risks in the Central Valley	X					June 2009
Meeting the Challenge: Building on Existing Information and Developing New Data	X					June 2009
Meeting the Challenge: Central Valley Flood Protection Plan	X					June 2009
Meeting the Challenge: Flood Management Implementation Activities	X					June 2009
Reports						
Communications and Engagement Framework	X					June 2009 (Public Draft)
Operations and Maintenance Scope Definition Work Group Summary Report	X					November 2009 (Draft)
Levee Performance Scope Definition Work Group Summary Report	X					November 2009 (Draft)
Climate Change Scope Definition Work Group Summary Report	X					December 2009 (Draft)

Table 3-2. Use of Other Communication Tools (contd.)

Tool Types	Phases			CVFPP Companion Documents	FloodSAFE Related Efforts	Publication Dates
	1	2	3/4			
Environmental Stewardship Scope Definition Work Group Summary Report	X					December 2009 (Draft)
State Plan of Flood Control Descriptive Document	X			X		January 2010 (Draft), November 2010
Regional Conditions Report – A Working Document	X					March 2010
Interim Progress Summary No. 1	X					April 2010
Important Considerations for the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan Related to Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley Agriculture	X					May 2010 (Draft)
Phase 1 External Communication and Engagement Assessment	X					September 2010
Phase 2 Climate Change Threshold Analysis Work Plan		X				September 2010 (Draft)
Notice of Preparation: Program Environmental Impact Report for the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan		X		X		October 2010
Management Actions Report		X				November 2010 (Draft)
Interim Progress Summary No. 2		X				December 2010
Central Valley Flood Protection Plan Progress Report		X				January 2011
Final Public Scoping Report: 2012 Central Valley Flood Protection Plan Program Environmental Impact Report			X	X		February 2011
Central Valley Flood Protection Plan Summary – Working Draft for Work Group Member Review			X			October 2011
Central Valley Flood Protection Plan – Working Draft for Work Group Member Review			X			October 2011
Public Draft Flood Control System Status Report				X		December 2011
Public Draft 2012 Central Valley Flood Protection Plan			X			December 2011

Table 3-2. Use of Other Communication Tools (contd.)

Tool Types	Phases			CVFPP Companion Documents	FloodSAFE Related Efforts	Publication Dates
	1	2	3/4			
Web Site						
Materials Continue to Be Posted to the Program Web Site	X	X	X	X		Continuous
Multimedia						
Videos						
Flood Risk Notification					X	June 2011
Regional Management Actions Workshops Orientation Video		X				July 2010
Overcoming the Deluge: California's Plan for Managing Floods (27-minute version)			X		X	November 2011
Overcoming the Deluge: California's Plan for Managing Floods (12-minute version)					X	November 2011
Webcasts and Webinars						
Webcast – June 2010 Valleywide Forum	X					June 2010
Webcast – December 2010 Valleywide Forum		X				December 2010
Webinars – 11 Round 1 Management Actions Workshops		X				July 2010
Webinars – Regional Work Group Briefings			X			May 2011
Webinars – 2012 CVFPP Summary Working Draft for Work Group Member Review			X			November 2011
Webinar – 2012 CVFPP Working Draft for Work Group Member Review Workshop			X		X	November 2011

Note:
[1] Content developed by DWR in coordination with the Sacramento District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Key:
CVFMP = Central Valley Flood Management Planning Program
CVFPP = Central Valley Flood Protection Plan
FloodSAFE = FloodSAFE California

3.2 Stakeholder Representation

Throughout the communications and engagement process, DWR sought to connect, engage, and interact with a diverse and widely representative group of stakeholders. The communications and engagement activities included agencies at all levels of government, academic experts, local businesses, valley and Delta communities, elected officials, water suppliers, California Native American organizations, nonprofits, agricultural interests and environmental groups within and outside the SPFC. Represented stakeholders provided invaluable input at all levels of the engagement process, and made extensive contributions to development of the 2012 CVFPP. A comprehensive list of stakeholders is documented in Appendix B.

This page left blank intentionally.

4.0 Plan Development Support

As described in Section 2, DWR approached development of the 2012 CVFPP via four general planning phases. Each phase was anticipated to have content developed through iterative planning. This planning environment was supported by strategies and tactics identified in the Framework and follow-on coordination with stakeholders.

This approach provided the flexibility many stakeholders expressed as vital for them to identify, analyze, and address the technical, social, economic, and environmental conflicts that have faced Central Valley flood management planning for decades. This approach further accommodated staffing and management changes at DWR that occurred before and after transition of the State's executive administration in January 2011.

4.1 Phased Process

The four planning phases identified for development of the 2012 CVFPP included Regional Conditions (Phase 1), Management Actions (Phase 2), and Systemwide Investment Formulation (Phases 3 and 4). The function and conduct of these planning phases included continuous and direct input and involvement by staff of the Board and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District (USACE).

4.2 Regional Conditions (Phase 1)

From June 2009 through early June 2010, DWR hosted a variety of engagement activities that included conducting forums and work group sessions, and briefings to legislative staff, interest-based groups and California Native American Tribes. During that time, DWR also released a variety of publications. Following is an overview of stakeholder meetings and outreach activities during Phase 1.

4.2.1 Regional and Valleywide Forums

Five Regional Forums were held in June 2009 to launch Phase 1 and recruit work group members (see Figure 4-1). Locations included Chico, West Sacramento, Walnut Grove, Modesto, and Los Banos.

In June 2010, a Valleywide Forum was held to conclude Phase 1 and launch Phase 2. The location was West Sacramento.

Figure 4-1. Five Central Valley Flood Protection Plan Engagement Regions

4.2.2 Work Groups

Five Regional Conditions Work Groups (RCWG) were chartered to help develop content for the DWR *Regional Conditions Report – A Working Document* (DWR, 2010b). These work groups represented five geographic regions: Upper and Lower Sacramento Valley, Delta, and Upper and Lower San Joaquin Valley. Forty meetings were held.

Four Topic Work Groups were chartered to help define the scope of, and important considerations for, topics relevant to all regions in the areas of climate change, environmental stewardship, levee performance, and operations and maintenance (O&M). Sixteen meetings were held.

An Agricultural Stewardship Scope Definition Joint Subcommittee was convened, with participants from each Phase 1 regional and topic work group, to identify and capture the agricultural community's concerns for integration into the 2012 CVFPP. Four meetings were held.

4.2.3 Workshops

No workshops were held in Phase 1.

4.2.4 Briefings and Coordination

In-person and phone briefings were given to local governmental agencies and their staff. Twenty-three briefings were held (see Table 4-1).

One coordination meeting was held with the California Central Valley Flood Control Association.

In advance of the June 2010 Valleywide Forum, briefings were held with four Central Valley print media outlets:

- Sacramento Bee
- Woodland Daily Democrat
- Capitol Weekly
- Associated Press

Table 4-1. Phase 1 In-Person and Phone Briefings

Colusa County Board of Supervisors	Madera County Water Advisory Commission	Shasta County Public Works Director & Planning Manager
Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors Chair	Madera County Board of Supervisors	Glenn County Board of Supervisors
Solano County Board of Supervisors Chair & Supervisor	Yuba County Board of Supervisors	Yolo County Board of Supervisors Chair
Solano County Board of Supervisors	Merced County Public Works/ Planning Staff	Woodland City Council
Contra Costa Board of Supervisors	Stanislaus County Board of Supervisors	Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency
Fresno County Board of Supervisors Chair	Rio Vista City Council & Staff	Sutter County Board of Supervisors
Fresno County Planning & Public Works Staff	City of Sacramento Staff (2 meetings)	
Madera County Board of Supervisors Chair	Sacramento City Council	

4.2.5 Legislative Outreach

A briefing was given to legislative staff at the State Capitol in January 2010.

4.2.6 California Native American and Environmental Justice Outreach

California Native American Tribes and tribal organizations received FloodSAFE/CVFPP briefings following contact with more than 100 organizations. Eleven briefings were held (see Table 4-2).

A database was developed of nongovernmental organizations with interests in environmental justice. Notices of CVFMP Program events and milestones were e-mailed to these groups with briefing offers.

Table 4-2. Phase 1 Briefings for California Native American Tribes and Tribal Organizations

California Indian Basket Weavers	Cortina Indian Rancheria	Inter-Tribal Council of California, Inc.
Northern Circle Indian Housing Authority	Redding Rancheria	Sacramento Native American Health Center
Hinthil Environmental Resource Consortium	Inter-Tribal Council of California	Bureau of Indian Affairs
North Fork Mono Tribe	California Rural Indian Health Board, Inc.	

4.2.7 Phase 1 Public Information

Publications

Newsletters The CVFPP effort led to development of the *FloodSAFE Focus*, a periodic publication of DWR's Division of Flood Management. This publication is geared to report on the accomplishments of FloodSAFE as they contribute to public safety, environmental stewardship, and economic stability. During Phase 1, one issue of the newsletter was published (DWR, 2010–2011).

Fact Sheets and Flyers Eight fact sheets were developed, including overviews of FloodSAFE, the CVFMP Program and the range of communications and engagement opportunities. DWR also produced a fact sheet designed to encourage California Native American Tribe and tribal organization participation in 2012 CVFPP development. These documents were updated periodically as planning efforts advanced and stakeholders became more acquainted with technical aspects of the CVFPP and related documents. In addition to being used by work groups, fact sheets were distributed at briefings with California Native American Tribes, local land-use agencies, local elected officials, interest-based groups, legislative staff, and policy makers. Electronic copies of these fact sheets were posted on the CVFMP Program Web site and cross-linked to the FloodSAFE program Web site

Informational flyers were developed in support of the Regional and Valleywide forums.

Guides A *Reader's Guide to the Interim Progress Summary No. 1 and Regional Conditions Report – A Working Document* (DWR, 2010c) was developed to serve as a companion document to the DWR *Interim Progress Summary No. 1* (DWR, 2010d) and the *Regional Conditions Report – A Working Document* (DWR, 2010b), and to summarize and describe their structures.

Posters Four large-scale posters were developed for use in the Regional Forums to describe the challenges of the Central Valley flood management system and potential corrective opportunities to be realized through the CVFPP.

Reports Major Phase 1 documents posted to the CVFMP Program Web site included the DWR *Levee Performance Scope Definition Work Group Summary Report* (2009c), the *Operations and Maintenance Scope Definition Work Group Summary Report* (2009d), the *Environmental Stewardship Scope Definition Work Group Summary Report* (DWR, 2009e), the *Climate Change Scope Definition Work Group Summary*

Report (DWR, 2009f), the *State Plan of Flood Control Descriptive Document* (DWR, 2010a), the *CVFPP Regional Conditions Report – A Working Document* (DWR, 2010b), the *Interim Progress Summary No. 1* (DWR, 2010d), and *Important Considerations for the CVFPP Related to Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley Agriculture* (DWR, 2010e).

Web Site and Multimedia

Web Site The CVFMP Program Web site (www.water.ca.gov/cvfmp) was developed to provide access to CVFPP-related information. This site was organized as subordinate to the FloodSAFE Web site (www.water.ca.gov/floodsafe). Links on the CVFMP Program Web site included the following:

- **About the Program** – Describes goals of the CVFMP Program, and links to other related or companion documents to the CVFPP.
- **Calendar** – Draws from DWR's Water Calendar and provides visitors with single-click access to CVFPP-related meetings.
- **Publications** – Contains a repository of program publications.
- **Meetings** – Assists in promoting meetings and distribution of meeting materials, summaries, and charters for visitor reference.
- **Work Group Resources** – Contains background information on various work groups.
- **Partner Registry** – Provides stakeholders with the opportunity to subscribe to the CVFMP Program e-mail lists based on their areas of interest; more than 250 have signed up.
- **Contact** – Includes physical mailing addresses for DWR, as well as an online form that allows a site visitor to contact the CVFMP Program.

Videos No videos were produced in Phase 1.

Webcasts and Webinars The June 2010 Valleywide Forum was broadcast live via Webcast. Stakeholders viewing the event were able to pose questions to panelists and staff. The Webcasts were posted to the Web for follow-on viewing and archived for future viewing.

4.3 Phase 1 External Assessment

To evaluate stakeholder perceptions and opinions regarding the effectiveness of Phase 1 engagement activities, structured meeting discussions, interviews and surveys were conducted to produce the *Phase 1 External Communication and Engagement Assessment* (DWR, 2010f). In addition to evaluating the overall effectiveness of Phase 1 engagement activities, the assessment assisted in guiding the format and function of Phase 2 communications and engagement activities. Of the 192 individuals participating in Phase 1 work groups and subcommittees, 18 responded via an online survey; 24 completed an in-depth interview with a work group facilitator; and nearly all of the approximately 90 RCWG members discussed the topic during a work group meeting. Work group members who never attended a meeting were contacted to learn if they had concerns. The *Phase 1 External Communication and Engagement Assessment* is available on the program Web site and results of the assessment were presented to stakeholders. Research collected through this effort identified the following:

- Most respondents provided favorable comments about DWR's efforts to date but reserved judgment about DWR's commitment to the process until they could view the *Regional Conditions Report – A Working Document* (DWR, 2010b), and they had been briefed on the next phase of work.

- Respondents suggested that DWR more clearly explain why participant-generated information was important, and some respondents expressed concern that some Phase 1 work group efforts might not be incorporated into future work products. Many suggested that a clearer road map (including schedule, work objectives, expected products and their use, and expected level of effort) be provided to the work groups.

- Many RCWG members felt that participation in the process decreased over time because of the extensive number of meetings and because of concerns about the lack of incorporation of feedback into materials to produce the 2012 CVFPP. Many participants also commented that Phase 1 pacing and volume of work were not sustainable, yet they recognized the overall process would be driven by external deadlines.

- Aside from pacing and work volume, most respondents gave positive marks to meeting support and the general process design. Some respondents noted that it was difficult for them to assess the degree to which information generated across all work groups had been integrated into the *Regional Conditions Report – A Working Document* (DWR, 2010b) and other CVFPP materials. Participants also identified

challenges for future CVFPP development, especially in developing management actions. While work group members were aware of outreach to elected officials, key opinion leaders, and others, they suggested that more outreach, more often, would be needed.

Following release of the *Interim Progress Summary No.1* (DWR, 2010d), DWR was contacted by several stakeholder participants with concerns regarding the nature and findings of the document. In general, these stakeholders were dissatisfied because they felt some of the important issues raised during the Phase 1 meetings were not included and they did not agree with the characterization of the "Level of Agreement" section of the document. Several small-group meetings were held with stakeholders in response to these concerns, which were captured and represented in the Phase 1 Assessment and follow-on CVFPP documents. Results of these sessions served as guidance for subsequent plan development activities and coordination with stakeholders during Phase 2.

4.4 Management Actions (Phase 2)

From June 2010 through December 2010, DWR continued hosting forums, work groups, and briefings to interest-based groups and California Native American Tribes. DWR also released of a variety of CVFPP-related publications. During Phase 2, workshops were introduced into the planning process. Following is an overview of stakeholder meetings and outreach activities during Phase 2.

4.4.1 Regional and Valleywide Forums

In December 2010, a Valleywide Forum was held to conclude Phase 2 and launch Phase 3/4. The location was West Sacramento.

No regional forums were held.

4.4.2 Work Groups

Five Regional Management Actions Work Groups (RMAWG) were convened to help frame management action categories and assist with the general approach for incorporating management actions into the CVFPP. These work groups represented the same geographic regions as in Phase 1 RCWGs. Fifteen meetings were held.

Two Climate Change Threshold Approach Work Group meetings were convened as follow-on work to the Phase 1 climate change work. The Phase 2 work surveyed the approaches of ongoing studies to facilitate

development of a consistent climate change analysis process for DWR planning purposes.

A Regional Management Action Objectives subcommittee was convened by each RMAWG to articulate regional objectives related to the primary CVFPP goal of improved flood risk management, then to report back to the main work groups for review and discussion. Seven meetings were held.

4.4.3 Workshops

Fifteen Regional Management Action Workshops were held in Phase 2. The Round 1 workshops reviewed and developed management actions contributing to the 2012 CVFPP goals in 11 categories:

- Policy and Regulations
- Ecosystem Restoration
- Flood Protection System Modification
- Permitting
- Disaster Preparedness and Flood Warning
- Floodfighting, Emergency Response, and Flood Recovery
- Finance and Revenue
- Operations and Maintenance
- Additional Floodplain and Reservoir Storage
- Storage Operations

The Round 2 workshops identified how management actions could be applied in community settings within the CVFPP planning areas, and also identified opportunities to integrate environmental, water supply, and other benefits. The categories of these four workshops were as follows:

- Small Communities Workshop
- Integration Workshop
- Rural/Agricultural Areas Workshop
- Urban Areas Workshop

Total attendance exceeded 450 people. More than 800 written and verbal comments were received.

4.4.4 Briefings and Coordination

Eight in-person and phone briefings were given to local government agencies and their staff (see Table 4-3).

Six coordination meetings were held with organizations whose members spanned large geographic areas (see Table 4-3).

A media availability notice was delivered to Central Valley media in August 2010 to raise awareness of Phase 2 planning activities and remind the media of the State's flood management planning efforts as the anniversary of Hurricane Katrina neared. While follow-up calls were held with print media reporters throughout the Central Valley, no news articles on Phase 2 were published as a result of this outreach.

Table 4-3. Phase 2 In-Person and Phone Briefings and Coordination

In-Person and Phone Briefings		
Madera County Water Advisory Commission	Butte County Planning Department Staff	Sutter Local Agency Formation Commission
Madera County Board of Supervisors	Sacramento County Planning Department Staff	Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency
Contra Costa County Engineering Committee	Water Resources Association of Yolo County	
Coordination Meetings		
San Joaquin Area Flood Control Agency/San Joaquin County	Society of Marketing Professional Services	Lower American River Task Force
San Joaquin County Flood Control Technical Advisory Committee (2 meetings)	Delta Stewardship Council	

4.4.5 Legislative Outreach

No formal legislative staff outreach was performed in Phase 2.

4.4.6 California Native American and Environmental Justice Outreach

California Native American Tribes and one statewide tribal organization received FloodSAFE/CVFPP briefings. Five briefings were held (see Table 4-4).

E-mail notices about CVFPP-related events and milestones were sent to organizations with known interests in environmental justice issues.

Table 4-4. Phase 2 Briefings for California Native American Tribes and Tribal Organizations

Chowchilla Tribe of North Valley Yokuts	Nashville-Eldorado Miwoks Tribe	California Manpower Indian Consortium
Grindstone Rancheria	Wintu Tribe of Northern California	

4.4.7 Phase 2 Public Information

Publications

Newsletters During Phase 2, four issues of the *FloodSAFE Focus* were published (DWR, 2010–2011).

Fact Sheets and Flyers The California Native American Tribe program fact sheet was updated and published.

Public Notice The Notice of Preparation: Program Environmental Impact Report for the CVFPP was published by DWR in October 2010.

Guides An *Attendee's Guide to Phase 2 Workshops* (DWR, 2010g, updated August 2010) was developed to assist and orient workshop participants in their consideration of which workshop to attend and how their input would be applied to the current and subsequent planning phases.

Posters No posters were produced during Phase 2.

Reports Major Phase 2 documents posted to the program Web site included the DWR *Management Actions Report* (DWR, 2010h), the *Interim Progress Summary No. 2* (DWR, 2010i), and the *Phase 2 Climate Change Threshold Analysis Work Plan* (DWR, 2010j), the *State Plan of Flood Control Descriptive Document* (DWR, 2010a), and the *Final Public Scoping Report: 2012 CVFPP Program Environmental Impact Report* (DWR, 2011b).

Web Site and Multimedia

Web Site Materials continued to be posted to the program Web site throughout Phase 2.

Videos A 12-minute *Regional Management Actions Workshops Orientation Video* (DWR, 2010k) was produced and published online in advance of the July 2010 workshops. This video was part of DWR's stakeholder recruitment efforts, and supported stakeholder understanding of the scope and purpose of the scheduled workshops, and how stakeholder participation helped in development of the CVFPP.

Webcasts and Webinars The December 2010 Valleywide Forum was broadcast live via Webcast and stored on the program Web site for future viewing.

All Round 1 Management Actions Workshops were offered via Webinar for those unable to attend in person.

4.5 Phase 2 External Assessment

Following Phase 2 of engagement to produce the 2012 CVFPP, a written survey was created with a mix of 12 quantitative and qualitative questions aimed at obtaining feedback to help improve the engagement process during the next phase of CVFPP development. Topics included stakeholders' levels of satisfaction with the Phase 2 process and work group support staff, understanding of how stakeholder input would feed in into development of the CVFPP, potential future challenges that could arise, and other topics.

The survey was distributed at five RMAWG meetings conducted in early November 2010 and was sent electronically to RMAWG members who did not attend the meetings. Survey participants were offered the opportunity to be interviewed. The Phase 2 External Assessment was based on 52 survey responses received, other input and correspondence provided to the meeting facilitators, and 15 phone interviews conducted by the meeting facilitators across the five work groups. The Phase 2 External Assessment was presented to DWR for internal use to inform the design of subsequent phases of engagement. Findings of the assessment included the following:

- The assessment found overall satisfaction with the engagement process, with more than 80 percent of respondents indicating that they were either "satisfied" or "somewhat satisfied," and no respondents indicating that they were either "unsatisfied" or "very unsatisfied." However, overall satisfaction was highly contingent on next phases and eventual contents of the 2012 CVFPP. Respondents identified several successful elements during Phase 2, including: development of regional objectives in subcommittees, creation of management actions, diversity of work group participation, and support provided by DWR staff and others.

- A significant majority of survey respondents (87 percent) saw the stakeholder engagement process as somewhat to very likely to have a meaningful impact on the content of the 2012 CVFPP. Respondents cited DWR's efforts to engage local perspectives and recruit diverse participation as two key strengths of the engagement process to date.

- Respondents also requested less emphasis on discussing process during meetings, a slower pace of work, and a clearer understanding of how agricultural and environmental values would be integrated into flood

management planning. Respondents cited two key challenges for successfully developing the 2012 CVFPP: (1) the time available to develop the plan, and (2) funding for implementing the plan. Suggestions from participants for future phases of CVFPP development included: focusing on prioritized "recommended actions," using maps and tools to support place-based discussions; and providing specific examples of how work group involvement and engagement would be conducted in subsequent phases.

4.6 Systemwide Investment Formulation (Phase 3/4)

From January 2011 to December 2011, DWR continued hosting workshops and briefings to interest-based groups, and California Native American Tribes. DWR also released a variety of CVFPP-related publications. Following is an overview of stakeholder meetings and outreach activities during Phase 3/4.

4.6.1 Regional and Valleywide Forums

No forums were held in Phase 3/4.

4.6.2 Work Groups

No work groups were formed in Phase 3/4.

4.6.3 Workshops

In January 2011, a workshop was held to release Version 4 of the *Interim Levee Design Criteria* (ILDC) (DWR, 2010l) and solicit comments for consideration in Version 5.

Two CVFPP Technical Analyses Workshops were held in June 2011 to provide an overview of analyses supporting development of the State Systemwide Investment Approach, including evaluation methods and initial findings. The locations included Stockton and West Sacramento.

In October 2011, DWR held two Webinars to present and brief work group members on the availability of the *Central Valley Flood Protection Plan Summary – Working Draft for Work Group Member Review* (DWR, 2011c). These Webinars preceded the October 2011 release of the *Central Valley Flood Protection Plan – Working Draft for Work Group Member Review* (DWR, 2011d). Details of this document were discussed with CVFMP Program work group members during two November 2011 workshops held in Stockton and Sacramento. Following these workshops, a

Webinar was held to receive input from stakeholders who were unable to attend the prior events.

4.6.4 Briefings and Coordination

In May 2011, Regional Work Group participants were invited to participate in two Webinar briefings. These briefings brought attendees up to date with current planning activities and next steps.

4.6.5 Legislative Outreach

No legislative outreach occurred in Phase 3/4.

4.6.6 Native American and Environmental Justice Outreach

During this phase, DWR presented at the February 2011 Region 9 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Regional Tribal Operations Committee meeting.

4.6.7 Phase 3/4 Public Information

Publications

Newsletter Four issues of *FloodSAFE Focus* were published (DWR, 2010-–2011).

Fact Sheets and Flyers

A package of fact sheets on various topic areas applicable to the CVFPP were developed as part of the public release.

Guides No guides were developed during Phase 3/4.

Posters No posters were developed during Phase 3/4.

Reports The public draft *Urban Levee Design Criteria* was released (DWR, 2011e). The *2012 Central Valley Flood Protection Plan Summary – Working Draft for Work Group Member Review* (DWR, 2011c) and the *2012 Central Valley Flood Protection Plan – Working Draft for Work Group Member Review* (DWR, 2011d) were released in October 2011. The *Public Draft Flood Control System Status Report* (DWR, 2011a) and the *Public Draft 2012 Central Valley Flood Protection Plan* (DWR, 2011f) were released in December 2011.

Web Site and Multimedia

Web Site Materials continued to be posted to the program Web site throughout Phase 3/4.

Videos Two public-awareness-oriented videos were developed during Phase 3/4:

- Titled *Overcoming the Deluge: California's Plan for Managing Floods* (WEF, 2011), the Water Education Foundation (WEF) public education video is a 27-minute documentary-style production geared to inform a lay audience of the history of flood threats in the Central Valley, and the State's efforts to address these challenges. WEF developed the video as a subcontractor to the CVFMP Program. From a content perspective, DWR functioned as a resource for information and interview referrals, and confirmation of data selected by the producer for inclusion in the video. To conform to producer guidelines for the Public Broadcast System (PBS), DWR did not engage in any editorial advocacy or influence over WEF or the producer selected by WEF in the development of the video. Therefore, the video was eligible to be shown on PBS stations in California. The program was broadcast three times during prime time on Sacramento PBS station KVIE in November 2011. Following this airing, the video was distributed to all other California PBS stations via satellite.

- A second, 12-minute video was produced by WEF based on footage and content produced for *Overcoming the Deluge: California's Plan for Managing Floods* (WEF, 2011). While this second video carried the same title, the video was developed to provide an abbreviated overview of the State's efforts to address flood management challenges, threats and potential solutions. To differentiate each video, WEF incorporated video content and interviews into the second video that were not used in the documentary video. The second video was shown during the September 2011 Flood Management Association conference in San Diego.

Webcasts and Webinars In May 2011, the two Regional Work Group briefings were held via Webinar.

In November 2011, two Webinars were held to present and receive comments on DWR's release of the *2012 Central Valley Flood Protection Plan Summary–Working Draft for Work Group Member Review* (DWR, 2011c).

4.7 CVFPP Phase 3/4 Assessment and Stakeholder Assessment Executive Summary

A CVFPP Phase 3/4 Assessment and Stakeholder Assessment Executive Summary is planned for development during the Board's adoption process of the CVFPP. This report will be updated once the assessment and summary is completed.

4.8 CVFPP Adoption Process

The Board, with support by DWR, plans to conduct a series of public meetings and public hearings for adoption of the 2012 CVFPP and the Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (PEIR). This report will be updated during the Board adoption process.

This page left blank intentionally.

5.0 Plan Companion Efforts

While DWR used methods such as structured work groups, workshops, and public forums to obtain input and content that would assist in 2012 CVFPP development, efforts to produce two companion documents – the *State Plan of Flood Control Descriptive Document* (DWR, 2010a) and the *Flood Control System Status Report* (DWR, 2011a) – required much different engagement approaches. These content-rich documents relied heavily on extremely localized input, knowledge, and data, and historical knowledge and documentation.

5.1 State Plan of Flood Control Descriptive Document

For the *State Plan of Flood Control Descriptive Document* (DWR, 2010a), released November 2010, DWR worked with individual levee districts, reclamation districts, and other maintaining agencies, the Board, and USACE to obtain materials related to the purpose and origin of the State-federal flood facilities under their management, including original and updated operations and maintenance manuals.

The *State Plan of Flood Control Descriptive Document* (DWR, 2010a) was released for a 1-month public review and comment period in January 2010. Additionally, the Regional Conditions Work Groups were briefed on the *State Plan of Flood Control Descriptive Document* and invited to review it before DWR finalized the document.

The Board provided comments on the draft document and posted the final draft to its Web site for electronic download in November 2010.

5.2 Flood Control System Status Report

To produce the *Flood Control System Status Report* (DWR, 2011a) – publicly released in December 2011 with the CVFPP – DWR engaged State, federal, and local agencies and landowners to gain a thorough understanding of the State-federal flood management system's performance in the Sacramento and San Joaquin valleys. Many of the *Flood Control System Status Report's* technical inputs were derived from on-the-ground inspections of flood management facilities, such as levees, in both urban and nonurban areas. In addition, DWR obtained historical data from State,

federal, and local agencies, and USACE and through interviewing local landowners.

Before the public draft release of the *Flood Control System Status Report* (DWR, 2011a), DWR provided an administrative working draft version to nearly 100 agencies and organizations which have direct operations and maintenance responsibilities over SPFC facilities. This July 2011 release aimed to gather the most up to date information on facility conditions, and elicit detailed feedback on how accurately the draft document characterized the performance of these facilities.

Coordinating with USACE to obtain data used in the *Flood Control System Status Report* (DWR, 2011a) was a critical component of the document development process. USACE also reviewed the report before it was released as a public draft.

6.0 Other Related FloodSAFE Efforts

Although most of the outreach and engagement efforts supported development of the 2012 CVFPP, DWR also conducted outreach for several CVFPP-related programs and projects that are part of the broader FloodSAFE initiative. These activities stem from six legislative bills enacted in October 2007 to address statewide flood problems, including: assessing the capabilities of the Central Valley levee system; developing plans to better manage the flood protection system; and mandating that local planning efforts recognize the risks of flooding. These bills became effective January 2008 and collectively added or amended sections in the California Code, Health and Safety Code, Public Resource Code, and Water Code. Together, these bills outlined a comprehensive approach to improving flood management at the State, regional, and local levels.

6.1 Building Standards Code Amendments

Included in the flood legislation of October 2007 was a California Health & Safety Code requirement for DWR to propose updated requirements to the California Building Standards Code (Code). The requirements proposed for adoption and approval by the California Building Standards Commission (CBSC) are for construction in areas protected by facilities of the CVFPP where flood levels are anticipated to exceed 3 feet for the 200-year flood event. These proposed Code amendments were developed after DWR consulted with the Board, the Division of the State Architect, and the Office of the State Fire Marshal.

To develop and direct the project until its completion, DWR formed a Building Codes Team (BCT) consisting of DWR staff, subject matter experts, and additional technical and facilitation support.

As noted above, DWR was required to consult with specified State agencies. To meet this requirement, the BCT convened a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to obtain input from stakeholder groups, including those agencies. The TAC consisted of more than 20 State agencies and organizations from different sectors of the building industry (residential, commercial, industrial, public, and private development). Members were recruited to augment the expertise in the BCT by forming a coalition of broad building code and flood management expertise. TAC members contributed technical expertise and knowledge to assist the BCT

in developing the proposed code changes, and gave advice on strategy for a viable, acceptable rollout plan for proposed Code amendments. TAC members also encouraged to take part in public engagement meetings. The TAC was not chartered with approval authority, nor did it represent a consensus-seeking process.

Public engagement meetings were held in January 2009, and later in the spring, to solicit input for the preliminary results of the investigation and, ultimately, the proposed CBSC update package. Multiple meetings were held in the Central Valley to facilitate broad participation of local agencies, interested parties, and individuals.

The BCT incorporated comments from the TAC, the public, and DWR management and submitted its proposal package to the CBSC in July 2009.

On August 11, 2009, the BCT met with the CBSC's Building, Fire & Other Code Advisory Committee (CAC), a meeting open to the public. The CAC advised DWR on package improvements. DWR incorporated the CAC advice and public review comments and –following protocol – resubmitted a revised proposal package to CBSC in September 2009. The revised package was also provided to the public for a 45-day review period.

During the public review period, comments were received only from the California Building Industry Association (CBIA). These comments, in short, agreed with DWR's proposed changes and requested that DWR clarify if the proposed changes to the California Residential Code were to be made in the code’s appendix. DWR concurred with CBIA and reissued the Express Terms regarding proposed updates to the California Residential Code.

As a result of the transparent and collaborative process, the Building Code amendments were adopted on a unanimous vote.

To prepare for a proposed second round of code amendments, a workshop and Webinar were held. The September 2010 workshop considered code issues that may impact children, seniors, and those with disabilities and focused on special access and functional needs before, during, and after a disaster. To help prepare for the workshop and webinar, outreach was directed to advocates for the access and functional needs community, as well as building industry officials and industry specialists.

As the need for additional Code amendments arises to meet requirements of the CVFPP and applicable sections of the Health and Safety Code or Residential Code, a staged work plan and additional public outreach will be needed to include stakeholder input is included in the amendment process.

6.2 Local Land Use Planning Handbook

In cooperation with the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, California Department of Housing and Community Development, California Emergency Management Agency, Board, and California Geological Survey, DWR prepared a guidance document titled *Implementing California Flood Legislation into Local Land Use Planning: A Handbook for Local Communities* (Handbook) (DWR, 2010m). The Handbook describes how the flood risk management legislation affects city and county responsibilities related to local planning requirements, including general plans, development agreements, zoning ordinances, tentative maps, and other actions.

The focus of the Handbook is identifying how the 2007 flood legislation related to local responsibilities affects cities and counties in implementing planning documents and tools such as general plans, zoning ordinances, development agreements, and subdivision maps, among others. The Handbook presents general guidance, identifies informational resources to help cities and counties develop locally relevant responses through obtaining applicable flood information, and notes appropriate agencies that can offer assistance.

The Handbook does not attempt to define specific policy or other solutions for compliance related to local responsibilities and implementation of the 2007 flood legislation.

Before release, a focus group of stakeholders was provided with an overview and given the opportunity to review and suggest revisions. As a result of this input, key sections were redrafted, and the Handbook was released, reflecting applicable stakeholder suggestions.

Since the release of the award winning Handbook,[3] DWR has provided briefings and more information to local jurisdictions, as requested.

[3] The Handbook has earned a statewide award from the California chapter of the American Planners' Association.

6.3 Flood Risk Notification

In 2010, DWR completed the first annual distribution of more than 275,000 notices to landowners, who collectively own more than 360,000 properties at risk of flooding from SPFC levees. Each flood risk notice identified the sources of potential flooding specific to the property and offered tips for the following:

- Flood emergency planning and preparedness
- Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) National Flood Insurance Program
- Preventing problems, such as keeping storm drains clear, and elevating, or flood-proofing, buildings

Each notice also includes a thumbnail map of the levee flood protection zones in the Sacramento and San Joaquin valleys and a Web address where property owners can view flood risk by street address and other important information.

These annual notices to property owners are a California Water Code requirement under Assembly Bill (AB) 156, which was passed with SB 5 as part of the 2007 flood legislation.

6.4 Flood Protection Criteria

SB 5 of 2007 (i.e., California Government Code (CGC) Section 65007(l)) (CGC, 2010) defines the urban level of flood protection as the level of flood protection necessary to withstand flooding that has a 1 in 200 chance of occurring in any given year, using criteria consistent with, or developed by, DWR. Passage of the legislation obligates jurisdictions with land use authorities to use flood protection criteria before:

- Entering into a development agreement for a property
- Approving a discretionary permit/discretionary entitlement/ministerial permit that would result in construction of a new residence

- Under certain situations related to other applicable sections of law, approving a tentative map/parcel map for a subdivision in urban and urbanizing areas within flood hazard areas identified by FEMA.[4]

For urban and urbanizing areas within flood hazard zones identified by FEMA, and protected by State-federal project levees in the Sacramento and San Joaquin valleys, the urban level of flood protection will be achieved by 2025. While cities and counties located outside the Sacramento and San Joaquin valleys are not required to make findings related to the urban level of flood protection, these criteria can help inform engineering and local land use decisions for areas at risk of flooding. To assist local governments and pertinent State agencies in complying with legal requirements, DWR initiated a series of work groups and workshops to develop levee design criteria associated with 200-year levels of flood protection and related issues.

6.4.1 Urban Level of Flood Protection Work Group

In July 2011, DWR distributed draft criteria to work group members for demonstrating urban level of flood protection to provide specific criteria associated with the urban level of flood protection, as defined in CGC Section 65007(l) and California Water Code Section 9602(i) (CWC, 2008).

DWR convened a work group consisting primarily of local government planners to obtain feedback on draft criteria and determine whether the criteria were comprehensive, provided a sufficient level of detail, and were implementable. Members were required to have expertise in land use decision making and, while expertise in floodplain management was welcome, it was not required.

In addition to local government representatives, DWR invited representatives from the California State Association of Counties, League of California Cities, California County Planning Directors Association, American Planning Association California Chapter, and Floodplain Management Association to participate in the work group. FEMA, USACE, the Board, California Department of Housing and Community Development, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, and California Emergency Management Agency were also invited to join the work group.

[4] Requirements apply beyond 36 months after the Board's adoption of the CVFPP, SB 5 of 2007, which requires cities and counties in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley to either demonstrate the urban level of flood protection, impose conditions that will achieve the urban level of flood protection (e.g., elevate or flood proof structures, construct a levee), or demonstrate adequate progress toward providing the urban level of flood protection.

The work group met in May, June, and August 2011 to review draft criteria, identify major concerns, and provide recommendations for improving the criteria and accessibility of the document.

6.4.2 Interim Levee Design Criteria

As noted above, SB 5 of 2007 (i.e., CGC Section 65007(l)) defines the urban level of flood protection as the level of flood protection necessary to withstand flooding that has a 1 in 200 chance of occurring in any given year, using criteria consistent with, or developed by, DWR.

Since 2007, DWR has developed three versions of the ILDC. For the fourth version, DWR has convened a stakeholder work group in December 2009, through the CVFMP Program, to help refine and supplement initial versions of the criteria. Members consisted primarily of engineers representing levee and reclamation districts throughout the Central Valley, as well as representatives from FEMA, USACE, and the California Emergency Management Agency. This approach allowed DWR to address complex technical and policy issues with representatives of those public agencies responsible for meeting legislative requirements. DWR released a final Version 4 ILDC on December 20, 2010, followed by a public workshop in January 2011 and a public comment deadline of February 4, 2011.

6.4.3 Urban Levee Design Criteria

In March 2011, DWR has reconvened the ILDC Work Group, expanded its membership, and renamed it the Urban Levee of Design Criteria (ULDC) Work Group. Based on recommendations from the California State Association of Counties and the Board, members new to the group included representatives of the San Francisco Bay Area and Los Angeles Basin. Members were charged with completing three tasks:

- Review existing public and work group member comments on previous versions of the ILDC and advise how to best address the comments.
- Provide additional comments and advice on a draft ULDC – including new issues that should be added – and, as appropriate, draft new text for the ULDC.
- Provide comments on selected topics being discussed by the Urban Level of Protection Work Group.

The ULDC Work Group was also asked to comment on urban levee vegetation criteria drafted for consideration by DWR and the California Roundtable for Central Valley Flood Management. The ULDC Work

Group also coordinated its efforts with the Urban Level of Protection Work Group, the CVFMP Program, the DWR Levee Evaluations and Early Implementation Projects programs, and the Board's revisions of Title 23 of the California Code of Regulations, which includes standards for levee construction on specifically identified streams throughout the Central Valley.

The work group met five times between March and July 2011.

6.4.4 Special ULDC Session on Levee Vegetation

In June 2011, DWR hosted a special ULDC session on levee vegetation. As with its ILDC predecessor, the ULDC Work Group helped develop and comment on early drafts of levee design criteria involving levee vegetation. The purpose of the special session was to solicit feedback on specific issues about which DWR had requested detailed discussion. These included environmental mitigation requirements, specifications for root distance, and minimum trunk diameter for trees to be removed or retained, and vegetation management on the waterside slope.

6.5 Urban and Nonurban Levee Evaluations

As part of its process to evaluate the structural integrity and performance of hundreds of miles of urban and nonurban levees in the Central Valley, DWR consulted with USACE, local maintaining agencies, and private landowners.

The levee evaluation process, began in 2007, relies extensively on geotechnical, topographic, bathymetric, and other types of explorations. DWR has worked with numerous State, federal, and local experts to obtain historical records and data, including current levee system conditions and performance data.

Input from local Central Valley stakeholders was particularly important for completing nonurban levee evaluations because there is limited or sparse documentation about the construction history, performance, and subsurface conditions of such structures. As part of the Urban Levee Evaluations (ULE) and Nonurban Levee Evaluations (NULE) projects, local agencies were actively engaged, including participating in interviews with maintenance personnel, meetings presenting initial findings, and meetings to review drafts of the preliminary results. Coordination with local agencies allowed the ULE/NULE teams to access and document extensive local knowledge of urban and nonurban levees. Coordination efforts also provided local stakeholders with an opportunity to provide input on initial ULE/NULE findings. DWR continues to use information obtained from

these efforts to help identify high priority areas for future investigation or remediation.

Urban and nonurban levee evaluation activities provided information used for completing the *Flood Control System Status Report* (DWR, 2011a).

6.6 Vegetation on Levees

The failure of New Orleans levees during Hurricane Katrina due, in part, to engineering design and construction deficiencies spurred a massive reevaluation of national levee policies by USACE. After the reevaluation was completed, with a focus on improving levee standards and increasing public safety, USACE clarified national policy and expanded enforcement actions on existing policy. A key enforcement action was application of a USACE policy that would, if stringently implemented, require substantial removal of vegetation from levees.

The most recent descriptions of USACE vegetation management policy are contained in the Engineer Technical Letter (ETL) 1110-2-571, *Guidelines for Landscape Planting and Vegetation Management at Levees, Floodwalls, Embankment Dams, and Appurtenant Structures* (USACE, 2009a) (adopted April 10, 2009), and the associated draft Policy Guidance Letter (PGL), *Process for Requesting a Variance from Vegetation Standards for Levees and Floodwalls* (USACE, 2009b) (Federal Register 6364-68).

On April 15, 2010, DWR and the California Department of Fish and Game submitted extensive comments on the above mentioned ETL and PGL. The agencies stated that the USACE vegetation management policy would reduce public safety in California and result in extensive and unnecessary environmental damage if implemented as directed by USACE.

The agencies further noted that noncompliance with the USACE vegetation policies allowed the federal government to withhold its resources to assist State and local maintaining agencies in their efforts to establish the integrity of State/federal levees in California.

California agrees with USACE that public safety is the highest priority for flood management. California further agrees on the importance of appropriate vegetation management on levees. However, despite these shared views, California asserts that USACE's strict enforcement of the ETL and PGL will adversely impact public safety. It is the State's viewpoint that while USACE's prescriptive approach to vegetation management can be applied in certain settings, its universal application is

inconsistent with numerous technical, financial, legal, and institutional factors.

6.6.1 Roundtable

In 2007, the California Levees Roundtable was established. Using a collaborative process that included USACE, the California Levee Roundtable created the *California Central Valley Flood System Improvement Framework* (California Levee Roundtable, 2009). This document provided temporary exemptions from ETL compliance for legacy levees in the Central Valley and committed USACE, the State of California, and DWR to ongoing collaboration on a long-term plan.[5]

This State/federal coordination coincided with USACE strictly enforcing the ETL on existing and new levees nationally, as well as for levee improvement projects in California in 2009. In 2010, USACE proposed an updated draft of its vegetation variance process by issuing a draft PGL (described above and being contested by the State).

6.7 Delta Programs

During the initiation of Regional Work Groups for the CVFPP, Delta stakeholders requested that DWR increase efforts to coordinate with Delta agencies and programs as part of its responsibility to develop a flood management plan for the Central Valley. California Natural Resources Agency Secretary Mike Chrisman distributed a memorandum on October 7, 2009, to participants and stakeholders in the Bay-Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) and FloodSAFE programs, outlining a series of coordination actions, commitments, and integrated planning principles. Included in the memorandum was a commitment to conduct regular joint public workshops with executive and policy representatives of major related agency initiatives.

Based on the memo, DWR's Division of Flood Management, through FloodSAFE and in conjunction with USACE, contacted agency staff

[5] As noted earlier, the State is engaged in an aggressive 25-year program, the FloodSAFE initiative, to upgrade its flood management system, and the CVFPP will prepare strategies for implementing comprehensive systemwide improvements. Under the framework, USACE allowed California to maintain Public Law 84-991 eligibility for its levees and remain active in the Public Law 84-99 program. This enables the State to continue receiving federal levee rehabilitation assistance in the event of a flood – if the State is demonstrating positive progress and meeting the milestones of achieving the framework's short-term goals and maintenance objectives. This Public Law 84-99 eligibility shall be reviewed annually for renewal in accordance with USACE policy and remain in effect until 2012, at which time the eligibility criteria will be reconsidered based on the contents of the CVFPP.

responsible for implementing a variety of flood, water supply, and ecosystem management programs, projects, plans, and studies. These included the following:

- **DWR** – BDCP and Delta Habitat Conservation and Conveyance Program; CVFMP Program; Delta Emergency Operations Plan; Delta Knowledge Improvement Program; Delta Levees Maintenance Subventions Program; Delta Levees Special Flood Control Projects; and Delta Risk Management Strategy.

- **Delta Stewardship Council** – *Delta Plan* (Delta Stewardship Council, 2011)

- **USACE** – CALFED Bay-Delta Program Levee Stability Program; Central Valley Integrated Flood Management Study; and Delta Islands and Levees Feasibility Study.

Through this outreach, the agencies have exchanged information on the purposes of the activities in the above list. Topics shared during this exchange included program/project-level integrated water management goals; major actions/tools to address the goals; program type and key milestones; and assumed critical dependencies with other programs and their coordination priorities.

7.0 Coordination Activities

Many of the coordination and engagement activities detailed in this document are described in terms of when they occurred during the roughly 4-year period DWR devoted to preparing for and producing the 2012 CVFPP. This section of the report also details coordination to produce the 2012 plan, but is organized by the internal and external partners with whom DWR worked during 2012 CVFPP preparation.

7.1 External Partners

To design and execute its vision for preparing the 2012 CVFPP and related documents, DWR worked with public agencies and elected officials at all levels of government, with local agencies responsible for maintaining the SPFC, and with California Native American Tribes and Tribal organizations, as detailed below.

7.1.1 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

As noted in Sections 3 and 4, and elsewhere in this report, USACE was one of DWR's key partners, providing input, information, and guidance for the 2012 CVFPP and related documents. USACE's involvement included the following:

- Input to the Framework via participation in stakeholder interviews
- Participation in work groups and workshops
- Attendance at periodic plan development team meetings
- Review of CVFPP management actions
- Input to and review of the *Flood Control System Status Report* (DWR, 2011a) and *State Plan of Flood Control Descriptive Document* (DWR, 2010a).

Additionally, DWR is currently assisting USACE as it undertakes its Central Valley Integrated Flood Management Study (CVIFMS). DWR and the Board will jointly implement the CVIFMS as nonfederal sponsors. Scheduled to be completed in 2017, this program-level feasibility study will complement the CVFPP.

7.1.2 Central Valley Flood Protection Board

Because the Board is the entity ultimately responsible for reviewing and adopting the 2012 CVFPP, DWR sought input from Board often, as is noted elsewhere in this report. As with USACE, communication with Board representatives and staff was open and ongoing throughout the CVFPP development process, but also included the following specific elements:

- Input to the Framework via participation in stakeholder interviews
- Participation in work groups and workshops
- Review of CVFPP management actions, the *Flood Control System Status Report* (DWR, 2011a), and the *State Plan of Flood Control Descriptive Document*. (DWR, 2010a)
- Periodic briefings from DWR management and staff during regular Board meetings or meetings specifically scheduled to review plan development progress

7.1.3 Maintenance Agencies

These local agencies are tasked with on-the-ground maintenance of SPFC facilities. Their feedback and input was critical in helping DWR understand the full range of challenges associated with addressing floods in the Central Valley and identifying specific strategies or projects that may be compatible with their local operations. As noted in the chapters above, this involvement also included elements such as the following:

- Input to the Framework via participation in stakeholder interviews
- Participation in work groups and workshops
- Providing historical documents and data for use in the *Flood Control System Status Report* (DWR, 2011a), and the *State Plan of Flood Control Descriptive Document* (DWR, 2010a)
- Targeted review of the draft *Flood Control System Status Report* (DWR, 2011a)

7.1.4 State and Federal Legislature

The CVFMP Program team worked closely with DWR liaisons to the State Legislature and members of Congress to inform Central Valley members of the California State Legislature and California Congressional Delegation about development of the CVFPP throughout the process.

The following strategies were used to inform elected officials:

- Delivery of CVFPP Progress Reports to appropriate Capitol offices/District offices with a cover memorandum from the Division of Flood Management (DFM).

- E-mail memorandum to each member at the launch of the program and each year following. The e-mail provided an update about the CVFMP Program and invited legislative staff to a DWR-sponsored briefing.

- Two briefings conducted at the State Capitol for staff of the State Legislature. One briefing was held in January 2010, and the second briefing was held in February 2011. The purpose of briefing legislative staff was to inform that each member's office about the progress of the CVFPP development and the extent of engagement by constituents in respective legislative districts in developing the CVFPP. The briefings also were an opportunity for DWR to provide general FloodSAFE updates to the Legislature.

- A briefing is also planned for early 2012 to coincide with the release of the CVFPP to the Board. District staff to California's Congressional Delegation will be invited to join State Legislature staff at the 2012 briefing.

7.1.5 Local Jurisdictions

DWR representatives made regular presentations in 2009 and 2010 about the CVFMP to the boards of supervisors, key city councils, and regional flood planning agencies of Central Valley counties. The purpose of these briefings was to inform jurisdictions about the progress of CVFPP development and the extent of engagement by constituents in developing the CVFPP. A three-step process was used to conduct briefings to local jurisdictions:

1. Meetings were held with city, county, and regional agency flood planning staff in advance of meeting with elected officials.

2. Briefings were offered to the chair of the boards of supervisors and mayors in key cities. In most cases, these briefings were conducted via telephone.

3. Presentations were made at regularly scheduled (public) meetings of the board of supervisors and at a few city council meetings. Presentations included an overview of FloodSAFE, the CVFMP Program, and the status of the CVFPP.

7.1.6 Native American Tribes

California Native American Tribes and Tribal organizations are key potential partners in FloodSAFE, the CVFMP Program, and other related efforts. CVFMP Program efforts to engage California Native American Tribes in planning activities focused on establishing two-way communication channels and cultivating working relationships with Tribes and tribal organizations that have a direct, historical, or cultural interest in the Systemwide Planning Area.

As part of this outreach, DWR developed a comprehensive Tribal Contacts Database of tribes throughout the Central Valley and upper watersheds, and of related Tribal organizations. This area was divided into three geographic sections or "tiers." Tier 1covers lands that receive flood protection from facilities of the SPFC and the Systemwide Planning Area. Tier 2 adds all lands within the watershed. Tier 3 includes lands that extend beyond the watershed. A fourth tier was created for Tribal organizations. The overall Tribal Contacts Database includes more than 160 California Native American Tribes and Tribal organizations.

The division of tribes into "tiers" was intended to identify potential plan development participants based on a direct (i.e., lands subject to Central Valley flooding) or indirect (e.g., historical or cultural) association with flood management planning applicable to the 2012 CVFPP. Tier 1 Tribes were seen as outreach priorities because these Tribes own and occupy lands that receive flood protection from facilities of the SPFC and are within the Systemwide Planning Area. Tier 2 Tribes were notified of planning activity and invited to participate if they had a historical or cultural interest in the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers, based on their geographic proximity. Tier 3 Tribes were informed of planning progress through e-mail. Ongoing relationships were achieved with more than 40 Tribes and Tribal organizations. Introductory and program update fact sheets were designed specifically for the Native American community and distributed to Tier 1, 2, and 4 contacts in coordination with DWR's Tribal Liaison. This outreach resulted in 17 presentations to Tribal councils and Tribal organizations in Phases 1 and 2 (see Table 7-1) by DWR Regional Coordinators.

This outreach contributed to the participation of four Tribes – Colusa Indian Community Council, Mechoopda Indian Tribe, Upper Lake Rancheria, and the Wintu Tribe – in technical planning activities.

Native American attendees at briefings generally were receptive to and appreciative of the presentations. While some Tribes became active planning participants, others expressed skepticism about flood management planning in California. Native American representatives at the briefings often suggested that State flood management planning efforts would benefit

greatly from coordination with Native American efforts to manage upstream watersheds. Additional key areas of interest included the following:

- Impact of flood management activities on sensitive sites, such as burial grounds, and on water storage levels.
- Role of tribes outside the Systemwide Planning Area.
- Role of the federal government and other jurisdictions.
- Availability of funding support for tribal flood management and planning projects.

Tribal interests not applicable to Central Valley flood management planning – either geographically or by subject matter – were referred to DWR's Tribal Liaison for follow-up.

Table 7-1. CVFMP and CVFPP Briefings for California Native American Tribes and Tribal Organizations

Tribe/Tribal Organization	Briefing Date
Inter-Tribal Council of California	October 31, 2009
California Indian Basket Weavers Association	December 5, 2009
Northern Circle Indian Housing Authority	January 9, 2010
Hinthil Environmental Resources Consortium	January 13, 2010
North Fork Mono Tribe	January 14, 2010
California Rural Indian Health Board, Inc.	January 22, 2010
Cortina Indian Rancheria	March 11, 2010
Inter-Tribal Council of California General Counsel	March 20, 2010
Sacramento Native American Health Coalition	April 7, 2010
Bureau of Indian Affairs	April 13, 2010
Redding Rancheria	May 11, 2010
Chowchilla Tribe of North Valley Yokuts	June 29, 2010
Grindstone Rancheria	July 11, 2010
Nashville-Eldorado Miwok Tribe	July 11, 2010
Wintu Tribe of Northern California	August 26, 2010
California Manpower Indian Consortium	November 6, 2010
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 9 Regional Tribal Operations Committee Meeting	February 9, 2011

Key:
CVFMP = Central Valley Flood Management Planning Program
CVFPP = Central Valley Flood Protection Plan

7.2 Internal Partners

To support successful development of the 2012 CVFPP, the team worked collaboratively with all related DWR divisions. In particular, the FloodSAFE Environmental Stewardship and Statewide Resources Office (FESSRO) Staff, Regional Coordinators, Legal and Legislative Affairs Offices, and Executive Team were essential partners in plan preparation. Participation ranged from regular briefings and joint team meetings to weekly attendance at Plan Development Team sessions.

7.2.1 Intradepartmental

To promote policy and technical consistency and improve coordination among and across all programs, a series of Functional Area Cross Coordination Teams (FAXCT) were developed. These teams meet on a regular basis (with additional meetings scheduled, as required) to support ongoing communication and improve opportunities to leverage the work of all the programs and operations.

Eight FAXCT groups were engaged during the planning cycle with two additional FAXCT groups planned. Following is a summary of the coordination structure.

FAXCT-1: Communication and Engagement
This group is charged with guiding, coordinating, and managing effective and strategic communication and engagement activities for successful implementation of FloodSAFE programs and projects.

FAXCT-2: Emergency Response
This group is responsible for DFM being continuously ready to respond to flood emergencies and to coordinate all information needs.

FAXCT-3: Flood Models Analysis and Dissemination
This group facilitates coordination within FloodSAFE to identify and share information about the different needs and types of hydrologic and hydraulic models being used and developed. The group also oversees a data and model repository that allows information to be distributed to government agencies and public.

FAXCT-4: Flood Management Planning and Conservation Strategy
The group provides overall coordination within FloodSAFE to establish DWR's organizational sponsorship for the CVFPP. Activities include coordinating and allocating resources for CVFPP content development and reviewing CVFPP products. The group also monitors CVFPP development progress and accomplishments for consistency with FloodSAFE implementation strategies and milestones. A key responsibility of this

FAXCT is providing guidance on strategy and policy and facilitating integration of regional projects and activities into the CVFPP systemwide approach and evaluation.

FAXCT-5: Operations and Maintenance and Environmental Stewardship

This group facilitates coordination within FloodSAFE to improve the quality and consistency of inspections and operations and maintenance of flood facilities statewide. This group is also tasked with establishing a sustainable and strategic investment process and facilitating a continuous open and collaborative dialogue with operators and maintainers of SPFC facilities, USACE, the Board and other key stakeholders.

FAXCT-6: Delta Programs

This FAXCT has not been activated yet.

FAXCT-7: Flood Risk Assessment

This group facilitates the development of consistent policies and standardized approaches for conducting flood risk assessments. It also seeks to maximize the usefulness and efficiency of FloodSAFE flood risk assessments, and is tasked with review and comment on proposed and final technical study results.

FAXCT-8: Floodplain Management

This group supports development of consistent plans, programs, principles, and policies for implementing floodplain management practices within FloodSAFE. It also coordinates and communicates DWR floodplain management policies and programs across the FloodSAFE functional areas. An additional task is commenting on proposed and final floodplain management plans and related activities within FloodSAFE implementation plans.

FAXCT-9: Regional Projects

This group creates and implements the process for Flood Risk Reduction projects and programs for urban and rural areas. The group uses a multi objective, systemwide approach. Activities include developing processes for participating or conducting State, federal, and local managed studies, projects, and programs.

FAXCT-10: Flood and Water Management and Statewide Planning

This FAXCT has not yet been activated, but is expected to assist in integrating Statewide Flood Management Program activities into FloodSAFE and DFM programs.

Where appropriate, members of USACE planning teams and Board staff may also participate in the FAXCT meetings.

This page left blank intentionally.

8.0 References

California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2009a. California Water Plan. http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/

———.2009b. Communications and Engagement Framework.

———. 2009c. Levee Performance Scope Definition Work Group Summary Report. November

———. 2009d. Operations and Maintenance Scope Definition Work Group Summary Report. November

———. 2009e. Environmental Stewardship Scope Definition Work Group Summary Report. December.

———. 2009f. Climate Change Scope Definition Work Group Summary Report. December.

———. 2010a. State Plan of Flood Control Descriptive Document. January. Available at <http://www.water.ca.gov/cvfmp/documents.cfm>.

———. 2010b. CVFPP Regional Conditions Report – A Working Document. March.

———. 2010c. Readers' Guide to the Interim Progress Summary No. 1 and Regional Conditions Report – A Working Document. April. Available at <http://www.water.ca.gov/cvfmp/docs/RCRIPSReadersGuideCVFPP20100402.pdf>

———. 2010d. Interim Progress Summary No. 1. April. Available at <http://www.water.ca.gov/cvfmp/docs/InterimProgressSummary1CVFPP20100420.pdf>

———. 2010e. Important Considerations for the CVFPP Related to Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley Agriculture. May.

———. 2010f. Phase 1 External Communication and Engagement Assessment. September. Available at < http://www.water.ca.gov/cvfmp/docs/RCWG_Phase1assessment_201009.pdf>

———. 2010g. Attendee's Guide to Phase 2 Workshops. July.

———. 2010h. Management Actions Report. November.

———. 2010i. Interim Progress Summary No. 2. December. Available at < http://www.water.ca.gov/cvfmp/docs/CVFPP-InterimProgressSummaryNo2_Dec2010a.pdf>

———. 2010j. Phase 2 Climate Change Threshold Analysis Work Plan. September.

———. 2010k. Regional Management Actions Workshops Orentation Video.

———. 2010l. Interim Levee Design Criteria, Version 4. December.

———. 2010m. Implementing California Flood Legislation into Local Land Use Planning: A Handbook for Local Communities. October.

———. 2010–2011. FloodSAFE Focus. Available at <http://www.water.ca.gov/floodsafe/>

———. 2011a. Flood Control System Status Report. December.

———. 2011b. Final Public Scoping Report: 2012 CVFPP Program Environmental Impact Report. February

———. 2011c. Central Valley Flood Protection Plan Summary – Working Draft for Work Group Member Review. October.

———. 2011d. Central Valley Flood Protection Plan – Working Draft for Work Group Member Review. October.

———. 2011e. Urban Levee Design Criteria. August.

———. 2011f. Central Valley Flood Protection Plan. December.

California Government Code (CGC) Section 65007(1). 2010. Available at < http://leginfo.ca.gov/pub/09-10/bill/sen/sb_1051-1100/sb_1070_bill_20100806_enrolled.html>

California Water Code (CWC) Section 9602(i). 2008. Available at < http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=wat&group=09001-10000&file=9600-9603>

California Levee Roundtable. 2009. Central Valley Flood System Improvement Framework. Available at <http://www.cvfpb.ca.gov/docs/031209flood_improvement.pdf>. Accessed September 14, 2011.

Delta Stewardship Council. 2011. Delta Plan. August.

DWR. *See* California Department of Water Resources.

International Association of Public Participation (IAP2). 2007 Available at http://www.iap2.org/associations/4748/files/spectrum.pdf

USACE. *See* U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). 2002. Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers Comprehensive Study, Technical Studies Documentation.

———. 2009a. Engineer Technical Letter (ETL) 1110-2-571, Guidelines for Landscape Planting and Vegetation Management at Levees, Floodwalls, Embankment Dams, and Appurtenant Structures. April.

———. 2009b. Process for Requesting a Variance from Vegetation Standards for Levees and Floodwalls (Federal Register 6364-68)

Water Education Foundation (WEF). 2011. Overcoming the Deluge: California's Plan for Managing Floods.

WEF. *See* Water Education Foundation.

This page left blank intentionally.

9.0 Acronyms and Abbreviations

AB.....Assembly Bill

BCT .....Building Codes Team

BDCP .....Bay Delta Conservation Plan

Board .....Central Valley Flood Protection Board

CAC.....Code Advisory Committee

CBIA.....California Building Industry Association

Code.....California Building Standards Code

CBSC .....California Building Standards Commission

CEQA .....California Environmental Quality Act

CVFMP.....Central Valley Flood Management Planning

CVFPO.....Central Valley Flood Planning Office

CVFPP .....Central Valley Flood Protection Plan

CVIFMS.....Central Valley Integrated Flood Management Study

DFM.....Division of Flood Management

DHCCP.....Delta Habitat Conservation and Conveyance Program

DWR.....California Department of Water Resources

ETL.....Engineer Technical Letter

FAXCT.....Functional Area Cross Coordination Teams

FEMA .....Federal Emergency Management Agency

FESSRO.....FloodSAFE Environmental Stewardship and Statewide Resources Office

FloodSAFE .....FloodSAFE California

Framework .....Communication and Engagement Framework

GC .....Government Code

Handbook .....Implementing California Flood Legislation into Local Land Use Planning: A Handbook for Local Communities

IAP2.....International Association of Public Participation

ILDC .....Interim Levee Design Criteria

NOP.....Notice of Preparation

NULE .....Nonurban Levee Evaluations Project
O&M .....operations and maintenance
PBS .....Public Broadcast System
PEIR .....Program Environmental Impact Report
PGL .....Policy Guidance Letter
RCWG .....Regional Conditions Work Group
RMAWG.....Regional Management Actions Work Group
SB .....Senate Bill
SPFC .....State Plan of Flood Control
State .....State of California
TAC .....Technical Advisory Committee
ULDC .....Urban Levee Design Criteria
ULE.....Urban Levee Evaluations Project
USACE .....U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
WEF.....Water Education Foundation

CENTRAL VALLEY
FLOOD MANAGEMENT
PLANNING PROGRAM

FloodSAFE
CALIFORNIA

Public Draft

2012 Central Valley Flood Protection Plan

Attachment 5: Engagement Record Appendix A – Central Valley Flood Management Planning Program Questions for Interviews with Partners and Interested Parties

December 2011

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
THE NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY
DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

This page left blank intentionally.

Appendix A

Central Valley Flood Management Planning Program Questions for Interviews with Partners and Interested Parties

DRAFT: January 16, 2009

Interviewer Script

Introduction
Thank you for talking/meeting with me today. First of all, let's take care of some housekeeping issues.

1. You were selected to be interviewed because you represent an organization/agency that has a stake in California flood management, or because you have been personally active in this arena. You are one of approximately 100 people that we are listening to this month to gather input about communication and engagement strategies so that an effective public engagement plan can be developed to support the development of the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan.

2. As I mentioned when we scheduled this call, it will take between 45 minutes and one hour. I'd like to confirm how much time you have available for this discussion. (***Wait for response***. ***Interviewer must moderate the discussion accordingly.)***

3. This interview will be a conversation rather than a strict poll-like survey, so please feel free to respond to my questions accordingly.

4. Your responses will be anonymous unless you specifically state that we can quote you.

5. If you have questions along the way that I'm unable to answer, I will forward them to Chris McCready, the Department of Water Resources FloodSAFE public information coordinator. She will make sure the right person answers the question and I will get the response back to you within a few days. Of course, if you have comments or questions you would like to discuss with Chris, you may contact her directly.

Background

The goal of the Central Valley Flood Management Planning Program is to improve understanding among the Central Valley's public agencies and constituent groups about the objectives related to flood management and our shared flood risk; evaluate and describe the current Central Valley flood management system status; and to identify potential for integrated and sustainable flood management solutions. This will be accomplished in part by receiving substantial input from local and regional public agencies, businesses and other interested parties in a participatory process.

The Central Valley Flood Management Planning Program is a part of FloodSAFE California—a statewide effort supported by voter-approved bonds. The California Department of Water Resources is leading the Program, with active participation by USACE and the Central Valley Flood Protection Board.

The major responsibilities of the Central Valley Flood Management Planning Program include:

- Describing the existing facilities and current performance of the state-federal flood management system in the Central Valley.

- Working with partners and interested parties to prepare a sustainable integrated flood management plan. This plan will inform future state, federal, and local investments in flood management actions and will describe a long-term strategy to help manage flood risk and accomplish other related flood management objectives in the Central Valley.

- Supporting state and local agencies in developing funding mechanisms to finance local flood management responsibilities, and providing assistance for complying with other specific mandates in the water code.

All of these tasks will require active communication and engagement with partners and interested parties throughout the process. This interview is intended to be an initial dialogue in which we hear your thoughts on the best ways for us to structure communication and engagement so that the Central Valley Flood Management Planning Program will be successful.

As I mentioned earlier, the Department of Water Resources will use the information gathered in these interviews to help develop a communications and engagement plan to support the Central Valley Flood Management Planning Program. This communications and engagement plan will be publicly available via the FloodSAFE Web site within a few months.

Question	Intent of Question
What involvement do you currently have in activities relating to water resource management or flood management?	Understand background and relevant experience, and how those experiences may shape their expectations for the CVFMP Program.
How familiar are you with the Central Valley Flood Management Planning Program?	Gather baseline information and help define necessary educational activities.
How would you define success for the effort to describe the state's existing flood management system and make recommendations for future improvements?	Understand whether partner's ideal flood management outcome is consistent with the goals and objectives of the CVFMP Program. Identify any disconnects between what the CVFMP Program is supposed to do and what partners may be expecting it to do.
What would you consider the biggest challenge in flood management in your local area? In the Central Valley?	Understand perception of challenges, without initiating a conversation regarding specific solutions.
Active participation by partners and interested parties is critical to the success of this effort. Here are examples of how this participation could occur: • Regular convening of a valley-wide forum with participation from diverse interests and regions to provide input on the "big picture." • Regular meetings of regional planning groups, for example in the Sacramento, San Joaquin and Delta areas, to provide input on regional issues. • Meetings of interested parties to address specific topics, such as maintaining protection in rural areas, ecosystem health or climate change.	Receive input on key expected components of the Communications and Engagement Plan.
What do you think of the examples for public participation that I just described? How do you see yourself or your organization/agency being involved? *If necessary, prompt with*: Actively involved in developing content during the planning process on a month-to-month basis? As an expert reviewer on key topics? As a reviewer only at key milestones? *If appropriate, prompt with the following:* Can you tell me now who from your organization is likely to participate in this effort? Can I follow up with you later to learn more about you or your organization's interest in participating?	Understand their key area of interest, their expected level of participation and their organization's participation.
Do you have any recommendations about how we can motivate partners and interested parties to remain actively engaged in the process?	Hear from them directly what will help them stay engaged.
Which other organizations or people should be involved in this process? Is there anyone else whom we should interview?	Non-positional way of learning who the partner views as important; gather information to expand the partner and interested parties database.

Question	Intent of Question
How would you like to receive information about the Central Valley Flood Management Planning Program in the future? Will you inform your organization/colleagues that we will provide them information about this effort?	Help ensure smooth communication; determine communications preferences.
Can you suggest any newsletters, Web sites, forums or other existing communication channels that should receive information about this effort?	Expand the CVFMP Program communication channels.
Is there anything else that you'd like us to know?	Gather unsolicited information.
Do you have any questions for me?	Maintain open channels of communication.

CENTRAL VALLEY
FLOOD MANAGEMENT
PLANNING PROGRAM

FloodSAFE
CALIFORNIA

Public Draft

2012 Central Valley Flood Protection Plan

Attachment 5: Engagement Record Appendix B – Comprehensive List of Stakeholder

December 2011

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
THE NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY
DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

This page left blank intentionally.

Appendix B

Table B. Comprehensive List of Stakeholders

Category	Organization
Consulting	AMEC Geomatrix
Flood Management	American River Flood Control District
Recreation	American River Recreation Association
Nonprofit	American River Watershed Institute
Environmental	American Rivers
Agriculture	Amistad Ranches
Consulting	Arcadis
Academic/Scientific	Arizona Water Institute
Environmental	Audubon Society
Environmental	Bay Institute
Environmental	Big Chico Creek Watershed Alliance
Flood Management	Brannan-Andrus Levee Maintenance District
Consulting	Brown and Caldwell
Business	Building Industry Association
Govt. – Federal	Bureau of Reclamation
Business	Burlington-Northern-Santa Fe Railroad
Govt. – Local	Butte County
Govt. – Local	Butte County Environmental Health
Agriculture	Butte County Farm Bureau
Govt. – Local	Butte County Public Works
Govt. – Local	Butte County Resource Conservation District
Environmental	Butte Creek Conservancy
Govt - State	CALFED Bay-Delta Program
Govt - State	CalFire
Govt - State	California Air Resources Board
Flood Management	California Central Valley Flood Control Association
Business	California Chamber of Commerce
Recreation	California Department of Boating and Waterways
Govt - State	California Department of Conservation
Govt - State	California Department of Education

Table B. Comprehensive List of Stakeholders (contd.)

Category	Organization
Govt - State	California Department of Fish and Game
Govt - State	California Department of Food and Agriculture
Govt - State	California Department of Parks and Recreation
Govt - State	California Department of Transportation
Govt - State	California Emergency Management Agency
Academic/Scientific	California Extreme Precipitation Symposium
Agriculture	California Farm Bureau Federation
Tribal	California Indian Basket Weavers
Tribal	California Indian Heritage Council
Tribal	California Manpower Indian Consortium
Business	California Manufacturers and Technology Association
Agriculture	California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley
Govt. – State	California Regional Water Quality Control Board
Agriculture	California Rice Commission
Govt. – Local	California Riparian Habitat Joint Venture
Tribal	California Rural Indian Health Board, Inc.
Recreation	California Sport Fishing Protection Alliance
Govt. – Local	California State Association of Counties
Govt. – State	California State Coastal Conservancy
Business	California Truckers Association
Academic/Scientific	California Water Institute – California State University Fresno
Recreation	California Waterfowl Association
Agriculture	California Women for Agriculture
Consulting	CBEC Inc.
Water Supply	Central California Irrigation District
Water Supply	Central Delta Water Agency
Govt. – State	Central Valley Flood Protection Board
Govt – Local	Central Valley Habitat Joint Venture
Consulting	CH2M Hill
Tribal	Chowchilla Tribe of North Valley Yokuts
Water Supply	Chowchilla Water District
Govt. – Community	City of Benicia
Govt. – Community	City of Chico
Govt. – Community	City of Colusa
Govt. – Community	City of Elk Grove

Table B. Comprehensive List of Stakeholders (contd.)

Category	Organization
Govt. – Community	City of Firebaugh
Govt. – Community	City of Folsom
Govt. – Community	City of Galt
Govt. – Community	City of Hamilton City
Govt. – Community	City of Isleton
Govt. – Community	City of Lathrop
Govt. – Community	City of Lodi
Govt. – Community	City of Manteca
Govt. – Community	City of Mendota
Govt. – Community	City of Modesto
Govt. – Community	City of Patterson
Govt. – Community	City of Rio Vista
Govt. – Community	City of Ripon
Govt. – Community	City of Sacramento
Govt. – Community	City of Stockton
Govt. – Community	City of Tehama
Govt. – Community	City of West Sacramento
Govt. – Community	City of Woodland
Nonprofit	Climate Central
Flood Management	Colusa Basin Drainage District
Elected	Colusa County Board of Supervisors
Agriculture	Colusa County Farm Bureau
Govt. – Local	Colusa County Planning Department
Environmental	Colusa County Resource Conservation District
Tribal	Colusa Indian Council
Consulting	Conaway Preservation Group LLC
Govt. – Local	Contra Costa County
Elected	Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors
Flood Management	Contra Costa Flood Control District
Tribal	Cortina Indian Rancheria
Consulting	DCC Engineering
Environmental	Deer Creek Conservancy
Govt. – Local	Delta 5 Counties Coalition
Govt. – Local	Delta Protection Commission
Agriculture	Deseret Farms of California
Consulting	Downey Brand LLP
Environmental	Ducks Unlimited

Table B. Comprehensive List of Stakeholders (contd.)

Category	Organization
Govt. – Local	East Bay Municipal Utility District
Agriculture	East San Joaquin Water Quality Coalition
Environmental	El Dorado County and Georgetown Divide Regional Conservation District
Business	Elliott Homes
Consulting	ENGEO
Environmental	Environmental Defense Fund
Environmental	Environmental Justice Coalition for Water
Agriculture	Families Protecting the Valley
Water Supply	Family Water Alliance
Flood Management	Floodplain Management Association
Elected	Fresno County Board of Supervisors
Agriculture	Fresno County Farm Bureau
Govt. – Local	Fresno County Planning & Public Works
Flood Control	Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District
Recreation	Fresno Trap and Skeet Club
Water Supply	Friant Water Users Authority
Environmental	Friends of the River
Consulting	GEI Consultants
Agriculture	Glenn Colusa Irrigation District
Elected	Glenn County Board of Supervisors
Govt. – Local	Glenn County Department of Agriculture
Flood Control	Glenn County Levee District 1
Flood Control	Glenn County Levee District 2
Govt. – Local	Glenn County Planning & Public Works Agency
Govt. – Local	Glenn County Water Advisory Committee
Tribal	Grindstone Rancheria
Tribal	Habematolel Pomo of Upper Lake
Tribal	Hinthil Environmental Resource Consortium
Nonprofit	Hospital Council of Northern and Central California
Consulting	ICF International
Environmental	Institute for Ecological Health
Tribal	Inter-Tribal Council of California
Consulting	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
Environmental	Kings River Conservation District
Consulting	Kjeldsen, Sinnock, and Neudeck

Table B. Comprehensive List of Stakeholders (contd.)

Category	Organization
Consulting	Kleinfelder Inc.
Flood Management	Knights Landing Ridge Drainage District
Consulting	KSN Inc.
Water Supply	Lake County Flood Control District
Flood Management	Lake County Water Resources Association
Agriculture	Lang Farm
Agriculture	Larrabee Farms
Water Supply	Lathrop Irrigation District
Nonprofit	League of Women Voters
Environmental	Low Flow Alliance
Flood Management	Lower San Joaquin Levee District
Flood Management	Lower Yolo Bypass Planning Forum
Consulting	Lumos and Associates
Agriculture	M&T Ranch
Elected	Madera County Board of Supervisors
Elected	Madera County Board of Supervisors
Govt. – Local	Madera County Resource Management Agency
Govt. – Local	Madera County Water Advisory Commission
Agriculture	Madera Farm Bureau
Water Supply	Madera-Chowchilla Water & Power Authority
Agriculture	Mapes Ranch
Tribal	Mechoopda Indian Tribe
Agriculture	Merced Council for the Central Valley Farmland Trust
Govt. – Local	Merced County Association of Governments
Govt. – Local	Merced County Public Works
Flood Control	Merced County Streams Group
Water Supply	Merced Irrigation District
Water Supply	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
Environmental	Mill Creek Conservancy
Tribal	Nashville-Eldorado Miwoks Tribe
Nonprofit	Natural Heritage Institute
Environmental	Natural Resources Defense Council
Environmental	Natural Resources Institute
Consulting	Newfields
Govt. – Federal	NOAA - National Marine Fisheries Service

Table B. Comprehensive List of Stakeholders (contd.)

Category	Organization
Environmental	North Delta CARES
Tribal	North Fork Mono Tribe
Consulting	North Star Engineering
Environmental	Northern California Conservation Planning Partners
Agriculture	Northern California Water Association
Tribal	Northern Circle Indian Housing Authority
Elected	Office of California Assemblyman Logue
Elected	Office of California Assemblyman Yamada
Elected	Office of California Senator Aanestad
Elected	Office of U.S. Representative Cardoza
Elected	Office of U.S. Representative Matsui
Business	Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations
Business	Pacific Gas and Electric
Consulting	Phillip Williams & Associates
Flood Management	Placer County Flood
Nonprofit	Planning and Conservation League
Recreation	Point Reyes Bird Observatory Conservation Science
Consulting	Praxis Consulting Group Inc.
Consulting	PWA, Ltd. Environmental Hydrology & Geomorphology
Recreation	Recreational Boaters of California
Tribal	Redding Rancheria
Nonprofit	Restore Americas Estuaries
Environmental	Restore the Delta
Elected	Rio Vista City Council
Environmental	Riparian Habitat Joint Venture
Agriculture	River Garden Farms Co.
Environmental	River Islands
Nonprofit	River Partners
Consulting	Roberts ECP
Nonprofit	S.D. Bechtel, Jr. Foundation
Flood Management	Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency
Elected	Sacramento City Council
Govt. – Local	Sacramento County Department of Water Resources
Govt. – Local	Sacramento County Municipal Services Agency
Business	Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce
Tribal	Sacramento Native American Health Center

Table B. Comprehensive List of Stakeholders (contd.)

Category	Organization
Govt. – Local	Sacramento River Conservation Area Forum
Environmental	Sacramento River Preservation Trust
Agriculture	Sacramento River Water Contractors
Flood Management	Sacramento River Westside Levee District
Agriculture	Sacramento Valley Landowner's Association
Flood Management	Sacramento West Side Levee District
Flood Management	San Joaquin Area Flood Control Agency
Govt. – Local	San Joaquin County Advisory Commission
Agriculture	San Joaquin County Farm Bureau
Flood Management	San Joaquin County Flood Management Division
Govt. – Local	San Joaquin County Office of Emergency Services
Govt. – Local	San Joaquin County Public Works
Agriculture	San Joaquin Farm Bureau Federation
Environmental	San Joaquin River Conservancy
Water Supply	San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors Water Authority
Environmental	San Joaquin River Parkway and Trust
Agriculture	San Joaquin River Resource Management Coalition
Environmental	San Joaquin River Resource Management Coalition
Agriculture	San Joaquin Valley Clean Energy organization
Water Supply	San Luis & Delta Mendota Water Authority
Consulting	SAS Strategies
Environmental	Save the American River Association
Consulting	Schaaf and Wheeler
Govt. – Local	Shasta County Public Works
Consulting	Shaw Group
Tribal	Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians
Environmental	Sierra Club
Business	Sierra Holdings
Nonprofit	Sierra Nevada Alliance
Recreation	Snug Harbor Marina
Business	Society of Marketing Professional Services
Govt. – Local	Solano County
Elected	Solano County Board of Supervisors
Agriculture	Solano/Yolo Air Resources Control Board
Water Supply	South Delta Water Agency
Academic/Scientific	Stanford University
Elected	Stanislaus County Board of Supervisors
Govt. – Local	Stanislaus County Planning Department

Table B. Comprehensive List of Stakeholders (contd.)

Category	Organization
Agriculture	Stanislaus Farm Bureau
Consulting	Stantec Consulting
Water Supply	Stevinson Irrigation District
Consulting	Stillwater Sciences
Water Supply	Stockton East Water District
Water Supply	Stony Creek Fan Conjunctive Water Management Group
Consulting	Storm Water Consulting
Flood Management	Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency
Elected	Sutter County Board of Supervisors
Environmental	Sutter County Resource Conservation District
Govt. – Local	Sutter Local Agency Formation Commission
Water Supply	Tehama Colusa Canal Authority
Environmental	Tehama County Resource Conservation District
Environmental	The Nature Conservancy
Flood Management	Three Rivers Levee Improvement Authority
Environmental	Trout Unlimited
Environmental	Trust for Public Land
Govt. – Local	Tulare County Redevelopment Agency
Environmental	Tuolumne River Trust
Water Supply	Turlock Irrigation District
Govt. – Federal	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Govt. – Federal	U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 0001
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 0003
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 0010
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 0017
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 0070
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 0108
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 0150
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 0307
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 0317
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 0341
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 0348
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 0349
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 0369
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 0404
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 0407
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 0501

Table B. Comprehensive List of Stakeholders (contd.)

Category	Organization
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 0524
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 0536
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 0537
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 0544
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 0551
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 0554
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 0556
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 0563
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 0755
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 0765
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 0784
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 0785
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 0787
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 0817
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 0827
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 0828
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 0900
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 0999
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 1000
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 1001
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 1002
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 1004
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 1007
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 1500
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 1600
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 1601
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 1602
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 1660
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 2031
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 2035
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 2058
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 2060
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 2062
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 2063
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 2064
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 2067
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 2068

Table B. Comprehensive List of Stakeholders (contd.)

Category	Organization
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 2074
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 2075
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 2085
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 2089
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 2091
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 2092
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 2094
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 2095
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 2096
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 2098
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 2099
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 2100
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 2101
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 2102
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 2103
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 2104
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 2107
Govt. – Local	Reclamation District 2126
Govt. – Federal	U.S. Department of Agriculture
Govt. – Federal	U.S. Federal Emergency Management Agency
Govt. – Federal	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Govt. – Federal	U.S. Forest Service
Academic/Scientific	University of California - Davis
Academic/Scientific	University of California - San Diego
Academic/Scientific	University of California - Santa Barbara
Govt. – State	University of California Cooperative Extension
Academic/Scientific	University of the Pacific, Natural Resources Institute
Agriculture	Van Ruiten Brothers
Environmental	Water Resources Association of Yolo County
Govt. – Local	Water Resources for Tehama County
Flood Management	West Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency
Consulting	West Yost Associates
Environmental	Western Regional Climate Center
Business	Western States Title Services
Consulting	Westervelt
Tribal	Winneman Wintu Tribe
Consulting	Winzler and Kelly

Table B. Comprehensive List of Stakeholders (contd.)

Category	Organization
Elected	Woodland City Council
Environmental	Yolo Basin Foundation
Elected	Yolo County Board of Supervisors
Govt. – Local	Yolo County Department of Parks and Resources
Agriculture	Yolo County Farm Bureau
Flood Management	Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
Govt. – Local	Yolo County Water Resources Agency
Elected	Yuba County Board of Supervisors
Govt. – Local	Yuba County Public Works

This page left blank intentionally.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
THE NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY
DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES