

CENTRAL VALLEY FLOOD MANAGEMENT PLANNING PROGRAM



Technical Memorandum

CVFPP Phase 1 – External Communication and Engagement Assessment

September 2010

This page left blank intentionally.

This Document Prepared by:

Authors

Principal Author

*Dorian Fougères, Ph.D.
Center for Collaborative
Policy, Sacramento State,
Facilitation Team*

Contributing Authors Facilitation Team

*Sharif Ebrahim, Ben
Gettleman, Pam Jones
Kearns & West*

*Kathryn Cox
Center for Collaborative
Policy, Sacramento State*

*Lisa Beutler
MWH*

Contributing Authors Outreach Team

*Veronica Rodriguez
Ogilvy*

Technical Support

Format & Graphics

*Amy Lehman
MWH
Administrative Assistant*

Editor

*Lisa Beutler
MWH
CVFPP Executive
Facilitator*

This page left blank intentionally.

Executive Summary

The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) is committed to continuous improvement of all aspects of communication and engagement for the Central Valley Flood Management Planning Program (CVFMP) and the resulting Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP). As part of planning for future phases of work, the CVFPP team of contracted neutral mediator-facilitators has conducted an assessment of the current CVFPP communication and engagement process. Assessment goals were to summarize efforts to date, evaluate outcomes, extract key lessons learned and provide recommendations for use in designing future public engagement. A key part of the assessment process involved gathering stakeholder views through meeting discussions, interviews and surveys. Stakeholders offered constructive suggestions for improvement as well as highlighting areas for concern that could potentially affect future project success. CVFPP leadership is using this feedback in its design of future project phases.

Overview and Background

The purpose of the CVFMP is to develop a sustainable, integrated flood management plan for areas protected by facilities of the State-Federal flood protection system in the Central Valley (Valley). Through the CVFPP, DWR seeks to create a broadly agreed to, long-term vision for improving flood management in the Central Valley. DWR believes a well-executed communication and engagement process is essential to project success.

DWR began communication and engagement efforts almost immediately after it was advised of its responsibilities for preparing the CVFPP by meeting with critical interested stakeholders and partners, both in and outside of government, to learn more about their desires for communication and engagement. More than 100 stakeholders were consulted in early 2009 to provide input.

Based on this and other feedback, DWR in June 2009 published a CVFPP Communication and Engagement Framework, which mapped out a systematic and collaborative planning process offering many options and venues for the public to participate. The first participation opportunity took place in spring 2009 when DWR held five Regional Forums in various parts of the CVFPP study area to introduce the project. Starting in August 2009, DWR convened a series of Regional Conditions Work Groups and Topic Work Groups, involving 192 individual stakeholders. Representatives of local governments, flood agencies, landowners, environmental organizations and other interested parties applied or were invited to participate in these work groups.

DWR also gave periodic briefings about the CVFPP and public engagement to Boards of Supervisors, City Councils, interest groups, Tribes and tribal organizations. Presentations were designed to ensure elected officials, interest groups and tribal organizations were aware of the CVFPP and its implications for their communities. A briefing was also conducted for interested legislative staff.

As the first phase of work was concluding, DWR requested that a Phase 1, mid-process assessment be conducted to:

CVFPP Phase 1 – Communication and Engagement Assessment

- Summarize the communication and engagement effort
- Evaluate outcomes
- Extract key lessons learned
- Provide recommendations for use in designing future engagement

Assessment Methodology

Conducted by neutral mediator-facilitators from Kearns & West and the Center for Collaborative Policy, California State University Sacramento, the assessment primarily evaluates the Regional Conditions Work Group (RCWG) and Topic Work Group (TWG) efforts. The bulk of stakeholder views were gathered from December 2009 through March 2010 in structured meeting discussions, interviews, and surveys. Original Assessment questions focused on the provision of meaningful opportunities to collaboratively develop plan content; representation of regional views and interests; process design; facilitation; recording of discussions; access to needed information; lessons learned; and suggestions for improving the effectiveness of the work groups. Of the 192 work group members, 18 participated in the online survey, 24 completed in-depth interviews, and nearly all (approximately 90) RCWG members participated in discussing the topic during a work group meeting. In the few cases where appointed work group members never attended a meeting, facilitators followed-up with them to learn whether they had concerns.

Additional information was generated during Regional Work Group Meeting #8 and post Phase I meetings with various stakeholders. This information, including additional participation is contained in the Assessment Addendum.

Results

Respondents offered constructive suggestions for moving forward into future phases of work, as well as highlighting areas of concern that could potentially affect future project success. Most respondents provided many favorable comments on DWR's efforts to-date, although a handful expressed significant concern and suggested changing the approach to meetings and the process as a whole. The assessment does include a cautionary tale: most stakeholders reserved judgment about DWR's commitment to the process until they could see the Regional Conditions Summary Report and had been briefed on the next phase of work. Comments and suggestions emphasized by work group participants follow.

Suggestions for future project phases included:

- DWR must ensure there is a clear explanation of why participant-generated information is important and how it is to be used -- this is critical to keeping people involved. They suggested that DWR leadership begin by demonstrating directly the relevance of stakeholder and partner participation and the value of continued engagement, particularly since members volunteered their time.

- DWR will need to be mindful that transparency will become even more important during the next phase of work, when multiple, competing options generated by stakeholders will have to be weighed and the process becomes more contentious. Members expressed concern that Phase I work group efforts on goals and objectives might not be incorporated into future work products.
- At the start of Phase II, a clear process for working together and completing the plan must be laid out. It was suggested that this include practical items like the schedule, work objectives, expected products and their use, and expected level of effort. DWR should provide greater detail on major steps, work product integration, and what will occur after management actions are identified.

Comments on Phase 1

- **Representation, Participation, and Roles** – While complimentary of DWR’s commitment to engagement and efforts to be inclusive, a variety of group members highlighted that some interests or technical perspectives are currently missing from their work group and made suggestions for filling those gaps. Several respondents were concerned that major State and federal agencies were missing from discussions or missed multiple meetings. Several noted that an environmental perspective was sometimes missing. Many RCWG members felt that participation dwindled over time due to what they believed were concerns about the lack of incorporation of feedback, and the number of meetings. Scattered concerns were raised that some comments were largely ignored, not seriously addressed, or misrepresented. These participants sought clarification on how comments on draft documents are processed
- **Pacing and Work Volume** – Many participants commented that Phase I pacing and volume of work were not sustainable. They felt the accelerated timeframe did not allow for sustained participation or enable the refinement needed to produce high-quality, balanced deliverables. All respondents recognized the constraints driven by external deadlines and several suggested that deadlines be revisited. Most stakeholders offered constructive suggestions for reducing meeting length, including pre-working some materials for group review, instead of the group attempting to create information in the meeting. Several suggested distributing documents further in advance and extending comment periods to enable members to review and thoughtfully comment on the large amount of material.
- **Meeting Support and Process Design** – Aside from pacing and work volume, most respondents gave meeting support and the general process design positive marks.
- **Work Product Integration** – The majority of RCWG and TWG members were unaware of, or confused by efforts to integrate input from various work groups in the Regional Conditions Report, and integrate the CVFPP development process with parallel policy efforts. Most noted they were frequently unclear about whether or how work group product integration was taking place. Because stakeholders have not yet seen final work products, it was difficult for them to assess the degree that information generated across all work groups had been integrated. The original work group process design included the use of a Valleywide forum to share this type

CVFPP Phase 1 – Communication and Engagement Assessment

of information, but the forum has been postponed. Most stakeholders felt integration was an important issue that should be addressed, as clear integration of their input would demonstrate that their work had value.

- **Key Challenges** – Participants identified challenges for future CVFPP development, particularly in the development of management actions. Most stakeholder recommendations were tactical, specific, and related to process design.
- **Key Messages and Suggested Strategies** – 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. They affirmed the importance of early and routine local government engagement for building advocacy, overcoming resistance to change, and ensuring successful implementation. They also highlighted the need for broader communications to the general public on flood issues. In addition, they emphasized that key messages must directly address sensitive local concerns, including fears that the State is passing liability onto local government, that government will take land, or that local concerns will be unaddressed or misrepresented by the CVFPP.

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Results provided by stakeholders, while largely positive, included some significant reservations that must be addressed in future phases of work. Additionally, perspectives gathered during the assessment process, while sometimes hard hitting, offered a number of well considered recommendations.

Based on stakeholder input and additional input provided by staff and project contractors, this assessment offers findings and recommendations that identify current effective efforts that warrant continuation, and target areas for improvement.

The following summarizes key issues to be considered in future project phases.

- **Transparency** – For project success, DWR must continue to be transparent in all aspects of project management. This includes better articulating and defining roles and responsibilities, as well as disclosing data development approaches, planning assumptions and decision-making processes. DWR should appropriately establish what decision areas will remain with the agency and announce and discuss this in advance of any decisions.
- **Time and Resources** – Stakeholders expressed the need to operate from realistic timeframes and deadlines. Resources to support plan development and stakeholder engagement must continue to be consistent, and scopes of work should be reflective of resource realities. The Phase 1 pace and volume of work was considered not sustainable and needs to be re-scoped. Numerous recommendations are offered to address this concern and improve meeting and process efficiencies. Ideas include reducing the length of Work Group meetings and better utilizing meeting time by focusing on critical deliverables. Other suggestions include creating

more sub-committees, pre-working and presenting select draft concepts for group discussion, better using web based tools, and better utilizing personnel assigned to support the stakeholder functions. These recommendations should be incorporated into future project design. Further, time is a critical risk factor for communications. Failure to communicate in a timely way and provide fresh material for review can lead stakeholders to believe DWR is not committed to transparency, resulting in a loss of goodwill developed to date.

- **Clearly Defined Executive Sponsorship and Decision Authority** – Clear policy direction, agency support and decision authority is essential to CVFPP. Numerous issues and recommendations for improvement are offered. Clear decision authority is essential to producing timely communication.
- **Clear Project Plans and Approaches** – Stakeholders emphasized the importance of a clear, publicized project plan, and specifically discussed actions needed to support the development of management actions. Future communication and engagement should be tightly aligned with producing plan deliverables. Communications goals, objectives and assumptions should be transparent and understood by all participants.
- **Broader Stakeholder Outreach** – Stakeholders appreciated efforts to date and expressed a need for an even more expansive outreach to build CVFPP support. In addition to sharing the broader FloodSAFE message with the general public, special attention must be made to engage local opinion leaders. Early and regular communications will ensure that local decision makers are not surprised by plan direction, allow project concerns to surface early so they can be addressed, and make certain that stakeholders impacted by the CVFPP understand the consequences of not moving forward with system improvements.
- **Best Practices** – Communication and engagement and project management practices are well known and should be intentionally incorporated in future phases of work. A method for monitoring and reporting performance metrics should be instituted.

Assessment Addendum

Additional content was added to the assessment based on a series of meetings that happened subsequent to the document's original draft. Interviews and comments from stakeholders captured during Meeting 8 of the Regional Conditions Workgroup, the Agricultural Subcommittee, feedback given from Environmental Interest groups and the results of two additional stakeholder meetings with the project team have been added.

Overall, work groups in Meeting 8 felt strongly that there was not enough representation by the Army Corps of Engineers. They were also felt the work pace was too rigorous.

Participants of the Agricultural (Ag) Subcommittee thought that DWR did a good job of engaging appropriate stakeholders but were sometimes critical of the tone of the meetings with some expressing skepticism about the process' neutrality.

CVFPP Phase 1 – Communication and Engagement Assessment

Following release of the CVFPP Interim Progress Summary (IPS) No.1, the CVFPP project team was contacted by several stakeholder participants with concerns regarding the nature and findings of the IPS No.1. While the IPS No. 1, due to its interim nature, will not be revised all agreed stakeholder comments were highly important in progressing towards meaningful stakeholder participation and progressive Project/Plan development. It was also noted that the CVFPP Phase 1 Project Assessment was specifically designed to document the perspectives of stakeholders regarding work to date and creates a reference point for future project phases.

In general, these stakeholders were dissatisfied with the lack of inclusion of some of the important issues raised during the Phase 1 meetings, the discussion process, and the characterization of the “Level of Agreement” Section of the IPS. They provided comments and suggestions for places throughout the document that they felt did not acknowledge their perspective and/or understated their concerns. This information, along with other information gathered in this Phase 1 Assessment will be considered in future phases of project/plan development.

Conclusions

The communication and engagement function is critical to overall project success. This assessment has validated the importance of DWR's effort to work with stakeholders to achieve good CVFPP outcomes. CVFPP project leadership is utilizing feedback gathered by this assessment to enhance its design of future phases of work.

Table of Contents

1.0	Assessment Goals and Purpose.....	1-1
2.0	CVFPP Communication and Engagement.....	2-1
2.1	Background and Overview	2-1
2.2	Environmental Scan	2-2
2.3	Initial Internal Review	2-2
2.4	Design Phase Stakeholder Input	2-2
2.5	Regional Forums	2-3
2.6	Regional and Topic Work Groups.....	2-3
2.7	Briefings	2-4
2.8	Valley Wide Forum	2-4
3.0	Phase 1 Assessment – Scope	3-1
3.1	About Assessments.....	3-1
4.0	Methodology	4-1
4.1	Work Group External Participants	4-1
4.1.1	Regional Conditions Work Groups.....	4-1
4.1.2	Topic Work Groups.....	4-1
4.1.3	Absentee Group Members.....	4-2
4.2	Briefings	4-2
4.2.1	Jurisdictions	4-2
4.2.2	Tribes.....	4-2
4.2.3	Interest-Based Groups.....	4-2
5.0	Assessment Results	5-1
5.1	Overarching Comments.....	5-1
5.2	Representation, Participation, and Roles	5-3
5.2.1	Pacing and Work Volume	5-3
5.3	Meeting Support and Process Design	5-4
5.3.1	Work Product Integration	5-5

**CVFPP Phase 1 – Communication
and Engagement Assessment**

5.4	Key Challenges	5-6
5.5	Key Messages and Suggested Outreach Strategy	5-8
5.6	Briefings Recap	5-9
5.7	Local Jurisdictions	5-9
5.7.1	Tribes.....	5-10
5.7.2	Interest Based Groups.....	5-10
5.8	Assessment Addendum: Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting 8 Summary.....	5-10
5.8.1	Representation, Participation and Roles.....	5-11
5.8.2	Pacing and Work Volume	5-11
5.8.3	Responsiveness to Comments	5-11
5.8.4	Key Gaps.....	5-11
5.8.5	Specific comments on the IPS #1	5-12
5.8.6	Specific Comments on the RCSR.....	5-12
5.9	Assessment Addendum: Phase 1 Completion Briefings Recap	5-13
5.9.1	Lower San Joaquin County Staff / San Joaquin Area Flood Control Agency	5-13
5.9.2	Environmental Interests (American Rivers, The Nature Conservancy, Natural Resources Defense Council).....	5-14
5.10	Assessment Addendum: Agricultural Subcommittee Assessment Survey and Interview	5-14
5.10.1	Overarching Comments.....	5-14
5.10.2	Representation, Participation.....	5-14
5.10.3	Process and Facilitation.....	5-15
5.10.4	Level of Engagement and Stakeholder Outreach	5-15
5.10.5	Recording Member Feedback.....	5-16
5.11	Assessment Addendum Stakeholder Supplemental Review	5-16
6.0	Analysis, Findings, and Recommendations	6-1
6.1	Summary of Findings and Recommendations.....	6-1
6.1.1	Transparency and Comment Tracking.....	6-1
6.1.2	Time and Resources.....	6-1
6.1.3	Clearly Defined Executive Sponsorship and Decision Authority	6-2
6.1.4	Clear Project Plans and Approaches	6-2
6.1.5	Broader Stakeholder Outreach	6-2
6.1.6	Performance Metrics for Monitoring Best Practices	6-3

7.0 Conclusion..... 7-1

8.0 Acronyms and Abbreviations..... 8-1

List of Tables

Table 4-1. Jurisdiction Briefings..... 4-3

List of Attachments

Attachment A: January 2009 Design Phase Stakeholder QuestionsA-1

Attachment B: RCWG Meeting 7 Process Goals Discussion Questions
and TWG On-line Survey TopicsB-1

Attachment C: Interview Questions for Individual RCWG and TWG
Work Group Members C-1

Attachment D: List of Design Phase and Phase 1 Assessment Interview
Participants..... D-1

Attachment E – Addendum Meeting Notes.....E-1

This page left blank intentionally.

1.0 Assessment Goals and Purpose

The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) is committed to continuous improvement of all aspects of communication and engagement for the Central Valley Flood Management Planning Program (CVFMP). This mid-process assessment summarizes the communication and engagement process used to date for the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP) and summarizes input from stakeholders on their assessment of Phase I and recommendations for Phase II. The assessment evaluates outcomes, extracts key lessons learned from the initial Design Phase and Phase I of the process, and provides recommendations for use in designing future public engagement.

The assessment is organized by the following sections:

- **CVFPP Communication and Engagement** – Provides a recap of project communication and engagement efforts to date, including initial outreach to assist in the project communication and engagement Design Phase.
- **Phase One Assessment Scope** – Outlines the project elements that were considered in preparing the assessment.
- **Methodology** – Describes the methodology used to gather input from project stakeholders and partners.
- **Assessment Results** – Summarizes the feedback provided by stakeholders and partners.
- **Findings and Recommendations** – Analyzes information reviewed and recommends next steps for project development, project communications and risk management associated with the communication and engagement effort.

The document Attachments include documentation of key review areas considered during the assessment process.

This page left blank intentionally.

2.0 CVFPP Communication and Engagement

2.1 Background and Overview

This section summarizes plan communication and engagement efforts to date.

The purpose of the CVFMP is to develop a sustainable, integrated flood management plan for areas protected by facilities of the State-Federal flood protection system in the Central Valley. The program is one of several DWR is implementing within FloodSAFE California to accomplish, in part, the goals of Propositions 1E and 84. The CVFMP consists of two primary projects: the State Plan of Flood Control and the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan.

DWR seeks to develop a CVFPP that establishes a broadly agreed-to, long-term vision for improving flood management in the Central Valley. The CVFPP will describe current flood risk; define goals, objectives, and constraints important in the planning process; identify potential plan elements; and recommend improvements to the State-Federal flood management system aimed at reducing the risk of Central Valley flooding.

DWR has focused CVFMP communication and engagement efforts on working with others to conduct, support, and improve integrated flood management planning to address risk and improve system performance in the Sacramento and San Joaquin valleys. General tactics have included:

- Creating strong working partnerships among the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE); the Central Valley Flood Protection Board (Board); DWR local flood project maintaining agencies; resource agencies; and other State, federal, tribal, regional, and local flood protection interests
- Improving public agency and constituent group understanding of flood risks by evaluating the existing State-federal flood management systems
- Fostering widespread participation in the development of the CVFPP and building broad support for it
- Developing a sustainable plan that addresses long-term maintenance costs and reduces conflicts

- Initiating and maintaining dialogue with critical stakeholders and partners

The communication and engagement effort to date has included the following components:

2.2 Environmental Scan

Prior to developing any engagement structure, key DWR representatives met with critical interested stakeholders and partners, both in and outside of government, to learn more about their desire for engagement and to discuss potential approaches. The purpose of this *environmental scan* is to assess aspects of the larger policy environment that may impact planning efforts. These conversations helped frame the DWR team’s initial thinking. In deference to direct feedback from some partners, DWR eliminated use of the term *stakeholder* and replaced it with the term *partner* in most communication and engagement materials.

2.3 Initial Internal Review

In internal meetings and workshops in January 2009, DWR staff reviewed the engagement approach and assessed challenges. The proposed communication and engagement approach dramatically exceeded the level of external interaction typically used by the DWR for similar efforts. While the organizational leadership believed this expanded approach would be necessary for a successful outcome, the project leadership understood this was a significant undertaking.

2.4 Design Phase Stakeholder Input

As a result of the anticipated challenges, DWR directed contracting communication and engagement specialists, along with a few key personnel, to formally solicit input about engagement from representatives of a variety of interests and communities throughout the Central Valley (Valley) so the process would reflect the ideas, needs, and concerns of the people who should be involved. More than 100 interviews were conducted in January-February 2009. See Attachment A for a list of interview questions. Individuals interviewed are listed in Attachment D.

Based on this input, DWR in June 2009 published a Communication and Engagement Framework, which serves as DWR’s “contract” with its

stakeholders for how communication and engagement will be conducted over the course of the program.

DWR also adopted a systematic and collaborative planning process that offers many options and venues for participation, as described in the Framework. Goals include:

- Promote broad public understanding of flood management challenges and threats to agricultural, rural, and urban areas in the Central Valley, with a special emphasis on areas receiving protection from the State-Federal flood protection system
- Create a variety of opportunities for efficient, collaborative planning
- Ensure the relevance of, and increase support for, the CVFPP through broad participation of partners and interested parties

2.5 Regional Forums

DWR launched the stakeholder process in late spring 2009 by holding five Regional Forums across the Valley to build understanding about the program and solicit stakeholder participation. Information gathered at the forums was used to refine concepts for work groups and identify potential participants.

2.6 Regional and Topic Work Groups

Beginning in August 2009, DWR convened a series of Regional Conditions Work Groups and Topic Work Groups, involving more than 190 stakeholders. By the end of Phase I, the work groups were:

- Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group (RCWG)
- Lower Sacramento RCWG
- Delta RCWG
- Lower San Joaquin RCWG
- Upper San Joaquin RCWG
- Climate Change Topic Work Group (TWG)
- Levee Performance TWG
- Operations and Maintenance TWG
- Environmental Stewardship TWG
- Agricultural Stewardship TWG

Work group members representing local governments, flood agencies, landowners, environmental organizations and other interested parties were either selected from the applicant pool or recruited if a particular stakeholder perspective appeared to be missing in a group. Charters for each group identified participant roles and decision-making protocols. All volunteers were offered an opportunity to be involved, although some applicants were encouraged to participate in groups for which they had not originally volunteered.

Charters directed each group to seek broad agreement on key ideas. If various perspectives did not agree, DWR asked that differences be recorded as part of the draft content for the Regional Conditions Report.

Work Group planning was led by a team consisting of executive sponsors, Central Valley Flood Planning Office (CVFPO) leads, DWR leads, technical leads and staff and contractor communication and engagement personnel.

Regional Conditions Work Group Meetings were initially conducted on a bi-weekly basis. In recognition of the not insignificant demands on participants, DWR later revised the schedule to monthly meetings and emphasized creating draft content for stakeholder review and discussion. Topic work groups met three or more times, depending on the complexity of issues being addressed.

2.7 Briefings

Communication and engagement also includes periodic brief presentations about the CVFPP and the public engagement process to local governments, interest groups, Tribes and tribal organizations representing regions in the study area, to ensure members of these organizations were aware of the CVFPP and its implications for their region, and to publicize opportunities for involvement in plan development.

2.8 Valley Wide Forum

DWR hosted a Valleywide Forum in June 2010. The purpose of the Forum was to bring together individuals from all the project area regions to share information about CVFPP progress and improve integration of information.

3.0 Phase 1 Assessment – Scope

As the first phase of work was concluding, DWR requested that a Phase 1, mid-process, assessment be conducted to:

- Summarize the communication and engagement effort
- Evaluate outcomes
- Extract key lessons learned
- Provide recommendations for use in designing future engagement

3.1 About Assessments

Assessments are routinely utilized to organize or refine stakeholder processes. The goal is to gather information needed to create useful outcomes for both the sponsoring agency and participants. Mid-process assessments typically evaluate efforts underway and inform future phases of work and/or, as necessary, a restructuring of current processes.

Assessments can be conducted by government officials or community representatives but in situations involving some potential for conflict or historic stakeholder concerns, a neutral third party, such as a mediator-facilitator, typically conducts the assessment. In general, this approach encourages more candid feedback.

A key principle of assessments conducted by neutrals is the need for confidentiality. This is done by reporting findings in the aggregate rather than as individual statements, unless a party explicitly agrees to be quoted. This in turn encourages feedback that is accurate and strengthens conditions for future interaction.

This page left blank intentionally.

4.0 Methodology

In order to create process improvements for future phases of work, the Phase 1 Assessment primarily focused on evaluating work group efforts. The assessment was conducted by the Facilitation Team (FT) which includes neutral mediator-facilitators from Kearns & West¹ and the Center for Collaborative Policy, California State University, Sacramento.²

The Assessment also utilizes information developed in early project phases and summarizes findings from briefings held with:

- Local Governments and Districts
- Tribes and Tribal Interests
- Legislative Staff
- Interested Organizations

4.1 Work Group External Participants

4.1.1 Regional Conditions Work Groups

The RCWGs include approximately 90 public members from throughout the project area. The RCWG assessment employed meeting discussions, interviews, and surveys to solicit input directly from work group members. Each of the five RCWGs dedicated a portion of their second to last meeting to this purpose, and facilitators followed up with absentees by email. In addition, facilitators interviewed two to five representatives from each of the RCWGs with more in-depth questions and offered that anyone who would like to be interviewed could participate. The assessment results were reviewed during the last RCWG meetings that occurred in late April / early May 2010. Copies of Assessment questions discussed in the group meetings and interviews are provided in Attachment B and C.

4.1.2 Topic Work Groups

At the time of the assessment, most TWGs had already completed their work. Facilitators interviewed two to four opinion leaders from each of the TWGs³ with the expanded questions used in the RCWG interviews (See Attachment C). In addition, facilitators invited TWG members to complete an on-line survey tool that included questions mirroring those used during

¹ For more information about Kearns and West see: <http://www.kearnswest.com>.

² For more information about the Center for Collaborative Policy, Sacramento State, see <http://www.csus.edu/ccp>.

³ No additional interviews were conducted with the Agricultural Sub-Committee as most members had already participated in either the TWG or RCWG survey or interview process.

discussions at the RCWG meetings (See Attachment B) and invited anyone wishing to be interviewed to participate in that process as well. Of the 112 TWG members, 18 participants provided feedback on-line.

4.1.3 Absentee Group Members

In the few cases where appointed work group members never attended a meeting, facilitators followed up with them to identify whether they had concerns about the process. They were invited to recommend someone else who might represent their perspective.

All together, 24 RCWG and TWG members completed in-depth interviews. This constitutes slightly more than one-eighth of the 192 members. A list of individuals interviewed is contained in Attachment D.

4.2 Briefings

As mentioned previously, brief presentations about the CVFPP and public engagement process were made to Boards of Supervisors, City Councils, interest groups, Tribes and tribal organizations representing regions in the study area.

4.2.1 Jurisdictions

Presentations and/or small group meetings were conducted in 2009 with many local jurisdictions. Table 4-1 lists the locations.

4.2.2 Tribes

A robust list of Tribes and Tribal organizations was developed using the database started for California Water Plan outreach. Top priority for outreach was Tribes with current representation in the Central Valley and organizations representing a variety of Tribes. Each top priority Tribe or organization was contacted with the offer of a presentation. In 2009 presentations were made to two organizations, the Inter-Tribal Council of California and California Basket Weavers. Both organizations include a significant number of Tribal members with potential interest in the CVFPP study area.

4.2.3 Interest-Based Groups

Interest-based groups as referenced in the Communication and Engagement efforts are organizations serving groups of people with common interests in topics relevant to the CVFPP. These groups may have a statewide reach or a local focus. They also exist independently outside of the CVFPP process. A list of more than 100 relevant interest based groups has been developed for this process. The CVFPP management team determined top priority

groups based on research and work group member input. The following organizations received a briefing or presentation during 2009:

- California Special Districts Association
- Sacramento Metro Chamber
- Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA)
- Great Valley Center

Table 4-1. Jurisdiction Briefings

Colusa County	Presentation to Board of Supervisors - Staff attended BOS presentation.
Contra Costa County	Call with Board Chair and Presentation to Board of Supervisors
Fresno County	Call with Board Chair Meeting with staff
Madera County	Call with Board Chair, Meeting with Water Advisory Commission. Presentation to Board of Supervisors
Merced County	Meeting with staff
Sacramento (City of)	Meeting with staff.
Shasta County	Call with Planning Director
Stanislaus County	Presentation to Board of Supervisors
Sutter County	Presentation to Board of Supervisors
Sutter/Butte Flood Agency	Meeting with staff
Woodland (City of)	Presentation to City Council
Yolo County	Call with Board Chair

Assessment Addendum

Additional information was generated during Regional Work Group Meeting #8 and post Phase I meetings with various stakeholders. This information, including additional participation is contained in the Assessment Addendum.

This page left blank intentionally.

5.0 Assessment Results

Respondents offered constructive suggestions for moving forward into future phases of work, as well as highlighting areas of concern that could potentially affect future project success.

Most respondents provided many favorable comments on DWR's efforts to-date, although a handful expressed significant concern and suggested changing the approach to meetings and the process as a whole.

The assessment does include a cautionary tale: most stakeholders reserved judgment about DWR's commitment to the process, deferring until they could see the Regional Conditions Summary Report and they had been briefed on the next phase of work. The Assessment Addendum (sections 5.8 through 5.10) summarizes the feedback stakeholders provided on the Report and Interim Progress Summary #1.

For the purpose of review, work group comments from all sources were summarized by the facilitation team into the following categories:

- Overarching Comments
- Representation, Participation and Roles
- Pacing and Work Volume
- Meeting Support and Process Design
- Work Product Integration
- Key Challenges
- Key Messages and Suggested Strategies

5.1 Overarching Comments

Overall, RCWG and TWG participants said they valued the effort DWR made to include people who could represent different regions, interests, expertise, and perspectives. Respondents felt that DWR expressed genuine interest in engaging them and soliciting their ideas. They contrasted this with other flood planning efforts, which they criticized as having been developed without local stakeholder participation.

Almost all respondents expressed some degree of positive feedback and support of the process. This support extended to each of the major topics covered in this assessment (representation, materials, process design, and facilitation). They viewed the process as having made a good start and heading in the right direction, and they generally found DWR and MWH staff and facilitators responsive to participants. Members also offered

constructive recommendations for how the process might be improved. A handful of respondents expressed significant dissatisfaction, and suggested alterations to the approach to meetings and the process as a whole.

Numerous RCWG members made it clear that they will judge the meaningfulness and effectiveness of the process based on the final Regional Conditions Report and how well it incorporates their group's ideas. (See the Assessment Addendum, sections 5.8 through 5.10.)

In scattered responses, some participants perceived that some comments – from individual groups, multiple regions, and/or minority perspectives – were largely ignored or not addressed seriously. In some cases they felt that comments and the group's perspective were misrepresented.

These participants requested clarification of how comments on draft documents are processed and who processes them. Some respondents felt that the importance of consensus and a genuine sense of collaboration have been understated, and that DWR must explain revisions it makes to what participants view as previously agreed-upon documents.

Suggestions for the future project phases included:

- DWR must ensure there is a clear explanation of why participant-generated information is important and how it is to be used. Respondents view this as critical to keeping people involved. It will also be important if DWR plans to bring new public work group members on board. They suggested that DWR leadership begin by demonstrating directly the relevance of stakeholder and partner participation and the value of continued engagement, particularly since members volunteered their time.
- DWR must maintain and improve transparency, especially in the next phase as competing options generated by stakeholders have to be weighed. Both RCWG and TWG members expressed concern that their group's goals and objectives, generated and documented during Phase I, would not be substantively incorporated in the management actions developed during the Phase II, and the rationale for their omission would not be shared.
- A clear process for working together and completing the plan must be laid out at the start of developing management actions. This should include items like the schedule, work objectives, expected products and their use, and expected level of effort. Furthermore, it was suggested that DWR provide greater detail on major steps, work product

integration, and what will occur after management actions are identified.

5.2 Representation, Participation, and Roles

Participants generally approved of work group composition, perceiving that DWR made an effort to reach out to a range of interests, and that this demonstrated respect for local knowledge and history. However, several RCWG and TWG members felt that interests and/or major players were missing, had weak attendance, or were not adequately represented. Several noted that an environmental perspective was sometimes missing.

Numerous RCWG members also said that participation dwindled as the process moved forward, due to what they believed were concerns about the lack of incorporation of feedback, and the number and frequency of meetings. Additionally, most work groups had one or two people who applied and were appointed as members but never attended a meeting.⁴

Several RCWG and TWG members expressed a need for greater clarity on participant roles. This included requesting better definition of DWR staff roles. In particular, it was noted that DWR executive sponsors had different styles of engagement, some more directive and others more suggestive, and this was confusing. Finally, the way visiting members of the public were expected to participate was not always clear.

5.2.1 Pacing and Work Volume

Numerous respondents said meetings were too frequent and too long, and felt the accelerated CVFPP timeframe eroded participation and quality. It was noted that local agencies could not afford to allocate large amounts of staff time to the project, as DWR could. Several requested morning meetings of 4-5 hours in length, held in more accessible locations. Many felt the schedule was unrealistic, did not allow for sustained participation or meaningful review of the significant volume of materials, and did not allocate sufficient time to produce high-quality, balanced products.

RCWG participants generally praised the sharing and quality of information, and valued the opportunity to comment directly on materials at meetings. At the same time, numerous members felt overwhelmed by the volume of material. The range of materials – including multiple

⁴ Based on phone conversations and electronic surveys, the main reasons for non-participation were schedule conflicts and confidence that their interests were being represented by others at the table.

revisions of documents – made it hard to track documents, to organize them, and to thoughtfully comment on them in discussions.

Suggestions for improving distribution and review of documents included releasing all meeting materials two weeks before each meeting and providing a venue to submit electronic comments in advance of group discussions. The comment system would allow staff to highlight themes and differing perspectives in order to create more robust discussion during plenary sessions.

Several suggested a more cohesive comment process might be to get agreement on the main concepts that will shape each document, focus on the most important issues, be more strategic about requests for comments, and provide more complete drafts to review. These members highlighted the ability to specify what decisions need to be made, and how this will occur as a strength of other processes such as the CALFED Bay-Delta Program (CALFED).

5.3 Meeting Support and Process Design

Members generally praised meeting summaries. Several, however, said the nuances of discussions were not always captured in resulting summaries. Suggestions for improvement included using redline documents to track changes, revising documents on-screen rather than on flipcharts, and headlining emails with concise, indicative subject lines.

Members were generally happy with meeting facilitation. They felt the facilitators created a positive, supportive atmosphere for conversation, and that members had sufficient opportunities to voice concerns and input. They felt this was a distinct improvement over previous DWR flood planning efforts.

Specific concerns about facilitation included:

- A few participants dominated discussion and led the group discussions astray
- Technical information was sometimes poorly delivered and confusing
- Too much time was spent on housekeeping issues (e.g., reviewing action items, meeting summaries) and discussing the process, and not enough time on critical issues that need group input

- Too much time was spent rehashing ideas and debates from previous meetings
- In a few instances, key issues were glossed over and underlying issues left unexplored, or the facilitator intervened too often, stifled discussion, or lead discussion down a pre-determined path.
- Most participants felt the process design was effective for Phase I tasks, and that DWR and consultants responded well to needs for adjustment. A few common concerns and recommendations included:
 - Several RCWG and TWG members worried that in the next phases the project might try to encompass too much, and end up doing few things effectively (this was a lesson from the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins Comprehensive Study (Comprehensive Study)). Some suggested designing future work to focus more narrowly on critical issues, or areas at highest risk.
 - Several members praised small group work and requested more. (Note: this request was predicated on the large group providing the small group some autonomy and authority, and not repeating the small group's discussion.) Conversely, a few members believed that full group discussions were more valuable.
 - Several RCWG members suggested that subcommittees or sub-groups be created to take on particular tasks (e.g., issues teams, functional groups), especially if these required technical expertise. They felt DWR and its consultants could resolve disagreements as necessary.
 - Several participants suggested a need to plan for moving to larger watersheds, combining rivers' upper and lower reaches.

5.3.1 Work Product Integration

The majority of RCWG and TWG members were unaware of, or confused by efforts to integrate input from the various work groups into the Regional Conditions Report (RCR), and integrate the CVFPP development process with parallel policy efforts. Most noted the lack of distinct activities to bring work group representatives together. They felt that clear integration of their input would demonstrate that their work had value. Furthermore, they felt that for the CVFPP to be successful, it must be internally coherent (i.e., all parts of the plan must support one another) and well-coordinated with other major policy initiatives.

In considering these comments it should be noted most RCWG members had not seen comprehensive draft RCR text. Second, many TWG products, aside from the work of the Environmental Stewardship TWG, will not be integrated until future phases. Although a few participants noted that it was difficult to track how their comments were incorporated, most of these group members felt that a good effort was made to integrate their concepts (although still expressed concern about whether later documents would continue to reflect their input).

The varied exposure to draft text should be kept in mind when reading this section, as it may help to explain some of the concerns about integration.

- In terms of integration across regions, several RCWG members felt that the lack of interaction and information exchange between work groups made it difficult to understand other regional proposals and connections between geographic areas, and reconcile different regional perspectives.
- In terms of integration across topic and regional work groups, several RCWG members felt that topical work group input, including goals and objectives, was missing from the draft Regional Conditions Report they saw. Some suggested that TWG representatives attend RCWG meetings to ensure that technical content is incorporated and that RCWGs receive the information they need.
- TWG members expressed concern about the need to integrate so many technically complex issues. It was felt that a group effort would probably be more effective than DWR doing this alone.
- All-Regions Meetings were suggested as a strategy for developing shared meaning and recognizing that interests can be compatible, that opportunities exist, and that this is a comprehensive, Valley-wide plan.
- Numerous RCWG and TWG members emphasized that integration must also take place with parallel planning processes, planning venues, and agency activities. Examples included the Bay-Delta Conservation Plan, the State Water Resources Control Board's Delta efforts, the Delta Five-County Technical Advisory Committee, and the Interim Federal Action Plan. It was felt that the relevance of the CVFPP to these efforts has not been adequately emphasized.

5.4 Key Challenges

RCWG and TWG respondents noted a number of key challenges facing Phase II of the CVFPP:

- Management actions must be realistic and tailored to site-specific conditions. The documents should specify exactly how work will get done, as most proposed actions will not be new ideas, but efforts that have failed in the past due to insufficiently detailed plans for implementation.
- Appropriate expectations for the CVFPP must be set. It must be flexible enough to evolve as levees age, climate change progresses and new science, methods and data become available. The impacts of climate change will need to be regularly assessed. The public needs to be informed that flood planning is not a one-shot deal.
- DWR must inform and consult with local government decision-makers in a meaningful way. This will be critical to achieving Phase II management actions and implementation that are politically viable. The lack of such engagement was seen as the Comprehensive Study's fatal flaw, and there is significant local government opposition to the legislation's aim of 200-year flood protection. Some suggested that local government representatives be added to the CVFPP Plan Development Team.
- All RCWG/TWG members must actively and openly communicate CVFMP issues with their management and constituencies. Because management actions will be site specific, local landowners and similarly affected stakeholders must be involved as early as possible to build a foundation of trust and communication, and thus to ensure effective implementation.
- The lack of public awareness about the severity of flood threats, and how public actions shaped these threats, is another major challenge.
- For effective implementation, grant programs should issue funds based on regional and state needs, rather than those first in line with grant writing expertise.
- The objectives could be infeasible, too costly – particularly for rural counties – or incompatible or inapplicable across different regions. Care must be taken to balance all of the uses of the flood control system, and work group members must have a clear and shared understanding of what the objectives mean.
- Two major levee engineering uncertainties, hydraulic modeling and existing levee conditions, could undermine the project even if planning is done perfectly. The lack of an established hydraulic model and corresponding water surface elevations makes it impossible to

accurately identify the desired level of protection for each levee and the associated levee conditions. A lack of accurate information about existing levee conditions and problems confound repair efforts.

- In terms of climate change, members noted the high likelihood of a mismatch between short-term management actions and long-term climatic phenomenon, and said uncertainties about climate change will cause continuing difficulty in creating useful scenarios for flood planning and management.

5.5 Key Messages and Suggested Outreach Strategy

RCWG and TWG members noted that deadlines of 2015 and 2025 for making adequate progress toward 200-year flood protection⁵ seem far away, and the CVFPP must be made real for the public. DWR must be able to explain:

- The main issues that are being addressed
- How the CVFPP will benefit and impact the public (e.g., public safety, taxes)
- How the CVFPP will affect other flood and water policy funding
- How the CVFPP will immediately affect growth and development

RCWG and TWG members emphasized that messaging must directly address sensitive local concerns, including fears that the state is passing liability on to local government, that government will take land from property owners, and that local concerns will be misrepresented, discredited, or not addressed in the CVFPP. RCWG and TWG members had numerous suggestions for outreach and communication strategies, including how to share draft management actions and work products with affected constituencies. These included:

- Target decision-makers – mayors, boards of supervisors, public works departments, reclamation districts, etc.

⁵ Senate Bill 5 (i.e., Government Code Section 65865.6, 65962, 66474.5) requires urban and urbanizing areas in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley to have adequate progress toward 200-year flood protection by 2015 in order to continue development in the floodplain. Urban and urbanizing areas protected by State-Federal project levees in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley will need to achieve 200-year flood protection by 2025 in order to continue development in the 200-year floodplain.

- Target landowners and land management agencies
- Use multiple forums – not just presenting at public forums, but attending farm bureau meetings, briefing reclamation districts, leveraging resource conservation districts, etc.
- Identify key leaders in the agricultural community and work with them
- Develop a newsletter for reclamation districts to increase their awareness and engage them in developing management actions
- Record or webcast forums so they are more accessible
- Start early on this – multiple forums should be engaged well before the end of Phase Two

5.6 Briefings Recap

In order to inform the assessment, the Ogilvy communications consultant team reviewed notes from sessions held during the briefings described earlier in Section 4.3. Following are key findings from those interactions.

5.7 Local Jurisdictions

While each jurisdiction noted some areas of concern with the presentation content, representatives expressed appreciation for the meetings and/or presentations and asked to be kept informed. Common local jurisdiction areas of concern are:

- Legal mandates to meet flood protection requirements do not come with adequate State or federal funding.
- Zoning requirements will impede development, which will negatively impact local economic development.
- Definitions of “urban” vs. “urbanizing” may subject smaller communities to big city requirements.
- Agencies and programs may not adequately collaborate with each other. Local governments want to see evidence of collaboration between CVFPP and Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP), and DWR must collaborate with Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) on mapping and notification.

- A lack of understanding about who is deciding what 200-year protection is, and when maps will be available.

5.7.1 Tribes

Many California Native Americans have family or Tribal historical ties to the geography in the CVFPP study area. Historical data suggests that tribal burial grounds and other important or sacred sites and artifacts may be impacted by any action taken near rivers, streams and creeks.

In initial outreach, many Tribal contacts indicated an interest in receiving a briefing about the CVFPP in 2010. In all cases, Tribal organizations were interested in learning more about the CVFPP and how it affects their community. In most cases, Tribal representatives expressed appreciation of DWR's effort to inform them about the process.

5.7.2 Interest Based Groups

Presentations were made to a small group of interest-based organizations in fall 2009. In each case, these groups expressed appreciation for DWR's willingness to come to them with information and asked to be kept informed throughout the process. Most of them have offered to provide information about the CVFPP to their members and/or constituents through newsletters and their Web sites.

5.8 Assessment Addendum: Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting 8 Summary

The 8th and final RCWG meetings were held during late April / early May 2010 after the formal assessment was conducted. During Meeting 8, Work Troup participants were asked to provide comments on the accuracy and approach of the Regional Conditions Summary Report (RCSR), and the Interim Progress Summary number 1 (IPS #1). Although the IPS #1 was developed as an interim product and would not be revised, participant feedback was requested to help in the development of Phase 2 work. In preparation for this, members were also asked to identify gaps in participation in Phase 1 with the goal of securing balanced input throughout the process. For the purpose of review, Work Group comments from all 8 RCWG meetings were summarized by the facilitation team into the following categories:

- Representation, Participation and Roles
- Pacing and Work Volume
- Work Product Integration
- Key Gaps

- Specific comments on the IPS #1 and the RCR

5.8.1 Representation, Participation and Roles

Many of the RCWG members expressed a desire to increase the amount of local government buy-in before finalizing the 2012 CVFPP. There was a general acknowledgement of the need to coordinate CVFPP with the other DWR programs currently underway as well as projects and programs being conducted by other local, state, and federal agencies.

The concern about inconsistent USACE participation was common across each of the 5 RCWGs. Members felt this lack of participation was particularly important in light of the current conflict regarding the controversy surrounding the USACE Vegetation Management Plan.

5.8.2 Pacing and Work Volume

Members reiterated earlier comments that the pace and work volume during Phase 1 was too rigorous to allow for meaningful input and participation. There was a general appreciation that both the work pace and volume was going to be reduced during Phase 2.

5.8.3 Responsiveness to Comments

Many of the work group members acknowledged the significant effort it took to collect and combine comments and revise text accordingly in one joint effort for all five RCWGs. At the same time, one common concern was that the RCSR talked at a general level and did not reflect some regionally-specific concerns and comments. A suggestion was made in several meetings that a response to comments tracking table be created and distributed to meeting participants.

5.8.4 Key Gaps

The gaps in representation varied across the different RCWGs, with some interests being well-represented in some work groups and less well-represented in others. Some of the commonly identified gaps in representation included the following:

- Agricultural interests
- U.S. Army Corp of Engineers
- Building Industry
- California Department of Fish and Game
- Environmental interests
- Government / Academic
- Local City Officials and planning staff
- Utilities

- Water Districts

5.8.5 Specific comments on the IPS #1

- Ensure that the Butte Basin Overflow Area and Butte Basin are distinguished.
 - On page 34, second paragraph should say “erosion and head cuts” instead of “sedimentation.”
 - On page 19, list only those facilities not designed to Army Corp standards.
 - A few members expressed disappointment that the RCWG members were not given an opportunity to review the IPS#1 before it was released.
 - The goals and planning principles do not correlate.
 - It was suggested that an executive summary be included to present to legislators. The summary might include:
 - Major findings/topics
 - Key areas of agreement and recommendations
 - Statewide implications of CVFPP
 - It was suggested that in the “Next Steps” section, participants be encouraged to continue their participation in the following phases.
 - There was a request to see liability issues addressed.
 - There was specific concern that the identified orange and green areas on the provided map would eventually hold the State liable for flood damage within those areas.
 - There was a desire to see how the CVFPP process correlates with the Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) process.
 - There was a desire to see urban levels of protection addressed.
- #### **5.8.6 Specific Comments on the RCSR**
- DWR should consider an addendum to the RCSR capturing the comments and documenting responses.

- There was concern that the RCSR was not accessible to the general public.
- There was a request to see distinctions between the design and levels of protection of urban and non-urban levees addressed.
- Notify citizens of residual flood risk and options for dealing with that risk.
- It was suggested that the CVFPP boundaries correspond with the larger Flood SAFE boundaries.
- Participants noted that it was difficult to download the full RCSR from the website and suggested providing CDs.

5.9 Assessment Addendum: Phase 1 Completion Briefings Recap

DWR and facilitation team staff conducted post Meeting 8 briefings with the following organizations after the completion of Meeting 8. A summary of the comments provided during each briefing are as follows:

5.9.1 Lower San Joaquin County Staff / San Joaquin Area Flood Control Agency

Representatives from San Joaquin County and San Joaquin Area Flood Control Agency (SJAFCA) met with DWR and MWH staff on June 10, 2010. A summary of their concerns are as follows:

- Throughout Phase 1 San Joaquin County and SJAFCA provided comments both verbally and written in the review of documents and the approach. It is important that future comments are tracked and feedback provided regarding whether comments were considered and/or incorporated.
- The meeting schedule should be set up to accommodate local participation and not just DWR. Setting schedules that set a priority for DWR is not a true partnership.
- Participants were given copies of the IPS#1 during RCWG meeting 8 but told that comments would not be considered.
- It will be difficult to incorporate necessary updates to local General Plans and zoning ordinances into the CVFPP without local support.

- The Lower San Joaquin River Feasibility Study (LSJRFS) needs to be incorporated into the CVFPP.
- DWR should consider creating a role for a Local Chair. Members could vote to selection the person/organization to serve in that role.

5.9.2 Environmental Interests (American Rivers, The Nature Conservancy, Natural Resources Defense Council)

An environmentally-focused briefing for CVFPP Phase 2 planning and engagement was held June 8, 2010 in West Sacramento. CVFPO Office Chief Jeremy Arrich ran the meeting. Nineteen stakeholders and nine DWR (CVFPO and FESSRO) and consultant staff attended the meeting. DWR/consultants presented an outline of the CVFPP process and Phase 2 engagement opportunities in particular. Attendees included The Nature Conservancy, River Partners, Point Reyes Bird Observatory (PRBO) Conservation Science, California Department of Fish and Game, United States Army Corps of Engineers, National Marine Fisheries Service, United States Fish & Wildlife Service, CBEC Inc. Eco Engineering, California Riparian Habitat Joint Venture, Phillip Williams & Associates, UC Davis, Yolo County Flood Control & Water Conservation District, and Reclamation District 108.

Briefing participants asked clarifying questions about Phases 2-4 and about the logistics of participating in the different Phase 2 work groups and workshops. Some felt that the Phase 1 process consumed a lot of time and that future phases would need clearer goals. Much of the briefing focused on the importance to the planning process of better establishing how to quantify ecosystem benefits and impacts, which was suggested as an additional CVFPP topic work group. It was also noted that the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and San Joaquin River Restoration Program should be included in future discussions. The participants were invited to participate in the upcoming Regional Management Action Work Groups (RMAWG) and workshops.

5.10 Assessment Addendum: Agricultural Subcommittee Assessment Survey and Interview

5.10.1 Overarching Comments

The Joint Subcommittee on Agricultural Stewardship Scope Definition (Subcommittee) was primarily comprised of members recruited from the Regional Conditions and Topic Work Groups. Outside agricultural interests

were recruited with the assistance of Subcommittee members. The Subcommittee did not participate in the original assessment survey as their work had not yet been completed. Participants were invited to provide comments for the Assessment Addendum. Overall, most participants of the Subcommittee felt that DWR provided them with a meaningful opportunity to work together and develop content for the Regional Conditions Summary Report (RCSR) in the beginning stages of the committee meetings, but had some concerns with the end result.

Members were generally satisfied with the level of stakeholder engagement, accessibility of meeting materials and process design. However they thought that their comments were not adequately incorporated into the RCSR and that the feedback from the Subcommittee group was not adequately captured.

5.10.2 Representation, Participation

Almost all respondents were concerned with the level of participation from agricultural representatives, although they noted that DWR had made a strong effort to involve these representatives. Many did mention that meetings held during harvest time were difficult for farmers to attend and suggested holding meetings between the months of October-March to increase participation.

5.10.3 Process and Facilitation

Members felt that the representation of DWR's viewpoints at the initial meeting did not recognize and respect the importance of agricultural concerns, and felt that priority was given to environmental concerns. Members felt DWR's understanding of agricultural concerns improved as the Subcommittee's work product advanced.

The majority of respondents agreed that DWR provided an adequate venue for participants to work together cooperatively. Attendees favored meetings held at California Farm Bureau Federation over a DWR venue due, in part, to poor ventilation. Participants further suggested increasing the amount of web-based engagement options.

5.10.4 Level of Engagement and Stakeholder Outreach

Most respondents felt that DWR provided sufficient outreach to the appropriate stakeholders and gave ample opportunity for feedback and comment.

Several members felt that the level of effort was more characteristic of a topic workgroup than a subcommittee.

One participant suggested increasing the level of participation from federal agencies.

5.10.5 Recording Member Feedback

Most members felt that the meeting summaries sufficiently captured the group's sentiments and comments. One member did note that areas of disagreement appeared to be "glossed over."

5.11 Assessment Addendum Stakeholder Supplemental Review

Following release of the CVFPP Interim Progress Summary (IPS) No.1, the CVFPP project team was contacted by several stakeholder participants with concerns regarding the nature and findings of the IPS No.1. While the IPS No. 1, due to its interim nature, will not be revised, all agreed stakeholder comments were highly important in progressing towards meaningful stakeholder participation and progressive Project/Plan development. It was also noted that the CVFPP Phase 1 Project Assessment was specifically designed to document such concerns. The Phase 1 Assessment addresses the perspectives of stakeholders regarding work to date and creates a reference point for future project phases. On August 9, 2010 the California Central Valley Flood Control Association hosted a meeting with eight of these stakeholders and three representatives of the project team and a facilitation team representative, to enhance the project team's understanding of the stakeholders' perspectives and concerns, and capture important issues for inclusion in the Phase 1 Assessment. Additionally the team received feedback from some individuals unable to attend the meeting that had asked those at the session to share their concerns.

In general, these stakeholder participants were dissatisfied with the lack of inclusion of some of the important issues raised during the Phase 1 meetings, the discussion process, and the characterization of the "Level of Agreement" Section of the IPS#1. They provided comments and suggestions for places throughout the document that they felt did not acknowledge their perspective and/or understated their concerns. They also expressed concerns about the level of clarity throughout the IPS#1 and the consistency of terminology. Finally, they suggested a comprehensive glossary with definitions for terms used throughout the document be created along with specific definitions in text for project terms. Both general comments and more specific comments related to IPS#1 text were shared. A copy of the session notes, list of participants and specific text comments are contained in full in Attachment E. This information, along

with other information gathered in this Phase 1 Assessment will be considered in future phases of project/plan development.

6.0 Analysis, Findings, and Recommendations

6.1 Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Results provided by stakeholders, while largely positive, included some significant reservations that must be addressed in future phases of work. Additionally, perspectives gathered during the assessment process, while sometimes hard hitting, offered a number of well considered recommendations.

Findings and recommendations focus on six key areas:

- Transparency
- Time and Resources
- Clearly Defined Executive Sponsorship and Decision Authority
- Clear Project Plans and Approaches
- Broader Stakeholder Outreach
- Best Practices

Based on stakeholder input and additional input provided by staff and project contractors, this assessment offers findings and recommendations that identify current effective efforts that warrant continuation, and target areas for improvement.

The following summarizes key issues to be considered in future project phases.

6.1.1 Transparency and Comment Tracking

For project success, DWR must continue to be transparent in project management, including better articulating and defining roles and responsibilities, and disclosing data development approaches, planning assumptions and decision making processes. Along these lines, comment tracking would help participants understand how their concerns are included in the materials. DWR can appropriately establish what decision areas will remain with the agency; however, this should be announced and discussed in advance of any decisions.

6.1.2 Time and Resources

All stakeholders (internal and external) expressed the need to operate from realistic timeframes and deadlines. Resources to support plan development

and stakeholder engagement must be consistent and scopes of work should be reflective of resource realities.

While the Work Group process has been successful, the Phase 1 pace and volume of work was considered not sustainable and needs to be re-scoped. Numerous recommendations are offered to address this concern, improve meeting and process efficiency. Ideas include reducing the length of Work Group meetings and better utilizing meeting time by focusing on critical deliverables. Other suggestions include expanding options for engagement utilizing the International Association of Public Participation (IAP2)⁶ framework, creating more sub-committees, pre-working and presenting select draft concepts for group discussion, better using web based tools, and better utilizing personnel assigned to support the stakeholder functions. These recommendations should be incorporated into future project design.

Further, time is a critical risk factor for communications. Failure to communicate in a timely way and provide fresh material for review can lead stakeholders to believe DWR is not being transparent; result in a loss of goodwill developed to date; and have consequences for media relations.

6.1.3 Clearly Defined Executive Sponsorship and Decision Authority

Clear policy direction, agency support and decision authority is essential to the CVFPP. Numerous issues related to this topic were raised throughout the assessment. From a communication and engagement standpoint, clear decision authority is essential to producing timely communication.

6.1.4 Clear Project Plans and Approaches

Stakeholders emphasized the importance of a clear, publicized project plan, and specifically discussed actions needed to support the development of management actions. Future communication and engagement should be tightly aligned with producing plan deliverables. Communications goals, objectives and assumptions should be transparent understood by all participants.

6.1.5 Broader Stakeholder Outreach

External stakeholders expressed a need for a broader stakeholder outreach that builds support for the CVFPP. In addition to sharing the broader FloodSAFE message with the general public, special attention must be made to engage local opinion leaders. Early and regular communications will ensure local decision makers are not surprised by plan direction, allow

⁶ More about the IAP2 Framework may be found at http://www.iap2.org/associations/4748/files/IAP2%20Spectrum_vertical.pdf

project concerns to surface early and be resolved, and ensure that stakeholders impacted by the CVFPP understand the consequences of not moving forward with system improvements.

6.1.6 Performance Metrics for Monitoring Best Practices

Communication and engagement and project management practices are well known and should be incorporated in the future phases of work. A method for monitoring and reporting performance metrics should be instituted.

This page left blank intentionally.

7.0 Conclusion

The communication and engagement function is critical to overall project success. This assessment has validated the importance of DWR's effort to work with stakeholders to achieve good CVFPP outcomes.

The concerns raised in this assessment can be addressed in future project phases. CVFPP project leadership is utilizing feedback gathered by this assessment to enhance the design of these phases.

This page left blank intentionally.

8.0 Acronyms and Abbreviations

Ag	Agricultural
BDCP	Bay Delta Conservation Plan
Board	Central Valley Flood Protection Board
CALFED	CALFED Bay-Delta Program
Comprehensive Study	San Joaquin River Basins Comprehensive Study
CVFMP	Central Valley Flood Management Planning Program
CVFPO	Central Valley Flood Planning Office
CVFPP	Central Valley Flood Protection Plan
DWR	California Department of Water Resources
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FT	Facilitation Team
IAP2.....	International Association of Public Participation
IPS #1	Interim Progress Summary number 1
IPS.....	Interim Progress Summary
IRWM	Integrated Regional Water Management
LSJRFS	Lower San Joaquin River Feasibility Study
PRBO	Point Reyes Bird Observatory
RCR.....	Regional Conditions Report
RCSR	Regional Conditions Summary Report
RCWG	Regional Conditions Work Group
SAFCA	Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency
SJAFCA.....	San Joaquin Area Flood Control Agency
TWG	Topic Work Group
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Valley.....	Central Valley

This page left blank intentionally.

Attachment A: January 2009 Design Phase Stakeholder Questions

Central Valley Flood Management Planning Program

Response Form for Interviews

Interviewee: _____

Organization: _____

Date: _____

QUESTIONS
What involvement do you currently have in activities relating to water resource management or flood management?
How familiar are you with the Central Valley Flood Management Planning Program?
DWR will inventory the state's current Central Valley flood management system and describe its status (how well it works, etc.) DWR will also develop recommendations to improve or enhance the system. <i>With all of this in mind, how would you describe success for this effort?</i>
What would you consider the biggest challenge in flood management in your local area? In the Central Valley?
Active participation by members and interested parties is critical to the success of this effort. Here are examples of how this participation could occur: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. <i>What do you think of the examples for public participation that I just described?</i>
How do you see yourself or your organization/agency being involved? <i>(If necessary, prompt with:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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? <i>If appropriate, prompt with the following:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Can you tell me now who from your organization is likely to participate in this effort? <i>Can I follow up with you later to learn more about you or your organization's interest in participating?</i>

**CVFPP Phase 1 – Communication
and Engagement Assessment**

QUESTIONS

7. Do you have any recommendations about how we can motivate members and interested parties to remain actively engaged in the process?

8. Which other organizations or people should be involved in this process? Is there anyone else whom we should interview?

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?

10. Can you suggest any newsletters, websites, forums or other existing communication channels that should receive information about this effort?

11. Is there anything else that you'd like us to know?

12. Do you have any questions for me?

Attachment B: RCWG Meeting 7 Process Goals Discussion Questions and TWG On-line Survey Topics

Part 1

Thinking about the goals for the workgroup effort, to what extent did your Regional Conditions Work Group achieve these goals?

Process Goals		Outcome
1.	Provide a meaningful opportunity for participants to work together and with DWR to develop content for the Regional Conditions Report	
2.	Conduct the work group an open, fair and unbiased manner	
3.	Record work group discussions in a fair and unbiased manner	
4.	Provide a venue for work group participants to work together cooperatively	
5.	Provide opportunities for members and other interested parties to review and comment on how DWR used their input	
6.	Engage work group participants, which, as a group, represent the views and interests of this region in the development of the Regional Conditions Summary Report	
7.	Provide access to relevant information needed in order to participate effectively	
8.	Conduct an effective and efficient work group process	

Part 2

1. Thinking about the Regional Conditions Work Group process, what worked?
2. As we move to the next phase, what changes would improve the effectiveness of the Regional Work Groups? (What features of this process do you think should be used to make the next round of work on Management Actions be more effective and efficient?)
3. What are the other Lessons Learned? (Items to consider include meeting length and frequency, meeting materials, discussions, review and feedback and meeting support – or whatever “lessons learned” you would like to suggest.)

**CVFPP Phase 1 – Communication
and Engagement Assessment**

This page left blank intentionally.

Attachment C: Interview Questions for Individual RCWG and TWG Work Group Members

Questions posed to the RCWG members and TWG members were similar but slightly altered as most RCWG members had participated in discussing the process in a full group meeting (see Attachment B) where as TWG members may or may not have completed the on-line survey.

Questions posed to RCWG members follow:

RCWG Members

1. What questions and concerns will need to be addressed during the next round of work (developing management actions) for participants, members, and stakeholders to find validity in the process?
2. At this point, what factors or issues pose the biggest threat to developing a viable plan?
3. How effective is the current approach to integrating Topic Work Group products with Regional Conditions Work Group products? What are some ways to strengthen integration with all the work groups?
4. How would you compare this planning effort with other large-scale planning efforts (e.g., Comprehensive Study)? What lessons from those efforts are important to pay attention to as we enter the next phase of this effort?
5. How would you describe your level of agreement with the overall approach to developing work group products, and the resulting products (e.g., your group's summary report)?
6. What would make you more likely to participate in the next phase of work (developing management actions)?
7. In preparing for the Forum in February, what messages will participants need to hear in order to secure their interest in and support for the next phase of work (developing management actions)?
8. What other advice would you like to offer DWR, the technical team, and the facilitators?

TWG interviews referenced the on-line survey (see Attachment B) and provided additional background information about the assessment process. The following questions were then posed:

TWG Members

1. In addition to any information that you may have already provided related to the on-line survey questions, what advice would you like to offer DWR, the technical team, and the facilitators in moving forward with the planning process?
2. What questions and concerns will need to be addressed during the next round of work (developing management actions) for participants, members, and stakeholders to find validity in the process?
3. At this point, what factors or issues pose the biggest threat to developing a viable plan?
4. How effective is the current approach to integrating Topic Work Group products with Regional Conditions Work Group products? What are some ways to strengthen integration with all the work groups?
5. How would you compare this planning effort with other large-scale planning efforts (e.g., Comprehensive Study)? What lessons from those efforts are important to pay attention to as we enter the next phase of this effort?
6. How would you describe your level of agreement with the overall approach to developing work group products, and the resulting products (e.g., your group's summary report)?
7. What would make you more likely to participate in the next phase of work (developing management actions)?
8. In preparing for the Forum in February, what messages will participants need to hear in order to secure their interest in and support for the next phase of work (developing management actions)?
9. What other advice would you like to offer DWR, the technical team, and the facilitators?

Attachment D: List of Design Phase and Phase 1 Assessment Interview Participants

D.1 – List of CVFPP Design Phase Interview Participants

Organization	Name
American River Flood Control District	Brian Holloway
American River Flood Control District	Tim Kerr
American River Flood Control District	Virginia Moose
American River Watershed Institute	Gary Estes
American Rivers	Steve Rothert
Building Industry Association	Steve La Mar
Bureau of Reclamation	Jason Phillips
CALFED	Joe Grindstaff
CALFED	Sergio Guillen
California Central Valley Flood Control Association	Melinda Terry
California Central Valley Flood Control Association and Lower Yolo Planning Forum	Michael Hardesty
California Chamber of Commerce	Valerie Nera
California Department of Boating and Waterways	Steve Watanabe
California Department of Conservation	Don Drysdale
California Department of Food and Agriculture	Ken Trott
California Department of Parks and Recreation	Dan Ray
California Department of Water Resources DPLA	John Andrew
California Emergency Management Agency	Tom Maruyama
California Farm Bureau	Chris Scheuring
California Membership for the San Joaquin Valley	Fritz Grupe
California Sport Fishing Protection Alliance	Jim Crenshaw
California State Water Resources Control Board	Dorothy Rice
California Truckers Association	Gino Dicaro
Caltrans	Kazeem Alabi
CalTrout	Scott Feierabend
Central Delta landowner	Tom Zuckerman
Central Valley Flood Protection Board	Butch Hodgkins
Central Valley Flood Protection Board	Emma Suarez
Central Valley Flood Protection Board	Jay Punia
Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board	Greg Vaughn, Joe Mello

**CVFPP Phase 1 – Communication
and Engagement Assessment**

Organization	Name
Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board	Kiran Lanfranchi-Rizzardi
Citizen Feather	Dan Silva
City of Rio Vista	Jan Vic
City of Sacramento Public Works	Bill Busath
City of Stockton	Connie Cochran
City of West Sacramento	Bill Panos
City of Yuba	Kash Gill
Colusa County	Gary Evans
Congresswoman Matsui	Nathan Dietrich
Delta Protection Commission	Linda Fiack
Ducks Unlimited	Rudy Rosen
El Dorado County and Georgetown Divide Regional Conservation District	Mark Egbert
East Bay MUD	Doug Wallace
Elliott Homes	Russ Davis
Environmental Justice Coalition for Water	Debbie Davis
Family Water Alliance	Asheley Indieri
Federal Emergency Management Agency	Dennis McKweon, Ian Dixon
Federal Emergency Management Agency	Sally Ziolkowski
Floodplain Management Association	Iovanka Todt
Former Yolo County Supervisor	Tom Stallard
Friant Water Users	William Luce
Friends of the River	Ron Stork
Glenn County Farm Bureau	Mike Verschagin
Glenn County Planning and Public Works	Dan Obermeyer
Glenn/Colusa Water District	Thad Bettner
Great Valley Center	David Hosley
Hospital Council of Northern and Central California	Scott Seamons
Kjeldsen, Sinnock and Neudeck	Chris Neudeck
Knights Landing Ridge Drainage District	Lewis Bair
Levee District 1, San Luis Canal	Chase Hurly
Low Flow Alliance	Bill Connelly
Lower San Joaquin Levee District	Reggie Hill
MBK Engineers	Joe Countryman
Multiple San Joaquin River & Delta Interests	Dante Nomellini
Natomas Basin Conservancy	John Roberts

Organization	Name
Natural Heritage Institute	John Cain
Natural Resources Defense Council	Monty Schmitt
NOAA Fisheries	Russ Strach
Northern California Water Association	Todd Manley
Pacific Gas and Electric	Nancy McFadden
Placer County Flood Control & Water Conservation District	Brian Keating
Planning & Conservation League	Jonas Minton. Mindy McIntyre
Recreational Boaters of California	Lenora Clark
Reclamation District 1001	Diane Fales
River Islands	Susan Dell'Osso
Sacramento Area Council of Governments	David Shabazian
Sacramento Area Flood Control Association	Stein Buer
Sacramento City Council	Ray Tretheway
Sacramento County Board of Supervisors	Don Notolli
Sacramento County Water Agency	Michael Peterson
Sacramento Metro Chamber of Commerce, Member Representative	Roy Brewer & Greg Eldridge
Sacramento River Conservation Area Forum	Beverly Anderson
Sacramento River Preservation Trust	John Merz
Sacramento Valley Landowners Association	Les Harringer
San Joaquin County	Ron Baldwin
San Joaquin County Public Works	Candace Oldham
San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors Water Authority	Steve Chedester
San Joaquin River Parkway and Trust	Dave Koehler
San Joaquin River Resource Management Coalition	Mari Martin
San Luis and Delta-Mendota Water Authority	Dan Nelson
Save the American River Association	Felix Smith
Save the American River Association	Frank Cirill
Save the American River Association	Jim Jones
Solano County	Mike Reagan
South Delta Landowner	Alex Hildebrand
Stockton East Water District	Kevin Kauffman
Sutter County	Larry Montna
Sutter County Public Works	Daniel Paterson, P.E.
The Nature Conservancy	Susan Tatayon
Turlock Irrigation District	Randy Fiorini

**CVFPP Phase 1 – Communication
and Engagement Assessment**

Organization	Name
US Army Corps of Engineers	Brandon Muncy
US Army Corps of Engineers	Chris Altendorf
US Army Corps of Engineers	David Van Rijn
US Fish and Wildlife Service, Sac National Wildlife Refuge Center	Kevin Forrester
US Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Habitat Conservation	Michael Hoover
US Geological Survey	Jon Bureau
Yolo Basin Foundation – Bypass Working Group	Robin Kulakow
Yolo County	Mike McGowen
Yolo County Farm Bureau	Chuck Dudley
Yolo County Water Conservation	Stephen Lorzato

D.2 – List of Phase 1 Interview Participants

Completed Interviews as of Monday, March 9, 2009

List of Interviewees	
1. Mark Connelly	13. Steve Winkler
2. Kara DiFrancesco	14. Eric Ginney
3. Karen Medders	15. John Hopkins
4. Dave Shpak	16. Pia Sevelius
5. Leo Winternitz	17. Ron Heinzen
6. Ryan Luster	18. Mary Perlea
7. Les Heringer	19. Louis Bair
8. Bill Center	20. Jim Sandner
9. Margit Aramburu	21. Susan Tatayon
10. John Shelton	22. Steve Winkler
11. Kevin Kauffman	23. Stu Townsley
12. Dave Peterson	24. Michael Dettinger

Agricultural Joint Sub-Committee Interviewees as of June 28 2010

List of Interviewees
1. Mari Martin
2. Sue Sutton
3. Tom Ellis
4. Max Sakato
5. Ray Anderson
6. Karen Medders

This page left blank intentionally.

Attachment E – Addendum Meeting Notes

E.1 Regional Conditions Work Group Meetings # 8

After release of the initial draft Assessment, participants were invited to make additional comments regarding project documents and the Assessment during Regional Conditions Work Group Meetings # 8. Comments from these sessions are summarized in the Sections 5.8 of this Assessment. Full texts of the Meeting Notes are located on-line at the following links.

Upper Sacramento

<http://www.water.ca.gov/cvfmp/docs/Meeting8SummaryUSacRCWG20100429.pdf>

Lower Sacramento

<http://www.water.ca.gov/cvfmp/docs/Meeting8SummaryLSacRCWG20100525.pdf>

Delta

<http://www.water.ca.gov/cvfmp/docs/Meeting8SummaryDeltaRCWG20100505.pdf>

Lower San Joaquin

<http://www.water.ca.gov/cvfmp/docs/Meeting8SummaryLSJRCWG20100427.pdf>

Upper San Joaquin

<http://www.water.ca.gov/cvfmp/docs/Meeting8SummaryUSJRCWG20100503.pdf>

E. 2 Meeting notes of August 9, 2010

Following release of the CVFPP Interim Progress Summary (IPS) No.1, the CVFPP project team was contacted by several stakeholder participants with concerns regarding the nature and findings of the IPS No.1. On August 9, the California Central Valley Flood Control Association hosted a meeting, with eight of these stakeholders and three representatives of the project and a facilitation team representative, to enhance the project team's understanding of the stakeholders' perspectives and concerns, and capture important issues for inclusion in the Phase 1 Assessment. Additionally the team received feedback from some individuals unable to attend the meeting that had asked those at the session to share their concerns. The meeting notes from that session follow:

August 9, 2010, 8:30 am - 10:00 pm

Stakeholder Participants

#	NAME	ORGANIZATION
•	Bill Darsie	KSN, Inc
•	Max Sakato	RD 1500
•	Tom Ellis	SRWSLD
•	Gil Labrie	DCCE
•	Christopher Neudeck	KSN, Inc.
•	Melinda Terry	CCVFCA
•	Pete Ghelfi	SAFCA
•	Mike Hardesty	RD 2068

CVFPP Team

#	NAME	ORGANIZATION
•	Jeremy Arrich	California Department of Water Resources (DWR)
•	Erin Mullin	DWR
•	Yung-Hsin Sun	MWH (Consultant)

CVFPP Facilitation Team

#	NAME	ORGANIZATION
•	Christal Love	Center for Collaborative Policy

List of Acronyms

AG	Agricultural
BDCP	Bay Delta Conservation Plan
CVFPP	Central Valley Flood Protection Plan
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
IPS	Interim Progress Summary Report
RD	Reclamation District

Meeting Purpose

Discuss and respond to comments received regarding the CVFPP Interim Progress Summary (IPS) No.1. Address concerns of some workgroup members regarding certain wording, presentation, and conclusions made within the document.

Background

Following release of the CVFPP Interim Progress Summary (IPS) No.1, the CVFPP project team was contacted by several stakeholder participants with concerns regarding the nature and findings of the IPS No.1. While the project team does not plan to revise the IPS No. 1 due to its interim nature, all agreed stakeholder comments were highly important in progressing towards meaningful stakeholder participation and progressive Project/Plan development. It was also noted that the CVFPP Phase 1 Project Assessment was specifically designed to document such concerns. The Phase 1 Assessment addresses the perspectives of stakeholders regarding work to date and creates a reference point for future project phases. The meeting of August 9 was convened to enhance the project team's understanding of the meeting participants perspectives and concerns, and capture important issues for inclusion in the Phase 1 Assessment. A summary of this meeting will be included in the Assessment and the full meeting notes will also be available as part of the project record. The Assessment will be available on CVFMP Web site for future reference.

Overview of Comments

Generally, these stakeholder participants were dissatisfied with the lack of inclusion of some of the important issues raised during the Phase 1 meetings, the discussion process, and the characterization of the "Level of Agreement" Section of the IPS. They provided comments and suggestions for places throughout the document that they felt did not acknowledge their perspective and/or understated their concerns. They also expressed concerns about the level of clarity throughout the IPS No. 1 and the consistency of terminology. Finally, they suggested a comprehensive glossary with definitions for terms used throughout the document be created along with specific definitions in text for project terms.

Participants provided general comments and more specific comments related to the IPS No. 1 as follows.

General Comments

Clear and Direct Language

- Provide clearer and more direct language with terms defined within the sections of text along with glossary references.
- The term Local Maintaining Agencies (LMA) has no statutory meaning and is not useful for the purposes of the CVFPP. As an alternative include a Statutory definition of the specific types of maintaining agencies (such as RDs, LDs, MAs, and others) and use those terms as appropriate. Also recognize that there is variation in responsibilities

CVFPP Phase 1 – Communication and Engagement Assessment

among agencies that maintain levees and other flood protection features. The previous use of the term LMA could be clarified in the historical document and referenced appropriately.

- It was noted that the following terms are used interchangeably throughout the document and need more clarity and consistency as part of their usage throughout the text:
 - Flood Protection
 - Flood Management
 - Flood Risk Management
 - Flood Prevention
 - Flood Control

To the extent these are used interchangeably, settle on a single expression and use it consistently, for example some prefer “flood protection.” If there are differences to the expressions, identify these in the glossary

- The use of the term “private levees” is problematic. Instead use the term “non-project” levees since they are maintained by a public agency, rather than individual “private” landowners.

Historical Context

- Properly establish a historical setting and context for the flood control system in the IPS. Include legislative and legal history as part of the discussion. It was noted that there were no specific historical background references within the document.
- Include the history of RDs, LDs, and MAs and also State and Federal aspects of flood control projects in the Central Valley.
- DWR responded that there would be a separate historical document created in the near future and that there is currently a historian working on the project to provide historical context.

Other

- Reference comments made by the Mayor of Rio Vista during the Valley Wide Forum held June 3, 2010.

- Need to incorporate discussion that any proposed ecosystem projects should be required to provide flood benefits/components, just as flood projects are required to provide ecosystem elements.
- Provide appropriate reference to public safety within the summary.
- Add a disclaimer to the IPS that explains that the document is the best representation of what was said by members but does not necessarily capture all input.

Comments on Specific Text

- Page 2, Paragraph 1: There was concern that “...Senate Bills 5, 70 and 156, directs use of the bond funds to increase levels of urban protection and address flood liability...” incorrectly implies that \$5 Billion will be spent on flood protection only for urban areas.
- Page 14, “Problems and Opportunities”: Some statements in the table were seen as value judgments, which should be avoided.
- Page 16, “Risks and Consequences of Flooding,” (E) Additional Downstream restrictions: There was concern regarding the functionality of the Lower Bypass.
 - It was suggested that the Lower Sacramento region and the tidal region of the Delta are both applicable.
 - It was noted that this needs to be looked at “system wide” since the regions are inter-dependant.
 - The table entries show regional conditions only, and the systemwide views are not present.
- Page 17
 - “Existing flood management system does not provide the level of protection desired and/or required...”: There was concern that this section was oversimplified, noting that the system did not require a level of protection when it was designed. It was suggested that the system be described for what it was designed for (a geometric standard, rather than a specific level of protection), not that it is not suitable to accommodate modern society’s needs, which implies that the system design shortcomings should have been anticipated.
 - “Challenges to existing post-flood recovery plans and programs”: It was noted that the response has proved to be problematic.

CVFPP Phase 1 – Communication and Engagement Assessment

- It was noted that the paramount obligation of the flood protection system should be public safety and protection of lives and property.
- There was concern that funding from FEMA has been denied in the past for not completing the process correctly.
- There was concern that Ecosystem was characterized as an equal to public safety and protection of life and property.
- It was noted that with the current draft BDCP cost analysis and financial plan looks to flood management, presumably, CVFPP, for paying part of the BDCP costs.
- Page 18, “Ecosystem” definition: This was seen as a value judgment.
- Page 21, Flood Risk Management,” Bullet 4; There was confusion regarding the term “Flood Mechanisms.”
 - It was noted that the purpose of the language was to assist people in understanding the difference between Central Valley flooding and flooding elsewhere.
 - There was concern that individuals might not understand the difference between FEMA insurance and land use planning programs and flood protection.
- Page 22
 - Bullet 4: Need to address planning, preparedness, response and recovery.
 - Need to address liability.
 - DWR is working with legal staff to determine how to address questions about liability.
 - Bullet 9: There is a need for acknowledgement that the Agricultural sector has already improved land management.
 - A box within the evaluation form should be added to determine if the Management Action affects adjacent lands.
 - There was confusion as to the definition of the term “flooding mechanisms.”

Comments on Level of Agreement (page 23 of IPS)

General Comments

- It was suggested that the level of agreement section be re-written.
- It was noted that regional differences must be accounted for.
- It was suggested that the tactic used to assess the level of agreement should be re-evaluated.
- It was proposed that there be a method for determining topics that are “agreed,” “possibly agreed through negotiation,” and “never agreed” upon.
- It was recommended that the document include topics that were disagreed upon

Comments Related to Specific Text

- **Bullet 2** – It was noted that there was no agreement on that flooding in a regulated system would result in sediment deposits to replenish productive agricultural soils. They viewed this as a text book example for a natural system, with no application in the modern agricultural practice in a regulated system.
- **Bullet 3** – There was concern that the statement about the system was not designed to meet current multifunctional requirements would leave the impression that the system was not designed properly. The statement can be stated more directly to say the system was originally design to meet protection needs according to then-acceptable criteria and standards.
 - DWR agreed to revise this characterization in the future documents and pay extra attention to the fine distinction.
- **Bullet 4** – It was noted that there was a distinction made but there is no difference between flood control and flood management.
- **Bullet 5** – It was noted that the sentence was confusing, suggesting that it propose a system-wide approach.
- **Bullet 8** – The agreement was that multi-benefits have to be cut both ways.
 - There was concern over the term “traditional mitigation requirement.” There was no traditional approach for mitigation

because the system was designed prior to enactment of current environmental laws. The phrase “the current mitigation requirements” is more appropriate.

- **Bullet 9** – There was concern over the level of accuracy for this statement. It was noted that no agreement on this topic.

Comments Related to Agricultural Concerns

- It was suggested that a definition for flood plain processes and floodplain functions be included.
- The Agricultural (AG) sector believes it is receiving increased crop yields from management of the soil, and as long as there is continued flood protection and water supplies, the yields will continue.
- It was noted that there should be careful attention paid to making sure that AG interests are considered and prioritized on the same level as the environmental and urban interests.
- It noted that discussing transitory storage without an AG Stewardship work group might be problematic.
- DWR described the purpose of the Phase 2 Management Action workshops, noting they are supposed to define integration and characterize what can and cannot be done, adding that it would be used to set up the discussion for Phase 3.
- It was suggested that the Joint Sub-Committee on Agricultural Scope Definition be identified, defined and added as a formal Topic Work Group for the next phases of the Plan development process.
- DWR described that Phase 1 topic workgroups were also for scoping purposes and thus, discussions were broad. However, Phase 2 would not include topic work groups to discuss general issues but rather more specific recommendations. There is no environmental group with general purposes either. A topic workgroup can be established as a specific need is identified.

Next Steps

Meeting participants were informed that all comments would be incorporated in the Phase 1 Assessment and that while there would be no changes made to the IPS No.1, the IPS No. 2, along with the legislatively required CVFPP Progress Report, would reflect input received.

