

2.1 Stakeholder Planning Process

This chapter describes the process undertaken to develop the CABY IWRMP, including stakeholder and public outreach and involvement.

As mentioned in Chapter 1, the IRWMP effort was initiated by a group of water suppliers, power utilities, and watershed conservation groups with interests in all or some of the CABY watersheds. The group realized many shared objectives for the entire region and supported the need for an integrated planning effort to develop solutions that support the common and individual objectives for the region.

This description provides the framework for collaboration among and between the stakeholders and interested public. The IRWMP Stakeholder Planning Committee, formed in 2005, served as the policy and decision-making body for the CABY IRWMP effort. The CABY IRWMP *charter* reflects the consensus reached among the Stakeholder Planning Committees on structure, decision making, membership, and communication.

2.1.1 Purpose

The primary purpose of the CABY planning process was to produce the CABY IRWMP. The IRWMP identifies the vision, guiding principles, broadly-supported goals, objectives, strategies, actions and projects for enhancing the beneficial uses of water in the CABY region, including the provision of long-term water supplies, protection and improvement of water quality, and enhancement of environmental and habitat resources. The IRWMP, initially informed by the various pre-existing plans in the region, provides an integrated approach to water management in the Cosumnes, American, Bear, and Yuba watersheds. The IRWMP will provide opportunities for obtaining local, state and federal grants and other financial support to accomplish the goals for the region. Adopted

by more than 25 diverse organizations in the region, the CABY stakeholder process and public outreach met its goal of informing as many stakeholders as possible about plan development and ensuring widespread support once the plan was finished.

2.1.2 Planning Process

The CABY IRWM planning process involved the following steps:

1. regional stakeholders gathered in response to the opportunity to integrate efforts and identified shared goals that confirmed the benefits of working together and ultimately the region;
2. developed structures, protocols, actions, schedule and resources necessary to complete the plan on schedule;
3. developed a common vision, goals, and issues;
4. established workgroups to develop specific objectives and actions to address the three management areas;
5. brought these objectives and actions back to the plenary planning committee to integrate with the goals and objectives of the existing mandatory plans;
6. created a rigorous process to prioritize the first set of actions/projects aimed at addressing the integrated set of goals and objectives of the CABY IRWMP;
7. developed a strategy for implementing the IRWMP, including needs for institutional structures, staffing, monitoring and evaluation, data management and funding mechanism; and
8. briefed and sought plan adoption from diverse CABY stakeholders.

CABY Planning Horizon

The CABY planning horizon is approximately twenty years into the future -- in the range of

2027 – 2030; many of CABY’s discussions and actions, however, will be informed by a longer time horizon of up to fifty years. Initial discussions and brainstorming sessions worked to creatively tackle the issue of regional watershed management. These sessions developed idea boards for several key areas including a 2026 Vision illustration (Figure 2.1) and a Values and Guiding Principles illustration (Figure 2.2).

2.1.3 CABY Stakeholder Structure

1. **Planning Committee:** This decision-making body for the IRWMP process was comprised of organizations representing diverse interests across the four CABY watersheds.
2. **Workgroups:** Appointed by the Planning Committee, the Workgroups developed goals, objectives, actions and recommendations for specific management areas (water supply, water quality, and environment and habitat protection).
3. **Coordinating Committee:** A smaller, representative group of the Planning Committee was appointed by the Planning Committee and consisted of four water agencies and four conservation groups. The Committee assisted staff with process planning, technical proposals, and communications to the stakeholder group in the region and beyond.

Roles and Responsibilities

Planning Committee

1. Organizations and governmental agencies that participated in the CABY process selected one formal designee to represent their interests on the CABY Planning Committee.
2. The Planning Committee was the decision making body of the IRWMP process, and its members committed to making a good faith effort to achieve

consensus to produce a Plan with the strongest support possible.

3. Planning Committee members attended meetings consistently and, if unable to attend any session, sent an alternate also chosen by their organization. However, use of alternates was discouraged to maintain discussion and decision-making continuity.
4. Members participated in at least one Workgroup and attended these meetings regularly.
5. Members regularly communicated information about the process to their organizations or agencies, as well as to the individual constituencies and communities they represent.
6. The Planning Committee made decisions in accordance with the rules set out in the Planning Committee Decision Making section below.
7. A Planning Committee member’s eligibility to take part in IRWMP decision-making depended upon active participation by that member (defined in the Decision Making section below).

Workgroups

1. Each Workgroup was dedicated to one of the three major goals set out in the planning framework and guided by the DWR proposal. These are referred to as management areas: water supply, water quality, and environment and habitat protection. The Planning Committee reviewed and established additional goals where needed.
2. Workgroups identified additional participants from outside the Planning Committee to increase the diversity of interests represented, provide input from all four watershed areas, or provide additional expertise.



Figure 2.1. CABY 2026 Vision Illustration



Figure 2.2. CABY IRWMP Values and Guiding Principles

3. Workgroup membership represented diverse interests and was kept to a workable number to facilitate in-depth discussions.
 4. Each Workgroup sought participation from all four watersheds to promote regional integration in all the management areas.
 5. Consistent attendance at Workgroup meetings was essential since a large part of the IRWMP workload was carried by these groups.
 6. Workgroups were guided by:
 - a. direction from Planning Committee (with feedback from public), and
 - b. requirements of IRWMP grant and final product.
 7. A manager and a technical consultant staffed each of the Workgroups.
 8. Workgroups sought consensus and, when consensus could not be reached, they presented the full range of opinions on any proposal to the Planning Committee to inform the committee's decisions.
3. The Coordinating Committee, at the request of the Planning Committee, played a role in the development of the IRWMP, including preparation of substantive proposals, but had no decision-making authority.
 4. The Coordinating Committee sought consensus and, when consensus could not be reached, presented the full range of opinions on any proposal to the Planning Committee to inform the Planning Committee's decisions.
 5. The Coordinating Committee also served as a technical sub-committee. Members reviewed and evaluated the projects proposed for inclusion in the plan using criteria approved by the Planning Committee.

Communication

1. All CABY meeting participants agreed to ground rules of meeting conduct to promote productive, quality discussions considering diverse viewpoints to develop the IRWMP.
2. Meeting summaries were provided following each Planning Committee meeting.
3. When asked about the CABY's progress by external parties, including the media, members were advised to speak only for their organization or themselves, unless there was a formal adoption of a statement, concepts, or recommendations by the Planning Committee.
4. In addition, staff made presentations about CABY and group's work at meetings, conferences, or other venues. Members were strongly encouraged to provide or arrange presentations about the group's work wherever feasible to increase awareness of the IRWMP process.
5. The Planning Committee was encouraged to develop common IRWMP statements for periodic public release. Suggested text for the statements was developed by staff and facilitators or was offered by a group member.

Coordinating Committee

1. The Coordinating Committee consisted of the following eight organizations, as determined at the Planning Committee's March 1, 2006 meeting: El Dorado Irrigation District; El Dorado County Water Agency; Placer County Water Agency; Nevada Irrigation District; Sierra Nevada Alliance; Natural Heritage Institute; South Yuba River Citizens League; and American Rivers.
2. The role of the Coordinating Committee was that of process planning and logistics to assist staff with scheduling, recommendations for process modifications, communication, and other issues for which staff needed advice in between Planning Committee meetings.

2.1.4 Decision Making

1. **Consensus as the Fundamental Principle:** The Planning Committee strove for consensus (agreement among all participants) in all of its decision-making. Working towards consensus was a fundamental principle of the CABY process.
2. **Definition of “Consensus”:** In reaching consensus, some Planning Committee members may have strongly endorsed a particular proposal while others may have accepted it as "workable." Others may have been only able to “live with it.” Still others may have chosen to “stand aside” by verbally noting disagreement, yet allowing the group to reach a consensus without them if the decision did not affect them or compromise their interests.
3. **Less than 100% Consensus Decision Making:** The Planning Committee was able to develop the plan using consensus. However, the Planning Committee did develop the following protocol at its outset in case it was unable to reach consensus. The Planning Committee did not limit itself to strict consensus if 100% agreement among all participants could not be reached after all interests and options were thoroughly identified, explored, discussed, and considered. Less-than-consensus decision-making would not be undertaken lightly. If, after full exploration and discussion the Planning Committee could not come to 100% agreement, it agreed to use the less-than-consensus decision-making protocols described below. For plan proposals to be endorsed by the Planning Committee, they had to pass the two tests identified below, in the order as presented. This means that the proposal first had to meet the first test (a) before the second test (b) could be applied.
 - a) **Broad Support of the Planning Committee Membership:** The proposal or decision had to be endorsed by a 75%

supermajority of the total number of *active* members of the Planning Committee. (In other words, the proposal or decision could not be opposed by more than 25% of the total number of *active* members of the Planning Committee.) *Active* participation is defined in item 4 below.

- b) **Representation from Major Interests:** The above 75% supermajority would have to include three of the four following public agencies: El Dorado Irrigation District; El Dorado County Water Agency; Placer County Water Agency; Nevada Irrigation District; and three of the four following non-profit organizations: Sierra Nevada Alliance; Natural Heritage Institute; South Yuba River Citizens League; and American Rivers.
4. **Definition of Active Participation by Planning Committee Members:** Active participation was defined as having regularly attended Planning Committee meetings; regularly participating in at least one Work Group or ensuring that a designee of the Planning Committee member’s organization participated in a Work Group under the Planning Committee member’s close guidance; and reviewing planning and other written documents before discussions were held or decisions made. It was understood that Planning Committee members would occasionally miss Planning Committee and/or Workgroup meetings. If there was a question as to whether a Planning Committee member should be considered “active” for purposes of decision-making, the Coordinating Committee would make that determination.
5. **Conditional Endorsements:** It was understood that Planning Committee members that represent organizations were unable to make final commitments without conferring first with their organizations. In this case, agreements were considered conditionally endorsed pending organizational confirmation.

2.1.5 Adoption of the Plan

The Plan was endorsed by the Planning Committee on November 29, 2006. As of March 2007, more than 25 organizations representing diverse public and non-governmental interests have adopted the CABY IRWMP; others will be adopting in the near future. Every effort is made to ensure that adopting organizations understand the IRWMP and that the IRWMP reflects these organizations' concerns.

Organizations that have adopted or will adopt the Plan generally had a representative participating in monthly Planning Committee meetings where all elements of the IRWMP were discussed and approved. As a member of the Committee, each representative assumed responsibility for articulating the interests and concerns of his or her respective organization and its constituents. At key milestones, planning committee members scheduled briefings with their organizations.

Once the draft plan was available, the planning committee developed a resolution of adoption. Planning Committee representatives returned to their organizations with the draft plan and the resolution to seek formal adoption. Member organizations used the voting protocols stipulated in their organization to ensure that the adoption was formal. Copies of these resolutions may be found in the Plan appendices.

The Plan is not a legally binding document but a regional compact with accompanying commitments. Adoption of the IRWMP by an organization represents a commitment to participate in the implementation of the Plan.

This does not mean that after adoption of the Plan there will be no differences in approach, method, or interpretation of the Plan. The Plan will be an adaptable document that will need to change over time. Adoption of the Plan implies that organizations agree to continue building common ground and to resolve differences collaboratively.

CABY Philosophy

The members of the CABY Planning Committee affirmed its commitment to work

in good faith with all the diverse interests represented on the Planning Committee. Good faith implied regularly attending and participating in CABY meetings and Workgroups, striving to understand all perspectives, engaging in dialogue and deliberation, and earnestly working toward building common ground and consensus with fellow Planning Committee members.

The CABY philosophy also acknowledged that Planning Committee members and their organizations had to occasionally unilaterally pursue their interests during the CABY planning process. This was sometimes referred to as the reality of "living in two worlds" and did not imply that an organization was violating their good faith participation. No one participating in the CABY process was asked to abandon their obligations to their organizations or give up any type of rights.

Open Process

1. All meetings of the CABY process were open to the public.
2. Planning Committee agendas were sent out in advance of the meetings and posted on the CABY web site. At each meeting the public was given an opportunity to comment.
3. Members of the public were expected to adhere to CABY ground rules and meeting protocols.

2006	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Expand Interested Parties List								
Phase 1 Briefings								
Phase 2 Briefings								
Release Two-Page Briefings								
Produce Newsletter Articles								
Press Releases								
Staff Conduct Briefings								
Planning Committee Members Brief Constituents								
Approval and Adoption								

Figure 2.3: 2006 General timeline for the public participation process

2.2 Public Outreach

Development of the IRWMP included significant public participation throughout the planning process. CABY developed a public participation plan to outline the process by which the CABY region was to inform and seek input from a diverse audience and to ensure ultimate plan adoption by Planning Committee member organizations.

Members of the Planning and Coordinating Committees contributed names of organizations and agencies to help the outreach effort. The interested parties list was broad and included anyone who wanted to stay informed about the development and outcome of the CABY IRWM planning effort. The general timeline for public involvement and information sharing is shown in Figure 2.3.

The CABY portal (www.CABYRegion.org) was a major element of public outreach and was included in the grant work plan and budget so that it remains available to the public. The objective, which was met, was to link portals for CABY and each watershed. The project calendar, meeting announcements, materials, and project documents were included on the web site.

Briefings

To ensure that the IRWMP was reviewed and adopted by as many stakeholder groups as possible in the Planning Committee, CABY staff kept agency Board members informed throughout the planning process. CABY staff and Planning Committee members provided regular briefings to interested organizations on an ongoing basis in response to requests and actively solicited opportunities to brief constituencies, such as business, that did not actively participate in the Planning Committee but have a direct interest in regional water management. At key milestones, Planning Committee members briefed constituents and boards of the organizations that they represented. The purpose of these briefings was twofold: to inform and educate constituents about integrated planning efforts and to solicit input from constituents on the

contents of the Plan. In addition, the CABY director conducted many briefings at constituent organizations, including but not limited to Mountain Counties, Sierra Business Council, Water Education Foundation, Boards of Supervisors, and others.

Outreach with Disadvantaged Communities and Tribes

In addition, the CABY facilitator and staff conducted telephone outreach with disadvantaged communities and Tribes in the region to make sure that these stakeholders were aware that the IRWMP was under development, offer to conduct briefings at existing meetings, identify issues that the plan should address, and ensure that projects might be submitted for inclusion in the IRWMP. The goal of this outreach was to provide opportunities, other than attending Planning Committee meetings and Workgroups to influence the plan.

Coordination with Adjacent IRWMPs

A special meeting was held with adjacent IRWMP efforts in the process of developing the CABY IRWMP. This meeting highlighted the need for regular, ongoing meetings for this group throughout the implementation phase.

Information Materials

Materials used by members and staff for public presentation purposes or for brief updates at membership, community, or agency meetings, included an introductory brochure, two-sided informational pages on goals & objectives, the planning process, the IRWMP, and 3-5 minute PowerPoint slide shows. In addition, CABY staff prepared newsletter articles and brief announcements that were distributed to local news organizations and placed on the CABY web site to keep interested parties informed and to reach beyond the circle of those already informed to the greater community. Newsletter articles, brochures and press releases were distributed after each major phase of the work plan was completed as part of the overall outreach effort.

2.3 Export of Lessons Learned: Sierra IRWMP Conference

The CABY IRWMP co-sponsored the Sierra IRWMP Conference with the Sierra Nevada Alliance, Mountain Counties Water Resources Association, and the Sierra Nevada Conservancy. The Sierra Nevada Alliance, a member of the CABY Coordinating Committee planned and executed the conference, held on March 9, 2007.

The Conference goal was to bring together Sierra stakeholders to understand how to develop successful IRWMPs in the Sierra. The Conference co-sponsors invited Sierra conservation groups, water agencies, non governmental organizations, IRWMPs, regions, local governments, landuse agencies, resources agencies, and power companies. In fact, we received so many sign-ups for the Conference, we had to cut off registration due to a limit of 80 attendees at the Conference venue, the Sierra Health Foundation.

The Sierra IRWMP Conference offered speakers, panels, and break-out discussion on forming an IRWMP launch team, lessons and successes from other IRWMPs, forming integrated goals and objectives, and the state perspective on the future of the IRWMPs. We were pleased to have Secretary of Resources, Mike Chrisman, kick off the conference as the keynote speaker. Following this opening, John Woodling from DWR discussed the state's definition of integration and vision for the future of IRWMPs. To share lessons from existing Sierra IRWMPs, we invited leaders from the Plumas IRWMP, Tahoe Sierra IRWMP, and CABY IRWMP talk about their governance membership, public process, and their integrated projects. The CABY facilitator, Gina Bartlett, from Center for Collaborative Policy shared successful processes for including broad stakeholders representation in IRWMPs and how to make these groups successful. Matt Zidar, Water Resources & Information Management Engineering, dissected the different elements of an IRWMP. Finally, a panel comprised of representatives from a water agency, County planning department, and Forest Service

discussed with the participants how to develop integrated goals and objectives.

After the speaker panels, conference participants broke into groups according to their IRWMP hydrologic planning units including: Lahontan North and South; Sacramento Valley; San Joaquin; and Tulare Lake Regions. Based on the status of the existing and proposed IRWMPs in the hydrologic unit, participants in each break-out group discussed a wide range of issues including: how to launch new IRWMPs to cover Sierra regions that had none; how to encourage better coordination between existing IRWMPs; how to improve IRWMP's consultation and inclusion of ngos and other non-water agency entities; IRWMP boundary definitions; and how to foster non-controversial projects and collaboration in IRWMPs.

The Sierra IRWMP Conference helped CABY export a successful and collaborative model for genuinely integrated water management to the rest of the Sierra. New Sierra IRWMPs can now build from the foundation outlined in the Sierra IRWMP Conference. Handouts and participants' contact information from the conference are available on the Sierra Nevada Alliance website.

