Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan

Attachment A – Landowner and Stakeholder Analysis, Final (December 30, 2013)

Prepared by:

United States Department of the Interior
Bureau of Reclamation
Mid-Pacific Region

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Reclamation

December 2013

Executive Summary

The Landowner and Stakeholder Analysis (LSA) is a study to assess and measure landowner and stakeholder opinions, assumptions, and awareness of a proposed plan to reintroduce federally-listed Chinook salmon into two major tributaries of Shasta Lake as part of the Shasta Dam Fish Passage Pilot Evaluation (Project). The Project is being led by the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), in partnership with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and other Federal and State agencies. The information collected through this LSA assists in development of the Project's Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan. It further affords insight to the technical, social, institutional, and policy issues that could influence the Project's development and completion.

The LSA contains results of one-on-one telephone interviews conducted in August and September 2013 with 20 people identified in three stakeholder tiers: Primary, Secondary, and Influencer. These tiers were selected based on a variety of factors, including ownership of land along rivers proposed for fish reintroduction, having a direct or indirect influence over Project implementation, and direct experience with the habitat and history of the rivers. These tiers and their associated groups include:

Primary:

- Landowner, Industrial/Agricultural
- Landowner, Recreational
- Landowner, Private Cabin
- Utility Providers

Secondary:

- River Users

Influencer:

- Local Government Agencies
- Native American Tribes
- Non-Governmental Organizations

All interviews were conducted from a single questionnaire designed to collect and record responses reflecting the respondent's personal and professional viewpoints. To support consistent collection of responses, a standard script was developed for each interview. Attachment B, Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation Questions for Interviews with Stakeholders and Landowners contains the questionnaire and interviewer script. Interview comments were recorded and/or paraphrased into an Interview Summary Sheet. Respondents were invited to review their individual summary sheet for accuracy and completeness. See Attachment C, Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation Interview Summaries, for copies of all interview summaries.

To foster open and unfiltered dialog during the interview, Reclamation and NMFS provided anonymity to participants. This anonymity included removal of stakeholder names from the Interview Summary Sheets contained in this document. While respondents were also offered the option to be removed from the List of Participants (Table E-1), none accepted the invitation.

Table E-1. Landowner and Stakeholder Assessment Participant List

Category	Tier	Organization	Name
Business Landowner	Primary	Sierra Pacific Industries	Herb Baldwin
Business Landowner	Primary	Crane Mills	Frank Barron
Elected Officials/Local Government	Influencer	County of Siskiyou	Ric Costales
Native American Tribes	Influencer	Shasta Indian Nation	Janice Crowe
Business Landowner	Primary	Bollibokka Fly Fishing Club/Westlands Water District	Russ Freeman
Landowner	Primary	Cabin Owner	Doug Ginno
Environmental/NGO	Influencer	Trout Unlimited	Rene Henery
Business Landowner	Primary	McCloud River Club	Jocelyn Herbert
Business Landowner	Primary	Roseburg Resources Company	Arne Hultgren
Business Landowner	Primary	PG&E	John Klobas
Environmental/NGO	Influencer	Cal-Trout	Curtis Knight
Elected Officials/Local Government	Influencer	Shasta County Board of Supervisors	Bill Schappell
Environmental/NGO	Influencer	California SportFishing Protection Alliance	Chris Shutes
Native American Tribes	Influencer	Winnemem Wintu Tribe	Caleen Sisk
Environmental/NGO	Secondary	American Whitewater	Dave Steindorf
Business Landowner	Primary	The Nature Conservatory	George Stroud
Business Owner	Secondary	Art Teter Guide Service	Art Teter
Landowner	Primary	SweetBrier Cabin Owners Association	Bill Tolson
Business Owner	Secondary	Jack Trout Fly Fishing & Guide Service	Jack Trout
Elected Officials/Local Government	Influencer	Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors	Ed Valenzuela

Key:
NGO = Non-Governmental Organization
PG&E= Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Interview Format

The interview sought to collect responses in the following two general areas:

- Project awareness and opinions
- Project communication channels

Project Awareness and Opinions (Questions 1 – 8)

This section has two parts. Questions 1 and 2 identified the respondent's awareness and assumed level of participation in the Project. Questions 3 through 8 focus on responses to questions as they related to the six major task areas of the Project: Fish Health and Genetics; Fish Passage Technology: Habitat; Pilot Plan; Policy and Regulatory; and Public Outreach. For these, participants were asked to:

- Score difficulty to research, conduct or implement each task area
- Rank the communication, engagement, and informational importance of each task area

Respondents were asked to provide answers based on their personal and professional view and on what they believe would represent the answers of their peers.

Project Communication Channels (Questions 9 – 14)

This section focuses on communication channels, including collecting responses and suggestions for communication channels and outreach methods, how stakeholders and landowners receive information, and the identification of additional stakeholders in the Project area.

Limitations

Contents in this document can be viewed as a representative of the viewpoints for a segment of the stakeholder community for which they belong. Due to the small sample size, however, this data cannot be fully extrapolated to the Project area population as a whole.

Key Findings

Key findings outline essential information to be considered for development of the Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan and as guides when engaging with various stakeholder groups during the Project.

Project Awareness

Approximately two-thirds of respondents had prior knowledge of the effort to reintroduce federally-listed Chinook salmon in tributaries of Shasta Lake for at least one year. The remaining respondents knew for less than one year.

Task Difficulty (Question 3)
When asked to score the level of difficulty to research, conduct, or implement the six task areas, the aggregate response showed the following order:

1. Policy and Regulatory
2. (*Tie*) Pilot Plan and Fish Passage Technology
3. Habitat,
4. Fish Health and Genetics.
5. Public Outreach

A comparison of responses between tier groups can provide insight to whether stakeholders share a common understanding of a subject or task. While the sample size provides limitations on statistical analysis, three task areas – Fish Passage Technology, Public Health and Habitat – have the widest variation in responses between tier groups. This wide variation in responses indicates potential for conflict and a need to plan for management of those differences.

Task Importance (Question 6)
When asked to rank tasks in order of communication, engagement, and informational importance, the aggregate response showed the following order of importance, based upon the percentage of respondents classifying the task area as highly important:

1. Public Outreach
2. Policy and Regulatory
3. Pilot Plan
4. Fish Passage Technology
5. (*Tie*) Habitat and Fish Health and Genetics

An analysis of responses among tier groups shows that respondents view Public Outreach as the most important in terms of communication, engagement, and informational importance. The next three important task areas are Policy and Regulatory, Pilot Plan, and Fish Passage Technology; these were also considered the most difficult to implement. The two least important task areas were Habitat and Fish Health and

Landowner and Stakeholder Analysis Interviews:

California has gone from a salmon state to an agricultural state. The fight is either over water or fish. California needs to be a salmon state, as it has the best estuary options in the whole United States.

Stakeholder:
Native American Tribe

Genetics, as these are viewed as being the least complex and controversial.

Conclusions

Interview results show that Policy and Regulatory, Pilot Plan, and Fish Passage Technology are the highest rated topics among tier groups in terms of difficulty to implement and were also considered important for communication. While all topics are important to the overall completion of the Project, these high-value topics should receive additional emphasis during development and implementation of the Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan. Findings contained in this document will serve to help develop the Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan.

Contents

Tables

Abbreviations and Acronyms

BO	Biological Opinion
CRMP	Coordinated Resource Management Plan
CVP	Central Valley Project
ESA	Endangered Species Act
LSA	Landowner and Stakeholder Analysis
LTO	Long-Term Operations
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
Project	Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation
Reclamation	U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation
SWP	State Water Project

This page left blank intentionally.

Chapter 1
Interview Background

Twenty primary landowners and subject-matter stakeholders were selected for their experience, expertise, and position among their peer group as it pertains to the either the Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation (Project) area or the Project topic to participate in a 1-hour, one-on-one telephone interview. These interviews were to measure initial awareness of the goals and objectives for the Project. Respondents were informed that results of interviews will be used to develop the Project's Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan.

All interviews were conducted from a single questionnaire designed to collect and record responses that reflected the respondent's personal and professional viewpoints. To support consistent collection of responses, a standard script was developed to guide staff in conducting each interview, see Attachment A for a copy of the questionnaire and interview script. Comments received during each interview were recorded and/or paraphrased into an Interview Summary Sheet. Respondents were invited to review their individual summary sheet for accuracy and completeness. See Attachment C for copies of all interview summaries.

To foster open and frank dialog during the interview, the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) provided anonymity to participants. This anonymity included removal of stakeholder names from the Interview Summary Sheets contained in this document. While respondents were also offered the option to be removed from the List of Participants (see Table E-1), none accepted the invitation.

Stakeholder Tiers and Categories

As a way to interpret the responses and maintain anonymity, interviewees were categorized using a tiered approach. The stakeholder's tiers were based on their proximity to the potential Project sites on the McCloud and Sacramento rivers.

Primary: A primary stakeholder is any person(s) or organization(s) ultimately affected, either positively or

negatively, by the Project actions. For the Project, primary stakeholders have been identified as those stakeholders that are immediately along the McCloud or Sacramento rivers or in close proximity that will be impacted by the implementation of the Project. Primary Stakeholders include both business and private landowners. Nine primary stakeholders were interviewed and represent four stakeholder subgroups:

- Landowner, Industrial/Agricultural
- Landowner, Recreational
- Landowner, Private Cabin
- Utility Providers

Secondary: A secondary stakeholder is any person(s) or organization(s) indirectly affected by the Project actions. For the Project, secondary stakeholders include businesses that are located on the rivers or use the rivers, like river and fishing guides or rafting clubs, as they could potentially be affected by the Project. Three secondary stakeholders were interviewed in one stakeholder subgroup:

- River Users

Influencer: An influencer is any person(s) or organization(s) with significant influence on, or importance in, an organization. An influencer can also belong to the first two groups. This stakeholder group has been identified mainly based on focus, proximity to Project area, and activity level of the organizations. Eight influencers were interviewed and represent three stakeholder subgroups:

- Local Government Agencies
- Native American Tribes
- Non-Governmental Organizations

Interview Format

An approved standard script was used for all the interviews. The interview questions were formulated to allow for a mix of tabulated results and open-ended answers. The questions also allowed the responses to be compared across categories, the results of which are presented below. In addition, interviewees were able to elaborate on their answers and explain their viewpoints related to the Project. Those interviewed were asked about their personal viewpoint as well as what they

thought would be the viewpoints of their colleagues and/or peers.

Before the interview, the interviewees were provided with links to the Project Web site (http://www.usbr.gov/mp/BayDeltaOffice/Documents/Shasta_Fish_Passage/index.html) and the Project fact sheet. The participants were asked to review the six task areas of the Project before the scheduled interview. The six task areas were based on the six interagency subcommittees established the fish passage program. The description of each task area provided in the Project fact sheet is reiterated below:

- **Habitat** – Conduct habitat-related work, including surveys, data collection, and habitat mapping, and address related habitat issues and decisions. This work will culminate in a habitat assessment report.

- **Fish Passage Technology** – Develop and assess technologies for the safe and effective collection, passage, and transport of juvenile and adult Chinook salmon necessary to reach the Project goals. The fish passage technology subgroup will study passage efficacy, design, reservoir hydrodynamics, fish screen criteria, and operations.

- **Fish Health and Genetics** – Assess the health of existing fish populations in tributaries above Shasta Lake, and identify broodstock selection, and the health and genetics of the potential broodstock.

- **Pilot Plan** – Compile information from the Habitat, Fish Passage Technology, Fish Health and Genetics, and Policy and Regulatory task areas, as well as identifying other management activities and monitoring programs to successfully implement a Pilot Implementation Plan for fish reintroduction.

- **Policy and Regulatory** – Define and comply with National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (Wild and Scenic), and Endangered Species Act (ESA) permits and regulations as they relate to reintroduced Chinook salmon.

- **Public Outreach** – Coordinate and foster broad awareness and transparency of the Project among the

public, agencies, landowners, organizations, elected officials, and other interested parties.

Chapter 2
Interview Analysis

This chapter describes the process used to evaluate the results of the interviews conducted through the Landowner and Stakeholder Analysis.

Methodology

Results of these interviews have been aggregated based on the numerical values assigned by respondents or via categorization of responses provided for open ended questions. Numerical responses were provided for questions 3 through 8, found in Appendix A, which focus on responses to questions as they related to the six major task areas of the Project: Fish Health and Genetics; Fish Passage Technology: Habitat; Pilot Plan; Policy and Regulatory; and Public Outreach. For these, participants were asked to:

- Score task difficulty on a scale of 1 to 6 (with six being the highest score) the level of difficulty to research, conduct or implement each task.

- Rank the communication, engagement, and informational importance of each task from first to sixth place.

Each numerical response was assigned a category, as seen in Table 2-1. Assigning qualitative categories to the quantitative responses assists in the interpretation of this data. More advanced statistical and mathematical methods could not be used for data interpretation as the sample size was small (20 respondents) and not randomly chosen.

Table 2-1. Assigned Categories for Analysis

Score of Difficulty	Rank	Assigned Category
1 or 2	5th or 6th Place	Low
3 or 4	3rd or 4th Place	Medium
5 or 6	1st or 2nd Place	High

This page left blank intentionally.

Chapter 3
Interview Questions: Awareness and Opinions

Questions related to Project awareness and opinions account for 8 of the 14 questions posed to respondents. This section had two parts. Questions 1 and 2 identified the respondent's familiarity/awareness of the Project and the respondent's perceived level of participation in the Project. Questions 3 through 8 focus on responses to questions as they related to the six major task areas of the Project: Fish Health and Genetics; Fish Passage Technology: Habitat; Pilot Plan; Policy and Regulatory; and Public Outreach. For these, participants were asked to:

- Score the *difficulty* of implementing each task area
- Rank the communication, engagement, and informational *importance* of each task area

The following describes the purpose of each question and the results. Additionally, this section summarizes other concerns that the interviewees expressed during the interview.

Interviewee Familiarity

The first question put forward was intended to gauge a baseline of Project awareness and to identify communication channels used by stakeholders. Interviewees were asked when they first heard of the Project and to what extent they consider themselves familiar with the Project (see Table 3-1).

Table 3-1. Project Awareness by Year

Year First Heard of Project*	Percentage of Total Interviewees
2009	36.7%
2010–2012	26.6%
2013 (Present)	36.7%

Note:
*Some interviewed provided exact years while other dates were estimated.

Many participants mentioned hearing about the Project through meetings with CalTrout, McCloud River Coordinated Resource Management Plan (CRMP), Reclamation, and NMFS. Almost 37 percent of the participants first heard of the Project when the *Long-Term Operations for the Central Valley Project and State Water Project Biological Opinion* (BO) was released by NMFS in 2009; some respondents mentioned that they have been following anadromous fish issues before 2009. Approximately 27 percent of those interviewed heard of the Project sometime between 2010 and 2012. The remaining interviewees (almost 37 percent) heard of the Project in 2013; almost all of these learned of the Project from the interview request or through notification of the Landowner and Stakeholder Public Workshop held in Lakehead, California on August 27, 2013.

As a way to categorize how familiar the interviewees consider themselves with the Project, their answers were separated into three categories: unfamiliar, familiar, and very familiar. The responses among these categories are evenly distributed, representative of a diverse stakeholder group, and indicative of the opportunities for public outreach (see Table 3-2).

Table 3-2. Level of Project Familiarity

Familiarity	Count
Unfamiliar	7
Familiar	6
Very Familiar	7

Task Area Related Questions

Scoring of Implementation Difficulty

The interviewees were asked their opinion of how difficult they believed it would be to research or implement each of the six task areas, Fish Health and Genetics, Fish Passage Technology, Habitat, Pilot Plan, Policy and Regulatory, and Public Outreach. The degree of difficulty could be attributed to technical (e.g., fisheries, engineering), policy, political, or financial reasons. Overall, task areas that interviewees considered the most difficult were:

- Policy and Regulatory

- (*Tie*) Pilot Plan and Fish Passage Technology
- Habitat
- Fish Health and Genetics
- Public Outreach

It should be noted that for all issues except Pilot Plan and Policy and Regulatory, at least one participant assigned the difficulty of the task as low and one participant scored the task as a highly difficult, meaning some participants percieve the task as the most difficult while others view the same task as the least difficult. See Table 3-4 for the distribution of how the interviewees perceived the levels of difficulty to implement for each of the task areas.

Table 3-4. Distribution of Scores for Task Area Difficulty

Perceived Level of Difficulty to Implement	Fish Health and Genetics	Fish Passage Technology	Habitat	Pilot Plan	Policy and Regulatory	Public Outreach
Low	35%	10%	50%	10%	0%	40%
Medium	40%	45%	20%	45%	30%	35%
High	25%	45%	30%	45%	70%	25%

The interviewees saw the Policy and Regulatory issues as the most complex part of the Project, citing that regulatory issues are very involved and politcal. The respondents expressed concern for the additional regulations and rules that would accompany the reintroduction of an endangered species and how this would affect regulations and practices already in place. The uncertainty regarding a safe harbor or an experiemental status was cited as an issue of concern.

The scoring of difficulty for both the Pilot Plan and Fish Passage Technology were the same. Pilot Plan was considered difficult because all task areas of this complex Project will be coming together in a single pilot plan. Reasons cited for the difficulty related to fish passage technology include the high costs, uncertainty of success, and the likely use of untested

methods for passing fish in the Project area, compared with passage in the other areas of the Pacific Northwest.

Habitat was considered the easiest component to implement, with 50 percent of the respondents assigning this task area as a low difficulty to implement, as fish habitat assesments are routine and a wealth of fish habitat information is already available; habitat assesments can be achieved outside of the political framework. Some respondents felt public outreach was an easier task relative to other task areas because the outreach infrastructure is already in place and the two watersheds are considered relatively unpopulated. Fish Health and Genetics was considered by the respondents to be an internal issue that will be decided by NMFS and Reclamation, that is, NMFS and Reclamation are responsible for all the research and reporting necessary under this task area.

Ranking of Communication, Engagement, and Informational Importance

The interviewees were asked to assess the communication, engagement, and informational importance of the same six task areas. Overall, the respondents ranked the task areas in order from most to least important, with this ranking being based on the percentage of respondents ranking the task area as highly important:

1. Public Outreach
2. Policy and Regulatory
3. Pilot Plan
4. Fish Passage Technology
5. (*Tie*) Habitat and Fish Health and Genetics

See Table 3-5 for a representation of how the respondents ranked each task area in terms of their communication, engagement, and informational importance.

Table 3-5. Distribution of Rankings for Communication, Engagement, and Informational Importance

Importance	Fish Health and Genetics	Fish Passage Technology	Habitat	Pilot Plan	Policy and Regulatory	Public Outreach
Low	55%	30%	35%	5%	35%	45%
Medium	20%	40%	40%	55%	20%	5%
High	25%	30%	25%	40%	45%	50%

Half of the respondents viewed Public Outreach as being the most important task area in terms of communicational importance while almost the same proportion of respondents ranking this task area as having low importance. This disparity can be attributed to the attitude of some respondents who mentioned that Public Outreach was implied and included in the communication, engagement, and dissemination of information, thereby warranting a low rank for Public Outreach. The next three task areas in terms of communicational importance were Policy and Regulation, Pilot Plan, and Fish Passage Technology, which were also considered the most difficult to implement in the previous question. When interviewees explained why they chose the policy and regulatory task area as the most important, the difficulty of implementing this task was cited. It is anticipated that this "sensitive topic" will be very time consuming and it will be complicated because of the ESA-listed status of the Chinook salmon. Respondents reiterated the communicational importance of the Shasta Dam Fish Passage Implementation Pilot Plan, stating that being open, transparent, and clear with the roles, timeline, and specifics of the Pilot Plan are extremely important. The stakeholders in the region feel they are knowledgeable and well versed about the issues involved in the Pilot Plan, and feel it is important to communicate what is and is not going to be done as part of this Project. Fish Passage Technology was considered important for outreach because the issue is complex and it may be difficult to understand and to get agreement on the best methods.

The two task areas considered the least important, Habitat and Fish Health and Genetics, were also viewed as the least controversial topics, i.e., less political. The communication of habitat-related issues is considered the least important because

it is anticipated that the public will be less involved with this task area. The habitat assessments will be conducted by fisheries professionals, and additionally the Project will use available habitat data on previously surveyed streams. The respondents see Fish Health and Genetics as a task to be undertaken by experienced scientists, and therefore, there is less need for public involvement.

Landowner and Stakeholder Analysis Interviews:

How does the addition of salmon affect the habitat of the other fish and aquatic species already in the water? How does this affect trout fishing, and overall effect on aquatic life in the rivers?

Stakeholder: Landowner

Concerns

The interviewees were asked about other concerns they had related to the project. Approximately half of those interviewed stated that the cost of the project was a major concern; many respondents felt that expenditures would be large while the success of the anadramous Chinook salmon reintroduction is unproven. More than a third of participants had concerns about how the project would impact flows in the river; some partcipants are concerned about how this will affect the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission relicensing process. Participants are concerned about how increased regulation will effect their operations.

Chapter 4
Interview Questions: Communication

This chapter focuses on communication channels, including collecting responses and suggestions for communication channels and outreach methods, how stakeholders and landowners receive information, and the identification of additional stakeholders in the Project area.

Stakeholder Recommendations

The respondents were asked what they felt was the best ways to engage stakeholders and also for suggestions to improve and increase the avenues for communication for the Project. Their responses were distilled into three main categories:

- Hold public meetings
- Publish/distribute information
- Engage specific landowners and stakeholders

Table 6-1 shows the most suggested outreach strategies. Several methods of communication channels were mentioned by the interviewees; these are shown in Table 4-3. The interviewees stressed that the message presented needs to be clear, well thought out, unified between groups (particularly Reclamation and NMFS), and must accurately represent the opinions of stakeholders. Half of the interviewees recommended publishing and distributing information to stakeholders. All respondents said they would like to receive information electronically, through e-mail, and regular updates to the Project Web site. People mentioned wanting e-mails sent out with regular Project updates or developments. E-mails should have links to relevant documents and Web sites. A limited number of respondents would like print mail in addition to electronic communication. Others suggested print mailings and publishing articles in local and regional newspapers.

Table 4-1. Respondent Recommended Outreach Strategies

Engagement Strategy	Percentage of Interviewees who Suggested this Strategy (percent)
Hold Meetings	**89**
Large/Public Meetings	44
Small Peer-Group Meetings	22
One-on-One Meetings	28
Publish/Distribute Information	**56**
Engage Specific Stakeholders/Landowners	**50**

Table 4-2 provides existing communication channels that were identified by the respondents, which could be used to help distribute information regarding the Project.

Table 4-2. Respondent Recommended Communication Channels

Groups and Meetings
CalTrout
Fall River Conservancy
McCloud River CRMP
Resort Business Association
River Exchange
Technical review committee (to be created)
Print Media
Local Newspapers (Mt Shasta Herald, Siskiyou Daily News, Redding Record Searchlight)
San Francisco Chronicle
Fish Periodicals
Web sites
American Whitewater
Chamber of Commerce Web sites (Mount Shasta, Dunsmuir)
Fish Web sites/Chat rooms
NCTV 15
Tribal

Key:
CRMP = Coordinated Resource Management Plan
NCTV = Northland Cable Television

Many of the interviewees suggested and advocated for holding meetings. Large public meetings should be informal, planned in advance and well organized. Meeting locations should rotate to cover the entire region. For smaller meetings, outreach staff should convene with established groups, such as those listed in Table 4-3. Small peer group meetings were suggested so that specific topic issues and concerns are able to be addressed in a more informal setting, such as a river float trip or meal at a campground.

Table 4-3. Organizations Recommended by Respondents for Inclusion in Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation Communication and Engagement Activities

Organization
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance
California Water Impact Network
California Department of Transportation
California Trout*
Campbell and John Hancock Timber Management
City of Dunsmuir
City of Mount Shasta
Cow Creek Ranchers Association
Federation of Fly Fishers Northern California Council
Hearst Corporation*
Hoopa Valley Tribe
KARE (Kalamath Alliance for Resource and Environment)
McCloud CRMP Signatories*
Pacific Forest Trust
PG&E*
Pit Tribe
Union Pacific Railroad
River Bend Books
San-Luis Delta Mendota Water Authority
Shasta County Resource Conservation Districts
Shasta Nation*
Sierra Pacific Industries
Siskiyou County
Springs Rivers
California State Parks
The Fly Shop
The Nature Conservancy

Table 4-3. Organizations Recommended by Respondents for Inclusion in Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation Communication and Engagement Activities (contd.)

Organization
Trout Unlimited*
United States Forest Service
University of California, Davis
Upper Sacramento River Exchange
Washington Fisheries Commission
Wild Salmon Center
Westlands Water District
Winnemum Wintu*
Yurok Tribe

Notes:
* Suggested by multiple interviewees

Chapter 5
Stakeholder Involvement and Participation

This chapter focuses on the stakeholders' intended participation and involvement in the Project going forward.

Involvement

Respondents were asked about their anticipated involvement in the Project going forward, this information is provided in Table 5-1. Sixty percent of the respondents see themselves involved in the Project at various levels, with their anticipated level of participation ranging from possibly involved (20 percent) to involved (30 percent) to highly involved (10 percent). About 25 percent of the interviewees do not see themselves involved in the Project, but do see themselves staying informed of the Project. Some participants were unsure of their participation and another stakeholder didn't see their organization involved in the Project but were willing to provide data they have already collected in the potential Project area.

Table 5-1. Respondents Anticipated Level of Involvement

Involvement	Percentage of Those Interviewed (%)
Unknown	10
Providing Data	5
Informed	25
Possibly Involved	20
Involved	30
Highly Involved	10

This page left blank intentionally.

Chapter 6
Conclusions and Recommendations

This section summarizes the findings of the report and provides recommendations for the outreach strategy for the Project moving forward. The interview sought to collect responses for Project awareness and opinions. Additionally, the interviews provided a way to identify additional Project communication channels. Information and responses to these topics have been incorporated into the Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan.\

Conclusions

The following key findings outline essential information to be considered for development of the Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan and as guides when engaging with various stakeholder groups during the Project.

Project Awareness: Approximately two-thirds of respondents had prior knowledge of the effort to reintroduce federally-listed Chinook salmon in tributaries of Shasta Lake for at least one year. The remaining respondents knew for less than one year.

Opinions: Overall the respondents viewed Policy and Regulatory, Pilot Plan, and Fish Passage Technology to the most difficult to implement and these task areas are also ranked highly in terms of communicational importance. Other concerns related to the project include: project cost, effectiveness, success, and increased regulations.

Communication: Respondents overwhelmingly prefer for communication to be conveyed through in person meetings. It was also recommended that information regarding the Project is published and distributed.

Involvement: Sixty percent of the respondents see themselves involved in the Project at various levels and about 25 percent of the interviewees do not see themselves involved in the Project, but do see themselves staying informed of the Project. Another stakeholder didn't see their organization involved in

the Project but were willing to provide data they have already collected in the potential Project area.

Recommendations

Findings contained in this document will serve to help develop the Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan. The following information regarding involvement, communication channels, and the task areas should be considered going forward.

Engagement: More than half of the interviewed landowners and stakeholders would like to be involved in the Project in some capacity; include and actively engage these interested parties going forward. Perform outreach to engage the stakeholders and landowners suggested by the interviewees. Continue hosting large public meetings. Begin hosting smaller, industry specific meetings (e.g., foresters, non-governmental organizations). Publish Project updates on the Project Web site. Distribute information via e-mail with links to relevant Project Web sites.

Task Areas: Interview results show that Policy and Regulatory, Pilot Plan, and Fish Passage Technology are the highest rated topics among tier groups in terms of difficulty to implement and were also considered important for communication. Additionally, the concerns of the respondents should be addressed. While all topics are important to the overall completion of the Project, these high-value topics should receive additional emphasis during development and implementation of the Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan.

Landowner and Stakeholder Analysis Interviews:

It is will be difficult to reintroduce fish into these areas that they haven't been in since Shasta Dam was built. If they are willing to put in a Safe Harbor Act, then this item could go down on the difficulty scale.

Stakeholder: Landowner