

# Floodplain Vulnerability Assessment Board Workshop Outline

## Workshop #1

1. Introduction & Workshop Objectives
  - a. Building flood resiliency in our watershed is a major undertaking and marks the next era for the District. The planning will take time in order to do it collaboratively with partners, and those partnerships are crucial for implementation down the road. The implementation itself will take several years to complete.
  - b. The Floodplain Vulnerability Assessment will help us target capital projects, similar to our diagnostic study process, but it will be more than that. It will ideally strengthen partnerships within the community and result in a multi-faceted approach to resiliency building which spans beyond CLFLWD project construction. Examples may include role setting with partners, education of local stakeholders and behavior change implementation on a local level, coordinated efforts such as culvert replacements/pond cleanouts, and folding this into CLFLWD's existing programs (e.g., identifying hot spot zones where additional permit review may be warranted).
  - c. Board workshop objectives:
    - i. Review Assessment goals, comparison to other WD efforts
    - ii. Ensure everyone on the CLFLWD team understands what went into the mapping/prioritization efforts to date (presentation by staff/EOR)
    - iii. Achieve consensus on priority scoring (discussion)
    - iv. Give EOR direction on where to focus more detailed modeling efforts (discussion)
    - v. Ensure everyone on the CLFLWD team understands next steps (staff present outline of next steps)
2. Presentation: Assessment Goals, Comparison
  - a. Assessment Goals:
    - i. CLFLWD to be the technical expert and support partners with data/modeling
    - ii. Be more inclusive and understanding of vulnerable communities (e.g., people who are more vulnerable to natural disasters – this is included in the social vulnerability layer, and staff will elaborate on this during the workshop)
    - iii. Be proactive in the face of a changing climate and changing population dynamics
    - iv. Identify mitigation strategies that best serve the community priorities, and therefore set the stage to work with partners and jointly build a more climate resilient watershed
    - v. Position the CLFLWD for flood mitigation grants
  - b. Comparison to other WD efforts: Compare and contrast our approach to other similar efforts by other WDs/cities.
3. Presentation: [Scoring and Mapping](#)
4. Discussion: Priority Scoring
  - a. Recommendation: as presented, all these factors are weighed equally (social vs environmental vs infrastructure vs flood hazard) in order to create these maps

- b. We reviewed these presentation slides with the engineers for cities of Forest Lake, Scandia and Wyoming, and they agreed with a flat prioritization approach at this stage
  - c. This may determine where we focus our modeling and project efforts, on a relatively large scale (subwatershed scale)
  - d. Further refinement will occur as part of the planning process in order to identify projects/practices, and further prioritization can come into play at that stage as well in order to rank projects
  - e. Checkpoint: Does the Board agree with this recommendation, or do you wish to alter the ranking, which may consequently alter the Integrated Map?
5. Discussion: Where to Focus Modeling
- a. Intro: EOR briefly speak about what the modeling will entail and what the deliverable will look like
  - b. Recommendation: Direct EOR to do more detailed modeling in one or two subwatersheds, then review the results and decide whether to model more subwatersheds afterward. Staff will present map with recommendation.
  - c. Discussion: Does the Board agree with focusing modeling efforts on this one or more subwatersheds, or do you wish to see additional/different subwatersheds get a closer look?
6. Next steps – future workshops/meetings

## Workshop #2

1. Address questions from Workshop #1 and/or return with more info as needed.
2. Summarize Community Engagement
  - a. Discuss goals of community engagement.
    - i. Solicit feedback on priorities from known partners and underserved communities. Might confirm what we already expect and might bring new information to light. We don't know what we don't know.
    - ii. Build buy-in and trust with known partners and underserved communities. Communicate our recommendations to them and give them something to react to. Achieve shared understanding of threats and mitigation strategies.
  - b. Review scope of work from [Zan Associates](#) and consider approving.
  - c. Review updated scope of work from EOR and consider approving (scope revision underway currently and will be ready before Workshop #2).

## Workshop #3

Hold if necessary to follow up on board questions/requests and/or provide additional time for discussion.