

**Public Education, Participation and Outreach Workgroup
Interbasin Compact Committee**

**April 13, 2011
9:00am-11:00am**

PEPO Workgroup Mission:

- 1. Create a process to inform, involve, and educate the public on the IBCC's activities and the progress of the inter-basin compact negotiations. This will be accomplished by communicating the vision, mechanics and relevance of the 1177 process to the general public, and securing and relying upon other groups whose focus is to provide water education to the public.*
 - 2. Create a mechanism by which public input and feedback can be relayed to the Interbasin Compact Committee and compact negotiators. This will be accomplished by encouraging participation of a broad range of stakeholders through Roundtable representatives.*
 - 3. Provide water education opportunities to Roundtable and IBCC members to help them make more informed decisions.*
-

**MEETING MINUTES
Action Items Underlined**

I. Convene & introductions

Jacob Bornstein, CWCB	(Absent)
Kristin Maharg, CFWE	Travis Smith
Nicole Seltzer, CFWE	Jeris Danielson
Jeff Devere, IBCC	Carl Trick
Jay Winner, IBCC	Reagan Waskom
Caroline Bradford, Colorado	Jeff Crane
Tom Acre, Metro	Bert Weaver
George Sibley, Gunnison	Perry Cabot
Mikaela Gregg, Peak Facilitation	Denise Rue-Pastin
Magaret Herzog, DWR	Paul Strong
	Deb Alpe

II. No one had any comments on the minutes from 2/3/2011 PEPO meeting

III. Statewide Roundtable Summit debrief

PEPO reviewed a summary of the Summit feedback survey and discussed lessons from this first statewide meeting. Kristin asked people to give an overview of their overall impressions.

Caroline thought the registration table should be set up earlier with a larger area. Mix and mingle aspect was great, different color card stock for name tags to know who was from where. Next time, we'll keep the nametags that weren't picked up to figure out who attended. Nominal charge

helps ensure attendance. Food was excellent. Jay thought it went really well, the mix of people at the tables was good and the next Summit should have more table discussions throughout the day. Tom agreed and hoped it will help roundtables move forward and continue the dialogue.

If we do it again, how can we get more roundtable members there? Over 40% of each roundtable registered except for Southwest, Rio Grande, North Platte – perhaps because they are not as entrenched in statewide issues.

Jacob noted that we weren't really sure what was going to come out of the Governor's talk and the 29 tables but there was actually a lot of overlap – implementation, roundtable involvement, collaboration – people are saying same things as outlined in the proceedings. CWCB is internally working on a road map memo for the Chairs that lay out next steps in the process – portfolio development, strategic implementation – which is essentially what the Governor asked for.

Nicole commended Kristin and Jacob for getting the proceedings and the survey out quickly and she would encourage IBCC and CWCB staff to address the Summit discussion at the next meeting. The group thinks we should sign up all interested parties to receive all the IBCC correspondence and they can opt out if desired. Margaret suggested that the first communication after the next IBCC meeting explains what has been done since the Summit and how feedback was used in developing work plan.

The group looked at the summary of the survey. Kristin suggested that we break out the data by basins to see if there are any differences or similarities, in particular by east-west. There were 82 completed surveys – do we want to try to get more? We've closed the survey and have the information we need to move forward. Each Ed Liaisons has been talking about Summit for ten minutes their meetings.

Some of the highlights of the survey were discussed:

- 80% of respondents thought it was very good or excellent!
- Good distribution of which tables people were at, some tables may have had a less favorable experience, the fitting it all together tables struggled the most
- Participants expected to understand other roundtables approaches
- We met expectations 97% as sufficient or better
- People liked the table discussions the best, afternoon sessions may have diluted the energy, more like a typical conference, not as easy to have a dialogue
- Most said that the Summit did not change their overall impression of the framework, 82% said the framework was somewhat to substantially better than the status quo, mostly improved people's understanding of the individual components
- Minority of people do not think we are ready to enter into an implementation stage, this was the most polarized part of the question
- Everyone thinks we need to build broader engagement

The word 'impression' implies perception or feeling of the framework, George thinks that "impression" is a hard word to define and respond to, we could have said "does it change your mind about the importance of this or that".

It would be interesting to look at where responses from Q14 came from on diminished impression (11 in this question where only three before in Q11) as well as who is saying that roundtable should or should not have a larger role.

Tom translated the specificity part of Q16 is that people think we are ready to do something but we can't agree on what to do.

Respondents would recommend all approaches for roundtable-to-roundtable discussions so we need to be flexible as we develop future programs by pursuing specific programs for each need. We need to consider how often to host a Summit and start developing the other approaches through the subcommittee level. Subcommittees are meeting next week to develop a work plan and there will be time on the IBCC agenda for PEPO to share their thoughts.

Jeff thinks that the IBCC should take PEPO ideas on the road such as smaller Summits. For example, on conservation we need a broad-based discussion with all stakeholders to explore which parts of the framework are a starter and no-starter. PEPO has a role to play as the facilitator of process and a support mechanism.

Caroline thinks that there was a definite need for this Summit but maybe not needed every year, there needs to be a reason for people to give input. Nicole said that right now we need to think about how to use all the feedback on the framework to move the process forward. Planning the Summit even nine months out felt rushed partly due to changing administration, emerging framework, changes to the agenda, etc.

The key to moving forward is how to bring more stakeholder groups and the public together, such as mapping the nonconsumptive reaches. Margaret suggested that roundtable members be responsible for reaching out to different stakeholder groups as this hasn't been systematically done. IBCC members could also give status updates on their roundtables at each meeting. Kristin noted that right now we have Education Action Plans, which includes empowering roundtables to do their own Summit-type programs.

George commented that a Summit implies bringing people together on a specific topic and this is not really useful once a year. There needs to be a focus and if something critical comes up (i.e. Flaming Gorge) then we'll consider a statewide meeting.

Jacob informed the group that within 18 months we'll have statewide portfolios and a good idea of how roundtables are meeting their needs and involving the public, after that we'll be ready for another Summit.

Early spring date worked really well. Let's set deadlines with IBCC work plan and go from there. Jacob reported that it will require a \$25K budget line item (each year is about an additional \$75K for CFWE plus can allocate extra in section budget) but CWCB budget is already tight.

Mikaela noted that there was an extensive conversation at the last IBCC meeting on how to expand outreach between roundtables and create a system of consistency so that the conservation can advance forward.

IBCC doesn't rely enough on PEPO for this work. Our IBCC reps need to be our spokespeople (Travis, Jeris, Carl, Jeff and Jay). Jacob noted that PEPO has come really far in the past five years and Nicole agreed that the process has to get to a certain point before public feedback is actually possible. This is education with a purpose, not just general awareness.

Kristin shared information about Water 2012 and how the roundtables can be involved such as connecting with activities within their basin to share their needs assessments. Jacob wanted more definition on exactly what are we trying to accomplish with 2012 (i.e. cultivating votes when water supply becomes a larger crisis). Some of this will be defined as the new coordinator, Wendy Newman, creates an outreach plan for each component of Water 2012. Nicole wants every organization in the state to have their own set of outcomes to work towards and use the larger initiative to leverage momentum around the 2012 tools.

Caroline wants to know if it would be redundant with current efforts within the roundtables such as the Action Plans. Kristin sees it as complementary by connecting with the statewide perspective and CFWE will act as support to achieve these goals. For example, there is a subcommittee to develop displays for libraries and museums. The roundtables can be involved in those displays by tying in the water story to their needs assessments. In order to link individual roundtable activities to 2012, Kristin will have conversations with the Education Liaisons to identify, plan and connect them to each other, but ultimately the roundtables will be responsible for implementation. This initiative also appeals to larger set of funders.

IV. Recommendations to the IBCC on how to proceed with public outreach

As the IBCC subcommittees continue to address substantive feedback on the framework, PEPO is asked to give their advice about how to proceed with broader outreach and engagement efforts to move the process forward. At the April 29 meeting, PEPO will give a committee update led by Jeff Devere:

- Subcommittees outreach to regional groups for feedback and create action items on how to move forward with strategic implementation
- Better define a process for releasing the work of the IBCC, expand mailing list and communicate how feedback has been used
- Define a package of partnerships, leverage with other outreach tools such as Water 2012
- Continue development and implementation of the Education Action Plans and promote cross-sharing of basin activities
- Ask John Stulp to set expectations as related to a system of consistent and accountable communication between the IBCC representatives, their roundtables and constituencies
- Host another statewide summit after next milestone in the process

After the 4/29 IBCC meeting, PEPO will meet the week of May 9 to review and approve our next scope of work. Updates on Education Action Plans are also planned for the agenda.

The meeting adjourned at 11:15am.