

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

**May 30, 2012
5:30 – 8:00pm**

Beaver Run Resort - Breckenridge, CO

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.*
-

MINUTES

Attendees

Tom Acre, Metro
Caroline Bradford, Colorado
Ren Martyn, Yampa/White
Judy Lopez, Rio Grande

Jeff Devere, IBCC
Reagan Waskom, CWI
Kristin Maharg, CFWE
Jacob Bornstein, CWCB

Feedback from Statewide Roundtable Summit

The group discussed highlights and lessons learned from the 2012 Summit as it relates to education and outreach. Similar to last year, it was a great success. Reagan heard that people liked the 2012 Summit more than 2011. Survey respondents answered more confidently that the roundtable process has made progress over the past year. Additionally, respondents liked the interaction of other roundtable members as well as the table discussions. Caroline thinks that CWCB now has the attention of the Governor through John Stulp and members feel that their work is being heard and implemented. Tom commented that we've been operating in a vacuum but recently there are more joint roundtable meetings and there is greater cross-basin discussions.

How often should we convene a Summit? Whose role is this – John Stulp and the roundtable Chairs? PEPO laid the groundwork for the first Summit and then reviewed the 2012 agenda. Little details were lost this year except let note-takers know to bring computers. Jeff commented that we shouldn't vary the pattern too much too fast – having it in spring has momentum and purpose. Everyone agreed that an annual Summit is a benchmark for people to check in on their work and keep moving forward.

Ren asked if the goals we set for the Summit were reached. Yes and in particular, one of the themes from the proceedings was how to get more specific on implementation as well as managing risks to move forward on specific pieces. Additionally there were common elements across portfolios (80% success on IPPs, conservation, plan and preserve options for new supplies, limit dry-up of ag, NC values). The scenario-planning framework will include these common elements resulting in a no regrets strategy. The Colorado Basin is still uncomfortable with the bulls-eye and can CWCB provide technical support on which Colorado River projects are actually viable? Also, how do we re-frame the language that is creating cultural barriers such as the number and amount of possible passive conservation?

Review draft scope of work for FY2013

Kristin presented and solicited input on a draft scope of work extending 07/01/12 – 06/30/13. The group thought it looked good and discussed in detail what the statewide outreach tasks could look like. Is the IBCC at a stage where consensus messages are articulated enough to disseminate? Does this group hire a professional marketer? This is an activity to work towards for the first half of the coming fiscal year. No action alternative or status quo result is a message we can start with – this is what we agree on, this is where we're going and this is why we need buy-in from specific stakeholders. Jeff commented that we need turbulence in this process to generate innovation and action – look at what happened with the toilet legislation. Take the process jargon, create a slogan and have content behind it that's accessible and offered online and print. This may include a mini-textbook or guide that communicates the messages with enough quantification, depth and content yet maintaining the human interest story (i.e. farmers 401k vs. selling water without choice). What is the link between water and land use planning? How do we succinctly communicate with water boards and zoning commissions? We could also bring in members of the land trust community and ask each basin to tell their story of the status quo message. Reagan thinks it's most important that PEPO support the educational activities of the roundtables. We can create a message that is relevant – this is the state water plan and what it means for your local issues. CFWE and CWCB will take a look at what is necessary to implement the message.

Education Action Plan reports

There was a little time left for some of the Education Liaisons to share progress to date on their basin's education and outreach program, including successes and obstacles associated with Water 2012 activities.

The Rio Grande hired a coordinator to implement their WSRA grant. So far they have weekly newspaper articles, which will continue in 2013 with the Value of Water campaign, plus radio spots, which have resulted in a podcast series on the regional Water 2012 website. They doubled the size of this year's water festival and started doing tours of roundtable projects (minimal costs due to in-kind and collaborative contributions) on why those projects are important to their water future. They have a newspaper pullout coming this fall, including K-12 lesson plan and reading materials for all schools to receive after the Rio Grande anniversary event. The display would have worked better if there was kids activities on the back plus a more interactive and community feel.

The Metro has new and revitalized membership and their committee takes a team approach, meeting once a month with several educators on board. They're planning to build upon all

the other education efforts (both water and land) in the Metro area by leveraging those relationships. A critical question is how to get a consistent message out to everyone since each community and water provider has their own message. The second reception was successful although didn't draw as many elected officials as anticipated. Now they want to target the constituents that influence the elected officials. A major idea is to develop common theme videos on water conservation techniques and build upon the Douglas County Water Ambassador program from Douglas County. In terms of supporting K-12 education activities, the WSRA guidelines are specific – projects must be oriented on the needs and solutions that the roundtable is pursuing. Jacob will have a conversation with CWCBC leadership on this.

The group discussed what it takes to broaden the audience to educators. We need to build the base of knowledge first through entry-level programs. Judy is a full-time educator on natural resources and those are the people we need to engage in each basin to carry the message. Some roundtables are beginning to pursue those educational partnerships at every level (youth, community, decision-makers and the water community). The key is to build a variety of educational tools that reach each audience. Kristin asked how PEPO sees its role to provide these tools for the roundtables. We can only do so much and should decide on the platform and its purpose plus be specific on dissemination mechanisms. The Summit is a mechanism to galvanize the roundtable process. Now, how do we get beyond the barrier between those that are very engaged and those that are not? Jeff noted that we are making products but how are those delivering long-term outcomes? The outreach process will rely on greater engagement of roundtable members to carry the message to their stakeholders.