

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

February 19, 2013  
2:00-4:00 pm  
Denver, 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.*
- 

**MEETING MINUTES**

**Attendees**

Jacob Bornstein, CWCB  
Perry Cabot, Arkansas  
Casey Davenport, Metro  
Cheryl Jones, public  
Tom Browning, CWCB  
Joel Schneekloth, South Platte  
Becky Mitchell, CWCB  
Mark Shively, Metro  
Greg Johnson, CWCB  
Alyssa Quinn, CO WaterWise  
Kristin Maharg, CFWE

Nicole Seltzer, CFWE  
Julio Iturreria, Metro  
George Sibley, Gunnison  
Jeff Devere, Yampa/White  
Judy Lopez, Rio Grande  
Denise Rue-Pastin, Southwest  
Caroline Bradford, Colorado  
Russ Sands, Boulder  
Ren Martyn, Yampa/White  
Tom Acre, formerly Metro  
Margaret Herzog, DWR

**Value of Water**

PEPO has not met since September, and a lot has happened since then this meeting will get everyone up to speed and solicit input on statewide outreach activities. Tom Browning gave an overview of the current survey being conducted by BBC and GBSM on behalf of CWCB. They had about 2,000 phone surveys across Colorado. Each region of the state had about 350 completed surveys in Nov/Dec. The firm is currently doing an analysis of the data. There is a one page fact sheet enclosed with these minutes. The remaining work is currently under review due to concerns and interest by a number of groups. Instead of conducting regional focus groups in person, CWCB may instead do follow up phone calls to those already contacted to clarify their

answers in certain areas. This will culminate in a report early summer and then determine how the water community wants to move forward together.

The group asked about preliminary results they are seeing. Tom said that the survey showed most Coloradans (about 2/3) do not know that agriculture is the largest user of water in the state. There was also a high desire to know and understand water issues. Jacob said that one question asked who was a trusted source of information, and regional groups like conservation and conservancy districts were high on the list and federal agencies were last. Nicole asked about the concerns that lead to changing the focus groups into follow up phone calls. Tom said that it may be that the process is not trusted so the results are not viewed as accurate, or that there is fear or anxiety about the results and there is a desire to more fully explore them. The survey gives us data in terms of what citizens think about water, and it will hopefully be useful for many people as they work to design education and outreach programs. Jacob said that there is a desire for more information on what types of individuals were surveyed as there is skepticism that some survey results, such as a willingness to pay more for water, were accurate. Tom reiterated that the survey itself is not a decision tool, but provides data for others to make decisions.

Nicole reported that with Water 2012 now over, there are a few short and medium term action items. The Water 2012 website will be decommissioned, with content such as logo downloads and teaching resources moved to other sites such as CFWE or Colorado WaterWise. CFWE will be creating a “water educator” membership that will provide best practices, networking and learning opportunities for educators, meeting the desire for those involved with Water 2012 to stay connected. In addition, Water 2012 volunteers would like to see movement on the creation of a grant fund for water education, as both state and local funding for this work is limited.

Alyssa gave an update on Colorado WaterWise’s next steps with the Value of Water campaign. They held a workshop in the fall to gain understanding on what people would like to see in a statewide messaging campaign. They have applied for an EPA grant to fund message development, and will find out in March. They are in a wait and see mode until the survey is complete and the EPA grant announcement is out. Jacob asked if there has been progress in getting buy-in from the leadership of major utilities. Alyssa said they are having these meetings and are working to ensure, for example, that the Front Range Water Council is supportive. Perry asked when WaterWise will convene everyone next. He is worried that if we do not meet prior to June, the drought may overshadow this process. Casey said that we need to make sure not to lose momentum that has been built in the past year and Denise echoed the sentiment that waiting until June is too long. Alyssa agreed that timing is important and sooner is better.

## **PEPO Outreach Strategy**

The group turned to the “Decision-Maker Outreach Strategy” in the meeting packet. Kristin and CWCB have been working to identify short/medium term goals for CWCB/IBCC/PEPO public education and outreach for the last 6 months, starting with the workshop in the fall and culminating with meeting with state leadership. The idea is to create a centralized education program that can be used locally by the basin roundtables.

The outcome that has been identified is “Decision makers understand the roundtable and IBCC processes’ history, purpose, representation, transparency, and next steps, including the need for a balanced mix of solutions to fill the “gap”. Kristin asked for initial feedback on this outcome. Perry said there may be push back from ag-focused basins like Ark and South Platte to not define the “gap” solely as a municipal and industrial problem that is ultimately meant to convince farmers to give up their water. Denise said she’s very on board with the strategy—it’s simple and doable. Judy agrees. Ren asked what marketing/communication about the IBCC process would look like. The general public does not know about the IBCC process. Kristin noted however, the current strategy before us does not address this issue—it would be more targeted to elected and appointed local officials and getting their feedback. Ren suggested that few elected officials are going to care much about this unless the general public first shows an interest. It should trickle down from the public first. Jacob wonders if we are not giving the roundtable enough credit for their ability to attract interest from elected officials themselves, without creating a general public education campaign. Casey sees a dilemma here as well—how do we get to elected officials without also educating the public. Perry can see an opportunity in widening understanding about the Water Supply Reserve Account grant program in that it can be pitched to communities as a resource.

Jacob went through approaches to achieve the outcome. One is making sure that the roundtables have the tools and resources they need to educate decision makers. The other is physically going to the “watering holes” of decision makers and conducting outreach. Kristin asked what would work better—us going to the officials, or having them come to us. Caroline believes that centralized workshops might work in urban places, but going to council work sessions and board meetings would work better in more dispersed areas. She believes that roundtable members have a duty to go back to their constituents and ensure they know what is going on, but there is not a formal “feedback” process back to the roundtable.

Tom asked if current elected officials understand the importance of the process. In the Colorado basin, Caroline said all county commissioners get updates on the process at the River District Board meeting. CFWE materials like the basin issue of *Headwaters* and leave-behind education materials are also very helpful as they are written in a way that is digestible to the general public. Judy agrees that using a CWCB handout is often difficult because they are so lingo heavy. Denise is glad that the CO Basin roundtable communicates with their constituents effectively. She is not sure the same thing is happening at other roundtables. Margaret asked if a survey of basin roundtable education liaisons would be helpful since their needs seem to be so different. Judy asked if the materials would be coming from the state, or is there money given to each roundtable to develop their own materials. Jacob said that he hopes that funding in FY2014 will return to prior levels, and that much of the money can go towards roundtable education needs.

Casey asked how the 2015 State Water Plan plays into this. Should we be focusing on creating support for that? What about helping the roundtables with recruitment and diversification? Jacob said that outreach on a state water plan would be a different process, as would roundtable membership. All of these ideas were discussed at one time or another and state leadership felt priority should be placed on decision-maker education about the IBCC process and getting their feedback.

Jacob asked what the roundtables would need to move forward with something like this approach. Denise said that she would need to think about it for awhile, but some fact sheets on the process and its goals would be helpful. Denise asked what the idea around training for roundtable members was. Kristin said that it could be a training to refresh members' understanding on their responsibilities around outreach, what tools are available, and helping them to focus on education as an equal priority to the technical work. Perry would like to have something that was a DVD that could be given in a "shotgun" manner that did not require him to attend meetings all over the basin. Judy said the Rio Grande basin is committed to having an education action plan, but other basins do not have the same educational capacity. Resources should be directed to those who need the help.

George is concerned that the desired outcome statement is too focused on process and not enough focused on the problem we are trying to address. He feels that the "training" around gathering input would be very important to get people actively thinking after they are given a presentation. We will only get input back if we create a better way to ask for it.

Denise asked about the work in #2. Tom and Reagan agree that this kind of work is important and it needs a compelling message. Denise does not see this as the role for the local education liaisons, but Tom sees a role for local/regional faces to "open the door". Caroline agrees that both approaches are needed. Having the "panel" approach whereby CFWE/CWCB arranges for a group of experts to participate at different meetings like CML/CCI is a good one, and is a mix of approaches. It needs to be heard locally and in statewide forums for it to sink in.

Reagan thinks that the message should be crafted in a way that can resonate with each basin and their communities. Perhaps think through the messages and how they can be adapted for each intended audience and each distinct region. A city council person has so many immediate issues that they need compelling and relevant messages. They may care about water issues, but how does the roundtable play into that? Margaret said that talking about the goal and the importance of the work is most important – empower people to care and get involved.

## **Updates from Education Liaisons**

Arkansas basin will be hosting a workshop on the valuation of agricultural water in June in Colorado Springs. Rio Grande basin has a CWCB grant to fund local education that will continue their Water 2012 activities such as newspaper articles, tours and a leadership program. Tom Acre is leaving the Metro roundtable as he has accepted the position of City Manager for Trinidad. South Platte has done 3 groundwater meetings that have been very well attended and lively. The roundtable has been right in the thick of these.

Next steps: take the consensus messages back to those interested in education on your roundtable and talk through how the messages can be adapted locally and what tools/methods would be a best fit for your available resources/community needs. CFWE/CWCB will refine the cost/resources needed for these approaches and come back to the group. Kristin will circulate follow up materials and feedback questions. The next PEPO meeting will occur in April or May to review the revised outreach strategy before it goes to the IBCC.

# Decision-Maker Outreach Strategy

---

*2/14/2013 DRAFT for PEPO and IBCC consideration*

## Purpose

The purpose of this document is to outline an initial education and outreach approach for those decision makers currently not involved with Colorado's water planning process. Once one or more of the options is selected, it will be developed into a more detailed strategy.

The need for engaging stakeholders is expressed both in the original language of the Colorado Water for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Act as well as subsequent work by the Interbasin Compact Committee and the Colorado Water Conservation Board's Statewide Water Supply Initiative 2010 recommendations. The need for education and outreach continues to grow as the water planning process moves forward with implementation and the drafting of a state water strategy. As stated in the *Strategic Communications Recommendations for the IBCC and Basin Roundtable Process* prepared by GBSM for CWCB, "it will be important for future communications to be even more strategic and effective. There are several reasons for this:

- "The work performed by the IBCC and Basin Roundtables is critical to securing Colorado's water future. Municipalities, businesses, farmers and families depend on a secure water future and must feel confident the state is taking appropriate action. It is in the state's interest to inform the public that they are hard at work ensuring a secure water future for Coloradans."
- "The work of the IBCC and Basin Roundtables is complex and not easily understood by the general public, and yet it will have an increasingly important impact on the public and its secure water future."
- "To be successful with its future work plan, including development of a statewide water plan, it will be important to reach out to and engage a broader group of stakeholders."

In order to harness these opportunities, state leadership has prioritized decision-maker groups as a primary target audience. Additionally, discussions with key water entities engaged in effective stakeholder communication are helping to articulate how the IBCC and roundtables can increase awareness of their consensus messages and create support for balanced water supply solutions.

## Key Content

In December of 2010, the IBCC produced a summary of accomplishments to the Governor. Concepts in the letter considered consensus items were translated for public outreach by the PEPO Workgroup and presented to the IBCC. As such, the following seven consensus

messages have been adopted as key content for outreach purposes. The PEPO Workgroup chose not to wordsmith each one, since these messages need to be reworked in a professional manner for a given context. Each of the strategies outlined in this document will require consideration of which messages are most appropriate to consistently communicate with target audiences. However, many of the outreach strategies require inclusion of all consensus messages since they are not mutually exclusive of one another.

- I. We have a stakeholder driven process in the state working on solving our future water needs
- II. Our water needs exceed our planned supplies, creating a “gap.” We need a portfolio of solutions that incorporates water from conservation, reuse, agricultural to municipal transfers, and the development of new supplies to minimize the impact to agriculture, the environment, and recreation
- III. Balanced water solutions will cost money in the future
- IV. We are also supporting agriculture, environmental, and recreational projects, and many projects can be multi-purpose, meeting more than one need
- V. Our water future is connected statewide (e.g. transbasin projects, agricultural and recreational economies, impacts of compact calls)
- VI. Why and how to get involved in the current work of the IBCC
- VII. A State Water Plan that incorporates a balanced portfolio of solutions will occur in 2016

## **Desired Outcome and Example Approaches**

**Decision makers understand the roundtable and IBCC processes’ history, purpose, representation, transparency, and next steps, including the need for a balanced mix of solutions to fill “the gap”**

- Example Approach #1: IBCC and roundtable members have the tools, support, and capacity to educate and outreach to decision-makers in their representative regions
- Example Approach #2: Statewide efforts that reach as many decision makers as possible are utilized

## **Example Approach #1: IBCC and roundtable members have the tools, support, and capacity to educate decision-makers in their representative regions**

### **Target Audience:**

County commissions, city councils, councils of governments, state legislators, and other community leaders and decision-makers

### **Approach:**

- A. Example activities
  - a. Supported and active Education Action Plan for each basin with mechanisms to invite decision-makers to important roundtable meetings and events
  - b. Basin Roundtable member outreach
    - i. Develop basic public engagement tools such as targeted contact lists, talking points, fact sheets, videos, adaptable presentations and/or CFWE Headwaters on the Colorado Water for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century process, history, representation, transparency, and next steps
    - ii. Train members so they are qualified to solicit input from their representative decision-maker groups
    - iii. Active participation by roundtable members to reach out to the stakeholders and organizations they represent through activities such as targeted one-on-one meetings with individuals and organizations, county-by-county decision maker lunch and learns, community workshops, task-groups with affected stakeholders, roundtable representation at non-BRT events, WSRA project tours, and evening receptions
    - iv. Distribution of basin fact sheets to local decision-makers
    - v. Development of community vignettes on local impacts of the “status quo” and the remaining water needs
    - vi. Each basin roundtable develops human interest stories on regional representative(s)
    - vii. Decision-maker feedback forum at roundtable meetings
- B. Existing efforts
  - a. Metro Roundtable’s decision maker reception
  - b. Some outreach from current members to their constituents
  - c. Annual IBCC and WSRA Reports to State Legislature
  - d. WSRA tours in the Rio Grande Basin
  - e. Water provider tours and materials
  - f. Environmental organizations’ events and materials
- C. Necessary partnerships
  - a. Relationships with community and water stakeholder groups within a basin who are represented by IBCC and roundtable members

## **Example Approach #2: Statewide efforts that reach as many decision makers as possible are utilized**

### **Target Audience:**

Colorado Municipal League, Colorado Counties Incorporated, Colorado General Assembly

### **Approach:**

- A. Example activities
  - a. Clearer, more frequent and consistent communications on the history, strategic accomplishments and direction of the IBCC and basin roundtable process
    - i. Statewide, targeted and expanded email lists for decision makers
    - ii. More accessible email and report formats
  - b. Support interim water committee in hosting regional events to deliberately increase dialogue amongst fellow state legislators and elected officials
  - c. Statewide open house hosted by John Stulp, IBCC legislative appointments and/or Governor Hickenlooper with Q&A session on IBCC activities
  - d. Presentation at statewide gathering's of decision-makers, such as at Colorado Municipal League and Colorado Counties Inc. meetings
- B. Existing efforts
  - a. Email communication through the state's mass email system to stakeholders who have signed up
  - b. CFWE tours and materials, especially basin-focused Headwaters magazines
  - c. Personal contacts by IBCC members and CWCB staff
- C. Necessary partnerships
  - a. Umbrella organizations for local decision-makers (e.g. CML, CCI)
  - b. Local elected leadership (e.g. city councils and county commissioners)
  - c. State leadership (e.g. Governor's Cabinet, Colorado General Assembly)
  - d. Special interested groups (municipal, agricultural, environmental and recreational)