

## Summary of Summit Survey Data

<b>Question 1: Are you a member of a basin roundtable or the IBCC?</b>			<b>Raw #</b>	<b>% of respondents</b>
Roundtable Member			45	63%
Not a Roundtable Member			26	37%
<b>Question 2: Overall, how would you rate the 2012 Statewide Roundtable Summit?</b>				
Excellent			9	13%
Very good			47	66%
Good			12	17%
Okay			3	4%
Poor			0	0%
<b>Question 3: What was the best part of the Summit? (check all that apply)</b>				
Meeting members of other roundtables and interested public			50	70%
Hearing from Eric Hecox during the morning on where the portfolio work is heading			14	20%
Understanding the approaches behind the roundtable portfolios during the morning plenary panel			29	41%
Hearing from the Governor and John Stulp			33	46%
Table discussions on the roundtable portfolios including their commonalities and differences			43	61%
Hearing from Jennifer Gimbel during lunch on Risk Management as it relates to the Colorado River			28	39%
Hearing from Kristin Maharg during lunch on Water 2012 and watching the associated videos			8	11%
Hearing from Todd Doherty lunch during lunch on entering an implementation phase			9	13%
Participating in the afternoon breakout sessions on implementation elements			44	62%
Hearing from John Stulp on the themes learned from the day at the close of the Summit			12	17%
Day of Summit Logistics (e.g., registration, table assignments, food, etc.)			20	28%
Pre Summit Logistics (e.g., online registration process, payment, amount of advertising, etc.)			10	14%
<b>Question 4: What part of the Summit was least beneficial or effective? (check all that apply)</b>				
Meeting members of other roundtables and interested public			0	0%
Hearing from Eric Hecox during the morning on where the portfolio work is heading			2	3%
Understanding the approaches behind the roundtable portfolios during the morning plenary panel			8	11%
Hearing from the Governor and John Stulp			7	10%
Table discussions on the roundtable portfolios including their commonalities and differences			9	13%
Hearing from Jennifer Gimbel during lunch on Risk Management as it relates to the Colorado River			4	6%
Hearing from Kristin Maharg during lunch on Water 2012 and watching the associated videos			13	18%
Hearing from Todd Doherty lunch during lunch on entering an implementation phase			11	15%
Participating in the afternoon breakout sessions on implementation elements			6	8%
Hearing from John Stulp on the themes learned from the day at the close of the Summit			6	8%
Day of Summit Logistics (e.g., registration, table assignments, food, etc.)			5	7%
Pre Summit Logistics (e.g., online registration process, payment, amount of advertising, etc.)			5	7%
<b>Question 5: How balanced was the mix of plenary presentations and the three table discussions (one morning and two afternoon breakouts)?</b>				
Too much time spent at tables			13	18%
Right amount of time for table discussions			46	65%
Not enough time at the tables			10	14%
<b>Question 6: How prepared were you for the discussions that occurred at the individual tables?</b>				
Completely prepared			10	14%
Mostly prepared			34	48%
Moderately prepared			19	27%
Slightly prepared			8	11%
Completely unprepared			0	0%
<b>Question 7: Was 75 minutes enough time to adequately have each of the table discussions?</b>				
Too much table time			9	13%
Right amt table time			53	75%
Too little table time			8	11%
<b>Question 8: Did you attend the 2011 Statewide Roundtable Summit in Westminster that focused on the IBCC Framework?</b>				
Attended last yr summit			40	56%
Did not attend			31	44%

## Summary of Summit Survey Data

### Question 9: Would you say the roundtable and IBCC process has made progress within the past year?

Yes, definitely	20	28%
Yes, somewhat	34	48%
Not sure	13	18%
Little progress	4	6%
No progress	0	0%

### Question 10: How, if at all, did the presentations and discussions at the Summit affect your overall understanding of the roundtable portfolios?

It improved my understanding	52	73%
It did not change my understanding	19	27%
It diminished my understanding	0	0%

### Question 11: Based on what you learned at the Summit, do you think your basin roundtable will adjust your portfolios? (leave blank if you are not a roundtable member)

Definitely	0	0%
Likely	18	37%
Not sure	20	41%
Unlikely	11	22%
Definitely not	0	0%

### Question 12: How close is your roundtable to determining a small handful of consumptive and nonconsumptive projects to implement in the near future? (leave blank if you are not a roundtable member)

We are close to selecting some projects that are ready for grant and/or loan applications	8	18%
We are close to selecting some projects that could use technical assistance from CWCB prior to a grant and/or loan application	9	20%
We have or are working on scheduling a nonconsumptive and/or consumptive workshop with project proponents and partners to help the roundtable with this process	7	16%
We would like help from CWCB to schedule consumptive and/or nonconsumptive workshops to help with this process	5	11%
We have not begun thinking about this at our roundtable	3	7%
I'm not sure where we are at with this at my roundtable	12	27%

### Question 13: What approach would you recommend for further roundtable-to-roundtable discussions? (check all that apply)

More statewide summits	19	27%
Joint roundtable meetings (smaller meetings of fewer roundtables)	42	59%
Statewide initiatives on a specific topic with each roundtable sending a couple representatives	24	34%
Roundtables exploring a specific topic and then sharing a recommendation with other roundtables, the IBCC and	28	39%
Other, please specify		

### Question 14: If you favor additional statewide summits, how often should these occur?

As needed	20	33%
Annually	30	50%
Next year	4	7%
18 months	4	7%
Two years	2	3%

## Summary of Summit Survey Data

### Question 15: What topic(s) would you like to see discussed at future summits?

How about some complete scenarios of what the Statewide water solutions might look like in 2050?	Refined Scenarios
Sustainable futures, planning for the wet times and the dry. What projects make sense with what we know about climatic variability and change.	Projects for different scenarios
Discussion of specific statewide projects	Implementation
The role of the public in the 1177 process. Developing a "state water plan" without the requisite public process (and not just comments here or there, but a true dialogue) may end up causing more discord than agreement. Even if all roundtable members get to agreement on the need for limited trans-basin diversions, they are still accountable to their neighbors and if that dialogue isn't played well in the public sphere, then it may set the whole process back. I believe that proactive public information should be given a higher priority by CWC.	Public Process
This event was one of the few IBCC/roundtable activities that I seen foster some cooperation instead of enabling geographic divisions between the state. I think the focus of all summits should be on learning from others, behaving respectfully and seeking common ground. We need to do this to offset the divisive nature of the roundtables. And the IBCC is not able to play this role.	Learning from others
More civic engagement	Public Process
Value of water.	Public Process
Tangible results!	Implementation
We need to focus on implementing IPP's. Talking about the problem is good, solving it by building something is	Implementation
Storage, conjunctive use of surface and groundwater, alluvial storage	Projects for different
More in depth comparison of portfolios since for some the differences in ag transfers between Scenario 4 and 5 on Table 2 is small yet one has no Colorado River system project and the other has 130,000 a-f of new supply.	
Thinking outside the box on sources of supply.	
Policy/Legislative fixes to roadblocks to projects.	Policy
a statewide water plan	State Water Plan
Why isn't there: 1) a priority system implemented associated with a CO R compact call and if this is not possible, 2) a priority system that impacts the most junior of water rights (i.e. those issued after 2012)? 3) Should the issuance of new water rights be subject to some sort of a public interest test?	
Some of the legs of the stool had specific recommendations. I would like to know how close the members are to implementing the recommendations proposed and an identification of issues lacking total consensus. Also, at the last Summit, someone posed the question of implementation, who has the power and authority. No one mentioned that issue at the 2012 Summit and I think it should have been addressed.	Progress on implementing IBCC recommendations
Risk management in each basin as it pertains to the Colorado River Compact.	Risk Management
Support for alternative ag transfer experiments -- I would like to see a negotiation process supported by the CWC with some willing attorneys and engineers as consultants to try to develop models for some long-term deals. The "permanence" requirement must be addressed much more effectively than so far.	ATMs
Role of the State in implementing water projects.	Policy - State Role in Implementing
Colorado River water availability	CRWAS
Picking a project and moving forward	Implementation
Methods to move IPP's forward.	Implementation
How do we as a State Provide new water supplies to the State?	Policy - State Role in Implementing
Implementation of projects and solutions	Implementation
Let's talk about SOLUTIONS to the problems and start the negotiation to get those solutions on the fast track to implementation. It would also be nice to figure out exactly how much water is available in this State for new development and have a discussion about where that development should happen.	Implementation
IPPs and New Supply - I think we as the water community need to work together to help get these projects completed. There are a lot of vocal opposers. The proponents need to be just as vocal and educate water users.	Implementation
We need to approach this "Colorado Water" issue as Coloradoans with unique knowledge and interests and see how we can work things together for a water "win" that benefits as many stakeholders as possible.	State Water Plan
Agricultural conservation and the economics of water. If about 10% of water is used for M&I and more than 80% of water is used for agriculture, where can conservation yield the best return? Also, from a \$ perspective, it appears that farmers in the East are able to make more money with less water than farmers in the West.	ATMs
kick starting projects	Implementation

## Summary of Summit Survey Data

Portfolio Tool management coupled with Risk Management of the Colorado River new supply leg of the stool, as it pertains to the sustainability issue discussed early on in the IBCC.	State Water Plan
Conservation and non-consumptive uses.	NC
Alternative Agriculture Methods and Markets	ATMs
I have limited knowledge of this process but found your entire program very interesting and worthwhile.	
Additional risk management discussions and exploring the State as a whole to improve water conditions throughout the State while maximizing Colorado's water use.	Risk Mangement
non-consumptive input to tool	NC
The 2050 water supply demand is on the front range, lets focus on scenarios and alternative facilities to meet that demand.	

### Question 16: Please provide any additional feedback or insights you have about the 2012 Statewide Roundtable Summit

The Omni Interlocken Resort was an excellent choice. Location, acoustics, tech equipment, food, service - all exceptional. I called them after the event looking for the recipe for the chocolate chip cookies they served - yes, seriously. Their Executive Chef, David Harker, gladly emailed it to me.	Logistics
Good transfer of information. Information supplied by staff overly filtered through political lens. More detailed technical information distilled for a non-technical (but intelligent) audience needed for real progress.	Contrived
Nice job to staff. It was seamless this year.	Logistics
The Summit was good in many aspects. The explanation of the process, the panel and Jennifer's presentation were critical. The opportunity to understand others view points in the table discussion was a big improvement over the normal roundtable discussions. What the Summit seriously lacked was a summary and wrap-up of what went on in the table discussions. We put alot of time into those discussions and the results should have been reported. We never saw the charts with the results. It feels like alot of busy work with no results. Stulp's wrap-up was helpful but too very general. I would remove one of the table discussion and replace it with a learnings, wrap-up and next steps session to make something out of what went on. The group should be accountable for finding some conclusions and identifying next steps. Simply talking in small groups without any outcome is a waste of an opportunity to make progress.	More summary
Too much time spent explaining to non-members what we were doing and why.	Non BRT Members
There does seem to be a tendency toward wanting things to be the way they've always been. I heard several comments regarding the need for 'visionary' leadership. I can see how some people might feel that the 'conservation conversation' is getting shut down.	Leadership
It all comes down to the money and how to pay for all the things we need to do.	Money
I thought that the east-west issues, particularly on ag dry-up were recognized better as an issue of statewide importance rather than by basin, i.e. loss of ag land in one basin hurts another basin as well.	Ag
If we are headed toward a State Water Plan, what is the schedule? Milestones? Role of roundtables and IBCC?	Schedule
I thought the framework and theme were a little contrived. It was informational, but not worthy of the expense / time required. There are more relevant topics that warrant a Summit. Did the Governor choose the theme?	Contrived
Some of the participants who had not pre-registered did not have a good understanding of the Roundtable scenarios. Maybe they should have been allowed to observe only.	Non BRT Members
Congratulations on a wonderfully prepared summit. For me, it was both educational and inspirational.	Logistics
Do you plan to send summary results to the participants?	
Great hotel; good food	Logistics
Great. Thanks.	
The lack of trust in the CO water community is shocking -- and I've been working in the west (not CO) water business for > 20 years.	
Holding three table discussions was a bit much for the day. It seemed that a lot of people left prior to the end of the day. Maybe a more condensed or shortened program day would be helpful.	Tables

## Summary of Summit Survey Data

Participants at my table were surprised about the specificity of the RISK topic. Jennifer framed the topic very well during lunch, however, many can with a broader picture. Perhaps the program should have reflected the narrower concern.	Risk
Seemed like portfolio's were directed to promote the assumption of "extra" West Slope water meeting future "statewide" needs. The afternoon sessions needed more direction. Was hoping for more information to be disseminated, less opinion expression.	Tables
Some participants have so much experience and some so little... I hope we can get past the endless renditions of how prior appropriation works, and avoid background over and over... "Face time" is too valuable to spend on hearing things everyone should already know at this level of interest and involvement. The second structural issue is the time spent on forms and questions which may not be very useful; perhaps they serve the contractor interests in having some beans to count, but they may eat up too much time. I wish there were a way to pose questions, which takes me back to a forum sort of process which would not be the Water Congress or a district, but state-operated and public. It could link to CFWE and such to make basics available, summaries of SWSI, and the reports... and enable discussion if someone responsible moderated to keep things useful. One of the real problems in the process has been the lack of science informing the discussions on some topics, and we are losing ground and losing water choices while we treat all opinions as equally valid in fact as well as emotion.	Non BRT Members / Forum
In group discussions the majority of the folks were of task. The folks who were supposed to guide the discussions either posed their own veiw points or did not understand the process. What was interesting is that most folks felt that the portfolio tool was an excise in futility and was waste of money and time and even though they had voiced to CWCB the process would move forward anyway - I thought that was interesting. I was suprised to hear that from folks across basins and from different areas. I guess I thought there was more buy in to the process it seems like we are where we were last year. Too Bad.	Portolio
Very well put together. Overall I think the roundtables, IBCC and CWCB are headed in the right direction. We need to focus now on implementation. We need to work towards a common ground solution to risk	Common Ground
If Summits are going to continue to be in Denver, there needs to be more travel money allocated so all roundtables can fairly be represented.	Travel Money
Great venue, great organization. I thought the table discussions were very helpful in getting a diverse group to better understand where the other parties were coming from in their portfolio decisions and with regard to what issues they had to deal with.	Logistics
I was very impressed with the organization of this meeting. The details were all covered: there was enough space, breaks, coffee, etc. These little things make large meetings more enjoyable. I really appreciated CWCB hosting this meeting, it allowed me to broaden my perspective by talking to others. I know feel I have a better understanding of issues in other basins. Thanks!	Logistics
It is a great process and it is vital (the key) to a "prosperous Colorado future".	
So many people that attend the Summit have blinders on and have little appreciation for the larger picture. There is so much animosity from the West Slope about the Front Range taking water, when the Front Range takes a relatively small amount of water on the whole. The lack of understanding runs across all basins, and all interests.	
the portfolio tool is just a tool, it is time for the State to support projects!	Projects
Excellent logistics prior to and during the Summit. Jacob's work in the morning of the Summit with the panel was very beneficial	Logistics
For a organization that considers Conservation as of of the legs of the stool, I found it ironic to find single use cloth towels at the facility. Like we all have adapted to 'seat belt use,' I think that a generational change in attitude and behavior is necessary for conservational changes in individual water use to occur.	
The smaller table discussions were excellent and enabled people to discuss hard topics openly.	Tables
I am not clear on the purpose of the notes from the breakout tables. Doesn't seem to be any closure or value compared to the amount of time spent.	Tables