

Results of Southwest Basin Roundtable (SWBRT) Member Questionnaire:

We received a total of five responses to the questionnaire that was sent out. Those responses are provided below:

1. Are we satisfied with the current SWBRT schedule & activities? (Other roundtables have subcommittees around interest groups environmental, municipal, agricultural & recreational. Others also have more meetings, 6 per year.)
 - a. **I am satisfied in general. I think when subcommittees are needed for a particular topic/issue or additional meetings are needed because we have more to do, then we can add meetings when necessary.**
 - b. **It does feel hard to cover all pertinent material at just quarterly meetings. I think subcommittees may be valuable . We hae seen limited in-person attendance at some recent meetings. There have been unfortunate conflicts with other meetings (SWCD, UCRC) but maybe the focus should be on full attendance of existing meetings. Geographic breadth is another challenge (ie 2+ hour drive from northern boundary of Southwest Basins). Would it be possible to have meetings rotate elsewhere in the basins? Cortez and Durango are both 2+ hour drive from areas in Montrose County.**
 - c. **I believe that setting up subcommittees as they are needed is the best process.**
 - d. **Yes Satisfied. I don't see a need for additional subcommittees.**
 - e. **The current schedule of quarterly meetings seems to work fine. The issue we need to focus on is what "activities" should we pursue so that more folks may become engaged in the SWBRT.**
2. Would there be interest in project tours? (Focus tours on projects funded through the Water Supply Reserve Fund (WSRF) Grants by the SWBRT in the past or that might be funded in the future. Another thought is to move the July & October meetings to new venues around southwest Colorado and combine with local project tours. The tours could extend beyond SWBRT grant funded projects to learn more about how your neighboring water users operate and their successes and challenges.)
 - a. **I think that would be nice to do. Unfortunately, zoom will always be necessary so the meeting itself should still be capable of zoom.**
 - b. **Yes, definitely interested in project tours. Yes, agree with new venues based on previous response.**

- c. **Yes, I think that project tours could help members see where our money is being spent and what issues different organizations are facing. Combining the tours with a quarterly meeting in other areas of the Roundtable is also a good idea.**
 - d. **No opinion.**
 - e. **Tours are always valuable. Though I recognize my participation is part of my job. It can be hard for others to take time to do such things. It may be worthwhile to try and do one tour this summer and see what kind of participation there is. Tours of projects funded by the SWBRT, CWCB, or others would be great.**
3. Would you like to add a presentation topic at our quarterly meetings that highlights a specific sub-basin, project or entity? (Several ideas included a discussion of the Colorado River District's Shoshone power plant water purchase, review of San Juan cloud seeding programs and/or endangered fish recovery programs.)
- a. **Yes, it seems like we always have an educational presentation, but continuing to do that it good. I think any Co water topic is fine.**
 - b. **San Miguel Water Conservancy District has a new board and is facing challenges determining the role of the district given the infeasibility of the San Miguel Project. There's an ongoing discussion (and litigation) surrounding beneficial uses of water rights associated with the project. It would be interesting to hear what ideas roundtable members may have regarding the district. This would be dependent on interest from te District.**
 - c. **If there is time and someone from a basin that would like to give a presentation, that would be a great idea.**
 - d. **Good ideas and I would add updates on the LIDAR assessment of snow pack and how correlates to SNOTELs.**
 - e. **Every meeting should include one "special presentation" on something relevant to SW Colorado water users. All topics listed are good ideas and there are certainly many others.**
4. Should we engage the public more? (Could be at the SWBRT regular meetings or specific scheduled events beyond the regular schedule.) Would you participate?
- a. **I think occasional public events, perhaps co-sponsored with CWCB or another water group could be good. For example a public event on the Water Plan or some other relevant issue. They would need to move around the basin as well, and I would probably only participate if it was in my basin.**

- b. **Yes, it's great that WSRF funds are a reliable source of funding for those in the know but I think more awareness/competition may lead to better projects.**
 - c. **I think we get pretty good public participation. I don't know what kind of event we would hold for the public.**
 - d. **Certainly, making the public aware of being welcome at the regular meetings. I am open to participation.**
 - e. **Ultimately, yes. However, the focus now should be on ensuring strong engagement from all SWBRT members and ensuring all seats are filled.**
5. Are there other agenda items that the SWBRT should be scheduling? (One observation was that many early roundtable issues revolved around the intrastate east-slope/west-slope conflicts. It appears we have shifted towards larger interstate Colorado River issues. All the roundtables have a Colorado River group and/or regular CWCB updates.)
- a. **like the CWCB and Co River updates and appreciate those each meeting. I would like to hear more from the tribes (S. Ute and Ute Mtn. Ute) with regards to water issues.**
 - b. **No response.**
 - c. **Issues that are brought forward by Subcommittees should be agenda items. I don't know if there is enough time in a regular meeting to discuss important issues in-depth.**
 - d. **Domestic grey water use; I'm remembering the presentation at the 2023 Water Seminar. Produced Water recovery/usage. Hydro-electric production in irrigation channels.**
 - e. **This is the same discussion occurring within the IBCC. I think current activities in Colorado may inform this question in the coming months/years. Would there be any interest in having some sort of legislative update at relevant SWBRT meetings?**
6. We are having some turnover of experienced members. How will the SWBRT recruit new members?
- a. **I think turnover is good; in fact, perhaps the BRT should consider term limits. We've never had trouble recruiting interest, in fact it's been embarrassing that so many people are interested in being on the BRT, but we keep voting in the same**

people. If the word gets out that we truly want to fill vacancies and there is opportunity for new people, I don't think we will have any trouble finding interested people.

- b. Happy to help publicize open seats around the San Miguel Basin. I think greater diversity in membership will benefit the roundtable moving forward.
- c. There always seems to be plenty of people interested in serving on the Roundtable. I don't know that this is a big issue.
- d. Nine Basins Newsletter. Word of mouth. Fort Lewis College – Water Group. MSI.
- e. No Response.

7. Should we emphasize more in-person attendance? (Zoom is handy, but diminishes some exchanges.)

- a. I think all of us want to be there in person, but Zoom is necessary for many of us who work and can't always be gone for the entire day or who have to travel over 2 hours for a meeting, sometimes in bad weather.
- b. Yes.
- c. I believe that in-person attendance provides better participation and should be encouraged. There will always be a need for Zoom to allow members and the public that can't attend in person to be able to participate.
- d. Agree with limitations of ZOOM. Would having a meeting in the northern part of the Basin attract folks from that area; possibly missing members from this area.
- e. I agree that in-person has increased value. Maybe the summer meeting should include a tour associated with the SWBRT meeting – where no Zoom option is offered.

8. Are there other ideas to engage the public and SWBRT members and make the SWBRT more engaged around the state? Would you attend a meeting of west slope roundtables in 2024?

- a. If the agenda was very engaging and it was free – yes.
- b. Yes, potentially more opportunity for scholarships for roundtable member to attend events/conferences. Would like to see more diverse industry attendance at Sustaining Colorado Watersheds Assembly, Water Congress is expensive.
- c. I don't know that we need to be more engaged around the State. I would attend a West Slope Roundtable meeting. I think it is important to have common ground with the rest of the Western Slope.
- d. Not sure I'm the right person to attend other west slope roundtables.

- e. **Any type of crossover with other roundtables would be good and have value. We just need to make sure there would be enough participation by SWVRT members to make the effort worthwhile.**