

CDSN Outreach Evaluation

Indicators	Results	Notes
Process Indicators – Attendance, workshops, etc		
# of trainings	11 trainings Colorado Basin: Fall 2006 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Craig • Frisco • Glenwood Springs • Grand Junction South Platte Basin: Spring 2007 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Golden (2) • Longmont • Ft. Morgan Gunnison/San Juan/Dolores Basin: Fall 2007 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gunnison • Montrose • Durango Rio Grande/Arkansas Basins: Spring 2008 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alamosa • Salida • Pueblo • Rocky Ford 	Training dates designed to follow the WCDD Triennial Review Process
Training Attendance	166 attended swaps, 132 attended trainings	831 individuals invited
Data in System	21 organizations (8 NPS Related) 26 projects (17 NPS Related)	4 “must have” NPS data sets in the system
System membership (to input/export)	NA	
Number of non attendee system users	Did not track during first grant period	
Number of inquiries received	NA	
Plans to meet after training	New outreach calendar developed	Participants of each swap indicated a desire to meet again in 1 to 2 years
Events attended	WQCC Presentation (2008) Water Quality Forum (2006, 2007, 2008) Water Congress (2006) Waste Water Utility Council (2007) Watershed Conference (2006, 2007 presentations) STORET Austin Conference (2007)	Brochures distributed at each event
CWQMC Membership	1406 names in the CWQMC mailing list All are by default members of the CWQMC	
Newsletter Incorporation	SWAP Fact Sheet Annual membership outreach – update email	SWAP fact sheets can be incorporated into a newsletter
Website Links	cwqmc.coloradowatershed.org	Website has CWQMC and CDSN information/links
State coverage – gap analysis	See CDSN web based map www.codsnstoret.com Have data in the South Platte, Arkansas, Gunnison, Yampa/White and San Juan Basins	Need more coverage in the Rio Grande and Colorado Basins
Swap/training Evaluations	Valuable, continue every 2 years Overall content and pace about right	See notes below for all evaluation results

User Feedback	Not enough users yet	
Impact Indicators – behavior, awareness, knowledge		
Before and After surveys	Most SWAP/training participants showed ability to use DSN before vs. after training	See notes below for all evaluation results
NPS 319 Compliance	8 Organizations/ 17 projects uploaded to the CDSN and migrated to National STORET	WQCD strategy to include CDSN in new NPS Project Sponsor trainings
STORET uploads/usage - CO	21 organizations (8 NPS Related) 26 projects (17 NPS Related)	
CDPHE Triennial Review	SWAPS/Trainings organized around Triennial Review Process	See CDSN Outreach Calendar
Collaborative projects initiated from participation	Too soon to tell Collaborative discussions at Gunnison SWAP	
Before/after monitoring activity characterization	Too soon to tell	
Context Indicators – community perception, economic and political ramifications		
CDPHE Evaluation on Triennial Review	NA	
Duplication elimination	Too soon to tell	
How received – surveys after the fact	Surveys not conducted	
Proper messengers?	CWQMC goal is a diverse membership (i.e. geographic and organizational). Watershed Teams created for each CDSN Basin-wide series of SWAP/Trainings	See notes below for all list of watershed team participants

CDSN SWAP/TRAINING EVALUATIONS

Colorado Basin Evaluation Summaries:

Yampa/White (Craig)

Was this valuable? What frequency should this continue?

- 2-3 years seems appropriate to generate information, analyze and share
- Every year would be too frequent
- Swaps are important to understanding where needs and gaps are in order to match with available resources

Evaluation Summary

- Content about right (100%)
- Be better to run tutorial than watch it, great information
- Overall pace about right (100%)
- Ability to upload or use system was 100% in the middle, before and after the training
- Met expectations, primarily to learn what this is about and how I should participate

Upper Colorado (Frisco)

Was this valuable? What frequency should this continue?

- Yes
- Every 2-3 years there will be something to share and it might be relevant and keep efforts going through staff turnover, budget cycles, priority shifts, etc.
- 4-5 is too long of a period, too much can happen between

Evaluation Summary

- Content about right (100%)
- Good information, good training
- Overall pace about right (100%)
- Met expectations, wanted more information on how to get data versus provide data, wanted to see graphic aspect, learn about DSN, how to support folks w/ DSN, how to get data in/out of DSN
- Most showed ability to use DSN before vs. after training
- Suggestions: will be necessary to provide support in formatting, especially large data sets

Middle Colorado (Glenwood Springs)

Was this valuable? What frequency should this continue?

- 5 years too long
- Should do every year locally, do not need DSN
- Conduct before WQCC hearings is very valuable, share important data
- 2-3 years if cannot do more frequently alone

Evaluation Summary

- Content about right (9), too much (1)
- We can benefit from this, doing this frequently would be good
- Overall pace about right (9), too fast (1)
- Met expectations, learned about DSN and bigger picture, lots of data being generated but not available, want to share data and have mechanism to do so, want and need more data, wanted more information on how to get data versus provide data, wanted to see graphic aspect,
- Most showed ability to use DSN before vs. after training

Lower Colorado (Grand Junction)

Was this valuable? What frequency should this continue?

- Yes, 2-3 year frequency seems appropriate

Evaluation Summary

- Content about right (100%)
- Very beneficial, good overview, might be too complex unless use information right away
- Overall pace about right (100%)
- Met expectations, learned about DSN and bigger picture Most showed ability to use DSN before vs. after training

South Platte Basin Evaluation Summaries:

SP Headwaters (Golden I)

Was this valuable? What frequency, scale and potential topics?

- Yes, two years to annually were responses, 20 is limit on size to be workable
- Scale is adequate for most, some entities would need to attend more than one like Denver Water Board, WQCC or CDOW
- Topic - How to manage and analyze continuous reading temperature data
- Topic - A sharing of data and results from all the Hayman Fire Studies would be of value
- Topic - Data analyses-study results, share stories and data needs

Evaluation Summary

- Content about right (100%) and Overall pace about right (100%)
- Unanimous increased knowledge of DSN and difference between Database and map (100%)
- About ½ of participants plan to upload data, the other ½ did not generate data but planned to use map and database
- About ½ of participants have legacy data and also requested help loading data into DSN

Main stem SP (Golden II)

Was this valuable? What frequency, scale and potential topics?

- Yes, valuable, frequency ranged from 6 months, one year and 2-3 years
- Need to do data calls every 6 months to a year at minimum
- Topics – current issues where data policy meet in addition to field type issues, monitoring issues, data management and analyses issues, tips

Evaluation Summary

- Content about right (100%) and Overall pace about right (100%)
- Almost unanimous increased knowledge of DSN and difference between Database and map (92%)
- SWAP was more interesting than I thought it would be
- 10 out of 12 participants plan to upload data or where considering it, those that were not did not have date to upload
- 7 of 12 participants have legacy data to upload and 6 requested help loading data into DSN

SP Major Tributaries (Longmont)

Was this valuable? What frequency, scale and potential topics?

- Yes the scale is right, many of us already communicate and swap needs w/in our own basin, but to hear what other basins are doing is helpful too, cross pollination
- Smaller scale is valuable, sharing is richer and better representation
- Many of our watersheds have sources from other basins
- If too large loose meaning, have a large event and then smaller swaps
- Frequency was consensus annually, five years too long
- Topics – Study results, new regulations or methods, data-to-information stories or processes, reporting or how groups have provided technical information to the public, emerging issues discussions, relevant water quality standards or criteria, the water quantity round table concept, as technology changes help adapt to STORET changes, be a clearing house as a glossary, terminology, scientific resource for each parameter, if something came out of the database itself, how folks are using the data/results, etc.

Evaluation Summary

- Content about right (100%) and Overall pace about right (100%)
- Almost unanimous increased knowledge of DSN and difference between Database and map (100%)
- SWAP was valuable and interesting across similar watersheds
- 10 out of 13 participants plan to upload data or where considering it, those that were not did not have date to upload or it was getting there already
- 8 of participants have legacy data to upload and 4 requested help loading data into DSN
- Internet access would be useful

Lower SP (Ft. Morgan)

Was this valuable? What frequency, scale and potential topics?

- Yes, quarterly to biannual if possible
- Scale is right
- Join a multi-topic event like part of a state SWAP, DSN, WS plan, ½ day or more
- Colorado Rural Water annual meeting good for rural areas
- Topics – data analyses and results

Evaluation Summary

- Content about right (100%) and Overall pace about right (100%)
- Almost unanimous increased knowledge of DSN and difference between Database and map (88%)
- Organized agenda, overwhelming task but very necessary project, exceed expectations, feels like a statewide database is actually possible
- 7 out of 8 participants plan to upload data or need to get permission it, those that were not did not have date to upload
- 3 of participants have legacy data to upload and 6 requested help loading data into DSN

Gunnison/San Juan/Dolores Basin Evaluation Summaries:

Gunnison (Gunnison)

Was this valuable? What frequency, scale and potential topics?

- Yes, value the sharing, information exchange and networking, no other outlet for this at this time. Value for non data generators as well.
- Yes, this is the right scale. Interest in what going on in lower basin but have to know what is going on in upper basin, so value both, but discussions different.
- Frequency ranged from annual to 2-3 years. Fast evolving issues need more frequency. They could meet on their own, modify a website for more communication, get more involvement from land use decision makers.
- Future topics, include a share between upper and lower basins. Presentations of Tyler's report and other groups completed work. Results oriented across the area could be presented quickly, lots of information could be summarized if done well, quick review of local scale issues and also include global scale issues, use this as a way to re-connect and rejuvenate program sponsors. Have a technical part of day and then a more public part of the day.

Evaluation Summary

- Content about right (100%) and Overall pace about right for most, one participant felt it was too fast to keep the connectivity
- Unanimous increased knowledge of DSN and difference between Database and map (100%)
- DSN is a great concept and tool, looking forward to using it, informative presentation
- Data storage system seems difficult, glad someone can help, but this would be hard to create on own also

- Live demonstrations always helpful, so is one-on-one help

Uncompahgre/San Miguel (Montrose)

Was this valuable? What frequency, scale and potential topics?

- Yes, was valuable to learn all that is going on and share which helps us understand our role in the watershed, face to face is valuable, but we really didn't swap data.
- Frequency every few years seems appropriate, enough changes to be interesting
- Scale is accurate.
- Future topic a way to share with community members, communicate success, problem areas and needs
- Future topic sharing of how you get from data to information, from results based on objectives and how the data answered those objectives.
- Have a state of the watershed report card, at state level be a generic check list
- Present project results, success and failures
- Spend time on the cutting edge of thinking; parameter list expanding, riparian health, etc. help integrate these.
- Need agencies commitment that this is valuable from top down in order to participate and the field level, and we SHOULD participate in this for our own efforts.

Evaluation Summary

- Content about right (80%) and Overall pace about right (80%, one evaluation was too fast/too much)
- Most folks increased their knowledge of DSN and difference between Database and map, two did not but admitted they left early
- Good introduction for first time exposure, informative and useful, clear and clean presentation
- Concern quality of data will be an issue, would help to have computers and hands-on with database next time
- Need support from this group to my boss to make this be a priority
- Suggestion to make sure we stay focused and do not let the scope creep
- SWAPS in November and December time frame better, avoid the field season

Dolores (Durango)

Was this valuable? What frequency, scale and potential topics?

- Yes, from a watershed perspective something like this is needed to get anything accomplished at this scale, the entire ecosystem needs to be included, pooling of resources, reduce duplication and fragmentation.
- Yes, helps make sense in a bigger picture scale, and from an efficiency perspective.
- Yes, seems like an equitable and valuable approach, especially for non data generators.
- Frequency, every two years, in line with WQCC basin hearing also
- Would be valuable to provide a forum on website for each watershed, where folks could post information and ask questions.
- Scale – many folks in Cortez would be interested in those rivers, many don't know about the issues but are concerned. Note that DSN had a SWAP scheduled in Cortez but only had one participant sign up.
- Scale, yes for Upper San Juan, need to get more Pagosa Springs, headwaters folks.
- Future topic Swap with public or a different approach to reach a different audience than the data generators or technical folks, have an informational swap for all to get the general conversation started, then a technical swap to follow.
- Future topic Presentation of completed studies, special speakers and a public forum, provide information on local watershed groups and activities.
- Conducting a group gap analyses (if have all information on the map).

Evaluation Summary

- Content about right (100%) and Overall pace about right (100%)
- All but one participant increased knowledge of DSN and difference between Database and map (100%)
- 66% said would upload data to map, remaining did not have data.
- Good overview, provided relevant information, discussions valuable
- Would like to include a lay persons session as part of this SWAP

Arkansas/Rio Grande Basin Evaluation Summaries:

Arkansas Headwaters (Salida)

Was this valuable? What frequency, scale and potential topics?

- Yes, quarterly to stay informed
- Yes, spring and fall related to monitoring season, collaborate before, review and modify after

- Yes, once a year adequate
- Scale is accurate.
- Future topic Swap with local land use decision makers
- Future topic Presentation of completed studies

Evaluation Summary

- Content about right (100%) and Overall pace about right (100%)
- All but one participant increased knowledge of DSN and difference between Database and map (100%)
- 44% said would upload data to database and did not need help, 44% needed to evaluate and remaining did not have data.
- 60% said would use the data 40% were not sure and it was function of if their issue required data or not.
- has data upload data but is part of a 319 project, the others did not generate data but planned to use map and database

Arkansas (Alamosa)

Was this valuable? What frequency, scale and potential topics?

- Yes, at least annually
- Scale is accurate.
- Future topic Swap bring your data or have it in DSN and use as example for discussions
- Future topic Presentation of completed studies

Evaluation Summary

- Content about right (100%) and Overall pace about right (100%)
- All agreed good introduction to a valuable product, Swaps good opportunity to network
- Unanimous increased knowledge of DSN and difference between Database and map (100%)
- Only one participants has data upload data but is part of a 319 project, one other group plans to use the database, four groups did not generate data and four the others did not know yet, similar response to providing data for the map
- 66% said they would use the map/database, 1% said would not, 2% still needed to evaluate it
- Networking a valuable part of this effort work it into agenda
- Hope this grows into a multi-state effort
- Keep the tutorial aspect of the training

Middle Arkansas (Pueblo)

Was this valuable? What frequency, scale and potential topics?

- Yes, can see how this would increase in value with more data, efforts and sharing
- Have entities provide handouts on what do, but if really succeed at coordination and sharing these would be moot, at least for this audience.
- Frequency every few years following WQCD cycle makes sense.
- Scale is accurate.
- Future topic presentation on existing and new TMDL implementation efforts
- Future topic Presentation of completed studies
- Need to fix DSN map to include Fountain Creek.

Evaluation Summary

- Content about right (100%) and Overall pace about right (100%)
- Unanimous increased knowledge of DSN and difference between Database and map (100%)
- Good project, good discussions, great for public, today's participation bias towards municipalities but see potential, table tents w/names would be great
- 33% will upload data to database, 22% will not-no data, remaining uncertain about their data types or other issues, 37% of those that will upload to database requested help
- two felt appropriate to load data on map versus database
- Group desire to have WQCD data in database some day understanding the hurdles now
- 100% planned to use the data/map
- Group summary handouts would be valuable, so would internet access, provide a list of participants websites
- Universities should be part of this effort
- Only 1 participants has data upload data but is part of a 319 project, the others did not generate data but planned to use map and database

Lower Arkansas (Rocky Ford)

Was this valuable? What frequency, scale and potential topics?

- Yes, can see how this would increase in value with more data, efforts and sharing
- Frequency depends upon content, more often in this phase of monitoring and understanding. When all on same page reduce frequency. Local folks can take responsibility to host later and build from initial coordination.
- Come to us, please, we always have to drive to front range, for driving scale could be smaller but for issues is about right.
- Future topics, show/share what information is available
- Presentation of completed studies
- Identify gaps and on the ground collaboration efforts

Evaluation Summary

- Content about right (100%) and Overall pace about right (100%)
- Unanimous increased knowledge of DSN and difference between Database and map (100%)
- Limited data generators in this SWAP and basin. Most of work is done by USGS, is part of a large NPS project (data in system), is on tamarisk removal, or is typical municipality data.
- All participants need data and plan to use the database and map where appropriate.

CDSN SWAP/TRAINING WATERSHED TEAMS

Colorado Basin

- Dave Kanzer (Colorado River District)
- Nicole Seltzer (Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District)
- Shelia Murphy (USGS)
- Vic Lucero (City of Thornton)
- Barb Horn (DOW)

South Platte Basin

- Matt Sares (Colorado Geological Survey)
- Mark Williams (Boulder County)
- Russ Clayshulte (Bear Creek/Chatfield)
- Jim Dorsch (Metro Waste Water Reclamation District)
- Vic Lucero (City of Thornton)
- Barb Horn (DOW)
- Joan Carlson (USFS)

Gunnison/San Juan/Dolores Basin

- Dave Kanzer (Colorado River District)
- Anthony Poponi (Coal Creek Watershed Coalition)
- Elizabeth Roscoe (Friends of the River Uncompahgre)
- Brian Haines (Southern Ute Tribe)
- Chuck Wanner (San Juan Citizens Alliance)

Arkansas/Rio Grande Basins

- Mike Gibson (Rio Grande Headwaters Project)
- Vic Lucero (City of Thornton)
- Katie Lucchesi (Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District)
- Sarah Reeves/Michelle Winn (Brown and Caldwell/SPCURE)
- Barb Horn (DOW)