

Evaluation Summary

1. Did the conference provide useful information on source water protection?

23 said Yes; 3 said Somewhat; 0 said No.

Comments:

- Abundance of information - very satisfied.
- Get a core involved group with tangible tasks, continue to work together.
- Good energy and curiosity from the participants
- However, the technical/practical details of the physical part of protection was not covered in much depth.
- Incredibly helpful. Good program, outstanding speakers.
- It described the reasons for protecting source water so drinking water will be protected very well.
- It was great to combine Clean Water with SWP.
- It was great to hear the success stories! Picked up some good resources.
- More sessions on "how to" and less on "what we did" would be useful
- New partners, new programs
- NY & Seattle case studies [responded Yes]
- Range of view & perspectives. Useful to network with other parts of U.S. - different approaches.
- This was a good first step. It should be continued next year. A little too general, too much preaching to the choir. But it was good to build momentum and motivate.
- Lots of great information was offered on many topics.

2. Did you find the Resource Fair valuable?

15 said Yes; 3 said Somewhat; 5 said No.

- A lot of info that there would never be time to cover in presentations. Most are very good!
- Able to pick up handouts from missed sessions - so many good ones.
- CCR examples - public education examples

- Exhibitors were cramped - no room to visit with participants and very little room to spread out materials.
- Great wide range of materials. Maybe also allow sale of videos, etc.
- Helpful for meeting people.
- I did not talk with anyone but Univ. of WI but did pick up several documents and web sites.
- More handouts
- Need to allow participants more room to spread out!
- Not enough time to meet with everyone. Nice that it was available the whole time to view.
- Not particularly future oriented; "here's what we did" not "here's where we are going."
- I was asked to go to a GWPC meeting then. Not enough time to really read the posters at that time. The handouts that some brought were useful.

3. Which training session did you attend? Did you find the training session valuable? Do you have any suggestions for additional training?

Overview of Clean Water Act Tools for Drinking Water Protection

1 respondent attended this session. No comments.

Sharing the Power of Partnerships: Water Utility/Agriculture Alliances

1 respondent attended this session. No comments.

Source Water Protection TMDLs

2 respondents attended this session. Comments:

- Very informative. Well organized and presented. Good interaction among participants.

USDA Funding Opportunities for Rural Water Protection

2 respondents attended this session. Comments:

- I enjoyed the presentations.
- Integrate into general conference as a breakout rather than a post workshop.

Thinking Like a Marketer: How to Use Social Marketing Tools to Change Behavior

4 respondents attended this session. Comments:

- Found to be very useful very good presenter. Additional training in how to get people involved in your program or issues.
- Great!!!
- It was very useful "how to" information
- Very good. Additional training sessions also looked very interesting.

Funding Options for Watershed Protection

1 respondent attended this session. Comments:

- USEPA should have been on the panel.

Using GIS Data and Tools in EPA's WATERS Website to Support SWP

1 respondent attended this session. No comments.

BMPs and Other Measures for Protecting Drinking Water Supplies

3 respondents attended this session. Comments:

- Good session; great handbook. Additional training - how to mold watershed protection planning with municipal boundaries that most often aren't the same.

4. What kinds of after-conference follow up activities would be most useful (e.g., at the federal, tribal, state, local, or other level)?

- A year or two from now, this topic should be revisited. Need to figure how to better report meaningful protection vs. token protection in SDWIS & SDWIS/State.
- Follow-up with USDA agencies on SDWA needs & new partners.
- Funding to states for SWP.
- Local
- Make registrants' email addresses available to appropriate agencies so they can send info on projects and future conferences.
- More regional opportunities for conferences, training, where we might share more common experiences and problems.
- National ad campaign

- National level advertising campaign on source water protection. I think that this is very important!
- National Strategy
- One of the water training courses
- Provide information to participants on the cooperative extension service water quality coordinators in their states to encourage agricultural partnerships and as a link to eventually bring more farmers to the table. There is a directory at www.usawaterquality.org for download.
- To be able to get tapes - either audio or video of the presentations since I could not attend every session. Either tapes/CD/DVD.
- Visiting location in areas that have been cleaned up or are in process of being cleaned up from pollution - Discuss process by which area ended up that way and what future holds. Most communities have this issue.
- Watershed-based source water protection conferences targeted at drinking water utilities and potential partners - why not work on a watershed basis? (or basin - scale)
- We are planning a state conference this summer.
- More information about how to actually deal with PSOCs. What motivates them? How can SWP be a motivating factor?

5. What improvements would you recommend?

- 1) Fewer presentations, more opportunities for discussion; 2) Legibility of handouts could be better; 3) More examples of competing interests: for example, pressure on county planning/zoning to allow development for associated revenue.
- As someone not directly involved in SWP, it would have been helpful to broaden the focus of some of the sessions.
- Better pre-conference planning. Up until 2 weeks before I thought I was a presenter in a break out session. Instead, we were asked to participate in the resource fair. Better publication of conference info.
- Finalize speakers and logistics earlier.
- Hall and rooms were overly warm. Need a little A/C.
- Have bigger rooms for breakouts.
- Less similar concurrent sessions.
- More "how to" training sessions that are not concurrent - too much to choose from.
- More breakout sessions with more case histories.

- More networking opportunities - the boat cruise would have been great for that. Maybe an optional luncheon or dinner for all attendees. The NRWA reception was great!
- None
- None - excellent.
- Panels need to do quicker responses.
- Provide handouts from all sessions to all conference attendees (maybe at a central location).
- Show how to cost justify SWP. Show example of a good PR campaign for SWP. Show us PSA's in use - print/radio/TV. Bring in industry - even a contrarian view would be instructive - not just the choir!
- Some people did not use microphones well so they were hard to hear.
- To me this was more of a SWAP conference, not a Source Water Conference. There should have been a much greater diversity in groups (even in EPA) at the tables.
- Encourage the resource fair as part of coffee break. Spread it out more.

Conference Content

A1 Assessments as a Tool to Launch Protection (6 respondents attended)

Topics: 3 rated Excellent; 2 rated Good; 1 rated Fair; 0 rated Poor

Presentations: 2 rated Excellent; 4 rated Good; 0 rated Fair; 0 rated Poor

Comments:

- The presentations really didn't provide anything new.
- Good presentations, link to protection not clear.
- The assessments were not really incorporated into some of these presentations.

A2 Communicating Assessment Results (6 respondents attended)

Topics: 2 rated Excellent; 4 rated Good; 0 rated Fair; 0 rated Poor

Presentations: 2 rated Excellent; 4 rated Good; 0 rated Fair; 0 rated Poor

Comments:

- Offered good concrete examples of working with the public and stake holders.
- Good speakers - tried to keep session lively.
- Very good presentations, but almost no Q&A time. Have less speakers to allow Q&A.

A3 Using Geo-spatial Tools to Target Protection (4 respondents attended)

Topics: 0 rated Excellent; 3 rated Good; 1 rated Fair; 0 rated Poor
Presentations: 0 rated Excellent; 3 rated Good; 1 rated Fair; 0 rated Poor
Comments: None

A4 Source Water Protection and Homeland Security (4 respondents attended)

Topics: 2 rated Excellent; 2 rated Good; 0 rated Fair; 0 rated Poor
Presentations: 2 rated Excellent; 2 rated Good; 0 rated Fair; 0 rated Poor
Comments:

- Important and timely.
- Slide copies for handouts very helpful.
- Very helpful. Could use additional follow-up for medium and small facilities.

B1 CWA/SDWA Integration (12 respondents attended)

Topics: 1 rated Excellent; 4 rated Good; 6 rated Fair; 1 rated Poor
Presentations: 1 rated Excellent; 6 rated Good; 4 rated Fair; 0 rated Poor; 1 no response
Comments:

- Could have been the time but it was slow.
- Q&A approach not helpful.
- Q&A format failed to consider all sides of an issue.
- The RWA presentation (Idaho) was very good, but otherwise kind of dull and unhelpful.
- USEPA presentation could have been more specific for SWP. Session too long!

B2 Conservation and Land Acquisition (4 respondents attended)

Topics: 0 rated Excellent; 3 rated Good; 1 rated Fair; 0 rated Poor
Presentations: 0 rated Excellent; 3 rated Good; 1 rated Fair; 0 rated Poor
Comments:

- New ideas to acquire land.
- Presentations became too specific to individual cases to be transferable.

B3 Recent EPA Regulations (2 respondents attended)

Topics: 1 rated Excellent; 1 rated Good; 0 rated Fair; 0 rated Poor

Presentations: 1 rated Excellent; 1 rated Good; 0 rated Fair; 0 rated Poor

Comments:

- Should show better how protection efforts can reasonably be documented to support use in rule implementation.

B4 Ripe Opportunities (4 respondents attended)

Topics: 0 rated Excellent; 3 rated Good; 0 rated Fair; 0 rated Poor; 1 no response

Presentations: 0 rated Excellent; 3 rated Good; 0 rated Fair; 0 rated Poor; 1 no response

Comments:

- Cannot rate. Varied a lot in terms of usefulness; some speakers excellent, others poor.

C1 Implementing Protection Through Partnerships (4 respondents attended)

Topics: 3 rated Excellent; 1 rated Good; 0 rated Fair; 0 rated Poor

Presentations: 3 rated Excellent; 1 rated Good; 0 rated Fair; 0 rated Poor

Comments:

- Actual case studies helped.

C2 Upstream Neighbors (10 respondents attended)

Topics: 6 rated Excellent; 4 rated Good; 0 rated Fair; 0 rated Poor

Presentations: 6 rated Excellent; 3 rated Good; 0 rated Fair; 0 rated Poor (1 no response)

Comments:

- "Upstream" aspect not as clear. Would like strategies on how to get upstreamers involved.
- Very good, helpful examples.
- Worksheet directions?
- Absolutely excellent.

C3 CWA/SDWA Integration, continued (3 respondents attended)

Topics: 1 rated Excellent; 2 rated Good; 0 rated Fair; 0 rated Poor

Presentations: 1 rated Excellent; 2 rated Good; 0 rated Fair; 0 rated Poor

Comments:

- Enjoyed the session.

C4 Leveraging Rural Partnerships (5 respondents attended)

Topics: 3 rated Excellent; 2 rated Good; 0 rated Fair; 0 rated Poor

Presentations: 3 rated Excellent; 2 rated Good; 0 rated Fair; 0 rated Poor

Comments:

- Great interaction with the rotating format! Allow more time for questions.
- Needed five more minutes per presenter.
- Provide small group interaction.
- Relating speakers was effective.
- The mix of different programs A+++

Financing Plenary

Topics: 5 rated Excellent; 11 rated Good; 3 rated Fair; 0 rated Poor

Presentations: 5 rated Excellent; 11 rated Good; 1 rated Fair; 0 rated Poor

Comments:

- Disappointed - OGWDW did not present or participate on panel.
- Good contrast in approach, NYC vs. Seattle.
- Handouts helpful as well.
- Please encourage collaboration with local coop. extension agents. They have a lot of expertise and understand farm bill programs.
- Q&A?
- Very well done, although Q&A didn't adequately answer the questions.

Please provide any additional comments or suggestions:

- 1) Food and drinks at breaks, 2) Social events, 3) Hospitality rooms, 4) Larger rooms for training session
- 1) Length of time was good. Nice to have a reception and a resource fair for networking. Rooms were small and crowded for breakouts. Good mix of people. Nice balance of plenary and breakout. 2) Make this an annual or biannual event to maintain momentum.
- An acronym (glossary) handout would help. Those who do not work daily in the field have a hard time remembering the acronyms.
- Excellent conference. Please keep momentum going from assessments to protection for surface water supplies.
- Good location, excellent presentations.

- Hotel was disorganized, rooms for training were small. Need food and drink at breaks.
- I would have gotten more out of this if it truly addressed source water protection. As a water supplier I need to know who is doing what in my watershed, both locally and federally. For me to protect my water supply, I have found USGS a greater partner in source water protection than the EPA. They have relevant data and share it. Having good, accurate information is much more important to me than hearing that there is a need to protect my water supply. I think we all know that there is a need but how to get there is more important.
- It was great to see representation from almost every state. The conference was more geared to state-level employees, but as a county employee I still did benefit from attending the conference.
- More specific BMP information and detail on how to bring assessment results to source water protection.
- National ad campaign; more money for implementation, less studies.
- Need more audience input and questions (esp. during closing plenary session). "Listen to your stakeholders" OK, good to hear from these 5 guys, but they are not the be-all/end-all. Good to have a utility up there. But, Cambridge, MA is a rarity, a tiny watershed that is highly urbanized. What about agricultural or mixed use/developing watersheds? Question session was great - could have lasted for 30-45 minutes longer.
- Some issues related to source protection in western states would be irrelevant to eastern states (and v.v.); maybe it would be worthwhile to have a session dedicated to those issues. Examples: water rights, drought, land use, development and growth issues. P.S. - Dr. Griffith's presentation was really galvanizing and inspiring, but otherwise the plenaries and panel discussions were kind of dull and not particularly helpful.
- The worksheet ideas did not work well. Not enough time or direction.
- This conference much appreciated. I'd have liked more info. on what states found in SWAP assessments. And more ideas on moving through assessments to protection. Best part of conference: networking. State session on data management should have been at time other than at fair time.
- Well done conference with very helpful stuff. Last question: Why have EPA person speak to what do we need EPA to do - whole room had little chance to give input. Time was used up.
- Conference had a really nice cooperative atmosphere. . . . Nice mix of organizations.