

# Colorado River Basin Decision-Making Survey

John Berggren, University of Colorado – Boulder

[John.berggren@colorado.edu](mailto:John.berggren@colorado.edu)

December 2016

In 2010 a survey was sent to the members of the Colorado River Water Users Association (CRWUA). This survey included questions pertaining to issues of water supplies, demands and water availability, perceived need for institutional reform, and potential solution strategies. The goal of this survey was to better inform and guide research through the Western Water Policy Program at the University of Colorado – Boulder. In 2016, another survey was administered that included the exact same questions asked in the 2010 survey. By asking the same questions in both years, researchers will be able to conduct a temporal analysis of how particular issues have changed (if at all) during those six years. In addition to the 2010 questions, twelve questions were added to the 2016 survey. These new questions pertained to opinions on Colorado River Basin decision-making processes, changes to the Law of the River, the importance of various stakeholder groups, the structural deficit in the Lower Basin, and the importance of various ongoing negotiations.

The two surveys were administered in the summer of 2010 and the fall of 2016 to the CRWUA membership. Using the 2008 and 2015 CRWUA membership directory, researchers identified 903 and 978 unique, individual email addresses, respectively. Because the CRWUA membership is a dynamic and ever-changing group, additional survey panelists could complete the survey if they were identified through snowball sampling by current CRWUA members. Less than 1% of the panelists were recruited this way.

In 2010, the survey yielded 185 unique responses for a 20.5% response rate (185/903). In 2016, the survey yielded 212 unique responses for a 21.3% response rate (212/997). It is important to note that not all respondents answered all questions. The survey was completely anonymous but almost all the panelists voluntarily reported their location (by state or region) and occupation/affiliation. As shown in the following report, these variables were used to organize the responses. Questions 1-12 are the new questions for the 2016 survey and Questions 13-23 are the ones that were asked for both surveys. The tables for Questions 13-23 show the comparative results from both surveys.

If you have any questions or comments about the survey, please email John Berggren ([john.berggren@colorado.edu](mailto:john.berggren@colorado.edu)).

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Distribution of 2010 and 2016 Survey Respondents .....</b>	<b>7</b>
 <b>1. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statement regarding your own interests in Colorado River Basin management .....</b>	<b>9-11</b>
<i>Question 1a: The people negotiating and making decisions on Colorado River Basin issues are concerned about my own interests .....</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Question 1b: The people negotiating and making decisions on Colorado River Basin issues have adequate power to protect my own interests .....</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Question 1c: Any new decisions or changes to the current Law of the River will positively impact my own interests.....</i>	<i>11</i>
 <b>2. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statement regarding Colorado River Basin management .....</b>	<b>12-16</b>
<i>Question 2a: The people negotiating and making decisions on Colorado River Basin issues are trustworthy .....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Question 2b: Colorado River Basin negotiations and decision-making are transparent .....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Question 2c: The Law of the River as it stands today is adequate to handle any current or future problems as they relate to Colorado River Basin management .....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Question 2d: The way the Colorado River Basin is currently managed is equitable .....</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Question 2e: The way the Colorado River Basin is currently managed is sustainable.....</i>	<i>16</i>
 <b>3-4 . Changes to the Law of the River.....</b>	<b>17-18</b>
<i>Question 3: The 2007 Interim Shortage Guidelines were developed to coordinate operations of Lake Powell and Lake Mead and to develop shortage-sharing guidelines for the Lower Basin states as Lake Mead elevation levels declined. In your opinion, how big of a change were the 2007 Interim Shortage Guidelines to the Law of the River?.....</i>	<i>17</i>
 <i>Question 4:Minute 319 to the 1944 Mexico Treaty was signed in 2012 to guide future management of the Colorado River in the US and Mexico. This included establishing shortage</i>	

<i>sharing procedures, enhancing water infrastructure, coordinating storage operations, and promoting ecological health in the Colorado River Delta. In your opinion, how big of a change was Minute 319 to the Law of the River?</i> .....	18
<b>5. In your opinion, please rate the level of importance of participation for each of the following groups in Colorado River Basin negotiations and decision-making</b> .....	19-29
<i>Question 5a: The federal government of the United States</i> .....	19
<i>Question 5b: The federal government of Mexico</i> .....	20
<i>Question 5c: The state governments of the seven US Basin States (Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada, and California)</i> .....	21
<i>Question 5d: The state governments of the two Mexico States (Baja California and Sonora)</i> .....	22
<i>Question 5e: Local/municipal governments</i> .....	23
<i>Question 5f: Irrigation/conservancy districts</i> .....	24
<i>Question 5g: Non-governmental organizations (NGOs)</i> .....	25
<i>Question 5h: Native American Tribes</i> .....	26
<i>Question 5i: Academics/researchers</i> .....	27
<i>Question 5j: General public</i> .....	28
<i>Question 5k: Other (write-in)</i> .....	29
<b>6. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding the process of arriving at new decisions or developing new policies in the Colorado River Basin</b> .....	30-34
<i>Question 6a: Any new decisions in the Colorado River Basin will require long-term engagement between stakeholders</i> .....	30
<i>Question 6b: Any new decisions in the Colorado River Basin will require changing the Law of the River</i> .....	31
<i>Question 6c: Any new decisions in the Colorado River Basin must be informed by the best available science</i> .....	32
<i>Question 6d: Any new decisions in the Colorado River Basin will require all users to agree to undertake shortages</i> .....	33
<i>Question 6e: Any new decisions in the Colorado River Basin will require some users to agree to undertake shortages</i> .....	34
<b>7. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding barriers to implementing new decisions in the Colorado River Basin</b> .....	35-39
<i>Question 7a: Any new decisions would require significant</i>	

<i>changes to the Law of the River .....</i>	<i>35</i>
<i>Question 7b: People making those decisions do not understand local/regional politics.....</i>	<i>36</i>
<i>Question 7c: People making those decisions are not trustworthy.....</i>	<i>37</i>
<i>Question 7d: Any new decisions would require all stakeholder groups to compromise on some part of their position.....</i>	<i>38</i>
<i>Question 7e: Any new decisions could lead to litigation .....</i>	<i>39</i>
<b>8. In recent years there has been a focus on including more stakeholders in the decision-making process in the Colorado River Basin. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding your own participation in these decision-making processes .....</b>	<b>40-43</b>
<i>Question 8a: I feel like I have an adequate seat at the negotiating table when it comes to Colorado River Basin decision-making.....</i>	<i>40</i>
<i>Question 8b: While I'm not at the actual negotiating table, people who adequately represent my interests are at the table.....</i>	<i>41</i>
<i>Question 8c: My involvement is typically being consulted about a new decision after it has been drafted .....</i>	<i>42</i>
<i>Question 8d: I don't feel involved at all in Colorado River Basin decision-making.....</i>	<i>43</i>
<b>9. The 'structural deficit' in the Lower Basin .....</b>	<b>44-50</b>
<i>Question 9: The 'structure deficit' in the Lower Basin has been identified as a significant problem for Colorado River Basin management. Please rate your familiarity with the 'structure deficit' .....</i>	<i>44</i>
<b>10. The preceding question was about the 'structural deficit' in the Lower Basin. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding addressing the 'structural deficit' .....</b>	<b>45-50</b>
<i>Question 10a: Addressing the 'structural deficit' in the Lower Basin will require fundamental changes to the Law of the River .....</i>	<i>45</i>
<i>Question 10b: Addressing the 'structural deficit' in the Lower Basin will require minor changes to the Law of the River.....</i>	<i>46</i>
<i>Question 10c: Addressing the 'structural deficit' in the Lower Basin will not require any changes to the Law of the River.....</i>	<i>47</i>
<i>Question 10d: Addressing the 'structural deficit' in the Lower Basin will require permanent curtailments .....</i>	<i>48</i>
<i>Question 10: Addressing the 'structural deficit' in the Lower</i>	

<i>Basin will require temporary curtailments .....</i>	<i>49</i>
<i>Question 10f: Addressing the ‘structural deficit’ in the Lower Basin will not require any curtailments .....</i>	<i>50</i>
<b>11. The following topics are the subject of current, ongoing negotiations in the Colorado River Basin. In your opinion, how important is it for negotiators to reach an agreement on each of these topics? .....</b>	<b>51-57</b>
<i>Question 11a: Continued US-Mexico negotiations (Minute 32X) .....</i>	<i>51</i>
<i>Question 11b: Lower Basin Drought Contingency Planning .....</i>	<i>52</i>
<i>Question 11c: Progress on a Salton Sea solution.....</i>	<i>53</i>
<i>Question 11d: Tribal water settlements and water use flexibility .....</i>	<i>54</i>
<i>Question 11e: Upper Basin water bank.....</i>	<i>55</i>
<i>Question 11f: Upper Basin reservoir re-operations .....</i>	<i>56</i>
<i>Question 11g: Expansion of the System Conservation Program.....</i>	<i>57</i>
<b>12. Perception of Colorado River water reliability .....</b>	<b>58</b>
<i>Question 12: How reliable do you think your current supply of Colorado River water will be at its current size in the next 15 years? .....</i>	<i>58</i>
<b>13-17. Supplies, demands, and water availability .....</b>	<b>59-68</b>
<i>Question 13: Between now and 2026, what do you think the chances are that Lake Mead storage will drop to a level that requires curtailments to CAP (as called for in the shortage sharing rules)?.....</i>	<i>59</i>
<i>Question 14: What do you think the chances are that a “compact call” will arise between the Upper and Lower Basins by 2026? .....</i>	<i>61</i>
<i>Question 15: What do you think the chances are that a “compact call” will arise between the Upper and Lower Basins by 2050? .....</i>	<i>63</i>
<i>Question 16: Between now and 2050, what do you expect average natural flows on the river (at Lee’s Ferry) to be?.....</i>	<i>65</i>
<i>Question 17: Based on your understanding of water use trends and projections, at what point in time do you expect total average water demands on the Colorado River to meet (or exceed) total average supplies (based on 10-year running averages)? .....</i>	<i>67</i>
<b>18. Perceived need for institutional reform .....</b>	<b>69-70</b>
<i>Question 18: In your opinion, will addressing current and future water availability concerns on the Colorado River require making changes to the Law of the River and related “institutional” arrangements? .....</i>	<i>69</i>

<b>19. As policy-makers search for solutions, what general categories of strategies should be the primary focus of research and experimentation? .....</b>	<b>71-94</b>
<i>Question 19a: Improved technology to reduce wastes and inefficiencies (e.g., canal-lining, advanced irrigation systems) .....</i>	<i>71</i>
<i>Question 19b: Utilize desalination as a part of a regional water management framework.....</i>	<i>73</i>
<i>Question 19c: Encourage improved water management within states as the primary strategy for reducing interstate tensions and promoting improved basin-wide conditions.....</i>	<i>75</i>
<i>Question 19d: Infrastructure updates and expansions designed to more fully capture high flows and/or reduce spills (e.g., tributary storage) .....</i>	<i>77</i>
<i>Question 19e: Pursue additional regional studies/planning efforts to better coordinate among jurisdictions and sectors including water, energy, land-use, and environment.....</i>	<i>79</i>
<i>Question 19f: Use pricing incentives and/or regulatory (non-structural) measures to more explicitly promote conservation and discourage waste.....</i>	<i>81</i>
<i>Question 19g: Further enhance/refine rules for coordinate operation of Lakes Powell and Mead .....</i>	<i>83</i>
<i>Question 19h: River augmentation from weather modification (cloud seeding) and/or vegetation management (e.g., tamarisk control, logging) .....</i>	<i>85</i>
<i>Question 19i: Promote voluntary water reallocation across state lines (e.g., water banking, marketing of ICS water) .....</i>	<i>87</i>
<i>Question 19j: Revisit key Compact terms and adopt rules to address points of ambiguity and dispute .....</i>	<i>89</i>
<i>Question 19k: Importation of water from other basins (e.g., Great Lakes, Columbia, Mississippi) .....</i>	<i>91</i>
<i>Question 19l: Establish a river basin organization to aid in regional decision-making .....</i>	<i>93</i>
<b>20. Solution preferences, continued (Write-in comments) .....</b>	<b>95-99</b>

Distribution of 2010 and 2016 Survey Respondents							
	Occupation/Affiliation						
	Water Manager / Government	Water Professional	Water User	Citizen / Other or Unknown	Non-governmental Organization	TOTAL 2010	TOTAL 2016
<b>Region</b>							
Arizona							
2010	<b>52.6%</b> (30/57)	<b>36.8%</b> (21/57)	<b>3.5%</b> (2/57)	<b>5.3%</b> (3/57)	<b>1.8%</b> (1/57)	<b>30.8%</b> (57/185)	
2016	<b>44%</b> (22/50)	<b>40%</b> (20/50)	<b>6%</b> (3/50)	<b>4%</b> (2/50)	<b>6%</b> (3/50)		<b>23.6%</b> (50/212)
California							
2010	<b>47.2%</b> (17/36)	<b>33.3%</b> (12/36)	<b>11.1%</b> (4/36)	<b>8.3%</b> (3/36)	<b>0%</b> (0/36)	<b>19.5%</b> (36/185)	
2016	<b>35.71%</b> (10/28)	<b>39.29%</b> (11/28)	<b>14.29%</b> (4/28)	<b>7.14%</b> (2/28)	<b>3.57%</b> (1/28)		<b>13.2%</b> (28/212)
Nevada							
2010	<b>56%</b> (14/25)	<b>24%</b> (6/25)	<b>12%</b> (3/25)	<b>4%</b> (1/25)	<b>4%</b> (1/25)	<b>13.5%</b> (25/185)	
2016	<b>80%</b> (12/15)	<b>6.67%</b> (1/15)	<b>6.67%</b> (1/15)	<b>6.67%</b> (1/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)		<b>7.1%</b> (15/212)
Colorado							
2010	<b>57.1%</b> (16/28)	<b>21.4%</b> (6/28)	<b>7.1%</b> (2/28)	<b>7.1%</b> (2/28)	<b>7.1%</b> (2/28)	<b>15.1%</b> (28/185)	
2016	<b>45.1%</b> (23/51)	<b>27.45%</b> (14/51)	<b>5.88%</b> (3/51)	<b>5.88%</b> (3/51)	<b>15.69%</b> (8/51)		<b>24.1%</b> (51/212)
New Mexico							
2010	<b>50%</b> (3/6)	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)	<b>0%</b> (0/6)	<b>3.2%</b> (6/185)	
2016	<b>33.33%</b> (4/12)	<b>33.33%</b> (4/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>25%</b> (3/12)		<b>5.7%</b> (12/212)
Utah							
2010	<b>38.9%</b> (7/18)	<b>44.4%</b> (8/18)	<b>5.6%</b> (1/18)	<b>5.6%</b> (1/18)	<b>5.6%</b> (1/18)	<b>9.7%</b> (18/185)	
2016	<b>58.33%</b> (14/24)	<b>33.33%</b> (8/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)	<b>8.33%</b> (2/24)		<b>11.3%</b> (24/212)
Wyoming							
2010	<b>50%</b> (4/8)	<b>25%</b> (2/8)	<b>12.5%</b> (1/8)	<b>12.5%</b> (1/8)	<b>0%</b> (0/8)	<b>4.3%</b> (8/185)	
2016	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)		<b>2.4%</b> (5/212)
Mexico							
2016	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)		<b>1.4%</b> (3/212)

Other / Unknown							
2010	<b>42.9%</b> (3/7)	<b>14.3%</b> (1/7)	<b>0%</b> (0/7)	<b>28.6%</b> (2/7)	<b>14.3%</b> (1/7)	<b>3.8%</b> (7/185)	
2016	<b>50%</b> (12/24)	<b>20.83%</b> (5/24)	<b>8.33%</b> (2/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)		<b>11.3%</b> (24/212)
<b>TOTAL</b>							
<b>2010</b>	<b>50.8%</b> (94/185)	<b>30.8%</b> (57/185)	<b>7.6%</b> (14/185)	<b>7.6%</b> (14/185)	<b>3.2%</b> (6/185)	<b>100%</b> (185/185)	
<b>2016</b>	<b>46.7%</b> (99/212)	<b>31.13%</b> (66/212)	<b>7.08%</b> (15/212)	<b>4.25%</b> (9/212)	<b>10.85%</b> (23/212)		<b>100%</b> (212/212)



**Question 1a. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statement regarding YOUR OWN INTERESTS in Colorado River Basin management:**

**“The people negotiating and making decisions on Colorado River Basin issues are concerned about my own interests.”**

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	N/A
<b>Region</b>						
Arizona	<b>22.45%</b> (11/49)	<b>38.78%</b> (19/49)	<b>10.2%</b> (5/49)	<b>18.37%</b> (9/49)	<b>8.16%</b> (4/49)	<b>2.04%</b> (1/49)
California	<b>46.43%</b> (13/28)	<b>28.57%</b> (8/28)	<b>14.29%</b> (4/28)	<b>10.71%</b> (3/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)
Nevada	<b>57.14%</b> (8/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Colorado	<b>25.49%</b> (13/51)	<b>49.02%</b> (25/51)	<b>9.8%</b> (5/51)	<b>13.73%</b> (7/51)	<b>1.96%</b> (1/51)	<b>0%</b> (0/51)
New Mexico	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>50%</b> (6/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)
Utah	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)	<b>58.33%</b> (14/24)	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)	<b>8.33%</b> (2/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)
Wyoming	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>60%</b> (3/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>100%</b> (3/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)	<b>29.17%</b> (7/24)	<b>8.33%</b> (2/24)	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>						
Water Manager / Government	<b>29.29%</b> (29/99)	<b>40.4%</b> (40/99)	<b>13.13%</b> (13/99)	<b>9.09%</b> (9/99)	<b>6.06%</b> (6/99)	<b>2.02%</b> (2/99)
Water Professional	<b>24.62%</b> (16/65)	<b>36.92%</b> (24/65)	<b>10.77%</b> (7/65)	<b>15.38%</b> (10/65)	<b>7.69%</b> (5/65)	<b>4.62%</b> (3/65)
Water User	<b>46.67%</b> (7/15)	<b>33.33%</b> (5/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)	<b>13.33%</b> (2/15)	<b>6.67%</b> (1/15)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>77.78%</b> (7/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>52.17%</b> (12/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>25.59%</b> (54/211)	<b>41.71%</b> (88/211)	<b>9.95%</b> (21/211)	<b>12.32%</b> (26/211)	<b>7.11%</b> (15/211)	<b>3.32%</b> (7/211)

**Question 1b. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statement regarding YOUR OWN INTERESTS in Colorado River Basin management:**

**“The people negotiating and making decisions on Colorado River Basin issues have adequate power to protect my own interests.”**

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	N/A
<b>Region</b>						
Arizona	<b>20.41%</b> (10/49)	<b>46.94%</b> (23/49)	<b>14.29%</b> (7/49)	<b>12.24%</b> (6/49)	<b>4.08%</b> (2/49)	<b>2.04%</b> (1/49)
California	<b>39.29%</b> (11/28)	<b>28.57%</b> (8/28)	<b>14.29%</b> (4/28)	<b>14.29%</b> (4/28)	<b>3.57%</b> (1/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)
Nevada	<b>42.86%</b> (6/14)	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Colorado	<b>15.69%</b> (8/51)	<b>50.98%</b> (26/51)	<b>13.73%</b> (7/51)	<b>17.65%</b> (9/51)	<b>1.96%</b> (1/51)	<b>0%</b> (0/51)
New Mexico	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>33.3%</b> (4/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>25%</b> (3/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)
Utah	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>56.52%</b> (13/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
Wyoming	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>80%</b> (4/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)	<b>50%</b> (12/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>						
Water Manager / Government	<b>21.21%</b> (21/99)	<b>46.46%</b> (46/99)	<b>17.17%</b> (17/99)	<b>10.10%</b> (10/99)	<b>4.04%</b> (4/99)	<b>1.01%</b> (1/99)
Water Professional	<b>17.19%</b> (11/64)	<b>48.44%</b> (31/64)	<b>10.94%</b> (7/64)	<b>12.5%</b> (8/64)	<b>7.81%</b> (5/64)	<b>3.13%</b> (2/64)
Water User	<b>40%</b> (6/15)	<b>33.33%</b> (5/15)	<b>6.67%</b> (1/15)	<b>6.67%</b> (1/15)	<b>6.67%</b> (1/15)	<b>6.67%</b> (1/15)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>22.2%</b> (2/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>52.17%</b> (12/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>21.43%</b> (45/210)	<b>45.71%</b> (96/210)	<b>12.86%</b> (27/210)	<b>11.9%</b> (25/210)	<b>5.24%</b> (11/210)	<b>2.86%</b> (6/210)

<b>Question 1c. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statement regarding YOUR OWN INTERESTS in Colorado River Basin management:</b>						
<b>“Any new decisions or changes to the current Law of the River will positively impact my own interests.”</b>						
	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	N/A
<b>Region</b>						
Arizona	<b>14.29%</b> (7/49)	<b>16.33%</b> (8/49)	<b>38.78%</b> (19/49)	<b>18.37%</b> (9/49)	<b>10.2%</b> (5/49)	<b>2.04%</b> (1/49)
California	<b>21.43%</b> (6/28)	<b>17.86%</b> (5/28)	<b>29.29%</b> (11/28)	<b>14.29%</b> (4/28)	<b>7.14%</b> (2/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)
Nevada	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>42.86%</b> (6/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Colorado	<b>10%</b> (5/50)	<b>20%</b> (10/50)	<b>40%</b> (20/50)	<b>18%</b> (9/50)	<b>12%</b> (6/50)	<b>0%</b> (0/50)
New Mexico	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>50%</b> (6/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)
Utah	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>31.13%</b> (9/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)
Wyoming	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>8.33%</b> (2/24)	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)	<b>25%</b> (6/24)	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)	<b>20.83%</b> (5/24)	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>						
Water Manager / Government	<b>16.16%</b> (16/99)	<b>13.13%</b> (13/99)	<b>38.38%</b> (38/99)	<b>17.17%</b> (17/99)	<b>13.13%</b> (13/99)	<b>2.02%</b> (2/99)
Water Professional	<b>7.81%</b> (5/64)	<b>20.31%</b> (13/64)	<b>40.63%</b> (26/64)	<b>10.94%</b> (7/64)	<b>17.19%</b> (11/64)	<b>3.13%</b> (2/64)
Water User	<b>33.33%</b> (5/15)	<b>13.33%</b> (2/15)	<b>33.33%</b> (5/15)	<b>6.67%</b> (1/15)	<b>6.67%</b> (1/15)	<b>6.67%</b> (1/15)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>22.2%</b> (2/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>13.64%</b> (3/22)	<b>22.73%</b> (5/22)	<b>40.91%</b> (9/22)	<b>13.64%</b> (3/22)	<b>0%</b> (0/22)	<b>9.09%</b> (2/22)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>14.35%</b> (30/209)	<b>16.75%</b> (35/209)	<b>38.76%</b> (81/209)	<b>14.35%</b> (30/209)	<b>12.44%</b> (26/209)	<b>3.35%</b> (7/209)

<b>Question 2a. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statement regarding Colorado River Basin management:</b>  <b>“The people negotiating and making decisions on Colorado River Basin issues are trustworthy.”</b>					
	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
<b>Region</b>					
Arizona	<b>26.53%</b> (13/49)	<b>46.94%</b> (23/49)	<b>22.45%</b> (11/49)	<b>4.08%</b> (2/49)	<b>0%</b> (0/49)
California	<b>39.29%</b> (11/28)	<b>32.14%</b> (9/28)	<b>14.29%</b> (4/28)	<b>14.29%</b> (4/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)
Nevada	<b>50%</b> (7/14)	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Colorado	<b>43.14%</b> (22/51)	<b>39.22%</b> (20/51)	<b>11.76%</b> (6/51)	<b>5.88%</b> (3/51)	<b>0%</b> (0/51)
New Mexico	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>50%</b> (6/12)	<b>25%</b> (3/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah	<b>54.17%</b> (13/24)	<b>29.17%</b> (7/24)	<b>8.33%</b> (2/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)	<b>8.33%</b> (2/24)
Wyoming	<b>60%</b> (3/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>34.78%</b> (8/23)	<b>34.78%</b> (8/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>					
Water Manager / Government	<b>42.86%</b> (42/98)	<b>34.69%</b> (34/98)	<b>13.27%</b> (13/98)	<b>9.18%</b> (9/98)	<b>0%</b> (0/98)
Water Professional	<b>34.85%</b> (23/66)	<b>40.91%</b> (27/66)	<b>16.67%</b> (11/66)	<b>6.06%</b> (4/66)	<b>1.52%</b> (1/66)
Water User	<b>50%</b> (7/14)	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>55.56%</b> (5/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>52.17%</b> (12/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>38.1%</b> (80/210)	<b>39.05%</b> (82/210)	<b>14.76%</b> (31/210)	<b>7.14%</b> (15/210)	<b>0.95%</b> (2/210)

<b>Question 2b. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statement regarding Colorado River Basin management:</b>					
<b>“Colorado River Basin negotiations and decision-making are transparent.”</b>					
	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
<b>Region</b>					
Arizona	<b>8%</b> (4/50)	<b>30%</b> (15/50)	<b>14%</b> (7/50)	<b>34%</b> (17/50)	<b>14%</b> (7/50)
California	<b>21.43%</b> (6/28)	<b>32.14%</b> (9/28)	<b>3.57%</b> (1/28)	<b>21.43%</b> (6/28)	<b>21.43%</b> (6/28)
Nevada	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>42.86%</b> (6/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)
Colorado	<b>9.8%</b> (5/51)	<b>35.29%</b> (18/51)	<b>9.8%</b> (5/51)	<b>37.25%</b> (19/51)	<b>7.84%</b> (4/51)
New Mexico	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>25%</b> (3/12)	<b>41.67%</b> (5/12)	<b>25%</b> (3/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)
Utah	<b>20.83%</b> (5/24)	<b>25%</b> (6/24)	<b>20.83%</b> (5/24)	<b>20.83%</b> (5/24)	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)
Wyoming	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>13.64%</b> (3/22)	<b>18.18%</b> (4/22)	<b>18.18%</b> (4/22)	<b>22.73%</b> (5/22)	<b>27.27%</b> (6/22)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>					
Water Manager / Government	<b>9.18%</b> (9/98)	<b>34.69%</b> (34/98)	<b>19.39%</b> (19/98)	<b>24.49%</b> (24/98)	<b>12.24%</b> (12/98)
Water Professional	<b>12.12%</b> (8/66)	<b>30.30%</b> (20/66)	<b>15.15%</b> (10/66)	<b>27.27%</b> (18/66)	<b>15.15%</b> (10/66)
Water User	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>44.44%</b> (4/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>34.78%</b> (8/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>11.43%</b> (24/210)	<b>30%</b> (63/210)	<b>16.67%</b> (35/210)	<b>27.62%</b> (58/210)	<b>14.29%</b> (30/210)

<b>Question 2c. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statement regarding Colorado River Basin management:</b> <b>“The Law of the River as it stands today is adequate to handle any current or future problems as they relate to Colorado River Basin management.”</b>					
	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
<b>Region</b>					
Arizona	<b>18.37%</b> (9/49)	<b>30.61%</b> (15/49)	<b>10.2%</b> (5/49)	<b>16.33%</b> (8/49)	<b>24.49%</b> (12/49)
California	<b>25%</b> (7/28)	<b>25%</b> (7/28)	<b>17.86%</b> (5/28)	<b>28.57%</b> (8/28)	<b>3.57%</b> (1/28)
Nevada	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)
Colorado	<b>29.41%</b> (15/51)	<b>23.53%</b> (12/51)	<b>0%</b> (0/51)	<b>27.45%</b> (14/51)	<b>19.61%</b> (10/51)
New Mexico	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>33.33%</b> (4/12)	<b>33.33%</b> (4/12)
Utah	<b>33.33%</b> (8/24)	<b>29.17%</b> (7/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)	<b>25%</b> (6/24)	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)
Wyoming	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>34.78%</b> (8/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>					
Water Manager / Government	<b>24.24%</b> (24/99)	<b>24.24%</b> (24/99)	<b>8.08%</b> (8/99)	<b>28.28%</b> (28/99)	<b>15.15%</b> (15/99)
Water Professional	<b>24.62%</b> (16/65)	<b>26.15%</b> (17/65)	<b>9.23%</b> (6/65)	<b>23.08%</b> (15/65)	<b>16.92%</b> (11/65)
Water User	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)	<b>50%</b> (7/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>43.48%</b> (10/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>23.33%</b> (49/210)	<b>24.29%</b> (51/210)	<b>8.57%</b> (18/210)	<b>27.14%</b> (57/210)	<b>16.67%</b> (35/210)

<b>Question 2d. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statement regarding Colorado River Basin management:</b>					
<b>“The way the Colorado River Basin is currently managed is equitable.”</b>					
	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
<b>Region</b>					
Arizona	<b>18%</b> (9/50)	<b>30%</b> (15/50)	<b>10%</b> (5/50)	<b>28%</b> (14/50)	<b>14%</b> (7/50)
California	<b>25%</b> (7/28)	<b>39.29%</b> (11/28)	<b>10.71%</b> (3/28)	<b>17.86%</b> (5/28)	<b>7.14%</b> (2/28)
Nevada	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)	<b>42.86%</b> (6/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Colorado	<b>17.65%</b> (9/51)	<b>33.33%</b> (17/51)	<b>13.73%</b> (7/51)	<b>25.49%</b> (13/51)	<b>9.8%</b> (5/51)
New Mexico	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>33.33%</b> (4/12)	<b>41.67%</b> (5/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)
Utah	<b>25%</b> (6/24)	<b>37.5%</b> (9/24)	<b>8.33%</b> (2/24)	<b>20.83%</b> (5/24)	<b>8.33%</b> (2/24)
Wyoming	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>80%</b> (4/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>39.13%</b> (9/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>					
Water Manager / Government	<b>19.19%</b> (19/99)	<b>32.32%</b> (32/99)	<b>17.17%</b> (17/99)	<b>23.23%</b> (23/99)	<b>8.08%</b> (8/99)
Water Professional	<b>22.73%</b> (15/66)	<b>25.76%</b> (17/66)	<b>12.12%</b> (8/66)	<b>31.82%</b> (21/66)	<b>7.58%</b> (5/66)
Water User	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>0.0%</b> (0/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>55.56%</b> (5/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>31.13%</b> (9/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>19.43%</b> (41/211)	<b>28.91%</b> (61/211)	<b>14.22%</b> (30/211)	<b>27.96%</b> (59/211)	<b>9.48%</b> (20/211)

<b>Question 2e. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statement regarding Colorado River Basin management:</b>					
<b>“The way the Colorado River Basin is currently managed is sustainable.”</b>					
	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
<b>Region</b>					
Arizona	<b>12%</b> (6/50)	<b>9%</b> (18/50)	<b>12%</b> (6/50)	<b>26%</b> (13/50)	<b>32%</b> (16/50)
California	<b>14.29%</b> (4/28)	<b>21.43%</b> (6/28)	<b>10.71%</b> (3/28)	<b>32.14%</b> (9/28)	<b>21.43%</b> (6/28)
Nevada	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>57.14%</b> (8/14)	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)
Colorado	<b>7.84%</b> (4/51)	<b>19.61%</b> (10/51)	<b>19.61%</b> (10/51)	<b>15.69%</b> (8/51)	<b>37.25%</b> (19/51)
New Mexico	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>25%</b> (3/12)	<b>25%</b> (3/12)	<b>41.67%</b> (5/12)
Utah	<b>8.33%</b> (2/24)	<b>41.67%</b> (10/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)	<b>33.33%</b> (8/24)	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)
Wyoming	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>60%</b> (3/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)
Mexico	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)	<b>1%</b> (1/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>34.78%</b> (8/23)	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>					
Water Manager / Government	<b>3.03%</b> (3/99)	<b>23.23%</b> (23/99)	<b>14.14%</b> (14/99)	<b>33.33%</b> (33/99)	<b>26.26%</b> (26/99)
Water Professional	<b>10.61%</b> (7/66)	<b>21.21%</b> (14/66)	<b>15.15%</b> (10/66)	<b>25.76%</b> (17/66)	<b>27.27%</b> (18/66)
Water User	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>60.87%</b> (14/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>8.06%</b> (17/211)	<b>21.33%</b> (45/211)	<b>12.8%</b> (27/211)	<b>28.44%</b> (60/211)	<b>29.38%</b> (62/211)



**Question 3. The 2007 Interim Shortage Guidelines were developed to coordinate operations of Lake Powell and Lake Mead and to develop shortage-sharing guidelines for the Lower Basin states as Lake Mead elevation levels declined. In your opinion, how big of a change were the 2007 Interim Shortage Guidelines to the Law of the River?**

	Fundamental change	Significant change	Minor change	No change	Not sure
<b><i>Region</i></b>					
Arizona	<b>6%</b> (3/50)	<b>48%</b> (24/50)	<b>22%</b> (11/50)	<b>16%</b> (8/50)	<b>8%</b> (4/50)
California	<b>10.71%</b> (3/28)	<b>39.29%</b> (11/28)	<b>21.43%</b> (6/28)	<b>14.29%</b> (4/28)	<b>14.29%</b> (4/28)
Nevada	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>64.29%</b> (9/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Colorado	<b>3.92%</b> (2/51)	<b>49.02%</b> (25/51)	<b>25.49%</b> (13/51)	<b>11.76%</b> (6/51)	<b>9.8%</b> (5/51)
New Mexico	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>50%</b> (6/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)
Utah	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)	<b>45.83%</b> (11/24)	<b>33.33%</b> (8/24)	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)
Wyoming	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>100%</b> (3/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>20.83%</b> (5/24)	<b>33.33%</b> (8/24)	<b>25%</b> (6/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)
<b><i>Occupation / Affiliation</i></b>					
Water Manager / Government	<b>12.12%</b> (12/99)	<b>43.43%</b> (43/99)	<b>23.23%</b> (23/99)	<b>14.14%</b> (14/99)	<b>7.07%</b> (7/99)
Water Professional	<b>6.06%</b> (4/66)	<b>50%</b> (33/66)	<b>19.7%</b> (13/66)	<b>13.64%</b> (9/66)	<b>10.61%</b> (7/66)
Water User	<b>13.33%</b> (2/15)	<b>33.33%</b> (5/15)	<b>33.33%</b> (5/15)	<b>6.67%</b> (1/15)	<b>13.33%</b> (2/15)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>44.44%</b> (4/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>65.22%</b> (15/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>9.43%</b> (20/212)	<b>46.7%</b> (99/212)	<b>22.64%</b> (48/212)	<b>11.79%</b> (25/212)	<b>9.43%</b> (20/212)

**Question 4. Minute 319 to the 1944 Mexico Treaty was signed in 2012 to guide future management of the Colorado River in the US and Mexico. This included establishing shortage sharing procedures, enhancing water infrastructure, coordinating storage operations, and promoting ecological health in the Colorado River Delta. In your opinion, how big of a change was Minute 319 to the Law of the River?**

	Fundamental change	Significant change	Minor change	No change	Not sure
<b>Region</b>					
Arizona	<b>12%</b> (6/50)	<b>50%</b> (25/50)	<b>18%</b> (9/50)	<b>14%</b> (7/50)	<b>6%</b> (3/50)
California	<b>3.7%</b> (1/27)	<b>37.04%</b> (10/27)	<b>29.63%</b> (8/27)	<b>14.81%</b> (4/27)	<b>14.81%</b> (4/27)
Nevada	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>57.14%</b> (8/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)
Colorado	<b>3.92%</b> (2/51)	<b>54.9%</b> (28/51)	<b>25.49%</b> (13/51)	<b>5.88%</b> (3/51)	<b>9.8%</b> (5/51)
New Mexico	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>41.67%</b> (5/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>25%</b> (3/12)
Utah	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)	<b>41.67%</b> (10/24)	<b>41.67%</b> (10/24)	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)
Wyoming	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>60%</b> (3/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>100%</b> (3/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)	<b>50%</b> (12/24)	<b>20.83%</b> (5/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>					
Water Manager / Government	<b>8.08%</b> (8/99)	<b>43.43%</b> (43/99)	<b>31.31%</b> (31/99)	<b>11.11%</b> (11/99)	<b>6.06%</b> (6/99)
Water Professional	<b>9.09%</b> (6/66)	<b>51.52%</b> (34/66)	<b>16.67%</b> (11/66)	<b>12.12%</b> (8/66)	<b>10.61%</b> (7/66)
Water User	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>50%</b> (7/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>55.56%</b> (5/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>52.17%</b> (12/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>9.95%</b> (21/211)	<b>47.87%</b> (101/211)	<b>23.22%</b> (49/211)	<b>9.95%</b> (21/211)	<b>9%</b> (19/211)

**Question 5a. In your opinion, please rate the level of importance of participation for each of the following groups in Colorado River Basin negotiations and decision-making:**

**The federal government of the United States**

	Extremely important	Very important	Moderately important	Slightly important	Not at all important
<b><i>Region</i></b>					
Arizona	<b>76%</b> (38/50)	<b>20%</b> (10/50)	<b>2%</b> (1/50)	<b>0%</b> (0/50)	<b>2%</b> (1/50)
California	<b>71.43%</b> (20/28)	<b>25%</b> (7/28)	<b>3.57%</b> (1/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)
Nevada	<b>85.71%</b> (12/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Colorado	<b>76.47%</b> (39/51)	<b>19.61%</b> (10/51)	<b>0%</b> (0/51)	<b>3.92%</b> (2/51)	<b>0%</b> (0/51)
New Mexico	<b>66.67%</b> (8/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah	<b>62.5%</b> (15/24)	<b>25%</b> (6/24)	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)
Wyoming	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>65.22%</b> (15/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b><i>Occupation / Affiliation</i></b>					
Water Manager / Government	<b>73.74%</b> (73/99)	<b>19.19%</b> (19/99)	<b>6.06%</b> (6/99)	<b>0%</b> (0/99)	<b>1.01%</b> (1/99)
Water Professional	<b>69.7%</b> (46/66)	<b>21.21%</b> (14/66)	<b>3.03%</b> (2/66)	<b>6.06%</b> (4/66)	<b>0%</b> (0/66)
Water User	<b>50%</b> (7/14)	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>88.89%</b> (8/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>73.91%</b> (17/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>71.56%</b> (151/211)	<b>20.85%</b> (44/211)	<b>4.74%</b> (10/211)	<b>2.37%</b> (5/211)	<b>0.47%</b> (1/211)

**Question 5b. In your opinion, please rate the level of importance of participation for each of the following groups in Colorado River Basin negotiations and decision-making:**

**The federal government of Mexico**

	Extremely important	Very important	Moderately important	Slightly important	Not at all important
<b><i>Region</i></b>					
Arizona	<b>38%</b> (19/50)	<b>34%</b> (17/50)	<b>20%</b> (10/50)	<b>6%</b> (3/50)	<b>2%</b> (1/50)
California	<b>39.29%</b> (1/28)	<b>32.14%</b> (9/28)	<b>21.43%</b> (6/28)	<b>7.14%</b> (2/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)
Nevada	<b>53.85%</b> (7/14)	<b>15.38%</b> (2/14)	<b>23.08%</b> (3/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Colorado	<b>33.33%</b> (17/51)	<b>41.18%</b> (21/51)	<b>19.61%</b> (10/51)	<b>5.88%</b> (3/51)	<b>0%</b> (0/51)
New Mexico	<b>41.67%</b> (5/12)	<b>33.33%</b> (4/12)	<b>25%</b> (3/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah	<b>20.83%</b> (5/24)	<b>62.5%</b> (15/24)	<b>8.33%</b> (2/24)	<b>8.33%</b> (2/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)
Wyoming	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>31.13%</b> (9/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)
<b><i>Occupation / Affiliation</i></b>					
Water Manager / Government	<b>35.71%</b> (35/98)	<b>42.86%</b> (42/98)	<b>14.29%</b> (14/98)	<b>7.14%</b> (7/98)	<b>0%</b> (0/98)
Water Professional	<b>31.82%</b> (21/66)	<b>40.91%</b> (27/66)	<b>18.18%</b> (12/66)	<b>7.58%</b> (5/66)	<b>1.52%</b> (1/66)
Water User	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>42.86%</b> (6/14)	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>44.44%</b> (4/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>43.48%</b> (10/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>34.78%</b> (8/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>34.76%</b> (73/210)	<b>38.57%</b> (81/210)	<b>19.52%</b> (41/210)	<b>6.19%</b> (13/210)	<b>0.95%</b> (2/210)

**Question 5c. In your opinion, please rate the level of importance of participation for each of the following groups in Colorado River Basin negotiations and decision-making:**

**The state governments of the seven US Basin States (Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada, and California)**

	Extremely important	Very important	Moderately important	Slightly important	Not at all important
<b><i>Region</i></b>					
Arizona	<b>72%</b> (36/50)	<b>24%</b> (12/50)	<b>4%</b> (2/50)	<b>0%</b> (0/50)	<b>0%</b> (0/50)
California	<b>78.57%</b> (22/28)	<b>7.14%</b> (2/28)	<b>10.71%</b> (3/28)	<b>3.57%</b> (1/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)
Nevada	<b>71.43%</b> (10/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Colorado	<b>90.2%</b> (46/51)	<b>9.8%</b> (5/51)	<b>0%</b> (0/51)	<b>0%</b> (0/51)	<b>0%</b> (0/51)
New Mexico	<b>66.67%</b> (8/12)	<b>33.33%</b> (4/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah	<b>75%</b> (18/24)	<b>20.83%</b> (5/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)
Wyoming	<b>80%</b> (4/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>60.87%</b> (14/23)	<b>34.78%</b> (8/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b><i>Occupation / Affiliation</i></b>					
Water Manager / Government	<b>76.77%</b> (76/99)	<b>20.2%</b> (20/99)	<b>2.02%</b> (2/99)	<b>1%</b> (1.01/99)	<b>0%</b> (0/99)
Water Professional	<b>77.27%</b> (51/66)	<b>15.15%</b> (10/66)	<b>7.58%</b> (5/66)	<b>0%</b> (0/66)	<b>0%</b> (0/66)
Water User	<b>78.57%</b> (11/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>77.78%</b> (7/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>69.57%</b> (16/23)	<b>20.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>76.3%</b> (161/211)	<b>19.43%</b> (41/211)	<b>3.79%</b> (8/211)	<b>0.47%</b> (1/211)	<b>0%</b> (0/211)

**Question 5d. In your opinion, please rate the level of importance of participation for each of the following groups in Colorado River Basin negotiations and decision-making:**

**The state governments of the two Mexico States (Baja California and Sonora)**

	Extremely important	Very important	Moderately important	Slightly important	Not at all important
<b><i>Region</i></b>					
Arizona	<b>14%</b> (7/50)	<b>36%</b> (18/50)	<b>20%</b> (10/50)	<b>26%</b> (13/50)	<b>4%</b> (2/50)
California	<b>17.86%</b> (5/28)	<b>28.57%</b> (8/28)	<b>28.57%</b> (8/28)	<b>25%</b> (7/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)
Nevada	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Colorado	<b>27.45%</b> (14/51)	<b>23.53%</b> (12/51)	<b>33.33%</b> (17/51)	<b>13.73%</b> (7/51)	<b>1.96%</b> (1/51)
New Mexico	<b>41.67%</b> (5/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>33.33%</b> (4/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>43.48%</b> (10/23)	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
Wyoming	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>80%</b> (4/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>43.48%</b> (10/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b><i>Occupation / Affiliation</i></b>					
Water Manager / Government	<b>22.22%</b> (22/99)	<b>24.24%</b> (24/99)	<b>33.33%</b> (33/99)	<b>18.18%</b> (18/99)	<b>2.02%</b> (2/99)
Water Professional	<b>16.92%</b> (11/65)	<b>33.85%</b> (22/65)	<b>27.69%</b> (18/65)	<b>21.54%</b> (14/65)	<b>0%</b> (0/65)
Water User	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>42.86%</b> (6/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>21.9%</b> (46/210)	<b>27.14%</b> (57/210)	<b>30.95%</b> (65/210)	<b>18.57%</b> (39/210)	<b>1.43%</b> (3/210)

**Question 5e. In your opinion, please rate the level of importance of participation for each of the following groups in Colorado River Basin negotiations and decision-making:**

**Local/municipal governments**

	Extremely important	Very important	Moderately important	Slightly important	Not at all important
<b><i>Region</i></b>					
Arizona	<b>10%</b> (5/50)	<b>34%</b> (17/50)	<b>40%</b> (20/50)	<b>10%</b> (5/50)	<b>6%</b> (3/50)
California	<b>22.22%</b> (6/27)	<b>18.52%</b> (5/27)	<b>11.11%</b> (3/27)	<b>29.63%</b> (8/27)	<b>18.52%</b> (5/27)
Nevada	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>50%</b> (7/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)
Colorado	<b>17.65%</b> (9/51)	<b>33.33%</b> (17/51)	<b>31.37%</b> (16/51)	<b>17.65%</b> (9/51)	<b>0%</b> (0/51)
New Mexico	<b>33.33%</b> (4/12)	<b>33.33%</b> (4/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)	<b>45.83%</b> (11/24)	<b>29.17%</b> (7/24)	<b>20.83%</b> (5/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)
Wyoming	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>80%</b> (4/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)
<b><i>Occupation / Affiliation</i></b>					
Water Manager / Government	<b>11.11%</b> (1/99)	<b>36.36%</b> (36/99)	<b>28.28%</b> (28/99)	<b>17.17%</b> (17/99)	<b>7.07%</b> (7/99)
Water Professional	<b>21.54%</b> (14/65)	<b>24.62%</b> (16/65)	<b>35.38%</b> (23/65)	<b>15.38%</b> (10/65)	<b>3.08%</b> (2/65)
Water User	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>44.44%</b> (4/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>15.71%</b> (33/210)	<b>30.48%</b> (64/210)	<b>30.48%</b> (64/210)	<b>18.10%</b> (38/210)	<b>5.24%</b> (11/210)

**Question 5f. In your opinion, please rate the level of importance of participation for each of the following groups in Colorado River Basin negotiations and decision-making:**

**Irrigation/conservancy districts**

	Extremely important	Very important	Moderately important	Slightly important	Not at all important
<b><i>Region</i></b>					
Arizona	<b>20%</b> (10/50)	<b>46%</b> (23/50)	<b>20%</b> (10/50)	<b>10%</b> (5/50)	<b>4%</b> (2/50)
California	<b>32.14%</b> (9/28)	<b>42.86%</b> (12/28)	<b>25%</b> (7/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)
Nevada	<b>38.46%</b> (5/13)	<b>30.77%</b> (4/13)	<b>30.77%</b> (4/13)	<b>0%</b> (0/13)	<b>0%</b> (0/13)
Colorado	<b>20%</b> (10/50)	<b>52%</b> (26/50)	<b>18%</b> (9/50)	<b>8%</b> (4/50)	<b>2%</b> (1/50)
New Mexico	<b>33.33%</b> (4/12)	<b>58.33%</b> (7/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>39.13%</b> (9/23)	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
Wyoming	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>60%</b> (3/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>47.83%</b> (11/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b><i>Occupation / Affiliation</i></b>					
Water Manager / Government	<b>12.37%</b> (12/97)	<b>51.55%</b> (50/97)	<b>23.71%</b> (23/97)	<b>11.34%</b> (11/97)	<b>1.03%</b> (1/97)
Water Professional	<b>31.82%</b> (21/66)	<b>34.85%</b> (23/66)	<b>25.76%</b> (17/66)	<b>4.55%</b> (3/66)	<b>3.03%</b> (2/66)
Water User	<b>7.69%</b> (1/13)	<b>53.85%</b> (7/13)	<b>30.77%</b> (4/13)	<b>7.69%</b> (1/13)	<b>0%</b> (0/13)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>56.52%</b> (13/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>20.67%</b> (43/208)	<b>45.19%</b> (94/208)	<b>23.08%</b> (48/208)	<b>9.62%</b> (20/208)	<b>1.44%</b> (3/208)



**Question 5g. In your opinion, please rate the level of importance of participation for each of the following groups in Colorado River Basin negotiations and decision-making:**

**Non-governmental organizations (NGOs)**

	Extremely important	Very important	Moderately important	Slightly important	Not at all important
<b><i>Region</i></b>					
Arizona	<b>4%</b> (2/50)	<b>18%</b> (9/50)	<b>48%</b> (24/50)	<b>20%</b> (10/50)	<b>10%</b> (5/50)
California	<b>14.29%</b> (4/28)	<b>25%</b> (7/28)	<b>39.29%</b> (11/28)	<b>14.29%</b> (4/28)	<b>7.14%</b> (2/28)
Nevada	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)
Colorado	<b>11.76%</b> (6/51)	<b>33.33%</b> (17/51)	<b>33.33%</b> (17/51)	<b>17.65%</b> (9/51)	<b>3.92%</b> (2/51)
New Mexico	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>25%</b> (3/12)	<b>41.67%</b> (5/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>34.78%</b> (8/23)	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)
Wyoming	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>100%</b> (3/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>39.13%</b> (9/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b><i>Occupation / Affiliation</i></b>					
Water Manager / Government	<b>5.1%</b> (5/98)	<b>28.57%</b> (28/98)	<b>31.63%</b> (31/98)	<b>26.53%</b> (26/98)	<b>8.16%</b> (8/98)
Water Professional	<b>12.12%</b> (8/66)	<b>19.7%</b> (13/66)	<b>42.42%</b> (28/66)	<b>19.7%</b> (13/66)	<b>6.06%</b> (4/66)
Water User	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>42.86%</b> (6/14)	<b>42.86%</b> (6/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>44.44%</b> (4/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>34.78%</b> (8/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>10%</b> (21/210)	<b>24.76%</b> (52/210)	<b>35.71%</b> (75/210)	<b>23.33%</b> (49/210)	<b>6.19%</b> (13/210)

**Question 5h. In your opinion, please rate the level of importance of participation for each of the following groups in Colorado River Basin negotiations and decision-making:**

**Native American Tribes**

	Extremely important	Very important	Moderately important	Slightly important	Not at all important
<b><i>Region</i></b>					
Arizona	<b>26%</b> (13/50)	<b>46%</b> (23/50)	<b>16%</b> (8/50)	<b>10%</b> (5/50)	<b>2%</b> (1/50)
California	<b>53.57%</b> (15/28)	<b>25%</b> (7/28)	<b>21.43%</b> (6/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)
Nevada	<b>42.86%</b> (6/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)
Colorado	<b>43.14%</b> (22/51)	<b>39.22%</b> (20/51)	<b>9.8%</b> (5/51)	<b>7.84%</b> (4/51)	<b>0%</b> (0/51)
New Mexico	<b>66.67%</b> (8/12)	<b>33.3%</b> (4/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah	<b>20.83%</b> (5/24)	<b>45.83%</b> (11/24)	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)
Wyoming	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>60%</b> (3/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>43.48%</b> (10/23)	<b>43.48%</b> (10/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b><i>Occupation / Affiliation</i></b>					
Water Manager / Government	<b>33.33%</b> (33/99)	<b>40.40%</b> (40/99)	<b>16.16%</b> (16/99)	<b>8.08%</b> (8/99)	<b>2.02%</b> (2/99)
Water Professional	<b>42.42%</b> (28/66)	<b>39.39%</b> (26/66)	<b>12.12%</b> (8/66)	<b>6.06%</b> (4/66)	<b>0%</b> (0/66)
Water User	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>42.86%</b> (6/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>77.78%</b> (7/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>47.83%</b> (11/23)	<b>47.83%</b> (11/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>38.86%</b> (82/211)	<b>38.86%</b> (82/211)	<b>14.69%</b> (31/211)	<b>6.64%</b> (14/211)	<b>0.95%</b> (2/211)

**Question 5i. In your opinion, please rate the level of importance of participation for each of the following groups in Colorado River Basin negotiations and decision-making:**

**Academics/researchers**

	Extremely important	Very important	Moderately important	Slightly important	Not at all important
<b><i>Region</i></b>					
Arizona	<b>2%</b> (1/50)	<b>12%</b> (6/50)	<b>36%</b> (18/50)	<b>30%</b> (15/50)	<b>20%</b> (10/50)
California	<b>3.57%</b> (1/28)	<b>14.29%</b> (4/28)	<b>25%</b> (7/28)	<b>53.57%</b> (15/28)	<b>3.57%</b> (1/28)
Nevada	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>42.86%</b> (6/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)
Colorado	<b>5.88%</b> (3/51)	<b>19.61%</b> (10/51)	<b>39.22%</b> (20/51)	<b>23.53%</b> (12/51)	<b>11.76%</b> (6/51)
New Mexico	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>33.3%</b> (4/12)	<b>41.67%</b> (5/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)	<b>33.33%</b> (8/24)	<b>41.67%</b> (10/24)	<b>8.33%</b> (2/24)
Wyoming	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)
Mexico	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>43.48%</b> (10/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)
<b><i>Occupation / Affiliation</i></b>					
Water Manager / Government	<b>5.05%</b> (5/99)	<b>17.17%</b> (17/99)	<b>31.31%</b> (31/99)	<b>31.31%</b> (31/99)	<b>15.15%</b> (15/99)
Water Professional	<b>4.55%</b> (3/66)	<b>7.58%</b> (5/66)	<b>37.88%</b> (25/66)	<b>37.88%</b> (25/66)	<b>12.12%</b> (8/66)
Water User	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>50%</b> (7/14)	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>55.56%</b> (5/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>39.13%</b> (9/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4.74%</b> (10/211)	<b>16.59%</b> (35/211)	<b>34.12%</b> (72/211)	<b>31.28%</b> (66/211)	<b>13.27%</b> (28/211)

**Question 5j. In your opinion, please rate the level of importance of participation for each of the following groups in Colorado River Basin negotiations and decision-making:**

**General public**

	Extremely important	Very important	Moderately important	Slightly important	Not at all important
<b><i>Region</i></b>					
Arizona	<b>4%</b> (2/50)	<b>12%</b> (6/50)	<b>30%</b> (15/50)	<b>38%</b> (19/50)	<b>16%</b> (8/50)
California	<b>7.14%</b> (2/28)	<b>21.43%</b> (6/28)	<b>14.29%</b> (4/28)	<b>42.86%</b> (12/28)	<b>14.29%</b> (4/28)
Nevada	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)
Colorado	<b>6%</b> (3/50)	<b>24%</b> (12/50)	<b>34%</b> (17/50)	<b>22%</b> (11/50)	<b>14%</b> (7/50)
New Mexico	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>25%</b> (3/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>41.67%</b> (5/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah	<b>8.33%</b> (2/24)	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)	<b>29.17%</b> (7/24)	<b>41.67%</b> (10/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)
Wyoming	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)
Mexico	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>43.48%</b> (10/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)
<b><i>Occupation / Affiliation</i></b>					
Water Manager / Government	<b>4.04%</b> (4/99)	<b>19.19%</b> (19/99)	<b>23.23%</b> (23/99)	<b>39.39%</b> (39/99)	<b>14.14%</b> (14/99)
Water Professional	<b>6.15%</b> (4/65)	<b>20%</b> (13/65)	<b>33.85%</b> (22/65)	<b>24.62%</b> (16/65)	<b>15.38%</b> (10/65)
Water User	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>57.14%</b> (8/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>34.78%</b> (8/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6.19%</b> (13/210)	<b>19.52%</b> (41/210)	<b>26.19%</b> (55/210)	<b>34.76%</b> (73/210)	<b>13.33%</b> (28/210)

**Question 5k. In your opinion, please rate the level of importance of participation for each of the following groups in Colorado River Basin negotiations and decision-making:**

**Other (write-in)**

IID
Agricultural interests
Bureau of Reclamation
Scientists and engineers, not academics
Local/regional environmental orgs.
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Social sciences
Environmental agencies
An Interstate Commission
CA water agencies
Other affected parties
Large urban water districts
The press
Congress
Colorado River BCPA section 5 contractors
Business community
Hydropower
Former managers
Power customers
Contract holders
Urban water agencies – very imp.; env justice groups – moderately important
Muni water suppliers
Conservation Districts
Other hydropower contractors
Sec 5 contractors
Ag land owners

**Question 6a. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding the PROCESS of arriving at new decisions or developing new policies in the Colorado River Basin:**

**“Any new decisions in the Colorado River Basin will require long-term engagement between stakeholders.”**

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
<b>Region</b>					
Arizona	<b>86%</b> (43/50)	<b>12%</b> (6/50)	<b>0%</b> (0/50)	<b>2%</b> (1/50)	<b>0%</b> (0/50)
California	<b>89.29%</b> (25/28)	<b>7.14%</b> (2/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)	<b>3.57%</b> (1/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)
Nevada	<b>71.43%</b> (10/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)
Colorado	<b>78.43%</b> (40/51)	<b>17.65%</b> (9/51)	<b>0%</b> (0/51)	<b>3.92%</b> (2/51)	<b>0%</b> (0/51)
New Mexico	<b>83.33%</b> (10/12)	<b>12%</b> (6/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah	<b>79.17%</b> (19/24)	<b>20.83%</b> (5/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)
Wyoming	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>60%</b> (3/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>79.17%</b> (19/24)	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>					
Water Manager / Government	<b>81.82%</b> (81/99)	<b>16.16%</b> (16/99)	<b>0%</b> (0/99)	<b>1.01%</b> (1/99)	<b>1.01%</b> (1/99)
Water Professional	<b>78.79%</b> (52/66)	<b>16.67%</b> (11/66)	<b>3.03%</b> (2/66)	<b>1.52%</b> (1/66)	<b>0%</b> (0/66)
Water User	<b>73.33%</b> (11/15)	<b>20%</b> (3/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)	<b>6.67%</b> (1/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>100%</b> (9/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>78.26%</b> (18/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>80.66%</b> (171/212)	<b>16.04%</b> (34/212)	<b>0.94%</b> (2/212)	<b>1.89%</b> (4/212)	<b>0.47%</b> (1/212)

<b>Question 6b. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding the PROCESS of arriving at new decisions or developing new policies in the Colorado River Basin:</b>					
<b>“Any new decisions in the Colorado River Basin will require changing the Law of the River.”</b>					
	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
<b>Region</b>					
Arizona	<b>10.2%</b> (5/49)	<b>34.69%</b> (17/49)	<b>24.49%</b> (12/49)	<b>12.24%</b> (6/49)	<b>18.37%</b> (9/49)
California	<b>7.14%</b> (2/28)	<b>28.57%</b> (8/28)	<b>21.43%</b> (6/28)	<b>10.71%</b> (3/28)	<b>32.14%</b> (9/28)
Nevada	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)
Colorado	<b>9.8%</b> (5/51)	<b>29.41%</b> (15/51)	<b>23.53%</b> (12/51)	<b>19.61%</b> (10/51)	<b>17.65%</b> (9/51)
New Mexico	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>33.33%</b> (4/12)	<b>25%</b> (3/12)	<b>25%</b> (3/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)	<b>33.33%</b> (8/24)	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)	<b>37.5%</b> (9/24)
Wyoming	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)
Mexico	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>34.78%</b> (8/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>21.72%</b> (5/23)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>					
Water Manager / Government	<b>12.12%</b> (12/99)	<b>24.24%</b> (24/99)	<b>28.28%</b> (28/99)	<b>13.13%</b> (13/99)	<b>22.22%</b> (22/99)
Water Professional	<b>10.77%</b> (7/65)	<b>33.85%</b> (22/65)	<b>13.85%</b> (9/65)	<b>15.38%</b> (10/65)	<b>26.15%</b> (17/65)
Water User	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>47.83%</b> (11/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (2/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>11.43%</b> (24/210)	<b>28.57%</b> (60/210)	<b>22.38%</b> (47/210)	<b>15.24%</b> (32/210)	<b>22.38%</b> (47/210)

**Question 6c. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding the PROCESS of arriving at new decisions or developing new policies in the Colorado River Basin:**

**“Any new decisions in the Colorado River Basin must be informed by the best available science.”**

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
<b>Region</b>					
Arizona	<b>58%</b> (29/50)	<b>26%</b> (13/50)	<b>12%</b> (6/50)	<b>2%</b> (1/50)	<b>2%</b> (1/50)
California	<b>64.29%</b> (18/28)	<b>25%</b> (7/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)	<b>7.14%</b> (2/28)	<b>3.57%</b> (1/28)
Nevada	<b>64.29%</b> (9/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Colorado	<b>68.63%</b> (35/51)	<b>19.61%</b> (10/51)	<b>5.88%</b> (3/51)	<b>5.88%</b> (3/51)	<b>0%</b> (0/51)
New Mexico	<b>50%</b> (6/12)	<b>41.67%</b> (5/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah	<b>45.83%</b> (11/24)	<b>37.5%</b> (9/24)	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)
Wyoming	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>60%</b> (3/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>54.17%</b> (13/24)	<b>37.5%</b> (9/24)	<b>8.33%</b> (2/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>					
Water Manager / Government	<b>52.53%</b> (52/99)	<b>33.33%</b> (33/99)	<b>10.10%</b> (10/99)	<b>2.02%</b> (2/99)	<b>2.02%</b> (2/99)
Water Professional	<b>62.12%</b> (41/66)	<b>25.76%</b> (17/66)	<b>7.58%</b> (5/66)	<b>4.55%</b> (3/66)	<b>0%</b> (0/66)
Water User	<b>60%</b> (9/15)	<b>26.67%</b> (4/15)	<b>6.67%</b> (1/15)	<b>6.67%</b> (1/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>77.78%</b> (7/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>73.91%</b> (17/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>59.43%</b> (126/212)	<b>28.30%</b> (60/212)	<b>8.02%</b> (17/212)	<b>3.3%</b> (7/212)	<b>0.94%</b> (2/212)



**Question 6d. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding the PROCESS of arriving at new decisions or developing new policies in the Colorado River Basin:**

**“Any new decisions in the Colorado River Basin will require ALL users to agree to undertake shortages.”**

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
<b>Region</b>					
Arizona	<b>40.82%</b> (20/49)	<b>24.49%</b> (12/49)	<b>14.29%</b> (7/49)	<b>20.41%</b> (10/49)	<b>0%</b> (0/49)
California	<b>21.43%</b> (6/28)	<b>32.14%</b> (9/28)	<b>17.86%</b> (5/28)	<b>14.29%</b> (4/28)	<b>14.29%</b> (4/28)
Nevada	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)
Colorado	<b>21.57%</b> (11/51)	<b>33.33%</b> (17/51)	<b>19.61%</b> (10/51)	<b>15.69%</b> (8/51)	<b>9.8%</b> (5/51)
New Mexico	<b>33.33%</b> (4/12)	<b>25%</b> (3/12)	<b>33.33%</b> (4/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah	<b>20.83%</b> (5/24)	<b>25%</b> (6/24)	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)	<b>20.83%</b> (5/24)
Wyoming	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)
Mexico	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)	<b>25%</b> (6/24)	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)	<b>25%</b> (6/24)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>					
Water Manager / Government	<b>24.49%</b> (24/98)	<b>23.47%</b> (23/98)	<b>23.47%</b> (23/98)	<b>18.37%</b> (18/98)	<b>10.2%</b> (10/98)
Water Professional	<b>21.21%</b> (14/66)	<b>34.85%</b> (23/66)	<b>13.64%</b> (9/66)	<b>19.7%</b> (13/66)	<b>10.61%</b> (7/66)
Water User	<b>33.33%</b> (10/15)	<b>13.33%</b> (2/15)	<b>13.33%</b> (2/15)	<b>20%</b> (3/15)	<b>20%</b> (3/15)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>44.44%</b> (4/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>43.48%</b> (10/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>27.01%</b> (57/211)	<b>26.54%</b> (56/211)	<b>19.43%</b> (41/211)	<b>16.59%</b> (35/211)	<b>10.43%</b> (22/211)

<b>Question 6e. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding the PROCESS of arriving at new decisions or developing new policies in the Colorado River Basin:</b> <b>“Any new decisions in the Colorado River Basin will require SOME users to agree to undertake shortages.”</b>					
	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
<b>Region</b>					
Arizona	<b>38.78%</b> (19/49)	<b>20.41%</b> (10/49)	<b>10.2%</b> (5/49)	<b>14.29%</b> (7/49)	<b>16.33%</b> (8/49)
California	<b>32.14%</b> (9/28)	<b>35.71%</b> (10/28)	<b>17.86%</b> (5/28)	<b>7.14%</b> (2/28)	<b>7.14%</b> (2/28)
Nevada	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)
Colorado	<b>39.22%</b> (20/51)	<b>25.49%</b> (13/51)	<b>19.61%</b> (10/51)	<b>7.84%</b> (4/51)	<b>7.84%</b> (4/51)
New Mexico	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>41.67%</b> (5/12)	<b>25%</b> (3/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)
Utah	<b>37.5%</b> (9/24)	<b>29.17%</b> (7/24)	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)
Wyoming	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>34.78%</b> (8/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>					
Water Manager / Government	<b>35.71%</b> (71/98)	<b>29.59%</b> (29/98)	<b>18.37%</b> (18/98)	<b>9.18%</b> (9/98)	<b>7.14%</b> (7/98)
Water Professional	<b>34.85%</b> (23/66)	<b>33.33%</b> (22/66)	<b>12.12%</b> (8/66)	<b>12.12%</b> (8/66)	<b>7.58%</b> (5/66)
Water User	<b>50%</b> (7/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>34.76%</b> (73/210)	<b>28.57%</b> (60/210)	<b>15.71%</b> (33/210)	<b>11.43%</b> (24/210)	<b>9.52%</b> (20/210)

<b>Question 7a. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding BARRIERS to implementing new decisions in the Colorado River Basin:</b>					
<b>“Any new decisions would require significant changes to the Law of the River.”</b>					
	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
<b>Region</b>					
Arizona	<b>10%</b> (5/50)	<b>34%</b> (17/50)	<b>18%</b> (9/50)	<b>22%</b> (11/50)	<b>16%</b> (8/50)
California	<b>14.29%</b> (4/28)	<b>28.57%</b> (8/28)	<b>17.86%</b> (5/28)	<b>10.71%</b> (3/28)	<b>28.57%</b> (8/28)
Nevada	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)
Colorado	<b>11.76%</b> (6/51)	<b>33.33%</b> (17/51)	<b>15.69%</b> (8/51)	<b>21.57%</b> (11/51)	<b>17.65%</b> (9/51)
New Mexico	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>50%</b> (6/12)	<b>33.33%</b> (4/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah	<b>8.33%</b> (2/24)	<b>29.17%</b> (7/24)	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)	<b>33.33%</b> (8/24)
Wyoming	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)
Mexico	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>					
Water Manager / Government	<b>11.11%</b> (11/99)	<b>29.29%</b> (29/99)	<b>20.20%</b> (20/99)	<b>18.18%</b> (18/99)	<b>21.21%</b> (21/99)
Water Professional	<b>15.15%</b> (10/66)	<b>30.30%</b> (20/66)	<b>13.64%</b> (9/66)	<b>16.67%</b> (11/66)	<b>24.24%</b> (16/66)
Water User	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>44.44%</b> (4/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>43.48%</b> (10/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12.32%</b> (26/211)	<b>30.81%</b> (65/211)	<b>18.48%</b> (39/211)	<b>18.01%</b> (38/211)	<b>20.38%</b> (43/211)

<b>Question 7b. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding BARRIERS to implementing new decisions in the Colorado River Basin:</b>					
<b>“People making those decisions do not understand local/regional politics.”</b>					
	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
<b>Region</b>					
Arizona	<b>4%</b> (2/50)	<b>24%</b> (12/50)	<b>14%</b> (7/50)	<b>34%</b> (17/50)	<b>24%</b> (12/50)
California	<b>0%</b> (0/28)	<b>21.43%</b> (6/28)	<b>35.71%</b> (10/28)	<b>21.43%</b> (6/28)	<b>21.43%</b> (6/28)
Nevada	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>57.14%</b> (8/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)
Colorado	<b>1.96%</b> (1/51)	<b>17.65%</b> (9/51)	<b>15.69%</b> (8/51)	<b>41.18%</b> (21/51)	<b>23.53%</b> (12/51)
New Mexico	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>25%</b> (3/12)	<b>41.67%</b> (5/12)	<b>25%</b> (3/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)	<b>29.17%</b> (7/24)	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)	<b>20.83%</b> (5/24)	<b>29.17%</b> (7/24)
Wyoming	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)
Mexico	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>39.13%</b> (9/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>					
Water Manager / Government	<b>2.02%</b> (2/99)	<b>19.19%</b> (19/99)	<b>18.18%</b> (18/99)	<b>35.35%</b> (35/99)	<b>25.25%</b> (25/99)
Water Professional	<b>6.06%</b> (4/66)	<b>22.73%</b> (15/66)	<b>22.73%</b> (15/66)	<b>19.7%</b> (13/66)	<b>28.79%</b> (19/66)
Water User	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>42.86%</b> (6/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>60.87%</b> (14/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4.74%</b> (10/211)	<b>19.43%</b> (41/211)	<b>18.96%</b> (40/211)	<b>33.65%</b> (71/211)	<b>23.22%</b> (49/211)

<b>Question 7c. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding BARRIERS to implementing new decisions in the Colorado River Basin:</b>					
<b>“People making those decisions are not trustworthy.”</b>					
	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
<b>Region</b>					
Arizona	<b>0%</b> (0/50)	<b>6%</b> (3/50)	<b>22%</b> (11/50)	<b>40%</b> (20/50)	<b>32%</b> (16/50)
California	<b>3.57%</b> (1/28)	<b>10.71%</b> (3/28)	<b>14.29%</b> (4/28)	<b>28.57%</b> (8/28)	<b>42.86%</b> (12/28)
Nevada	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>57.14%</b> (8/14)
Colorado	<b>1.96%</b> (1/51)	<b>1.96%</b> (1/51)	<b>23.53%</b> (12/51)	<b>33.33%</b> (17/51)	<b>39.22%</b> (20/51)
New Mexico	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>33.33%</b> (4/12)	<b>33.33%</b> (4/12)	<b>33.33%</b> (4/12)
Utah	<b>8.33%</b> (2/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)	<b>20.83%</b> (5/24)	<b>20.83%</b> (5/24)	<b>50%</b> (12/24)
Wyoming	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)
Mexico	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>43.48%</b> (10/23)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>					
Water Manager / Government	<b>1.01%</b> (1/99)	<b>3.03%</b> (3/99)	<b>23.23%</b> (23/99)	<b>32.32%</b> (32/99)	<b>40.40%</b> (40/99)
Water Professional	<b>4.55%</b> (3/66)	<b>7.58%</b> (5/66)	<b>22.73%</b> (15/66)	<b>22.73%</b> (15/66)	<b>42.42%</b> (28/66)
Water User	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>42.86%</b> (6/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>44.44%</b> (4/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>39.13%</b> (9/23)	<b>43.48%</b> (10/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2.37%</b> (5/211)	<b>5.69%</b> (12/211)	<b>21.8%</b> (46/211)	<b>29.86%</b> (63/211)	<b>40.28%</b> (85/211)

**Question 7d. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding BARRIERS to implementing new decisions in the Colorado River Basin:**

**“Any new decisions would require all stakeholder groups to compromise on some part of their position.”**

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
<b><i>Region</i></b>					
Arizona	<b>38%</b> (19/50)	<b>38%</b> (19/50)	<b>12%</b> (6/50)	<b>8%</b> (4/50)	<b>4%</b> (2/50)
California	<b>28.57%</b> (8/28)	<b>42.86%</b> (12/28)	<b>14.29%</b> (4/28)	<b>14.29%</b> (4/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)
Nevada	<b>42.86%</b> (6/14)	<b>42.86%</b> (6/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)
Colorado	<b>33.33%</b> (17/51)	<b>43.14%</b> (22/51)	<b>9.8%</b> (5/51)	<b>11.76%</b> (6/51)	<b>1.96%</b> (1/51)
New Mexico	<b>41.67%</b> (5/12)	<b>50%</b> (6/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)	<b>62.5%</b> (15/24)	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)	<b>8.33%</b> (2/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)
Wyoming	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)
Mexico	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>52.17%</b> (12/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)
<b><i>Occupation / Affiliation</i></b>					
Water Manager / Government	<b>32.32</b> (32/99)	<b>47.47%</b> (47/99)	<b>11.11%</b> (11/99)	<b>7.07%</b> (7/99)	<b>2.02%</b> (2/99)
Water Professional	<b>24.24%</b> (16/66)	<b>39.39%</b> (26/66)	<b>15.15%</b> (10/66)	<b>15.15%</b> (10/66)	<b>6.06%</b> (4/66)
Water User	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>57.14%</b> (8/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>47.83%</b> (11/23)	<b>43.48%</b> (10/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>31.28%</b> (66/211)	<b>44.55%</b> (94/211)	<b>11.37%</b> (24/211)	<b>9%</b> (19/211)	<b>3.79%</b> (8/211)

<b>Question 7e. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding BARRIERS to implementing new decisions in the Colorado River Basin:</b>					
<b>“Any new decisions could lead to litigation.”</b>					
	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
<b>Region</b>					
Arizona	<b>26%</b> (13/50)	<b>42%</b> (21/50)	<b>20%</b> (10/50)	<b>8%</b> (4/50)	<b>4%</b> (2/50)
California	<b>39.29%</b> (11/28)	<b>53.57%</b> (15/28)	<b>7.14%</b> (2/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)
Nevada	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)
Colorado	<b>11.76%</b> (6/51)	<b>49.02%</b> (25/51)	<b>19.61%</b> (10/51)	<b>11.76%</b> (6/51)	<b>7.84%</b> (4/51)
New Mexico	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>58.33%</b> (7/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah	<b>29.17%</b> (7/24)	<b>33.33%</b> (8/24)	<b>29.17%</b> (7/24)	<b>8.33%</b> (2/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)
Wyoming	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>34.78%</b> (8/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>					
Water Manager / Government	<b>19.19%</b> (19/99)	<b>46.46%</b> (46/99)	<b>23.23%</b> (23/99)	<b>6.06%</b> (6/99)	<b>5.05%</b> (5/99)
Water Professional	<b>28.79%</b> (19/66)	<b>42.42%</b> (28/66)	<b>18.18%</b> (12/66)	<b>6.06%</b> (4/66)	<b>4.55%</b> (3/66)
Water User	<b>42.86%</b> (6/14)	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>44.44%</b> (4/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>22.75%</b> (48/211)	<b>42.65%</b> (90/211)	<b>20.85%</b> (44/211)	<b>8.06%</b> (17/211)	<b>5.69%</b> (12/211)

**Question 8a.** In recent years there has been a focus on including more stakeholders in the decision-making process in the Colorado River Basin. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding your own participation in these decision-making processes:

**“I feel like I have an adequate seat at the negotiating table when it comes to Colorado River Basin decision-making.”**

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	N/A
<b><i>Region</i></b>						
Arizona	<b>12%</b> (6/50)	<b>20%</b> (10/50)	<b>22%</b> (11/50)	<b>18%</b> (9/50)	<b>18%</b> (9/50)	<b>10%</b> (5/50)
California	<b>17.86%</b> (5/28)	<b>14.29%</b> (4/28)	<b>32.14%</b> (9/28)	<b>7.14%</b> (2/28)	<b>17.86%</b> (5/28)	<b>10.71%</b> (3/28)
Nevada	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)
Colorado	<b>6%</b> (3/50)	<b>34%</b> (17/50)	<b>14%</b> (7/50)	<b>26%</b> (13/50)	<b>14%</b> (7/50)	<b>6%</b> (3/50)
New Mexico	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>25%</b> (3/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>25%</b> (3/12)
Utah	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)	<b>25%</b> (6/24)	<b>33.33%</b> (8/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)	<b>8.33%</b> (2/24)	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)
Wyoming	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)
<b><i>Occupation / Affiliation</i></b>						
Water Manager / Government	<b>15.15%</b> (15/99)	<b>31.31%</b> (31/99)	<b>17.17%</b> (17/99)	<b>15.15%</b> (15/99)	<b>11.11%</b> (11/99)	<b>10.10%</b> (10/99)
Water Professional	<b>6.15%</b> (4/65)	<b>13.85%</b> (9/65)	<b>30.77%</b> (20/65)	<b>10.77%</b> (7/65)	<b>23.08%</b> (15/65)	<b>15.38%</b> (10/65)
Water User	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>34.78%</b> (8/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>11.43%</b> (24/210)	<b>24.76%</b> (52/210)	<b>20.95%</b> (44/210)	<b>14.76%</b> (31/210)	<b>17.14%</b> (36/210)	<b>10.95%</b> (23/210)



**Question 8b.** In recent years there has been a focus on including more stakeholders in the decision-making process in the Colorado River Basin. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding your own participation in these decision-making processes:

**“While I’m not at the actual negotiating table, people who adequately represent my interests are at the table.”**

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	N/A
<b><i>Region</i></b>						
Arizona	<b>28.57%</b> (14/49)	<b>36.73%</b> (18/49)	<b>4.08%</b> (2/49)	<b>10.2%</b> (5/49)	<b>12.24%</b> (6/49)	<b>8.16%</b> (4/49)
California	<b>50%</b> (14/28)	<b>21.43%</b> (6/28)	<b>10.71%</b> (3/28)	<b>7.14%</b> (2/28)	<b>7.14%</b> (2/28)	<b>3.57%</b> (1/28)
Nevada	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)
Colorado	<b>24%</b> (12/50)	<b>42%</b> (21/50)	<b>12%</b> (6/50)	<b>10%</b> (5/50)	<b>12%</b> (6/50)	<b>0%</b> (0/50)
New Mexico	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>41.67%</b> (5/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)
Utah	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>52.17%</b> (12/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)
Wyoming	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)
Mexico	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)
<b><i>Occupation / Affiliation</i></b>						
Water Manager / Government	<b>26.53%</b> (26/98)	<b>35.71%</b> (35/98)	<b>14.29%</b> (14/98)	<b>5.1%</b> (5/98)	<b>11.22%</b> (11/98)	<b>7.14%</b> (7/98)
Water Professional	<b>31.25%</b> (20/64)	<b>31.25%</b> (20/64)	<b>6.25%</b> (4/64)	<b>9.38%</b> (6/64)	<b>12.5%</b> (8/64)	<b>9.38%</b> (6/64)
Water User	<b>50%</b> (7/14)	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>44.44%</b> (4/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>28.37%</b> (59/208)	<b>33.65%</b> (70/208)	<b>10.10%</b> (21/208)	<b>9.13%</b> (19/208)	<b>11.54%</b> (24/208)	<b>7.21%</b> (15/208)

<b>Question 8c. In recent years there has been a focus on including more stakeholders in the decision-making process in the Colorado River Basin. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding your own participation in these decision-making processes:</b> <b>“My involvement is typically being consulted about a new decision after it has been drafted.”</b>						
	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	N/A
<b>Region</b>						
Arizona	<b>20%</b> (10/50)	<b>40%</b> (20/50)	<b>8%</b> (4/50)	<b>12%</b> (6/50)	<b>16%</b> (8/50)	<b>4%</b> (2/50)
California	<b>21.43%</b> (6/28)	<b>28.57%</b> (8/28)	<b>17.86%</b> (5/28)	<b>7.14%</b> (2/28)	<b>14.29%</b> (4/28)	<b>10.71%</b> (3/28)
Nevada	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)
Colorado	<b>10%</b> (5/50)	<b>42%</b> (21/50)	<b>10%</b> (5/50)	<b>18%</b> (9/50)	<b>10%</b> (5/50)	<b>10%</b> (5/50)
New Mexico	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>25%</b> (3/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>25%</b> (3/12)
Utah	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)
Wyoming	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)
Mexico	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>						
Water Manager / Government	<b>20.41%</b> (20/98)	<b>36.73%</b> (36/98)	<b>8.16%</b> (8/98)	<b>15.31%</b> (15/98)	<b>10.2%</b> (10/98)	<b>9.18%</b> (9/98)
Water Professional	<b>6.15%</b> (4/65)	<b>32.31%</b> (21/65)	<b>13.85%</b> (9/65)	<b>10.77%</b> (7/65)	<b>20%</b> (13/65)	<b>16.92%</b> (11/65)
Water User	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>15.31%</b> (32/209)	<b>32.06%</b> (67/209)	<b>11.96%</b> (25/209)	<b>14.83%</b> (31/209)	<b>14.83%</b> (31/209)	<b>11%</b> (23/209)

<b>Question 8d. In recent years there has been a focus on including more stakeholders in the decision-making process in the Colorado River Basin. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding your own participation in these decision-making processes:</b> <b>“I don’t feel involved at all in Colorado River Basin decision-making.”</b>						
	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	N/A
<b>Region</b>						
Arizona	<b>8%</b> (4/50)	<b>16%</b> (8/50)	<b>8%</b> (4/50)	<b>26%</b> (13/50)	<b>34%</b> (17/50)	<b>8%</b> (4/50)
California	<b>10.71%</b> (3/28)	<b>21.43%</b> (6/28)	<b>10.71%</b> (3/28)	<b>17.86%</b> (5/28)	<b>28.57%</b> (8/28)	<b>10.71%</b> (3/28)
Nevada	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>42.86%</b> (6/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Colorado	<b>8%</b> (4/50)	<b>20%</b> (10/50)	<b>16%</b> (8/50)	<b>24%</b> (12/50)	<b>18%</b> (9/50)	<b>14%</b> (7/50)
New Mexico	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>41.67%</b> (5/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)
Utah	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)
Wyoming	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>34.78%</b> (8/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>						
Water Manager / Government	<b>6.12%</b> (6/98)	<b>18.37%</b> (18/98)	<b>12.24%</b> (12/98)	<b>27.55%</b> (27/98)	<b>29.59%</b> (29/98)	<b>6.12%</b> (6/98)
Water Professional	<b>10.77%</b> (7/65)	<b>18.46%</b> (12/65)	<b>9.23%</b> (6/65)	<b>23.08%</b> (15/65)	<b>21.54%</b> (14/65)	<b>16.92%</b> (11/65)
Water User	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>50%</b> (7/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>8.61%</b> (18/209)	<b>17.7%</b> (37/209)	<b>12.92%</b> (27/209)	<b>24.88%</b> (52/209)	<b>26.32%</b> (55/209)	<b>9.57%</b> (20/209)

<b>Question 9. The 'structural deficit' in the Lower Basin has been identified as a significant problem for Colorado River Basin management. Please rate your familiarity with the 'structural deficit':</b>					
	Very familiar	Somewhat familiar	I've heard of it, but don't really know what it is	Never heard of it	Not sure
<b>Region</b>					
Arizona	<b>84%</b> (42/50)	<b>10%</b> (5/50)	<b>4%</b> (2/50)	<b>0%</b> (0/50)	<b>2%</b> (1/50)
California	<b>67.86%</b> (19/28)	<b>21.43%</b> (6/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)	<b>7.14%</b> (2/28)	<b>3.57%</b> (1/28)
Nevada	<b>64.29%</b> (9/14)	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Colorado	<b>60.78%</b> (31/51)	<b>35.29%</b> (18/51)	<b>3.92%</b> (2/51)	<b>0%</b> (0/51)	<b>0%</b> (0/51)
New Mexico	<b>50%</b> (6/12)	<b>25%</b> (3/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah	<b>50%</b> (12/24)	<b>37.5%</b> (9/24)	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)
Wyoming	<b>60%</b> (3/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>56.52%</b> (13/23)	<b>34.78%</b> (8/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>					
Water Manager / Government	<b>67.68%</b> (67/99)	<b>26.26%</b> (26/99)	<b>4.04%</b> (4/99)	<b>2.02%</b> (2/99)	<b>0%</b> (0/99)
Water Professional	<b>59.09%</b> (39/66)	<b>31.82%</b> (21/66)	<b>4.55%</b> (3/66)	<b>3.03%</b> (2/66)	<b>1.52%</b> (1/66)
Water User	<b>92.86%</b> (13/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>44.44%</b> (4/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>65.22%</b> (15/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>65.4%</b> (138/211)	<b>26.07%</b> (55/211)	<b>5.21%</b> (11/211)	<b>2.37%</b> (5/211)	<b>0.95%</b> (2/211)

**Question 10a.** The preceding question was about the ‘structural deficit’ in the Lower Basin. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding addressing the ‘structural deficit’:

**“Addressing the ‘structural deficit’ in the Lower Basin will require FUNDAMENTAL changes to the Law of the River.”**

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Not sure
<b><i>Region</i></b>						
Arizona	<b>22.45%</b> (11/49)	<b>26.53%</b> (13/49)	<b>8.16%</b> (4/49)	<b>26.53%</b> (13/49)	<b>14.29%</b> (7/49)	<b>2.04%</b> (1/49)
California	<b>17.86%</b> (5/28)	<b>25%</b> (7/28)	<b>21.43%</b> (6/28)	<b>7.14%</b> (2/28)	<b>25%</b> (7/28)	<b>3.57%</b> (1/28)
Nevada	<b>20%</b> (3/15)	<b>26.67%</b> (4/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)	<b>20%</b> (3/15)	<b>33.33%</b> (5/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)
Colorado	<b>10%</b> (5/50)	<b>30%</b> (15/50)	<b>8%</b> (4/50)	<b>34%</b> (17/50)	<b>16%</b> (8/50)	<b>2%</b> (1/50)
New Mexico	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>33.33%</b> (4/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)
Utah	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)	<b>20.83%</b> (5/24)	<b>8.33%</b> (2/24)	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)	<b>45.83%</b> (11/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)
Wyoming	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>80%</b> (4/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)
<b><i>Occupation / Affiliation</i></b>						
Water Manager / Government	<b>19%</b> (19/100)	<b>22%</b> (22/100)	<b>11%</b> (11/100)	<b>21%</b> (21/100)	<b>24%</b> (24/100)	<b>3%</b> (3/100)
Water Professional	<b>17.19%</b> (11/64)	<b>21.88%</b> (14/64)	<b>7.81%</b> (5/64)	<b>21.88%</b> (14/64)	<b>28.13%</b> (18/64)	<b>3.13%</b> (2/64)
Water User	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>44.44%</b> (4/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>34.78%</b> (8/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>16.67%</b> (35/210)	<b>25.24%</b> (53/210)	<b>10%</b> (21/210)	<b>21.9%</b> (46/210)	<b>23.33%</b> (49/210)	<b>2.86%</b> (6/210)

**Question 10b.** The preceding question was about the ‘structural deficit’ in the Lower Basin. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding addressing the ‘structural deficit’:

**“Addressing the ‘structural deficit’ in the Lower Basin will require MINOR changes to the Law of the River.”**

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Not sure
<b><i>Region</i></b>						
Arizona	<b>8.16%</b> (4/49)	<b>42.86%</b> (21/49)	<b>12.24%</b> (6/49)	<b>26.53%</b> (13/49)	<b>8.16%</b> (4/49)	<b>2.04%</b> (1/49)
California	<b>7.14%</b> (2/28)	<b>28.57%</b> (8/28)	<b>28.57%</b> (8/28)	<b>14.29%</b> (4/28)	<b>14.29%</b> (4/28)	<b>7.14%</b> (2/28)
Nevada	<b>13.33%</b> (2/15)	<b>20%</b> (3/15)	<b>13.33%</b> (2/15)	<b>20%</b> (3/15)	<b>33.33%</b> (5/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)
Colorado	<b>10%</b> (5/50)	<b>28%</b> (14/50)	<b>26%</b> (13/50)	<b>18%</b> (9/50)	<b>16%</b> (8/50)	<b>2%</b> (1/50)
New Mexico	<b>0%</b> (0/11)	<b>45.45%</b> (5/11)	<b>18.18%</b> (2/11)	<b>18.18%</b> (2/11)	<b>0%</b> (0/11)	<b>18.18%</b> (2/11)
Utah	<b>0%</b> (0/24)	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)	<b>20.83%</b> (5/24)	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)	<b>45.83%</b> (11/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)
Wyoming	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>100%</b> (3/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>39.13%</b> (9/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)
<b><i>Occupation / Affiliation</i></b>						
Water Manager / Government	<b>5%</b> (5/100)	<b>32%</b> (32/100)	<b>20%</b> (20/100)	<b>19%</b> (19/100)	<b>21%</b> (21/100)	<b>3%</b> (3/100)
Water Professional	<b>4.76%</b> (3/63)	<b>26.98%</b> (17/63)	<b>19.05%</b> (12/63)	<b>23.81%</b> (15/63)	<b>19.05%</b> (12/63)	<b>6.35%</b> (4/63)
Water User	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>31.93%</b> (9/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7.18%</b> (15/209)	<b>31.1%</b> (65/209)	<b>19.62%</b> (41/209)	<b>20.57%</b> (43/209)	<b>17.7%</b> (37/209)	<b>3.83%</b> (8/209)

**Question 10c.** The preceding question was about the ‘structural deficit’ in the Lower Basin. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding addressing the ‘structural deficit’:

**“Addressing the ‘structural deficit’ in the Lower Basin will NOT require any changes to the Law of the River.”**

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Not sure
<b><i>Region</i></b>						
Arizona	<b>6.25%</b> (3/48)	<b>12.5%</b> (6/48)	<b>20.83%</b> (10/48)	<b>18.75%</b> (9/48)	<b>37.5%</b> (18/48)	<b>4.17%</b> (2/48)
California	<b>14.81%</b> (4/27)	<b>11.11%</b> (3/27)	<b>25.93%</b> (7/27)	<b>14.81%</b> (4/27)	<b>18.52%</b> (5/27)	<b>14.81%</b> (4/27)
Nevada	<b>20%</b> (3/15)	<b>20%</b> (3/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)	<b>13.33%</b> (2/15)	<b>46.67%</b> (7/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)
Colorado	<b>9.8%</b> (5/51)	<b>17.65%</b> (9/51)	<b>15.69%</b> (8/51)	<b>21.57%</b> (11/51)	<b>33.33%</b> (17/51)	<b>1.96%</b> (2/51)
New Mexico	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>33.33%</b> (4/12)	<b>25%</b> (3/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)
Utah	<b>33.33%</b> (8/24)	<b>8.33%</b> (2/24)	<b>25%</b> (6/24)	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)
Wyoming	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)
<b><i>Occupation / Affiliation</i></b>						
Water Manager / Government	<b>14%</b> (14/100)	<b>14%</b> (14/100)	<b>17%</b> (17/100)	<b>23%</b> (23/100)	<b>25%</b> (25/100)	<b>7%</b> (7/100)
Water Professional	<b>14.29%</b> (9/63)	<b>22.22%</b> (14/63)	<b>15.87%</b> (10/63)	<b>9.52%</b> (6/63)	<b>33.33%</b> (21/63)	<b>4.76%</b> (3/63)
Water User	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>50%</b> (7/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>44.44%</b> (4/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>47.83%</b> (11/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>13.4%</b> (28/209)	<b>13.88%</b> (29/209)	<b>19.14%</b> (40/209)	<b>18.66%</b> (39/209)	<b>29.19%</b> (61/209)	<b>5.74%</b> (12/209)

**Question 10d.** The preceding question was about the ‘structural deficit’ in the Lower Basin. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding addressing the ‘structural deficit’:

**“Addressing the ‘structural deficit’ in the Lower Basin will require PERMANENT curtailments.”**

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Not sure
<b>Region</b>						
Arizona	<b>14.29%</b> (7/49)	<b>26.53%</b> (13/49)	<b>14.29%</b> (7/49)	<b>28.57%</b> (14/49)	<b>14.29%</b> (7/49)	<b>2.04%</b> (1/49)
California	<b>3.57%</b> (1/28)	<b>17.86%</b> (5/28)	<b>25%</b> (7/28)	<b>35.71%</b> (10/28)	<b>17.86%</b> (5/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)
Nevada	<b>6.67%</b> (1/15)	<b>33.33%</b> (5/15)	<b>20%</b> (3/15)	<b>6.67%</b> (1/15)	<b>33.33%</b> (5/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)
Colorado	<b>7.84%</b> (4/51)	<b>31.37%</b> (16/51)	<b>23.53%</b> (12/51)	<b>21.57%</b> (11/51)	<b>7.84%</b> (4/51)	<b>7.84%</b> (4/51)
New Mexico	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>25%</b> (3/12)
Utah	<b>20.83%</b> (5/24)	<b>33.33%</b> (8/24)	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)
Wyoming	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>60%</b> (3/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>						
Water Manager / Government	<b>11%</b> (11/100)	<b>31%</b> (31/100)	<b>22%</b> (22/100)	<b>20%</b> (20/100)	<b>14%</b> (14/100)	<b>2%</b> (2/100)
Water Professional	<b>7.69%</b> (5/65)	<b>23.08%</b> (15/65)	<b>16.92%</b> (11/65)	<b>27.69%</b> (18/65)	<b>16.92%</b> (11/65)	<b>7.69%</b> (5/65)
Water User	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>44.44%</b> (4/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>11.85%</b> (25/211)	<b>26.54%</b> (56/211)	<b>19.43%</b> (41/211)	<b>22.27%</b> (47/211)	<b>15.17%</b> (32/211)	<b>4.74%</b> (10/211)



**Question 10e.** The preceding question was about the ‘structural deficit’ in the Lower Basin. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding addressing the ‘structural deficit’:

**“Addressing the ‘structural deficit’ in the Lower Basin will require TEMPORARY curtailments.”**

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Not sure
<b>Region</b>						
Arizona	<b>22.45%</b> (11/49)	<b>51.02%</b> (25/49)	<b>10.2%</b> (5/49)	<b>10.2%</b> (5/49)	<b>6.12%</b> (3/49)	<b>0%</b> (0/49)
California	<b>10.71%</b> (3/28)	<b>53.57%</b> (15/28)	<b>14.29%</b> (4/28)	<b>10.71%</b> (3/28)	<b>10.71%</b> (3/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)
Nevada	<b>46.67%</b> (7/15)	<b>40%</b> (6/15)	<b>6.67%</b> (1/15)	<b>6.67%</b> (1/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)
Colorado	<b>35.29%</b> (18/51)	<b>49.02%</b> (25/51)	<b>5.88%</b> (3/51)	<b>1.96%</b> (1/51)	<b>7.84%</b> (4/51)	<b>0%</b> (0/51)
New Mexico	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>33.33%</b> (4/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>33.33%</b> (4/12)
Utah	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)	<b>20.83%</b> (5/24)	<b>37.5%</b> (9/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)	<b>20.83%</b> (5/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)
Wyoming	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>60%</b> (3/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>47.83%</b> (11/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>						
Water Manager / Government	<b>27%</b> (27/100)	<b>49%</b> (49/100)	<b>9%</b> (9/100)	<b>5%</b> (5/100)	<b>9%</b> (9/100)	<b>1%</b> (1/100)
Water Professional	<b>18.46%</b> (12/65)	<b>44.62%</b> (29/65)	<b>21.54%</b> (14/65)	<b>6.15%</b> (4/65)	<b>6.15%</b> (4/65)	<b>3.08%</b> (2/65)
Water User	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>42.86%</b> (6/14)	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>24.64%</b> (52/211)	<b>44.55%</b> (94/211)	<b>14.69%</b> (31/211)	<b>5.21%</b> (11/211)	<b>8.53%</b> (18/211)	<b>2.37%</b> (5/211)

**Question 10f.** The preceding question was about the ‘structural deficit’ in the Lower Basin. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding addressing the ‘structural deficit’:

**“Addressing the ‘structural deficit’ in the Lower Basin will NOT require any curtailments.”**

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Not sure
<b>Region</b>						
Arizona	0% (0/49)	6.12% (3/49)	12.24% (6/49)	22.45% (11/49)	59.18% (29/49)	0% (0/49)
California	3.57% (1/28)	3.57% (1/28)	17.86% (5/28)	35.71% (10/28)	39.29% (11/28)	0% (0/28)
Nevada	0% (0/15)	6.67% (1/15)	13.33% (2/15)	26.67% (4/15)	53.33% (8/15)	0% (0/15)
Colorado	1.96% (1/51)	0% (0/51)	9.8% (5/51)	25.49% (13/51)	60.78% (31/51)	1.96% (1/51)
New Mexico	0% (0/12)	0% (0/12)	16.67% (2/12)	33.33% (4/12)	16.67% (2/12)	33.33% (4/12)
Utah	0% (0/24)	0% (0/24)	20.83% (5/24)	16.67% (4/24)	62.5% (15/24)	0% (0/24)
Wyoming	0% (0/5)	0% (0/5)	0% (0/5)	20% (1/5)	80% (4/5)	0% (0/5)
Mexico	0% (0/3)	0% (0/3)	0% (0/3)	0% (0/3)	100% (3/3)	0% (0/3)
Other / Unknown	8.7% (2/23)	4.35% (1/23)	13.04% (3/23)	17.39% (4/23)	52.17% (12/23)	4.35% (1/23)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>						
Water Manager / Government	0% (0/100)	1% (1/100)	11% (11/100)	27% (27/100)	60% (60/100)	1% (1/100)
Water Professional	3.08% (2/65)	4.62% (3/65)	13.85% (9/65)	26.15% (17/65)	47.69% (31/65)	4.62% (3/65)
Water User	7.14% (1/14)	7.14% (1/14)	21.43% (3/14)	28.57% (4/14)	35.71% (5/14)	0% (0/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	0% (0/9)	0% (0/9)	44.44% (4/9)	22.22% (2/9)	33.33% (3/9)	0% (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	4.35% (1/23)	4.35% (1/23)	4.35% (1/23)	4.35% (1/23)	73.91% (17/23)	8.7% (2/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1.9% (4/211)</b>	<b>2.84% (6/211)</b>	<b>13.27% (28/211)</b>	<b>24.17% (51/211)</b>	<b>54.98% (116/211)</b>	<b>2.84% (6/211)</b>

**Question 11a.** The following topics are the subject of current, ongoing negotiations in the Colorado River Basin. In your opinion, how important is it for negotiators to reach an agreement on each of these topics?

**Continued US-Mexico negotiations (Minute 32X)**

	Extremely important	Very important	Moderately important	Slightly important	Not at all important	Not sure	Never heard of it
<b>Region</b>							
Arizona	<b>46%</b> (23/50)	<b>36%</b> (18/50)	<b>10%</b> (5/50)	<b>6%</b> (3/50)	<b>0%</b> (0/50)	<b>2%</b> (1/50)	<b>0%</b> (0/50)
California	<b>28.57%</b> (8/28)	<b>39.29%</b> (11/28)	<b>25%</b> (7/28)	<b>3.57%</b> (1/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)	<b>3.57%</b> (1/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)
Nevada	<b>46.67%</b> (7/15)	<b>33.33%</b> (5/15)	<b>20%</b> (3/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)
Colorado	<b>43.14%</b> (22/51)	<b>37.25%</b> (19/51)	<b>17.65%</b> (9/51)	<b>0%</b> (0/51)	<b>0%</b> (0/51)	<b>1.96%</b> (1/51)	<b>0%</b> (0/51)
New Mexico	<b>41.67%</b> (5/12)	<b>25%</b> (3/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah	<b>27.27%</b> (6/22)	<b>54.55%</b> (12/22)	<b>13.64%</b> (3/22)	<b>4.55%</b> (1/22)	<b>0%</b> (0/22)	<b>0%</b> (0/22)	<b>0%</b> (0/22)
Wyoming	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Mexico	<b>100%</b> (3/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>34.78%</b> (8/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>							
Water Manager / Government	<b>32.99%</b> (32/97)	<b>41.24%</b> (40/97)	<b>19.59%</b> (19/97)	<b>5.15%</b> (5/97)	<b>0%</b> (0/97)	<b>1.03%</b> (1/97)	<b>0%</b> (0/97)
Water Professional	<b>40%</b> (26/65)	<b>36.92%</b> (24/65)	<b>13.85%</b> (9/65)	<b>3.08%</b> (2/65)	<b>0%</b> (0/65)	<b>6.15%</b> (4/65)	<b>0%</b> (0/65)
Water User	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>52.17%</b> (12/23)	<b>34.78%</b> (8/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>37.5%</b> (78/208)	<b>37.98%</b> (79/208)	<b>16.83%</b> (35/208)	<b>4.81%</b> (10/208)	<b>0%</b> (0/208)	<b>2.88%</b> (6/208)	<b>0%</b> (0/208)

**Question 11b.** The following topics are the subject of current, ongoing negotiations in the Colorado River Basin. In your opinion, how important is it for negotiators to reach an agreement on each of these topics?

**Lower Basin Drought Contingency Planning**

	Extremely important	Very important	Moderately important	Slightly important	Not at all important	Not sure	Never heard of it
<b>Region</b>							
Arizona	<b>54%</b> (27/50)	<b>34%</b> (17/50)	<b>10%</b> (5/50)	<b>2%</b> (1/50)	<b>0%</b> (0/50)	<b>0%</b> (0/50)	<b>0%</b> (0/50)
California	<b>57.14%</b> (16/28)	<b>39.29%</b> (11/28)	<b>3.57%</b> (1/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)
Nevada	<b>80%</b> (12/15)	<b>13.33%</b> (2/15)	<b>6.67%</b> (1/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)
Colorado	<b>76.47%</b> (39/51)	<b>17.65%</b> (9/51)	<b>1.96%</b> (1/51)	<b>3.92%</b> (2/51)	<b>0%</b> (0/51)	<b>0%</b> (0/51)	<b>0%</b> (0/51)
New Mexico	<b>41.67%</b> (5/12)	<b>50%</b> (6/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah	<b>41.67%</b> (10/24)	<b>45.83%</b> (11/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)	<b>8.33%</b> (2/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)
Wyoming	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>60%</b> (3/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>100%</b> (3/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>39.13%</b> (9/23)	<b>34.78%</b> (8/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>							
Water Manager / Government	<b>57%</b> (57/100)	<b>33%</b> (33/100)	<b>7%</b> (7/100)	<b>3%</b> (3/100)	<b>0%</b> (0/100)	<b>0%</b> (0/100)	<b>0%</b> (0/100)
Water Professional	<b>56.06%</b> (37/66)	<b>31.82%</b> (21/66)	<b>9.09%</b> (6/66)	<b>3.03%</b> (2/66)	<b>0%</b> (0/66)	<b>0%</b> (0/66)	<b>0%</b> (0/66)
Water User	<b>50%</b> (7/14)	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>66.67%</b> (6/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>73.91%</b> (17/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>58.49%</b> (124/212)	<b>31.6%</b> (67/212)	<b>7.08%</b> (15/212)	<b>2.83%</b> (6/212)	<b>0%</b> (0/212)	<b>0%</b> (0/212)	<b>0%</b> (0/212)

**Question 11c.** The following topics are the subject of current, ongoing negotiations in the Colorado River Basin. In your opinion, how important is it for negotiators to reach an agreement on each of these topics?

**Progress on a Salton Sea solution**

	Extremely important	Very important	Moderately important	Slightly important	Not at all important	Not sure	Never heard of it
<b><i>Region</i></b>							
Arizona	<b>10%</b> (5/50)	<b>24%</b> (12/50)	<b>24%</b> (12/50)	<b>14%</b> (7/50)	<b>26%</b> (13/50)	<b>2%</b> (1/50)	<b>0%</b> (0/50)
California	<b>35.71%</b> (10/28)	<b>25%</b> (7/28)	<b>17.86%</b> (5/28)	<b>10.71%</b> (3/28)	<b>10.71%</b> (3/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)
Nevada	<b>13.33%</b> (2/15)	<b>13.33%</b> (2/15)	<b>33.33%</b> (5/15)	<b>26.67%</b> (4/15)	<b>6.67%</b> (1/15)	<b>6.67%</b> (1/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)
Colorado	<b>25.49%</b> (13/51)	<b>29.41%</b> (15/51)	<b>21.57%</b> (11/51)	<b>13.73%</b> (7/51)	<b>0%</b> (0/51)	<b>5.88%</b> (3/51)	<b>3.92%</b> (2/51)
New Mexico	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>25%</b> (3/12)	<b>41.67%</b> (5/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah	<b>8.33%</b> (2/24)	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)	<b>41.67%</b> (10/24)	<b>20.83%</b> (5/24)	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)
Wyoming	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b><i>Occupation / Affiliation</i></b>							
Water Manager / Government	<b>15%</b> (15/100)	<b>22%</b> (22/100)	<b>33%</b> (33/100)	<b>16%</b> (16/100)	<b>8%</b> (8/100)	<b>5%</b> (5/100)	<b>1%</b> (1/100)
Water Professional	<b>16.67%</b> (11/66)	<b>21.21%</b> (14/66)	<b>24.24%</b> (16/66)	<b>16.67%</b> (11/66)	<b>16.67%</b> (11/66)	<b>3.03%</b> (2/66)	<b>1.52%</b> (1/66)
Water User	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>39.13%</b> (9/23)	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>18.87%</b> (40/212)	<b>22.64%</b> (48/212)	<b>26.89%</b> (57/212)	<b>15.09%</b> (32/212)	<b>10.85%</b> (23/212)	<b>4.72%</b> (10/212)	<b>0.94%</b> (2/212)

**Question 11d.** The following topics are the subject of current, ongoing negotiations in the Colorado River Basin. In your opinion, how important is it for negotiators to reach an agreement on each of these topics?

**Tribal water settlements and water use flexibility**

	Extremely important	Very important	Moderately important	Slightly important	Not at all important	Not sure	Never heard of it
<b>Region</b>							
Arizona	<b>36%</b> (18/50)	<b>34%</b> (17/50)	<b>22%</b> (11/50)	<b>4%</b> (2/50)	<b>4%</b> (2/50)	<b>0%</b> (0/50)	<b>0%</b> (0/50)
California	<b>32.14%</b> (9/28)	<b>46.43%</b> (13/28)	<b>14.29%</b> (4/28)	<b>7.14%</b> (2/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)
Nevada	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Colorado	<b>37.25%</b> (19/51)	<b>41.18%</b> (21/51)	<b>15.69%</b> (8/51)	<b>3.92%</b> (2/51)	<b>0%</b> (0/51)	<b>1.96%</b> (1/51)	<b>0%</b> (0/51)
New Mexico	<b>66.67%</b> (8/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)	<b>50%</b> (12/24)	<b>25%</b> (6/24)	<b>8.33%</b> (2/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)
Wyoming	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>60%</b> (3/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>43.48%</b> (10/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>							
Water Manager / Government	<b>35.35%</b> (35/99)	<b>33.33%</b> (33/99)	<b>23.23%</b> (23/99)	<b>5.05%</b> (5/99)	<b>2.02%</b> (2/99)	<b>1.01%</b> (1/99)	<b>0%</b> (0/99)
Water Professional	<b>27.27%</b> (18/66)	<b>43.94%</b> (29/66)	<b>21.21%</b> (14/66)	<b>6.06%</b> (4/66)	<b>1.52%</b> (1/66)	<b>0%</b> (0/66)	<b>0%</b> (0/66)
Water User	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>77.78%</b> (7/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>47.83%</b> (11/23)	<b>34.78%</b> (8/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>35.07%</b> (74/211)	<b>36.02%</b> (76/211)	<b>20.38%</b> (43/211)	<b>5.69%</b> (12/211)	<b>1.9%</b> (4/211)	<b>0.95%</b> (2/211)	<b>0%</b> (0/211)

**Question 11e.** The following topics are the subject of current, ongoing negotiations in the Colorado River Basin. In your opinion, how important is it for negotiators to reach an agreement on each of these topics?

**Upper Basin water bank**

	Extremely important	Very important	Moderately important	Slightly important	Not at all important	Not sure	Never heard of it
<b><i>Region</i></b>							
Arizona	<b>10.42%</b> (5/48)	<b>29.17%</b> (14/48)	<b>22.92%</b> (11/48)	<b>6.25%</b> (3/48)	<b>4.17%</b> (2/48)	<b>18.75%</b> (9/48)	<b>8.33%</b> (4/48)
California	<b>21.43%</b> (6/28)	<b>46.43%</b> (13/28)	<b>17.86%</b> (5/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)	<b>7.14%</b> (2/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)	<b>7.14%</b> (2/28)
Nevada	<b>13.33%</b> (2/15)	<b>40%</b> (6/15)	<b>46.67%</b> (7/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)
Colorado	<b>25.49%</b> (13/51)	<b>35.29%</b> (18/51)	<b>27.45%</b> (14/51)	<b>7.84%</b> (4/51)	<b>1.96%</b> (1/51)	<b>0%</b> (0/51)	<b>1.96%</b> (1/51)
New Mexico	<b>50%</b> (6/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)
Utah	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)	<b>29.17%</b> (7/24)	<b>20.83%</b> (5/24)	<b>25%</b> (6/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)
Wyoming	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)
<b><i>Occupation / Affiliation</i></b>							
Water Manager / Government	<b>17.35%</b> (17/98)	<b>28.57%</b> (28/98)	<b>26.53%</b> (26/98)	<b>12.24%</b> (12/98)	<b>3.06%</b> (3/98)	<b>8.16%</b> (8/98)	<b>4.08%</b> (4/98)
Water Professional	<b>21.21%</b> (14/66)	<b>31.82%</b> (21/66)	<b>27.27%</b> (18/66)	<b>4.55%</b> (3/66)	<b>4.55%</b> (3/66)	<b>3.03%</b> (2/66)	<b>7.58%</b> (5/66)
Water User	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>66.67%</b> (6/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>39.13%</b> (9/23)	<b>34.78%</b> (8/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>20%</b> (42/210)	<b>32.38%</b> (68/210)	<b>25.71%</b> (54/210)	<b>9.05%</b> (19/210)	<b>2.86%</b> (6/210)	<b>5.71%</b> (12/210)	<b>4.29%</b> (9/210)

**Question 11f.** The following topics are the subject of current, ongoing negotiations in the Colorado River Basin. In your opinion, how important is it for negotiators to reach an agreement on each of these topics?

**Upper Basin reservoir re-operations**

	Extremely important	Very important	Moderately important	Slightly important	Not at all important	Not sure	Never heard of it
<b><i>Region</i></b>							
Arizona	<b>12%</b> (6/50)	<b>38%</b> (19/50)	<b>20%</b> (10/50)	<b>8%</b> (4/50)	<b>0%</b> (0/50)	<b>18%</b> (9/50)	<b>4%</b> (2/50)
California	<b>21.43%</b> (6/28)	<b>39.29%</b> (11/28)	<b>21.43%</b> (6/28)	<b>7.14%</b> (2/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)	<b>10.71%</b> (3/28)
Nevada	<b>13.33%</b> (2/15)	<b>60%</b> (9/15)	<b>26.67%</b> (4/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)
Colorado	<b>29.41%</b> (15/51)	<b>35.29%</b> (18/51)	<b>25.49%</b> (13/51)	<b>5.88%</b> (3/51)	<b>3.92%</b> (2/51)	<b>0%</b> (0/51)	<b>0%</b> (0/51)
New Mexico	<b>41.67%</b> (5/12)	<b>33.33%</b> (4/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah	<b>25%</b> (6/24)	<b>25%</b> (6/24)	<b>25%</b> (6/24)	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)	<b>8.33%</b> (2/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)
Wyoming	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>100%</b> (5/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b><i>Occupation / Affiliation</i></b>							
Water Manager / Government	<b>23%</b> (23/100)	<b>43%</b> (43/100)	<b>18%</b> (18/100)	<b>7%</b> (7/100)	<b>3%</b> (3/100)	<b>4%</b> (4/100)	<b>2%</b> (2/100)
Water Professional	<b>19.7%</b> (13/66)	<b>36.36%</b> (24/66)	<b>22.73%</b> (15/66)	<b>9.09%</b> (6/66)	<b>1.52%</b> (1/66)	<b>6.06%</b> (4/66)	<b>4.55%</b> (3/66)
Water User	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>44.44%</b> (4/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>34.78%</b> (8/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>21.7%</b> (46/212)	<b>37.74%</b> (80/212)	<b>22.17%</b> (47/212)	<b>8.02%</b> (17/212)	<b>2.36%</b> (5/212)	<b>5.66%</b> (12/212)	<b>2.36%</b> (5/212)



**Question 11g.** The following topics are the subject of current, ongoing negotiations in the Colorado River Basin. In your opinion, how important is it for negotiators to reach an agreement on each of these topics?

**Expansion of the System Conservation Program**

	Extremely important	Very important	Moderately important	Slightly important	Not at all important	Not sure	Never heard of it
<b><i>Region</i></b>							
Arizona	<b>30.61%</b> (15/49)	<b>38.78%</b> (19/49)	<b>16.33%</b> (8/49)	<b>10.2%</b> (5/49)	<b>2.04%</b> (1/49)	<b>0%</b> (0/49)	<b>2.04%</b> (1/49)
California	<b>28.57%</b> (8/28)	<b>50%</b> (14/28)	<b>7.14%</b> (2/28)	<b>10.71%</b> (3/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)	<b>3.57%</b> (1/28)
Nevada	<b>40%</b> (6/15)	<b>26.67%</b> (4/15)	<b>26.67%</b> (4/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)	<b>6.67%</b> (1/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)
Colorado	<b>22%</b> (11/50)	<b>36%</b> (18/50)	<b>30%</b> (15/50)	<b>10%</b> (5/50)	<b>0%</b> (0/50)	<b>2%</b> (1/50)	<b>0%</b> (0/50)
New Mexico	<b>25%</b> (3/12)	<b>50%</b> (6/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)	<b>29.17%</b> (7/24)	<b>25%</b> (6/24)	<b>25%</b> (6/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)
Wyoming	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>34.78%</b> (8/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b><i>Occupation / Affiliation</i></b>							
Water Manager / Government	<b>18%</b> (18/100)	<b>37%</b> (37/100)	<b>22%</b> (22/100)	<b>18%</b> (18/100)	<b>2%</b> (2/100)	<b>3%</b> (3/100)	<b>0%</b> (0/100)
Water Professional	<b>21.54%</b> (14/65)	<b>43.08%</b> (28/65)	<b>23.08%</b> (15/65)	<b>6.15%</b> (4/65)	<b>1.54%</b> (1/65)	<b>1.54%</b> (1/65)	<b>3.08%</b> (2/65)
Water User	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>42.86%</b> (6/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>50%</b> (4/8)	<b>37.5%</b> (3/8)	<b>12.5%</b> (1/8)	<b>0%</b> (0/8)	<b>0%</b> (0/8)	<b>0%</b> (0/8)	<b>0%</b> (0/8)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>56.52%</b> (13/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>25.24%</b> (53/210)	<b>37.62%</b> (79/210)	<b>20.48%</b> (43/210)	<b>12.38%</b> (26/210)	<b>1.43%</b> (3/210)	<b>1.9%</b> (4/210)	<b>0.95%</b> (2/210)

<b>Question 12. How reliable do you think your current supply of Colorado River water will be at its current size in the next 15 years?</b>							
	Very reliable	Mostly reliable	Somewhat reliable	Not too reliable	Unreliable	Not sure	N/A
<b>Region</b>							
Arizona	<b>6%</b> (3/50)	<b>34%</b> (17/50)	<b>46%</b> (23/50)	<b>10%</b> (5/50)	<b>0%</b> (0/50)	<b>0%</b> (0/50)	<b>4%</b> (2/50)
California	<b>17.86%</b> (5/28)	<b>46.43%</b> (13/28)	<b>25%</b> (7/28)	<b>3.57%</b> (1/28)	<b>7.14%</b> (2/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)
Nevada	<b>33.33%</b> (5/15)	<b>33.33%</b> (5/15)	<b>13.33%</b> (2/15)	<b>13.33%</b> (2/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)	<b>6.67%</b> (1/15)
Colorado	<b>13.73%</b> (7/51)	<b>52.94%</b> (27/51)	<b>19.61%</b> (10/51)	<b>3.92%</b> (2/51)	<b>1.96%</b> (1/51)	<b>3.92%</b> (2/51)	<b>3.92%</b> (2/51)
New Mexico	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>50%</b> (6/12)	<b>33.33%</b> (4/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah	<b>25%</b> (6/24)	<b>54.17%</b> (13/24)	<b>8.33%</b> (2/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)
Wyoming	<b>60%</b> (3/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Mexico	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>66.67%</b> (2/3)	<b>33.33%</b> (1/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Other / Unknown	<b>33.33%</b> (8/24)	<b>33.33%</b> (8/24)	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>							
Water Manager / Government	<b>21%</b> (21/100)	<b>47%</b> (47/100)	<b>22%</b> (22/100)	<b>4%</b> (4/100)	<b>3%</b> (3/100)	<b>0%</b> (0/100)	<b>3%</b> (3/100)
Water Professional	<b>10.61%</b> (7/66)	<b>42.42%</b> (28/66)	<b>33.33%</b> (22/66)	<b>6.06%</b> (4/66)	<b>1.52%</b> (1/66)	<b>1.52%</b> (1/66)	<b>4.55%</b> (3/66)
Water User	<b>33.33%</b> (5/15)	<b>60%</b> (9/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)	<b>6.67%</b> (1/15)
Citizen / Other or Unknown	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)
Nongovernmental Organization	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>34.78%</b> (8/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>04.35%</b> (1/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>17.37%</b> (37/213)	<b>44.13%</b> (94/213)	<b>24.88%</b> (53/213)	<b>5.63%</b> (12/213)	<b>2.35%</b> (5/213)	<b>1.41%</b> (3/213)	<b>4.23%</b> (9/213)

**Question 13. Between now and 2026, what do you think the chances are that Lake Mead storage will drop to a level that requires curtailments to CAP (as called for in the shortage sharing rules)?**

	Very Likely (≥ 90%)	Probable (≥ 70%)	Possible (~ 50%)	Unlikely (≤ 30%)	Very Unlikely (≤ 10%)
<b>Region</b>					
Arizona					
2010	<b>14.5%</b> (8/55)	<b>41.8%</b> (23/55)	<b>32.7%</b> (18/55)	<b>7.3%</b> (4/55)	<b>3.6%</b> (2/55)
2016	<b>60%</b> (30/50)	<b>28%</b> (14/50)	<b>10%</b> (5/50)	<b>0%</b> (0/50)	<b>2%</b> (1/50)
California					
2010	<b>20%</b> (7/35)	<b>31.4%</b> (11/35)	<b>40%</b> (14/35)	<b>8.6%</b> (3/35)	<b>0%</b> (0/35)
2016	<b>25%</b> (7/28)	<b>46.43%</b> (13/28)	<b>28.57%</b> (8/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)
Nevada					
2010	<b>40%</b> (10/25)	<b>32%</b> (8/25)	<b>8%</b> (2/25)	<b>16%</b> (4/25)	<b>4%</b> (1/25)
2016	<b>53.3%</b> (8/15)	<b>33.33%</b> (5/15)	<b>13.33%</b> (2/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)
Colorado					
2010	<b>3.8%</b> (1/26)	<b>26.9%</b> (7/26)	<b>34.6%</b> (9/26)	<b>19.2%</b> (5/26)	<b>15.4%</b> (4/26)
2016	<b>35.29%</b> (18/51)	<b>37.25%</b> (19/51)	<b>19.61%</b> (10/51)	<b>5.88%</b> (3/51)	<b>1.96%</b> (1/51)
New Mexico					
2010	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)	<b>66.7%</b> (4/6)	<b>0%</b> (0/6)	<b>0%</b> (0/6)
2016	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>66.67%</b> (8/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah					
2010	<b>27.8%</b> (5/18)	<b>16.7%</b> (3/18)	<b>22.2%</b> (4/18)	<b>22.2%</b> (4/18)	<b>11.1%</b> (2/18)
2016	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)	<b>50%</b> (12/24)	<b>33.33%</b> (8/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)
Wyoming					
2010	<b>12.5%</b> (1/8)	<b>25%</b> (2/8)	<b>37.5%</b> (3/8)	<b>25%</b> (2/8)	<b>0%</b> (0/8)
2016	<b>80%</b> (4/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Other/unknown					
2010	<b>14.3%</b> (1/7)	<b>57.1%</b> (4/7)	<b>28.6%</b> (2/7)	<b>0%</b> (0/7)	<b>0%</b> (0/7)
2016	<b>29.17%</b>	<b>41.67%</b>	<b>29.17%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>

	(7/24)	(10/24)	(7/24)	(0/24)	(0/24)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>					
Water Manager/ Government					
2010	<b>17.4%</b> (16/92)	<b>32.6%</b> (30/92)	<b>30.4%</b> (28/92)	<b>14.1%</b> (13/92)	<b>5.4%</b> (5/92)
2016	<b>37%</b> (37/100)	<b>39%</b> (39/100)	<b>21%</b> (21/100)	<b>2%</b> (2/100)	<b>1%</b> (1/100)
Water Professional					
2010	<b>16.7%</b> (9/54)	<b>33.3%</b> (18/54)	<b>31.5%</b> (17/54)	<b>11.1%</b> (6/54)	<b>7.4%</b> (4/54)
2016	<b>36.36%</b> (24/66)	<b>39.39%</b> (26/66)	<b>22.73%</b> (15/66)	<b>1.52%</b> (1/66)	<b>0%</b> (0/66)
Water User					
2010	<b>35.7%</b> (5/14)	<b>28.6%</b> (4/14)	<b>28.6%</b> (4/14)	<b>7.1%</b> (1/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
2016	<b>46.67%</b> (7/15)	<b>26.67%</b> (4/15)	<b>20%</b> (3/15)	<b>6.67%</b> (1/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)
Citizen/Other or Unknown					
2010	<b>14.3%</b> (2/14)	<b>42.9%</b> (6/14)	<b>35.7%</b> (5/14)	<b>7.1%</b> (1/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
2016	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>66.67%</b> (6/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization					
2010	<b>33.3%</b> (2/6)	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)	<b>33.3%</b> (2/6)	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)	<b>0%</b> (0/6)
2016	<b>56.52%</b> (13/23)	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>					
Count					
2010: 180	<b>18.9%</b> (34/180)	<b>32.8%</b> (59/180)	<b>31.1%</b> (56/180)	<b>12.2%</b> (22/180)	<b>5%</b> (9/180)
2016: 212	<b>39.15%</b> (83/212)	<b>38.68%</b> (82/212)	<b>19.81%</b> (42/212)	<b>1.42%</b> (3/212)	<b>0.94%</b> (2/212)

**Question 14. What do you think the chances are that a “compact call” will arise between the Upper and Lower Basins by 2026?**

	Very Likely (≥ 90%)	Probable (≥ 70%)	Possible (~ 50%)	Unlikely (≤ 30%)	Very Unlikely (≤ 10%)
<b>Region</b>					
Arizona					
2010	<b>1.9%</b> (1/52)	<b>30.8%</b> (16/52)	<b>28.8%</b> (15/52)	<b>23.1%</b> (12/52)	<b>15.4%</b> (8/52)
2016	<b>4%</b> (2/50)	<b>22%</b> (11/50)	<b>50%</b> (25/50)	<b>18%</b> (9/50)	<b>6%</b> (3/50)
California					
2010	<b>8.8%</b> (3/34)	<b>41.2%</b> (14/34)	<b>23.5%</b> (8/34)	<b>17.6%</b> (6/34)	<b>8.8%</b> (3/34)
2016	<b>3.7%</b> (1/27)	<b>25.93%</b> (7/27)	<b>48.15%</b> (13/27)	<b>7.41%</b> (2/27)	<b>14.81%</b> (4/27)
Nevada					
2010	<b>18.2%</b> (4/22)	<b>31.8%</b> (7/22)	<b>27.3%</b> (6/22)	<b>9.1%</b> (2/22)	<b>13.6%</b> (3/22)
2016	<b>13.33%</b> (2/15)	<b>40%</b> (6/15)	<b>6.67%</b> (1/15)	<b>13.33%</b> (2/15)	<b>26.67%</b> (4/15)
Colorado					
2010	<b>3.8%</b> (1/26)	<b>23.1%</b> (6/26)	<b>15.4%</b> (4/26)	<b>34.6%</b> (9/26)	<b>23.1%</b> (6/26)
2016	<b>9.8%</b> (5/51)	<b>17.65%</b> (9/51)	<b>17.65%</b> (9/51)	<b>25.49%</b> (13/51)	<b>29.41%</b> (15/51)
New Mexico					
2010	<b>0%</b> (0/6)	<b>50%</b> (3/6)	<b>50%</b> (3/6)	<b>0%</b> (0/6)	<b>0%</b> (0/6)
2016	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>33.33%</b> (4/12)	<b>33.33%</b> (4/12)	<b>25%</b> (3/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah					
2010	<b>5.9%</b> (1/17)	<b>29.4%</b> (5/17)	<b>17.6%</b> (3/17)	<b>23.5%</b> (4/17)	<b>23.5%</b> (4/17)
2016	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)	<b>33.33%</b> (8/24)	<b>29.17%</b> (7/24)	<b>8.33%</b> (2/24)	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)
Wyoming					
2010	<b>0%</b> (0/8)	<b>37.5%</b> (3/8)	<b>25%</b> (2/8)	<b>25%</b> (2/8)	<b>12.5%</b> (1/8)
2016	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)
Other/Unknown					
2010	<b>0%</b> (0/7)	<b>33.3%</b> (2/7)	<b>16.6%</b> (1/7)	<b>0%</b> (1/7)	<b>50%</b> (3/7)
2016	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)	<b>54.17%</b> (13/24)	<b>25%</b> (6/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)

<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>					
Water Manager / Government					
2010	<b>6.7%</b> (6/89)	<b>30.3%</b> (27/89)	<b>23.6%</b> (21/89)	<b>19.1%</b> (17/89)	<b>20.2%</b> (18/89)
2016	<b>6%</b> (6/100)	<b>21%</b> (21/100)	<b>35%</b> (35/100)	<b>16%</b> (16/100)	<b>22%</b> (22/100)
Water Professional					
2010	<b>4%</b> (2/50)	<b>26%</b> (13/50)	<b>26%</b> (13/50)	<b>28%</b> (14/50)	<b>16%</b> (8/50)
2016	<b>7.69%</b> (5/65)	<b>24.62%</b> (16/65)	<b>35.38%</b> (23/65)	<b>23.08%</b> (15/65)	<b>9.23%</b> (6/65)
Water User					
2010	<b>7.7%</b> (1/13)	<b>69.2%</b> (9/13)	<b>15.4%</b> (2/13)	<b>7.7%</b> (1/13)	<b>0%</b> (0/13)
2016	<b>26.67%</b> (4/15)	<b>20%</b> (3/15)	<b>20%</b> (3/15)	<b>20%</b> (3/15)	<b>13.33%</b> (2/15)
Citizen / Other or Unknown					
2010	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>50%</b> (7/14)	<b>35.7%</b> (5/14)	<b>14.3%</b> (2/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
2016	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>55.56%</b> (5/9)	<b>44.44%</b> (4/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization					
2010	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)	<b>0%</b> (0/6)	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)	<b>33.3%</b> (2/6)	<b>33.3%</b> (2/6)
2016	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>39.13%</b> (9/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>					
2010: 172	<b>5.8%</b> (10/172)	<b>32.6%</b> (56/172)	<b>24.4%</b> (42/172)	<b>20.9%</b> (36/172)	<b>16.3%</b> (28/172)
2016: 211	<b>8.53%</b> (18/211)	<b>23.7%</b> (50/211)	<b>34.6%</b> (73/211)	<b>18.01%</b> (38/211)	<b>15.17%</b> (32/211)

**Question 15. What do you think the chances are that a “compact call” will arise between the Upper and Lower Basins by 2050?**

	Very Likely (≥ 90%)	Probable (≥ 70%)	Possible (~ 50%)	Unlikely (≤ 30%)	Very Unlikely (≤ 10%)
<b>Region</b>					
Arizona					
2010	<b>23.8%</b> (10/42)	<b>28.6%</b> (12/42)	<b>26.2%</b> (11/42)	<b>14.3%</b> (6/42)	<b>7.1%</b> (3/42)
2016	<b>24.49%</b> (12/49)	<b>28.57%</b> (14/49)	<b>36.73%</b> (18/49)	<b>10.20%</b> (5/49)	<b>0%</b> (0/49)
California					
2010	<b>32.1%</b> (9/28)	<b>35.7%</b> (10/28)	<b>14.3%</b> (4/28)	<b>7.1%</b> (2/28)	<b>10.7%</b> (3/28)
2016	<b>22.22%</b> (6/27)	<b>33.33%</b> (9/27)	<b>29.63%</b> (8/27)	<b>3.70%</b> (1/27)	<b>11.11%</b> (3/27)
Nevada					
2010	<b>30.4%</b> (7/23)	<b>43.5%</b> (10/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>13%</b> (3/23)	<b>4.3%</b> (1/23)
2016	<b>46.67%</b> (7/15)	<b>13.33%</b> (2/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)	<b>33.33%</b> (5/15)	<b>6.67%</b> (1/15)
Colorado					
2010	<b>28%</b> (7/25)	<b>8%</b> (2/25)	<b>36%</b> (9/25)	<b>16%</b> (4/25)	<b>12%</b> (3/25)
2016	<b>23.53%</b> (12/51)	<b>23.53%</b> (12/51)	<b>21.57%</b> (11/51)	<b>21.57%</b> (11/51)	<b>9.8%</b> (5/51)
New Mexico					
2010	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
2016	<b>27.27%</b> (3/11)	<b>36.36%</b> (4/11)	<b>27.27%</b> (3/11)	<b>9.09%</b> (1/11)	<b>0%</b> (0/11)
Utah					
2010	<b>15.4%</b> (2/13)	<b>15.4%</b> (2/13)	<b>15.4%</b> (2/13)	<b>46.2%</b> (6/13)	<b>7.7%</b> (1/13)
2016	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>39.13%</b> (9/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)
Wyoming					
2010	<b>37.5%</b> (3/8)	<b>12.5%</b> (1/8)	<b>37.5%</b> (3/8)	<b>12.5%</b> (1/8)	<b>0%</b> (0/8)
2016	<b>60%</b> (3/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)
Other/Unknown					
2010	<b>16.67%</b> (1/6)	<b>16.67%</b> (1/6)	<b>33.33%</b> (2/6)	<b>0%</b> (0/6)	<b>33.3%</b> (2/6)
2016	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)	<b>29.17%</b> (7/24)	<b>45.83%</b> (11/24)	<b>8.33%</b> (2/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)

<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>					
Water Manager / Government					
2010	<b>25.3%</b> (21/83)	<b>24.1%</b> (20/83)	<b>25.3%</b> (21/83)	<b>18.1%</b> (15/83)	<b>7.2%</b> (6/83)
2016	<b>26.26%</b> (26/99)	<b>26.26%</b> (26/99)	<b>25.25%</b> (25/99)	<b>16.16%</b> (16/99)	<b>6.06%</b> (6/99)
Water Professional					
2010	<b>23.8%</b> (10/42)	<b>28.6%</b> (12/42)	<b>16.7%</b> (7/42)	<b>16.7%</b> (7/42)	<b>14.3%</b> (6/42)
2016	<b>21.54%</b> (14/65)	<b>26.15%</b> (17/65)	<b>33.85%</b> (22/65)	<b>13.85%</b> (9/65)	<b>4.62%</b> (3/65)
Water User					
2010	<b>44.4%</b> (4/9)	<b>33.3%</b> (3/9)	<b>22.2%</b> (2/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
2016	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>42.86%</b> (6/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown					
2010	<b>54.5%</b> (6/11)	<b>36.4%</b> (4/11)	<b>9.1%</b> (1/11)	<b>0%</b> (0/11)	<b>0%</b> (0/11)
2016	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>44.44%</b> (4/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization					
2010	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>60%</b> (3/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)
2016	<b>36.36%</b> (8/22)	<b>22.73%</b> (5/22)	<b>31.82%</b> (7/22)	<b>9.09%</b> (2/22)	<b>0%</b> (0/22)
<b>TOTAL</b>					
2010: 150	<b>27.3%</b> (41/150)	<b>26.7%</b> (40/150)	<b>22.7%</b> (34/150)	<b>14.7%</b> (22/150)	<b>8.7%</b> (13/150)
2016: 208	<b>26.44%</b> (55/208)	<b>27.88%</b> (58/208)	<b>26.92%</b> (56/208)	<b>13.46%</b> (28/208)	<b>5.29%</b> (11/208)



**Question 16. Between now and 2050, do you expect average natural flows on the river (at Lee's Ferry) to be:**

	Roughly the same as the past century (about 15 MAF/year)	Higher than the previous century	Lower than the previous century	Don't know
<b>Region</b>				
Arizona				
2010	<b>31.6%</b> (18/57)	<b>1.8%</b> (1/57)	<b>56.1%</b> (32/57)	<b>10.5%</b> (6/57)
2016	<b>16%</b> (8/50)	<b>2%</b> (1/50)	<b>74%</b> (37/50)	<b>8%</b> (4/50)
California				
2010	<b>22.9%</b> (8/35)	<b>0%</b> (0/35)	<b>65.7%</b> (23/35)	<b>11.4%</b> (4/35)
2016	<b>10.71%</b> (3/28)	<b>3.57%</b> (1/28)	<b>71.43%</b> (20/28)	<b>14.29%</b> (4/28)
Nevada				
2010	<b>32%</b> (8/25)	<b>0%</b> (0/25)	<b>64%</b> (16/25)	<b>4%</b> (1/25)
2016	<b>0%</b> (0/15)	<b>6.67%</b> (1/15)	<b>80%</b> (12/15)	<b>13.33%</b> (2/15)
Colorado				
2010	<b>35.7%</b> (10/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)	<b>46.4%</b> (13/28)	<b>17.9%</b> (5/28)
2016	<b>11.76%</b> (6/51)	<b>0%</b> (0/51)	<b>72.55%</b> (37/51)	<b>15.69%</b> (8/51)
New Mexico				
2010	<b>0%</b> (0/6)	<b>0%</b> (0/6)	<b>83.3%</b> (5/6)	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)
2016	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>83.33%</b> (10/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)
Utah				
2010	<b>38.9%</b> (7/18)	<b>0%</b> (0/18)	<b>38.9%</b> (7/18)	<b>22.2%</b> (4/18)
2016	<b>33.33%</b> (8/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)	<b>62.50%</b> (15/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)
Wyoming				
2010	<b>25%</b> (2/8)	<b>0%</b> (0/8)	<b>62.5%</b> (5/8)	<b>12.5%</b> (1/8)
2016	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>80%</b> (4/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)
Other/Unknown				
2010	<b>42.9%</b> (3/7)	<b>0%</b> (0/7)	<b>57.1%</b> (4/7)	<b>0%</b> (0/7)
2016	<b>8.33%</b> (2/24)	<b>0%</b> (0/24)	<b>75%</b> (18/24)	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)
<b>Occupation/Affiliation</b>				
Water Manager / Government				
2010	<b>27.7%</b> (26/94)	<b>1.1%</b> (1/94)	<b>60.6%</b> (57/94)	<b>10.6%</b> (10/94)
2016	<b>13%</b> (13/100)	<b>1%</b> (1/100)	<b>73%</b> (73/100)	<b>13%</b> (13/100)
Water Professional				
2010	<b>35.1%</b> (20/57)	<b>0%</b> (0/57)	<b>50.9%</b> (29/57)	<b>14%</b> (8/57)
2016	<b>12.12%</b> (8/66)	<b>0%</b> (0/66)	<b>71.21%</b> (47/66)	<b>16.67%</b> (11/66)

Water User				
2010	<b>15.4%</b> (2/13)	<b>0%</b> (0/13)	<b>53.8%</b> (7/13)	<b>30.8%</b> (4/13)
2016	<b>20%</b> (3/15)	<b>13.33%</b> (2/15)	<b>60%</b> (9/15)	<b>6.67%</b> (1/15)
Citizen / Other or Unknown				
2010	<b>42.9%</b> (6/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>57.1%</b> (8/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
2016	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>88.89%</b> (8/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization				
2010	<b>33.3%</b> (2/6)	<b>0%</b> (0/6)	<b>66.7%</b> (4/6)	<b>0%</b> (0/6)
2016	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>86.96%</b> (20/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>				
2010: 184	<b>30.4%</b> (56/184)	<b>0.5%</b> (1/184)	<b>57.1%</b> (105/184)	<b>12%</b> (22/184)
2016: 213	<b>12.68%</b> (27/213)	<b>1.41%</b> (3/213)	<b>73.71%</b> (157/213)	<b>12.21%</b> (26/213)

**Question 17. Based on your understanding of water use trends and projections, at what point in time do you expect total average water demands on the Colorado River to meet (or exceed) total average supplies (based on 10-year running averages)?**

	It has already happened	By 2020	By 2050	Later than 2050
<b>Region</b>				
Arizona				
2010	<b>37.7%</b> (20/53)	<b>28.3%</b> (15/53)	<b>22.6%</b> (12/53)	<b>11.3%</b> (6/53)
2016	<b>58%</b> (29/50)	<b>22%</b> (11/50)	<b>20%</b> (10/50)	<b>0%</b> (0/50)
California				
2010	<b>42.9%</b> (15/35)	<b>40%</b> (14/35)	<b>14.3%</b> (5/35)	<b>2.9%</b> (1/35)
2016	<b>62.96%</b> (17/27)	<b>25.93%</b> (7/27)	<b>7.41%</b> (2/27)	<b>3.7%</b> (1/27)
Nevada				
2010	<b>60%</b> (15/25)	<b>20%</b> (5/25)	<b>16%</b> (4/25)	<b>4%</b> (1/25)
2016	<b>66.67%</b> (10/15)	<b>20%</b> (3/15)	<b>13.33%</b> (2/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)
Colorado				
2010	<b>23.8%</b> (5/21)	<b>23.8%</b> (5/21)	<b>33.33%</b> (7/21)	<b>19%</b> (4/21)
2016	<b>64.71%</b> (33/51)	<b>17.65%</b> (9/51)	<b>15.69%</b> (8/51)	<b>1.96%</b> (1/51)
New Mexico				
2010	<b>50%</b> (3/6)	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)	<b>33.3%</b> (2/6)	<b>0%</b> (0/6)
2016	<b>83.33%</b> (10/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah				
2010	<b>29.4%</b> (5/17)	<b>11.8%</b> (2/17)	<b>35.3%</b> (6/17)	<b>23.5%</b> (4/17)
2016	<b>41.67%</b> (10/24)	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)	<b>41.67%</b> (10/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)
Wyoming				
2010	<b>62.5%</b> (5/8)	<b>0%</b> (0/8)	<b>37.5%</b> (3/8)	<b>0%</b> (0/8)

2016	<b>60%</b> (3/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Other / Unknown				
2010	<b>71.4%</b> (5/7)	<b>28.6%</b> (2/7)	<b>0%</b> (0/7)	<b>0%</b> (0/7)
2016	<b>62.5%</b> (15/24)	<b>20.83%</b> (5/24)	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>				
Water Manager / Government				
2010	<b>39.1%</b> (34/87)	<b>28.7%</b> (25/87)	<b>25.3%</b> (22/87)	<b>6.9%</b> (6/87)
2016	<b>58.59%</b> (58/99)	<b>19.19%</b> (19/99)	<b>21.21%</b> (21/99)	<b>1.01%</b> (1/99)
Water Professional				
2010	<b>39.6%</b> (21/53)	<b>24.5%</b> (13/53)	<b>20.8%</b> (11/53)	<b>15.1%</b> (8/53)
2016	<b>57.58%</b> (38/66)	<b>19.7%</b> (13/66)	<b>19.7%</b> (13/66)	<b>3.03%</b> (2/66)
Water User				
2010	<b>50%</b> (6/12)	<b>33.33%</b> (4/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
2016	<b>66.67%</b> (10/15)	<b>26.67%</b> (4/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)	<b>6.67%</b> (1/15)
Citizen / Other or Unknown				
2010	<b>64.3%</b> (9/14)	<b>14.3%</b> (2/14)	<b>14.3%</b> (2/14)	<b>7.1%</b> (1/14)
2016	<b>44.44%</b> (4/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization				
2010	<b>50%</b> (3/6)	<b>0%</b> (0/6)	<b>33.3%</b> (2/6)	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)
2016	<b>86.96%</b> (20/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>				
2010: 172	<b>42.4%</b> (73/172)	<b>25.6%</b> (44/172)	<b>22.7%</b> (39/172)	<b>9.3%</b> (16/172)
2016: 212	<b>61.32%</b> (130/212)	<b>19.81%</b> (42/212)	<b>16.98%</b> (36/212)	<b>1.89%</b> (4/212)

**Question 18. In your opinion, will addressing current and future water availability concerns on the Colorado River require making changes to the Law of the River and related “institutional” arrangements?**

	No, the Law of the River is adequate as is	Minor updates or revisions may be needed	Significant changes to the Law of the River are necessary	The Law of the River is inadequate and requires a fundamental restructuring
<b>Region</b>				
Arizona				
2010	<b>19.2%</b> (10/52)	<b>57.7%</b> (30/52)	<b>13.5%</b> (7/52)	<b>9.6%</b> (5/52)
2016	<b>16%</b> (8/50)	<b>46%</b> (23/50)	<b>36%</b> (18/50)	<b>2%</b> (1/50)
California				
2010	<b>29.4%</b> (10/34)	<b>38.2%</b> (13/34)	<b>17.6%</b> (6/34)	<b>14.7%</b> (5/34)
2016	<b>22.22%</b> (6/27)	<b>40.74%</b> (11/27)	<b>29.63%</b> (8/27)	<b>7.41%</b> (2/27)
Nevada				
2010	<b>0%</b> (0/24)	<b>29.2%</b> (7/24)	<b>50%</b> (12/24)	<b>20.8%</b> (5/24)
2016	<b>13.33%</b> (2/15)	<b>53.33%</b> (8/15)	<b>26.67%</b> (4/15)	<b>6.67%</b> (1/15)
Colorado				
2010	<b>34.6%</b> (9/26)	<b>42.3%</b> (11/26)	<b>23.1%</b> (6/26)	<b>0%</b> (0/26)
2016	<b>15.69%</b> (8/51)	<b>50.98%</b> (26/51)	<b>31.37%</b> (16/51)	<b>1.96%</b> (1/51)
New Mexico				
2010	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)	<b>66.7%</b> (4/6)	<b>0%</b> (0/6)
2016	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)	<b>100%</b> (3/3)	<b>0%</b> (0/3)
Utah				
2010	<b>23.5%</b> (4/17)	<b>52.9%</b> (9/17)	<b>11.8%</b> (2/17)	<b>11.8%</b> (2/17)
2016	<b>29.17%</b> (7/24)	<b>45.83%</b> (11/24)	<b>20.83%</b> (5/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)
Wyoming				
2010	<b>50%</b> (4/8)	<b>50%</b> (4/8)	<b>0%</b> (0/8)	<b>0%</b> (0/8)
2016	<b>60%</b> (3/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Other / Unknown				
2010	<b>50%</b> (3/6)	<b>33.3%</b> (2/6)	<b>0%</b> (0/6)	<b>16.6%</b> (1/6)
2016	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)	<b>54.17%</b> (13/24)	<b>29.17%</b> (7/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>				
Water Manager / Government				
2010	<b>22%</b> (20/91)	<b>51.6%</b> (47/91)	<b>17.6%</b> (16/91)	<b>8.8%</b> (8/91)
2016	<b>19%</b> (19/100)	<b>55%</b> (55/100)	<b>23%</b> (23/100)	<b>3%</b> (3/100)

Water Professional				
2010	<b>24.5%</b> (13/53)	<b>39.6%</b> (21/53)	<b>28.3%</b> (15/53)	<b>7.5%</b> (4/53)
2016	<b>18.46%</b> (12/65)	<b>36.92%</b> (24/65)	<b>40%</b> (26/65)	<b>4.62%</b> (3/65)
Water User				
2010	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>25%</b> (3/12)	<b>33.33%</b> (4/12)	<b>25%</b> (3/12)
2016	<b>26.67%</b> (4/15)	<b>46.67%</b> (7/15)	<b>20%</b> (3/15)	<b>6.67%</b> (1/15)
Citizen / Other or Unknown				
2010	<b>18.1%</b> (2/11)	<b>54.5%</b> (6/11)	<b>9.1%</b> (1/11)	<b>18.1%</b> (2/11)
2016	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>55.56%</b> (5/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)
Nongovernmental Organization				
2010	<b>66.7%</b> (4/6)	<b>0%</b> (0/6)	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)
2016	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>60.87%</b> (14/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>				
2010: 173	<b>23.7%</b> (41/173)	<b>44.5%</b> (77/173)	<b>21.4%</b> (37/173)	<b>10.4%</b> (18/173)
2016: 212	<b>17.92%</b> (38/212)	<b>45.75%</b> (97/212)	<b>32.08%</b> (68/212)	<b>4.25%</b> (9/212)

**Question 19a: As policy-makers search for solutions, what general categories of strategies should be the primary focus of research and experimentation?**

- **OPTION: Improved technology to reduce wastes and inefficiencies (e.g., canal lining, advanced irrigation systems)**

	High Priority	Medium Priority	Not a Priority
<b>Region</b>			
Arizona			
2010	<b>42.1%</b> (24/57)	<b>47.4%</b> (27/57)	<b>10.5%</b> (6/57)
2016	<b>85.71%</b> (42/49)	<b>12.24%</b> (6/49)	<b>2.04%</b> (1/49)
California			
2010	<b>69.4%</b> (25/36)	<b>16.7%</b> (6/36)	<b>13.9%</b> (5/36)
2016	<b>92.86%</b> (26/28)	<b>7.14%</b> (2/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)
Nevada			
2010	<b>64%</b> (16/25)	<b>32%</b> (8/25)	<b>4%</b> (1/25)
2016	<b>66.67%</b> (10/15)	<b>33.33%</b> (5/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)
Colorado			
2010	<b>53.6%</b> (15/28)	<b>35.7%</b> (10/28)	<b>10.7%</b> (3/28)
2016	<b>88.24%</b> (45/51)	<b>9.8%</b> (5/51)	<b>1.96%</b> (1/51)
New Mexico			
2010	<b>100%</b> (6/6)	<b>0%</b> (0/6)	<b>0%</b> (0/6)
2016	<b>75%</b> (9/12)	<b>25%</b> (3/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah			
2010	<b>83.3%</b> (15/18)	<b>5.6%</b> (1/18)	<b>11.1%</b> (2/18)
2016	<b>75%</b> (18/24)	<b>20.83%</b> (5/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)
Wyoming			
2010	<b>62.5%</b> (5/8)	<b>37.5%</b> (3/8)	<b>0%</b> (0/8)
2016	<b>100%</b> (5/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Other / Unknown			
2010	<b>42.9%</b> (3/7)	<b>28.6%</b> (2/7)	<b>28.6%</b> (2/7)
2016	<b>78.26%</b> (18/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>			
Water Manager / Government			
2010	<b>58.5%</b> (55/94)	<b>29.8%</b> (28/94)	<b>11.7%</b> (11/94)
2016	<b>85%</b> (85/100)	<b>15%</b> (15/100)	<b>0%</b> (0/100)

Water Professional			
2010	<b>54.4%</b> (31/57)	<b>35.1%</b> (20/57)	<b>10.5%</b> (6/57)
2016	<b>78.46%</b> (51/65)	<b>18.46%</b> (12/65)	<b>3.08%</b> (2/65)
Water User			
2010	<b>57.1%</b> (8/14)	<b>28.6%</b> (4/14)	<b>14.3%</b> (2/14)
2016	<b>85.71%</b> (12/14)	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown			
2010	<b>85.7%</b> (12/14)	<b>14.3%</b> (2/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
2016	<b>77.78%</b> (7/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization			
2010	<b>50%</b> (3/6)	<b>50%</b> (3/6)	<b>0%</b> (0/6)
2016	<b>91.3%</b> (21/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>			
2010: 185	<b>58.9%</b> (109/185)	<b>30.8%</b> (57/185)	<b>10.3%</b> (19/185)
2016: 211	<b>83.41%</b> (176/211)	<b>15.17%</b> (32/211)	<b>1.42%</b> (3/211)



**Question 19b: As policy-makers search for solutions, what general categories of strategies should be the primary focus of research and experimentation?**

- **OPTION: Utilize desalination as part of a regional water management framework**

	High Priority	Medium Priority	Not a Priority
<b>Region</b>			
Arizona			
2010	<b>66.1%</b> (37/56)	<b>26.8%</b> (15/56)	<b>7.1%</b> (4/56)
2016	<b>64%</b> (32/50)	<b>32%</b> (16/50)	<b>4%</b> (2/50)
California			
2010	<b>65.7%</b> (23/35)	<b>22.9%</b> (8/35)	<b>11.4%</b> (4/35)
2016	<b>46.43%</b> (13/28)	<b>42.86%</b> (12/28)	<b>10.71%</b> (3/28)
Nevada			
2010	<b>60%</b> (15/25)	<b>40%</b> (10/25)	<b>0%</b> (0/25)
2016	<b>53.33%</b> (8/15)	<b>40%</b> (6/15)	<b>6.67%</b> (1/15)
Colorado			
2010	<b>30.8%</b> (8/26)	<b>50%</b> (13/26)	<b>19.2%</b> (5/26)
2016	<b>47.06%</b> (24/51)	<b>41.18%</b> (21/51)	<b>11.76%</b> (6/51)
New Mexico			
2010	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)	<b>66.7%</b> (4/6)	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)
2016	<b>50%</b> (6/12)	<b>50%</b> (6/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah			
2010	<b>47.1%</b> (8/17)	<b>29.4%</b> (5/17)	<b>23.5%</b> (4/17)
2016	<b>54.17%</b> (13/24)	<b>41.67%</b> (10/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)
Wyoming			
2010	<b>50%</b> (4/8)	<b>25%</b> (2/8)	<b>25%</b> (2/8)
2016	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>60%</b> (3/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Other / Unknown			
2010	<b>28.6%</b> (2/7)	<b>71.4%</b> (5/7)	<b>0%</b> (0/7)
2016	<b>43.48%</b> (10/23)	<b>47.83%</b> (11/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>			
Water Manager / Government			
2010	<b>52.2%</b> (48/92)	<b>38%</b> (35/92)	<b>9.8%</b> (9/92)
2016	<b>48%</b> (48/100)	<b>46%</b> (46/100)	<b>6%</b> (6/100)

Water Professional			
2010	<b>65.5%</b> (36/55)	<b>25.5%</b> (14/55)	<b>9.1%</b> (5/55)
2016	<b>62.12%</b> (41/66)	<b>33.33%</b> (22/66)	<b>4.55%</b> (3/66)
Water User			
2010	<b>57.1%</b> (8/14)	<b>28.6%</b> (4/14)	<b>14.3%</b> (2/14)
2016	<b>71.43%</b> (10/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown			
2010	<b>23.1%</b> (3/13)	<b>53.8%</b> (7/13)	<b>23.1%</b> (3/13)
2016	<b>44.44%</b> (4/9)	<b>44.44%</b> (4/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)
Nongovernmental Organization			
2010	<b>50%</b> (3/6)	<b>33.3%</b> (2/6)	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)
2016	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>52.17%</b> (12/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>			
2010: 180	<b>54.4%</b> (98/180)	<b>34.4%</b> (62/180)	<b>11.11%</b> (20/180)
2016: 212	<b>51.89%</b> (110/212)	<b>41.04%</b> (87/212)	<b>7.08%</b> (15/212)

**Question 19c: As policy-makers search for solutions, what general categories of strategies should be the primary focus of research and experimentation?**

- **OPTION: Encourage improved water management within states as the primary strategy for reducing interstate tensions and promoting improved basin-wide conditions**

	High Priority	Medium Priority	Not a Priority
<b>Region</b>			
Arizona			
2010	<b>50.9%</b> (27/53)	<b>28.3%</b> (15/53)	<b>20.8%</b> (11/53)
2016	<b>60%</b> (30/50)	<b>30%</b> (15/50)	<b>10%</b> (5/50)
California			
2010	<b>47.2%</b> (17/36)	<b>38.9%</b> (14/36)	<b>13.9%</b> (5/36)
2016	<b>60.71%</b> (17/28)	<b>39.29%</b> (11/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)
Nevada			
2010	<b>60%</b> (15/25)	<b>32%</b> (8/25)	<b>8%</b> (2/25)
2016	<b>40%</b> (6/15)	<b>46.67%</b> (7/15)	<b>13.33%</b> (2/15)
Colorado			
2010	<b>53.6%</b> (15/28)	<b>39.3%</b> (11/28)	<b>7.1%</b> (2/28)
2016	<b>68.63%</b> (35/51)	<b>31.37%</b> (16/51)	<b>0%</b> (0/51)
New Mexico			
2010	<b>100%</b> (6/6)	<b>0%</b> (0/6)	<b>0%</b> (0/6)
2016	<b>83.33%</b> (10/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah			
2010	<b>38.9%</b> (7/18)	<b>50%</b> (9/18)	<b>11.1%</b> (2/18)
2016	<b>62.50%</b> (15/24)	<b>33.33%</b> (8/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)
Wyoming			
2010	<b>50%</b> (4/8)	<b>37.5%</b> (3/8)	<b>12.5%</b> (1/8)
2016	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>60%</b> (3/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Other / Unknown			
2010	<b>57.1%</b> (4/7)	<b>14.3%</b> (1/7)	<b>28.6%</b> (2/7)
2016	<b>52.17%</b> (12/23)	<b>47.83%</b> (11/23)	<b>0%</b> (0/23)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>			
Water Manager / Government			
2010	<b>53.2%</b> (50/94)	<b>36.2%</b> (34/94)	<b>10.6%</b> (10/94)
2016	<b>56%</b> (56/100)	<b>41%</b> (41/100)	<b>3%</b> (3/100)

Water Professional			
2010	<b>47.3%</b> (26/55)	<b>34.5%</b> (19/55)	<b>18.2%</b> (10/55)
2016	<b>60.61%</b> (40/66)	<b>34.85%</b> (23/66)	<b>4.55%</b> (3/66)
Water User			
2010	<b>57.1%</b> (8/14)	<b>28.6%</b> (4/14)	<b>14.3%</b> (2/14)
2016	<b>64.29%</b> (9/14)	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown			
2010	<b>58.3%</b> (7/12)	<b>25%</b> (3/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)
2016	<b>66.67%</b> (6/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)
Nongovernmental Organization			
2010	<b>66.7%</b> (4/6)	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)
2016	<b>82.61%</b> (19/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>			
2010: 181	<b>52.5%</b> (95/181)	<b>33.7%</b> (61/181)	<b>13.8%</b> (25/181)
2016: 212	<b>61.32%</b> (130/212)	<b>34.43%</b> (73/212)	<b>4.25%</b> (9/212)

**Question 19d: As policy-makers search for solutions, what general categories of strategies should be the primary focus of research and experimentation?**

- **OPTION: Infrastructure updates and expansions designed to more fully capture high flows and/or reduce spills (e.g. tributary storage)**

	High Priority	Medium Priority	Not a Priority
<b>Region</b>			
Arizona			
2010	<b>43.6 %</b> (24/55)	<b>38.2%</b> (21/55)	<b>18.2%</b> (10/55)
2016	<b>57.14%</b> (28/49)	<b>22.45%</b> (11/49)	<b>20.41%</b> (10/49)
California			
2010	<b>51.4%</b> (18/35)	<b>42.9%</b> (15/35)	<b>5.7%</b> (2/35)
2016	<b>60.71%</b> (17/28)	<b>28.57%</b> (8/28)	<b>10.71%</b> (3/28)
Nevada			
2010	<b>40%</b> (10/25)	<b>52%</b> (13/25)	<b>8%</b> (2/25)
2016	<b>26.67%</b> (4/15)	<b>33.33%</b> (5/15)	<b>40%</b> (6/15)
Colorado			
2010	<b>51.9%</b> (14/27)	<b>37%</b> (10/27)	<b>11.1%</b> (3/27)
2016	<b>49.02%</b> (25/51)	<b>41.18%</b> (21/51)	<b>9.8%</b> (5/51)
New Mexico			
2010	<b>66.7%</b> (4/6)	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)
2016	<b>41.67%</b> (5/12)	<b>50%</b> (6/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)
Utah			
2010	<b>52.9%</b> (9/17)	<b>29.4%</b> (5/17)	<b>17.6%</b> (3/17)
2016	<b>50%</b> (12/24)	<b>37.5%</b> (9/24)	<b>12.5%</b> (3/24)
Wyoming			
2010	<b>37.5%</b> (3/8)	<b>37.5%</b> (3/8)	<b>25%</b> (2/8)
2016	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)
Other / Unknown			
2010	<b>42.9%</b> (3/7)	<b>14.3%</b> (1/7)	<b>42.9%</b> (3/7)
2016	<b>43.48%</b> (10/23)	<b>34.78%</b> (8/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>			
Water Manager / Government			
2010	<b>43.5%</b> (40/92)	<b>41.3%</b> (38/92)	<b>15.2%</b> (14/92)
2016	<b>41.41%</b> (41/99)	<b>41.41%</b> (41/99)	<b>17.17%</b> (17/99)

Water Professional			
2010	<b>55.6%</b> (30/54)	<b>31.5%</b> (17/54)	<b>13%</b> (7/54)
2016	<b>57.58%</b> (38/66)	<b>28.79%</b> (19/66)	<b>13.64%</b> (9/66)
Water User			
2010	<b>28.6%</b> (4/14)	<b>57.1%</b> (8/14)	<b>14.3%</b> (2/14)
2016	<b>71.43%</b> (10/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown			
2010	<b>50%</b> (7/14)	<b>35.7%</b> (5/14)	<b>14.3%</b> (2/14)
2016	<b>77.78%</b> (7/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization			
2010	<b>66.7%</b> (4/6)	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)
2016	<b>39.13%</b> (9/23)	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>			
2010: 180	<b>47.2%</b> (85/180)	<b>38.3%</b> (69/180)	<b>14.4%</b> (26/180)
2016: 211	<b>49.76%</b> (105/211)	<b>34.12%</b> (72/211)	<b>16.11%</b> (34/211)

**Question 19e: As policy-makers search for solutions, what general categories of strategies should be the primary focus of research and experimentation?**

- **OPTION: Pursue additional regional studies/planning efforts to better coordinate among jurisdictions and sectors including water, energy, land-use, and environment**

	High Priority	Medium Priority	Not a Priority
<b>Region</b>			
Arizona			
2010	<b>38.9%</b> (21/54)	<b>44.4%</b> (24/54)	<b>16.67%</b> (9/54)
2016	<b>52%</b> (26/50)	<b>38%</b> (19/50)	<b>10%</b> (5/50)
California			
2010	<b>38.9%</b> (14/36)	<b>41.7%</b> (15/36)	<b>19.4%</b> (7/36)
2016	<b>50%</b> (14/28)	<b>39.29%</b> (11/28)	<b>10.71%</b> (3/28)
Nevada			
2010	<b>40%</b> (10/25)	<b>40%</b> (10/25)	<b>20%</b> (5/25)
2016	<b>20%</b> (3/15)	<b>60%</b> (9/15)	<b>20%</b> (3/15)
Colorado			
2010	<b>25.9%</b> (7/27)	<b>55.6%</b> (15/27)	<b>18.5%</b> (5/27)
2016	<b>50.98%</b> (26/51)	<b>47.06%</b> (24/51)	<b>1.96%</b> (1/51)
New Mexico			
2010	<b>66.7%</b> (4/6)	<b>33.33%</b> (2/6)	<b>0%</b> (0/6)
2016	<b>66.67%</b> (8/12)	<b>33.33%</b> (4/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah			
2010	<b>44.4%</b> (8/18)	<b>44.4%</b> (8/18)	<b>11.1%</b> (2/18)
2016	<b>29.17%</b> (7/24)	<b>66.67%</b> (16/24)	<b>4.17%</b> (1/24)
Wyoming			
2010	<b>25%</b> (2/8)	<b>37.5%</b> (3/8)	<b>37.5%</b> (3/8)
2016	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)
Other / Unknown			
2010	<b>50%</b> (3/6)	<b>33.33%</b> (2/6)	<b>16.67%</b> (1/6)
2016	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>56.52%</b> (13/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>			
Water Manager / Government			
2010	<b>38.5%</b> (35/91)	<b>45.1%</b> (41/91)	<b>16.5%</b> (15/91)
2016	<b>37%</b> (37/100)	<b>52%</b> (52/100)	<b>11%</b> (11/100)

Water Professional			
2010	<b>33.9%</b> (19/56)	<b>51.8%</b> (29/56)	<b>14.3%</b> (8/56)
2016	<b>48.48%</b> (32/66)	<b>45.45%</b> (30/66)	<b>6.06%</b> (4/66)
Water User			
2010	<b>35.7%</b> (5/14)	<b>28.6%</b> (4/14)	<b>35.7%</b> (5/14)
2016	<b>14.29%</b> (2/14)	<b>50%</b> (7/14)	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown			
2010	<b>45.5%</b> (6/13)	<b>27.3%</b> (4/13)	<b>27.3%</b> (3/13)
2016	<b>66.67%</b> (6/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization			
2010	<b>66.7%</b> (4/6)	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)
2016	<b>65.22%</b> (15/23)	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>			
2010: 180	<b>38.33%</b> (69/180)	<b>43.9%</b> (79/180)	<b>17.8%</b> (32/180)
2016: 212	<b>43.4%</b> (92/212)	<b>46.7%</b> (99/212)	<b>9.91%</b> (21/212)



**Question 19f: As policy-makers search for solutions, what general categories of strategies should be the primary focus of research and experimentation?**

- **OPTION: Use pricing incentives and/or regulatory (non-structural) measures to more explicitly promote conservation and discourage waste**

	High Priority	Medium Priority	Not a Priority
<b>Region</b>			
Arizona			
2010	<b>30.2%</b> (16/53)	<b>35.8%</b> (19/53)	<b>33.9%</b> (18/53)
2016	<b>48.98%</b> (24/49)	<b>40.82%</b> (20/49)	<b>10.2%</b> (5/49)
California			
2010	<b>50%</b> (17/34)	<b>35.3%</b> (12/34)	<b>14.7%</b> (5/34)
2016	<b>64.29%</b> (18/28)	<b>32.14%</b> (9/28)	<b>3.57%</b> (1/28)
Nevada			
2010	<b>28%</b> (7/25)	<b>48%</b> (12/25)	<b>24%</b> (6/25)
2016	<b>66.67%</b> (10/15)	<b>33.33%</b> (5/15)	<b>0%</b> (0/15)
Colorado			
2010	<b>53.6%</b> (15/28)	<b>28.6%</b> (8/28)	<b>17.9%</b> (5/28)
2016	<b>66.67%</b> (34/51)	<b>31.37%</b> (16/51)	<b>1.96%</b> (1/51)
New Mexico			
2010	<b>83.3%</b> (5/6)	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)	<b>0%</b> (0/6)
2016	<b>83.33%</b> (10/12)	<b>16.67%</b> (2/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah			
2010	<b>22.2%</b> (4/18)	<b>61.1%</b> (11/18)	<b>16.7%</b> (3/18)
2016	<b>54.17%</b> (13/24)	<b>37.5%</b> (9/24)	<b>8.33%</b> (2/24)
Wyoming			
2010	<b>25%</b> (2/8)	<b>50%</b> (4/8)	<b>25%</b> (2/8)
2016	<b>80%</b> (4/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Other / Unknown			
2010	<b>50%</b> (3/6)	<b>33.33%</b> (2/6)	<b>16.67%</b> (1/6)
2016	<b>65.22%</b> (15/23)	<b>26.09%</b> (6/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>			
Water Manager / Government			
2010	<b>39.6 %</b> (36/91)	<b>38.5%</b> (35/91)	<b>22%</b> (20/91)
2016	<b>58%</b> (58/100)	<b>37%</b> (37/100)	<b>5%</b> (5/100)

Water Professional			
2010	<b>33.9%</b> (19/56)	<b>37.5%</b> (21/56)	<b>28.6%</b> (16/56)
2016	<b>61.54%</b> (40/65)	<b>30.77%</b> (20/65)	<b>7.69%</b> (5/65)
Water User			
2010	<b>46.2%</b> (6/13)	<b>30.8%</b> (4/13)	<b>23.1%</b> (3/13)
2016	<b>64.29%</b> (9/14)	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>7.14%</b> (1/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown			
2010	<b>50%</b> (6/12)	<b>41.67%</b> (5/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)
2016	<b>55.56%</b> (5/9)	<b>44.44%</b> (4/9)	<b>0%</b> (0/9)
Nongovernmental Organization			
2010	<b>33.3%</b> (2/6)	<b>66.7%</b> (4/6)	<b>0%</b> (0/6)
2016	<b>78.26%</b> (18/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>			
2010: 178	<b>38.8%</b> (69/178)	<b>38.8%</b> (69/178)	<b>22.5%</b> (40/178)
2016: 211	<b>61.61%</b> (130/211)	<b>32.7%</b> (69/211)	<b>5.69%</b> (12/211)

**Question 19g: As policy-makers search for solutions, what general categories of strategies should be the primary focus of research and experimentation?**

- **OPTION: Further enhance/refine rules for coordinated operation of Lakes Powell and Mead**

	High Priority	Medium Priority	Not a Priority
<b>Region</b>			
Arizona			
2010	<b>31.5%</b> (17/54)	<b>48.1%</b> (26/54)	<b>20.4%</b> (11/54)
2016	<b>44%</b> (22/50)	<b>44%</b> (22/50)	<b>12%</b> (6/50)
California			
2010	<b>12.5%</b> (4/32)	<b>46.9%</b> (15/32)	<b>40.6%</b> (13/32)
2016	<b>59.26%</b> (16/27)	<b>33.33%</b> (9/27)	<b>7.41%</b> (2/27)
Nevada			
2010	<b>44%</b> (11/25)	<b>48%</b> (12/25)	<b>8%</b> (2/25)
2016	<b>26.67%</b> (4/15)	<b>46.67%</b> (7/15)	<b>26.67%</b> (4/15)
Colorado			
2010	<b>26.1%</b> (6/23)	<b>52.2%</b> (12/23)	<b>21.7%</b> (5/23)
2016	<b>47.06%</b> (24/51)	<b>47.06%</b> (24/51)	<b>5.88%</b> (3/51)
New Mexico			
2010	<b>50%</b> (3/6)	<b>33.3%</b> (2/6)	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)
2016	<b>58.33%</b> (7/12)	<b>41.67%</b> (5/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah			
2010	<b>29.4%</b> (5/17)	<b>47.1%</b> (8/17)	<b>23.5%</b> (4/17)
2016	<b>45.83%</b> (11/24)	<b>37.5%</b> (9/24)	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)
Wyoming			
2010	<b>12.5%</b> (1/8)	<b>50%</b> (4/8)	<b>37.5%</b> (3/8)
2016	<b>60%</b> (3/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>0%</b> (0/5)
Other / Unknown			
2010	<b>50%</b> (3/6)	<b>33.33%</b> (2/6)	<b>16.67%</b> (1/6)
2016	<b>39.13%</b> (9/23)	<b>39.13%</b> (9/23)	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>			
Water Manager / Government			
2010	<b>30.2%</b> (26/86)	<b>44.2%</b> (38/86)	<b>25.6%</b> (22/86)
2016	<b>44%</b> (44/100)	<b>44%</b> (44/100)	<b>12%</b> (12/100)

Water Professional			
2010	<b>26.4%</b> (14/53)	<b>52.8%</b> (28/53)	<b>20.8%</b> (11/53)
2016	<b>52.31%</b> (34/65)	<b>38.46%</b> (25/65)	<b>9.23%</b> (6/65)
Water User			
2010	<b>23.1%</b> (3/13)	<b>46.2%</b> (6/13)	<b>30.8%</b> (4/13)
2016	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)	<b>42.86%</b> (6/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown			
2010	<b>42.9%</b> (6/14)	<b>50%</b> (7/14)	<b>7.1%</b> (1/14)
2016	<b>55.56%</b> (5/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)
Nongovernmental Organization			
2010	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)
2016	<b>43.48%</b> (10/23)	<b>43.48%</b> (10/23)	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>			
2010: 171	<b>29.2%</b> (50/171)	<b>47.4%</b> (81/171)	<b>23.4%</b> (40/171)
2016: 211	<b>46.45%</b> (98/211)	<b>41.71%</b> (88/211)	<b>11.85%</b> (25/211)

**Question 19h: As policy-makers search for solutions, what general categories of strategies should be the primary focus of research and experimentation?**

- **OPTION: River augmentation from weather modification (cloud seeding) and/or vegetation management (e.g., tamarisk control, logging)**

	High Priority	Medium Priority	Not a Priority
<b>Region</b>			
Arizona			
2010	<b>32.7 % (18/55)</b>	<b>41.8% (23/55)</b>	<b>25.5% (14/55)</b>
2016	<b>44% (22/50)</b>	<b>42% (21/50)</b>	<b>14% (7.50)</b>
California			
2010	<b>31.4% (11/35)</b>	<b>48.6% (17/35)</b>	<b>20% (7/35)</b>
2016	<b>60.71% (17/28)</b>	<b>39.29% (11/28)</b>	<b>0% (0/28)</b>
Nevada			
2010	<b>24% (6/25)</b>	<b>40% (10/25)</b>	<b>36% (9/25)</b>
2016	<b>46.67% (7/15)</b>	<b>26.67% (4/15)</b>	<b>26.67% (4/15)</b>
Colorado			
2010	<b>18.5% (5/27)</b>	<b>29.6% (8/27)</b>	<b>51.9% (14/27)</b>
2016	<b>50% (25/50)</b>	<b>24% (12/50)</b>	<b>26% (13/50)</b>
New Mexico			
2010	<b>16.7% (1/6)</b>	<b>66.7% (4/6)</b>	<b>16.7% (1/6)</b>
2016	<b>41.67% (5/12)</b>	<b>33.33% (4/12)</b>	<b>25% (3/12)</b>
Utah			
2010	<b>38.9% (7/18)</b>	<b>44.4% (8/18)</b>	<b>16.7% (3/18)</b>
2016	<b>41.67% (10/24)</b>	<b>37.5% (9/24)</b>	<b>20.83% (5/24)</b>
Wyoming			
2010	<b>42.9% (3/7)</b>	<b>42.9% (3/7)</b>	<b>14.3% (1/7)</b>
2016	<b>20% (1/5)</b>	<b>80% (4/5)</b>	<b>0% (0/5)</b>
Other / Unknown			
2010	<b>14.3% (1/7)</b>	<b>28.6% (2/7)</b>	<b>42.9% (3/7)</b>
2016	<b>34.78% (8/23)</b>	<b>56.52% (13/23)</b>	<b>8.7% (2/23)</b>
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>			
Water Manager / Government			
2010	<b>33% (30/91)</b>	<b>42.9% (39/91)</b>	<b>24.2% (22/91)</b>
2016	<b>52% (52/100)</b>	<b>34% (34/100)</b>	<b>14% (14/100)</b>

Water Professional			
2010	<b>26.8%</b> (15/56)	<b>42.9%</b> (24/56)	<b>30.4%</b> (17/56)
2016	<b>40.91%</b> (27/66)	<b>42.42%</b> (28/66)	<b>16.67%</b> (11/66)
Water User			
2010	<b>30.8%</b> (4/13)	<b>38.5%</b> (5/13)	<b>30.8%</b> (4/13)
2016	<b>64.29%</b> (9/14)	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown			
2010	<b>7.7%</b> (1/13)	<b>46.2%</b> (6/13)	<b>46.2%</b> (6/13)
2016	<b>37.5%</b> (3/8)	<b>50%</b> (4/8)	<b>12.5%</b> (1/8)
Nongovernmental Organization			
2010	<b>33.3%</b> (2/6)	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)	<b>50%</b> (3/6)
2016	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>39.13%</b> (9/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>			
2010: 179	<b>29.1%</b> (52/179)	<b>41.9%</b> (75/179)	<b>29.1%</b> (52/179)
2016: 211	<b>46.45%</b> (98/211)	<b>36.97%</b> (78/211)	<b>16.59%</b> (35/211)

**Question 19i: As policy-makers search for solutions, what general categories of strategies should be the primary focus of research and experimentation?**

- **OPTION: Promote voluntary water reallocation across state lines (e.g., water banking, marketing of ICS water)**

	High Priority	Medium Priority	Not a Priority
<b>Region</b>			
Arizona			
2010	<b>16.67%</b> (9/54)	<b>35.2%</b> (19/54)	<b>48.1%</b> (26/54)
2016	<b>51.02%</b> (25/49)	<b>20.41%</b> (10/49)	<b>28.57%</b> (14/49)
California			
2010	<b>37.1%</b> (13/35)	<b>42.9%</b> (15/35)	<b>20%</b> (7/35)
2016	<b>75%</b> (21/28)	<b>25%</b> (7/28)	<b>0%</b> (0/28)
Nevada			
2010	<b>52%</b> (13/25)	<b>32%</b> (8/25)	<b>16%</b> (4/25)
2016	<b>40%</b> (6/15)	<b>46.67%</b> (7/15)	<b>13.33%</b> (2/15)
Colorado			
2010	<b>10.7%</b> (3/28)	<b>39.3%</b> (11/28)	<b>50%</b> (14/28)
2016	<b>52.94%</b> (27/51)	<b>33.33%</b> (17/51)	<b>13.73%</b> (7/51)
New Mexico			
2010	<b>33.3%</b> (2/6)	<b>33.3%</b> (2/6)	<b>33.3%</b> (2/6)
2016	<b>75%</b> (9/12)	<b>25%</b> (3/12)	<b>0%</b> (0/12)
Utah			
2010	<b>5.9%</b> (1/17)	<b>23.5%</b> (4/17)	<b>70.6%</b> (12/17)
2016	<b>33.33%</b> (8/24)	<b>37.50%</b> (9/24)	<b>29.17%</b> (7/24)
Wyoming			
2010	<b>0%</b> (0/8)	<b>37.5%</b> (3/8)	<b>62.5%</b> (5/8)
2016	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)
Other / Unknown			
2010	<b>33.33%</b> (2/6)	<b>50%</b> (3/6)	<b>16.67%</b> (1/6)
2016	<b>68.18%</b> (15/22)	<b>18.18%</b> (4/22)	<b>13.64%</b> (3/22)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>			
Water Manager / Government			
2010	<b>18.5%</b> (17/92)	<b>33.7%</b> (31/92)	<b>47.8%</b> (44/92)
2016	<b>45.45%</b> (45/99)	<b>35.35%</b> (35/99)	<b>19.19%</b> (19/99)

Water Professional			
2010	<b>29.1%</b> (16/55)	<b>41.8%</b> (23/55)	<b>29.1%</b> (16/55)
2016	<b>63.08%</b> (41/65)	<b>23.08%</b> (15/65)	<b>13.85%</b> (9/65)
Water User			
2010	<b>38.5%</b> (5/13)	<b>38.5%</b> (5/13)	<b>23.1%</b> (3/13)
2016	<b>50%</b> (7/14)	<b>28.57%</b> (4/14)	<b>21.43%</b> (3/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown			
2010	<b>30.1%</b> (4/13)	<b>38.5%</b> (5/13)	<b>30.1%</b> (4/13)
2016	<b>66.67%</b> (6/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)
Nongovernmental Organization			
2010	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)	<b>66.7%</b> (4/6)
2016	<b>78.26%</b> (18/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>			
2010: 179	<b>23.5%</b> (43/179)	<b>35.5%</b> (65/179)	<b>38.8%</b> (71/179)
2016: 210	<b>55.71%</b> (117/210)	<b>28.1%</b> (59/210)	<b>16.19%</b> (34/210)



**Question 19j: As policy-makers search for solutions, what general categories of strategies should be the primary focus of research and experimentation?**

- **OPTION: Revisit key Compact terms and adopt rules to address points of ambiguity and dispute**

	High Priority	Medium Priority	Not a Priority
<b>Region</b>			
Arizona			
2010	<b>16.67%</b> (9/54)	<b>37%</b> (20/54)	<b>46.3%</b> (25/54)
2016	<b>22%</b> (11/50)	<b>48%</b> (24/50)	<b>30%</b> (15/50)
California			
2010	<b>18.8%</b> (6/32)	<b>40.6%</b> (13/32)	<b>40.6%</b> (13/32)
2016	<b>25%</b> (7/28)	<b>42.86%</b> (12/28)	<b>32.14%</b> (9/28)
Nevada			
2010	<b>50%</b> (11/22)	<b>31.8%</b> (7/22)	<b>18.2%</b> (4/22)
2016	<b>20%</b> (3/15)	<b>40%</b> (6/15)	<b>40%</b> (6/15)
Colorado			
2010	<b>23.1%</b> (6/26)	<b>38.5%</b> (10/26)	<b>38.5%</b> (10/26)
2016	<b>23.53%</b> (12/51)	<b>35.29%</b> (18/51)	<b>41.18%</b> (21/51)
New Mexico			
2010	<b>50%</b> (3/6)	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)	<b>33.3%</b> (2/6)
2016	<b>50%</b> (6/12)	<b>41.67%</b> (5/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)
Utah			
2010	<b>22.2%</b> (4/18)	<b>38.9%</b> (7/18)	<b>38.9%</b> (7/18)
2016	<b>20.83%</b> (5/24)	<b>62.5%</b> (15/24)	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)
Wyoming			
2010	<b>28.6%</b> (2/7)	<b>14.3%</b> (1/7)	<b>57.1%</b> (4/7)
2016	<b>0%</b> (0/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>60%</b> (3/5)
Other / Unknown			
2010	<b>0%</b> (0/6)	<b>33.33%</b> (2/6)	<b>66.67%</b> (4/6)
2016	<b>21.74%</b> (5/23)	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>47.83%</b> (11/23)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>			
Water Manager / Government			
2010	<b>23.3%</b> (20/86)	<b>37.2%</b> (32/86)	<b>39.5%</b> (34/86)
2016	<b>26%</b> (26/100)	<b>45%</b> (45/100)	<b>29%</b> (29/100)

Water Professional			
2010	<b>20.4%</b> (11/54)	<b>33.33%</b> (18/54)	<b>46.3%</b> (25/54)
2016	<b>22.73%</b> (15/66)	<b>33.33%</b> (22/66)	<b>43.94%</b> (29/66)
Water User			
2010	<b>38.5%</b> (5/13)	<b>38.5%</b> (5/13)	<b>23.1%</b> (3/13)
2016	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>42.86%</b> (6/14)	<b>57.14%</b> (8/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown			
2010	<b>25%</b> (3/12)	<b>41.67%</b> (5/12)	<b>33.33%</b> (4/12)
2016	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>66.67%</b> (6/9)	<b>11.11%</b> (1/9)
Nongovernmental Organization			
2010	<b>33.3%</b> (2/6)	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)	<b>50%</b> (3/6)
2016	<b>34.78%</b> (8/23)	<b>47.83%</b> (11/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>			
2010: 171	<b>24%</b> (41/171)	<b>35.7%</b> (61/171)	<b>40.4%</b> (69/171)
2016: 212	<b>24.06%</b> (51/212)	<b>42.45%</b> (90/212)	<b>33.49%</b> (71/212)

**Question 19k: As policy-makers search for solutions, what general categories of strategies should be the primary focus of research and experimentation?**

- **OPTION: Importation of water from other basins (e.g., Great Lakes, Columbia, Mississippi)**

	High Priority	Medium Priority	Not a Priority
<b>Region</b>			
Arizona			
2010	<b>5.7%</b> (3/53)	<b>22.6%</b> (12/53)	<b>71.7%</b> (38/53)
2016	<b>14%</b> (7/50)	<b>18%</b> (9/50)	<b>68%</b> (34/50)
California			
2010	<b>20.6%</b> (7/34)	<b>29.4%</b> (10/34)	<b>50%</b> (17/34)
2016	<b>25%</b> (7/28)	<b>17.86%</b> (5/28)	<b>57.14%</b> (16/28)
Nevada			
2010	<b>25%</b> (6/24)	<b>54.2%</b> (13/24)	<b>20.8%</b> (5/24)
2016	<b>13.33%</b> (2/15)	<b>13.33%</b> (2/15)	<b>73.33%</b> (11/15)
Colorado			
2010	<b>7.1%</b> (2/28)	<b>17.9%</b> (5/28)	<b>75%</b> (21/28)
2016	<b>6.12%</b> (3/49)	<b>26.53%</b> (13/49)	<b>67.35%</b> (33/49)
New Mexico			
2010	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)	<b>33.3%</b> (2/6)	<b>50%</b> (3/6)
2016	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)	<b>58.33%</b> (7/12)	<b>33.33%</b> (4/12)
Utah			
2010	<b>23.5%</b> (4/17)	<b>29.4%</b> (5/17)	<b>47.1%</b> (8/17)
2016	<b>16.67%</b> (4/24)	<b>45.83%</b> (11/24)	<b>37.5%</b> (9/24)
Wyoming			
2010	<b>12.5%</b> (1/8)	<b>50%</b> (4/8)	<b>37.5%</b> (3/8)
2016	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>60%</b> (3/5)
Other / Unknown			
2010	<b>0%</b> (0/7)	<b>42.9%</b> (3/7)	<b>57.1%</b> (4/7)
2016	<b>4.35%</b> (1/23)	<b>34.78%</b> (8/23)	<b>60.87%</b> (14/23)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>			
Water Manager / Government			
2010	<b>15.4%</b> (14/91)	<b>31.9%</b> (29/91)	<b>52.7%</b> (48/91)
2016	<b>16%</b> (16/100)	<b>29%</b> (29/100)	<b>55%</b> (55/100)

Water Professional			
2010	<b>5.55%</b> (3/54)	<b>35.2%</b> (19/54)	<b>59.3%</b> (32/54)
2016	<b>10.61%</b> (7/66)	<b>27.27%</b> (18/66)	<b>62.12%</b> (41/66)
Water User			
2010	<b>42.9%</b> (6/14)	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>57.1%</b> (8/14)
2016	<b>23.08%</b> (3/13)	<b>30.77%</b> (4/13)	<b>46.15%</b> (6/13)
Citizen / Other or Unknown			
2010	<b>0%</b> (0/12)	<b>41.67%</b> (5/12)	<b>58.33%</b> (7/12)
2016	<b>12.5%</b> (1/8)	<b>12.5%</b> (1/8)	<b>75%</b> (6/8)
Nongovernmental Organization			
2010	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)	<b>66.7%</b> (4/6)
2016	<b>0%</b> (0/23)	<b>17.39%</b> (4/23)	<b>82.61%</b> (19/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>			
2010: 177	<b>13.56%</b> (24/177)	<b>30.5%</b> (54/177)	<b>55.9%</b> (99/177)
2016: 210	<b>12.86%</b> (27/210)	<b>26.67%</b> (56/210)	<b>60.48%</b> (127/210)

**Question 19I: As policy-makers search for solutions, what general categories of strategies should be the primary focus of research and experimentation?**

- **OPTION: Establish a river basin organization to aid in regional decision-making**

	High Priority	Medium Priority	Not a Priority
<b>Region</b>			
Arizona			
2010	<b>7.7%</b> (4/52)	<b>23.1%</b> (12/52)	<b>69.2%</b> (36/52)
2016	<b>14%</b> (7/50)	<b>36%</b> (18/50)	<b>50%</b> (25/50)
California			
2010	<b>20%</b> (7/35)	<b>31.4%</b> (11/35)	<b>48.6%</b> (17/35)
2016	<b>10.71%</b> (3/28)	<b>35.71%</b> (10/28)	<b>53.57%</b> (15/28)
Nevada			
2010	<b>26.1%</b> (6/23)	<b>34.8%</b> (8/23)	<b>39.1%</b> (9/23)
2016	<b>13.33%</b> (2/15)	<b>46.67%</b> (7/15)	<b>40%</b> (6/15)
Colorado			
2010	<b>11.1%</b> (3/27)	<b>25.9%</b> (7/27)	<b>63%</b> (17/27)
2016	<b>11.76%</b> (6/51)	<b>45.1%</b> (23/51)	<b>43.14%</b> (22/51)
New Mexico			
2010	<b>33.3%</b> (2/6)	<b>50%</b> (3/6)	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)
2016	<b>41.67%</b> (5/12)	<b>50%</b> (6/12)	<b>8.33%</b> (1/12)
Utah			
2010	<b>11.1%</b> (2/18)	<b>16.7%</b> (3/18)	<b>72.2%</b> (13/18)
2016	<b>20.83%</b> (5/24)	<b>29.17%</b> (7/24)	<b>50%</b> (12/24)
Wyoming			
2010	<b>0%</b> (0/8)	<b>0%</b> (0/8)	<b>100%</b> (8/8)
2016	<b>20%</b> (1/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)	<b>40%</b> (2/5)
Other / Unknown			
2010	<b>25%</b> (1/4)	<b>0%</b> (0/4)	<b>75%</b> (3/4)
2016	<b>13.04%</b> (3/23)	<b>39.13%</b> (9/23)	<b>47.83%</b> (11/23)
<b>Occupation / Affiliation</b>			
Water Manager / Government			
2010	<b>7.6%</b> (7/92)	<b>28.3%</b> (26/92)	<b>64.1%</b> (59/92)
2016	<b>15%</b> (15/100)	<b>34%</b> (34/100)	<b>51%</b> (51/100)

Water Professional			
2010	<b>24.5%</b> (13/53)	<b>15.1%</b> (8/53)	<b>60.4%</b> (32/53)
2016	<b>18.18%</b> (12/66)	<b>36.36%</b> (24/66)	<b>45.45%</b> (30/66)
Water User			
2010	<b>15.4%</b> (2/13)	<b>53.8%</b> (7/13)	<b>30.8%</b> (4/13)
2016	<b>0%</b> (0/14)	<b>35.71%</b> (5/14)	<b>64.29%</b> (9/14)
Citizen / Other or Unknown			
2010	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>22.22%</b> (2/9)	<b>55.56%</b> (5/9)
2016	<b>0%</b> (0/9)	<b>66.67%</b> (6/9)	<b>33.33%</b> (3/9)
Nongovernmental Organization			
2010	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)	<b>16.7%</b> (1/6)	<b>66.7%</b> (4/6)
2016	<b>30.43%</b> (7/23)	<b>60.87%</b> (14/23)	<b>8.7%</b> (2/23)
<b>TOTAL</b>			
2010: 173	<b>14.5%</b> (25/173)	<b>25.4%</b> (44/173)	<b>60.1%</b> (104/173)
2016: 212	<b>16.04%</b> (34/212)	<b>39.15%</b> (83/212)	<b>44.81%</b> (95/212)

**Question 20: The preceding four questions featured a list of frequently mentioned strategies. We acknowledge, however, that many additional options are possible. In the box below, please describe any additional ideas or approaches that you think deserve more research and considerations.**

*Below are the unedited write-in comments (from 57 respondents) generated by this question:*

Lower Basin states should cut back and vigorously promote more conservation and support upper states in obtaining their full water allocation from the Colorado.

---

Weather modification (continue to pursue new technology and testing of applications) Evaluate the potential for desalination of unusable ground water in the Basin States. Continue to pursue the the latest technology in desalination and the potential for exchange with with entities with access to ocean water. Explore the latest technology for extracting water from ambient air.

---

Water-use reduction and conservation are critical and should be the top management priority, along with severe restrictions on growth in the Southwest, particularly in Las Vegas, Phoenix and southwestern Utah. I believe Glen Canyon Dam should be decommissioned to allow water to flow to Lake Mead, partly for supply reasons, and partly to help restore natural flows through both Glen Canyon and the Grand Canyon. The electrical power isn't needed, and the water loss through evaporation and seepage at the Lake Powell makes it a foolish option.

---

Augmentation is key to the future. Local jurisdictions and politicians encourage population and economic growth; that growth will come with water demand.

---

Incentives to create and redistribution of "saved" water resulting from less water intensive crop selection, more salt tolerant crop selection, reduction in use of water for cooling power plants, other industrial use savings, evaporative loss management in distribution systems, conversion of Salton Sea to low water need habitat and not open water habitat.

---

Lower Basin needs to account for evaporation out of their allocation - plan and simple. Lowers the SD by over half.

---

Planning on the Colorado River must include Indian Tribes and recognition that they have present perfected water rights in the Colorado River and its tributaries. Planning meetings by the BOR with non-Indian stakeholders continue to occur without any explicit, or even implicit, acknowledgement of the rights of the Tribes to the Colorado river. BOR is a trustee of the Indian water rights and they have fiduciary obligations that are different than either their contract obligations with regard to water delivery or their more general public trust responsibilities in the management of water.

---

Research is not required, but a review of the existing research is necessary. For example, the National Academy of Sciences should review the findings of the CRB Supply and Demand Study. The Basin Study is not a NEPA document, though it rightly should be. Therefore, the public was not allowed to openly scrutinize the findings of this document in the academic and judicial systems. The 29 tribes of the basin and the scholars of the humanities have not been consulted in this process either, especially as it relates to the ethics of providing water for the joy of Nature. This is a study by water managers for water managers and they are hopelessly

unqualified to provide solutions since they are responsible for the imbalance. While under their thumb, there will be no water justice.

---

Plus flows (Flushing flows) that don't generate electricity and that are strictly for ESA purposes should be reevaluated!

---

other new / different short term / interim /pilot voluntary compensated agreements that are not precedent setting or that impact water rights

---

Regarding the question of permanent or temporary curtailments that might arise from addressing the structural deficit, I ticked both as highly likely and more accurately I see permanent curtailment arrangements coming into place but they may only have effect in some years. Water users that become the most adept of working with that type of water supply will be those that prosper the most – it can be done (ref Murray-Darling Basin experience)!

---

A US government led program to divert floodwaters from one area of the US to other areas in need of water. Avoid the costs associated with flood damage while avoiding the economic downturns associated with drought. Benefit from the economic prosperity that having adequate reliable water supplies brings to an area. Get rid of the Endangered Species Act, such that responsible environmental approaches can be undertaken without the non-value added cottage industry environmental complaint specialists having an over-weighted impact on proceedings.

---

Instream flow allocations.

---

I have none

---

About 80% of Colo river is used to raise hay and cattle. That can be done more efficiently in other parts of the country.

---

National and regional study of efficiencies and priorities for food production - perhaps requiring water turns and water marketing for upper states - similar to what is done on a small scale within irrigation companies. Special considerations for Tribal interests - allowing marketing from upper to lower states thus providing economic benefit long-term and a means of promoting tributary storage or banking. Where irrigation is more efficient in more developed and better climatic conditions, perhaps allowing Indian Tribes to market will maximize Tribal and Regional interests.

---

Evaporation losses in Lake Mead should be shared by all water users in the Lower Basin States.

---

Aggressively explore how flexibility can be built into the system. Law of the River offers many protections, but does not incentive conservation (e.g. use or lose) so strategies like water banking that offer security to those who have water rights, yet afford flexibility to use that water where needed.

---

Revisions to operation of well fields in the Yuma region

---

Modificatons to the Human genome allowing survival with less water. . . Short of that, some study/comparison of the the aggregate economic benefits provided by current agricultural practices, including food-pricing and health benefits, and year-round availability, components, versus the aggregate benefits of water use in urban/municipal, commercial/industrial and environmental settings - to include watershed valuation and recreational components - seems like it could provide helpful data, long term.



Further, facilitating water market transfers within the current superstructure of the Law of the River, which is a dynamic and not static institution.

---

The previous four slides only mention a "one-size fits all" approach to problem solving. Where the states have found success and support is in assessing the problem and giving each community and/or state the ability to meet their respective obligations without another state or water user prescribing what another state or community should do. There is broad general agreement on the problems and broad support for working proactively to solve them. What works in Phoenix may not work in Denver and what works for the Imperial Irrigation District will not work for Yuma Valley Water Users.

---

Binational coordination with Mexico for shared drought contingency plans, water efficiency projects, storage and management of Lake Mead and the environment.

---

You did a profound study at CU regarding the impacts well pumping has had on the River. I don't believe that's widely known and it certainly has not been address vis a vis a requirement to provide replacement water, etc.

---

At the outset of any negotiations on changes in river management, engage Indian tribal governments directly and at the outset to insure that they become direct partners along with the federal and Basin state government in the management of the River.

---

Better survey questions if you want to get good feedback. Many questions were compound thus precluding a fair answer. Others used undefined terms that may have been misleading. A disappointing survey.

---

Rainwater harvesting, grey water systems, water reuse

---

Import water from the Gulf into the Salton Sea and desalination Salton Sea water to remove Salt and augment Lower Basin supplies. Another approach would be to implement the Lower Basin shortage criteria expected by the Congress in 1968 when CAP was authorized -- 1 MAF per year CAP shortage when Mead drops below 1124. Leaves water for only CAP cities and Tribes. No non-Indian agency water when Mead below 1124.

---

eliminate storage in Lake Powell.

---

The Secretary of the Interior already has tools available and legal obligations that would go far in addressing the Lower Basin structural deficit, but she has chosen not to use them. For example, the Secretary could use her authority under CFR Part 417 to charge water users for transportation losses and/or take into account unlined and inefficient distribution systems. The Secretary could charge water users for water ordered but not taken, which is currently lost to the system. The Secretary could comply with the Colorado River Salinity Control Act and replace bypass flows that are currently lost to the system. The Secretary could comply with section 4 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act and require California to provide 375 KAF from existing uses to satisfy the Mexican Treaty obligation. Congress could provide that proportionate evaporative losses are charged to Lower Basin contractors. There are many ways to fix current problems without wholesale change to the Law of the River.

---

I believe The Colorado River Board is sufficiently doing a good job with all aspects concerning governing the Colorado River!

---

Mechanisms for water transfers-developing models and templates, developing tools for price models to support the development of a water market, increasing the role of tribal water users and sharing conservation practices with this user base in particular

Inclusion of evaporation in the Lower Basin allocations.

---

lo

---

Institute 1922 compact terms of use and allocation. I.e. Count all tributary use against basin allocations including the Mexican deficiency accounting. Also note there is no such thing as a call to the upper basin by the lower basin only a curtailment of use if the rolling 10 year average to the lower basin drops below 75 Maf

---

Links between water conservation and energy, e.g. Floating PV

---

Take advantage of existing interstate relationships such as the Colorado River Water Users Association.

---

Maintain production agriculture in the Basin with assistance towards increased efficiency

---

The Law of the River has expanded over the last 15 years to adapt to significant changes in supply and demand and to meet environmental needs (interim surplus, operating (shortage) guidelines, MSCP, Minutes 318 and 319). Our future needs could be addressed with the adoption of standardized, reliable state-based programs and processes to implement water transfers to meet emerging needs.

---

Investigate opportunities to expand and manage local and regional water markets to alleviate supply/demand imbalances, secure water for municipalities, provide compensation for water use reductions, and restore healthy flows to rivers and streams.

---

tribal off-reservation leasing interstate water banking federal buyouts

---

I am not a direct beneficiary of decisions made by the CRWUA. So many of the questions did not apply

---

Structural deficit \*\*\*must be addressed\*\*\*. This major design flaw in the coordinated operations of Lakes Powell and Mead is the primary focal point of contention between the upper and lower division states. Water banking and conservation measures are very minor compared to the over-allocation issues in Arizona and California. The Law of the River must address firm yield based on current knowledge rather than wishful thinking from the 1920's. Until this is addressed, there will be controversy and contention in the basin. Also, the lower basin drought contingency plan as currently proposed is a shell game without real system recovery in mind.

---

Reduce Lower Basin allocations to account for system losses (i.e. evaporation of of Lake Mead, etc) and/or reduce lower basin allocations to account for one-half of the Mexican Treaty delivery obligation. Either of these strategies would, for the most part, solve the structural deficit issue in the Lower Basin.

---

Enforcing the Compacts as written would go a long way to address the structural deficit and other water supply problems in the Colorado River Basin.

---

This is not a new matter but I think water importation will ultimately be the only feasible solution. There will not likely be any additional water in the Colorado River, possibly less if in fact global warming is occurring/will occur, and the demands we know will continue to increase. Therefore a new supply is the only choice.

---

double down on Intentionally created surplus pilot. Those entities that will get cut in shortage need to help fund a larger effort. The least efficient systems are on tribal reservations; tribes must be included in these

programs to get the most bang for the buck. Tribes own 20% of CO river water, collectively they need to play far more significant role in solving this problem.

---

Interstate transfers of water, including tribal water marketing.

---

While participating in this survey, I'm not sure how Colo University defines "the Law of the River". How far beyond provisions embodied in the 1922 Compact are being considered?

---

The River should be managed as a single basin, with priority given to Grand Canyon flows mimicking natural hydrology and storage in Mead.

---

Social Engineering - Historically when a natural resource such as water is limited the population in the area naturally adjusts through wars, famine, disease, or migration. Better to adapt voluntarily than be forced through most historical processes.

---

ICS in Lake Powell for Upper Colorado Basin States

---

A general comment: To reshape or reopen the Law of the River may precipitate lawsuits that take decades to resolve. (History is a teacher of this.) Within the existing framework there are means and methods to find resolution between the states and Mexico in a cooperative way. ICS, Minute 319 and other discussions are a good start. Any discussions/negotiations need to be transparent and inclusive. It seems the tendency is gather in a small group have secret negotiations and the players outside of the discussion derail the thing.

---

Retire or temporarily fallow farmland through voluntary agreements with landowners. Irrigation districts do not represent interests of land owners. Land owners want economic incentives to fallow land, irrigation district managers and attorneys want as much water as possible and continued conflict to keep the billable hours flowing.

---

1) Planning and policy decisions should be made primarily by the States bound by the Law of the River - not be done by conservancy districts and NGOs. 2) The Law of the River has proven to be flexible enough to handle varying supply, demand, and structural issues and it would be a mistake (especially to the Upper Basin states) to promote changes to the underlying compacts. 3) Structural solutions, for example additional storage, expanded capacity to deliver water from lower levels in Lake Powell, should be considered. 4) Tribal rights are important, but a realistic look at developed should be considered in lieu of full reserved water rights.

---

Deficit irrigation

---

none come to mind

---