

I. Introduction

Participants were advised at the time they registered for the workshop that they would be asked to complete a survey at the end of the event.

The survey contained 3 classes of questions, the consent question, filtering questions, and information gathering questions. The consent question documents that the participant gave informed consent to participate. Filtering questions demonstrate that the group interviewed was diverse according to several characteristics including gender, ethnicity, length of irrigation practice, irrigation purpose (commercial or personal), and how far into the adjudication process the individual was.

There were several purposes for the survey: first, to cause the participants to review important points for better retention; second, as an assessment tool to see whether participants met the objectives of the workshop; third, as an assessment of what I was actually communicating during the workshop.

During the interviews, “short-timer” irrigators had been defined as those with less than 10 years irrigating (Q4). Seven attendees indicated that they were short-timers according to this definition. Just under half of the attendees indicated that they had responded to the summons. Of the remainder, two said they had never received a summons, and three could not recall. No one had received the OOJ as of the date of the workshop.

One participant declined to complete the survey saying that her husband completed it for both of them. Based on observation I would say that she had limited English skills, which probably contributed to her decision.

II. Consent and Filtering Questions

Q1 I have read and understand the consent form. I have had an opportunity to have all of my questions answered and I freely consent to participate.

Yes	17
No response	2*

* One of the respondents completed the survey anyway.

Q2 Community Ditch and Organization Structure

Ditch	
Organized	12 (+1*)
Mambrino	8
El Cid	4 (+1)
Unorganized	
Rocinante	5
Santa Maria	2
Other	1
Other	2
Unknown	0

* Where I know enough about the participant who declined to complete the survey to suggest an answer, I have indicated it in parentheses. Otherwise, throughout this analysis, I have included her in the “unknown” or “no response” category.

Q3 Gender

Male	12
Female	4 (+1)
No response	1

Q4 Ethnicity

White / Anglo	10
Hispanic	5 (+1)
White/Anglo AND Hispanic	2
Unknown	0

Q5 Length of Irrigation Practice on Ditch

< 5 years	3
5 to 9 years	4
10 to 25 years	3
> 25 years	7
Unknown	1

Q6 Total acres irrigated and Q7 EBID Rate Classification (flat or farm rate)

< 2 ac. (flat-rate)	13
< 10 ac. (farm-rate)	3
10+ ac. (farm-rate)	1
Unknown	1

Q8 Irrigation Purpose

Income-based farming (at least 20% of annual income)	1
Raising crops as a hobby (< 20% of annual income)	2
Domestic or house lot irrigation	14
Unknown	1

Q15 Summons Response

Responders	8
Nonresponders	4
Did not receive packet*	2
Don't Know	1
Don't Remember	2
Unknown	1

Q16 OOJ Receipt

Yes	0
No	17 (+1)
Don't Know	0
Don't remember	0

* "Did not receive packet" was not an option on the survey. However, 2 people wrote it in.

III. Information Gathering Questions

Q9 How CDA could be improved (refer to section IV for details)

Organized CDA	
Suggestions	9
No response	4

Unorganized Ditch	
Suggestions	3
No response	2

Q10 What is a water right?

Referred to beneficial use	10
Another answer	4
No response	4

Q11 Water right characteristics

Correct	2
Incorrect	12
No response	4

Q12 How EBID water right can be lost

B is the best answer; A is also true, at least theoretically
 C is not really "loss" of a water right
 D and E are incorrect

Correct:	
A, B	4
A,B,C	4
A only	2

Incorrect:	
A,B,C,E	2
A,B,D	1
A,B,E	2
A,C,E	1

No response	1
-------------	---

Q13 Are some beneficial uses more important than others?

Correct (false)	12
Incorrect (true)	4
No response	2

Q14 Do earlier uses have a better right?

Correct (true)	17
Incorrect (false)	0
No response	1

Not respond timely if OOJ is incorrect
(correct)

	1
Forfeiture or abandonment	2
Non beneficial use	3
Something else	6
No response	6

Q17 Purpose of an adjudication?

B is the best answer; A is also acceptable
D is incorrect; C and E are indirect effects of
adjudication

Correct:	
B only	7
A,B	1

Incorrect:	
A,B,E	3
A,B,C	1
A,B,C,E	3

A only	1
E only	1

No response	1
-------------	---

Q20, 21 Self-rating knowledge about adj. before and after workshop.

A very knowledgeable	
B somewhat knowledgeable	
C not very knowledgeable	

Less knowledgeable*	
A to B	2

More knowledgeable	
B to A	2
C to A	4
C to B	6

About the same	
B to B	2
C to C	1
No response	1

Q18 From whom would you seek help?

A. An attorney	2
B. EBID	7
C. OSE	16
D. Ombudsman	9
E. Friends	0
F. Town clerk, etc.	1
G. Other ("Court")	1

Q22 Did workshop make adj. less intimidating?

Did not find it intimidating	2
Much less intimidating	12
Somewhat less intimidating	3
No effect	0
No response	1

Q19 How could a legitimate right be lost in the adjudication?**Q23 Did workshop address your questions?**

“very well, OK, excellent” 17*
 No response 1

Q24 Attend workshop if offered by this entity?

	Y / N / no resp
A OSE	11/ 5 / 2
B Ombudsman	7 / 8 / 3
C Court	6 / 8 / 4
D independent org.	12/ 2 / 4
E university	10/ 4 / 4
F ag. group	7 / 6 / 5

Q25 Heard about workshop from?

A friend or neighbor	6
B CDA	7 (+1 D)
C investigator	4
D other (flyer = “B CDA”)	1 (-1)
No Response	1

Q26 Workshop length?

Too long	1
Too short	1*
About right	15
No response	1

* Participant wrote that more time was needed for questions; but a longer workshop might be too long.

Q27 Convenient time and place

Yes	16
No response	2

Q28 Instructor clear

Yes	16
No response	2

Q29 Most valuable aspect of workshop?

No response	2
Other answers varied (refer to discussion below)	

Q30 Suggestions to improve workshop.

Suggestions	5 *
“none”	6
No response	6

* refer to discussion below

Q31 What else could be done to help?

OK as is	1
Suggestions	8
No response	9

Q32 Would you recommend to a friend?

Yes	16
No response	2

IV. Responses to Open-Ended Questions

The survey was designed not to require extensive written answers from participants, knowing that it would come at the end of a long day and an information-packed evening. However, the open-ended questions that were included elicited a variety of helpful comments.

Q9 What are your ideas about how your CDA could be improved?

Question 9 was intended to show what attendees thought of their ditch and CDA. Of those who were members of an organized CDA, the comments were:

- Additional meetings
- Better understanding of NM state law.
- Fix the ditch - concrete or pipe it
- Have a more structured one [CDA]
- Increased community endeavors
- Install under ground pipe
- More participation by the membership would be very worthwhile.
- More participation. Also CDA should be more active in adjoining ditches.
- Better communication among users.

Comments from members of unorganized ditches were:

- We could form a CDA.
- People working together.
- More understandable information for the people.

Q23 How well did this workshop address your questions about the adjudication?

Most of the responses were “very well” or a similar comment. Here are the responses that differed:

- Very well except stating or placing a value on a water right.
- This was great use to do mock OOJ and have discussion about the process.
- Presenter delivered the information in a manner that was understood by most in attendance.
- Made me more aware.
- I learned that adjudication is not such a hard word. I am knowledgeable enough to answer the question more comfortably.

Q2 What was the most valuable aspect of the workshop?

- Responses were:
- Able to respond better to adjudication
- Attendance
- Direct questions and open discussion
- Extensive insight gained into adjudication process
- Gaining knowledge
- Learning more about water and irrigation
- Learning process & aspects of adjudication
- Leslie knows her material & presents it very well
- Made me aware of the adjudication process
- Overall discussion of issues and then use of exercises in seminar to practice conceptual comprehension
- Seeing forms to be received and filled. Learning more about EBID
- That the water right cannot be taken away without legal action
- The adjudication process
- The discussions & experience of both instructor and then members of the group
- The whole class was beneficial

Q30 What would you suggest to improve the workshop?

Many participants either left this one blank or indicated that the workshop was fine as delivered.

- Great class
- This was good
- I thought it went well
- This was a good job on a complex subject delivered in an evening workshop

Suggestions for change were:

- First exercise confusing but was worthwhile
- Just give a lecture
- None - cooler air and no train would be good
- Shorter
- Tough - longer time for discussions (1+ hours) but then it's a long workshop
- Weekends.

Q31 What else could be done (by the Court, the OSE, or others) to assist you with the adjudication?

Responses were:

1. Online completion of forms - ability to access them yourselves rather than wait for mailing
2. Have people to assist you when filling out the paper work
3. More class room application [is this a comment about the workshop?]
4. Speak more in laymens terms [is this a comment about the materials from the OSE, or about the workshop?]
5. More information
6. Provide more transparency into the process
7. More explanation similar to that presented in the workshop
8. Have more workshops
9. Workshop is good

Re comment 2: Since this help is available through the OSE and the Ombudsman Program, perhaps this can be addressed by making this resource more explicit in the workshop. (By the way, this comment came from a respondent.)

Re comments 6-9: All of these support more information sessions similar to the workshop.