Summary of concerns/recommendations received from stakeholders[1]
(received in response to the TWDB October 26, 2016 request for comments)

Administration/procurement

1) Reduce administrative duties of full regional water planning group (RWPG) or allow a RWPG subcommittee to address administrative tasks, such as approving contractual actions like budget amendments or developing bylaws.
2) Implement a more streamlined administration process to alleviate time pressures of planning group meetings.
3) TWDB rules and RWPG bylaws should provide explicit, uniform regulatory requirements for procurement by RWPGs.

Bylaws/term limits

4) TWDB rules should be expanded to include additional criteria for RWPG bylaws and the TWDB should issue updated and expanded version of model bylaws.
5) TWDB rules and RWPG bylaws should require as part of planning documents developed that RWPGs document they have reviewed their bylaws and confirm terms of bylaws were satisfied or explain variances.
6) Provide term limits for RWPG members.
7) TWDB rules and RWPG bylaws should consider establishing term limits for executive committee members.
8) TWDB rules and RWPG bylaws should consider limiting number of consecutive planning cycles served by voting members.
9) Rules should specify term limits for RWPG members.

Meetings

10) Require more notice of meetings – including longer notice time and more publication of notice and supporting materials.
11) RWPG meetings should be easily accessible to people with regular, full-time jobs.
12) Audio recordings of all meetings should be provided and input taken from individuals unable to attend meeting in person.

[1] Prepared for the purpose of facilitating discussion only. Not a comprehensive list of all comments or language received. May include multiple, similar comments made by separate stakeholders. Excludes recommended changes that are already directly addressed by existing Texas Water Code or agency planning rules.

13) All RWPGs should require posting of audio recordings of meetings like is done by Region G.

14) TWDB rules and RWPG bylaws should include that RWPGs use its website to openly post for public access meeting notice, agendas, and supporting materials.

15) TWDB rules and RWPG bylaws should include requirements of posting notice of committee meetings and prepare and post minutes from committee meetings.

Membership – filling vacancies

16) TWDB should establish uniformity in the way RWPGs replace and add voting members, including:

- Stakeholder groups should have input in RWPG membership process;
- Appropriate stakeholder groups should be notified of member vacancies; and
- Stakeholders should have an opportunity to formally nominate a person for consideration of the vacancy.

17) Provide minimum requirements for publicizing membership vacancies, including identifying how stakeholders can be involved in nominating and selecting new members of RWPGs.

18) Advertising and recruiting of new RWPG members should be more visible.

19) TWDB rules and RWPG bylaws should require publishing notice of membership vacancies on website in addition to other publication requirements.

20) TWDB rules and RWPG bylaws should establish process for identifying potential candidates and nominating for membership vacancies; advise nominees of time commitment required to effectively participate.

Membership – groundwater representation

21) Remove the requirement for all groundwater management areas (GMAs) to be individually represented.

22) Designate a single "Groundwater" interest category position that would be open to GMA representatives or districts under Texas Water Code (TWC) Chapter 36. Instead of one for each GMA; redefine "Water District" interest group to include all districts *except* those under TWC Ch. 36.

23) Groundwater conservation district representation is too high on RWPGs (>25% on Region G).

24) RWPG representation is disproportionately weighted towards groundwater interests.

Membership – other representation

25) TWDB consider developing rules to establish procedure for membership composition and voting processes in bylaws, ensuring:
    - Accurate and invested stakeholder representation;
    - Processes for fostering active membership participation, including RWPG membership vetoing interest group representation if member not personally invested in process; and
    - Methods to modify membership composition should it be inadequate.
26) TWDB provide option for RWPGs to request additions or exceptions to voting membership as needed.
27) Specific individual cannot tell who represents them on a RWPG.
28) Planning committees could invite Sierra Club, Audubon, or other groups to a rotating position for input from their regions with the board.
29) TWDB rules and RWPG bylaws should clarify authority of RWPG member alternates, send them all materials sent to voting members, encourage them to attend all meetings and fully participate except for voting (unless substituting for voting member).
30) TWDB should support RWPGs to meet requirements of including non-voting members in 31 Texas Administrative Code 357.11(e)(4) (Surface Water right holders >1,000 AFY) by:
    - Providing an interactive database listing such entities that is regularly updated.
    - Publicize listings of such entities and regularly update.
    - Train and fund RWPG staff to identify, track, and engage such entities.
31) Provide guidance on "adequate" representation of membership addressing:
    - Accountability of member to their interest (e.g., is a retiree from municipality adequate?);
    - Stagnant membership when serve for extended periods of time; and
    - Large voting bodies are vulnerable to political influences over data-driven influences.
32) TWDB rules and RWPG bylaws should require that member representing a "geographic area" or interest group must reside within that geographic area, or at least within the Regional Water Planning Area (RWPA).

Operation

33) Implement 10-yr planning cycle with a rotating yearly emphasis on a particular portion of the Regional Water Plan to audit RWPG efforts and effectiveness over time.

34) SWIFT process has created an ever-growing number of water management strategies (WMSs) in the regional water plans (RWPs) resulting in a diminishment of planning authority and a perception that RWPG curate wish lists of potential projects.

35) RWPGs should create and adhere to strict WMS inclusion deadlines to keep process on schedule and on budget.

36) RWPGs should emphasize prioritizing WMSs according to their economic and geographic suitability and impact on source aquifers.

37) RWPGs, members, and TWDB should work together to develop mechanisms to collect input from all affected individuals and organizations to ensure a two-way communication between public and RWPGs.

38) RWPG members do not attempt to understand concerns of people within RWPA boundaries.

39) RWPGs have a lack of public outreach.

40) TWDB rules and RWPG bylaws should require use of confidential ballots when voting on potentially sensitive matters (e.g. executive committee membership).

41) TWDB rules and RWPG bylaws should "Continue to assist the RWPGs in complying with Open Meetings Act and Public Information Act requirements." Should provide training and reference documents on these topics and agency staffers as resources, especially during RWPG meetings.

42) TWDB should make rules to require members or the RWPGs administration to alert people who may be impacted by WMSs considered by the RWPG.