TWDB CUSTOMERS

<u>Stakeholder Workshop</u>

During FY 2005-2006 the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) sought customer input on its strategic planning process by conducting a stakeholder workshop in connection with its October 2005 board meeting held in San Antonio, Texas. Customers received written invitations, with additional telephone follow-up confirmation, in preparation for the workshop. Customers were provided with information that they would be asked to comment on during the workshop, along with instructions as to how the workshop would be conducted, and workshop location and time details. The stakeholder feedback was instrumental in developing a strategy map as well as guidelines for both internal and external performance measurement in the 2007-2011 strategic plan. The input received in these stakeholder meetings guided the TWDB's 2006-2007 Legislative Appropriations Request and laid the foundation for developing the TWDB 2007 Legislative agenda.

Stakeholder workshop invitees represented a wide cross-section of customers served by the TWDB, and included the following groups:

- Regional Water Planning Group Members
- Irrigation District Members
- Professional organizations
- Water and/or natural resources-related State and local governmental entities
- City organizations, including local Council of Governments
- Engineering firms
- Groundwater Conservation Districts
- Higher education representatives
- Financial services providers
- Legal services providers
- Water providers, including water supply corporations, public utilities and river authorities
- National natural resources organizations
- Environmental groups
- Consultants
- Legislative representatives
- General public

<u>Online Customer Survey</u>

Also during FY 2005-2006 the TWDB launched an online customer satisfaction survey designed to provide continuous input from its customers in a quick and easy-to-use format. Survey participants were asked to indicate if they represented the following categories:

- Individual (general public)
- Political subdivision (city, county, groundwater district)
- Water supply corporation
- Regional water planning group member
- Consultant
- Governmental Agency
- Other

All of the above-referenced groups of external customers receive a wide variety of services from the TWDB, including:

- Regional water planning assistance, including historical water use and projected water needs data
- Groundwater data, including reports, groundwater availability modeling and well sampling data
- Surface water data, including lake hydrographic survey information, bays and estuaries, and instream flow data
- GIS mapping data
- Financial assistance for water, wastewater, flood, and conservation projects
- Conservation assistance, including municipal and individual literature and data
- Innovative water management information, including desalination and rainwater harvesting
- General water-related information

INFORMATION GATHERING METHODS

Stakeholder Workshop

The October 2005 stakeholder workshop invitation targeted approximately 93 representatives of the groups noted above. Approximately 75 of the invitees participated in the one-day workshop. The TWDB refined the stakeholder meeting process to better facilitate the information gathering process. To accomplish this, the morning session was conducted by dividing participants into seven product/service breakout groups. The groups were organized according to product/service lines in the 2005-2009 strategic plan and each group was asked a series of questions designed to collect opinions on strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. The seven product/service breakout groups included:

- Water Planning Grants and Technical Assistance (includes Municipal Conservation)
- Groundwater Modeling/Data Collection/ Research Grants and Technical Assistance
- Surface Water Modeling/Data Collection/Research Grants and Technical Assistance
- Infrastructure Construction Finance
- Grants and Loans for Disadvantaged and Rural Communities
- Agricultural Water Conservation grants and Loans/Technical Assistance
- GIS/TNRIS/Data Collection and Dissemination

The second session utilized a different mix of the participants into five areas of focus based on the agency mission statement. Questions were structured to collect views on how well the TWDB is accomplishing its mission, identify priorities and get ideas on desired improvements. The five areas of focus based on the agency mission statement included:

- Economic
- Political
- Technological
- Demographic
- Social

The focus groups were then asked to evaluate input from the seven product/service groups within the context of leadership, planning, financial assistance, data collection and dissemination and education.

The participants completed a survey consisting of a series of questions concerning how beneficial the workshops were. The TWDB will use these survey results to improve the process for future information gathering sessions with stakeholders.

Online Customer Survey

On September 1, 2005 the TWDB, working with the University of Texas Organizational Excellence Group, launched an online customer satisfaction survey to provide customers with an ongoing method of providing customer satisfaction input, as well as provide additional comments. The link to the survey was prominently displayed on TWDB's home page under "Hot Topics." The survey's launch was promoted in the Fall 2005 edition of the agency's quarterly printed newsletter, *Water for Texas*, which reaches approximately 1,000 printed copy readers, and over 300 customers who receive the quarterly newsletter via email. The information was also included in subsequent issues. Additionally, online survey promotional postcards were created for distribution at a variety of TWDB events, including speaking engagements, meetings with external customers, trade show exhibits, and for distribution to customers visiting the main office or the agency's field offices throughout the state. The link to the survey was also included in the *TWDB Executive Administrator's Online Newsletter*, which is distributed twice monthly to over 50 legislative customers as well as made available to the public on the publications section of the web site. In addition, several areas of the agency contacted their regular customers by email to let them know about the survey. The Public Information Office provided the link to the survey in its email communications with the public.

Survey users had the option of directing their comments to specific areas of the agency, including: Legal Services, Human Resources, Executive Operations and Administration, Office of the Chief Financial Officer, Office of Project Finance and Construction Assistance, Resource Information Office, Office of Planning, or to General/Unsure if not pertaining to a particular area. An online description of agency divisions assisted customers in directing their responses to the appropriate area.

Using numerical scoring options ranging from "Strongly Agree" (5) to "Strongly Disagree"(1), survey participants provided input on the following statements:

(1) Staff member(s) were helpful.
(2) I got the information I needed.
(3) The procedures/instructions were straightforward and easy to understand.
(4) My phone call, email, or letter was routed to the proper person.
(5) The website was easy to use and contained helpful information.
(6) If I filed a formal complaint, it was addressed in a reasonable manner.
(7) Overall, I was satisfied with the amount of time it took to get service/assistance/information.
(8) Printed materials contained clear and thorough information.
(9) Overall, I am satisfied with my experience.

Additionally, participants directing their comments to the Office of Project Finance and Construction Assistance were given the opportunity to comment on three additional items:

(7a[KB1]) Overall, I was satisfied with the amount of time it took to get a loan application processed.
(7b) Overall, I was satisfied with the amount of time it took to get a loan closed.
(8a) The Drinking Water State Revolving Fund and the Clean Water State Revolving Fund Intended Use Plan (IUP) information forms were easy to understand and fill out.

Survey users were also provided an opportunity to submit suggestions for improvement, compliments, complaints, and requests for information. Survey results were monitored by staff representatives in each of the agency service areas. Input was shared with staff on a regular basis in division meetings as well as agencywide meetings. If the participant desired to be contacted, appropriate staff followed up with the necessary action. Particular attention was paid to improvement suggestions, which were implemented where feasible. By the end of April 2006, over 200 respondents had participated in the survey.

On May 1, 2006 a targeted email survey was conducted by the University of Texas Organizational Excellence Group at the TWDB's request in order to increase participation in the online customer survey. Each division of the agency submitted email addresses representing a wide cross-section of customers. The targeted email survey was sent to over 700 addressees. This resulted in a dramatic increase in the utilization of the survey, which totaled 417 respondents on May 19, 2006.

RESULTS OF CUSTOMER INPUT

Stakeholder Workshop

Input from both sessions of the Stakeholder Workshop was collected onsite, then collated and synthesized to eliminate duplicate responses. A detailed listing of the responses is attached to

this report as Attachment 1.

Each participant in the workshop was also asked to complete a Customer Workshop Evaluation comprised of four statements, and were asked to rank each statement on a five-point scale from 5 (Strongly Agree) to 1 (Strongly Disagree.) Twelve participants completed the evaluation, with an overall average score for all questions of 4.40. Workshop evaluation details were as follows:

Statement	**Score**
The session provided me with a meaningful opportunity to express my thoughts about the Texas Water Development Board's future activities.	4.58
The session was a valuable use of my time.	4.17
I found the format to be an effective method for this type of discussion.	4.42
I would be interested in participating in similar opportunities/events in the future.	4.42
Average score for all questions combined	4.40

Respondents also provided comments and suggestions for improving the process for conducting future stakeholder workshops.

Online Customer Survey

Utilizing the online customer survey, as of May 19, 2006 the TWDB collected data from 417 respondents. Customers were asked to identify themselves by category and ethnicity, as well as by their status as first time or repeat customer, number of years interacting with the agency, and number of times contacting the agency within the last 12 months.

The survey collected responses on each statutorily required customer service quality element - staff, communications, Internet sites, complaint-handling processes, service timeliness, and printed information, utilizing the questions noted in the above section entitled, "Information Gathering Methods." (Note: The element of facilities was not deemed relevant by the customer satisfaction survey team and was, therefore, excluded from the survey).

In addition, responses were solicited by the Office of Project Finance and Construction Assistance on the loan application and closing process, and the ease of understanding and usability of the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Fund Intended Use Plan processes. Respondents were asked to rate each statement on a five-point scale from 5 (Strongly Agree) to 1 (Strongly Disagree.)

A summary of item score averages is as follows:

Statement	Average Score
Overall, I was satisfied with the amount of time it took to get a loan application processed.	3.44
Overall, I was satisfied with the amount of time it took to get a loan closed.	2.98
The Drinking Water State Revolving Fund and Clean Water State Revolving Fund Intended Use Plan (IUP) information forms were easy to understand and fill out.	3.64
Staff member(s) were helpful.	4.40
I got the information I needed.	4.22
The procedures/instructions were straightforward and easy to understand.	3.81
My phone call, email, or letter was routed to the proper person.	4.28
The website was easy to use and contained helpful information.	3.84
If I filed a formal complaint, it was addressed in a reasonable manner.	3.68
Overall, I was satisfied with the amount of time it took to get service/assistance/information.	4.07
Printed materials contained clear and thorough information.	4.03
Overall, I am satisfied with my experience.	4.08

Complete details of the online survey are attached in chart/tabular form as Attachment 2 to this report.

In addition to the survey questions, respondents were encouraged to provide comments to each area of the agency: Human Resources (HR), Office of Project Finance and Construction Assistance (OPFCA), Resource Information Office/Texas Natural Resources Information System (RIO/TNRIS), Office of Planning (OOP), Executive Operations and Administration (EXEC), Legal Services (LEGAL), Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO), and General/Unsure (where the respondent was unsure of the area or wanted to submit a general comment). These comments were categorized as: compliments, complaints, suggestions, requests for information, and non-specified. Between September 1, 2005 and May 19, 2006, a total of 82 comments were collected on the online survey. A summary of comments received by type within each area of the agency is as follows:

Area	Compliments	Complaints	Suggestions	Requests for Information	Total Comments
HR	0%	50%	50%	0%	2
OPFCA	62.5%	25%	25%	0%	16
RIO/TNRIS	62.5%	25%	25%	12.5%	8
OOP	22.7%	9.1%	22.7%	13.6%	22
EXEC	75%	0%	12.5%	0%	8
LEGAL	0%	0%	50%	0%	2
OCFO	66.7%	0%	0%	0%	3
GENERAL/ UNSURE	30%	10%	50%	0%	10
TOTAL	40.2%	12.2%	25.6%	4.9%	82

NOTE: Percentages may not total 100% due to comments without a specified comment type and comments with multiple comment types selected.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

Stakeholder Workshop

The information collected during the stakeholder workshop and detailed in Attachment 1 to this report, was then analyzed and categorized based on each goal or initiative and the specific action required in order to accomplish them. The categorization of the stakeholder input focused on the following recommended actions:

- Inclusion in the Strategic Plan
- Legislative Appropriations Request Exceptional Item
- Need for Budget Structure Change
- State Legislation Required
- Federal Legislation Required
- Rule Change Needed
- Procedural Change Needed
- Other Action Required
- No Action Required

The TWDB used this categorized stakeholder input to plan and coordinate the agency's legislative process development. This ensured that each stakeholder issue was addressed by the agency during its planning cycle.

The TWDB is endeavoring to implement as many stakeholder suggestions as possible in order to improve its products and services. The success of implementation of all of the recommendations will depend on various factors, including: legislative action, resource availability, rule and/or procedural change, and budget structure change.

Suggestions received from the evaluation of the stakeholder workshop which will be used to enhance future workshops as follows:

- Identification of those persons making comments in the closing session
- A need for more time allotted for each discussion
- More physical separation between breakout groups to improve concentration and the discussion within the group

Overall, participants thought the process provided a meaningful opportunity to express thoughts about the TWDB (4.58 out of 5). Based on the positive response to the workshop, the TWDB will include stakeholder input in future strategic planning sessions.

Online Customer Survey

As indicated in Attachment 2 to this report, the highest scoring online survey areas were as follows:

Staff member helpfulness	4.40
Effective response handling	4.28
Information provided satisfactorily	4.22
Overall satisfaction	4.08
Speedy response	4.07

These scores indicate that the single most important resource of the agency is its employees and their abilities to assist and respond with the correct information within a satisfactory time frame. In many cases, individual staff was lauded through comments on the online survey. The TWDB was often complimented on its ability to serve its customers, as indicated by the comments received below:

1. The staff is always friendly and helpful. It is a pleasure to work with these folks.
2. In my over thirty years of experience with state agencies, the TWDB has always been the most responsive.
3. I have never worked with an agency that was as efficient and good and I have been at this for over 40 years.
4. The TWDB planning staff are always extremely helpful when I have questions or need

assistance.

5. The TWDB staff go above and beyond what is expected and by no means appear to act as a non-caring government agency. I wish that all government agencies would practice the TWDB model.
6. This is one of the better run agencies in Texas.
7. Very professional, well-run agency.
8. Keep up the good work.

TWDB staff will continue to emphasize to its staff that customer service is the number one priority of the agency. Customer satisfaction will remain at the top of the agency's strategy map and will continue to guide all decisions made by TWDB leadership.

The TWDB is now focusing on improving the lowest scoring areas set out in Attachment 2 as follows:

1. Satisfaction with the amount of time to close a loan   2.98
2. Satisfaction with the amount of time to process a loan   3.44
3. Drinking Water and Clean Water IUPs were easy to
   understand and fill out   3.64

OPFCA, Legal and the OCFO will be evaluating internal processes associated with these three areas in order to determine options for improving the process. One change already in place that will assist in this effort is OPFCA's recently developed four-person Marketing and Customer Relations section. This team, along with staff from the OCFO's office will focus efforts on improving the IUP process, identifying new customers, working closely with repeat customers and improving marketing and informational materials.

Some of the online survey comments and suggestions received that will help guide the work of staff include the following:

1. Cumbersome bureaucratic requirements, including bond covenants and requirements for Corps of Engineers 404 permit authorizations
2. Conflicting instructions and closing information in the loan closing process
3. Allowing 30 to 40 years amortization on loan repayments rather than 20 years
4. Continuing to work closely with the smaller political subdivisions
5. Delays in getting funding released due to engineering review process

The Marketing and Customer Relations team, along with the Deputy Executive Administrator for OPFCA and the agency's Communications Officer are conducting an initial retreat to develop a marketing and customer relations work plan on June 14, 2006.

The remainder of the customer suggestions and comments are reviewed by the specific area upon receipt. They are responded to, where indicated, and form the basis for discussion at regularly scheduled staff meetings. The recent targeted email survey results will also be reviewed by the

agency's Executive Staff at a retreat scheduled for May 30-31, 2006.

In order to increase the use of the online survey in the future, TWDB staff will be urged to provide link information on their publications, newsletters, handouts, emails, and regular correspondence. In addition, TWDB staff who provide presentations in a variety of venues throughout the year will remind audience members of the survey. The agency may also consider conducting future targeted email surveys.

OUTCOME MEASURES

The outcome measures detailed below are based on the statistics provided from the online customer survey and do not include the stakeholder workshop information.

Percentage of Surveyed Customer Respondents
 Expressing Overall Satisfaction with Services

80.97% (311 out of 417 respondents) indicated they strongly agree or agree with the statement, "Overall, I am satisfied with my experience."

Percentage of Surveyed Customer Respondents
 Identifying Ways to Improve Service Delivery

5% (21 out of 417) submitted comments categorized as "suggestions." Note: Some general comments also contained suggestions, but are not included in this count.

Number of Customers Surveyed

706 were sent a targeted email, plus an unknown number of additional survey participants

Number of Customers Served

Unable to determine

Cost per Customer Surveyed

$5.99 ($2,500 for development and maintenance of online survey, plus targeted email survey/417 respondents)

Number of Customers Identified
417 respondents

Number of Customer Groups Inventoried

Respondents identified themselves from approximately 30 different groups/types

ATTACHMENT 1

Session 1: Water Planning Grants and Technical Assistance (includes Municipal Conservation)

1. What future issues or trends will have the most effect on this product or service?

Cost of Energy
More serious application of Water Conservation
Municipal Conservation
Water Reuse
Growing water demands
Changing demographics
Changing in types of water demands
Increased activity of Water Conservation Districts
Continued Legislative Funding
Increased Value of Water
Technology Changes
- Conservation
- Desalination
- Rain Water Harvesting
- Condensate
Pressure on provider due to aging infrastructure
Political threats to Planning
Loss of provider/Institutional knowledge
- Includes Professional and Technical resources
Development of Markets
Increased pressure and knowledge of environmental water needs
Increased speed of information exchange – impact on service provisions
More public involvement
Increased demand for funding – Regional Projects - Planning to O/M (operations & maintenance)
Need for more consolidation of Resources/Partnerships
Continued dispute over ownership of water
Begin implementation of Regional Water Plans
Continued drought
Flooding impacts
Growth in flood prone areas
Climate change
Add permit requirement – need for funding
Cultural/Demographic changes
General economy
Impacts from existing water use -- recreational vs. supply
Water rate increase and implementation issues
General Education of Public
Increased emphasis on management of supply, water assistance
Transportation issues – Physical movement of Water
Increased demand on providers with fewest resources
Water Quality

2. What should we keep doing in this product/service area?

Continue Instream Flow Studies
Continue Regional Water Planning
Continue Surface and Groundwater Monitoring
Continue all of the activities you presently perform.
Conservation Research
Technical Assistance for Municipal Conservation
Provide multiple options/alternatives for Planning Research
Further evaluation/dissemination of information on Drought Contingency Measures
Focus on Statewide Needs
Build more focus on macro planning (Statewide Plan)
Build more focused plan for state and extend beyond 50 year time period
Preservation of key reservoir sites
Decrease focus on implementation conflicts in planning process
Take a more active role in regional conflicts (including a clarification of the process) to
resolve conflicts
Increase emphasis on Water Quality Planning
Focus more Research on Trends in Agricultural Conservation i.e. crop patterns
Include in planning, making recommendations on Water Rights Enforcement mechanisms
Elevate use of state resources benefiting (regional) statewide projects
Exercise more leadership in "Getting Federal Funds"
Enhance partnership between State Agencies
Need more employees involved in Water Assistance

3. What will we need to do differently?

Eliminate Construction Management
Will need more collaborative use of resources
Perform Field Studies in conjunction with the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers
Need larger collaboration on Legislative issues, i.e. Conservation
More Education of Legislature on importance of Research & Planning
Put more emphasis on Planning, Funding, Research & Technology Programs
More research on trends of water resource needs
Increase size of Municipal Conservation Technical Assistance
Build off water loss surveys in expanding water initiatives
Need a Municipal Conservation Grant Program, including Water Reuse
Rethink next round of Regional Water Plan
Study environmental flows/needs
Go to a 10-year cycle (every other 5 emphasize on research & implementation)
Planning is too prescriptive
Consider momentum in off-year cycles (5 years) for planning
Consider coordination (integration) of Groundwater planning and Regional Water Planning
Reassess general Planning assumptions
Adapt planning to area needs
Acknowledge need to amend plans as needed if on 10-year cycle

Session 1: Groundwater Modeling/Data Collection/Research Grants and Technical Assistance

1. What future issues or trends will have the most effect on this product or service?

Increased demand on Groundwater
Keep doing GAMS
The need to keep more accurate data
As GCDs become more regulatory, well permitting will need to be more sophisticated
Must make decisions on well permitting – affects decisions (Management)
Need more finite delineations of Groundwater
To support management decision
GMAs are regional now – better if they were more site specific – better management decisions
As smaller GCDs gather data, larger districts will have more resources. This helps smaller GCDs
GMAs – Increased need to adjust tools to GMAs
Increasing demand on groundwater – GCDs must have good data
Regulatory and implementation
In Regional use of water
Conjunctive use of water will be a bigger concern
Wholesale water providers (wholesale) will increase
Social and – cultural changes put – more reliance on groundwater
Need to educate the public and use the best available data
Technology: Look to brackish and desalination as a new source
How will we deal with brackish groundwater?
How do we encourage usage of brackish groundwater?
Treatment of brackish groundwater locally at well sites
How dispose of brine? Research
Look at availability and water quality – water shed and basin management
We will see more regionalization (GMAs)
Difficult to change GCD boundaries to aquifer boundaries
Need to develop strategies so that groundwater, surface water and desalination all contribute to same goal
Use what is best for conservation
All of these work together
Some form of regulation - by districts or other means

2. What should we keep doing in this product/service area?

GAMs – make information available to GCDs and support local GCDs
Push for desalination
Data development

Pair state and local data (computerize) (reconcile)
Keep collecting data
Continue to improve cooperative relationship
One-on-one interaction
Helps build relationships
GCDs
Continue bottom up approach – GCDs as resources
GAMs – more site specific for better use for smaller areas
Weakness – Recharge data on Aquifer
Technical assistance <u>must</u> continue
Technical assistance for groundwater availability – critical seek $ to bridge this gap
Will see increase in need for funding
Agency that says "We are developing groundwater and we will learn and apply information later"

3.What will we need to do differently?

Incentives for GCDs
Develop conjunctive use desalination so GCDs can develop rules to offer incentives for reuse, brackish groundwater, desalination
Ability to consider sources differently
Expand technical capabilities
Conservation Incentives – Agricultural
Need Incentives – Economic
Permitting process
Local decision making could be strengthened
Stronger push for funding source/agency for water
Better integration with Federal Government for funding
Develop state strategy for federal funding
More <u>flexibility</u> to accommodate creative
Oppositions and all available
Water supply sources
Education and understanding of Federal Government
How do we develop focused plan on getting Federal funding
Surface water cannot be taken out of basin of origin – This needs to change
Need help on water supply transportation
Policy too segmented
TWDB approach to water development needs to be – more integrated
More statewide planning needed
Need more interregional strategies
Provide guidance and staff for Conservation Education
Guidance for implementation of statewide Conservation Education
Texas needs to understand more about brackish groundwater
Effects of large scale pumping of brackish groundwater
Mod flow modeling not reliable (brackish groundwater)

Session 1: Infrastructure Construction Finance

1. What future issues or trends will have the most effect on this product or service?

Limited availability of funds
Water Resource Development Act - Pending federal changes that will effect Clean and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds
Legislative restrictions
Population growth
Natural disasters
Declining ability to finance compliance with federal drinking water requirements
Increasing number of innovative procurement options such as DBO and BOT
Less grants, more loans
More governmental restrictions on loan issuance
Reduced grant availability and increases in capital financing costs resulting in a higher number of communities meeting disadvantaged criteria
Increasing initial investment costs for technology
Reduced costs through applied technology
Cost of not investing in technology
Rapid growth in unincorporated areas
Trend toward the increased evaluation of underground, vs. surface, infrastructure
Legislative initiatives, i.e. SB3
Greater need for TWDB to provide technical support to small or disadvantaged applicants
Concern for ensuring self-sustaining utilities
Competing urban/rural interests
Potential impact from leadership changes through state and federal elections
Doing more with less

2. What should we keep doing in this product/ service area?

Drinking Water State Revolving Fund program – installment closing process is working better
Communications and the legal process are improved with regard to closings
Staff's outreach and knowledge of other state and federal agencies is an asset for an applicant who is leveraging various funding sources

3. What will we need to do differently?

Better state coordination on disaster planning
TWDB needs long-range planning regarding disaster, legislative initiative allowing for sufficient budget and FTEs
Require applicants to budget adequate working capital to include disasters

Funding sources, such as in SB3, should be broad based (not sectors)
TWDB infrastructure financing should recognize long range impacts on development to avoid substandard development
Create priority for comprehensive projects
Inclusive communications prior to initiating legislation, i.e., SB3 late roll-out
Re-evaluate TWDB business plans/processes to evaluate effectiveness in meeting trends and mission
Paperless
Change constraints of SRF programs to meet needs of borrowers (i.e. weighted average maturity requirement of 14 years)
Designate staff backups – who to call when those not available
Programs must beat market

Session 1: Grants and Loans for Disadvantaged and Rural Communities

1. What future issues or trends will have the most effect on this product or service?

Long-term threat to grant funding (i.e. CDBG)
Limited state grant funding (i.e. EDAP)
Statewide need
Urbanization statewide
More state regulations
The low lying fruit has been picked and only expensive projects are left
There is less funding from Federal sources, but there are more regulations/duties (i.e. drinking water standards)
Different population growth patterns in the state
Increased costs of connections
Increased costs of construction
Decreasing number of qualified contractors
Shift in demographics from rural to urban create a growing need in rural areas
Greater emphasis on reporting on progress to Legislature
Only high dollar projects remain
Regionalization/cooperation is increasing but everyone wants their own kingdom
Need for private funds to supplement public funds
Cities need to minimize risk to acquire private funds
Need more disaster relief funds due to increased number of disasters in Texas
Use of private funds due to state program requirements

WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED BY STAKEHOLDER UNABLE TO ATTEND

Increased costs of engineering
Small colonia communities do not have finances to pay back a loan

2. What should we keep doing in this product/service area?

Leverage Funds
Project specific coordination, including site visits, with others agencies (ORCA, SOS, NADB)
Keep requiring good project development information and funding in this early phase
TWDB maintains openness to change in order to move projects to completion

3. What will we need to do differently?

Consolidation of programs (applications & funding)
Encourage WSCs to convert to SUDs to get better, tax-exempt financing, standardize local representation and develop taxing authority.
Need more funding for early project development
Better coordination with ORCA on CEDAP projects
Legislative work on ORCA CEDAP rider regarding coordination with TWDB
Seed funding for innovative or regional projects which can pay for itself (Invest in innovative ideas)
No competition between self-help and other funding programs (encourage self-help)
Up front funds – use it or lose it (establish deadlines for use of funds)
Give counties right-of-way acquisition funding so they can condemn, if necessary
Increase incentive for Regional Projects (stronger compelling incentives)
Need to narrow the pay gap between public and private sectors (specifically engineering)
Slow down TWDB staff turnover little or no continuity on projects with the current rate of turnover
Development of loan programs
Need for self-help funding
Need alternative technologies/regional projects
Need to leverage programs
Institutional programs (Training)
Need to time projects such that multiple sources of funding can participate (i.e. BECC, NADBANK, ORCA, USDA-RD, etc.)
Streamline federal and state application processes
Greater emphasis on reporting on progress to Legislature
Offer economic or regulatory incentives for regionalization – Tie into funding
Don't fund projects that encourage sprawl
Oversize facilities with private funds to supplement lack of public funds
Review program requirements
Need to increase allocation of funding for disadvantaged communities in TWDB programs

WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED BY STAKEHOLDER UNABLE TO ATTEND

Eliminate loan requirement in Small Community Hardship Program

Small Community Hardship projects should be 100% grants

Engineering services should be competitively bid. Engineers for the design phase should go through a procurement process

Projects funded by TWDB should be started immediately

Applicants receiving TWDB funding should commit to starting projects within three months

Monthly progress reports on TWDB funded projects should be made to the agency Executive Administrator and Board

Applicants who receive funding for one project should be not be able to apply for financial assistance (loans or grants) for other projects until the first project is completed

TWDB should set a timetable for projects to be completed one year after commitment date

No application to TWDB for financial assistance should be submitted until an open meeting has been held and a majority of shareholders and property owners approve of submitting the application. Documented proof must be provided. Particularly applicable to appointed receivers over water supply corporations.

State receivers should be held to a higher degree of scrutiny to provide proof of shareholders' support for loan and grant applications to the TWDB.

TWDB should require economical surveys of the project area for every project application it receives in order to determine eligibility for grant funding for a project (actual economical data should be used).

Formula used by TWDB to determine income in a project area needs to be changed to accurately represent the income level of the project area.

Session 1: GIS/TNRIS/Data Collection and Dissemination
1. What future issues or trends will have the most effect on this product or service?

A. Groundwater Issues
Increasing pressure on groundwater usage stimulates need for data to evaluate availability.
Continuing need for standardized groundwater availability models.
Increased fuel prices cause agricultural water costs to rise which favors lower usage.

B. Funding Issues
Limited available funds to develop needed data sets (i.e. location of wells.)
Shortage of data and need to collect more relative to surface water and in-stream flows.

C. Emergency Management Issues
Some data collection is disaster driven - realize value in developing data after a disaster occurs.

D. Data Collection Trends
Decreasing cost and preparation time for data collection while increasing quality, due to technology advances.

E. Data Coordination and Dissemination

Centralized systems to collect and disseminate data are desired.

There is a lack of infrastructure to support all the data collection, processing and dissemination that is needed.

Homeland Security - USGS is changing focus and federal funding from rural to urban data development.

Agencies such as Farm Service Agency use TWDB data relating to crops and water. (FSA also provides data to TWDB)

Need for continued cooperation between local, regional, state, and federal groups.

Need for service consolidation – produce more value added data.

Texas working together – consolidate needs, greater input among customers for common standards.

2. What should we keep doing in this product/service area?

A. Coordination Issues

Keep cooperating – do better job between diverse groups.

Devise methodologies to receive input and suggestions from customers for data to collect/distribute.

B. Data Access Issues

Keep regional and state data in public domain.

Continue data collection at local and regional levels.

Ensure TNRIS data stay current. Clients rely on updated data which is an ongoing process. Keep data sets fresh.

Keep TNRIS as data clearinghouse.

Continue working with federal and local agencies in using StratMap data to update/maintain floodplain maps.

C. Funding Issues

Continue to find ways to match federal funds. Limited resources mean we need to ensure we maximize use of federal matching funds, by having state matching funds available.

3. What will we need to do differently?

A. Data Access Issues

Instead of just collecting data, TNRIS should provide more application services on the data.

Increase public outreach to provide frequently updated information about what data sets are available across Texas.

TNRIS website needs to be updated regularly.

Be more aggressive in outreach and set higher performance targets for data delivery.

Make data available in optimal formats.

Start tracking who's working on what projects and share the information, to increase coordination and reduce duplication. For example, show status of floodplain modifications and where data are available.

B. Data Production Issues

Aerial photography – keep scanning and rectifying TNRIS's photo collection.

Seek statewide funding for purchasing public domain data sets.

To extent possible leverage state and local funding. Look for private sources of funding.

Session 1: Agricultural Water Conservation Grants and Loans/Technical Assistance

1. What future issues or trends will have the most effect on this product or service?

Extremely high energy costs – How will that affect Best Management Practices?

There is a proliferation of groundwater districts but they lack the resources to operate – especially newer and smaller districts.

Groundwater districts don't have background information about how their groundwater operates.

Need Resources

- Financial

- Information

- Education

Urbanization will require the wise use of the funding resources we have – focus resources on area where needed

Annual Irrigation water use data (that is available through TWDB) – question about accuracy – shows there is not much of a decrease. Not really reflective in LRGV amount of use doesn't reflect the need if they had the water. General note" Information/data not as accurate.

Irrigation water use data should be analyzed to ensure good data and take into account losses. If supply is limited, it will go to urban areas – instead of Agricultural

Are we going to use all the water for service purposes (Commercial and Industry) not production purposes (Agricultural)?

Growth of livestock industry (feed lots, dairies) not just crops.

Educate bankers about what the Link Deposit program is and how it works – better communication with banking community.

Current Demonstration Projects have to do with quantity issues. Should focus grant research topics on Quality issues – use poor quality water more (non potable for urban use) – Suggested as a Grant Research topic?

Research into irrigation technology – Research into drought tolerant/salt tolerant plants needs to be on-going. Research topic?

National Resources Conservation Service funding is likely to decrease in technical assistance grants and other areas but there are - always a need for more technical assistance. The lack of technical assistance will be more of a problem than the loss of cost share for farmers – likely that Federal Agricultural Conservation programs will level or decrease – peak now going down.

2. What should we keep doing in this product/service area?

Keep all – do more.

All dollars historically have been demonstration dollars – not "fix-all" – this is a good start but the – Governor should look at more of that – show you can make money by doing it this way – incentives.

Previous and current activities are looking at mechanical/physical aspects. - What about bio-engineering of plants/Develop plants that – need less water - Salt tolerant, etc.

3. What will we need to do differently?

Reconsider the value of water. There is – needless waste and use – There could be a cultural issue – we pump water on the ground, we wouldn't do that with oil.

As water becomes more valuable, there is greater incentive for re-use.

Environmental and legal hoops to re-use make it not worth it – Chapter 210 – TCEQ rules. Maybe education issues.

Make people/farmers more aware they could re-use water – Regional planning process – It becomes taboo if we say it enough times and it could be a source of revenue for cities.

Connection with development of salt tolerant plants – treated water sometimes contains more salt than normal water supply.

Session 1: Surface Water Modeling/Data Collection/Research Grants and Technical Assistance

1. What future issues or trends will have the most effect on this product or service?

Future changes – global warming

Next drought

Funding Source?

Federal Funding

Funding data for instream flows

Evolving science

Adaptive Regulation

Population growth competition for less reliable resources

Impact of questionable funding of water

Impact of groundwater pumpage on surface water sources

Concentration on Flood Control

Competition between hydroelectric and municipal needs

Watershed management – effect on Bay & Estuary water quality

Private landowner – watershed impact

Increase interest

Local – regional in SUR programs

Re-use issues unresolved (state policy)

Scalping flood water (Aquifer recharge)

Spring flow maintenance

Urbanization – flow timing

Funding for basic data collection

Incorporate conflict between urban – rural interests
Lake front property owner (reservoir) issues
Water Conservation issues related to urbanization or rural areas
Inadequate funding for increased needs – data, supply, etc.
Facilitating interbasin transfer, other export plans
Fine tune regional planning implementation capabilities
Move forward with adopted planning strategies
Planning recognition of energy cost dynamics implication for current plans and facilities
Regional planning and local implementation
More expectation of peer review of scientific methodologies and stakeholder input
Modeling in a fish bowl requirement to use models and data
More sophisticated models
Shifting academic focus from infrastructure to environment/biological
Greater participation
Growing need to make public more technically informed

2. What should we keep doing in this product/service area?

Hydrographic Survey
Gage data collection – increase maintain
Programs addressing environment needs
Public education – more emphasis
More emphasis on water quality
Instream flow – critical
Continue all basic programs
Public/Stakeholders input
Major Rivers education
Continue reassessment of instream floes with adequate funding
Mesh with Regional Planning cycle
Refocus Regional Planning to targeted issues (such as environmental flows)
Grants for Research/Pilot projects
Partner with State, Federal, Regional, Local to be more effective
Use TWDB Grants for Long-term evaluation of emerging technologies

3. What will we need to do differently?

Board should pursue corporate/private funds
Bay & Estuaries – reassess study approach (more inclusive, consensus – driven, participatory
Use Galveston Bay as a model
Bay & Estuaries tie science to policy/implementation
Involve/GLO and Department of Health in Bay & Estuaries issues

Session 2: Leadership

1. What TWDB Legislation, rule change, appropriation or other high-level policies would move us forward in this area of our mission?

Appropriation for implementing water conservation Task Force recommendations
Include money target – advance. Water research and technology development
Continue appropriations for **regional** water planning
Ensure analytical tools are adequate for decision making
Equal purpose/goals regional water planning
Conservation - further research needed
Focus on policy, especially responsible development
State perspective in regional water planning process
Develop effective mechanisms for regional water quality programs
Mechanism to communicate common goals to Legislators
More leadership from the Board to coordinate regional planning efforts
Enhance participation between state agencies in order to implement efficiencies
Enhance participation between state agencies and federal agencies
Add implementation to mission statement
More assistance building
Increase availability of federal funds
Assist in permit issues
Legislative recognition of need of state role in implementation
Don't use state money for permit issues
Include Board role in problem solving
Include leadership prior to project implementation
Caution leadership to be mindful of local control concerning project implementation
Maintain over groundwater regulatory issues
Develop standard conservation program for implementation by locals
Implement efficiencies of state/fed funding programs including leadership at the state level.
Expand the concept of water needs, especially environmental, and conservation needs
Exert leadership of technical assistance with groundwater issues
Exert leadership of development of science coordination with all interests
Require interaction with local policy makers prior to funding
Ensure all issues are understood
Regional approach to environmental flow planning implementation
Develop a program to deal with conjunctive use, including legislative support – relieve pressure on groundwater.
Encourage programs that promote advanced technology especially desalination
Provide incentives to encourage new technology.
Evaluate potential impacts of trends on future water needs
Ensure effectiveness of funding systems especially consider local/board interaction
Holistic approach to water fees, funding systems at the state wide level
Educate broader legislative leadership and others of water issues especially beyond natural resource committees
More interaction with educational systems on water education
Need a rule or legislation to encourage conjunctive use

Develop a mechanism for groundwater districts to issue conjunctive use of permits
Clarify environmental requirements for the planning process
Evaluate underutilized state funding programs

2. What Federal legislation, rule change, appropriation or other high-level policies would move us forward in this area of our mission?

Congressional statutes and EPA rules related to original purpose of SRF programs
Increase flexibility of Federal Farm bill on conservation, environmental flows, water quality, and supply impacts
Increase interaction w/Feds - more communication
Fed interaction involving technical assistance. TWDB serving as Centralized clearinghouse on State/Federal water issues
Increase cooperation with the State and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers - participation in projects. Use other associations and states.
New code authorizing water supply projects & applications for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Board should interact w/Feds on permitting issues
Better integration of Federal AG Program Impact on water quality and supply issues
Take a more holistic approach to appropriations to have federal agencies work together on water program implementation effectiveness.

Session 2: Planning

1. What TWDB Legislation, rule change, appropriation or other high-level policies would move us forward in this area of our mission?

Take Planning and move toward implementation (include funding)
Move projects of statewide importance to implementation
TWDB (or TWAC) as advocate for water supplies (Possible conflict of interest for TWDB?)
Go from 5- to 10-year State/Regional Water Plan and re-allocate money for environmental flows and other regional specific needs
Both TCEQ and TWDB should better define "Consistency" with State Water Plan
Get Environmental flow bill passed and get money from Legislature
Broaden Environmental Flows stakeholders involvement and get them involved up front (e.g. Jan. vs. April of Legislative session)
TWDB should be authorized to acquire Senior Water Rights and place them in the Water Trust and hold in case of drought (amend Water Code)
Identify major complicated infrastructure projects and facilitate water solutions and take lead (e.g. desalination and canal lining)
Allow Amendments to Regional Water Plans for new project (HB 2431 – 79th Leg)
Get stakeholders information on amendment Bill (community support)
Legislation to facilitate transfers of both groundwater and surface water

State should facilitate Interbasin Transfers for actual consumed water from Basin of Origin not paper rights

Use Existing Basin-Specific studies in Environmental Assessments vs. Default Criteria

Authorize TWDB to review statewide perspective on high impact groundwater export projects. Look at barriers to do item above. Look at historic use vs. sustainable use (Fortify legislation)

Protect potential Reservoir Sites. TWDB go to Legislature on unique reservoir sites

Add unique streams of ecological significance (come to agreement on what those are and protections)

Re-calculate what is the "Drought of Record". Need funds for this.

TWDB should do more to attract Fed money

Work better with stakeholders to attract Fed money (Unified voice statewide)

Establish broad-based, user-funded fee for water projects

Give Regional Water Planning Groups a role in implementation

TWDB needs to look for charitable funds for research

Clarify ambiguous definitions in Water Code

Consolidate water planning, funding, regulation in one agency (i.e. Water Resource Agency) including rates, fair market value at tap

Authorize Design-Build for water projects

2. What Federal Legislation, rule change, appropriation or other high-level policies would move us forward in this area of our mission?

Funding to comply with Federal Drinking Water standards

Force up front participation of US Fish and Wildlife Service and the US Army Corps of Engineers in the Regional Water Planning process

Allow State planning to trump Fed standards if meet supply needs

Improve statewide unity to acquire federal cooperation; Develop Tex-Fed (similar to California Fed)

More TWDB Federal involvement

Pursue funding opportunities with other Federal water-related programs (i.e. Dept. of Commerce, NADBank, EPA)

Develop one set of planning requirements that meets the needs of all state and federal agencies (TWDB, TCEQ, NADB, EPA, BECC)

Extend Tax-Exempt Bond Financing to all entities (non-profits) not just governmental entities

Support legislation to expand USACE mission on water projects (supply, operations and management)

Integrate planning and permitting

Evaluate NEPA and how it could interfere with project development

Bring air funding when discussing water funding

Session 2: Financial Assistance

1. What TWDB Legislation, rule change, appropriation or other high-level policies would move us forward in this area of our mission?

Programs overlap – need legislation to consolidate - them benefits, cut costs (however, may cut out some folks)

Prioritize projects with consolidated programs (rule change)

Rule-change to re-examine C.P.C. (EDAP)

Take 4 Bills on list not passed and work on passing them, especially HB 2431 and HB 1223

What can TWDB do to encourage/promote require regionalization funding

Incentives to comply and promote regionalization, especially debt forgiveness

Even though TWDB is not regulatory – Need regulatory (TCEQ) to require push for areas to regionalize

TWDB should have more of a role in requiring compliance with regulations

Focus more on compliance as a condition of funding

Focus on need first, compliance second

Comment: TWDB is a funding, not regulatory agency

Legislation for rules

MSR's state wide requirements

TWDB needs to maintain flexibility in rules even in considering compliance. Ex. Rita and Katrina - mechanism for extensions, exceptions

Policies in place to address disorders

Appropriation in advance to address disasters with immediate financing, flexibility

Appropriations – No specific source of funding for project development

Appropriations – Communities – Self help need dedicated source and should not be in competition with other projects

Combine funding programs - TWDB has too many programs – Focus on the need by consolidating

Appropriations- more funding in EDAP, Disadvantage Communities (Grants)

Change EDAP to less of a grant program (increase loan comp. 75/25)

Change 1989 requirements (Done w/467), need appropriation

Re-evaluate ORCA/TWDB MOU on $2m

Include funding for platting (allow for and have money available)

Farmer Home, as a funding agency, focuses on compliance to target the funding

2. What Federal Legislation, rule change, appropriation or other high-level policies would move us forward in this area of our mission?

Non-profit Water Supply Corporations – change them from being taxable to tax-exempt (instead of needing RWAF notes, Legislation to encourage Non-profit Water Supply Corporations to convert to Special Utility Districts state level)

Review PAB allocation – carve out subcategory for water projects

Proposed HR 1708 removes caps (PAB) recommend TWDB support

Repeal A.M.T.

ARB rebate initiative repeal (S.148) support

Appropriations available to mirror regulatory changes

Session 2: Data Collection and Dissemination

1. What TWDB legislation, rule change, appropriation or other high-level policies would move us forward in this area of our mission?

A. TWDB Focus

TWDB should expand focus from primarily drought & water supply planning to all water needs (brackish, wastewater, reuse, reclamations, etc).

B. Homeland Security

Identify the types of data that will be, or can be shared, and what is too sensitive.   If the data is sensitive, how can it be shared? Development of a data policy and procedure for accessing sensitive data was suggested.

C. Funding

Develop a funding mechanism for groundwater data collection.

Pursue more funding from local, state, regional, federal, and private sources.

Ask for money for implementing HB 1763. (groundwater conservation districts data for decision making).

Pursue matching funds on State Map program for geologic mapping.

Seek more resources that are dedicated to: data collection; data quality control; and data dissemination.

Seek appropriations to support TNRIS.

More active pursuit of funding to maintain land cover data sets.

Establish a policy to use funds earmarked for matching outside sources to leverage opportunities.

Maintain a funding pool to be used during difficult financial times.

Expand network and increase stream gage funding.

D. Groundwater and Surface Water

Do a better job with existing GAMs. Update models more frequently, increase the amount of data to made modeling more accurate. Increase data collection to monitor well pumpage.

Standardize groundwater planning models.

TWDB should move toward more risk-based analysis and probabilities (percentage based numbers) for groundwater availability analysis instead of absolute numbers.

More active pursuit of funding to maintain land cover data sets.

Expand network and increase stream gage funds.

E. Data Sources

Groups need to work together to integrate data from different sources.

TWDB needs to take a leadership position to interpret data coming from multiple sources. Determine how legislation can ensure public water systems providers give more water level data to the state in terms of water quantity and quality. Determine how to best obtain water and well data from the public providers. (Opinions differed on whether to make data gathering and sharing mandatory for local entities.)

F. Economy of Scale
Assign priority status to regional projects for financing infrastructure construction.

G. Water Sources
Give brackish water serious consideration as a source.

2. Question: What Federal legislation, rule change, appropriation or other high-level policies would move us forward in this area of our mission?

A. Funding
Ensure all federal funding agencies have systems/processes to fairly distribute federal funds among states. Do all the federal agencies recognize the need for more money to meet increased stringent standards?

Seek federal funds for drinking water quality improvement projects to meet increasingly stringent federal standards.

B. Emergency Preparedness/Response
Create a policy for increasing the number of stream gaging stations.
Create policy for pre-planning coordination of data development resources to implement as needed for emergency response.

C. Data
State and federal legislation to support need for separate nodes for capturing and accessing regional data during disasters. Need multiple back-up locations of data to support management and distribution of data through separate nodes.
Need exists for post-disaster data coordination and distribution.
TNRIS needs to take an active role with emergency management. Establish a single source with built-in redundancy for access.
TWDB should take the lead role in coordinating emergency management.
Need for a state geo-spatial plan.

Session 2: Education

1. What TWDB Legislation, rule change, appropriation or other high-level policies would move us forward in this area of our mission?

Education is part of the TWDB Mission

Expand to other areas (State vs. Federal) -- not just Conservation, water quality, flood control and mitigation

Educate customers on funding opportunities

Continue Water IQ results – Broader approach to water issues

Concept presentation from faucet to source

More consideration of Environmental needs for water

Educate TWDB Customers (people that come to Board) on broader issues of water resources.

Educate the Federal Government agency staff about Texas issues

Make sure all players understand mutual benefits of conservation and supply development

Texas Farm Bureau example – Environmental/ Water and Conservation modules in Texas Agricultural Display

Partnering with other entities – increase face to face opportunities

Increase TWDB information in other programs/agencies

Low impact development (don't increase flooding issues, reduce environmental impacts.)

A form of development minimizing effect on water resources

Incentives to (Low Impact Development) Funds to promote L.I.D

Less use of and effect on water resources

Focus/use on existing changes to educate

Internet… include links to other sites

Distribute resources (TWDB) Geographic's to increase logos for interaction

Legislation supporting hiring more FTE's.

Better use of existing video/telecommunication facilities (such as A&M's)

Texas Parks & Wildlife Foundation (PPP's & Funding opportunities) -- Nothing comparable @ TWDB -- Legislation to support a similar organization at TWDB for Education

Implementation of 79th Water Conservation Task Force recommendations for regional conservation coordinators

2. What Federal Legislation, rule change, appropriation or other high-level policies would move us forward in this area of our mission?

Renew efforts to quality Fed Legislation

Are there any Federal efforts currently? Same within EPA wastewater programs such as CWSRF.

Amend CWSRF – Education component

Consider Energy bill as example for water conservation/resources.

Look at California as example of use of EPA Grant program

Information is needed on greywater and water reuse

Education focus on issues

Federal/State Education on Desal

Amend WRDA to ensure education funding is considered as one of the projects

Question added by Break-out Group – What are Other Related Priority Topics for Education?

Other Topics

 State - State should leverage data acquisition to avoid duplication of data with other entities.

Example is Aerial photos
Group purchase of data
Wider distribution of models to avoid duplication
TWDB Customer Education of AG linked deposits. Need to educate users & banks about program.
Maintain water bank information and awareness
Education on basic facts about water quality
Example - With scientific impact on water resources

Add Non-point source pollution education - Tie in with TCEQ
Rainwater Harvesting for new housing construction
Education on reuse
Coordinate w/other partners
Create centralized location to avoid duplication on educational matter and programs
Example WIID for water resource data
Data Clearing House efforts underway on water emergencies issues among water professional generators
Municipal Conservation should be a legislative priority
Education of local level officials on importance of water conservation vs. selling water

Customer Service *Excellence*

Survey Results for

Customer Satisfaction Survey

for

580 - Texas Water Development Board

Through
May 19, 2006

Survey Items

580 - Texas Water Development Board

Survey Respondents

Total Number of Respondents: 417

33

Survey Items

Select the agency division you last had contact with.

Number of Respondents: 380

Item Response	Count	Pct.
Human Resources	6	1.58%
Office of Project Finance and Construction Assistance	79	20.79%
Resource Information Office/Texas Natural Resources Information System	43	11.32%
Office of Planning	124	32.63%
Executive Operations and Administration	57	15.00%
Legal Services	8	2.11%
Office of the Chief Financial Officer	17	4.47%
General/Unsure	46	12.11%

Survey Items

580 - Texas Water Development Board

Frequency Distribution

Human Resources	1.58%
Office of Project Finance and Construction Assistance	20.79%
Resource Information Office/Texas Natural Resources Inf	11.32%
Office of Planning	32.63%
Executive Operations and Administration	15%
Legal Services	2.11%
Office of the Chief Financial Officer	4.47%
General/Unsure	12.11%

Survey Items

580 - Texas Water Development Board

How would you describe yourself? Check all that apply.

Number of Respondents: 417

Item Response	Count	Pct.
General Public	39	9.35%
Political Subdivision (example: city, county, groundwater district,)	124	29.74%
Water Supply Corporation	12	2.88%
Regional Water Planning Group member	54	12.95%
Consultant	112	26.86%
Governmental Agency	74	17.75%
Other	37	8.87%

Frequency Distribution

General Public	9.35%
Political Subdivision (example: city, county, groundwat	29.74%
Water Supply Corporation	2.88%
Regional Water Planning Group member	12.95%
Consultant	26.86%
Governmental Agency	17.75%
Other	8.87%

36

Survey Items

> How would you describe yourself? Check all that apply.
>
> | **Verbatim Responses:** | 41 |
> | --- | --- |
>
> - Bond Counsel
> - Financial Advisor
> - Retired Prior Employee
> - university research
> - university
> - student
> - Legislative Staff
> - Research administrator, TX Agricultural Experiment Station, Texas A&M University System
> - Municipal Water Authority
> - professor
> - Public Interest Representative
> - Business Tourism owner
> - non-profit
> - Business
> - state association
> - ngo
> - Concerned Citizen
> - Concerned Texan
> - higher education
> - Retired Local Gov,
> - Large Quantity water user
> - Historian
> - investor owned water utility
> - sales of automation equipment
> - Attorney
> - College Professor

Survey Items

580 - Texas Water Development Board

Verbatim Responses: (Cont.)	41

- Federal
- Municipal Financial Advisor
- City Water Employee
- banker
- state university
- State Representative
- researcher
- Nonprofit organization
- River Authority
- Groundwater developer
- Investment Bank
- Vendor
- University Research Support
- Banker
- Vendor

Survey Items

My race/ethnicity is:

Number of Respondents: 378

Item Response	Count	Pct.
African-American/Black	4	1.06%
Mexican-American/Hispanic	37	9.79%
Anglo-American/White	322	85.19%
Asian-American/Native American	7	1.85%
Multiracial/Other	8	2.12%

Frequency Distribution

African-American/Black	**1.06%**
Mexican-American/Hispanic	**9.79%**
Anglo-American/White	**85.19%**
Asian-American/Native American	**1.85%**
Multiracial/Other	**2.12%**

39

Survey Items

580 - Texas Water Development Board

First Time Customer?

Number of Respondents: 386

Item Response	Count	Pct.
Yes	48	12.44%
No	338	87.56%

Frequency Distribution

Yes	**12.44%**
No	87.56%

40

Survey Items

580 - Texas Water Development Board

If you are a repeat customer, number of years you have been interacting with this agency:

Number of Respondents: 359

Item Response	Count	Pct.
Less than 1 year	19	5.29%
1 to 3 years	37	10.31%
More than 3 years	303	84.40%

Frequency Distribution

Less than 1 year	5.29%
1 to 3 years	10.31%
More than 3 years	84.4%

41

Survey Items

580 - Texas Water Development Board

Times in contact with this agency in last 12 months

Number of Respondents: 384

Item Response	Count	Pct.
Once	26	6.77%
2 to 3 times	54	14.06%
More than 3 times	304	79.17%

Frequency Distribution

Once	6.77%
2 to 3 times	14.06%
More than 3 times	79.17%

42

Survey Items

580 - Texas Water Development Board

Overall, I was satisfied with the amount of time it took to get a loan application processed.

Score:	3.44
Std. Dev.:	1.118
Number of Respondents:	72

Item Response	Count	Pct.
Strongly Agree	9	12.50%
Agree	26	36.11%
Neutral	13	18.06%
Disagree	9	12.50%
Strongly Disagree	4	5.56%
Not Applicable	11	15.28%

Frequency Distribution

Strongly Agree	12.5%
Agree	36.11%
Neutral	18.06%
Disagree	12.5%
Strongly Disagree	5.56%
Not Applicable	15.28%

43

Survey Items

Overall, I was satisfied with the amount of time it took to get a loan closed.

Score:	2.98
Std. Dev.:	1.308
Number of Respondents:	72

Item Response	Count	Pct.
Strongly Agree	5	6.94%
Agree	19	26.39%
Neutral	9	12.50%
Disagree	10	13.89%
Strongly Disagree	10	13.89%
Not Applicable	19	26.39%

Frequency Distribution

Strongly Agree	6.94%
Agree	26.39%
Neutral	12.5%
Disagree	13.89%
Strongly Disagree	13.89%
Not Applicable	26.39%

44

Survey Items

580 - Texas Water Development Board

The Drinking Water State Revolving Fund and Clean Water State Revolving Fund Intended Use Plan (IUP) information forms were easy to understand and fill out.

Score:	3.64
Std. Dev.:	0.879
Number of Respondents:	73

Item Response	Count	Pct.
Strongly Agree	8	10.96%
Agree	24	32.88%
Neutral	15	20.55%
Disagree	6	8.22%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%
Not Applicable	20	27.40%

Frequency Distribution

Strongly Agree	10.96%
Agree	32.88%
Neutral	20.55%
Disagree	8.22%
Strongly Disagree	0%
Not Applicable	27.4%

45

Survey Items

580 - Texas Water Development Board

Staff member(s) were helpful.

Score:	4.40
Std. Dev.:	0.824
Number of Respondents:	390

Item Response	Count	Pct.
Strongly Agree	209	53.59%
Agree	141	36.15%
Neutral	18	4.62%
Disagree	10	2.56%
Strongly Disagree	6	1.54%
Not Applicable	6	1.54%

Frequency Distribution

Strongly Agree	53.59%
Agree	36.15%
Neutral	4.62%
Disagree	2.56%
Strongly Disagree	1.54%
Not Applicable	1.54%

46

Survey Items

580 - Texas Water Development Board

I got the information I needed.

Score:	4.22
Std. Dev.:	0.915
Number of Respondents:	385

Item Response	Count	Pct.
Strongly Agree	164	42.60%
Agree	173	44.94%
Neutral	21	5.45%
Disagree	11	2.86%
Strongly Disagree	12	3.12%
Not Applicable	4	1.04%

Frequency Distribution

Strongly Agree	42.6%
Agree	44.94%
Neutral	5.45%
Disagree	2.86%
Strongly Disagree	3.12%
Not Applicable	1.04%

Survey Items

The procedures/instructions were straightforward and easy to understand.

Score:	3.81
Std. Dev.:	1.044
Number of Respondents:	384

Item Response	Count	Pct.
Strongly Agree	99	25.78%
Agree	154	40.10%
Neutral	70	18.23%
Disagree	26	6.77%
Strongly Disagree	15	3.91%
Not Applicable	20	5.21%

Frequency Distribution

Strongly Agree	25.78%
Agree	40.1%
Neutral	18.23%
Disagree	6.77%
Strongly Disagree	3.91%
Not Applicable	5.21%

48

Survey Items

My phone call, email, or letter was routed to the proper person.

Score:	4.28
Std. Dev.:	0.806
Number of Respondents:	383

Item Response	Count	Pct.
Strongly Agree	158	41.25%
Agree	158	41.25%
Neutral	28	7.31%
Disagree	7	1.83%
Strongly Disagree	5	1.31%
Not Applicable	27	7.05%

Frequency Distribution

Strongly Agree	41.25%
Agree	41.25%
Neutral	7.31%
Disagree	1.83%
Strongly Disagree	1.31%
Not Applicable	7.05%

49

Survey Items

580 - Texas Water Development Board

The website was easy to use and contained helpful information.

Score:	3.84
Std. Dev.:	0.993
Number of Respondents:	382

Item Response	Count	Pct.
Strongly Agree	98	25.65%
Agree	130	34.03%
Neutral	82	21.47%
Disagree	23	6.02%
Strongly Disagree	8	2.09%
Not Applicable	41	10.73%

Frequency Distribution

Strongly Agree	25.65%
Agree	34.03%
Neutral	21.47%
Disagree	6.02%
Strongly Disagree	2.09%
Not Applicable	10.73%

50

Survey Items

580 - Texas Water Development Board

If I filed a formal complaint, it was addressed in a reasonable manner.

Score:	3.68
Std. Dev.:	1.156
Number of Respondents:	358

Item Response	Count	Pct.
Strongly Agree	24	6.70%
Agree	20	5.59%
Neutral	28	7.82%
Disagree	2	0.56%
Strongly Disagree	6	1.68%
Not Applicable	278	77.65%

Frequency Distribution

Strongly Agree	**6.7%**
Agree	**5.59%**
Neutral	**7.82%**
Disagree	**0.56%**
Strongly Disagree	**1.68%**
Not Applicable	**77.65%**

Survey Items

580 - Texas Water Development Board

Overall, I was satisfied with the amount of time it took to get service/assistance/information.

Score:	4.07
Std. Dev.:	0.995
Number of Respondents:	382

Item Response	Count	Pct.
Strongly Agree	136	35.60%
Agree	166	43.46%
Neutral	35	9.16%
Disagree	17	4.45%
Strongly Disagree	14	3.66%
Not Applicable	14	3.66%

Frequency Distribution

Strongly Agree	35.6%
Agree	43.46%
Neutral	9.16%
Disagree	4.45%
Strongly Disagree	3.66%
Not Applicable	3.66%

52

Survey Items

Printed materials contained clear and thorough information.

Score:	4.03
Std. Dev.:	0.918
Number of Respondents:	377

Item Response	Count	Pct.
Strongly Agree	111	29.44%
Agree	159	42.18%
Neutral	51	13.53%
Disagree	11	2.92%
Strongly Disagree	9	2.39%
Not Applicable	36	9.55%

Frequency Distribution

Strongly Agree	29.44%
Agree	42.18%
Neutral	13.53%
Disagree	2.92%
Strongly Disagree	2.39%
Not Applicable	9.55%

Survey Items

Overall, I am satisfied with my experience.

Score:	4.08
Std. Dev.:	1.024
Number of Respondents:	389

Item Response	Count	Pct.
Strongly Agree	152	39.07%
Agree	163	41.90%
Neutral	35	9.00%
Disagree	21	5.40%
Strongly Disagree	15	3.86%
Not Applicable	3	0.77%

Frequency Distribution

Strongly Agree	39.07%
Agree	41.9%
Neutral	9%
Disagree	5.4%
Strongly Disagree	3.86%
Not Applicable	0.77%

54

Survey Items

580 - Texas Water Development Board

Item Score Summary

Item Text	Score	Std. Dev.
Overall, I was satisfied with the amount of time it took to get a loan application processed.	3.44	1.118
Overall, I was satisfied with the amount of time it took to get a loan closed.	2.98	1.308
The Drinking Water State Revolving Fund and Clean Water State Revolving Fund Intended Use Plan (IUP) information forms were easy to understand and fill out.	3.64	0.879
Staff member(s) were helpful.	4.40	0.824
I got the information I needed.	4.22	0.915
The procedures/instructions were straightforward and easy to understand.	3.81	1.044
My phone call, email, or letter was routed to the proper person.	4.28	0.806
The website was easy to use and contained helpful information.	3.84	0.993
If I filed a formal complaint, it was addressed in a reasonable manner.	3.68	1.156
Overall, I was satisfied with the amount of time it took to get service/assistance/information.	4.07	0.995
Printed materials contained clear and thorough information.	4.03	0.918
Overall, I am satisfied with my experience.	4.08	1.024

55