

**Texas AgriLife Extension Service
Texas Water Resources Institute**

**Texas Watershed Planning Short Course Project
EPA Clean Water Act §319(h) Grant
TCEQ Agreement No. 582-7-77049**

Quarter no. 10 From 6/1/09 Through 8/31/09

I. Abstract

This quarter was a very active quarter. The project was amended and extended one year to provide 1 additional Short Course in 2010, 3 *Getting in Step* courses, 2 *Key EPA Internet Tools* courses and semi-annual Watershed Coordinator Roundtable meetings. As a result, TWRI is now initiating two new subcontracts, amending two existing subcontracts, and amending two subaccounts. Over 80 watershed professionals were in attendance at the Watershed Coordinator Roundtable held in Temple on July 8 to discuss sustaining watershed plan implementation. Additionally, a total of 45 water professionals attended the third offering of the *Texas Watershed Planning Short Course* on August 17-21, 2009. On a scale of 1-5, the rating for the overall satisfaction of the short course was 4.03 (i.e. 80% satisfied). The Watershed Planning Short Course Website (<http://watershedplanning.tamu.edu/>) continues to see a lot of interest and has been visited by a total of 2,997 visitors since it became accessible online. Three *Getting in Step* courses have been scheduled for next quarter in Houston, Austin, and Dallas on September 22-24. All 3 offerings of the *Getting in Step* course have been filled with 30 participants at each location. The first *Key EPA Internet Tools* course will also be offered next quarter on November 19 in conjunction with the Land, Water, People 2009 Conference.

II. Overall Progress and Results by Objective and Task

OBJECTIVE 1: PROJECT COORDINATION AND ADMINISTRATION

Task 1.1: Team Organization – TWRI will assemble a Project Team made up of university, TCEQ, TSSWCB, EPA, Texas AgriLife Extension, TiAER and RSI personnel, along with EPA-trained watershed coordinators, to guide the development and delivery of the Texas WPSC to water resource professionals throughout Texas. This Project Team will meet approximately quarterly to discuss project status, provide input, and coordinate project activities. These meetings will consist of face-to-face meetings, teleconferences, and TTVN meetings as appropriate.

The following actions have been completed during this reporting period:

- a. On June 4, a planning team meeting was held via conference call to make preparations for the July 8 Watershed Coordinator Roundtable Meeting.

70% Complete

Task 1.2: Project Coordination – TWRI will coordinate the project with other ongoing watershed efforts including, but not limited to the USDA CSREES Southern Regional Water Program, TSSWCB Regional Watershed Coordination Steering Committee, Texas Watershed Steward Program, and TCEQ TMDL Program.

The following actions have been completed during this reporting period:

- a. Texas AgriLife Extension Service is a member of the planning team and has been subcontracted to assist with the Short Course, ensuring coordination with the Watershed Stewardship Program and Southern Region Water Quality Coordination Project.
- b. TSSWCB is a member of the planning committee and has participated in all planning team meetings. AgriLife Extension and TWRI regularly participate in the TSSWCB Wharton Regional Office Watershed Coordination Project, further ensuring coordination.
- c. TCEQ TMDL Program personnel are members of the planning team and participate in planning meetings when possible.

70% Complete

Task 1.3: Quarterly Progress Reports – TWRI will prepare electronic quarterly progress reports (QPRs) for submission to the TCEQ, TSSWCB, EPA, and all members of the Project Team. QPRs will be submitted by the 15th of the month following each state fiscal quarter for incorporation into EPA's Grant Reporting and Tracking System (GRTS). The QPRs are to include (1) Status of deliverables for each objective and (2) Narrative description in Progress Report format.

The following actions have been completed during this reporting period:

- a. TWRI submitted Progress Report #9 on June 15, 2009.

70% Complete

Task 1.4: Project Oversight – TWRI Project Manager will provide technical and fiscal oversight to ensure Tasks and Deliverables are acceptable and completed as scheduled and within budget. With TCEQ Project Lead authorization, TWRI may secure the services of contractors as necessary. Project oversight status will be provided with the QPRs. In addition, TWRI will attend meetings with project manager and other meetings, as needed, to review project status, deliverables, etc.

The following actions have been completed during this reporting period:

- a. Subcontracts were initiated with the Texas Institute for Applied Environmental Research (TIAER) at Tarleton State and the River Systems Institute (RSI) at Texas State to secure assistance with development and delivery of the Short Course. As of 8/31/09, the following expenditures had been reported:
 - TIAER = \$2,303
 - RSI = \$5,590
- b. Subaccounts were initiated with Texas AgriLife Research (Biological and Agricultural Engineering Department) and Texas AgriLife Extension Service (Soil

and Crop Sciences Department) to secure assistance with development and delivery of the Short Course. As of 5/31/09, the following expenditures had been reported:

- Texas AgriLife Research = \$13,939
 - Texas AgriLife Extension Service = \$23,299
- c. On August 28, 2009, the project was extended for 1 year, the budget was increased by a total of \$93,006, and the plan of work was amended carry out the following additional tasks: input Texas data into the Directory of Watershed Resources and provide 1 additional WPSC, 3 Getting in Step courses, 2 Key EPA Internet Tools courses and 3 semi-annual Watershed Coordinator Roundtable meetings.
- d. As a result of the project extension/amendment, TWRI is in the process of initiating subcontracts with (1) Tetra Tech for work described in Tasks 3.4 and 3.5 and (2) the Environmental Finance Center at Boise State University for work described in Task 2.3. TWRI is also amending and extending the contracts with TIAER and RSI, as well as the subaccounts with AgriLife Research and AgriLife Extension.

70% Complete

Task 1.5: Reimbursement Forms – TWRI will submit appropriate Reimbursement Forms (2 copies), purchase vouchers (269a, and 269a 1-4) and Small and/or Minority Owned Business Report (where applicable) by the last day of the month following each state fiscal quarter.

The following actions have been completed during this reporting period:

- a. The total federal funds expended as of May 31, 2009 were \$115,030.

60% Complete

Task 1.6: Contractor Evaluation – TWRI will participate in Contractor Evaluation.

The following actions have been completed during this reporting period:

- a. Contractor Performance Evaluation Reports for years 1 and 2 have been submitted to TCEQ. The third evaluation is expected next quarter.

66% Complete

OBJECTIVE 2: DEVELOP TRAINING MATERIALS AND EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM FOR WATERSHED PLANNING SHORT COURSE

Task 2.1: Compile and Summarize Existing Programs – TWRI will collect and compile information about existing training programs.

The following actions have been completed during this reporting period:

- a. Information on existing programs was compiled and discussed with the planning team during the first and second quarters. No further work is planned.

100% Complete

Task 2.2: Develop Training Program – As directed by the TCEQ and Project Team, TWRI will modify existing training programs, such as the EPA Watershed Training Materials and those found as a result of subtask 2.1, to fit the needs of Texas water resource professionals.

The following actions have been completed during this reporting period:

- a. A Planning Team is planned for next quarter to (1) review the course agenda and participant surveys for the third Short Course and (2) assess the need for any revisions prior to the fourth Short Course in May 2010.

100% Complete

Task 2.3: Facilitate Updating of Directory of Watershed Resources for Texas – TWRI will coordinate with the Environmental Finance Center at Boise State University in year 4 of the project to update the Directory of Watershed Resources with data for Texas-specific funding programs. The Directory of Watershed Resources is an on-line, searchable database for watershed restoration funding. The database includes information on federal, state, private, and other funding sources and assistance. This will allow Texas users to query information in a variety of ways including agency sponsor, keyword, or by a detailed search.

The following actions have been completed during this reporting period:

- a. TWRI is in the process of initiating the contract with the Environmental Finance Center at Boise State University so that work may begin on this task next quarter.

0% Complete

Task 2.4: Watershed Training Webpage – TWRI will develop (Months 1-3), host, and maintain (Months 3-48) an internet Web site for information sharing and use by WPSC participants.

The following actions have been completed during this reporting period:

- a. TWRI developed the Website (<http://watershedplanning.tamu.edu/>) in May 2007 for information sharing and use by short course participants.
- b. The Website was viewed by and estimated 148 unique visitors in June 2009.
- c. The Website was viewed by 199 unique visitors in July 2009.
- d. The Website was viewed by 153 unique visitors in August 2009.
- e. So far this year, the Website has been viewed by 1,205 unique visitors. In 2008, the Website was viewed by a total of 1,612 unique visitors. Including the 180 unique visitors in 2007, a grand total of 2,997 unique visitors have viewed the Website.

70% Complete

OBJECTIVE 3: CONDUCT WATERSHED PLANNING SHORT COURSE AND OTHER WATERSHED TRAINING

Task 3.1: Organize WPSC Events – TWRI will identify key speakers for training, make all arrangements for facilities, advertise the WPSC, conduct registration, and make all travel arrangements for speakers. Travel for speakers will be fully paid for through project funds.

The following actions have been completed during this reporting period:

- a. On June 4, the Short Course appeared in AgriLife News.
- b. On June 8, TWRI sent a *Water Resources Training Courses* e-mail update regarding training courses (including the *Watershed Planning Short Course*) to state agencies, river authorities, consulting firms, and academia.
- c. Work began this quarter on organizing the fourth *Watershed Planning Short Course*, set for May 10-14, 2010.
 - TWRI has reserved the Mayan Ranch for the fourth course.
 - TWRI has contacted and confirmed the availability of the speakers that assisted in the third Short Course for the fourth *Watershed Planning Short Course*.
 - Registration for the fourth Short Course will be opened next quarter.

75% Complete

Task 3.2: Deliver WPSC – TWRI will facilitate the delivery of four Texas WPSCs to 160 water resource professionals in Texas and the surrounding region. Certificates will be provided to participants upon completion of the course. A registration fee of \$350 will be charged to WPSC participants. As funding and need allow, additional offerings of the WPSC will be considered.

The following actions have been completed during this reporting period:

- a. A total of 129 water professionals have participated in the Texas Watershed Planning Short Courses held June 2-6, 2008 (43), January 12-16, 2009 (41), and August 17-21, 2009 (45).

80% Complete

Task 3.3: Organize One Applied Fluvial Geomorphology Short Course – TWRI will coordinate with Wildland Hydrology to provide Applied Fluvial Geomorphology Short Course to 40 water resource professionals in Texas. A registration fee of \$500 will be charged to short course participants.

The following actions have been completed during this reporting period:

- a. Forty-four participants from TPWD, TCEQ, TXDOT, TFS, Extension, and TWRI participated in the *AFG Short Course* held on January 28-February 1, 2008.

100% Complete

Task 3.4: Organize Three Getting in Step Courses – TWRI will coordinate with Tetra Tech to provide three Getting in Step Courses (in Houston, Austin, Dallas) to assist 90 water resource professionals (30 participants per course) in conducting watershed outreach campaigns. No registration fee will be charged to participants.

The following actions have been completed during this reporting period:

- a. Getting in Step courses have been scheduled for Houston, Austin, and Dallas for September 22-24. All 3 offerings of the Getting in Step course have been filled with 30 participants at each location.

25% Complete

Task 3.5: Organize Two Key EPA Internet Tools for Watershed Management Course – TWRI will coordinate with Tetra Tech to provide two Key EPA Internet Tools for Watershed Management Courses to 50 water resource professionals (20-30 per course). This course will provide instruction on using the Internet tools developed by EPA to support development of watershed plans. EPA’s Watershed Central website will be highlighted. No registration fee will be charged to participants.

The following actions have been completed during this reporting period:

- a. TWRI has been working with the River Systems Institute at Texas State on providing 1 of the Key EPA Internet Tools courses in conjunction with the Land Water People 2009 Conference in November 19, 2009. All arrangements have been made. Registration for this course will be opened early next quarter.
- b. It is anticipated that the second training will be held in conjunction with the Watershed Coordinator Roundtable Meeting tentatively scheduled for next July.

10% Complete

Task 3.6: Develop and Administer Questionnaires and Evaluations – TWRI will oversee the development and administration of questionnaires and evaluations to gauge the knowledge gained and how effective the course was for each course participant. Questionnaires will be administered at the beginning and end of selected short courses to demonstrate the course’s effectiveness and to identify areas needing adjustment.

The following actions have been completed during this reporting period:

- a. The short course evaluation (Appendix A) indicated that participants of the third short course were very satisfied with the course. On a scale of 1-5, the rating for the overall satisfaction of the short course was 4.03 (i.e. 80% satisfied), which was a drop from the previous course rating of 4.43. Ratings for individual presentations ranged from 3.16 – 4.59.
- b. The pre- / post-course exam again turned out to be very difficult for the course participants. The average on the pre-course exam was 31.64 and the average on the post-course exam was 76.10. However, despite the difficulty of the exam, it did demonstrate a considerable improvement in knowledge as a result of the course.

75% Complete

Task 3.7: Facilitate Watershed Coordinator Roundtables – TWRI will coordinate with the TCEQ, TSSWCB and EPA to organize and facilitate semi-annual Watershed Coordinator Roundtables in year 4 of the project. These Roundtables will build upon the fundamental knowledge conveyed through the WPSC and establish a continuing dialogue between watershed coordinators in order to facilitate interactive solutions to common issues being faced by watershed coordinators statewide. Roundtables shall be organized as face-to-face meetings only.

The following actions have been completed during this reporting period:

- a. A Watershed Coordinator Roundtable Meeting was held on July 8, 2009. It focused on sustaining watershed plan implementation and over 80 watershed professionals were in attendance. The meeting included presentations on organizing watershed

groups, creating and working with nonprofit partners, and forming the legal framework for a nonprofit organization. The agenda is attached (Appendix B) and a video of the meeting should be available on the Website next quarter.

33% Complete

OBJECTIVE 4: SUBMIT FINAL REPORT

Task 4.1: Draft Report

The following actions have been completed during this reporting period:

- a. No activity.

0% Complete

Task 4.2: Final Report

The following actions have been completed during this reporting period:

- a. No activity.

0% Complete

III. Related Issues/Current Problems and Favorable or Unusual Developments

- N/A

IV. Projected Work for Next Quarter

- Hold Planning Team Meeting to discuss revisions needed to agenda for fourth *Texas Watershed Planning Short Course*.
- Prepare and submit Progress Report for the 10th Quarter of the Project
- Initiate subcontracts with Tetra Tech and the Environmental Finance Center at Boise State University
- Amend / extend contracts with TIAER and RSI, and the subaccounts with AgriLife Research and AgriLife Extension
- Submit Contractor Evaluation to TCEQ as needed
- Initiate work on Directory of Watershed Resources for Texas
- Update Website as materials are developed
- Begin making arrangements for and marketing the fourth *Texas Watershed Planning Short Course*
- Deliver 3 Getting in Step Courses and 1 Key EPA Internet Tools Course
- Develop agenda and make arrangements for Watershed Coordinator Roundtable Meeting tentatively scheduled for January 2010

**Appendix A
Participant Evaluations**

Texas Watershed Planning Short Course -- Evaluations								
Topics	Level of Satisfaction					No answer	Average	Additional Comments
	1	2	3	4	5			
Overall, how would you rate the short course?			4	26	5	5	4.03	
Nine Elements of a Watershed Protection Plan		2	10	16	11	1	3.92	Great speaker
State and Federal Perspectives on WPPs		5	5	21	7	2	3.79	Great speaker
Working with Stakeholders to Move the Process Forward			4	11	24	1	4.51	Excellent
Partnership Building Experiences in Plum Creek			5	20	15		4.25	
Defining the Scope of the WPP			11	20	8	1	3.92	
Gathering data to assess your watershed			10	22	8		3.95	
Using Outreach to Develop & Implement WPPs - Element E			2	10	22	1	4.59	
Analyzing Data to Characterize Your Watershed	3	6	15	10	4	2	3.16	Too dense - he has a lot of expertise but this session was too much info. Hearing more of his stories and perspectives would have been helpful. Had difficulty understanding presentation.
The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly		2	7	9	22		4.28	Good exercise - not effective for me - needed more.
Revising the Texas Water Quality Standards	1	2	17	14	6		3.55	
Web-Based Tools for Watershed Assessment & Management	2	2	8	18	9	1	3.77	
Expectations for Element A	1	1	6	19	12	1	4.03	
Overview of Models for Estimating Loads & Reductions		4	8	21	6	1	3.74	
Simple Tools for Estimating Loads & Reductions		4	11	16	8	1	3.72	Needed more simplified.
Water Quality Monitoring: Practical Guidelines and Lessons Learned		1	3	22	12	2	4.18	Excellent exercise.
Expectations for Element B		3	5	19	10	3	3.97	
Pollutant Fate and Transport Mechanisms	1	1	10	8	3	17	3.48	
Urban NPS Measures		5	8	13	13	1	3.87	
Agricultural NPS Measures and WQMPs		2	12	12	12	2	3.89	Some info out of date
Wastewater Treatment Systems		2	11	15	11	1	3.90	
Wastewater Issues	1	2	11	14	10	2	3.79	
Other Approaches to Managing Pollutant Sources	1		11	8	12	8	3.94	
Cedar Creek Reservoir Case Study		3	9	19	9		3.85	
Overview and Expectations for Element C		1	10	14	9	1	3.91	
Targeting Critical Areas and Scheduling Implementation	1	5	8	17	8	1	3.67	
Developing Interim Milestones & Criteria to Measure Progress	1	5	10	17	7		3.60	
Designing & Implementing Effectiveness Monitoring		2	10	17	9	2	3.87	Too much about results of monitoring and not enough about design and implementation process
Using Volunteer Monitoring For Assessment and Outreach		2	9	18	10	1	3.92	
Expectations for Element D		1	11	18	10		3.93	
Hickory Creek - Implementation Strategies for BMPs			2	18	20		4.45	duplication with WPP in Okla. - could probably eliminate one
Watershed Protection Plan Implementation in Oklahoma		1	9	19	10	1	3.97	
Texas Watershed Steward Program and Online Modules			3	20	15	2	4.32	
Sustaining Watershed Groups for Implementation Success		3	8	18	11		3.93	
Putting it All Together		1	4	15	14	6	4.24	
Implementing your WPP - Arroyo Colorado Case Study		1	5	12	16	6	4.26	
National Perspectives on Watershed Group Organization			7	11	13	9	4.19	
If you were not completely satisfied with the Short Course, please tell us what we could have done better in order for you to have been completely satisfied.								
Start earlier, end earlier and use easier to read powerpoint slides. Charlie, Shannon and John had the best slides. Others too wordy and designed to be in a book.								
Too long of sessions with a short breaks. Meeting room too warm at times. Need a short break after each session, especially on 8:30 to 6:30 days (too long).								
This "short" course is very long. I realize many people enjoy getting away from the office for a week, and this is a pretty place, but I'd personally have preferred it to be held in Austin and have the talks grouped in a way that perhaps one could attend only relevant parts.								
Presentations were generally too long. Limit to 30-45 minutes. End by 5 p.m. each day. Too much detail - will not be retained by most trainees								
Limit Case Studies and speakers on time limit; spend 30 minutes on each of the 6 steps and 30 minutes on each of the 9 elements; this is 7.5 hours of a course; have demos as a workshop; potentially have participants prepare an outline of a WPP for an example watershed								

Appendix A Participant Evaluations

Complete satisfaction is hard to do with varying levels of technical knowledge to service in one room
Don't put a four day course in five days. Maximum sitting time should be 2 hrs. You could end each day with 3 hrs., 2.5 hrs., 3.5 hrs. Start earlier (no need for 1.25 hr breakfast). End earlier
Pretty long days, shorter but more presentations would help break it up a little more
Please have more breaks, especially in the afternoons. Make a 45 minute talk to 40 minutes and give people 5 minutes to go to the bathroom. I suggest starting at 8:15 and ending earlier because 6:30 was really late. Also, please update presentation handouts (Ex: Cedar Creek Case Study).
Have a break at least every 2 hours. Add more interactive sessions - especially later in the week. Some presentations could be much more focused. Have people submit volunteer draft WPPs for in-course feedback.
We need more information on what EPA expects as far as reliability and scientific accuracy on measuring effectiveness of BMPs in WS Plans. Guidance given during the training was sketchy. Course time should have been reduced by 0.5 to 1 hour. Mr. Davenport with Region 5 EPA did a great job criticizing WS plans and troubles he had with other agencies, but offered few ideas for improvement. Mr. Lamb and Mr. Crocker w/ Region 6 did a great job explaining what their expectations were and were a little more forthcoming with unknowns on their end. These EPA Region 6 guys just seemed more reasonable and approachable
Excellent range of topics, but could use a greater focus on some of the entry-level "how-to" basics
Evening sessions were long and hard to pay attention. Possibly put shorter sessions at the end of the day.
I would have preferred the classes start earlier and end earlier or else not have lunch until 1 or 1:30. Six hours after lunch is too much
Days were too long to sit and listen
Have break-out groups or sessions for components (detailed modeling info was not needed for all participants)
Days were too long. I understand that it is a great deal of information, but after a certain hour, everyone is tired and no information is retained. If all of the material is absolutely necessary, perhaps the training should be split into 2 parts. Incorporate more breaks into the schedule (they can be 10 minutes), especially after very long presentations. Begin the days earlier, to end the day earlier.
Concurrent/breakout sessions would be a good way of diversifying the topics and addressing the variety of skill levels of the participants. Make attempts to diversify presentation styles to avoid powerpoint overload
Days were too long - could probably eliminate some of the presentations
To the extent that presenters simply read their ppt slides, I question the value of that presentation since 90-95% as much could be gained by reading the slides. To the extent presenters used slides to support their comments, experiences, perspectives, the presentations were more effective. In places, the workshop got too technical and detailed. What was most helpful for me was descriptions of concepts, process, experiences & insights shared
Very good
TMI - we need to find a way to break this up. Review the presentations - did the group need an introduction to standards or a report on current events
Break out session for those of us who are novices to water quality standards, NPS regulations
It seems like there was some duplication; seems like it could be a 3-day course. Seems like 1/3 of talks could be dropped with no effect on content. Maybe some talks could be reduced by 1/2, or end at 5 p.m. each day.
More afternoon breaks
Days were too long
Determine if BMPs need to show a positive benefit to cost ratio. For a list of BMPs describe conservation benefits and landowner benefits. Such as a pond for sediment and pond for recreation. Lose the agency bashing, one speaker was rather negative
Course needs to be extended to cover more days; days need to be shortened; one 30-minute or hour break after lunch; some topics seemed rushed; needed more time
Acoustics were inconsistent. It may have been the room or microphone or both
NO ANSWER: 10
What was the most significant thing(s) you learned from this short course?
The complexity and flexibility of the process
Case studies were good to illustrate elements
Outline of the process and challenges that are involved with plan
Stakeholders; EPA funding; groups working on the issues; failures that occurred/would have liked a few more success stories
Understanding of 9 elements
Website resources and Case Studies
Scope and magnitude of the effort needed and the variety of resources available
EPA expectations for WPP plans
Work being done in Denton
Stakeholders
How substantive the planning and implementation process is
How far our basin was behind in implementing watershed protection programs
The structure of a plan from start to finish. Importance of stakeholder process that is thorough and inclusive
The Introductory Presentations (Nine Elements; What is a Watershed) because they are very informative (and I'm new to watershed issues). Very much enjoyed all of Charlie's presentations. They will help a great deal with our community
Importance of stakeholder involvement
What resources are available for help
The Plum Creek example was great! I learned of a ton of wonderful resources to use not only for creating watershed plans but everyday tools.
There is not "cookie cutter" way to develop a WPP

**Appendix A
Participant Evaluations**

A better top-down understanding of the process
Watershed characterization importance. Bill Jarocki was excellent
Everything. Completely new to the process.
Overall process of WPP
Outreach, connecting with stakeholders
The load variation with density
How complete the process really is
Involving stakeholders
Texas is out of step with EPA. The smallest Texas Watershed is twice the optimum size according to the EPA. The largest is 1000 times the optimum.
Human factor, nine elements, and basic planning
Public outreach portion - all talks by Charlie were very helpful
Nice to hear EPA/TCEQ conversations about financing issues. I got a lot from the outreach perspectives and stakeholder involvement problems/successes associated with other WPPs
Location and sources of support material
New contacts
Information on what watershed planning is, and involvement in preparing a plan
Methods and difficulties in monitoring/sampling streams. Methods to enhance public information efforts
About Google Earth flyover as a tool for giving a unique, interactive view of a watershed
Availability of various websites and resources available
There is a considerable amount of material readily available to assist in building WPPs and good people all over who are very knowledgeable
NO ANSWER: 3
Which topic(s) covered by this Short Course, if any, would you have like discussed in greater detail?
How the Texas agencies carry out their specific duties - where they cooperate well and where they don't
Developing interim milestones
Data analysis - This is a vital part of a project, with great potential for misuse (whether intentional or not). The whirlwind presentation on this was far too superficial to be helpful
Many topics had too much detail
Examples of successful plans
Creative methods of in-kind contributions
Based on questions I got over the course maybe a talk on 305(b)/303(d) Basics; how we determine AV's, what data we use, more detailed info on coordinated monitoring process. All of this was mentioned but not discussed in detail. A better understanding of the process that gets water bodies listed and how people can comment on those listings might be helpful to watershed planners
Stakeholder initiation, involvement
Someone actually meeting the milestones and then the adjustments made to achieve the TMDL delisting
Ag BMPs and how to persuade producers to adopt
How to add new BMPs to an existing plan
I would have liked to have heard more about analyzing data and how to know the amount of data to collect. I like the real-case examples
Characterizing watershed data; schedule; milestones (did not follow the speaker who covered these topics)
Walk through an actual WPP in the course - this could be spread over the entire week and used to reference/give perspective to each section
I would have like an hour in the day to look at our own watershed maps (if they were chosen) to look over them. I did this with an EPA person at night but think it would have been good for more to be able to do this
Load Duration Curves, basics of a WPP document preparation/format, standards for estimating load reductions for given BMPs
Modeling. Maybe you could have pulled up the SWAT program and showed its functions? I also know there are separate courses so maybe this is why we did not go into great detail. I find the modeling useful.
Specific situations that some are facing - or that one might face in developing a WPP
Financial and technical assis. - how to aquire
The modeling was interesting, especially for anyone that has no knowledge on it. Due to time restraints, these parts were often rushed. Also, I would have like an explanation of 319 and 303, because there were many who who were new to all of the material
Funding opportunitis
Best watershed plans; how to get WWTP & OSSF info and what to do with it
Multiple people addressing same topic from different viewpoints - panels mixed with presentations; vision - 319, 604 - details of expectations for these
9 Elements
Operation & Maintenance of BMPs and associated costs; auditing and recording of funds
More applied info on modeling
BMP selection - especially urban - this was only touched on. Also, examples of monitoring designs would have been useful. Success stories were not discussed (actual program activity that EPA has to report on)
NO ANSWER: 13

**Appendix A
Participant Evaluations**

Which topic(s), if any, did you have a particular interest in but was not covered by the short course?
Open dialog or more panel discussions would have been nice to break up lecture format. Also Q&As during meeting would have been nice. Should have allotted at least 10 minutes for Q&A after each presentation
Grant writing
EPA Cost Share; targeting the audience you are speaking to
Grant
Actual WPPs could have been passed around and presentations could have gone step by step thru a written plan(s). Show good and bad written examples
Details of expectations for 319 & 604
Practical implementation methods, i.e. WW collection line mapping, inspection, maintenance and repair programs
Grant writing
The role of habitat conservation in the process
Everything covered was interesting and I can only think to include more watershed examples, or how to deal with trying to start a watershed plan in a large river basin
Watershed planning for BEGINNERS; need to have an early session for novice planners
It would be nice to show the tradeoffs of various BMPs. For example if a farmer spreads more often what is the trade off for increased emissions, etc. I would have liked to learn more about urban BMPs. Especially how planning agencies often address climate change. Air quality, what good does it do to ignore other env. Factors. Lets take a truly holistic approach.
Integrating habitat/wildlife issues into WPPs, introduction to standard BMPs, grant-writing
Conflict resolution and facilitation skills
Add learning objectives at beginning and keep coming back to these each day
Jurisdictional boundaries in WPPs - crossing state lines, county lines, international lines for the watershed
None - very comprehensive course
Got it
Actually conducting stakeholder meetings (format of meetings). Most productive way to get info from stakeholders. QAPP Development
Stormwater permitting; CAFO permitting; wildlife related issues in water quality
Long-term sustainability requires continual training. Many practices (BMPs) are cyclical. If stories are not documented, potential repeat history is increased. Also, how to "sell" the process. We are all salesman to help the environment and watershed for future generations. Future generations need to have a personal awareness of the cost & price paid to keep watersheds restored. Useful to have NRCS present info on FA & TA available ...
Getting started. Establishin the need to have a WPP when TMDLs are not required
NO ANSWER: 18
What topic(s), if any, should be omitted from future Short Courses?
Waste water issues could be combined with wastewater treatment issues easily without lengthening the session
All topics are fine, but some either need to be given more time or removed entirely (or atleast included only as a brief subtopic in another presentation)
Presentations should be limited to 30 minutes. The web-based tools should be hands-on demos before or after class. 2-3 people could have shared a computer and glanced at sites in less time. Less time on outreach (speaker was excellent). Presenters should not publicly denounce other agencies during presentations.
A few seemed duplicative
Just be watching for hot new topics
"Analyzing Data to Characterize Your Watershed" - definite bias against models, misrepresentation of role of professional conservationist & others by using negative examples ONLY of their work.
The course seemed pretty comprehensive from a non-watershed planner point of view
Some of the technical modeling lost a lot of attendees. Larry Hauck did good generalizing but others were way too in-depth.
Maybe not so much about LDCs
All topics were important - none should be omitted. You could however, remove Mr. Davenport w/ EPA to shorten the course length. His presentations covered too much anxiety.
Eliminate some of the overlap of presentations and focus back more on the 9 elements
Web module overviews
Some of the more technical modeling info
Davenport's criticism of other states & various issues "social scientists" as touch feely?
Topics were fine - they were however too long without enough opportunity to ask specific questions - need more breaks and down time
None - but some should be optional as they do not apply to everyone
I didn't see anything that should be omitted. However, certain things could probably have been spoken about less (some presentations had redundant info or spoke too long on unimportant things)
Implementing WPP in Oklahoma
In general, all the topics are important. The could potentially be broken up into multiple sessions presented on a rotating basis
Stick to Plum Creek, no need to add in Cedar Creek/Oklahoma unless it's highlighting only 1) sub-segment or sub-element
Duplication; many talks could have been combined w/ other talks or topics
Agency bashing

**Appendix A
Participant Evaluations**

LID
Consider grouping presentations of linked elements (e.g. L and G)
N/A: 6
NO ANSWER: 10
How satisfied were you with the quality of the Course materials? Are there additional resources that should be provided at future courses?
Appreciated receiving all presentations
Very good
Good; EPA Rules/Requirements; Real life stories of success
Good stuff. The binder is all-inclusive, which is important because sometimes I was overloaded
Reference list i.e. Water Quality Standards Handbook
I am satisfied with the course materials. I would suggest providing the materials of topics frequently discussed (such as the EPA manual when 303 & 619 are everyday topics). More reading material for informational purposes.
A list of all presenters contact info for follow-up purposes
A comprehensive list of resources i.e. Websites; emails
I really enjoyed Charlie MacPherson. She is awesome! The examples were great (Plum Creek & Cedar Creek)
Great materials! An online gallery of contact info w/ a photo would be a great networking tool
Good
Walk through an actual WPP
Let you know later
Satisfied. Good information. I learned a lot
Very satisfied. The TCEQ SWQM program may have reference materials that can be added to the course. CD; Assessment guidance, monitoring guidance and other materials that summarize some of the upfront processes, pre-WPP. Guide to Freshwater Ecology; water education field guide; conducting a watershed survey
Overall very good - but some presentations need updates. Ordering was incorrect because of changes with speakers.
I appreciate the acronym page. A page of Websites would be very handy
Ok
Average
Contact info for speakers. The CD is a very nice touch. Hearing the presentations will be very useful
Good
Very satisfied. Thank you for the CD with materials and the binder with slides for notes during presentations.
Need examples of successful plans
Satisfied. More Q&A and less worry on time constraints
Excellent
Need contact info for speakers. Sub-tabs will be helpful especially when reorganizing during meeting take tab A on Monday and put behind C for Wed.
There is a lot of good info in the materials. It would be helpful to have it categorized more distinctly by Element
I'm satisfied. I wish we would have been able to receive the EPA Handbooks
Very satisfied - can't think of anything
Great! WPP Handbook
Material could be condensed; provide a single packet with web-resources that is organized
The materials are fine. A paper copy of the EPA Handbook would have been nice but I realize that was not your fault.
Hands-on and field exercises were excellent
VERY SATISFIED: 4
NO ANSWER: 3
What is your level of satisfaction with the sequencing of topics?
I'd prefer more grouping of related topics, allowing one to attend only certain days
I liked the sequencing
It worked
4
5
It could be more fluid. A review of the nine steps would be useful each day to put the topics in perspective
Basically okay, despite what Brad Lamb said Thurs.; Nice shuffle for jury duty
Very satisfied for my level of involvement with WPPs

**Appendix A
Participant Evaluations**

Satisfied
I enjoyed it a lot
Good. You might tab each individual presentations in the folder to make them easier to find.
A few things could have been turned around to flow better
Flows well
I thought it was great to have collaboration and stakeholder involvement in the beginning because I believe this is the most important (science & democracy!)
Overall, the sequencing was good
First day was great
VERY GOOD: 3
FINE: 2
OK: 5
GOOD: 10
VERY SATISFIED: 1
NO ANSWER: 3
What will be the first 3 steps you'll implement as a result of taking this training?
Using training to improve my understanding of watershed based plans (overall)
1) More involvement through attending stakeholder meetings; 2) Work with TSSWCB more; 3) Site visits
Good
Train other stay members, develop a handbook, study funding, improve customer relations, listen more talk less; for each BMP develop a coservation objective and a landowner objective
Add Google Maps to Webpage - flyover; Get a WPP together for Aaron; look to put together local partnerships
Writing a plan for; addressing my plan - starting with stakeholders and data collection
Follow up on Cedar Creek & Hickory Creek. Focus on stormwater volume reductions
We will assess our river basin, begin contacting potential partners, and try to speak to the community more
1) Identify and contact stakeholders; 2) Identify watershed for which plan will be written; 3) find source of financing for implementation
Talk more with stakeholders. Better ground truthing. Look for historical flow data.
1) Using the tools to create better public outreach & education; 2) Assessing watershed issues and pollutants; 3) Determining their sources/causes
Revise sections of current WPP, look into advanced training, sleep
1) Better characterization of the WS; 2) Call the EPA Economic Center about their workplan
As an NRCS rep, I will make sure that D.C.s (at least one) from each WS are available to offer services to Louisiana WS Coordinators
Take a new approach in involving stakeholders; look for funding in different places; develop new projects based on upcoming needs
Look for existing WPPs. We can help do modeling, look for watersheds in our area that need a WPP, Examine stakeholders and assess needs
The course gives me a better overall perspective on how the outcome of my job (305(b)/303(d)) and monitoring influences or can support WPP efforts
1) Contact those I met here to continue a workin relationship; 2) try to digest it; 3) lose weight
Expanded volunteer monitoring program; watershed steward program; attitude adjustment to reduce cynicism
Review our outreach materials and create more. Beging to work on mailing lists, contacts. Discuss with Mexico
Depends on the funding from EPA
Obviously, this really depends on where you are in your WPP so personally I will be contacting stakeholders, organizing a watershed steward training and working on a QAPP for monitoring
Spend considerable time and effort on planning and budgeting
Develop stakeholder team; characterize watershed; start developing goals
1) Outline needs for preparing WPP for lower Colorado River; 2) Network to gain capacity for winning a 319 grant; 3) perhaps prepare/participate in grant support
I will be sure to offer food at outreach events (or rewards of some kind for involvement)
Look for additional sources of funding. Develop participation programs. Characterize watershed.
More communication with stakeholders. Adjust BMPs. Organize and report interim milestones.
1) Identify NRCS funding sources; 2) Bulletin on Watershed Planning and how our local NRCS folks can assist in the process; 3) Update Website with NRCS resources available
I work with TMDL/IP development, not WPPs. For future projects, I want to do a better job of informing local interested parties from the earliest stages of the project.
Indepth review of materials; Develop outline & sample of WPP development; Develop better techniques for outreach & public education
NO ANSWER: 10
Looking beyond the course, in your opinion what could the state and/or federal agencies do to best serve you in your WPP efforts?
I look at more involvement by EPA before plan written, during rather than just after it is complete
Better guidance

**Appendix A
Participant Evaluations**

Clarify the requirements for assistance; the objectives and needs defined; engage the public thru education and media outlets to encourage participation
It seems like Oklahoma's approach is easier and more organized
EPA & La. DEQ need to have a meeting with all us coordinators to review expectations
Provide realistic guidance and standardization of procedures
We would benefit from more training, and perhaps reading material (manuals)
I am so new to this, I cannot answer this one yet
Provide brochures/posters, newsletters to be sent out to the community or used in schools and libraries, etc. This gets expensive without funding.
Provide trainings like this! Think Publicly. Change and encourage zoning policies and regulations; create incentives for BMPs both urban and rural. Create disincentives for "not" using BMPs urban and rural.
Whenever possible, consolidate resources and efforts
Know what's expected of the process to begin with
Be more timely
Guide the funding process and help support stakeholder interest as well as help sustain the WPP after implementation
(Start or) Keep talking to each other
Continue these and other trainings, perhaps one day courses on specific topics (implementation, outreach, etc.); Web-based resources
This is a complicated, complex issue. However, it would help to de-jargon the public information using language the average stakeholder can relate to.
Provide resources; provide technical assistance with BMPs and working with farmers
Texas needs to try to work with EPA rather than trying to do their own thing. There seems to be a huge gulf between the two entities
Work to reduce the cost associated with modeling
Ad campaign for each agency so stakeholders know how to find proper resources and who responsible
Help answer specific questions
Be more flexible in regards to new/experimental BMPs
Again, I don't directly work with WPPs. But with those being largely non-regulatory, many, many agencies & programs can play a role in these. It makes it confusing and complicated. It might just be easier if on agency has a specific charge to do/approve/manage WPPs.
More funding and technical guidance
NO ANSWER: 15
What other tools, training, capacity building, etc. (if any) would you suggest to serve your efforts in WPP planning?
Could have workshops focusing on elements or groups of linked elements for improving understanding and to help states & watershed groups better develop watershed based plans
Working with sponsors; working with groups of 12 & less and working with groups greater than 12 members. Again, back to structure and how to facilitate the two groups.
More break-out/interaction in small teams, so that we can
Bring in TWDB & SRF
As I previously stated, more training and informational reading materials
See answer to #11 --- which was --- I am so new to this, I cannot answer this one yet :)
How to deal with disproportionality & binational issues (Mexico). Social justice etc. ...
Separate modeling training; field work/visits
Time for one-on-one or small group Q&A based on need during the day
More on how to approach landowners and how to persuade them
N/A -- overall good job
?
This course should be archived on a webinar
See previous -- which was -- Continue these and other trainings, perhaps one day courses on specific topics (implementation, outreach, etc.); Web based resources
The river site component was good; try to break up the sitting with more activity - hands on (models, mapping, etc)
Working with bilingual groups
More "realistic" watershed examples - Most of us probably will not have multi-million dollar budget
How to quantify costs & build budgets
Perhaps future WPP trainings could have different tracks & breakouts to match attendees interests & needs - more technical & specific sessions for those studying with such issues - more conceptual sessions for those just getting into the WPP process
I would suggest more interactive exercises
Mostly need time to let information soak in and review in detail w/ daily evaluations
N/A: 8
NO ANSWER: 11

**Appendix A
Participant Evaluations**

What was your level of satisfaction with the training location and facility?
Acoustics could have been better. Great facility - it encourages networking
Good
Good location - hard to get to site
Great, easy, fun
The location and facility were final (although very HOT!)
Excellent - would have liked a bit more free time to explore
Most satisfactory, but we had no time available to partake of the activities offered at the location
I really enjoyed this training. I thought this was a great location.
Great main room, great food, rooms need renovation badly. Lack of room phones, full wireless coverage was problematic
Great location!
Very good. Fun, affordable, great service & food
This is always a good location for meetings and networking. You can't get overall quality of service anywhere else without paying top dollar for that service. The course was very well done. Well organized, good speakers. I appreciate the effort that went into developing and implementing this short course. Thank you.
Air conditioning not up to par. Need more breaks - even short "stand up" breaks. Could use more comfortable chairs if you are going to have long classroom sessions. Audio could be louder.
Just fine - not completely necessary to be so far away from civilization - but it's ok.
Fair
Terrific
Okay but a little too hot. How about October?
Location and facility were great
Great
Location was great. Mayan Ranch did a great job. Nice to be able to get out of the classroom and go down to the river.
Awesome!
Poor
It would be nice to do the meeting in a setting where good WPP BMPs have been implemented. Bamberger Ranch, e.g.
Excellent - wish wireless Internet was expanded
Only one restroom and located next to speaker; potential to flip room around; not close to major airport (DFW or HOU); New Ulm near Houston might be an option; like the informal setting; set 2 pp./table; have power cords available. Hyatt Lost Pines Resort
The facility/food are fine. I'd have preferred a version of this course be held in Austin with so many from there.
Training room too warm after lunch. Excellent location, excellent food and accommodations
VERY SATISFIED: 2
SATISFIED: 2
EXCELLENT: 3
OK: 2
VERY GOOD: 3
NO ANSWER: 1
How would you rate the WPP you are involved in as meeting the intent of EPA's WPP Guidelines?
They meet the guidelines
Not started yet
Non-existent thus far
A plus
Currently, we are not involved in a WPP. We attended the course to gain knowledge on them, and to gain further understanding of the process.
N/A -- too new to this
It is a very small watershed but I believe it will meet the intent of EPA's WPP
We are not currently working on a watershed plan
It's fairly unique in its scale and flows. I think it needs further work.
Average
It's on its way
Solid
A 2 out of 10

**Appendix A
Participant Evaluations**

Just getting started
Not currently involved
Poor
Depends on which one. Some projects intended to improve watersheds are not being done strictly in EPA WPP format. Where we've been asked to help write plans in conjunction with ADEM (Al. Dept of Env. Mgmt) it's dismal and pathetic
High
Good
It is very good but the Ag component nutrient loading will not work without tweaking and adding new BMPs
N/A: 13
NO ANSWER: 7
In your watershed, what are the local strengths for success?
Good collaboration
Need and purpose of the project. Wisdom of the sponsors. Knowledge of politicians, leaders and anti project persons.
Lots of opportunity for change with no place to go but up. In S.E. La. People are more likely to lend an ear to environmental issues - especially if you tag it to coastal restoration
A few motivated individuals or groups
Interest is high within our agency. We have some community members and media who are passionate about issues dealing with the river.
Stakeholder involvement
Very small community
Local strengths for our successes have been volunteer monitoring partners
Community organizations (churches, etc.) and proximity to local resources (Houston universities, etc.)
Enthusiasm from politicians
NRCS, LDAF, SWCDs, RC&Ds, etc ...
Knowledge about resources
We won't start our first WPP in the North Bosque so ... n/a
Partnerships & continuous communication
To be determined
? Would have to evaluate. Perhaps interested municipalities and volunteers
There is a true concern for the goal of the watershed
Active non profit groups (Cibolo Nature Center)
Data, \$21 Million in studies - N. Bosque
Local landowners/land users
We have a good quality river system that is not yet challenged. A number of projects have developed data/info, LCRA, SAWS, etc.
Technical expertise, some communities that get it (including elected officials)
Strong coordination
Rural watershed fewer landowners to deal with
Very passionate stakeholders that want clean water
Local involvement and awareness
Houston area - highly organized implementation group for bacteria TMDLs
N/A: 7
NO ANSWER: 6
In your watershed, what are the local obstacles for success?
Being able to attract (engage) all stakeholders
Funding, age of sponsors related to ability to meet & lead, failure to take risks to move forward. Lack of state agencies assistance.
I'm not sure yet
Drivers for BMP implementation
Limited community interest/involvement/binational issues, a very large river basin, and our agency location is very isolated, which could make communicating with the community difficult
Money
Lack of water quality knowledge & the effects/causes of NPS
Low income, language barriers, lack of regulatory control
Farmers & agriculture interests; my inability to run meetings effectively

**Appendix A
Participant Evaluations**

Pinpointing NPS pollution and confusion over why these WSs need attention
Leaders are not timely
Dairy producers and their broken relations with TIAER
Individual agencies protecting their turf
To be determined
Our watershed is binational so many of the steps don't apply, or apply differently
The plan and Texas only address the river and not the watershed. Aaron says this himself
Existing divisions between conservation driven nature center supporters and private property rights groups/landowners
Dairies and past history
Funding
1) Recognized impairments are up-river for the most part; 2) River not fully recognized as a resource and that there is a need to protect
Political power structure; municipal codes; lack of awareness, knowledge of many elected officials
Finances/costs
Many stakeholders outside of the watershed. People in watershed may feel that outsiders are telling them what to do.
Ag component/nutrient loading reductions cannot be met
Funding
Competing interests/goals of groups
N/A: 7
NO ANSWER: 7
Other:
Reduce classroom time to more of 8-5 format; Use more class participation events; Length of presentations (some) could be reduced - such as the presentation on Web-based tools (a lot of time spent on each slide); Outdoor presentation at the River on monitoring was excellent - it really provided a welcome break from classroom presentations & was informative and interesting; Speak in terms of existing loads, load reductions, etc. instead of Element A, B; Not necessary to spend a lot of time on Web sites/tools. People can do this later once they are aware of the site.
Thank you for the immense amount of work that went into presenting this course! So many great people!
There are a lot of "tools" I picked up that will be used to develop programs and approaches to get active participation from the ag. Sector
I liked the case studies, example WPP presentations, and all of Charlie MacPherson's talks
This venue was fantastic for networking
Thomas Davenport - Too long, too detailed, could not follow even though an important topic. Hard to hear and follow. Did much better at later sessions
Overall, a very worthwhile workshop. We'd be interested in collaborating to make these trainings more regional throughout the SE. Applying adult learning theory to the way the sessions are designed would increase learning and participant engagement
Hole punch ALL handouts; Virtual tours of a watershed - visit FPPC Inc Website for example video tours; have some key individuals from project at the training; Information on thumb drive & have participants bring laptops can make notes (tablets do not have a CD drive on them); Have notepads available & pens/pencils; Potential for Webcast of presentations & Q&A; Break up Course Evaluation into Day 1, Day 2, Day 3; Potential for breakout sessions.
I heard numerous people mention that the daily presentations go too late into the day. I know I would have preferred starting earlier in the morning to end earlier in the afternoon. At the very least, there needs to be on more break in the afternoon.

Appendix B

Texas Watershed Coordinator Roundtable
“Sustainable Organizational Structure for Long-Term WPP Implementation”
July 8, 2009
9:30 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.
AgriLife Research & Extension Center at Temple

Agenda

- 9:30 – 10 a.m. Welcome & Purpose/Introductions [Aaron Wendt, TSSWCB]
- 10 – 10:15 a.m. Models for Sustainability [Roger Miranda, TCEQ]
- 10:15 – 10:30 a.m. National Perspective on Watershed Group Organization [Matt Berg, AgriLife Extension]
- 10:30 – 10:40 a.m. Break
- 10:40 – 11:40 a.m. Sustaining Watershed Groups and Implementation [Bill Jarocki, NW Env. Finance Ctr.]
- 11:40 – 12:10 p.m. Creating and then Working with a Nonprofit Conservation Partner [Bill West, GBRA]
- San Antonio Bay Foundation
 - Guadalupe-Blanco River Trust
- 12:10 – 12:30 p.m. Catered working lunch (or bring your own) [RSVP required]
- 12:30 – 1:30 p.m. Keynote lunch speaker: Legal Framework for Nonprofit Organization Formation
- Texas Association of Nonprofit Organizations [Barry Silverberg]
- 1:30 – 2:30 p.m. Discussion of Organizational Structures [Aaron Wendt, TSSWCB]
- San Marcos River Foundation [Dianne Wassenich]
 - Lower Rio Grande Valley Stormwater Task Force [Javier Guerrero – not confirmed]
 - Coastal Bend Bays and Estuaries Program [Ray Allen]
 - Open Discussion
- 2:30 – 2:40 p.m. Break
- 2:40 – 3:15 p.m. Other topics for discussion/status/follow-up [Aaron Wendt, TSSWCB]
- Clearinghouse of Funding Mechanisms [Kevin Wagner, TWRI]
 - Texas Watershed Planning Short Course [Kevin Wagner, TWRI]
 - Texas Watershed Steward Program [Jennifer Peterson, AgriLife Extension]
 - Initiative for Watershed Excellence [Eric Mendelman, RSI]
 - Texas Stream Team [Jason Pinchback, RSI – not confirmed]
 - EPA WPP Review Guide [Randy Rush, USEPA – not confirmed]
- 3:15 – 3:30 p.m. Wrap-Up [Kerry Niemann, TCEQ]
- Other Tools and Resources Needed by Coordinators
 - Next meeting