

**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. 13 From 3/1/10 Through 5/31/10

**I. Abstract**

This quarter, the fourth offering of the *Texas Watershed Planning Short Course* was held. It was well attended (40 participants) and received high marks (4.4 out of 5). Arrangements were also made and the agenda was completed for the upcoming Watershed Coordinator Roundtable scheduled for July 27. In conjunction with the Roundtable, a *Key EPA Internet Tools* course will be held on July 26. Registration is open for both the Roundtable and *Tools* course. These are being actively marketed at this time to maximize involvement. Along with these activities, work has begun on closing out the project. TWRI submitted a Close Out Plan to TCEQ this quarter and began work on the final report. The project will be completed next quarter on time and on budget.

**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 March 11, 2010, TWRI met with the Texas River Systems Institute to discuss the Watershed Planning Short Course and finalizing the project.
- b. On March 12 and 26 and April 5 and 19, TWRI personnel met to discuss the May 2010 Watershed Planning Short Course, the potential for putting on a Stream Restoration Course, and close-out of the grant.

**93% 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 were members of the original planning team and participated in planning meetings when possible.

**93% 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 #12 on March 15, 2010.

**93% 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, Tetra Tech, the Environmental Finance Center (EFC) at Boise State University, and the River Systems Institute (RSI) at Texas State to develop a Directory of Watershed Resources for Texas and assist with delivery of the Short Course and other training to watershed coordinators in the State. As of 6/14/10, the following expenditures had been reported:
  - TIAER = \$4,262 (91%)
  - Tetra Tech = \$10,074 (73%)
  - EFC = \$8,827 (60%)
  - RSI = \$13,178 (73%)

- 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 12/31/09, the following expenditures had been reported:
  - Texas AgriLife Research = \$17,072 (88%)
  - Texas AgriLife Extension Service = \$23,890 (85%)
- c. On April 20, 2010, TWRI submitted a Close Out Plan to TCEQ.

**93% 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 February 28, 2010 were \$170,617.

**69% Complete**

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

The following actions have been completed during this reporting period:

- a. The Contractor Performance Evaluation Report for year 3 was completed on September 17, 2009.

**75% 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. The agenda for the fourth and final short course was finalized this quarter, completing this task.

**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. The Environmental Finance Center imported an additional 14 programs into the Directory of Watershed Resources, accumulating a total of 69 programs to date.
- b. The Environmental Finance Center constructed and distributed a promotional flyer for the Texas Watershed Short Course which allowed the promotion of Directory of Watershed Resources Database for the State of Texas to occur on a micro and macro level.
- c. The Environmental Finance Center conducted a presentation that focused on a holistic approach to watershed planning that utilized EFC Boise State University's Plan2Fund and Directory web-based tools at the May 2010 Texas Watershed Planning Short Course.

**60% 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 207 unique visitors in March 2010.
- c. The Website was viewed by 154 unique visitors in April 2010.
- d. The Website was viewed by 126 unique visitors in May 2010.
- e. So far in 2010, the Website has been viewed by 718 unique visitors. The Website was viewed by a total of 1,437 unique visitors in 2009 and 1,612 unique visitors in 2008. Including the 180 unique visitors in 2007, a grand total of 3,947 unique visitors have viewed the Website.

**93% 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. Work on organizing the fourth and final *Watershed Planning Short Course* held on May 10-14, 2010 was completed this quarter.
- b. The *Texas Watershed Planning Short Course*, *Key EPA Internet Tools Course*, and *Watershed Coordinator Roundtable* were advertised in the *March, April 2010 Water Resources Training Courses Update*.
- c. Worked with Texas AgriLife News to develop and distribute short article advertising the Short Course; appeared on AgriLife Communications website.
- d. Story advertising the Short Course appeared in the April 2010 issue of the *High Plains/Midwest Ag Journal*.
- e. Advertisement of the May Short Course appeared in the “Upcoming Public Meetings” section of the Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board, March and April 2010 *Monthly Program News and Activities* update.
- f. The *Texas Watershed Planning Short Course* was advertised in the *May 2010 Environmental Finance Center Newsletter*.

**100% 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 165 water professionals have participated in the Texas Watershed Planning Short Courses held June 2-6, 2008 (43), January 12-16, 2009 (41), August 17-21, 2009 (45), and May 10-14, 2010 (36).

**100% 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 were provided in Houston, Austin, Dallas, and Georgetown on September 22-24, 2009 and January 28, 2010, respectively, training a total of 86

water resource professionals in conducting watershed outreach campaigns. On a scale of 1-5, participants gave the course an average score of 4.2.

**100% 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. The first *Key EPA Internet Tools* course was provided to 22 water resource professionals in conjunction with the Land Water People 2009 Conference in San Marcos on November 19, 2009.
- b. The second training will be held at the Texas AgriLife Research and Extension Urban Solutions Center in Dallas on July 26<sup>th</sup> in conjunction with the Watershed Coordinator Roundtable Meeting. Currently, there are 13 registered for this training.

**44% 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 B) indicated that participants of the fourth 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 4.4 (i.e. 88% satisfied), which was an improvement from the previous course rating of 4.03. Ratings for individual presentations ranged from 3.3 – 4.6.
- b. The pre- / post-course exam again turned out to be very difficult for the course participants. Grades on the Pre-course Exam ranged from 3-82 and averaged 38.2 while grades on the Post-course Exam ranged from 38.5-91 and averaged 82. However, despite the difficulty of the exam, it did demonstrate a considerable improvement in knowledge as a result of the course.
- c. A questionnaire is being developed for distribution at the Watershed Coordinator Roundtables to better allow participants to provide input on satisfaction with roundtables, discussion topics needed at future roundtables, and dates for roundtables.

**93% 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. The next Texas Watershed Coordinator Roundtable has been scheduled for July 27 at the Texas AgriLife Research and Extension Urban Solutions Center in Dallas. The primary discussion topic will be financing watershed organizations and watershed plan implementation. The agenda has been finalized and is attached (Attachment A). Currently, there are 41 registered for the Roundtable.
- b. TWRI has also developed a listserv for Watershed Coordinators to assist in the exchange of information (<http://watershedplanning.tamu.edu/subscribe>).

**66% Complete**

#### **OBJECTIVE 4: SUBMIT FINAL REPORT**

##### *Task 4.1: Draft Report*

The following actions have been completed during this reporting period:

- a. Work has begun on drafting the final report. The DRAFT Final Report will be submitted to the TCEQ next quarter for review and approval.

**20% 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**

- Prepare and submit final Quarterly Progress Report for the Project
- Submit budget amendment to move remaining funding to salaries
- Close out all subcontracts
- Submit final request for reimbursement
- Close out project
- Complete work on Directory of Watershed Resources for Texas
- Update Website

- Continue marketing and finalize preparation for the *Key EPA Internet Tools* course and Watershed Coordinator Roundtable
- Offer *Key EPA Internet Tools* course on July 26 in Dallas
- Host Watershed Coordinator Roundtable on July 27 in Dallas
- Prepare and submit Final Report for the Project



## Appendix A

### **Texas Watershed Coordinator Roundtable “Financing Watershed Plans”**

**July 27, 2010**

**9:30 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.**

**AgriLife Research & Extension Center at Dallas**

#### **Agenda**

- |                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| 9:30 – 9:45 a.m.   | Welcome & Introductions [Kevin Wagner, TWRI]   |
| 9:45 – 10:45 a.m.  | Directory of Watershed Resources [Bill Jarocki, Environmental Finance Center]  |
| 10:45 – 11:00 a.m. | Break  |
| 11:00 – 12:00 p.m. | Keys to Effective Grant Writing [Bill Jarocki, Environmental Finance Center]   |
| 12:00 – 12:30 p.m. | Catered working lunch (or bring your own) [RSVP required]  |
| 12:30 – 1:30 p.m.  | Keynote lunch speaker: Financing the Illinois River Watershed Partnership <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• IRWP Executive Director [Dr. Delia Haak]</li></ul> |
| 1:30 – 2:15 p.m.   | Match from a Contractors Perspective [James Earp, City of Kyle]  |
| 2:15 – 2:30 p.m.   | Break  |
| 2:30 – 3:00 p.m.   | State Revolving Fund [Velma Smith, EPA]  |
| 3:00 – 3:30 p.m.   | Wrap-Up [Kevin Wagner, TWRI] <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Other Tools and Resources Needed by Coordinators</li><li>• Next meeting</li></ul>               |

Appendix B  
**Compilation of Evaluations**  
**For**  
**May 2010 Texas Watershed Planning Short Course**

| Level of Satisfaction  | 1 | 2 | 3        | 4         | 5         | No Answer | Total     | Average    |
|--|---|---|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|
|  |   |   |          |           |           |           |           |            |
| <b>Overall Course Rating</b>   |   |   | <b>2</b> | <b>12</b> | <b>11</b> | <b>6</b>  | <b>31</b> | <b>4.4</b> |
|  |   |   |          |           |           |           |           |            |
| <b>Nine Elements of a Watershed Protection Plan</b>                        | 3 | 1 | 4        | 8         | 10        | 5         | 31        | 3.8        |
| <b>Perspectives on WPPs</b>  | 0 | 2 | 3        | 11        | 10        | 5         | 31        | 4.1        |
| <b>Working with Stakeholders to Move The Process Forward</b>               | 0 | 0 | 4        | 6         | 16        | 5         | 31        | 4.5        |
| <b>Partnership Building Experiences in Plum Creek</b>                      | 0 | 0 | 0        | 13        | 13        | 5         | 31        | 4.5        |
| <b>Expectations for Element E</b>  | 1 | 0 | 9        | 12        | 5         | 4         | 31        | 3.7        |
| <b>Using Outreach to Develop &amp; Implement WPPs</b>                      | 0 | 0 | 1        | 10        | 17        | 3         | 31        | 4.6        |
| <b>Texas Watershed Steward Program</b>                                     | 0 | 1 | 4        | 15        | 8         | 3         | 31        | 4.1        |
| <b>Expectations for Element A</b>  | 2 | 0 | 8        | 13        | 4         | 4         | 31        | 3.6        |
| <b>Gathering data to assess your watershed</b>                             | 1 | 1 | 5        | 13        | 8         | 3         | 31        | 3.9        |
| <b>Defining the Scope of the WPP</b>                                       | 0 | 0 | 10       | 7         | 10        | 4         | 31        | 4.0        |
| <b>The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly</b>                                     | 0 | 0 | 4        | 6         | 17        | 4         | 31        | 4.5        |
| <b>Analyzing Data to Characterize Your Watershed</b>                       | 3 | 4 | 7        | 11        | 3         | 3         | 31        | 3.3        |
| <b>Web-Based Tools for Watershed Assessment &amp; Management</b>           | 0 | 1 | 4        | 13        | 9         | 4         | 31        | 4.1        |
| <b>Expectations for Element B</b>  | 0 | 1 | 7        | 15        | 6         | 2         | 31        | 3.9        |
| <b>Overview of Models for Estimating Pollutant Loads &amp; Reductions</b>  | 0 | 1 | 2        | 11        | 15        | 2         | 31        | 4.4        |
| <b>Simple Tools for Estimating Loads and Load Reductions</b>               | 0 | 3 | 11       | 10        | 4         | 3         | 31        | 3.5        |
| <b>Watershed Modeling: Plum Creek Case Study</b>                           | 0 | 2 | 14       | 10        | 2         | 3         | 31        | 3.4        |
| <b>Overview and Expectations for Element C</b>                             | 0 | 4 | 4        | 12        | 10        | 1         | 31        | 3.9        |
| <b>Urban NPS Measures</b>  | 0 | 0 | 4        | 9         | 16        | 2         | 31        | 4.4        |
| <b>Agricultural NPS Measures</b>   | 0 | 3 | 7        | 11        | 7         | 3         | 31        | 3.8        |
| <b>Wastewater Treatment Systems</b>  | 0 | 1 | 2        | 10        | 17        | 1         | 31        | 4.4        |
| <b>Wastewater Issues</b>   | 0 | 4 | 6        | 15        | 3         | 3         | 31        | 3.6        |
| <b>Online Wastewater Treatment Modules</b>                                 | 0 | 2 | 6        | 10        | 10        | 3         | 31        | 4.0        |
| <b>Expectations for Element F, G, and H</b>                                | 0 | 3 | 9        | 9         | 6         | 4         | 31        | 3.7        |
| <b>BMP Selection: Cedar Creek Reservoir Case Study</b>                     | 0 | 0 | 5        | 10        | 16        | 0         | 31        | 4.4        |
| <b>Targeting Critical Areas and Scheduling Implementation</b>              | 0 | 0 | 9        | 8         | 13        | 1         | 31        | 4.1        |
| <b>Developing Interim Milestones &amp; Criteria to Measure Progress</b>    | 2 | 1 | 2        | 11        | 15        | 0         | 31        | 4.2        |
| <b>Designing &amp; Implementing Effectiveness Monitoring - Element I</b>   | 1 | 1 | 2        | 8         | 14        | 5         | 31        | 4.3        |
| <b>Water Quality Monitoring: Pratical Guidelines &amp; Lessons Learned</b> | 0 | 0 | 4        | 8         | 19        | 0         | 31        | 4.5        |
| <b>Texas Stream Team Monitoring Methods Demonstration</b>                  | 1 | 1 | 2        | 7         | 20        | 0         | 31        | 4.4        |
| <b>Expectations for Element D</b>  | 1 | 2 | 5        | 12        | 10        | 1         | 31        | 3.9        |
| <b>Sustaining Watershed Groups for Implementation Success</b>              | 1 | 3 | 2        | 12        | 10        | 3         | 31        | 4.0        |

|   |   |   |   |    |    |   |    |     |
|---|---|---|---|----|----|---|----|-----|
| <b>Putting It All Together</b>                              | 0 | 1 | 8 | 11 | 10 | 1 | 31 | 4.0 |
| <b>Implementing Your WPP - Arroyo Colorado Case Study</b>   | 1 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 13 | 1 | 31 | 4.2 |
| <b>Watershed Protection Plan Implementation in Oklahoma</b> | 0 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 15 | 0 | 31 | 4.4 |
| <b>Perspectives on Watershed Group Organization</b>         | 0 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 12 | 1 | 31 | 4.2 |

**3 What could we have done better in order for you to have been completely satisfied?**

Long days of sitting was painful. Recommend breaking up the day more with field trip/exercise like the Thursday afternoon events.

Facility with better Internet.

The repetition is tedious when you hear it for the fifth time. Otherwise, no gripes about syllabus/content.

N/A - Except maybe have a field trip mid-week instead of at the end.

More economics and more emphasis on effectiveness and related costs and choices among BMPs.

Include small-scale case studies. Address buy in of difficult stakeholders.

It was very long. A lot of powerpoint presentations. It would be nice to have more hands on activities. Also, being in communications, I would like to see even more on outreach to stakeholders: more on human to human contact in getting them to support WPP and Implementation.

Great course. A lot of great information. Only suggestion would be to have more creative approaches to topics. Any other opportunities for field trips to break up the lectures?

Especially in the Element oriented sections provide examples from a plan(s) for the particular item being addressed. Too Texas focused.

Have speakers speak at more venues - we did go to the river one day, which was nice and changed the mood - changing venues with speakers I think makes people's attention span more effective when trying to absorb and grasp all this info.

Was a very good course overall.

It would have been nice if more of the presentations had been interactive, like Charlie's presentations. Perhaps we could critique a plan from another state to learn more about the 9 Elements.

I was completely satisfied and all expectations were met.

The modeling and load reduction components provided a lot of information, but created more questions than answered. It was emphasized that estimating load reductions were difficult, but did not offer many practical solutions.

Most presentations simply repeated text on PowerPoints - redundant - and should have focused on more interactive discussion or info that supplemented slides.

Just wish New Mexico had something like this that was a bit more relative to New Mexico.

Many of the PowerPoints were ineffective, too much text, hard to see.

Give participants more time off to break & absorb the information. 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. for four days is just too long! No one is listening at the end of the day -- information overload! Don't schedule out-of-state speakers for the last time slot - a waste of their time & they don't get the attention they deserve.

Too many speakers read the slides. I can read.

1 hour with a single speaker was pretty rough with some subjects. Some folks were not very good speakers and some elements weren't covered well as a result. Any variety is good. All lectures too much.

Lots of good information, but not all needs to be presented in a PowerPoint - and certainly no simply read from the PowerPoint. Anything that's simply read from a slide should not be presented orally and anything that isn't legible on a slide or a handout should not be presented at all.

**4 Most significant things learned from the course**

Where there are resources to help in developing a plan.

Resources available and not everyone has it "figured out"

WPP and TMDL implementation plans are not different

Nine Elements of the plan, all of the tools available to assist you in developing & implementing your WPP, google Earth tours of a watershed

Effectiveness of public outreach publications

The outreach topics were helpful (& fun). The data gathering helped as we get ready developing or GIS. The web topic was useful (the EPA Watershed Website).

Public outreach

Relationship & application of 9 Elements. Process to put together successful WPP

Some good strategies for outreach. The milestones & monitoring components also provided great ideas.

How to develop key stakeholder groups; better understanding of drafting and implementing WPPs

6 Steps of WPP; 9 Elements of WPP; Public outreach importance; organization structure of the ad-hoc committee

I learned of many more available resources to help with putting together a watershed plan.  
BMP effectiveness  
Planning is very important  
The several aspects about a WPP  
How difficult and time consuming and resource intensive it can be to write a good enough plan  
All of the great resources available. The step by step guidelines  
I got a much better understanding of what a WPP is and especially the difference between a WPP and a TMDL. This is something that my coworkers have been struggling with - how to communicate these differences  
It's a complex plan  
That this is a very long term, difficult, complicated process  
Total breadth and scope of WPP process and linkages of many components  
There are lots of people and resources dedicated to ensuring our success - holding our hands  
Learned much but most significantly it helped to put the pieces together with regards to how the CWA works  
Where do I begin? This is an invaluable training for anyone working with the 9 Elements. For me though, outreach is a big problem/issue for us. Lack of local outreach expert.  
This course taught me a lot about the language and scope of a WPP.  
The role different agencies play in NPS projects  
Finance modeling of BMPs - generating options for stakeholders  
How other watersheds have developed their plans. Ways to present model results.  
More indepth knowledge about the 9 Elements. A lot about modeling that was unknown to me prior to now.  
For LID success, you need personnel infrastructure. Thanks, Tom.  
Prior to taking this course, I did not realize the scope & breadth of what is involved to implement a WPP. Now I do.

**5 Topics to discuss in greater detail**

LID's - the presentation was excellent. Could use more practical advice on how to implement.  
Missed the lawyer in the January 2009 course.  
The Texas Stream Team Presentation was good, but I have also seen them do a classroom presentation that can go over some of the data they have available. How we can access that data.  
Defining scope early in process  
Understanding basic financial analysis (enough to talk intelligently! Not model)  
Implementing BMPs  
There was a large emphasis on funding. That is very important but at this point, my interests are purely technical.  
Why Plum Creek hasn't resulted in reduced NPS pollution.  
Outreach as it relates to social networking and new media.  
Data (common problems in getting it, best literature to use, analysis, methodology, etc.)  
Cowboy breakfasts  
Stakeholder involvement and outreach  
It was all covered significantly  
More examples like North Central Texas of plan development especially using smaller plans without access to modeling. Some New Mexico examples.  
Everything was explained very well.  
It was a lot of information in short time but most were covered pretty well.  
None  
The process of gathering and involving stakeholders.

Urban NPS measure

All were discussed about right, not sure I would increase time.

Greater discussion on decisions associated with choosing how building a watershed to work in, which pollutants have great potential to improve and other variables to assist the planner on where to focus the original planning efforts (ie. Were to watershed plan).

More critical examination of completed WPPs & Ips -- what worked, what didn't work. Ways to improve - emphasis on "lessons learned" - Tom Davenport began to touch on these topics.

Modeling

It seems E. coli, TN & TP were the only impairments discussed in depth. Perhaps discussing others as well would be helpful.

Load duration curves, getting new stakeholders initial interest in the project, expanding talk on gathering data and what you do with the information once you find it.

Lots of examples, but not a lot of discussion on HOW to get ther. A lot of information was a repeat. Daren Harmel should have had a talk - not just materials and demo.

If anything, there should have been LESS detail.

**6 Topic of interest but not covered by course**

Examples of failures or problems in developing WPPs and the lessons learned; Effective ways to communicate technical WQ information to stakeholders; Tips for Writing 319 grants (planning or implementation) that get funded.

Ken Banks, City of Denton, should present on Element C. He's a great speaker and has accomplished a lot there. And it's not Plum Creek. Buck Creek WPP - bacteria source tracking talk really good (don't know her name) And not Plum Creek.

Stormwater issues, MS4's, SSOs were not covered.

QAPPs

More specific strategies, lessons learned from actual watershed planning and implementation projects in Texas and elsewhere.

New Mexico specific project info. Demonstrations of how things can work in an arid environment, mountainous region, with very sparse populations.

I am too new to this to know

Case studies of small WPPs; strategies for small WPPs

I'd be interested in broad overview of the CWAs contents and its history from a policy standpoint

Stormwater management (ie. Wild arroyos)

Stakeholder facilitation skills

How to get local information and how to use it considering privacy protection

None

**7 Topics to be omitted**

Detailed modeling presentation

It's hard to say. I had very little interest in the wastewater treatment sections but I wouldn't want to omit them because they are likely useful to others.

How to use Web pages -- I can't imagine any professional these days who cannot navigate an interface - it's good to know about the resources, but not click by click.

Anything before 10 a.m. and after 5 p.m.

Seems like the brief reviews of the Elements were not needed since we later went into detail about the Elements.

I think all were helpful.

Perhaps less on modeling and data analysis but they do need to be included.

None

Most of the wastewater modules. Could be paired down and give greater connection to the planning and implementation process

Online demos should be set up to view during breaks, lunch, after presentations, rather than as a presentation. Gives all a chance to "play" w/ Website, etc.

Stuff about WWTP

Reviewing the 9 Elements in the intro when it is discussed directly after that -- is redundant. Should be eliminated from intro slides. (This happened a lot when we reviewed "expectations" topics and later topics elaborating. Could they be lumped?) Tools for estimating loads was confusing probably based on clarity of speaker (might keep on agenda with different speaker), she was knowledgeable but confusing. Texas Stream Team demo did not fit in well, although being at the dam by the river was nice. "Wastewater issues" did not fit in well w/ the rest of the agenda. Did not see the purpose of volunteer monitoring demonstration. Element overviews not good enough to take the time. And the financial info may have been good - but message lost with speaker placement. All the sessions on Expectations of the Elements of the plan - handouts are sufficient. Gathering Data - handouts sufficient - unless discuss specific recommendations

**8 How satisfied were you with the quality of the course material? Are there additional resources that should be provided in the future?**

Fine, except for the figures or charts that are not legible.  
Good -- I vote 6 slides/page. Not many notes needed when all slides provided. When sharing with others, they can add pages.  
Good -- no additions needed.  
Good materials, but too much paper!!  
Very satisfied. Very well-organized.  
I didn't feel like I needed all of the slides for every section but personalizing notebooks for each person would have been a nightmare. In general, I was satisfied (although my suitcase is probably more than the allowable 50 lbs.)  
Very, notebook and handouts will be handy. Nice to be able to follow along and write notes.  
Good -- cd is useful  
Generally very good materials  
The course materials are great and will provide a good reference in the future  
Very satisfied  
Moderately satisfied. I cannot think of any.  
It was well presented with plenty of materials  
The resources and materials available was excellent  
Satisfied  
Great materials, I'm still reviewing it all.  
A lot of PowerPoints. Not sure how to avoid that, but especially slides with graphs, etc .... They are hard to read.  
Very satisfied. Ideally some of the PowerPoint pages should be typed to make them readable.  
Super -- t-shirts!  
Seemed pretty comprehensive - a good starter kit  
Very satisfied  
The use of binders, PowerPoints and the Web was very good.  
Very satisfied. Great literature and I appreciate the CD w/ presentations  
4 out of 5  
They are all excellent  
Completely, really impressed (summaries/short papers and talks provided @ future courses.)  
I recommend encouraging some speakers shorten the quantity of information they are trying to convey per slide: fewer words. Otherwise, good course materials

**9 What is your level of satisfaction with the sequencing of topics?**

Good mix; for the most part, no one speaker had too much of a block of time.  
Completely satisfied  
Fairly satisfied  
Honestly, it felt a bit jumbled/hopping around  
Great. The beginning sessions were a great way to start the course.



At this point in my experience, it was fine.

Just fine.

Good. It builds to create a complete picture of the WPP

Made sense; followed EPA steps

Super

Seemed fine (2)

It seemed to be all over the place.

Very satisfied with the sequencing.

Sequencing was good

10 out of 10

Done well (2)

Good

Satisfied (2)

Very good

Good (4)

Wish modeling talk was in morning. Important info - but dry - after lunch it was making me sleepy

Pretty well structured. A speaker should not give back to back presentations, a 2 1/2 time slot is way too long and even an hour is pushing it. Wednesday should be a half-day so people can unwind.

Honestly, I don't remember

I could not discern the rationale for the order of the topics.

**10 What are the first 3 steps you'll implement as a result of taking this training?**

1. Review notes and prioritize topics for review or to pursue more info; 2. Practice writing flyers/invitations to stakeholder meetings; 3. Check out various commended Websites, and try the Plan2Fund tools.

Help with review of plans presented to me and as a technical advisor.

N/A

1. Change my approach when interacting with stakeholders. Emphasizing more "what in it for them" and let them know what their vote will be.

Establish relationships within my community, design public outreach activities and pamphlets, map land use within watershed.

1. Work on getting stakeholder participation and materials; 2. Getting my organization set up on EPA Website

Review modeling; BMPs

Develop watershed partnership to address watershed water quality

Greater outreach efforts; sharing the information learned with stakeholders and staff; reviewing our planning to date and adjusting our approach

Not real sure as I do not play a direct role in WPPs at this point

1. Meet with NRA to define strategy and stakeholders; 2. Check what resources we have; financial; personnel; 3. Determine the limits of the WPP

I'm not sure because I'm not currently coordinating a WPP but it will bring up some discussions in our program

Restructure QAPP sampling plan; use Boise State's resources

Stakeholder outreach techniques; data collection technique guidance; be aware and careful of data that is not supported

1. Make sure we have the necessary staff resources to go forward with a plan; 2. Review course materials to identify missing pieces on work plan; 3. Walk the watershed;

4. Begin process of working with stakeholders.

Characterize -> look at watershed to see if there is a problem. If so, where is it? Partnership -> Who can help me fix the problem and how will we do it? Set goals

Looking for data that has already been collected in my watershed - Cedar Bayou. This will help communicate with the stakeholders, the need to collect additional data.

Getting the county I work for more involved in watershed protection

1. A serious, sober assessment of what we're getting in to; 2. An outline for the whole proce- probably using computer model discussed.  
 1. Talk to my wife about her cooking; 2. plan for more walks in the morning & afternoon; 3. Sign up for the next workshop so that I can absorb more.  
 Try to get a job as a coordinator; use the Watershed Plan Builder to organize our plan.  
 Check out the EFC Resources online; check out the contents of the resource CD; look for the WPPs for the watersheds that my agencies work in.  
 Outreach, data quality/analysis quality, updating our WBP  
 1. Review our current sampling parameters; 2. Begin formation of stakeholders/interested parties; 3. Look for more technical/financial people already on staff  
 Take advantage of EPAs online resources; learn more about/how to use models  
 Refine sampling program; collect loading rates by LU/LC; incorporate precipitation flow on WQ modeling  
 1. Communicate importance to clients of researching approach and other plans successes & failures prior to start; 2. Presenting the large breadth of models and tools and appropriate use  
 1. Look at some of the funding info from EFC; 2. Look at doing some economic modeling with Arroyo stuff; 3. Review my WPP carefully and see what needs to be addressed  
 Encourage my colleagues & subordinates to attend

**11 What could the state and federal agencies do best to serve you in WPP efforts?**

I am not involved in a WPP yet  
 More resources for WPPs and possibly some group roundtables to discuss progress and other opinions  
 As a consultant, help us communicate with local agents on what we need (info) for modeling and what level of permission they have to share  
 Not worked on a WPP long enough to have an answer of value to you  
 Perhaps contacting local leaders and campaign for WPP in areas that do not have one in place  
 Provide this course in 3 days (condensed) to all states in Region 6  
 Maybe a short web-based version of this course  
 Extended, longer-term commitment of resources for grad student support  
 Have consultants available for groups to assist all along the process.  
 Assist with ideas, strategies, etc. for implementation  
 Support technically and financially, when I get involved with a WPP  
 Technical assistance particularly around modeling and measurables.  
 They could become more flexible to the stakeholders needs  
 Greater funding  
 More funding/partnerships for monitoring and implementation  
 The feds may consider being ore visible and approachable in these areas  
 Providing clear expectations on how we can provide load reduction estimates pre implementation and determine reductions associated with implementation  
 Regular outreach with info, networking, etc.  
 Consistency; keep requirements updated  
 More courses/trainings like this one  
 Explain why certain projects get funding and why others don't  
 N/A  
 EPA nes to be more flexible on how to spend money. Just because NPS failed in past, a hammer is not the answer. Work with states to get achievable/quantitative projects.

**12 What other tools, training, capacity building would you suggest to serve your efforts in WPP planning?**

I am not involved in a WPP yet  
 Stakeholder interviews  
 A bag to carry all this stuff in

Technical training for data analysis, development of LDCs, and load reduction estimates  
Some information about best practices for social networking outreach  
Good intro to GIS, its capabilities, how it can fill in for some modeling needs, etc.  
None - at this time  
I could probably answer this better in a few months. I'm too new to this process  
N/A (5)  
None  
Some training in outreach and gatering community partnerships  
I would suggest a 1 or 2 day overview for senior or mid managers. An overview to senior managers would help them understand WPP whether they have an urban or rural problem  
Better tools to determine loading estimates and loading reduction estimates associated with implementation practices  
Info on funding options, strategies, etc. using specific case studies in TX and elsewhere  
The Directory for Watershed Assistance is awesome - wish NM had that (or someone talking about where resources like that in NM are)  
Shorter, targeted sessions focused on particular topics and aimed at the different knowledge levels of potential attendees  
Learn different models, learn to write effective grants, how to go about getting funding  
Demonstration of how to create an FDC/LDS, demo of how to facilitate a meeting or how to deal with difficult/derailing stakeholders  
The how seems to be lacking. Wish the examples presented had highlighted how they found their guys, identified BMPs, how the stakeholder group made these decisions - or just voting on your proposals

**13 Satisfaction with location and facility?**

Mayan is always great location. The hospitality is wonderful and not that hard for out-of-towners to find. Recycling, even if event coordinators have to take it home - should really be implemented.  
Excellent. The Mayan Ranch is a great place for a conference. Although Internet access was spotty at times. Also, Bandera really needs to think about a recycling program. The amount of recyclables thrown in the trash was astounding. Seems hypocritical for an environmental conference to be here.  
Very satisfied. Absolutely beautiful  
Very pleasant. Wish wireless connections were not so problematic (would have liked more vegetables)  
I thought the ranch was great. My only regrets were the absence of recycling, use of (lots of) styrofoam and not option to not have sheets/towels replaced daily. As representatives of environmental orgs./agencies, I think we should request these things  
Great  
Good, nice to get away from work for awhile, but don't feel bored out here; It would be good to have more food options for vegetarian or dairy free  
Need to have facility with recycling - at least plastics and cans - fruit for snack selections  
Location and facily were good  
Mayan Ranch is always a great place  
Very satisfied. Excellent location for networking and learning from others.  
Moderate  
Very good  
Excellent! (2)  
Mayan Ranch is fantastic! - I think we should have had different oats in different buildings though (maybe half the week in one building and the other half in another)  
Seemed like a good choice except for use of styrofoam cups, plates, etc. Couldn't this be negotiated - if they want us they agree to use washable plates, cups, etc. and don't provide plastic water bottles -- glasses and large bottled water for example. It would be nice if they could be more responsive to dietary restrictions  
Very satisfied  
Great (2)

Very, very nice  
Great location, friendly staff. Could use healthier food. Recycling, etc. seems an appropriate request for this group  
Fantastic  
Well ... I love it here. I think the Medina River is a great example of all our goals  
A bit rustic, but quite nice  
Couldn't be better  
Very high - this was a perfect place  
Great choice  
I give it 5 out of 5 (5 stars)  
Location a little far for people who would fly but very pretty site - better Internet would be great  
Completely satisfied

**14 How would you rate the WPP you are involved as of meeting the intent of EPA's guidelines?**

I am not involved in a WPP yet  
Okay but not great  
1. Is pretty close but I feel needs to focus more on measurable milestones; 2. Struggles with community involvement and setting clear goals & scope  
Our goal is nothing short of enthusiastic approval by EPA. Seriously.  
ten out of ten  
We are at the very beginning of the entire process  
10! We haven't ID'd our sources of NPS but are well on our way, in large part due to our regional staff  
Not currently involved in one  
My project isn't on an impaired stream, so it seems to not follow many of the defined guidelines  
Way above average  
At the very beginning stages  
Currently not involved with a WPP  
One we are trying to get off the ground, but others I will need to lookover more closely because I bet there are ways to make them more solid  
Not involved at this time - YET!  
I'd say we have a lot of work to do particularly in identifying key sources, selecting BMPs, measurement criteria, etc.  
Very consistent  
I think they are doing well  
Fairly good  
The WPPs I attend seem to be following the guidelines well  
N/A (3)  
We are well on the way in the right direction  
Good so far  
We are currently revising our WBP so currently it doesn't adequately meet EPA standards. Several tools introduced will be helpful (especially in the web topic)  
Too early to tell  
Meeting the intent  
N/A  
The one almost done - does not meet guidelines - wish EPA had provided guidance and been involved sooner. The course is needed - thanks

**15 In your watershed, what are the local strengths for success?**

The potential technical subgroups  
Many interested stakeholders & developed connections

We have a lot of experienced people working on the plan  
 Too early to tell  
 Getting agencies and partners involved has been successful and securing grants to develop our WBP & GIS  
 N/A (2)  
 There is a citizen group that is already involved and they are very helpful in participating and advertising the plan  
 Stakeholders/advocacy groups  
 Good sparkplugs and community awareness  
 Smaller watershed; smaller number of landowners  
 The WPPs I attend have pretty good local participation and a local desire to see improvements  
 Active stakeholder knowledge  
 Stakeholder involvement  
 Community is involved and interested in doing the right things  
 Strong support for environmental issues  
 Diversity of the stakeholder group AND the cooperation and team work among the stakeholders  
 Great community knowledge. Extensive experience with all skill sets required except technical.  
 Engagement of stakeholders with project team  
 Strong stakeholder support and leadership  
 Well organized agency w/ low overhead  
 Partnerships. Hands down  
 We have demographics that can be very passionate about these topics. We just need to begin this process  
 The partnerships that were built  
 Still working on determining that  
 1st -- community involvement; 2nd -- sincere concern for protecting all aspects of watershed  
 Outreach & Education; wastewater infrastructure; stakeholder involvement  
 Property owners and stakeholders are slowly beginning to acknowledge the importance of water quality issues in the San Antonio River basin.

**16 In your watershed what are the local obstacles for success?**

Traditional agricultural practices (bad habits) like farming right up to or sometimes over a riparian feature. Also, ranchers allowing cattle to encroach into streams. Tactful education can overcome this obstacle  
 Agricultural issues (BMP implementation); sustainability  
 1st -- people quick to draw conclusions, geographical constraints to implement BMPs; 2nd -- Large scale of watershed, lack \$ resources and media outlets  
 Again, hard to say. Sorry, ask me next year  
 Getting data  
 Our potential stakeholders may be intimidated by the scale of this task  
 Public perception and uncertainty in data analysis/techniques/stats which leads to uncertainty in the effectiveness or management measures  
 Stakeholder buy-in (mostly landowners)  
 Data - getting access to it, the format it's in and its quality - makes accurate characterization difficult  
 \$  
 A very stratified community (income, education, cultural), will make it very difficult to get stakeholder agreement  
 Diversity - urban and rural and the growth occurring changing the makeup of the area  
 Tricultural community adds to challenge of stakeholder involvement and support. Acequia issues. Historical conflicts. Poverty levels high  
 Continued funding; human population increase (more development); feral hog population increase;  
 Implementation costs

Fear of government intrusion/regulation

Some of the WPPs I'm involved in need to collect monitoring data to evaluate the source of the problems and to have a good baseline

Public outreach; enough personnel from all agencies; financial resources

N/A (2)

Divergent views on what the purpose of the Rio Grande should be utilized for and what a healthy river is, and how to best change present conditions to improve water quality and habitat

Coordination; funding

Size of the watershed and getting people involved from whole area and not just in more 'urban' area

Getting stakeholders interested and involved is a struggle for us. We also have a staffing issue and \$ issues to keep our office open.

Too early to tell

Opposition from chicken farmers, large landowners, and local businesses

Perceptions of non-transparency by stakeholders, resistance to regulatory changes/gov't involvement, local gov't hesitancy to cooperate/participate

Data gaps and how to fill them. Identifying what the problem really is

#### **Additional Comments**

The last day talks were really good. Finally saw some examples that discussed why they did things. Shanon Phillips talk good with sequencing, lessons and why/how

Overall, the short course could have been significantly shorter and more effective. It might be helpful to provide some training or guidelines for presenters (Such as, not reading the slides and focusing on examples and minimum font size). More focus on "How To" topics would have been helpful. Days were too long. Consider a longer mid-day break (if not too hot) and working later -- closer to dinner; or ending no later than 4:30 or 5:00.

On Wednesday and Thursday maybe consider a free afternoon or stop at 3 p.m. to give people a chance to catch up on work, relax, enjoy the ranch, rest, etc. After a couple days of info overload, I think everyone could use it.

Details on sources of info (Tuesday a.m.) - too Texas focused. More helpful to discuss more fully needed data, data gaps. Example of "good enough data". We can easily read sections on where to get data -- didn't need to review out loud.

PowerPoint should not be used to read from. Should be used to elaborate upon. It would help if there were more specific examples from successful plans to illustrate presentations about the Elements - earlier on in the week.

Fantastic workshop!

Summary or white paper on tabs would be nice. It would be nice if presenters were familiar with other presentations so as to tie in or edit their talks. The "quilt" in Jarocki talk makes slides hard to read or take home materials.

In my opinion, the best presenters to retain for future courses: MacPherson; Hauck; Lesikar; Dictson (in no particular order)

Web-based tools presentation was very good!

Maybe delete Intro presentation of the 9 Elements -- seemed very repetitive

Lesikar - he needed more time

Cedar Creek Reservoir Case study was impressive!