Texas Water Development Board Report On Customer Service Fiscal Years 2013 – 2014

Report on Customer Service

Texas Water Development Board

FY 2013-2014

In conjunction with the 2015-2019 Strategic Plan

Cover photo courtesy of Chris Ledesma

Texas Water Development Board

BOARD MEMBER

TERM EXPIRES

| Carlos Rubinstein, Chairman | 02/01/17 |
|-----------------------------|----------|
| Bech Bruun | 02/01/19 |
| Kathleen Jackson | 02/01/15 |

Kevin Patteson Executive Administrator

This page is intentionally blank.

Table of Contents

| I. Compact with Texans | 5 |
|--|----|
| II. TWDB Mission | 6 |
| III. TWDB Customers | 8 |
| IV. TWDB Programs and Services | 10 |
| V. Data Collections Methods | 14 |
| VI. Analysis of Findings | 18 |
| VII. Performance Measure Information for Customer Service Standards | 21 |
| Attachment A: Customer Satisfaction Survey Executive Summary Results | |
| Attachment B: Customer Satisfaction Survey Suggestions | |

This page is intentionally blank.

Texas Water Development Board FY 2013-2014

I. Compact with Texans

The Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) is the state's primary water planning and financing agency, whose main responsibilities are threefold:

- Collect and disseminate water-related data;
- Plan for the development of the state's water resources; and
- Administer cost-effective financing programs.

Since 1957, the agency has been charged with planning for the state's water needs. With the passage of Senate Bill 1 by the 75th Texas Legislature, the TWDB stepped into an even greater leadership role: guiding, enabling, and supporting the state's water resources development.

To provide clear communication channels with the public and our agency, we have posted our Compact with Texans on our website. The compact outlines the following items:

- TWDB Mission
- TWDB's Programs and Services
- Complaint-Handling Process
- Information Request Process
- Open Records Request Process
- TWDB Web Site Accessibility

The TWDB pledges to put forth its best efforts to abide by high-quality service principles in order to provide customers a pleasant service experience with the agency.

II. TWDB Mission

The TWDB's mission is to provide leadership, information, education, and support for planning, financial assistance, and outreach for the conservation and responsible development of water for Texas.

In performing these responsibilities, the TWDB strives to achieve excellence in meeting and exceeding customer expectations and to provide information and services in a highly professional and timely manner. To attain these goals, the TWDB is committed to encouraging customer feedback on products and services provided, and to the continual evaluation of our programs to ensure they meet the needs of our customers.

Agency Core Values

To accomplish our mission, the TWDB will continue to focus on these core values:

COMMUNICATION: Our standard is effective communication through education and outreach to ensure openness, accuracy, and accountability.

CUSTOMER SERVICE: We respect and value customers' needs and interests in everything we do.

EXCELLENCE: We strive to achieve excellence in everything we do.

GOVERNANCE: Accountability, transparency, responsiveness, and integrity are the cornerstones of the agency's governing framework, guided by policies set by the Board that are carried out by the Executive Administrator.

INNOVATION: We seek innovation by encouraging fresh perspectives and divergent voices. We strive to be at the forefront of the water arena.

INTEGRITY: Our foremost responsibility is to the people of Texas. We expect all employees to perform their duties with integrity.

TALENT: We recruit the best employees and appreciate those with diverse talents and backgrounds who are passionate about our work. We diligently work to increase our capacity to learn, collaborate, and lead.

STEWARDSHIP: We recognize that great responsibility comes along with the trust placed in our agency by the citizens of Texas and our legislature. We administer our debt and loan portfolios with fiscal prudence, and we produce and manage robust technical information to safeguard the state's health, safety, and natural resources.

Texas Water Development Board FY 2013-2014

III. TWDB Customers

In February 2014, the TWDB launched its online customer satisfaction survey, developed for the agency by the University of Texas Institute for Organizational Excellence. The survey is designed to provide continual input from our customers in a quick and easy-to-use format.

Survey participants were asked to indicate if they represented the following categories:

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

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

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

harvesting; and

• General water-related information.

In fulfilling the agency's mission, the TWDB serves a wide array of customers in all areas of the state. The list below comprises some of the groups to whom the TWDB offers its services:

- Citizens
- Political subdivisions
- Water providers
- Texas Legislature
- Regional water planning groups
- Consultants

However, as water is a basic necessity, ultimately the agency's customers are all of the individuals of the state of Texas.

IV. TWDB Programs and Services

The strategies listed in the 2014-2015 General Appropriations Act outline the core of the services provided by our agency. The TWDB currently provides the following programs and services to customers:

• Environmental Studies:

- Collects data and conducts studies concerning the freshwater needs of the state's bays and estuaries.
- These services align with the A.1.1 Strategy—Environmental Impact Information.

• Data Collection:

- Collects data on the occurrence, quality, and availability of fresh waters in Texas.
- These services align with the A.1.2 Strategy—Water Resources Data.

• Texas Natural Resources Information System (TNRIS):

- Maintains a centralized data bank of information on the state's natural resources and manages the Strategic Mapping Initiative, a Texas-based, public and private sector cost-sharing program that produces large-scale computerized base maps describing basic geographic features of Texas.
- These services align with the A.2.1 Strategy—Technical Assistance and Modeling.

• Regional & State Water Planning:

- Guides the development of regional water plans; conducts studies and creates models of Texas' surface-water and groundwater resources; projects future water availability; incorporates regional water plans into a statewide water plan for the orderly development, management, and conservation of the state's water resources.
- These services align with the A.2.2 Strategy—Water Resources Planning.

• Research and Planning Grants:

- Provides agricultural water conservation funding and water-related research and regional facility planning grants.
- These services align with the A.3.1 Strategy—Water Conservation Education and Assistance.

• Water Conservation Assistance:

- Provides services to help cities, utilities, and districts establish effective water-wise conservation programs by lending out and providing training for leak detection and meter testing equipment, and assisting with water audits. Provides water conservation brochures and educational materials for schools for free or minimal cost to utilities and government entities.
- These services align with the A.3.1 Strategy—Water Conservation Education and Assistance.

• National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP):

- The TWDB administers this program in coordination with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The NFIP is designed so that floodplain management and flood insurance complement and reinforce each other. The partnership is established on the provision that FEMA will make flood insurance available, provided that a community implements adequate floodplain management regulations that mitigate flood risk.
- These services align with the A.4.1 Strategy—Perform Community Assistance Pursuant to the NFIP.

• State Financial Assistance:

 Provides loans to local governments for water supply and water quality projects, including wastewater treatment and nonpoint source pollution control; flood control projects, including beach renourishment; and agricultural water conservation projects.

- These services align with the B.1.1 Strategy—State & Federal Financial Assistance Programs
- Economically Distressed Areas Program (EDAP):
 - Provides grants and loans for the water and wastewater needs of the state's economically distressed areas that lack adequate water or wastewater service.
 - These services align with the B.1.2 Strategy—Economically Distressed Areas Program.

• Federal Financial Assistance:

- Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF):
 - Provides loans at interest rates lower than the market to political subdivisions with the authority to own and operate a wastewater system. The CWSRF also includes Federal (Equivalency) and Disadvantaged Communities funds that provide even lower interest rates for those meeting the respective criteria.
 - These services align with the B.1.1. Strategy—State and Federal Financial Assistance Programs.

• Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF):

- Provides loans at interest rates lower than the market offers to finance projects for public drinking water systems that facilitate compliance with primary drinking water regulations or otherwise significantly further the health protection objectives of the federal Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA). Projects must also be consistent with the current State Water Plan.
- These services align with the B.1.1. Strategy—State and Federal Financial Assistance Programs.

These programs are not a complete listing of all those offered by the TWDB, but they are meant to serve as examples of major services the agency provides for each of our strategies.

Report on Customer Service

Texas Water Development Board FY 2013-2014

V. Data Collection Methods

Online Customer Survey

On February 18, 2014, the TWDB, working with the University of Texas Institute for Organizational Excellence, launched an online customer satisfaction survey to provide customers with an ongoing method of providing customer satisfaction input.

The survey was promoted on the home page of our website and an invitation to take the survey was sent through e-mail by the Institute for Organizational Excellence to approximately 5,600 customers. The agency also sent an e-mail postcard to 3,795 customers.

Survey users had the option of directing their comments to specific areas of the agency, as follows:

- Human Resources
- Water Supply and Infrastructure (formerly Project Finance, Construction Assistance, and Water Resources Planning and Information)
- Water Science and Conservation
- Texas Natural Resources Information System
- Executive Administration
- Legal Services
- Finance
- Governmental Relations and Agency Communications
- Contract Administration
- General/Unsure

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

- Staff member(s) were helpful.
- I received the information I needed in a timely manner.
- The procedures/instructions were straightforward and easy to understand.
- My phone call, email, or letter was routed to the proper person.
- The website was easy to use and contained helpful information.
- If I had a concern or complaint, it was addressed in a reasonable manner.
- If I had a concern or complaint, it was addressed in a timely manner.
- Overall, I was satisfied with the amount of time it took to get service/assistance/information.
- Overall, I was satisfied with the amount of time it took to get a loan/grant application processed.
- Overall, I was satisfied with the amount of time it took to get a loan/grant closed.
- Printed materials contained clear and thorough information.
- I receive regular correspondence from the TWDB through direct mail, email, or social media.
- The correspondence I receive through direct mail, email, or social media is pertinent to my needs or interests.
- I have heard about the recent organizational changes at the TWDB.
- If yes, I believe the recent organizational changes will have a positive impact on how service is provided.
- Overall, I am satisfied with my experience.

Utilizing the identification methods noted above, the survey collected responses on each statutorily required customer service quality elements:

- General/overall
- Staff
- Communications
- Internet sites
- Complaint handling process
- Service timeliness
- Printed information

(Note: The facilities element was not deemed relevant to the TWDB and was excluded from the survey).

Survey users were also provided an opportunity to submit suggestions for improvement, compliments, complaints, and requests for information. The TWDB received 15 comments through the survey, and input was monitored by staff representatives in each area of the agency through the Thought Bubble comment handling system, administered by the Institute for Organizational Excellence. Input was shared with staff on a regular basis, and if the participant desired to be contacted, appropriate staff followed up with the necessary action. Comments marked as "Suggestions" from respondents are included at the end of this report as Attachment B.

A summary of item score averages for the 2014 survey is presented in the chart on the following page.

Report on Customer Service

Texas Water Development Board FY 2013-2014

| Statement | Average Score | |
|---|---------------|--|
| Overall, I was satisfied with the amount of time it took to get a loan/grant application processed. | 3.53 | |
| Overall, I was satisfied with the amount of time it took to get a loan/grant closed. | 3.55 | |
| Staff members were helpful. | 4.33 | |
| I received the information I needed in a timely manner. | 4.11 | |
| The procedures/instructions were straightforward and easy to understand. | 3.75 | |
| My phone call, email, or letter was routed to the proper person. | 4.20 | |
| The website was easy to use and contained helpful information. | 3.81 | |
| If I had a concern or complaint, it was addressed in a timely manner. | 3.94 | |
| Overall, I was satisfied with the amount of time it took to get service/assistance/information requested. | 3.99 | |
| Printed materials contained clear and thorough information. | 3.91 | |
| The correspondence I receive through direct mail, email, or social media is pertinent to my needs or interests. | 4.13 | |
| Overall, I am satisfied with my experience with the TWDB. | 4.06 | |

Scores are based on a scale of 1-5, with 1 meaning "strongly disagree" and 5 meaning "strongly agree." Complete details of the online survey are attached in chart/tabular form as Attachment A to this report.

Texas Water Development Board FY 2013-2014

VI. Analysis of Findings

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

| Staff member helpfulness: | 4.33 |
|--------------------------------------|------|
| Effective response handling: | 4.20 |
| Effective correspondence: | 4.13 |
| Information provided satisfactorily: | 4.11 |
| Overall satisfaction: | 4.06 |

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

- "TWDB Staff are very helpful & provide good guidance!"
- "We have worked with the TWDB since the 1960's. They have always been outstanding to work with. Compliments to Darrell W. Nichols for outstanding service, to Francia Harutunian, Deirdre Harden, and Joe Reynolds for their prompt service."
- "Mark Evans and the entire team were extremely responsive and helpful throughout the process."

The TWDB will continue to emphasize to its staff that high-quality customer service is the number one priority of the agency. Customer satisfaction will remain a top agency core value and will continue to guide decisions made by TWDB leadership. As in the past, the following areas are still the lowest scoring:

- Satisfaction with the amount of time to process a loan/grant: 3.53
- Satisfaction with the amount of time to close a loan/grant: 3.55

The score for *satisfaction with the amount of time it takes to process a loan/grant* decreased from last year and is a low mark that the TWDB continues to work on. The agency has been utilizing a comprehensive application for financial assistance since June 2010 in an effort to make requirements more transparent to the applicant. Additionally, the TWDB has been utilizing deadlines for administratively complete applications and for those needing additional information and has been returning applications that do not meet those deadlines.

However, a combination of issues has caused application process times to continue to take longer than the applicants or the TWDB prefers. Some of the causes for delayed processing times include difficult project issues and financial stability of applicants. In November 2014, the agency reorganized its financial assistance staff into teams based on geographic regions of the state. This new structure will increase efficiency and communication among agency staff and will result in streamlined processes and improved customer service.

The TWDB's score for *satisfaction with the amount of time to close a loan/grant* also decreased from last year. The time necessary to close a loan or grant is determined by multiple factors, none of which are completely under the control of the TWDB or the applicant. Requirements for financial transactions have been greatly increased for the TWDB, as well as for entities that affect closings such as Depository Trust Company, Comptroller of Public Accounts, and the Attorney General's Office. This increased attention has required additional documentation requirements and processes and which, if not addressed timely, can cause delays in closings. The TWDB is continuing to make improvements in the closing process so that any delays can be reduced to the extent possible while still meeting all fiduciary responsibilities.

The agency scored 3.81 on the statement, "The website was easy to use and contained helpful information." The TWDB seeks to provide information to customers in an accessible and easy-to-use format, and is constantly adding new features to make our large amounts of data easily available to the public. In order to create an even better experience for users of our website, the TWDB is in the preliminary stages of a refresh of our website. The agency will continue to make the usefulness of our website and the electronic availability of our data and information a priority.

Management and staff are also currently examining the following areas that scored below a 4.0 during this period to determine action plans, if needed, to improve future scores:

- Straightforward procedures/instructions 3.75
- Clear and thorough printed materials 3.91

VII. Performance Measure Information for Customer Service

Standards

The measures detailed below are based on the statistics provided from the online customer survey.

Outcome Measures

<u>Percentage of Surveyed Customer Respondents Expressing Overall Satisfaction with</u> <u>Services</u>

80.52% (343 out of 426 respondents) indicated they strongly agree or agree with the statement, "Overall, I am satisfied with my experience."

<u>Percentage of Surveyed Customer Respondents Identifying Ways to Improve Service</u> Delivery

40% submitted comments categorized as "suggestions."

Note: Some general comments also contained suggestions, but they are not included in this count.

Please see Attachment B—Customer Satisfaction Survey Suggestions.

Output Measures

Total Customers Surveyed

Approximately 5,600 were sent a targeted e-mail from the Institute for Organizational Excellence, 3,795 were sent an e-mail postcard from the TWDB, and an unknown number of survey participants accessed the link on the agency's website.

Total Customers Served

Unable to determine.

Report on Customer Service

Texas Water Development Board FY 2013-2014

Efficiency Measures

Cost per Customer Surveyed

\$5.70 (\$2,429 for renewal of maintenance for online survey, including targeted e-mail survey/426 respondents)

Explanatory Measures

Total Customers Identified

426 Respondents

Total Customer Groups Inventoried

Respondents identified themselves from approximately 30 different groups/types.

Attachment A:

Customer Satisfaction Survey Executive Summary Results

This page is intentionally blank.



Survey Results for

Customer Satisfaction Survey

for

580 - Texas Water Development Board

February 18, 2014 Through March 09, 2014

Attachment A TWDB Customer Service Report FY 2013-2014

Attachment A TWDB Customer Service Report FY 2013-2014

Survey Respondents

Total Number of Respondents: 426

| Number of Respondents: 409 | | |
|--|-------|--------|
| Item Response | Count | Pct. |
| Human Resources | 1 | 0.24% |
| Water Supply and Infrastructure (formerly Project Finance, Construction Assistance, and Water Resources Planning and Information) | 200 | 48.90% |
| Water Science and Conservation | 60 | 14.67% |
| Texas Natural Resources Information System | 20 | 4.89% |
| Executive Administration | 22 | 5.38% |
| Legal Services | 3 | 0.73% |
| Finance | 34 | 8.31% |
| Governmental Relations and Agency Communications | 19 | 4.65% |
| Contract Administration | 12 | 2.93% |
| General/Unsure | 38 | 9.29% |

| Human Resources | 0.24% |
|---|--------|
| Water Supply and Infrastructure (formerly Project Finan | 48.9% |
| Water Science and Conservation | 14.67% |
| Texas Natural Resources Information System | 4.89% |
| Executive Administration | 5.38% |
| Legal Services | 0.73% |
| Finance | 8.31% |
| Governmental Relations and Agency Communications | 4.65% |
| Contract Administration | 2.93% |
| General/Unsure | 9.29% |

Frequency Distribution

| Number of Respondents: 426 | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------|--------|
| Item Response | Count | Pct. |
| General Public | 23 | 5.40% |
| Political Subdivision | 133 | 31.22% |
| Water Supply Corporation | 46 | 10.80% |
| Regional Water Planning Group member | 33 | 7.75% |
| Consultant | 101 | 23.71% |
| Governmental Agency | 111 | 26.06% |
| Other (please specify) | 26 | 6.10% |

Frequency Distribution

| General Public | 5.4% |
|--------------------------------------|--------|
| Political Subdivision | 31.22% |
| Water Supply Corporation | 10.8% |
| Regional Water Planning Group member | 7.75% |
| Consultant | 23.71% |
| Governmental Agency | 26.06% |
| Other (please specify) | 6.1% |

| How would you describe yourself? Check all that apply. | | |
|--|----|--|
| Verbatim Responses: | 32 | |
| Association Executive Multiple Utility Provider Water and Sewer Public Finance Banker / Financial Advisor University academic Non-profit Water District Municipal Advisory Firm Education/Research kimble county gcd City Municapilty, Utility Dept Governmental Agency Engineer Municipal Utility University Faculty Special Utility District Universilty professor agriculture Auditor municipal utility district Municipality WES-Tex Groundwater conservation District Environmental Advocate | t | |

| Verbatim Responses: (Cont.) | 32 |
|---|----|
| Lawyer | |
| Non profit | |
| City Mayor | |
| Consumer | |
| Financial Advisor | |
| non profit ED | |
| agricuture | |
| Environmental NGO | |
| retired water specialist TWRI | |
| Water System Operator | |

| First-time customer? | | |
|----------------------|------------|--------|
| Number of Re | spondents: | |
| Item Resp | onse Count | Pct. |
| Yes | 43 | 10.39% |
| No | 371 | 89.61% |

Frequency Distribution

| Yes | 10.39% |
|-----|--------|
| No | 89.61% |

| If you are a repeat customer, been interacting with us: | numb | er of yea | ars you have |
|--|--------|-----------|--------------|
| Number of Respond | lents: | 3 | 75 |
| Item Response | Count | Pct. | |
| Less than 2 years | 24 | 6.40% | |
| 2-5 years | 56 | 14.93% | |
| More than 5 years | 295 | 78.67% | |

| Less than 2 years | 6.4% |
|-------------------|--------|
| 2-5 years | 14.93% |
| More than 5 years | 78.67% |

| Ti | nes in contact with this age | ency in | last 12 m | onths: |
|----|------------------------------|---------|-----------|--------|
| | Number of Respond | ents: | 403 | 3 |
| | Item Response | Count | Pct. | |
| | 1 time | 64 | 15.88% | |
| | 2-3 times | 88 | 21.84% | |
| | More than 3 times | 251 | 62.28% | |

| 1 time | 15.88% |
|-------------------|--------|
| 2-3 times | 21.84% |
| More than 3 times | 62.28% |

| Score: | | 3. | 53 |
|-------------------|------------------|--------|----|
| Std. Dev.: | 1.132 | | |
| Number of Respond | ents: 409 | | |
| Item Response | Count | Pct. | |
| Strongly Agree | 38 | 9.29% | |
| Agree | 102 | 24.94% | |
| Neutral | 36 | 8.80% | |
| Disagree | 31 | 7.58% | |
| Strongly Disagree | 15 | 3.67% | |
| Not Applicable | 187 | 45.72% | |

| Strongly Agree | 9.29% |
|-------------------|--------|
| Agree | 24.94% |
| Neutral | 8.8% |
| Disagree | 7.58% |
| Strongly Disagree | 3.67% |
| Not Applicable | 45.72% |

| Score: | 3.55 1.061 ents: 407 | | |
|--------------------|----------------------------|--------|--|
| Std. Dev.: | | | |
| Number of Responde | | | |
| Item Response | Count | Pct. | |
| Strongly Agree | 30 | 7.37% | |
| Agree | 105 | 25.80% | |
| Neutral | 38 | 9.34% | |
| Disagree | 26 | 6.39% | |
| Strongly Disagree | 12 | 2.95% | |
| Not Applicable | 196 | 48.16% | |

| Strongly Agree | 7.37% |
|-------------------|--------|
| Agree | 25.8% |
| Neutral | 9.34% |
| Disagree | 6.39% |
| Strongly Disagree | 2.95% |
| Not Applicable | 48.16% |

| Score: | | 4. |
|-------------------|--------|--------|
| Std. Dev.: | | 0.7 |
| Number of Respond | lents: | 4 |
| Item Response | Count | Pct. |
| Strongly Agree | 170 | 41.06% |
| Agree | 176 | 42.51% |
| Neutral | 23 | 5.56% |
| Disagree | 5 | 1.21% |
| Strongly Disagree | 4 | 0.97% |
| Not Applicable | 36 | 8.70% |

| Strongly Agree | 41.06% |
|-------------------|--------|
| Agree | 42.51% |
| Neutral | 5.56% |
| Disagree | 1.21% |
| Strongly Disagree | 0.97% |
| Not Applicable | 8.7% |

| Score: | | 4. | .11 |
|-------------------|-------|--------|-----|
| Std. Dev.: | | 0.8 | 869 |
| Number of Respond | ents: | 4 | 10 |
| Item Response | Count | Pct. |] |
| Strongly Agree | 127 | 30.98% | |
| Agree | 196 | 47.80% | |
| Neutral | 33 | 8.05% | |
| Disagree | 12 | 2.93% | |
| Strongly Disagree | 9 | 2.20% | |
| Not Applicable | 33 | 8.05% | |

| Strongly Agree | 30.98% |
|-------------------|--------|
| Agree | 47.8% |
| Neutral | 8.05% |
| Disagree | 2.93% |
| Strongly Disagree | 2.2% |
| Not Applicable | 8.05% |

| Score: | 3.75 | | |
|--------------------|------------|--------|--|
| Std. Dev.: | Std. Dev.: | | |
| Number of Responde | ents: | 410 | |
| Item Response | Count | Pct. | |
| Strongly Agree | 66 | 16.10% | |
| Agree | 184 | 44.88% | |
| Neutral | 66 | 16.10% | |
| Disagree | 28 | 6.83% | |
| Strongly Disagree | 11 | 2.68% | |
| Not Applicable | 55 | 13.41% | |

| Strongly Agree | 16.1% |
|-------------------|--------|
| Agree | 44.88% |
| Neutral | 16.1% |
| Disagree | 6.83% |
| Strongly Disagree | 2.68% |
| Not Applicable | 13.41% |

| Score: | | 4 | |
|-------------------|------------|--------|--|
| Std. Dev.: | Std. Dev.: | | |
| Number of Respond | ents: | 4 | |
| Item Response | Count | Pct. | |
| Strongly Agree | 128 | 30.99% | |
| Agree | 194 | 46.97% | |
| Neutral | 33 | 7.99% | |
| Disagree | 8 | 1.94% | |
| Strongly Disagree | 2 | 0.48% | |
| Not Applicable | 48 | 11.62% | |

| Strongly Agree | 30.99% |
|-------------------|--------|
| Agree | 46.97% |
| Neutral | 7.99% |
| Disagree | 1.94% |
| Strongly Disagree | 0.48% |
| Not Applicable | 11.62% |

| S | core: | | 3. | .81 |
|---|-------------------|-------|--------|-----|
| S | td. Dev.: | | 0.9 | 10 |
| N | umber of Respond | ents: | 4 | 10 |
| | Item Response | Count | Pct. | |
| | Strongly Agree | 72 | 17.56% | |
| | Agree | 197 | 48.05% | |
| | Neutral | 68 | 16.59% | |
| | Disagree | 22 | 5.37% | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 10 | 2.44% | |
| | Not Applicable | 41 | 10.00% | |

| Strongly Agree | 17.56% |
|-------------------|--------|
| Agree | 48.05% |
| Neutral | 16.59% |
| Disagree | 5.37% |
| Strongly Disagree | 2.44% |
| Not Applicable | 10% |

| Score: | | 3.98 | |
|-------------------|-------|--------|----|
| Std. Dev.: | | 0.8 | 76 |
| Number of Respond | ents: | 4 | 09 |
| Item Response | Count | Pct. | |
| Strongly Agree | 75 | 18.34% | |
| Agree | 148 | 36.19% | |
| Neutral | 44 | 10.76% | |
| Disagree | 6 | 1.47% | |
| Strongly Disagree | 8 | 1.96% | |
| Not Applicable | 128 | 31.30% | |

| Strongly Agree | 18.34% |
|-------------------|--------|
| Agree | 36.19% |
| Neutral | 10.76% |
| Disagree | 1.47% |
| Strongly Disagree | 1.96% |
| Not Applicable | 31.3% |

| Score: | | 3. | 94 |
|-------------------|-------|--------|----|
| Std. Dev.: | | 0.9 | 43 |
| Number of Respond | ents: | 4 | 12 |
| Item Response | Count | Pct. | |
| Strongly Agree | 76 | 18.45% | |
| Agree | 142 | 34.47% | |
| Neutral | 41 | 9.95% | |
| Disagree | 13 | 3.16% | |
| Strongly Disagree | 9 | 2.18% | |
| Not Applicable | 131 | 31.80% | |

| Strongly Agree | 18.45% |
|-------------------|--------|
| Agree | 34.47% |
| Neutral | 9.95% |
| Disagree | 3.16% |
| Strongly Disagree | 2.18% |
| Not Applicable | 31.8% |

| Score: | | 3. | .99 |
|----------------------------|-------|--------|-----|
| Std. Dev.: | | 0.9 | 952 |
| Number of Respondents: 410 | | | |
| Item Response | Count | Pct. |] |
| Strongly Agree | 109 | 26.59% | |
| Agree | 199 | 48.54% | |
| Neutral | 37 | 9.02% | |
| Disagree | 17 | 4.15% | |
| Strongly Disagree | 14 | 3.41% | |
| Not Applicable | 34 | 8.29% | |

| Strongly Agree | 26.59% |
|-------------------|--------|
| Agree | 48.54% |
| Neutral | 9.02% |
| Disagree | 4.15% |
| Strongly Disagree | 3.41% |
| Not Applicable | 8.29% |

| Score: | | 3. | Score: 3.91 | | |
|----------------------------|------------|--------|--------------------|--|--|
| Std. Dev.: 0.807 | | | | | |
| Number of Respondents: 410 | | | | | |
| Item Response Count Pct. | | | | | |
| Strongly Agree | 78 | 19.02% | | | |
| Agree | 200 48.78% | | | | |
| Neutral 66 16.10% | | | | | |
| Disagree 17 4.15% | | | | | |
| Strongly Disagree 3 0.73% | | | | | |
| Not Applicable | 46 | 11.22% | | | |

| Strongly Agree | 19.02% | | |
|-------------------|--------|--|--|
| Agree | 48.78% | | |
| Neutral | 16.1% | | |
| Disagree | 4.15% | | |
| Strongly Disagree | 0.73% | | |
| Not Applicable | 11.22% | | |

| I receive regular correspondence from the TWDB through direct mail, email, or social media. | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| Number of Respondents: 406 | | | | | |
| Iter | Item Response Count Pct. | | | | |
| Yes | Yes 367 90.39% | | | | |
| No 39 9.61% | | | | | |
| | | | | 1 | |

| Yes | 90.39% |
|-----|--------|
| No | 9.61% |

| | espondence I receive social media is perti | | 0 | |
|----------------------------|---|-------|--------|-----|
| | Score: | | 4. | .13 |
| | Std. Dev.: | | 0.7 | 30 |
| Number of Respondents: 409 | | | 09 | |
| | Item Response | Count | Pct. | |
| | Strongly Agree | 113 | 27.63% | |
| Agree 206 50.37% | | | | |
| Neutral 49 11.98% | | | | |
| Disagree 4 0.98% | | | | |
| Strongly Disagree 3 0.73% | | | | |
| | Not Applicable | 34 | 8.31% | |

| Strongly Agree | 27.63% | | |
|-------------------|--------|--|--|
| Agree | 50.37% | | |
| Neutral | 11.98% | | |
| Disagree | 0.98% | | |
| Strongly Disagree | 0.73% | | |
| Not Applicable | 8.31% | | |

| I have heard about at the TWDB. | the recer | nt orga | nization | al changes |
|---------------------------------|-----------|---------|----------|------------|
| Number of Respondents: 412 | | | | |
| Item I | Response | Count | Pct. | |
| Yes | | 298 | 72.33% | |
| No | | 114 | 27.67% | |
| L | | | | 1 |

| Yes | 72.33% |
|-----|--------|
| No | 27.67% |

| If yes, I believe the recent organizational changes will have a positive impact on how service is provided. | | | | |
|---|------------|-----|--------|--|
| Number of Respondents: 278 | | | | |
| Item R | esponse Co | unt | Pct. | |
| Yes | 2 | 09 | 75.18% | |
| No 69 24.82% | | | | |
| . <u></u> | | | | |

| Yes | 75.18% |
|-----|--------|
| No | 24.82% |

| would like regular information updates about: |
|---|
| Verbatim Responses: 76 |
| Events of interest to our constituents in the Alamo region. timely information and status of projects bidding with TWDB financial assistance The implementation of SWIFT and how to add a project to the the list of tasks to be completed. Specifically channeling water from Lake Livingston to Lake Conroe using water rights owned by the SJRA more detail information on the organizational changes Training mateosls, educational offerings, regional water developments Once a year N/A |
| Availability of funds to Water Supply Corporations and other Municipilaties Internal costs at TWDB are too high. Resulting closing costs and administrative costs resulted in open market being more competetive than a subsidized loan. Taxaable loans for entities with wholesale customers are not competitive through TWDB. Grants for water plant and sewer plant improvments Grants and loans for water and sewer projects Status of Stratmap, Data & GIS Portals and GIO postion and department Developments on "Water Data for Texas" a one-stop data portal for accessing environmental data collected by various state agencies in Texas (e.g TCEQ, TWDB, GLO, etc). |

| Verbatim Responses: (Cont.) 76 |
|---|
| non-profit water supply corporation topics |
| Colonias and colonias funding. 1) Access to TNRIS geographic data sets. 2) Freshwater inflow and circulation studies in bays and estuaries. Groundwater Modeling New programs, organizational changes Desalination projects, groundwater information, surface water information, drought information, state and local water issues. Grants for water supply systems, Groundwater resources and predictive models, water conservation. Allow the extremely talented and knownledgeable people you have on staff to have more say and power in all of the State of Texas's water plans. Aerial Photo Mapping and GIS shape file updates Recent changes are moving TWDB from an organization that supports local interests and regional planning to an organization that is directive to local interests and regional planning. This is a move in the wrong direction. DFC's, Irrelevant aquifers, cooperative agreements with TWDB Scoring criteria. 2. Information on the process for double checking |
| information submitted by applicants to be factural and correct.Regulatory updates; workshops. |

| Verbatim Responses: (Cont.) 76 |
|---|
| |
| Items pertaining to State water supply and forecasting |
| recen organizational changes |
| grants in all areas Drought, financial assistance & progress on HB4/prop 6, regional |
| planning, research grants, reports |
| water project state wide |
| Conservation |
| Water and Sewer forgiveness loans |
| New water supply alternatives |
| • Outreach material for the general public and students. |
| I would like for the TWDB to request Well Level information from the City of Sweetwater and the Bitter Creek Water System since the |
| TWDB is providing money to them. Maybe TWDB can get the info |
| from them since we can't without legal action. Then forward the |
| information to our water district by email. (Wes-Tex Groundwater |
| Conservation District) Since the 2 water providers lack honesty and |
| integrity, either they will not provide the information to the water distic |
| or they falsify the information. The 2 water providers cannot do |
| anything the easy way and just give you the correct info. I guess they have worked this way for so long that they don't know any other |
| method. They want the state money to do what ever they want but no |
| be accountable! Thanks for your help in this matter, Dale Adams Wes |
| Tex Groundwater Conservation district Sweetwater Texas |
| dale.adams@co.nolan.tx.us |
| • I am an office supervisor and we are not included, only the Manager |
| and Board Members Thanks |

- |

| Verbatim Responses: (Cont.) 76 |
|---|
| Policies, Funding opportunities and workshops, Regional planning any new changes that would involve my city Funding opportunities. Water & Wastewater issues. From start to finish. Ways we can help governmental entities obtain funding to improve their outdated infrastructure. New programs and Guidelines Financing and funding Water Planning (Region H) Water Reporting Water Conservation no place to make a statement, We received signed documents from one office of TWDB and a second office delayed the project because they did not have a copy of the signed document. really? Is the building so big that they could not walk across or better yet send an email requesting a copy? no intra office communication! I Our loan closed in December of 2013, but it's now almost March of 2014, and still no disbursements allowed from account. Apparently, environmental issues were raised after closing that are holding everything back. We have done lots of work and have yet been compensated. Lots of frustration!!! I dont understand what you are talking about, I am a county Judge if you don't start sucking water out of the Gulf Of Mexico we are not going to have a state, Thank You Judge Arthur Comanche County |

| | Verbatim Responses: (Cont.) 76 |
|---|---|
| • | Loans and grants financial assistance updates The has not been a sufficient amount of time to determine if the organizational changes have had a positive impact or not. Changes to the funding procedures for each program. Water and Wastewater Financial Assistance Programs Environmental Information Document requirements Cities are confused about which agency - TCEQ or TWDB is to receive various water reports. Even after auditing the Webinars on the upcoming Water Conservation/Drought Plan submission, I was still confused about exactly how many reports I had to complete, which ones were to be exhibits in the main report, which ones had to be sent to either TWDB or TCEQ and which ones had to be sent to both agencies. Frankly, the automated on-line reports are not easy to understand and the entire process seems much more difficult than it was 5 years ago when I submitted the plan. NA |
| • | Regional water planning and the State Water Plan Grants or loan forgiveness. desalination I would hope that the changes recently made will help the TWDB staff be more helpful and interested in moving projects forward instead look for reasons not to move forwardwhich has been part of the problem in the past. |

| Verbatim Responses: (Cont.) 76 |
|---|
| grant and loan information Not sure about the Regional Planning Area. I think it needs to ahve its own area and not be burried. Progress on full implementation of the Board's state Geographic Information Officer function, per water code 16.021. financing options; changes to rules The time table for the SWIFT program No thanks This survey is too generic to give you any good information. We have two DWSRF loans that are recently closed out. We had lots of issues with the agency on those loans. The engineering review was a huge joke and the rules made it easier just to go to the open market. We dealt with some really good people too. We currently have an application approved through the D Fund. That process was much better but the environmental section was a real pain that seemed to be a waste of time, increased cost and saved no critters from extinction. I don't want to complete the survey as it is because there was good and bad in many of the categories. I would be happy to talk to someone to explain. David Harris, City of Brownwood. What Texas is doing about climate change, which, of course, is nothing. |
| aquifer depleations around the state The Funding of the Water Plan. water supply planning flood protection planning flood insurance program in Texas |

Verbatim Responses: (Cont.) 76

- ground water
- For projects under 5 million dollars the savings available due to interest rate reductions does not offset the time and red tape required to access TWDB SRF funds. For projects under 5 million dollars TWDB funding only makes sense for entities that cannot access funding on the open market.
- flood mitigation grants
- If there were any new financial assistance programs that were applicable to our corporation and community.
- Groundwater policy

| Score: | | ٨ | 06 |
|-------------------|-------|--------|----|
| - | | | |
| Std. Dev.: | 0.873 | | |
| Number of Respond | ents: | 4 | 17 |
| Item Response | Count | Pct. | |
| Strongly Agree | 126 | 30.22% | |
| Agree | 217 | 52.04% | |
| Neutral | 43 | 10.31% | |
| Disagree | 16 | 3.84% | |
| Strongly Disagree | 9 | 2.16% | |
| Not Applicable | 6 | 1.44% | |

| Strongly Agree | 30.22% | |
|-------------------|--------|--|
| Agree | 52.04% | |
| Neutral | 10.31% | |
| Disagree | 3.84% | |
| Strongly Disagree | 2.16% | |
| Not Applicable | 1.44% | |

Item Score Summary

| Item Text | Score | Std. Dev. |
|---|-------|-----------|
| Overall, I was satisfied with the amount of time it took to get a loan/grant application processed. | 3.53 | 1.132 |
| Overall, I was satisfied with the amount of time it took to get a loan/grant closed. | 3.55 | 1.061 |
| Staff members were helpful. | 4.33 | 0.742 |
| I received the information I needed in a timely manner. | 4.11 | 0.869 |
| The procedures/instructions were straightforward and easy to understand. | 3.75 | 0.952 |
| My phone call, email, or letter was routed to the proper person. | 4.20 | 0.735 |
| The website was easy to use and contained helpful information. | 3.81 | 0.910 |
| If I had a concern or complaint, it was addressed in a reasonable manner. | 3.98 | 0.876 |
| If I had a concern or complaint, it was addressed in a timely manner. | 3.94 | 0.943 |
| Overall, I was satisfied with the amount of time it took to get service/assistance/information requested. | 3.99 | 0.952 |
| Printed materials contained clear and thorough information. | 3.91 | 0.807 |
| The correspondence I receive through direct mail, email, or social media is pertinent to my needs or interests. | 4.13 | 0.730 |
| Overall, I am satisfied with my experience with the TWDB. | 4.06 | 0.873 |

Attachment B:

Customer Satisfaction Survey Suggestions

(Suggestions taken word-for-word from Thought Bubble comment handling system)

Suggestions Provided by Customer Service Survey Respondents

- Loan Processing needs to become simpler and less time consuming Information requested should be pertinent Formats desgined for relaying information should be consistent and not changing depending upon the person receiving/reviewing it Turnaround of Funds should be in a timely manner and should not have to obtain short term financing to cover a Long Term Grant
- More effort needed for information dissemination and research activities (beyond the State Water planning effort) that benefits large communities that may not be interested in loans.
- I have clients that have used the services at the TWDB for many years and I have been a promoted the agencies programs. Over the last several years the staff has become less helpful and seemingly not interested in moving things forward. I hope that this new reorganization will help things to begin to move in the right direction. The last meeting I had with a client and the TWDB we were told it would take 6 months to get a project approved. That to me is not acceptable. The two step project with funding through the SRF is not ideal either. Also, I still have Engineers that are not happy with a the review requirements etc. and they tend to through up road blocks to your programs. With interest rates as low as they are it has been better to go to the open market to sell bonds and avoid all the red tape with the SRF program. For example, if I client borrows money for replacing water lines which the TWDB approves for very specific streets etc. but the entity ends up with a problem in an different area and would like to fix the lines in that area instead of the on already approved.....with market funds that is not a problem....with TWDB funds it is. Staff that I have recently interacted with have been very helpful they are: Jeff Walker and Nancy Richards. I hope the changes will improve your customer service and that you will actually listen to comments provided here by others and during your meetings on SWIFT. Thank You.
- Water is worth more then Oil,stop giving the tax payers money away to other LANDS & other countrys wars if you don't take that money & build Desalination Plants, and stark sucking out of the Gulf of Mexico we can say byby to Texas Ag,Texas Farms Texas Ranches, & Texas People, Thank you for your time JudgeArthur Comanche County, Texas ccjudge1@htcomp.net
- First we a appreciative of the help we did get getting through this most complicated process. But if the intent is to improve the process I will give an experience. We received the final signed documents from one office of TWDB and a second office delayed the releasing of funds and the start of the project because they did not have a copy of the signed document. really? Is the building so big that they could not walk across or better yet send an email requesting a

copy? This was our greatest frustration, no intra office communication. It was as though with each new contact we was having to start again. to move the process forward we scanned the documents and sent copies to office number 2. I can only imagine these two offices sit on the same floor across the hall from each other. With this experience our engineer has warned the 30 day project will take most of the year to complete.

• The people that we have been dealing with the most, Mireya Loewe, Jessica Zuba, John Muras, Jim Bateman, and Marvin Chaney have all been extremely helpful and responsive. They have been constrained a bit, by the process and protocol in place now. In short, the personnel that we have had the pleasure to work with up to now, have proven to be fully knowledgeable, professional and of the utmost help to us and our projects. The process is what may need to be streamlined some, if that is possible, in order to get some of these projects from application to construction faster.