

Appendix C: Watershed Roundtable Meetings Comments

All the comments received at the 14 watershed roundtable meetings held in February/March 2010 are presented below. See Table C.1, C.2, and C.3 for a summary of these comments organized by NCTCOG's goal of connecting people, places, and programs.

"River" watershed meeting comments

West Fork below Lake Worth Watershed

Accomplishments

- Improved quality of point-source discharges to Trinity River
- Hike and bike trail along Clear Fork – Fort Worth, TRWD, Streams & Valleys, Benbrook
- CDC and Trinity River Vision
- Recognition of the river/watershed as a significant natural asset that needs to be protected, managed and promoted
- Upper Trinity Mapping Needs Assessment established a consistent assessment of watershed based needs for flood risk identification
- Trinity River Vision Master Plan
- iSWM series, RSWMCC work
- Fort Worth Accomplishments:
 - Increasing high-water warning system
 - Developing flood warning system
 - Adopted portions of iSWM
 - Central City/TRV meeting FEMA/CDC Standards
- Texas SmartScape and the Storm Water Education Task Force
- COG's Educational outreach – great feedback among cities.

Opportunities

- Discourage large turf areas in landscapes and promote more planted areas that will absorb ore storm water
- Educate at the lowest common denominator to develop pride in the community – personal responsibility for not trashing your own space
- Quite waiting around for fed & state regs forcing action – move out and do the right things –lead rather than react
- Eliminate the provincialism within cities where there are physical linkages and interrelated impacts from individual actions
- Channel erosion is a major problem – physical change and quality issue. Learn how to develop such that the runoff regime is essentially unchanged.
- Keep development out of the 100-year floodplain. Preserve the riparian corridors. Apply to all streams
- Development standards that require "clean" runoff into the streams and rivers
- COE funding for programming/educational projects that promote smart use of the river
- Streambeds dedicated to public space for trail extensions and park/open space
- To cost share studies with RAMPP (Risk Assessment, Mapping, and Planning Partners) and neighboring cities to update and/or create studies
- Require a buffer or filter zone along all water
- Comprehensive incorporation of storm water management looking at both quantity and quality. ISWM can facilitate these integrated efforts
- High water mark programs along with stream gauges. Public reminders of flooding elevations will help buy-in.
- Encourage multi-jurisdictional coordination along individual tributaries.

- Increase opportunities for education of general public on things they can do to protect water quality in their watershed (ie through schools, utility bill inserts, city websites, etc).
- Provide leadership training focused on methods to generate community/public support for the area wide goals.
- Definitely should involve the Tx Railroad Commission due to widespread concern and misunderstanding about drilling
- Any type of regional flood warning system/additional flow gauge system should allow for the flow data to be used for purposes other than just flood issues – there are many water quality related uses (storm water, permitting, TMDLs, etc.)
- Work with local communities to engage CRS entry and possible points with participation in this program.
- Regional floodplain mapping updates (beyond FEMA and CDC regulations)
- Update of Upper Trinity Study (H&H)
- Regional rain and flow gauging with intent to develop flood warning system
- Work to get municipal planning and zoning departments to recognize the need to get on board with the iSWM development process
- Fort Worth Opportunities
 - Need more rain and flow gauges
 - Need to participate in FEMA – CTP
 - Extend CDC criteria to tributaries
- Adopt state irrigation rules in all cities not just cities with populations over 20,000 and enforce rules
- Develop parking lots with rain gardens not islands. Make no exemptions.
- Change landscape ordinance to reflect water conservation and storm water practices
- Require landscaping ordinances to require water conservation or resource efficient plants particularly by turf
- Have landscape ordinances encourage most planted beds where storm water is captured not runoff
- Require all new developments address storm water with plans that work and have a follow up to make sure it works.
- Make all small business control irrigation or fine them
- Mary's Creek development in unincorporated area
- Mary's Creek Water Recycling Center
- Land development practices in relationship to streams and rivers
- Create a regional watershed council
- In lean financial times for governments, use local universities for projects and resources etc (Tarleton State University [Hydrology program], UNT, UTA)
- Encourage long-term land use and transportation planning that use low-impact design.
- When is the appropriate time and how can the floodplain property owners goals and interests be brought into process
- Need for a regional watershed council for the Trinity River Basin, to address updated H&H and flood warning system
- Create a fee from the SWMP to be dedicated to watershed preservation state-wide.
- Focus on funding and COE involvement with updating the Trinity River H&H studies.
- Resource agencies share some disappointments regarding the Johnson Creek Project. Hopefully, there is an opportunity to learn from this to handle future projects differently.
- Integrate “big picture” environmental considerations into CDC process . exp. 1. Maintenance costs 2. Sustainability of project 3. Preservation/Protection of nationally and regionally important resources 4. Stream bank & bed erosion reduction
- Geomorphic analysis not just H&H
- Need more tributary and river water quality monitoring stations
- Training of consulting firms on new technologies as the work and perform for cities
- Require all medians to take in storm water, use drip irrigation and less turf
- Where are the county representatives?

- Increased emphasis on beneficial use of storm water (storm water reuse)
- Improvement of coordinated monitoring of both quantity and quality in order to better document needs and progress
- Development of coordinated statewide public awareness efforts to integrate water conservation, water reuse, storm water management
- TxDOT Coordination Contributions
- Railroad agencies cooperative participation BNRR TRE etc.
- Regional standard operating procedure for responding to spills, SSOs & IDDE. Better communication between cities
- Pilot project for central city retrofit for streetscape with BMPs and site BMPs for private development
- Incentives for BMPs for developers and homeowners
- Better integration of water quality with water quantity issues
- We must have a realistic picture of how future growth in populations and development might affect our plans. This applies to areas currently developed and rural.
- Petroleum exploration agencies involvement, cooperation, participation, contributions
- Clear Fork (Benbrook Dam to Southwest Blvd) as possible canoe stream

Elm Fork below Lewisville Lake Watershed

Accomplishments

- Open Space Preservation
- Water Supply and Conveyance
- DWU recycling of old gravel pit (SkiLake) into pressed. Basin serving Bachman WTP & Dallas Co. Park Cities MUD treatment costs
- The City of Lewisville storm water program has gone from a star up division to a very active fairly advanced program. I believe the we have made a real impact on the quality of waters in our area.
- Flood control
- Regional Construction Inspection Training Program
- Hutton Branch erosion control design
- Shared PSAs on storm water from Dallas, Plano, Irving and Garland
- Trail system
- iSWM
- Regional Storm Water Monitoring Program
- Floodplain water surface elevation stabilized from 1986 to 2009
- GIS Innovation and standardization region-wide
- Success of CDC program
- Uniform mapping and modeling of Elm Fork
- Standardized criteria for future development impacts in Elm Fork floodplain
- Floodplain Management
- Be Smarter than the Turkey FOG campaign
- NCTCOG Public Education Task Force
- Phase I storm water
- Phase II Storm Water
- USGS/NCTCOG Regional WQ Monitoring Program
- Irving has constructed 5.5 mile of trail along the Elm Fork
- Public Awareness
- CDC has helped to better communicate with different cities and agencies
- March is TX SmartScape Month
- Common Vision/CDC Process
- Dallas-Elm Fork flood control/athletic complex projects

- Lake Lewisville protected area
- Flood Management CDC Process Common Vision
- DOO The Right Thing Program
- Participation in the NCTCOG regional efforts at protecting watersheds

Opportunities

- Sustainable design with creeks and storm water systems
- Recreation Useable Waterways
- An opportunity to combine information from multiple areas: Floodplain, storm water, watershed, ecology, toward a common goal
- Focusing not only on the Trinity itself but the feeder streams and other water sources that influence flood control and water quality along the Elm Fork
- Certain area's in the county under the jurisdiction of FWSD's have no teeth re: SWM/Construction activities
- Stream Bank Stability
- Levee safety
- Promote the eco-tourism aspect of the Elm Fork corridor – highlight the close proximity to the heart of the metroplex
- Opportunity for interaction for development of the John Burke Nature Preserve. There is already an ILA
- Area needs real open-space so people have opportunities to “get away” . Connect areas through trails.
- Include cumulative hydraulic impact modelings in CDC permitting
- Educate public on accomplishments of this partnership
- Education and outreach for environmental protection
- Reduced flood risk
- Continued GIS integration region-wide
- Foster project specific multi-entity teams/meetings to look at overall watershed impacts
- Need some type of CDC enforcement tool outside of the city
- Integrated recreation and flood control design and planning
- Press forward on reducing sediment load along the Elm Fork and West Fork to improve the ecology and reduce impacts to the environment
- Continue the Trinity River Trails Expansion
- Expansion of Campion Trails From Coppell through Irving to Dallas at Tom Braniff/Wildwood
- DFW population will continue to grow and so will issues. Anticipate tomorrow's problems
- Create more open spaces for recreation
- Future Goals
 - Watershed-based permitting for storm water
 - Uniformity of Regulatory requirements within microsheds
- Expand Common Vision on watershed basis
- Support coordination between cities, counties, USACE, TWDB, etc to fund new Upper Trinity Study
- Expand the CDC process to the East Fork; East Fork will face same problems as other areas.
- Opportunity to expand horizons through association with universities, SMU, UTA, UTD
- CDC expansion to other areas
- Find ways to get smaller towns involved with regional watershed
- Need to update model
- New construction training
- Leaf and Lawn Mgt Cooperative Educational Program
- Increased Agency/Organization Coordination “Share Willingly”
- More educational aspects of Trinity River for grade schools
- Standardization of NPDES Inspection and Implementation

- More “organized” incentives for Cities to Cooperate to form a more specific “Common Vision”
- Fully establish Trinity Trails initiative by connecting Dallas with Elm Fork and making connections along West Fork thru metroplex.
- More cooperation/coordination between water quality and water quantity advocates
- Complete the trail connections between Irving/Dallas/Farmers Branch/Grand Prairie
- Water Supply
- More hike and bike along the entire corridor
- Elm Fork Significant Landfill & Need Close Management
- DEW the Right Thing for March 2010 TX SmartScape
- Beautiful and scenic amenity
- Expand participants of CDC to include TxDOT, NTTA, Flood Control Districts
- Work with neighboring cities to develop monitoring activities that can identify pollution problem areas
- Promote development of riparian wooded/vegetated buffer strips in urban/suburban areas
- Update CDC model for Elm Fork to best serve levee districts and cities with respect to flood risk management.
- Target clinics, hospitals, etc to prevent flushing of pharmaceuticals into WW systems
- With new HUC Boundaries established and Elm Fork watershed cities further defining their subwatersheds the Elm Fork hydrology could be updated to reflect new information.
- Recreation trails
- More stream restoration
- Flood control protection

Trinity River Headwaters Watershed

Accomplishments

- The Storm Water Public Education Task force through NCTCOG
- Education and outreach events sponsored by Agrilife at training citizens and professionals
- Water quality model development and data collection for North Central Texas
- CFM's in Texas – Increased awareness
- NFIP Training
- Partnering
- CDC – Empower communities to take ownership of flood risk, awareness and consequences
- Developing GIS mapping of storm sewer systems in Highland Park
- Mapping Needs Assessment
- Developments of local educational videos to share with COG to share with all member cities
- Regional Wet Weather Program
- Working on the Regional Watershed Permit
- Regional Analysis of Watershed
- Mill Creek/Peaks Branch Drainage Plan
- iSWM
- Dallas Green Building Ordinance
- Already seeing more “green” and “sustainable” referencing to project development
- Coke Park Detention Vault
- Mill Creek plan to day light streams
- Stream assessments for quality region-wide
- Targeting car wash fundraisers to prevent pollution into streams
- Set up site for local car wash facilities to provide a location at reduced rates/free
- Environmental Education is growing!
 - Trinity River Audubon Center
 - Elm Fork Education Center
 - River Legacy Science Learning Center

- Heard Museum
- Education through municipalities

Opportunities

- Watershed based GIS database for every watershed. Include all watershed data and make data available for all communities
- Need to integrate plans for watersheds, esp. with regard to common resources (e.g. Trinity River mainstem)
- Training of consulting firms and city and county employees on water quality models, their use and effectiveness
- Ordinance and development guidance documents for region
- We need to further pursue constructed wetlands to improve water quality and the ecology
- We need to continue pursuing hike, bike, equestrian & trail systems along the Trinity River corridors.
- GIS Web-based map
- Coordination region-wide between communities of what works: Outreach/education/permitting procedures/inventories/BMPs/Green Infrastructure
- Stop limiting municipal education efforts to city limits Broader watershed approach
- Starting to focus on particular groups/pollutants
- Volunteer storm water permit for “Green” LEED Building projects
- Points for LEED Project- but less resources commitment by city (city not required to commit full oversight and inspection)
- TADH City Dallas coordinate of Green Building and SWP3
- Make WQ training/professional development available and easily accessible
- Join forces (as we are today) share needs & desires combine forces
- Working with other governmental agencies
 - sharing water quality data
 - working outreach events together
 - cost-sharing with media/advertising (and using same messages)
- Work with local municipalities for collection of water quality data
- Need to define parameters that can be used to define (i.e. measure) functions of ecologically sustainable watershed/streams.
- “Functional Assessments” Streams and riparian areas, watersheds
- Nutrient standards are ahead. Actions now will help avoid future 303d listings.
- We need a way to better pull local gov’ts and people into these activities. For such a densely populated watershed, this meeting had rather sparse attendance. I’ve seen the same problem at TRA coordinated monitoring meetings and TMDL stakeholder meetings.
- More public awareness at local level
- Explore levee district partnership
- Educate public on successes of Common Vision
- Utilize City of Dallas watershed management outreach program
- Do more than just collect data. Review data for subwatershed & focus on areas of concern
- Work with other agencies that have responsibility for the watershed and upstream and downstream agencies
- To build a cleaner future, safer community, heighten awareness, must modify behavior and thinking
- Watershed rules that can regulate activities not in an ETJ and in which the county has no ordinance authority
- Get the “Ten Mile Creek” watershed into the FP into via NCTCOG
- Initiate a CDC process for permits for Ten Mile Creek WS
- We have a need to pursue “reuse” of our wastewater treatment plants instead of releasing the effluent back to the river
- We have a need to address soil contamination along the Trinity corridor, particularly lead.

- Research into native plants for bioengineering techniques specific to the North Texas area
- Green streets
- Combine quality and quantity aspects of water management
- Integration of watershed WQ models for all SW master plans region-wide (Agrilife WQ models)
- Plan for the future-extend the UTRFS to the confluence of the East Fork in/the Trinity River
- Get Kaufman & Ellis counties to the table on the UTRFS
- Dredging the Exall and Conner Lakes in Highland Park
- Erosion control of Creek Banks
- Coordination with Dallas and University Park on storm water issues
- Have WQ models available region wide from Agri-Life
- Improvements of the streams that are deteriorating under extreme urbanization – develop green belts
- Develop integrated authority to take undertaking
- Integration of GIS with all storm water modeling/inventories/assessments
- Standardization of region-wide coordination downstream
- Development of local green infrastructure guidance
- TMDL Implementation plans

Ten Mile/Red Oak Creeks and Trinity below Dallas Watersheds

Accomplishments

- Storm water funding improved greatly over last 10 years regionally
- Floodplain mgmt improved greatly over last 10 years regionally
- Bentle Branch Regional Detention Site – Regional Partnership
- As part of the Intermodal Facility along IH-45, two regional detention ponds developed that reduces discharges by 40%-45% downstream along tributaries to Cottonwood Creek (Trib to Ten Mile Creek)
- Construction wetlands for water treatment, tourism, etc.
- CH Regional Detention revised floodplain in (t) way
- DeSoto- city policy makers understand drainage issues and have supported LID projects and development standards to improve problem areas and mitigate future problems
- DeSoto- comprehensive plan & zoning requirements support acquisition of both sides of creeks
- Educated younger citizens thru partnership with Recycling program
- Environmental quality incentives program contacts that have addressed water quality, air quality, energy
- Conservation stewardship program contracts
- DeSoto Master Plan Completion
 - Funded 32 projects
 - Roughly \$8.0 million spent
 - Improved design criteria
 - Studied all tributaries
- Implemented SW utility fee
- FEMA HMGP Grant
- Adopted iSWM Orde.
- Trinity River Greenbelt is being assembled
- Ten Mile Creek Preserve (Greenbelt) Lancaster
- Partnerships along Ten Mile Creek and Trinity River
- Some group NCTCOG needs to ride herd on TCEQ and USACE on clean water

Opportunities

- MS4 Regional Storm Water Program –great opportunity for education and training of municipalities

- Pursue opportunities “Open Space” of Dallas County
- Increase funding for SW projects to minimize flooding
- Funding mechanisms
- Identification of Regional Detention Sites
- Procurement of Sites for regional detention in advance of future development (urban sprawl)
- Emergency action plans and maintenance issues for flood control dams need to address funding sources for maintenance needs to be developed or identified
- Use the water quality modeling (SWAT) done by Texas Agrilife Center to plan for future development in controlling water quality
- Public Education
 - Illegal Dumping
 - Trash/debris in streams
- Mapping of unmapped streams/creek
- Additional grant potential to acquire watershed areas
- Regional identify potential areas
- How can cities pool resources more efficiently to fund studies and examine funding opportunities
- A number of flood control dams in Ten Mile Creek watershed
 - They are a potential source for recreation in addition to other uses
 - They need to be acknowledged in plans
- Have cities establish stream erosion zones to prevent development in these areas. Will prevent damage to properties in future.
- Erosion knowledge, development criteria, and channel materials
- Improve regional cooperation between cities
- Has “watershed” costs (current spending on watershed level efforts) been estimated?
- Funding, funding and more funding
- DeSoto Continued erosion of Ten Mile Creek and Tributaries
- Flood control dams O&M issues. Local funding
- Opportunity may exist to coordinate some type of inspection/enforcement effort on salvage yards between the pertinent Phase I & II entities and TCEQ
- Work with bordering cities Red oak, Lancaster, etc. for regional detention basin (downstream)
- Preventing storm water pollution storm surveyor
- Contact bluebonnet RC&D to inquire about grants to remove structures out of flood ways
- Possible flood warning study and implementation on watershed basis. Cities worth with NWS and adjacent cities on a plan
- Some mulching companies like this one on Post Oak Road is accepting garbage and it is seeping into ground water along Trinity
- Bring auto salvage lots into compliance or remove them from creek banks
- Create CDC-like program for Ten Mile Creek/Red Oak watersheds where projects in 100-year floodplain have to be reviewed by cities in watershed and comments to study have to be addressed
- Regional cooperation works both ways NCTCOG should find methods of sharing data with cities so that work is not duplicated (GIS layer info, modeling data [not restricted to watershed], etc...)
- Water quality site regulations/requirements
- Regional water quality planning/projects

East Fork below Lake Ray Hubbard Watershed

Accomplishments

- Very successful TWDB/NCTCOG MNA project this summer 65 comm. 1300 needs
- Adoption of the Mesquite Comp Plan and implementing code calling for environmental stewardship, less impervious pavements, low-impact storm w management
- Protection of floodplain – leaving natural
- Mapping of all sub-basins in city

- Ordinances protecting watershed rise
- Code enforcement (proactive)
- Mesquite Drainage Utility District
- Through the Illegal Dumping campaign back in 2002-2003 the yellow SID banners helped get the message out to rural areas
- Balch Springs won grant from TWDB with support from Mesquite and Dallas
- New digital data from FEMA (DFIRMS) that can be merged and used for watershed based analysis
- Developing watershed based coordination meetings! Thank you!
- Mesquite has made a big step to improve and update H&H models for all streams within the city limit. Also they have no-rise policy. Other cities in this watershed should follow
- Keep Mesquite Beautiful
- Floodplain control
- Wetland – water reuse
- Convenience center for free, controlled dumping (run by city or county)
- Water quality education
- Drainage utility district establishment
- Floodplain mapping based on 100-year fully developed watershed
- Mesquite ETJ comp plan
- Mesquite has two East Fork studies available
- Balch Springs TWDB study Floodplain Management Hickory Creek
- COG funding thru solid waste grants for Code and public awareness
- Strong drainage ordinances
- East Fork Wetland a well kept secret - Need more info out on this gem
- Wetlands improvement for wildlife
- Conducted training for all city employees on BMP for storm water
- Have trained code enforcement officers in Illegal dumping
- Have made storm water comments on all plan reviews
- Decrease litter in Kaufman County since 2002

Opportunities

- Cooperative agreements to uniformly clean up & manage each watershed
 - Code enforcement
 - Education
 - Etc...
- Seek out funding opportunities
- Need: Better control floatables, public education “They are drinking water they pollute”
- How can a community encourage/fund/facilitate private pr

“Lakes” watershed meeting comments

Arlington/Benbrook/Joe Pool/Weatherford Lakes Watershed

Opportunities

- Increase public awareness
- Use ARRA funding for studies that will cut future CIP costs for cities
- Protect drinking water
- Chance to positively engage public
- Protection for wildlife
- Protection of Water Sources
- Establish Best Management Practices
- Expand participation in planning activities
- Make better local decisions based on better regional information
- Think about Citizens Advisory Committee for input
- Integrated approach to planning for Transportation, Environment, Health, etc.
- Should be able to get involvement from a variety of stakeholders
- Understanding needs of other watershed communities
- Pass some of the savings in water treatment along to the customers

Challenges

- Adverse effects of lake level fluctuations in Lake Benbrook
- Taste and odor issues (particularly from geosmin) in Lake Benbrook
- Increase non-government citizen participation in planning activities in the region
- NCTCOG needs more public info about meetings to organizations, local business, & residents of their local watershed
- Quality wildlife habitat preservation vs. recreations trails and parks
- Characterizing the background natural pollutants
- Anticipating future spills of pollutants from wrecks, etc.
- Public involvement
- Public involvement
- Identify where pollutant sources originate
- Multiple jurisdictions (cities/counties)
- Making sure all relevant departments in all affected local agencies communicate all relevant or needed information with each other
- Identifying collective impact of development; whether private or governmental
- Approval of individual projects, etc. have a collective impact
- Protecting the individual rights
- Bacteria, sediment loads, nutrient loads
- Reasonable standards that are achievable without having to make a contribution to a politician's campaign
- Anticipating potential terrorist plots to contaminate the water (or the PR scare)
- Impact of S. Dev. Joe Pool lake, esp. FWSD not in city boundaries that may have weaker regs
- Joe Pool-Recreational pressures Boat density. Marina Development. Encroachment on water in lake
- Coordinate efficient watershed based field activities with multiple municipalities
- This particular watershed might be a bit too large to deal with. We didn't have anyone from the west side. But there is still the question, if they are separate, will anyone show up even then?
- Understanding needs of other watershed communities
- Neighboring watershed based interlocal agreements

Lake Worth/Eagle Mountain Lake and Lake Bridgeport Watersheds

Opportunities

- The greatest opportunity is to manage sustainable development for future generations. It's up to us, working together, to insure this happens.
- Trail system along old railroad and road right of ways around Lake Bridgeport
- I like the idea of having watershed protection committees. These committees should include a variety of interest, such as municipalities, small business, industry, environment, public, etc. whatever is appropriate for the given watershed.
- Growth is coming whether it's wanted or not. Proper planning by cooperating cities/ agencies/ environmental groups will determine the outcome. More networking is necessary. This should be seen as an opportunity.
- Opportunity and Challenge: Engage both urban and rural landowners in the watershed-wide goals and their implementation.
- Incorporate improved lifestyle into growth areas via iSWM measures.
- If you pump water across the state lake to lake then everyone has a stake in it.
- Capturing new concepts for protection as land use changes
- Involve industry in developing effective watershed management plans.
- Coordinate an entire Tx watershed (Lake Worth) with a reasonable Master Plan (Challenge too)
- Choose Lake Worth as focused study area-can build on work already done through LW Vision Plans
- Need for science-based tools to assist in making decisions, maps and committee votes cannot effectively correct problems.
- Develop specific watershed-based plans (instead of generic one-size fits all) that people can get excited about and support.
- Promote sustainable new development
- Use federal and private (i.e. gas revenue) to protect and enhance water quality, supply, flood control, etc.
- Use of tools such as adaptive management
- Adopt common standards for storm water discharge quality
- To combine runoff, pollution and flood control
- To control pollution and food loss for years to come
- Adopt "full bore" iSWM in the Lake Worth watershed (a pilot for COFW?) This would be step for COFW toward full implementation.
- Understanding development needs/wants in upper basin areas
- Have state legislature pass enabling legislation empowering watershed districts with _____ authority
- Create regional watershed managements authority
- Public education and understanding of need for watershed management
- Better access to environmental corridors
- Proper utilization of public use properties
- Eagle Mountain is an exceptional water resource next to a large metroplex
- Eagle Mountain and GP have a huge dependable water supply for the area to drink.
- Consider a watershed council structure in pilot watersheds with potential for future constellation of watershed councils across the region.
- The opportunity to have a stick that compels local governmental leaders to address local storm water issues
- Reroute SH 170 to SH 114 loop
- Agree with bridge "somewhere" across EML (Should be able to incorporate WQ controls)

Challenges

- Integrating all stakeholders' concerns

- Understanding development needs/wants in upper basin areas
- Define success; measure success
- Complete Eagle Mtn Lake Watershed Protection Plan
- Limiting growth
- More inter-agency cooperation regarding future planning
- Smaller, semi-rural communities funding the design and construction of storm water drainage/collection systems.
- Divergent goals
- More and better communication between TRWD and lake residents
- Reducing pollution
- Where is the science in the process?
- Greenprinting on a large scale in western part of metroplex. Conflicts with future roadways/development
- Capturing the broad range of issues in extremely diverse watersheds
- Maintain Eagle Mtn closer to normal pool (Add'l water from Oklahoma might be a partial solution)
- Coordinate Lake Bridgeport interests with those down stream
- County jurisdictions and differences in needs
- What are pay back to Feds for taking stimulus money?
- All efforts to control runoff, reduce fertilizer, reduce trash, subdue oil/grease will have positive impacts but how do you quantify to make sure money is spent in the most efficient way or effort is not wasted on frivolous efforts. i.e. no P fertilizer in watershed when P is not a problem
- How to prevent an urban vs rural (or lakeside vs upstream) divide from developing in the Eagle Mtn Lake watershed when it comes to proposing ideas & solutions to lake water quality
- Communication
- Enforcement
- Coordination of multiple agencies with existing programs under various stages of development. Some targeted @ the same goal – some more diverse
- Different groups have different desires from each lake: swimming? Fishing? Drinking water? Water fowl? Boating? Nature? Can all goals be met with one plan?
- Don't we need more lakes for the future grown of all the people that are coming our way?
- Agree with bridge "somewhere" across EML (Should be able to incorporate WQ controls)
- Funding the selected projects and programs
- What is the goal of the plan and what is the litmus test to see if it is met. i.e. cleaner water goal
Test – more swimmers? Secchi depth
- Funding mechanisms for cities to implement changes using limited funds
- Implementation of suggested actions in areas with no entity that has jurisdiction to enforce
- Sustaining quality surface water in lakes that are major recreation centers as well as being highly developed
- Improve water quality on north end of EML
- Some of the lake watersheds extend into counties outside the NCTCOG. How do you bring those areas into the process?
- Challenge in allowing public access to the resource and controlling their impact on the resource – public education
- Achieving a consensus among stakeholders regarding public access to shoreline (balancing lakeshore residents interested against the broader community's interests)
- Maintaining growth for the area while controlling quality of life
- Ensuring all users are represented. Ex. Water allotments from Bridgeport Lake
- Time
- Special interest swaying things in a negative direction
- Get buy-in for regulations on rural development (new) that benefit or solve problems for urban areas
- Use caution not to impose such burdens on the "rural" watersheds that could effectively remove growth opportunities – i.e. impose new regulations
- Engage both urban and rural landowners in the watershed-wide goals and their implementation.

- Coordinate an entire Tx watershed (Lake Worth) with a reasonable Master Plan

Grapevine Lake Watershed

Opportunities

- Education outreach to elected officials
- Offer to buy conservation easements from landowners geared toward H2O quality improvement.
- Watershed education of cities and developers
- NCTCOG has means to get jurisdictions to collaborate – great idea!
- In other states, roadside signs let people know they are entering a certain watershed
- Low impact development for newly developing areas
- Agricultural BMPs for nutrient, sediment controls
- Long-term preservation of natural resources in urbanizing areas will provide increasing long term value
- Minimize drinking water treatment costs
- Central agency POC [point of contact?] for gas/oil well issues
- Market WWTP sludge as amendment/replacement for conventional fertilizer overuse
- Engage The Nature Conservancy as a partner to help protect Lake Grapevine
- Provide alternatives for safe disposal of unneeded medications rather than flushed to WWPs
- Require sewage outfalls to be treated to reuse water quality
- Preserve the fully developed floodplain with the exception of utility & roadway crossings
- Low-impact developments should be implemented when close to streams, rivers, lakes
- Local civic groups with similar interests
- Get Alliance, Hillwood, The Speedway and Perot to get involved in watershed protection planning
- Create watershed boards/commission that includes representatives from jurisdictions, property owners and other agencies within watershed.

Challenges

- Sufficient greenbelt zones around Lake Grapevine to mitigate vs. non-point source runoff
- Large property owners/ranchers should be engaged early in process
- Permit Barnett Shale gas exploration & development while engineering sufficient environmental protection into needed operations.
- Economic conditions
- Regulations of unmonitored areas for developments by private parties that are supposed to be regulated
- Getting cooperation between 4 counties, multiple medium and small cities, developers and unincorporated areas
- Limited education in region about watersheds and their purpose
- Multi-jurisdictional coordination
- Limited regulations regarding point & nonpoint pollution
- Relatively uninformed general public re: local water quality issues
- Limited to no interjurisdictional communication and cooperation
- Dealing with agriculture runoff
- Balance economic concerns with environmental concerns “developer buy-in”
- Buy in...explaining why this will benefit community
- Achieving buy-in & participation from all key stakeholders
- Municipality involvement for smaller jurisdictions
- Competition between cities to recruit development. No one wants additional restrictions on this
- Stake out dump sites and publically ID dumpers
- People don't want more regulation & don't understand importance of watershed/ environmental quality

Lewisville Lake and Ray Roberts Lake Watersheds

Opportunities

- Local municipalities to pass resolution supporting watershed protection
- Regional detention facilities
- Get water utility districts committed to educating their users - by info on their billing: chemical dumping
- Put on this or similar presentations to the major developers within the region. Along with engineers and city planners.
- HHW Program
- Common message—theme about watershed protection
- Future growth ensures that these efforts should start immediately. Watershed protection has been in place in the Chesapeake Bay area for years. Excellent models have already been developed.
- Most meeting attendees are from urbanized areas of the watershed (or at least small cities). How do we increase rural involvement?
- Cost share with other cities/water supply districts to develop public education materials.
- Share development codes that implement well w/surrounding cities.
- The corps could be more involved in watershed education.
- Wetlands education/Develop for clean watershed
- Come up with a motto/mantra-
 - Safe
 - Clean
 - Green } Water & use on all advertising
- Funding sources for local municipalities to address the challenges of
 - County Programs
 - Federal Programs
 - State Programs
- Continuing discussion like these to identify goals and objectives and those who can be involved
- Undeveloped areas shaping future development
- Implement similar riparian protection zones along streams in neighboring cities
- Ask John at NCTCOG if they have or will implement an ed. Forum for const. firms-large and small- about best practices for watershed protection as the area is developed, i.e., architectural firms – these are construction activities and completion – if they have these can they be expanded? (Sorry I have to leave, thank you so much)
- Can TCEQ Source Water Protection Program be better integrated into watershed planning issues?
- Many interested parties and stakeholder/resources
- Educational efforts can make best management practices a part of everyday behavior.
- We still have time and space to plan development & BMPs to curb pollution in our runoff – time will run out when most of area is developing
- Water quality will always be on the forefront of elected officials
- Volunteer cleanup programs for municipalities

Challenges

- When pollution is in storm water, what can you do about it?
- Planting trees along streams when they are designated as mow-areas for drainage in urban areas (Frowned upon because would require hand mowing instead of large bushhog)
- Exotic plant species and their effect on native plant communities
- Develop downstream of flood protection site dams
- Consistent enforcement efforts across boundaries
- Urbanization of rural areas—smaller communities more developer friendly (threats)

- How do you coordinate the cities (now 13) who agree to adopt watershed protection ordinances? Are there long range plans? How do you establish continuity?
- Routine water quality monitoring through the TCEA Clean Rivers program is somewhat intense in the DFW area, but drops off dramatically as you move into the outer counties. We need a way to bring other participants into the program (medium-sized cities like Gainesville; entities like NTMWD and UTRWD). The program in general (through TCEQ and TRA) is seriously underfunded.
- A severe lack of education about water quality issues among the general public and a lack of support from decision makers (agency executives; funding sources) in prioritizing education and outreach projects
- Floodplain encroachment
- FEMA floodplain maps need to incorporate breach analysis data from flood prevention site dams
- Who is a contact for concerns regarding potential problems that may affect the watershed?
- How we push a unified message that helps our population understand the importance of watershed protection and adopt the new behavior.
- Education on storm water detention ponds
- Overgrazing and poor range and pasture education
- Illegal dumping and who foots the bill
- Changing the current mind-set of developers and homeowners
- Non-management of land in transition of development
- Tying together the city and agency missions and agendas
- Fragmentation of farms and ranches due to urbanization
- Staff time to get new ordinances to council
- How do get unincorporated areas to join with the cities who have agreed to adopt watershed ordinances? Can you get counties to join in this planning? Have you?
- Can you begin publication of information which cities can use on their web sites & newsletters to educate their residents?
- How do we get “Mr Public” informed and compliant about dumping trash & chemicals
- Restricting development in floodplains when developer follows FEMA processes (CLOMR/CLOMA)
- Erosion and stream degradation
- Mapping floodway and establishing base flood elevations
- Localized flooding in ditches and small areas outside of the floodplain
- How do you protect against illegal dumpers and litterers?
- Visual pollution (trash) is one of the worst kinds of pollution
- Pharmaceutical disposal station – challenges in siting/security
- No single entity is responsible for the protection of the watershed. Enforcement is difficult with perceived multi-jurisdictional responsibilities

Lake Lavon and Lake Ray Hubbard Watersheds

Opportunities

- Due to economic downturn some cities are experiencing a slump in development. Now is the time to use spare time and staff for “big picture” visioning and implementation prior to future growth.
- Reinvigoration of COG’s stream team concepts in the area
- Utilization of TPWD’s wildlife action plan to ID conservation opportunities within each subwatershed
- Couldn’t the grant money be used to measure and quantify pollutants of key “nodes” where streams enter/exit communities? When that data for the watershed is compiled, then communities can better react or access problem area and initiate specific plans to address verifiable data. Money could be used to : 1) create sampling standards 2) sample water/log data 3) compile data into a report

- Due to a lack of funding and staff on the city level opportunities are wide open for volunteer organizations to head up the education effort.
- Political will is building on water related issues so time is right to move forward.
- Working with other entities
- Taking a hard look at the potential secondary (and cumulative impacts) of projects before the NEPA phase. Perhaps monitor @ each planning stage.
- Leveraging agency initiatives/resources/programs
- Significantly slow reservoir aging by controlling sedimentation and associated nutrients
- Sharing experiences
- Sharing successes and pitfalls to create a better program
- Regional cooperative programs could reduce costs for some programs such as public education. Many times out sources or venues for public education cross city limits.
- Cooperative regional watershed programs that involve multiple cities could possibly be sued to meet storm water permit requirements
- Planning for the future by informing citizens, working across political divisions, teaching younger population.
- Organize Phase II cities/counties to adopt county/city wide storm water program (not just in UAs)
- Learning watershed health
- Be a part of your local growth so that your voice and concerns are heard and addressed
- Cooperative, region-wide water quality/storm water education program. Ex: consistent ads, outreach materials that are adopted by the entire region in order to educate about watersheds/water quality issues
- Provide incentives for using organic landscaping
- Look for opportunities to create bio swale areas within tributaries
- Interlocal agreements share responsibility for managing lake area
- Incorporated areas adopt a 100% organic standard for park maintenance
- Defining regional processes to establish eco-frameworks before they are set by federal/state agencies
- Develop park systems/naturalization from downstream (most polluted) to upstream end.
- COG can allocate more resources to the cities which take the brunt of issues/silting/trash etc. COG can help with conditions/rules to mix & match transportation /energy / storm as an incentive to the resources
- City/county websites, presentations to realtor associations, home builder associations bout new storm water requirements (NOI/Construction Site notice collection)
- Coordinate with counties in watersheds to update subdivision regulations to require some storm water aspects.
- Structuring ILAs to address system level impacts, related to WQ, bio-preservation-conservation
- Tighter city regulations regarding runoff. New developments (transportation and private) should incorporate strategies that are known to reduce runoff and improve the quality of runoff (vegetated buffers, permeable pavement)
- Collaborative planning with most stake holders (potential for)
- Assist local soil and water districts on their programs
- Increased monitoring by cities through the Clean Rivers Program or Texas Watch

Challenges

- Educating homeowners on water usage
- Education on correct application of fertilizer and herbicides
- Invest in existing food lakes already built. They already control sediment for Lavon & Hubbard
- Many communities have different outlooks on what can or should be done for our watersheds. They have different political support and priorities. Everyone will have to learn compromise and look at the future needs. This is not possible most of the time.
- Smaller cities are having a difficult time keeping up with state storm water programs, not to mention the allocation of manpower and funds to support such programs. Could an initiative be

developed to combine local entity efforts and storm water controls be developed? Perhaps a watershed approach to TCEQ permitting?

- SWAT has been run on some of the reservoirs, any thought of running SWAT-Deg to predict future downcutting (erosion) of Rowlett Creek?
- Est. buffer zones in unincorporated areas along unstudied streams
- Study smaller streams
- It is the right thing for the future
- Smart people working together wanting to treat people right
- Lack of understanding by public officials and/or citizens
- Private property rights vs. long range planning
- Fractionalized political entities with different impacts, finances & goals
- Inability to impact agriculture uses Plowed fields – sediment herbicides & pesticides uses
- Cities that receive their water from a wholesale provider may lack the upper organizational vision to protect its watersheds. This lack of vision/urgency is in part due to the fact that they do not monitor& treat the public water supply.
- Assist local ag users on implementing BMPs
- Address John Q. Public on “What’s in it for me” on most issues and improvements, especially 20 miles away
- Do we know enough to make the right decision?
- Establishing legal framework for multiple governmental levels & entities to enforce conservation/protectionist initiatives across jurisdictional boundaries
- Will the corps allow mitigation for future water supply lakes in more urbanized watersheds
- Many cities are currently in a financial crisis that only allows them to do minimum measures to meet current requirements. They cannot take on new programs and will not have the political or financial support needed.
- Some communities do not have qualified or trained staff to support a regional or watershed-based program. There will not be funds available to hire people.
- Rapidly developing areas = increased runoff, increased siltation, higher peak flows
- As part of intercommunity cooperation, somehow get cities within watershed’s development, water quality and surface water regulations to agree and become more streamlined to encourage easier future growth.
- Oftentimes water users for a reservoir have no presence in the watershed (e.g. Dallas & Denton have no land area in Ray Roberts Watershed). How do they convince residents in watersheds to develop protective programs? Give them money?
- Funding/staffing
- How will TMDLs fit into the planning efforts
- How do developers fit into or react to concepts that restrict their current freedom to develop, particularly in unincorporated areas?
- Not familiar with other agencies/groups missions-maybe seem to conflict
- Transportation (FHWA down to MPO level) admitting the potential secondary impacts of their projects & assessing those in planning & in NEPA.
- Numerous municipalities will want to know what their return on investment will be if they choose to be involved in this approach
- Convincing elected officials
- How do we keep stakeholders invested for 25 years with elections, career opportunity changes, etc.
- Lack of time or volunteer for clean up programs
- \$
- Rowlett Creek Lake Ray Hubbard aesthetics/sedimentation
- Priorities of different cities on the upstream end would be different than the ones downstream “equalizing the table”
- Transportation of watershed should have different boundaries eg 2 mile corridor, 5 mile corridor etc.
- Storm water runoff (development, transportation)

- Funding needed to start programs
- Streams crossing jurisdictional boundary carrying trash
- Lack of funding for programs on local level
- Conflicting interests
- Lack of citizen knowledge and education
- Existing conditions bringing them into compliance
- Lack of funding and lack of staff on city level to allocate time and money to citizen and council education specific to watersheds
- Trash accumulation is an environmental eyesore. Many people are still not getting the message.

“Surrounding” watershed meeting comments

Brazos River Upper and Brazos River Lower Watersheds

Opportunities

- To incorporate all sustainability issues in one plan: environmental, recreational, water supply, water quality, business needs, construction needs
- In watershed protection plans include mechanisms for ID and funding conservation of floodplain management easements along waterways
- Because watershed coordination is already a recognized priority why is coordination not paid directly from BRA operating funds and not wait for grants. Let grants fund programming.
- Find new sources of energy – wind, solar, to provide for expanding Texas population, rather than only water driven.
- Individual contact with local entities where possible thru more public friendly venues (i.e. open discussion of the spring plan rather than power point).
- Development of Lake Granbury Watershed Protection Plan may provide data needed to assist funding grants.
- Integrating enforcement/protection activities between local, regional, state and federal agencies (especially TCEQ and Railroad Commission)

Challenges

- Replacement of OSSFs with municipal or regional POTWs or find funding for individual OSSF repair/replacement
- Funding to implement improvements
- Predominant concern for Lake Granbury water quality is the large number of septic systems in close proximity to the lake. Need funding for wastewater collection and treatment.
- Accommodating local concerns with regional goals
- Why is BRA decommissioning the PK hydroelectric plant when it can be re-build as a viable source of income for the state (clean energy, green jobs, etc)
- How do you control the wildlife and cattle
- Recognizing the value of sand and gravel resources to the region
- Information what is going on in the watershed?
- Drilling mud farms spring up without notice – permitted by the Railroad Commission
- How to find out
- Who monitors
- The biggest challenge is individual citizen's attitudes. Example: My everyday actions play a role in water quality
- Salinity, Golden Algae, Bacterial reduction in dead end canals, public perception/attitude toward
- Look at local “unique” demands of watersheds and treat each individually rather than as a “collective” group.
- Less national and state control/mandates of local resources
- Protect water level in lake
- Prevent erosion in lake
- Provide incentive to residents to repair/replace defective septic systems

Lake Tawakoni, Jim Chapman Lake, and Lake Fork Watersheds

Opportunities

- Media coverage on local levels of this NCTCOG Strategic plan to get citizens involved
- Coordination with water planning region “D”
- Educate public on areas of water conservation

- Maybe consider land-banking around water supply reservoirs where land in the Lake Tawakoni watershed is left undeveloped and instead use land as open space for various recreation
- Keep wild places wild

Challenges

- Erosion control
- Water Vitalization
- Funding for existing water source re-vitalization
- Urban reclamation programs for existing watersheds sustainability
- Siltation at Jim Chapman lake is occurring at a higher rate than projected
- Fund programs to help cities re-coop cost from Illegal Dumping
- Protecting agriculture from more input costs (i.e. dairies, beef cattle operations, etc.)
- More regulation by county government
- Water quality affected by overuse of herbicides and fertilizers on urban landscapes
- Water quality affected by runoff containing herbicides and fertilizers stored on commercial parking lots
- Fund programs to continue to maintain existing flood prevention sites in the county

Richland Chambers Watershed

Opportunities

- Growth rate of Ellis & Navarro counties and affect on groundwater
- Growth rate of entire Metroplex
- Slaughterhouse (rendering plant) on Slama Rd in Ellis County, good part of property is in Navarro County
- More stakeholder input on modeling in watershed and from city personnel
- Utilize NCTCOG landuse GIS Data & urban expansion layers in modeling work done by TRWD
- Development in the headwaters is inevitable. In-stream erosion will become a huge problem as will sediment in the reservoirs. So implement development rules that will hold runoff to predevelopment volumes, rates and patterns. (use iSWM)
- Prevent WQ concerns before they become an issue (303d) listing
- Fertilizer education – Reduce P
- Ranchette ordinance – tax exemption loophole for agriculture
- Est. buffer zones early or set aside the 100-year fully developed floodplain
- Developing plans for control of encroaching under brush and reestablish native grass species at Bardwell Lake
- Increased education on water literacy for local residents
- Reestablish wildlife species, quail, turkey, etc on Bardwell Lake
- Environmental interpretive programs at campgrounds, day use parks and Bardwell Lake

Accomplishments

- SWAT & WASP reservoir modeling
- TRWD Agrilife partnership
- TSSWCB Best management practice verification study for Mill Creek
- Prairielands Groundwater Conservation District of Ellis, Johnson, Somervell and Hill counties
- Mill Creek BMPs
- USGS gage on Richland Creek @ Love Bridge above lake
- TRWD's WPP plan
- Navarro county zoning practices
- EPA Watershed protection plan development by TRWD
- Mill Creek BMP implementation w/TSSWCB & local S&WCD

- Tarrant Regional Water District financially supporting conservation efforts through Navarro SWCD, Ellis-Prairie SWCD and USDA-NRCS. Cost share incentives are provided to landowners/operators for completed BMPs

Cedar Creek Lake Watershed

Opportunities

- Develop education and nutrient planning for parks, golf courses, yards, and lawns. Chemical pest management also.
- NCTCOG may have only about 50% of the CC watershed in their sights, but they have about 75% of the water as Kings and Cedar are the major tribs of the reservoir. Efforts in the NCTCOG area would be effective at helping lakes.
- Phase II storm water activity that is focused @ sediment and phosphorus control will be helpful to Cedar Creek Lake. Some other facets of Phase II will not have much effect.
- Part of education effort may need to be on what constitutes a stakeholder group – that a group of 1000 won't accomplish much, 10 representing 100 each can be effective.
- Education of “new generations”
- Fix the water in the reservoir before anything else
- Finding funding (grants) sources for education and studies
- Watershed “coalitions” where communities/stakeholders come together to share lessons learned

Challenges

- Brushy Creek and Kings Creek have some very erosive soils that appear to be super conducive to bank erosion. With the development of Rockwall to Terrell area the runoff could increase a lot and cause SEVERE channel erosion
- Many people in the Terrell area do not even know they are in the CC watershed. Education of where you live and what you affect could be beneficial
- Cedar Creek is on the 303d list for high pH. Could increase the std to make this reservoir similar to others in the area (i.e. 8.5 max to 9.0 max) or could look at the 24-hour average rather than an instantaneous since high pH is typically mid day as a result of photosynthesis
- How do you monitor success?
- Who implements?
- What funding source?
- “Green” is a great concept but green grass means P-fertilizer. That mentality has to be changed to protect our water qualities. Less rigorous landscaping need to be practiced.
- Agriculture – Most of the larger farms or ranches are lease property (especially cropland) and operators do not want to implement any BMPs because they might not have the property the next year.
- Municipal \$ - Cost to meet objectives could be of concern
- Need to point out how much federal and state money funds many of these programs, BMPs, construction etc. Making one level of government the enemy is just plain foolish.
- Limited funding for studies/education
- Get the EPA/HUD/DOT out of these state/regional programs
- How much control is federal – not from state of Texas on the greenprinting processes. Beware of Trust of Public Land.

Comment summary

Table C.1: A summary of the opportunities identified at the “river,” “lakes,” and “surrounding” watershed roundtable meetings.

	“River” Watersheds	“Lakes” Watersheds	“Surrounding” Watersheds
Overall	Connecting People: 32% Connecting Places: 33% Connecting Programs: 35%	Connecting People: 39% Connecting Places: 20% Connecting Programs: 41%	Connecting People: 35% Connecting Places: 44% Connecting Programs: 21%
Connecting People	(39%) More collaboration/coordination (31%) Improve/expand education/outreach (15%) Engage/involve a variety of interests (9%) Develop/expand public involvement efforts/opportunities (6%) Create an organized watershed committee/district/board (5%) Increase awareness/knowledge or modify behavior/thought	(37%) Improve/expand education/outreach (30%) Engage/involve a variety of interests (11%) Create an organized watershed committee/district/board (9%) More coordination/collaboration (9%) Develop/expand public involvement efforts/opportunities (4%) Increase awareness/knowledge	(43%) Improve/expand education (25%) Develop/expand public involvement efforts/opportunities (16%) Engage/involve a variety of interests (16%) More collaboration/coordination
Connecting Places	(21%) Improve/update/share mapping/modeling/data collection (21%) Enhance/promote recreational opportunities (21%) Identify/deal with watershed issues/pollutants (16%) Expand programs to other areas (12%) Preserve/protect specific areas/resources (8%) Watershed-based efforts	(56%) Preserve/protect specific areas and resources (16%) Watershed-based efforts (12%) Consider future conditions/changes (8%) Increase monitoring (8%) Understand needs of other watershed communities	(33%) Identify/deal with watershed issues/pollutants (27%) Preserve/protect/restore specific areas/resources (20%) Consider future conditions/changes (13%) Enhance/promote recreational opportunities (7%) Share mapping resources
Connecting Programs	(34%) Implement/further sustainable practices/development strategies (17%) Explore funding opportunities (14%) Consider a holistic/integrated approach (11%) Enhance uniformity among programs (11%) Better manage water resources/flooding risks (8%) Plan for the future (4%) Assess/define watershed functionality	(25%) Better manage/protect resources/watersheds (23%) Consider a holistic approach/integrated approach (21%) Implement/further sustainable practices/development strategies (13%) Establish a legal/organized framework (6%) Explore funding opportunities (4%) Use science-based tools (2%) Plan for the future	(58%) Identify funding sources/means (14%) Further sustainable practices/development (14%) Expand regulations/requirements (14%) Consider a holistic approach

Table C.2: A summary of the challenges identified at the “lakes” and “surrounding” watershed roundtable meetings.

	“Lakes” Watersheds	“Surrounding” Watersheds
Overall	Connecting People: 47% Connecting Places: 27% Connecting Programs: 26%	Connecting People: 14% Connecting Places: 43% Connecting Programs: 43%
Connecting People	(22%) Coordination/ collaboration/cooperation (12%) Educating the public/lack of education (9%) Limited/lack of knowledge (9%) Lack of support/buy-in (8%) Changing the current mindset (6%) Public involvement (6%) Enforcement (5%) Engaging a variety of interests/ensuring all interests are represented/not over-represented (4%) Lack of staff (4%) Communication/improving communication (3%) Protecting individuals' rights (3%) Meeting all stakeholders' goals (3%) Achieving a consensus among interests (3%) Lack of vision/urgency (1%) Time (1%) Keeping stakeholders invested (1%) Separating politics and protection	(80%) Changing attitudes/perception (20%) Education
Connecting Places	(43%) Identifying/dealing with watershed issues/pollutants (16%) Impacting/managing/studying specific areas (10%) Balancing recreation/public areas and preservation (6%) Developing in sensitive areas (4%) Anticipating/planning for future contamination (4%) Understanding needs/wants of neighboring watersheds/upper basin areas (4%) Accommodating future growth while controlling the quality of life (4%) Mapping floodway (4%) Matching planning efforts with future conditions (2%) Exotic species (2%) Siting/security challenges	(69%) Managing water quality/quantity issues (19%) Considering economic drivers (12%) Identifying watershed characteristics
Connecting Programs	(27%) Funding for programs/projects or ensuring efficient use of funds (18%) Differences among organizations (11%) Establishing a legal/organized framework (7%) Identifying the collective impact of projects (5%) Fitting requirements into planning efforts/daily operations/complying (5%) Imposing regulations (5%) Defining/measuring success (5%) Economic conditions/concerns (5%) Incorporating science in watershed protection efforts (2%) Limited regulations (2%) Streamlining development/water quality regulations (2%) Determining the return on investment (2%) Watershed Protection Plans (2%) Investing in existing infrastructure	(43%) Funding for programs/projects (19%) Limited regulations/incentives (13%) Furthering sustainable practices/development (13%) Federal control of programs (6%) Accommodating local concerns with regional goals (6%) Defining/measuring success

Table C.3: A summary of the accomplishments identified at the “river” watershed roundtable meetings.

	“River” Watersheds
Overall	Connecting People: 22% Connecting Places: 27% Connecting Programs: 51%
Connecting People	(56%) Education and outreach efforts (24%) Training opportunities/efforts (8%) Coordination/collaboration (8%) Increased public support/awareness (4%) Proactive enforcement
Connecting Places	(42%) Mapping/modeling/data collection efforts (29%) Protecting areas/resources (13%) Watershed-based efforts (10%) Creating recreational opportunities (6%) Drainage utility districts/fees
Connecting Programs	(33%) Flood control/floodplain management programs (24%) Storm water management programs (24%) Development/adoption of codes/criteria/plans to further sustainable development (9%) Funding opportunities (5%) Management of water resources (5%) Solid waste programs