STAKEHOLDER ISSUE VOTING
JUNE 30, 2004 STAKEHOLDER MEETING

Issues are ranked based on results of dot voting at the June 30, 2004 Stakeholder Meeting.
Rank of 1 indicates most votes received, 2 next most, etc...

"Rank by Total Votes From Other Groups" - rankings based on total votes received from other stakeholder groups, **not** including the group that originally identified the issue.

"Rank by Total Votes From All Stakeholders" - rankings based on totals votes received from all stakeholders, **including** the stakeholder group that originally identified the issue.

RANK BY TOTAL VOTES FROM OTHER GROUPS	RANK BY TOTAL VOTES FROM ALL STAKE-HOLDERS	ISSUE
1	1	Water quality too narrow, include other water impact related issues (stream erosion, head water protection, water use).
2	4	Education.
3	3	Non-degradation of existing water quality.
4	5	Incentive program for native plants and rainwater harvesting; remove disincentives.
5	8	Educating the public (landowners and concerned groups) on avenues for public/private conservation (i.e., Hill Country Conservancy, Nature Conservancy, etc…).
6	1	Long - Term preservation management of watershed and aquifer for future generations.
7	6	Enforcement jurisdiction/mechanisms for Aquifer water quality and management. Single aquifer-wide entity.
7	6	Review and enforcement must be uniform and competent.
9	10	Limit density and impervious cover of development to assure nondegradation, sustainability and sufficient water supply.
10	12	Water conservation (rainwater collection). Provide incentives. Eliminate restrictions (financing). Xeriscape/ native plants.
10	14	Funding mechanisms for implementation, maintenance and enforcement.
12	12	WQ impacts: includes E&T species, non-degradation of water quality, evaluating appropriateness of water supply sources and wastewater treatment. Also includes quantity and quality.
13	8	Preservation of open space. Encourage conservation easements.

STAKEHOLDER ISSUE VOTING
JUNE 30, 2004 STAKEHOLDER MEETING

Issues are ranked based on results of dot voting at the June 30, 2004 Stakeholder Meeting.
Rank of 1 indicates most votes received, 2 next most, etc...

"Rank by Total Votes From Other Groups" - rankings based on total votes received from other stakeholder groups, **not** including the group that originally identified the issue.

"Rank by Total Votes From All Stakeholders" - rankings based on totals votes received from all stakeholders, **including** the stakeholder group that originally identified the issue.

RANK BY TOTAL VOTES FROM OTHER GROUPS	RANK BY TOTAL VOTES FROM ALL STAKE-HOLDERS	ISSUE
14	**14**	Master planned development. Reasonable balance/promotion of renewable resources/stewardship of resources.
15	**16**	Regional--consistent and steady course regulation. (Illegible) regs. Impervious cover requirement/water buffer.
16	**19**	Moratorium on Development within watershed until Regional Plan Adoption.
17	**26**	Conservation easements.
18	**11**	Over-development - overly intensive/dense.
18	**18**	Water quality regulations based on science, not emotions.
20	**17**	Identify responsible agency with authority for enforcement.
20	**22**	Land acquisition/easements. How much/where? Configuration (landscape level). Funding sources--revenue streams. Recharge. Critical environmental features.
22	**24**	Open space--land acquisition and conservation easements as part of the Plan.
23	**19**	Create an authority/perhaps combine the Trinity Aquifer District and BSEACD and give them authority to review and approve development applications for compliance with water quality provisions, and enforce WQ protection measures, and maintain WQ structures.
23	**21**	BMP Issues: BMPs that require minimal maintenance; institutional framework for BMP maintenance; funding for monitoring BMPs; preference for non-structural BMPs.
23	**24**	Water value vs. land value (eminent domain). Balance between sustainable economics & ecosystems based on good science.

STAKEHOLDER ISSUE VOTING
JUNE 30, 2004 STAKEHOLDER MEETING

Issues are ranked based on results of dot voting at the June 30, 2004 Stakeholder Meeting.
Rank of 1 indicates most votes received, 2 next most, etc...

"Rank by Total Votes From Other Groups" - rankings based on total votes received from other stakeholder groups, **not** including the group that originally identified the issue.

"Rank by Total Votes From All Stakeholders" - rankings based on totals votes received from all stakeholders, **including** the stakeholder group that originally identified the issue.

RANK BY TOTAL VOTES FROM OTHER GROUPS	RANK BY TOTAL VOTES FROM ALL STAKE-HOLDERS	ISSUE
26	**22**	Incentives for high quality development (to include high water quality measures) - flexibility to innovate.
27	**27**	Create or use (an existing) single (taxing) authority to administrate and maintain the plan and resulting BMPs.
28	**30**	Impervious cover limits.
29	**34**	Encourage collaborative planning to better coordinate effective water quality features.
30	**32**	Control the bad effects of increased volumes of runoff from development. Post development hydrology should equal pre-development hydrology: both peak flows and volume.
30	**36**	Any economic analysis must be holistic and include all cost (i.e. endangered species, habitat).
32	**27**	Goal definition: Define non-degradation. Is non-degradation achievable? What level of degradation of aquifer is acceptable, if any? How can non-degradation be achieved?
33	**27**	Define local governmental roles and responsibilities. Is a regional entity needed and appropriate (centralized vs. decentralized)?
33	**31**	Neighborhood education on water quality, low water use xeriscape, water collection, conservation; pesticide, fertilizer, chemical use.
33	**33**	Promotion of vegetative cover that will promote water infiltration (including juniper control, other invasive, destructive plants).
36	**37**	Retrofitting of old infrastructure/developments with outdated management practices.

STAKEHOLDER ISSUE VOTING
JUNE 30, 2004 STAKEHOLDER MEETING

Issues are ranked based on results of dot voting at the June 30, 2004 Stakeholder Meeting.
Rank of 1 indicates most votes received, 2 next most, etc...

"Rank by Total Votes From Other Groups" - rankings based on total votes received from other stakeholder groups, **not** including the group that originally identified the issue.

"Rank by Total Votes From All Stakeholders" - rankings based on totals votes received from all stakeholders, **including** the stakeholder group that originally identified the issue.

RANK BY TOTAL VOTES FROM OTHER GROUPS	RANK BY TOTAL VOTES FROM ALL STAKE-HOLDERS	ISSUE
36	**40**	There should be environmental impact study for subdivision and commercial development.
38	**34**	Upstream development consequences on downstream property owners (value and water quality).
38	**37**	Water quality - all aspects - not just stormwater (USFWS) - e.g. wastewater.
40	**40**	Acknowledge and respect property rights.
41	**43**	Determine maintenance responsibility (property owner, HOA, municipality, etc.).
41	**43**	Simplify/coordinate regulatory requirements--administrative.
43	**47**	Focus our energies on enabling good development vs. regulating “bad” development.
43	**49**	Science-based water quality protection.
45	**37**	Interim regulations eliminate grandfathering.
46	**43**	Impervious coverage percentage.
46	**54**	Acknowledge legitimacy of secondary impacts of government investment in infrastructure (+ and - impacts).
46	**55**	Require xeriscaping and IPM (integrated pest management) to eliminate the use of herbicides and pesticides.
49	**43**	Provide a legal safe harbor for the development process - dependable and predictable.
49	**51**	What effect will centralized sewer have vs. septic systems.
51	**51**	Protection of critical water quality features.
51	**55**	Grandfathering of existing platted subdivisions.

STAKEHOLDER ISSUE VOTING
JUNE 30, 2004 STAKEHOLDER MEETING

Issues are ranked based on results of dot voting at the June 30, 2004 Stakeholder Meeting.
Rank of 1 indicates most votes received, 2 next most, etc...

"Rank by Total Votes From Other Groups" - rankings based on total votes received from other stakeholder groups, **not** including the group that originally identified the issue.

"Rank by Total Votes From All Stakeholders" - rankings based on totals votes received from all stakeholders, **including** the stakeholder group that originally identified the issue.

RANK BY TOTAL VOTES FROM OTHER GROUPS	RANK BY TOTAL VOTES FROM ALL STAKE-HOLDERS	ISSUE
51	**55**	Low impact development.
51	**60**	Expansion of water lines, roads and other infrastructure - impact on water quality.
51	**61**	Determine maintenance criteria--clear maintenance program.
56	**48**	Use existing TCEQ regulations as "plan". Implement program for government maintenance responsibility.
56	**51**	Regional Infrastructure (transportation, utilities, water [ground and surface], sewage).
56	**55**	All sources of pollution must be addressed.
56	**61**	Waste water management.
60	**42**	Fiscal surety--Assuring the costs are fairly distributed including monies from developers (sick creek syndrome); ensuring that W.Q. projects are adequately funded, constructed, maintained, monitored and enforced. Who pays fiscal surety?
60	**55**	Market & science should dictate density limitations, not emotions.
60	**63**	Regional planning project needs to stay on schedule.
60	**63**	Stressing alternatives (rainwater collection and septic).
60	**67**	Well water quality and quantity.
65	**63**	Education of pollution prevention.
65	**67**	Too many wells - impact on aquifer.
65	**73**	Restoration of land and vegetation following pipeline construction.
68	**73**	Balance community responsibility with private property rights.

STAKEHOLDER ISSUE VOTING
JUNE 30, 2004 STAKEHOLDER MEETING

Issues are ranked based on results of dot voting at the June 30, 2004 Stakeholder Meeting.
Rank of 1 indicates most votes received, 2 next most, etc...

"Rank by Total Votes From Other Groups" - rankings based on total votes received from other stakeholder groups, **not** including the group that originally identified the issue.

"Rank by Total Votes From All Stakeholders" - rankings based on totals votes received from all stakeholders, **including** the stakeholder group that originally identified the issue.

RANK BY TOTAL VOTES FROM OTHER GROUPS	RANK BY TOTAL VOTES FROM ALL STAKE-HOLDERS	ISSUE
68	**73**	Research needs: BSS levels of WQ constituents which may affect species (dissolved oxygen, pH, contaminants); types of BMPs/effectiveness; designing effective cumulative impacts analysis; funding sources.
68	**77**	Developer and neighborhoods conduct joint predevelopment planning sessions.
70	**63**	Work within the existing systems.
71	**49**	Clustering is not the only solution. Determine appropriate density.
71	**67**	Appropriateness of new roads and utilities.
71	**67**	Commercial tax base stewardship.
71	**79**	Property owners uninformed, left out of the process. Better communication, outreach.
76	**79**	Land stewardship for water quality and water quality effect on wildlife.
77	**67**	Property values – short term and long term -affected negatively by punitive regulations.
77	**73**	Publicly owned and financed open space vs. forced dedication.
77	**77**	Balance environment, affordable housing, economic & development issues. Keep central Texas open to all.
77	**79**	Prevent additional traffic in the Barton Springs Zone and reduce vehicle miles traveled with a transportation plan that limits access to the Barton Springs zone.
77	**84**	Conservation of Barton Springs salamander and other rare and endangered species.

STAKEHOLDER ISSUE VOTING
JUNE 30, 2004 STAKEHOLDER MEETING

Issues are ranked based on results of dot voting at the June 30, 2004 Stakeholder Meeting.
Rank of 1 indicates most votes received, 2 next most, etc...

"Rank by Total Votes From Other Groups" - rankings based on total votes received from other stakeholder groups, **not** including the group that originally identified the issue.

"Rank by Total Votes From All Stakeholders" - rankings based on totals votes received from all stakeholders, **including** the stakeholder group that originally identified the issue.

RANK BY TOTAL VOTES FROM OTHER GROUPS	RANK BY TOTAL VOTES FROM ALL STAKE-HOLDERS	ISSUE
77	**84**	Non-point source (runoff from various places – golf course, autos, home fertilizers).
83	**67**	Broad participation and representation of individuals outside of HOAs.
83	**84**	Incompetent regulation based on politics/anecdotal stuff.
83	**89**	Enforcement of regulation of water quality.
83	**89**	How water quality affects quality of life.
83	**94**	Education/outreach.
83	**94**	Filling scientific research gaps.
83	**94**	Financing options (PUD, MUDs).
90	**79**	Creation of a regulatory checklist.
90	**79**	Equality and fairness of allocation of resources (resources=impervious cover and water).
90	**84**	Share the economic pain.
90	**94**	Open public decision-making in the government process by getting more citizens involved.
90	**94**	Wastewater management/reuse must be considered and its impact on the environment, conservation and supply.
90	**100**	Cost/benefit analysis (regulatory).
90	**100**	How do we define success?
90	**100**	Legal analysis/evaluation of efficacy of various regulations.
90	**100**	Property valuation.
90	**100**	Research to fill gaps in technical knowledge about the effect of water quality.
90	**100**	Water collection.

STAKEHOLDER ISSUE VOTING
JUNE 30, 2004 STAKEHOLDER MEETING

Issues are ranked based on results of dot voting at the June 30, 2004 Stakeholder Meeting.
Rank of 1 indicates most votes received, 2 next most, etc...

"Rank by Total Votes From Other Groups" - rankings based on total votes received from other stakeholder groups, **not** including the group that originally identified the issue.

"Rank by Total Votes From All Stakeholders" - rankings based on totals votes received from all stakeholders, **including** the stakeholder group that originally identified the issue.

RANK BY TOTAL VOTES FROM OTHER GROUPS	RANK BY TOTAL VOTES FROM ALL STAKE-HOLDERS	ISSUE
101	**84**	Tax assessment forcing sale of properties on large acreages.
101	**89**	Provide a set of rules that allow the flexibility to plan for all types of development. Not impervious cover, but establish a water quality goal and allow engineering measures to accomplish.
101	**100**	Extraction of parkland during subdivision process.
101	**100**	How does sustainable yield of the aquifer factor in this discussion (water quality)?
101	**100**	Liability concerns. Who is responsible for regulations that are adopted? Can we depend on legally defensible regulations?
101	**100**	Rural neighborhood associations look out for the (rural) neighborhood.
101	**110**	Advocate rainwater harvesting as the first source of supply.
101	**110**	Balance science against best professional judgments.
101	**110**	Confidence that plan will provide adequate protection (HCP).
101	**110**	Prohibit industries that would pollute the aquifer from locating in the Barton Springs Zone.
101	**110**	Require retrofitting (reclamation).
101	**110**	Roadway runoff - low water crossings.
101	**110**	Some pre-developed flows may exceed good levels due to poor land management.
114	**89**	Rules should be site-specific.
114	**89**	Shifting burden of mitigation of water quality to undeveloped land.
114	**94**	Wildlife water sources.
114	**110**	Legally defensible measures.
114	**110**	Timelines for process.

STAKEHOLDER ISSUE VOTING
JUNE 30, 2004 STAKEHOLDER MEETING

Issues are ranked based on results of dot voting at the June 30, 2004 Stakeholder Meeting.
Rank of 1 indicates most votes received, 2 next most, etc...

"Rank by Total Votes From Other Groups" - rankings based on total votes received from other stakeholder groups, **not** including the group that originally identified the issue.

"Rank by Total Votes From All Stakeholders" - rankings based on totals votes received from all stakeholders, **including** the stakeholder group that originally identified the issue.

RANK BY TOTAL VOTES FROM OTHER GROUPS	RANK BY TOTAL VOTES FROM ALL STAKE-HOLDERS	ISSUE
114	**119**	Achieve consensus among all parties.
114	**119**	Agriculture waste.
114	**119**	Captured volumes that are re-irrigated and percolate into the Aquifer should not pollute the Aquifer.
114	**119**	Developers required to do rigorous environmental impact studies before getting approvals to build.
114	**119**	Different water quality guidelines for rural and urban areas within the region.
114	**119**	New paradigm to replace bulldozing the environment.
114	**119**	Protect recreational water use.
114	**119**	Recharge water quality.
114	**119**	Reporting mechanism for enforcement.
114	**119**	Resolution of mandated missions with respect to goals of this process (unfunded mandates).
114	**119**	Restoration - riparian/ historic (downtown).
114	**119**	Septic tanks number.
114	**119**	Wastewater effluent runoff.
114	**119**	Water lines, wastewater directed off the Barton Springs zone.
114	**119**	What are the development needs of central Texas? Economic diversity and population.