

TEXAS STATE SOIL & WATER CONSERVATION BOARD



CUSTOMER SERVICE REPORT

June 1, 2010

Introduction

This report presents the results of a survey that was made available to the customers and working partners of the Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board (TSSWCB). The purpose of this survey is to assess the quality of service delivered by the agency in fulfillment of legislative requirements. The survey was sent to all 216 Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCDs) in April 2010 and remains posted and available on the agency website. SWCDs and the individually elected directors that govern each district comprise the customer population with whom the agency employees interact most.

Each SWCD Board of Directors had the option of completing the survey as a district board or individually. Customers who participated in the survey off of our website did so as individuals and in limited cases as a summary of district board collaboration. In addition, our Regional Offices made the survey available to landowners or operators as contact was made with them.

The availability of the survey does not reflect participation in the survey. Only 145 surveys were returned to this office or recorded from the website. This number of responses represents a 47% decrease from the responses we had in our 2008 survey. The responses we received are from 82 counties around the state and this represents a decrease of 50% from our 2008 survey, however, 20 counties were ones that did not participate in our last survey. We point out, the totals in various summaries and figures do not add up to the total number of responses because not all respondents replied to all questions.

The survey instrument consisted of 22 questions that measure quality of service delivery by the Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board. The questions were designed to gather the level of satisfaction from customers concerning TSSWCB facilities, staff, communications, internet site, complaint process, service delivery and timeliness, cost-share payment processing and printed information. The survey also asks the respondents the type of customer they are as well as their race, age, gender and county of residence. Figures 1 through 4 present the demographic breakdown of the respondents and a separate list of the counties shows the response(s) received from a particular county.

To score the data, responses were recorded in one of five categories from Very Satisfied to Very Dissatisfied. Respondents were also provided a Not Applicable choice. Responses were tallied for each category and percentages for each applicable response were calculated for each question.

Customers were invited to add comments and suggestions at the bottom of the survey. The comments received have been included in this report.

Executive Summary

The overall satisfaction level of respondents to our survey measures of service delivery can be found in Table 1. In general, the customers and working partners of the Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board are satisfied with the Agency's service delivery as measured by the survey questions. We believe our overall rating increased significantly from our 2008 survey.

TSSWCB endeavors to provide the highest quality of service to all our customers. As reported in this document, TSSWCB is working to track and monitor customer feedback to identify specific needs and problems within the agency.

TSSWCB is determined to demonstrate high standards by not only meeting, but also exceeding the expectations of all our customers.

INVENTORY OF EXTERNAL CUSTOMERS BY STRATEGY

The customer service functions outlined below are based on the strategies included in the Fiscal Year 2010-2011 General Appropriations Act (GAA).

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT STRATEGIES

A. Goal: Soil and Water Conservation Assistance

A.1.1. Strategy: PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AND ASSISTANCE

Provide program expertise, technical guidance and conservation implementation assistance, and financial assistance on a statewide basis in managing and directing conservation programs.

Direct customers include 216 local soil and water conservation districts, locally elected district directors, district employees.

Indirect customers include USDA-Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) employees, agricultural landowners and producers, agricultural commodity groups, and the general public.

B. Goal: NONPOINT SOURCE POLLUTION ABATEMENT

B.1.1. Strategy: STATEWIDE MANAGEMENT PLAN

Implement and update as necessary a statewide management plan for the control of agricultural and silvicultural nonpoint source pollution.

Direct customers include 216 local soil and water conservation districts, locally elected district directors, district employees, and agricultural landowners and producers.

Indirect customers include various state and federal agricultural/environmental/natural resource/commodity/research agencies, various river authorities, agricultural commodity groups and the general public.

B.1.2. Strategy: POLLUTION ABATEMENT PLAN

Develop and implement pollution abatement plans for agricultural/silvicultural operations in identified areas.

Direct customers include 216 local soil and water conservation districts, locally elected district directors, district employees, and agricultural landowners and producers.

Indirect customers include various state and federal agricultural/environmental/natural resource/commodity/research agencies, agricultural commodity groups and the general public.

C. Goal: WATER SUPPLY ENHANCEMENT

C.1.1. Strategy: WATER CONSERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT

Provide program expertise, technical guidance and conservation implementation assistance, and financial assistance for brush control and other means to conserve water and enhance water yield in targeted areas.

Direct customers include local soil and water conservation districts in targeted areas, locally elected district directors, district employees, and agricultural landowners and producers.

Indirect customers include various state and federal agricultural/environmental/natural resource/commodity/research agencies, various river authorities, agricultural commodity groups and the general public.

D. Goal: INDIRECT ADMINISTRATION

D.1.1. Strategy: INDIRECT ADMINISTRATION

Provide indirect administration to programs.

Direct customers include agency employees, soil and water conservation districts, district directors and district employees.

Indirect customers include the general public.

Table 1: Overall Levels of Satisfaction (Totals add up to 100% due to rounding)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Just Okay	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Overall satisfied with TSSWCB	68	23	7	1	1
Satisfied staff is professional and courteous	81	13	4	1	1
Satisfied staff identified themselves adequately	82	12	4	1	1
Satisfied staff is sufficiently knowledgeable	76	19	3	1	1
Satisfied with WQMP Program	61	29	8	1	1
Satisfied with receiving WQMP Technical Assistance (TA)	62	29	5		4
Satisfied with Brush Control Program	59	31	5	2	3
Satisfied with receiving Brush Control TA	64	24	6	2	4
Satisfied with accuracy and timeliness of cost-share	61	31	5	1	2
Satisfied with accuracy/helpfulness of written information	65	28	5	1	1
Satisfied with ease of understanding written information	57	35	7	1	
Satisfied with handling your telephone calls/e-mails	73	20	6		1
Satisfied with ability to reach correct person by phone	70	23	7		
Satisfied with response to your e-mails	68	26	4	1	1
Satisfied with ease of finding information on our website	57	31	10	2	
Satisfied with usefulness of website information	56	31	11	2	
Satisfied with appearance and location of our facilities	52	36	11		1
Satisfied with the way filed complaint was handled	53	29	18		
Satisfied with response to filed complaint	60	33	7		
Satisfied with timeliness of handling filed complaint	62	23	15		
Satisfied TSSWCB is attentive to customer complaints	69	19	10		2

Table 2: Average Rating (On a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being Very Satisfied)


	Average Rating
Overall satisfied with TSSWCB	4.56
Satisfied staff is professional and courteous	4.72
Satisfied staff identified themselves adequately	4.73
Satisfied staff is sufficiently knowledgeable	4.68
Satisfied with WQMP Program	4.48
Satisfied with receiving WQMP Technical Assistance (TA)	4.41
Satisfied with Brush Control Program	4.41
Satisfied with receiving Brush Control TA	4.42
Satisfied with accuracy and timeliness of cost-share	4.48
Satisfied with accuracy/helpfulness of written information	4.55
Satisfied with ease of understanding written information	4.48
Satisfied with handling your telephone calls/e-mails	4.64
Satisfied with ability to reach correct person by phone	4.63
Satisfied with response to your e-mails	4.56
Satisfied with ease of finding information on our website	4.43
Satisfied with usefulness of website information	4.41
Satisfied with appearance and location of our facilities	4.37
Satisfied with the way filed complaint was handled	4.35
Satisfied with response to filed complaint	4.53
Satisfied with timeliness of handling filed complaint	4.47
Satisfied TSSWCB is attentive to customer complaints	4.51
Overall Average	4.52

2010 Customer Service Survey Tally.

Which customer type would you consider yourself: (Please mark only one) Total Responses - 145
Percentages add up to 100% due to rounding off.

- Soil and Water Conservation District – 10 responses (7%)
- Soil and Water Conservation District Director – 41 responses (28%)
- Soil and Water Conservation District Employee – 55 responses (38%)
- Farmer/Rancher – 21 responses (14%)
- Citizen – 7 responses (5%)
- Public/Elected Official/Government Employee – 8 responses (6%)
- Agricultural Industry/Association Representative – 3 responses (2%)

Figure 1: Which customer type would you consider yourself?




- SWCD Employee
- Soil and Water Conservation District Director
- Farmer/Rancher
- SWCD
- Public/Elected Official/Government Employee
- Citizen
- Agricultural Industry/Association Representative

What is your Gender? Total Responses 142
Percentages add up to 100% due to rounding off.

Male – 83 responses (58%)

Female – 59 responses (42%)

Figure 2: What is your gender?




What is your Ethnicity? Total Responses – 140
Percentages add up to 100% due to rounding off.

African-American – 1 responses (1%)

Hispanic – 17 responses (12%)

Anglo – 107 responses (76%)

Other – 15 responses (11%)



What is your age group? Total Responses – 141
Percentages add up to 100% due to rounding off.

Under 20 – no responses


20-29 – 10 responses (7%)

30-39 – 12 responses (9%)

40-49 – 24 responses (17%)

50 and Over – 95 responses (67%)

Figure 4 What is your age group?



What county do you live in? – Total Responses from 82 Counties

COUNTY			
Anderson	Dallam 1	Houston	Montgomery
Andrews 4	Dallas 1	Howard	Moore
Angelina	Dawson	Hudspeth	Morris
Aransas	DeWitt	Hunt	Motley
Archer 1	Deaf Smith 4	Hutchinson 1	Nacogdoches 1
Armstrong 1	Delta	Irion 2	Navarro 2
Atascosa 1	Denton	Jack	Newton
Austin 3	Dickens	Jackson	Nolan
Bailey	Dimmit	Jasper	Nueces
Bandera	Donley 1	Jeff Davis	Ochiltree
Bastrop	Duval	Jefferson	Oldham
Baylor	Eastland	Jim Hogg 5	Orange
Bee 1	Ector	Jim Wells	Palo Pinto 1
Bell 3	Edwards 1	Johnson 1	Panola 1
Bexar	El Paso	Jones	Parker 1
Blanco 2	Ellis	Karnes	Parmer 2
Borden	Erath	Kaufman	Pecos
Bosque	Falls	Kendall 1	Polk
Bowie 1	Fannin	Kenedy	Potter 1
Brazoria	Fayette	Kent 3	Presidio
Brazos	Fisher	Kerr	Rains
Brewster 7	Floyd	Kimble 1	Randall 1
Briscoe	Foard	King	Reagan
Brooks	Fort Bend	Kinney	Real
Brown	Franklin	Kleberg	Red River
Burleson 1	Freestone	Knox	Reeves
Burnet	Frio 1	La Salle	Refugio
Caldwell	Gaines 2	Lamar 1	Roberts
Calhoun 2	Galveston	Lamb 3	Robertson
Callahan	Garza	Lampasas 1	Rockwall
Cameron 2	Gillespie 1	Lavaca	Runnels 1
Camp	Glasscock	Lee	Rusk
Carson	Goliad	Leon 1	Sabine
Cass 2	Gonzales 1	Liberty	San Augustine
Castro	Gray 4	Limestone 2	San Jacinto
Chambers 1	Grayson	Lipscomb	San Patricio 1
Cherokee	Gregg	Live Oak 1	San Saba 1
Childress	Grimes	Llano	Schleicher
Clay	Guadalupe	Loving	Scurry 1
Cochran 1	Hale 3	Lubbock 1	Shackelford
Coke	Hall	Lynn	Shelby
Coleman	Hamilton	Madison	Sherman 1
Collin	Hansford	Marion 3	Smith
Collingsworth 1	Hardeman	Martin	Somervell
Colorado	Hardin	Mason	Starr 1
Comal	Harris 1	Matagorda	Stephens
Comanche	Harrison	Maverick	Sterling
Concho 1	Hartley	McCulloch 1	Stonewall
Cooke	Haskell	McLennan 1	Sutton
Coryell	Hays	McMullen 1	Swisher
Cottle	Hemphill 1	Medina	Tarrant
Crane	Henderson	Menard	Taylor
Crockett 1	Hidalgo 2	Midland	Terrell 1
Crosby 2	Hill	Milam 1	Terry
Culberson 1	Hockley	Mills 1	Throckmorton
	Hood	Mitchell	Titus
	Hopkins	Montague	Tom Green

Travis
Trinity
Tyler
Upshur 1
Upton
Uvalde 2
Val Verde 1
Van Zandt
Victoria 1
Walker 1
Waller
Ward
Washington 1
Webb
Wharton 3
Wheeler 1
Wichita
Wilbarger
Willacy 3
Williamson
Wilson
Winkler
Wise
Wood
Yoakum
Young
Zapata 4
Zavala

**For the following questions, the rating system that was used is below:
5 – Very Satisfied; 4 – Satisfied; 3 – Just OK; 2 – Dissatisfied; 1 – Very Dissatisfied**

**Overall how satisfied are you with the TSSWCB? Total Responses – 141
Percentages add up to 100% due to rounding off.**

5 – 95 (68%)


4 – 32 (23%)

3 – 10 (7%)

2 – 2 (1%)

1 – 1 (1%)

Not Applicable – 1



Staff-

**How satisfied are you that staff is professional and courteous? Total Responses – 145
Percentages add up to 100% due to rounding off.**

5 – 118 (82%)


4 – 17 (12%)

3 - 6 (4%)

2 - 1 (1%)

1 – 1 (1%)

Not Applicable - 0



**How satisfied are you that staff identified themselves adequately? Total Responses – 144
Percentages add up to 100% due to rounding off.**

5 – 119 (82%)

4 – 17 (12%)


3 – 6 (4%)

2 – 1 (1%)

1 – 1 (1%)

Not Applicable – 0

Figure 7: How satisfied are you that staff identified themselves adequately?



**How satisfied are you that staff is sufficiently knowledgeable? Total Responses – 143
Percentages add up to 100% due to rounding off.**

5 – 107 (76%)


4 – 27 (19%)

3 – 5 (3%)

2 – 1 (1%)

1 – 1 (1%)

Not Applicable - 2



Agency Programs-

How satisfied are you with our Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) Program?

Total Responses – 142 (91 responses after subtracting not applicable responses)

Percentages based on 91 responses.

Percentages add up to 100% due to rounding off.

5 – 56 (61%)


4 – 26 (29%)

3 – 7 (8%)

2 - 1 (1%)

1 – 1 (1%)

Not Applicable – 51



How satisfied are you with the length of time it took to receive WQMP technical assistance?
Total Responses – 139 (77 responses after subtracting not applicable responses)
Percentages based on 77 responses.
Percentages add up to 100% due to rounding off.

5 – 48 (62%)

4 – 22 (29%)


3 – 4 (5%)

2 – 0

1 – 3 (4%)

Not Applicable – 62

Figure 10: How satisfied are you with the length of time it took to receive WQMP technical assistance?



How satisfied are you with our Brush Control Program?

Total Responses – 140 (59 responses after subtracting not applicable responses)

Percentages based on 59 responses.

Percentages add up to 100% due to rounding off.

5 – 35 (59%)

4 – 18 (31%)


3 – 3 (5%)

2 – 1 (2%)

1 - 2 (3%)

Not Applicable – 81

Figure 11: How satisfied are you with our Brush Control Program?



How satisfied are you with the length of time it took to receive technical assistance for your brush control plan?

Total Responses – 144 (50 responses after subtracting not applicable responses)

Percentages based on 50 responses.

Percentages add up to 100% due to rounding off.

5 – 32 (64%)

4 – 12 (24%)


3 – 3 (6%)

2 – 1 (2%)

1 – 2 (4%)

Not Applicable - 94

Figure 12: How satisfied are you with the length of time it took to receive technical assistance for your brush control plan?



How satisfied are you with the accuracy and timeliness of cost-share payments?
Total Responses – 140 (92 responses after subtracting not applicable responses)
Percentages based on 92 responses.
Percentages add up to 100% due to rounding off.

5 – 56 (61%)

4 – 28 (31%)


3 – 5 (5%)

2 – 1 (1%)

1 – 2 (2%)

Not Applicable – 48

Figure 13: How satisfied are you with the accuracy and timeliness of cost-share payments?



Communications-

How satisfied are you with the accuracy/helpfulness of the written information or documentation you received?

Total Responses – 140 (122 responses after subtracting not applicable responses)

Percentages based on 122 responses.

Percentages add up to 100% due to rounding off.

5 – 79 (65%)

4 – 35 (28%)


3 – 6 (5%)

2 – 1 (1%)

1 – 1 (1%)

Not Applicable - 18

Figure 14: How satisfied are you with the accuracy/helpfulness of the written information or documentation you received?



How satisfied are you with the ease of understanding the written information or documentation you received?

Total Responses – 141 (124 responses after subtracting not applicable responses)

Percentages based on 124 responses.

Percentages add up to 100% due to rounding off.

5 – 70 (57%)

4 – 44 (35%)


3 – 9 (7%)

2 – 1 (1%)

1 – 0

Not Applicable – 17

Figure 15: How satisfied are you with the ease of understanding the written information or documentation you received?



How satisfied are you with the handling of telephone calls/and or emails you've placed to the TSSWCB?

Total Responses – 141 (132 responses after subtracting not applicable responses)

Percentages based on 132 responses.

Percentages add up to 100% due to rounding off.

5 – 97 (73%)

4 – 26 (20%)


3 – 8 (6%)

2 – 0

1 – 1 (1%)

Not Applicable – 9

Figure 16: How satisfied are you with the handling of telephone calls and/or e-mails you've placed with the TSSWCB?



How satisfied are you with the length of time you wait to reach the right person on the phone?
Total Responses – 143 (134 responses after subtracting not applicable responses)
Percentages based on 134 responses.
Percentages add up to 100% due to rounding off.

5 – 93 (70%)

4 – 31 (23%)


3 – 10 (7%)

2 – 0

1 – 0

Not Applicable – 9

Figure 17: How satisfied are you with the length of time you wait to reach the right person on the phone?



How satisfied are you with the response you received from e-mailing our offices or staff?
Total Responses – 143 (114 responses after subtracting not applicable responses)
Percentages based on 114 responses.
Percentages add up to 100% due to rounding off.

5 – 77 (68%)

4 – 30 (26%)


3 – 5 (4%)

2 – 1 (1%)

1 – 1 (1%)

Not Applicable - 29

Figure 18: How satisfied are you with the response you received from e-mailing our offices or staff?



Web Site-

How satisfied are you with the ease of finding information on our website?

Total Responses – 144 (116 responses after subtracting not applicable responses)

Percentages based on 116 responses.

Percentages add up to 100% due to rounding off.

5 – 66 (57%)

4 – 36 (31%)


3 – 12 (10%)

2 – 2 (2%)

1 – 0

Not Applicable – 28

Figure 19: How satisfied are you with the ease of finding information on our website?



How satisfied are you with the usefulness of information on our website?
Total Responses – 144 (112 responses after subtracting not applicable responses)
Percentages based on 112 responses.
Percentages add up to 100% due to rounding off.

5 – 63 (56%)

4 – 35 (31%)


3 – 12 (11%)

2 – 2 (2%)

1 – 0

Not Applicable -32

Figure 20: How satisfied are you with the usefulness of information on our website?



Facilities-

How satisfied are you with the appearance and location of our facilities?

Total Responses – 142 (89 responses after subtracting not applicable responses)

Percentages based on 89 responses.

Percentages add up to 100% due to rounding off.

5 – 46 (52%)

4 – 32 (36%)


3 – 10 (11%)

2 – 0

1 – 1 (1%)

Not Applicable – 53

Figure 21: How satisfied are you with the appearance and location of our facilities?



Complaint Handling -

If you have filed a complaint with the TSSWCB, how satisfied are you with the way your complaint was handled?

Total Responses – 142 (17 responses after subtracting not applicable responses)

Percentages based on 17 responses.

Percentages add up to 100% due to rounding off.

5 – 9 (53%)


4 – 5 (29%)

3 – 3 (18%)

2 – 0

1 -- 0

Not Applicable – 125



If you have filed a complaint with the TSSWCB, how satisfied are you with the response you received regarding your complaint?

Total Responses – 140 (15 responses after subtracting not applicable responses)

Percentages based on 15 responses.

Percentages add up to 100% due to rounding off.

5 – 9 (60%)

4 – 5 (33%)


3 – 1 (7%)

2 – 0

1 -- 0

Not Applicable – 125

Figure 23: If you have filed a complaint with the TSSWCB, how satisfied are you with the response you received regarding your complaint?



If you have filed a complaint with the TSSWCB, how satisfied are you with the timeliness of staff in handling your complaint?

Total Responses – 140 (13 responses after subtracting not applicable responses)

Percentages based on 13 responses.

Percentages add up to 100% due to rounding off.

5 – 8 (62%)

4 – 3 (23%)


3 – 2 (15%)

2 – 0

1 --0

Not Applicable – 127

Figure 24: If you have filed a complaint with the TSSWCB, how satisfied are you with the timeliness of staff in handling your complaint?



Overall how satisfied are you that the TSSWCB is attentive to customer complaints?
Total Responses – 143 (42 responses after subtracting not applicable responses)
Percentages based on 42 responses.
Percentages add up to 100% due to rounding off.

5 – 29 (69%)

4 – 8 (19%)


3 – 4 (10%)

2 – 0

1 – 1 (2%)

Not Applicable – 101

Figure 25: Overall how satisfied are you that the TSSWCB is attentive to customer complaints?



Suggestions

Do you have any other comments or suggestions on how we could serve you better?

Sometimes need more WQMP allocation. Make request through Regional Office to receive. Understand that at times we do not allocate all. Thanks

Please make the director information sheet (After election), where you can fill it in on the computer. Otherwise your paperwork is easily accessible and so are the people at the state office. Thank-you

Keep up the good work. (Signed – Name withheld)

I have received courteous, high quality advice and service consistently over several years. Good work is being done here!

Budget and activity level do not justify (illegible) Training State Board or Districts. Agency should fold in the Sunset process. Otherwise it will continue a slow decline to irrelevance. At present, the main activity is dam maintenance which is responsibility of counties. Advice of Districts could be adequately supplied through NRCS or TCEQ to counties.

There is a lack of communication from the NRCS FO staff, such as, what the schedule of activities for the month, what's going on with NRCS. As a District Conservation Technician, I am not included in the NRCS activities, uninformed of NRCS programs, not included in any type of staff conferences, not allowed to participate in conservation planning activities or field work, etc. Otherwise, this District employee is treated as a "second-class" person; in the office to answer the phone, pickup mail and maintain district files. There is no such thing as a partnership between NRCS FO staff or Zone and District employee. Other examples are not discussed.

The staff that works with us are excellent people- pleasant, knowledgeable, and friendly.

Very efficient group, friendly.

Satisfied with the program of cost sharing. It has been beneficial with farmers suffering economic hardships.

Let 'em roll the way they are going and we will get a lot accomplished.

The State Board needs to hold a District Director and District Employees Workshop at a location closer to the Districts in the Panhandle. These workshops are always held at or near Temple. If anyone from the Panhandle Districts want to attend, all expenses (travel, motel, meals, etc.) have to be paid by the District Board. Most Districts don't have the funds to send their directors or employees. I've mentioned having a workshop in the

Panhandle several times, but have always been told, "The material used in the training workshops can be accessed on our website." True, it can. But it's not the same as getting the training personally. If it was, there would be no need for the workshops to be held in Temple either - the material could be accessed from the website and save the expense of the workshop, right? There is very little if any training for new District managers/Secretaries, and that causes LOTS of problems. If nothing else, a workshop needs to be held for at least the District Managers/Secretaries, preferably at least every other year. There are plenty of experienced District Managers who would be willing to help with these workshops, if only the State Board and Field Reps would set it up. Please consider this suggestion seriously. Thank you.

No parking at facility/location.

Need more parking at location/facility.

Personnel very helpful with my conversion of sprinkler system. Questions I had were answered thoroughly, went over program thoroughly, and no problems. – (Signed – Name withheld)

These folks do a great job. Very courteous and efficient.