173

Black Hills Forest Resource Association

2040 West Main Street, Suite 315, Rapid City, South Dakota 57702-2447, (605) 341-0875

April 21, 2000

USDA, Forest Service
Content Analysis Enterprise Team
Attn: UFP, Building 2, Suite 295
5500 Amelia Earhart Drive
Salt Lake City, UT 84116

Dear Sirs:

Below are the comments of the Black Hills Forest Resource Association on the ***"Unified Federal Policy for Ensuring a Watershed Approach to Federal Land and Resource Management"*** published for comment in the federal register on February 22, 2000. The Black Hills Forest Resource Association represents timber purchasers from the Black Hills area in South Dakota and Wyoming. The Black Hills Forest Resource Association is committed to sustainable forestry which protects water quality.

The narrative language contained in the Clean Water Action Plan prefacing this particular key action, contains the following statement: ***"Activities such as road building, logging, mining, grazing, hydrologic modification, or excessive recreational use can degrade the integrity of these watershed and require actions to reduce their harm." (Clean Water Action Plan, page 30).***

Comment: Based on the above language it is apparent to the Association that the purpose for this policy has been determined. The intent is obviously based on the notion that virtually all land use activities are degrading the watershed, regardless of the method in which they are conducted. The states develop Best Management Practices to ensure that all of the above activities are conducted in a manner so as to protect the resource while meeting multiple use objectives. The above language indicates that regardless of how the activity occurs it must be degrading the watershed. The focus of the policy is clearly geared toward elimination of multiple use activities.

The policy is extremely vague. In reading the policy, one would question why it has even been published it is so lacking in specifics. This is an issue that could have likely been addressed had adequate NEPA analysis been conducted to identify and define the specific issues.

The policy is calling for actions and processes to be completed that are redundant to initiatives already being mandated by EPA through "authority" directed by the Clean Water Action Plan. More specific comments will be provided under the applicable section of the proposed policy.

The policy completely ignores the primacy of state's that have delegated authority for implementing the Clean Water Act. Again, it appears the policy is yet another attempt, as can be

CAET RECEIVED
2000

seen in the proposed TMDL regulations, to circumvent the role and primacy Congress intended for the states in implementing the provisions of the Clean Water Act.

The policy appears to substantially modify the management approach to federal lands. However, as indicated in March, there is no intent to issue planning regulation amendments. BHFRA would question the agency's determination that rule changes are not necessary and substantial changes in federal land management processes can be implemented with a two-page policy.

Specific comments on the policy:

1) **Page 8837; Introduction** The introduction states ***"Implementation of the following proposed policy will improve water quality and aquatic ecosystems on Federal lands and will further the use of a watershed approach to federal land and resource management activities."***

Comment: Again, it is troublesome that the introduction repeatedly refers to the Clean Water Action Plan as if it was a law that was enacted, investing additional authorities to the federal agencies. If the intent is truly to address resource planning and management on a watershed basis, then it is incomprehensible why the policy ignores the fact that it is highly unlikely that watersheds contain only federal resources and this watershed approach can be applied strictly to federal lands and still accomplish the intent of watershed planning. This leads to the next concern, which is the impact to private lands.

2) **Page 8837; Policy Goals** - The policy refers to the ***"managing the Federal lands, resources, and facilities in our care".***

Comment: The glossary section does not provide a definition of "resources". In order to clearly understand the intent and application of this proposal, it is necessary that a definition be provided.

Principle A. ***"Use a consistent and scientific approach to managing federal lands and resources and to assess, protect, and restore watersheds."***

Comment: Although this principle states a very laudable intent that would be supported by this Association, the policy is completely lacking in any specific detail on how this will be accomplished. BHFRA suggests that if the policy is truly intended to bring consistency among the federal agencies that the agencies incorporate the following:

A. Watershed Assessments: One of the basic fundamental challenges in efforts to pursue watershed assessments is the lack of consistency between local, state and federal entities on the level of science being collected for determination of watershed health. In addition, the federal agency monitoring process does not appear to consider geology, climate, soils, hydrology, stream succession, etc. Nor are the protocols, and ultimately the analysis of resource health, consistently applied. In addition, both the Forest Service and BLM monitoring activities are lacking in adequate science to determine water quality. The Bureau of Land Management tends to make

CAET RECEIVED
APR 22 2000

determinations on water quality without any water quality data (Proper Functioning Condition). They utilize subjective physical information solely. Although BHFRA does not oppose the collection and use of the information, it should not be misapplied to make water quality determinations or watershed health assessments.

The Black Hills Forest Resource Association recommends that the following information be used when determining watershed health, therefore providing consistency in the watershed assessment, planning, and implementation process.

> **40 CFR § 130.0(b)** **Water Quality Planning and Management**. Water quality standards (WQS) are the State's goals for individual water bodies and provide the legal basis for control decisions under the Act. **Water quality monitoring activities provide the chemical, physical and biological data needed to determine the present quality of a State's waters and to identify the sources of pollutants in those waters.** The primary assessment of the quality of a State's water is contained in its biennial Report to Congress required by section 305(b) of the Act. **(emphasis added)**

> **40 CFR § 130.4(b)** **Water quality monitoring.** **The state's water monitoring program shall include collection and analysis of physical, chemical and biological data and quality assurance and control programs to assure scientifically valid data. The uses of these data** include determining abatement and control priorities; **developing and reviewing water quality standards**, total maximum daily loads, wasteload allocations and load allocations; assessing compliance with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits by dischargers; reporting information to the public through the section 305(b) report and reviewing site-specific monitoring efforts. **(emphasis added)**

Principle C. ***"Use the results of watershed assessments to guide planning and management activities in accordance with applicable authorities and procedures."***

Comments: The Association is concerned that the ultimate actions that may be taken as a result of this policy may pose conflicts between applicable authorities and procedures.

Principle D. ***"Work closely with states, tribes, local governments, and stakeholders to implement this policy.***

Comments: Again, it is questionable that this policy is even necessary given the actions and activities related to water quality and resource management on a watershed basis that have been initiated either by state or local governments.

Principle E. ***"Meet our Clean Water Act responsibility to adhere to Federal, State, Tribal, interstate, and local water quality requirements to the same extent as non-governmental entities."***

CAET RECEIVED
APR 2000

Comments: It is obvious that the federal agencies clearly need to address their contribution to water quality impairments. However, it is unclear how this particular policy will result in federal agencies adhering to water quality standards. As an example, the Yellowstone National Park has been issued notices of violations from the Wyoming DEQ for water quality violations as a result of sewage spills into surface waters in the park. These spills occur due to outdated and dilapidated treatment facilities, however the state can do nothing more than issue a notice of violation. The state cannot assess any monetary penalties against the federal government. The Association would recommend that if agencies are as committed to adhering to water quality standards as any other individual or entity would be, then the state's should be allowed to assess penalties just as they would to any other individual or entity.

Principal F. ***"Take steps to ensure that Federal land and resource management actions are consistent with Federal, State, Tribal, and, where appropriate, local government water quality management programs."***

Comment: The BHFRA would endorse the intent of this language. However, it is unclear why the policy is necessary to achieve this means. Quite frankly, several local conservation districts and other local and state governments have attempted to be involved in federal land management planning activities. Vice versa, local governments, where federal lands are within a watershed, invite and involve federal agency personnel. Where these partnerships occur, great success in resource management is made. However, it is continually frustrating that although the agencies purport to want to coordinate, they consistently ignore provisions of NEPA which provide that where state and local governments have jurisdiction by law or special expertise, they should be granted cooperating agency status on federal land management planning activities. Merely following the intent and mandate of NEPA, coupled with encouragement and empowerment of local field personnel to participate in locally initiated watershed planning efforts would accomplish this "principal."

As well, the language "where appropriate" is vague and if the policy is adopted it should be clarified.

Page 8837; II. Agency Objectives; 1st paragraph states: ***To accomplish these policy goals,...All agencies will implement this policy as individual agency laws, missions, and fiscal and budgetary authorities and resources permit."***

Comment: It would seem logical that prior to developing and issuing this policy the agencies would have ensured that the goals and actions proposed in the policy were permissible under individual agency laws, missions, and fiscal resources were sufficient. The mere fact that this language is in the policy indicates that there may be some conflicts or limitations that exist between the intent and goals of the policy and current authorities.

Section A. 2. A through d; states: ***"We will conduct watershed assessments for watersheds that have significant Federal lands and resources."***

CAET RECEIVED

Comment: The term "significant" is not defined in the glossary provided. When asked what the definition of "significant" was, at a Denver meeting, the response was that a definition had not been developed and that those submitting comments should provide input on whether the term should be defined. In addition, it was stressed at the public meeting, that the policy does not apply to or affect private property. However, unless "significant" is defined as solely federal lands there will be an impact on private property. It is assumed that in watersheds that are identified as "impaired", "high priority", or some other category indicating water quality impairments, that some map or delineation will be published. If the federal agencies even categorize a watershed as priority and there are private lands within that watershed, then this policy does affect private lands. It is unfathomable how the agencies could even begin to suggest that there would be no affect on private property. In South Dakota & Wyoming, nearly all of the watersheds contain mixed ownership. Therefore, if the agencies truly intend for this policy to affect only federal lands then it should apply to those watershed which include strictly federal lands. This approach however, would obviously, in most instances defeat the purpose of a watershed approach. Therefore, BHFRA suggests that the policy be withdrawn. A commitment should be made by the agencies to watershed planning efforts initiated by state and local governments. The necessary resources to accomplish these watershed-based efforts are provided to the state and local governments, without the top down edicts, which fail to recognize local conditions. This would truly reflect what Congress intended to occur in the implementation of the Clean Water Act. This is supported with the language in the CWA at § 101(b) which states: **"It is the policy of the Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of States to prevent, reduce, and eliminate pollution, to plan the development and use (including restoration, preservation, and enhancement) of land and water resources, and to consult with the Administration in the exercise of his authority under this Act**.

Section B. 1 a through b.6; states: ***"We will work collaboratively to identify priority watersheds"***

Comment: This section goes on to provide a list of criteria or the process in which the agencies will determine priority watersheds. It is interesting to note that of the six criteria listed for determining priority watersheds, not one is directly related to scientific data indicating water quality degradation. Even though the goal of the policy is for federal agencies to comply with the Clean Water Act. Specifically one of the policy's goal state: "use a watershed approach to prevent and reduce water pollution resulting from federal land.."

Page 8838; B. 2. Through its entirety to section C.

Comment: Again, it is unclear, and this section solidifies this uncertainty, as to why the policy is necessary. This section discusses addressing nonpoint source pollution, implementation of Best Management Practices, total maximum daily loads, complying with state water quality standards, etc. Based on the BHFRA's knowledge these efforts are already occurring in various forms such as the large comprehensive Forest or BLM area planning processes, timber management, grazing strategies and management, coordination with states on water quality standards issues, etc. BHFRA would again recommend that the agencies merely make a commitment to watershed planning and involvement in such efforts.

CAFT RECEIVED

APR 2 2 2000

Page 8838; section C. in its entirety

Comment: This section is too vague to even provide meaningful comment. However, it is apparent through this section that there are changes in multiple uses in store as a result of this policy. This is an assumption based on current agency trends to phase out uses and management practices such as timber harvesting, grazing, etc. and the language contained in the CWAP.

Section D. "***We will enhance collaboration***".

D. 3. b. states "***Provide opportunities for interested stakeholders to participate in monitoring and assessing watershed conditions and in implementing watershed restoration projects.***

Comment: This statement clearly causes concern. On face value, given the lack of specifics contained in the policy, one can interpret this statement that any interested public will be invited and encouraged to monitor and assess watersheds. There is no mention, whatsoever, of any minimum qualifications for participation from stakeholders. Again, it is imperative that the federal agencies consult with and maintain consistency with the state's approach. Clearly, there must be some threshold established for the level of expertise necessary for stakeholders to be involved in the collection of scientific data.

D. 3. d. states: ***"Seek early feedback on key decisions affecting watershed management through the Watershed Forum process called for in the Clean Water Action Plan and carefully consider this feedback in agency decision making."***

Comment: This statement is a prime example of how the agencies are treating the Clean Water Action Plan as an authorizing law, rule or regulation. The public input processes for federal planning activities are clearly governed by the NEPA, Administrative Procedures Act, and other federal laws. Yet, the policy sets forth that a "new" process will be followed. One contained in a Plan that was not even subjected to Congressional review. The Clean Water Action Plan discusses the National Watershed forum and indicates a ***"....Forum will be convened to provide a coordinating mechanism for the development of watershed assessment, restoration, and protection efforts. The Forum will include a total of about 20 members, including representatives of: federal agencies, state agencies, tribal governments, local governments, other stakeholder organizations, and watershed partnerships and citizens." (Clean Water Action Plan, page 87)***

There is no discussion of these reviews and/or decisions being made at the local level within the affected watershed. Further, there is no mention of private landowners serving on this Forum. Given that fact that this policy will impact private lands, it is necessary to involve landowners.

D. 4. States: ***"We will expand opportunities for dialogue with private landholders in priority watershed with a mix of Federal and private lands, we will work with private sector landholders to involve them in the watershed management process. We will work closely to***

CAET RECEIVED

SEP 7 2000

ensure that Federally funded projects involving private cost-share partners fully consider watershed management objectives for both public and private lands."

Comment: At the UWP meeting held in Denver, agency representatives strongly assured attendees that the policy **DOES NOT AFFECT PRIVATE LAND (emphasis added).** This was surely presented in anticipation of concern over federal dictates of private land management. We believe this concern is well founded. This policy will obviously affect private landowners. Ironically, the policy does not discuss involving private landowners until the end of the policy. In addition, landowners are involved after the process of monitoring, assessing, prioritizing/categorizing, development and implementation of management practices, and collaboration with stakeholders. This demonstrates the clear lack of understanding and recognition that the federal agencies have of private property rights and working with private landowners voluntarily and cooperatively on resource management activities.

There are numerous examples throughout the west, where the majority of federal lands are located, that demonstrates private landowner commitment to sustainable resource management. This section sends a clear message that private landowners are an afterthought.

In closing, BHFRA would offer that if the federal land management agencies are truly interested in resource management on a watershed basis, then a sincere commitment needs to be made to work with state and local governments. Jointly the entities can discuss the development of a common process for approaching watershed management including a consistent understanding of the type of credible data necessary to assess watershed health. As well, the federal agencies must recognize the primacy of states in implementing the Clean Water Act, and most ***importantly*** recognize and respect the rights of those landowners with property located within these watersheds.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Tom Troxel
Director

CAET RECEIVED
APR 27 2010