Eve
Mike

23

Rick Kraus, Am Farm Bureau
John Imerman, Rec Vehicle Industry.

Questions [illegible]

1.) Scope of Policy Watersheds does not include St, Tribal & Pri
effect watershed policy should include Pri
State & Tribal Lands

2.) What action:

Q Will it entail Restrictions on uses of public land

A: Will not replace planning process. Use of land would be address there.

Will understand better the dynamics of watersheds
effect of uses on Water.

With multiple owners how can y

Better understand how watersheds function
Be consistent between agencies → Broader Picture will be taken

Better understand impact of Fed

Use existing info to start

Project level

Better info may change the decisions are made
this would feed into the planning process

Q Best MgMt Practices - would this be applied throughout the watershed
would they apply throughout the watershed
For non-point sources

Econon

More consistent determination and of applicant

RECEIVED
MAR 09 2000

Eve
Mike 2

23

TMDL - What Role do you see in development of TMDL
provide technical expertise
design and application of practices to Reduce TMDL
Speaks for all
providing better info that allows for better decision
Policy Does not supercede existing TMDL requirements
States have primary responsibility for assessing waters even on Fed land, setting TMDLs and implementation of policies
Sharing of info. with State to allocate loads and use existing laws to implement changes.

- Is the thrust to get other people involved.
- hope for greater involvement of Tribes, State & Stakeholders
- Use a defensable science
- mgmt decisions would be based on assessments
- Have an adequate knowledge of system and are comfortable with the decisions that are made from this
- Some watersheds out west may be exclusively Government owned.
  May be used by ranchers and/or mine activity.
- Looking at shared watershed
- Where approach may effect Fed land but does not influence uses on Non-Fed land.
- Effort may not be as productive in mixed ownership watershed

Eve
mk 3

23

- Policy may not be the mechanism in which all interested parties [illegible]
- As Fed ag. come to table and help try to craft a resolution to impacts to a watershed that it is done in a consistent way
- Get Fed family together
- Collect info already there and assess on Fed land
- Will data be difficult to coord on a watershed base?
- Planning will look at drainage at large
- assement will look at Fed land
- A considerable amount of data is already out there
- Is the data out there but not in a coordinated fashion?
- To share the info already out there
- Data consistency issues between data from sets will crop up. Policy will help to better coord on data
- Even though there is alot of data (USGS stream flow & quality) Watershed basis will allow to examine cause understand landscape capability
  A new way of looking at some data in a different way
- What Statutory & Reg. authority will be used to implement policy?
- No a call for authority.
- Recognize each agency has own authorities it operates under. Not every agency will march the same way. Clean Water Act is the predominate authority
- Clean water Act is evolving to use watershed approach
- will Section 319. be the predominate authority

Watershed is appropriate land unit to address water quality issues

Is there anything in operation status that would produce differencing in the way the policy is implemented? They the agencies

Will it effect the way the agencies do their mission
A greater understanding of watershed function will better meet agency responsibilities
How will the policy effect multiple use mission?
~~Does~~ not replace organic act
Best way to sustain use is to assure healthy watershed This will support agency mission rather than conflict with it.
Better info provides for better plans.
How will policy impact existing plans.
Better understand the capability of the landscape.

RAC set & defined stds for Water, soil, vegetation etc.
Compare stds to conditions.
Would modify used that cause standards from being met. Are mutually supportive.
→ Agencies would use similar protocol when performing assessments. So
Would activities be redundant?
Changes in certain Fed land practices need to be changed.

Designating watersheds as a special concern may restrict activities that people may participate in those areas.

"Special" is not a new class of "watershed"
To ID watersheds that may required special consideration (Domestic water supplies vs those that do not)
Confusion between Priority watershed vs a special watershed.
Comes accross like Wild & Scenic River designation that would restrict certain types of activity in areas.
- Priority - Can not address watersheds on all Fed land. So special designation
- Comparison to W & S River act is a law that Shoulds non use in 2 categories
- Policy is not a reg or a law
- If no special stps, what is the purpose of the special designation
- May result in change in the BMPs for the special areas.
- What is the authority using to designate special areas?
- Would rely on Clean Water Act.

Q1 What do you like, like changed?
- A unified Fed approach is good consistent use of same protocols & methodology.
- Consistency assessing & measurement is good.
- Science based data is needed.
- Forest Plan goes too far - in using science in planning
- Encourage to involvement of others
- Where info being used to restrict uses (timber permits)
- Use as a way to further regulate - a concern
- Ramifications
- Restrictions that will come
- Is it independent science or science w/an adgenda - how independent or objective is a big concern.

1 b. - If focusing a data & consistent methodology - is a useful direction for planning
- Public input into data & assessments is crucial.
- If data is made w/o stakeholder ability to review the data and data is used as basis for decisions Decisions could be made w/o public input.
- When looking a UP and No WI what will impact be in this area.
- Will have a western experience & [illegible]
- In west NV. rec activities are dependent of federal ~~[illegible]~~ land.
- Tell people who live there (in area) in advance what is to come.
- Tell people how this will impact them. Involve from beginning

- How this relates to planning function within Fed agencies -
- Emphasize that this is not a decision making policy, but info gathering

- Need a description of non point pollution. Need to be able to nail down details on that. To say that non point sources is too vague. Doesn't know what this means. Gives leeway to interfere alot.

- Non point sources have been addressing non-point sources in a non-regulatory way. Non-point sources are an issue. Part of a larger debate. This approach may help get a handle on the question

- 2. Priorities (funding)
  - Priorities setting assessments & info gathering is where funding should be. How can you take action without it?
  - Take a totally non-regulatory approach

3. ~~Part~~ Partnerships - collabor.
   → Collaboration w/ Local people
   Get all people together, assess watershed, what is main problem, develop solutions w/ all involved

   Fairly equal say in solution
   Methodology on how to operate

Many farmers are concerned about CWA -

- has been very directive

- need to be willing to listen to people
- If you involve them in making the change verses telling them what to do.
- Have local group come to solution. Have front end input in defining problem
- Are reasonable assessment
- a reasonable problem to address will come up with a reasonable solution
- Examples: Farmer called for convening of watershed issues. Defined problem, assessment valuation are are a way to acheiving Tennessee, Clinch River?
No Carolina these worked well (could not recall names)

- Coordinated resource mgmt. (analogous to)

- A concern that "it doesn't matter way the locals think" inclusion from the beginning is very important.
- After the WQP, what then.
- after policy, comments can be directed to assessments
- Will assessment be made available to public scrutiny.
- If an assessment is conducted finds unacceptable Non point source pollution - from line stock grazing what then?
- The policy will not make any decisions
- Federal [illegible] would have to go through NEPA process

23

& Options presented to decision maker includes socio-economic impact.

- That authority existed since FLPMA for then defined under rangeland reform - guidelines can be referred to. Agreements formed that allow for improvements - Policy does not impact that process.

- Without policy, assessments would not be done

- May influence how soon an assessment might take place.
- Wouldn't it make sence to coord priorities w/ State activities to assess the same watersheds as a whole at the same time
- If restriction comes it would like to be in agreement that this is important for the watershed.
  Better decisions for everybody
  looking at changes in appropriate way

- Fear of interpretation of data & how it is going to be used put into mushy standards leaving alot of room for interpretation by a bureau manager.
- Does not ecologic sustainability is an objective criteria
- No defined Standard - to much room for interpretation
- Fear for drastic decision w/ Big economic impact for only a small improvement of water.

23

How clean is clean water? How far do you go

- Policy does not set standards. Std would come from State — Policy would give a tool to meet that standard.
- Does the apply to where all Fed land is located
- Will impact where $ are spent will not assure all $

- Any insight in

People where aware - don't know why they didn't come.

Timing (more advance notice) and location - not close enough to Fed land may have had an impact.