LATE 237

Solari_Karen/wo@fs.fed.us

05/30/00 10:01 AM

To: lwatson/wo_caet-slc/HPMEXT1/lesliewatson#a#fs#f#fed#f#us@fs.fed.us, lesliewatson@fs.fed.us, watson_leslie/wo_caet-slc/HPMEXT1/lesliewatson#a#fs#f#fed#f#us@fs.fed.us, lesliewatson@fs.fed.us

cc:

Subject: Forw: FW: ODEQ Comments on the Proposed Unified Federal WatershedPolicy -Forwarded

----- Message from Solari_Karen/wo@sv8 on -----

To: Watson_Leslie/wo_caet-slc@sv8

Subject: Forw: FW: ODEQ Comments on the Proposed Unified Federal WatershedPolicy -Forwarded

----- Message from googoo/INTERNET///////RFC-822/googoo#a#saaz#f#com@sv8 on -----

To: Steven_J_Borchard@blm.gov, KSolari/wo@sv8

Subject: FW: ODEQ Comments on the Proposed Unified Federal WatershedPolicy -Forwarded

Steve and Karen, I don't know if the CAET got these comments from Oregon DEQ, RObert

```
>Date: Thu, 25 May 2000 16:40:47 -0400
>From: ROBERT GOO <GOO.ROBERT@epamail.epa.gov>
>Subject: FW: ODEQ Comments on the Proposed Unified Federal Watershed
Polic        y
> -Forwarded
>Sender: Postmaster@dcsmtp.wsm.epa.gov
>To: googoo@saaz.com
>Reply-to: GOO.ROBERT@epamail.epa.gov
>X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
>
>Received: from EPAHUB2.RTP.EPA.GOV (epahub2.rtp.epa.gov [134.67.213.31])
> by epamail.epa.gov (PMDF V5.2-32 #42055)
> with SMTP id <0FV4000OES2M5H@epamail.epa.gov> for
> goo-robert@dcsmtp.wsm.epa.gov (ORCPT rfc822;Goo.Robert@EPA.GOV); Thu,
> 25 May 2000 15:42:22 -0400 (EDT)
>Received: by
> EPAHUB2.RTP.EPA.GOV(Lotus SMTP MTA v4.6.3 hotfix 1  (767.1 12-15-1998))
>  id 852568EA.006BF3AD ; Thu, 25 May 2000 15:39:07 -0400
>Message-id: <852568EA.0061CDDE.00@EPAHUB2.RTP.EPA.GOV>
>X-Lotus-FromDomain: EPA
>Date: Thu, 25 May 2000 13:53:47 -0400
>From:  <Reid.Bevin@epamail.epa.gov>
>To: FLECKENSTEIN.LEONARD@EPAMAIL.EPA.GOV, GOO.ROBERT@EPAMAIL.EPA.GOV
>Subject: FW: ODEQ Comments on the Proposed Unified Federal Watershed
>            Polic             y
>Mime-Version: 1.0
>Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="=_DF87C635.7D1C6645"
>
>
>
>Looks like one os our states was able to comment after all....
>
>
>Bevin Reid
```

CAET RECEIVED
MAY 25 2000

>Clean Water Action Plan Coordinator
>U.S. EPA Region 10
>1200 Sixth Avenue (ECO-086)
>Seattle, WA 98101
>(206) 553-1566
>f:(206) 553-6984
>Reid.Bevin@epa.gov
>
>----- Forwarded by Bevin Reid/R10/USEPA/US on 05/25/2000 10:49 AM -----
>|--------+----------->
>| | David Powers |
>| | |
>| | 05/25/2000 |
>| | 09:42 AM |
>| | |
>|--------+----------->
> >----------|
> | |
> | To: Bevin Reid/R10/USEPA/US@EPA |
> | cc: |
> | bcc: |
> | Subject: FW: ODEQ Comments on the Proposed |
> | Unified Federal Watershed Polic y |
> >----------|
>
>
>
>Bevin - I assume that Roger provided DEQ's comments to you but I wanted to
make
>sure you had them. I think DEQ is right on target.
>----- Forwarded by David Powers/R10/USEPA/US on 05/25/2000 09:38 AM -----
>|--------+----------->
>| | WOOD.Roger.S@deq.s|
>| | tate.or.us |
>| | |
>| | 05/24/2000 04:52 |
>| | PM |
>| | |
>|--------+----------->
> >----------|
> | |
> | To: David Powers/R10/USEPA/US@EPA |
> | cc: |
> | Subject: FW: ODEQ Comments on the Proposed |
> | Unified Federal Watershed Polic y |
> >----------|
>
>
>
>
>
>
>I forgot to add your to the CC list on the first send...
>
>Roger
>wood.roger.s@deq.state.or.us
>(503) 229-6893 or 1-800-452-4011
>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: WOOD Roger S
>> Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2000 4:45 PM

>> To: 'cleanwater/wo_caet-slc@fs.fed.us'
>> Cc: LLEWELYN Michael; PEDERSEN Dick; SOLLIDAY Louise; HUNTINGTON
>> Geoffrey M
>> Subject: ODEQ Comments on the Proposed Unified Federal Watershed
>> Policy
>>
>>
>> Please accept these remarks from the Oregon Department of Environmental
>> Quality, and thank you for the opportunity to comment.
>>
>> I. Introduction and Goals
>> 1. We appreciate the recognition of existing programs and the
>> determination to build on these and enhance them.
>>
>> 2. We support the guiding principles in general, and particularly those
>> calling for close cooperation and consistency with States and other local
>> stakeholders.
>>
>> II. Agency Objectives
>>
>> 1. Assessment -- Components: We urge you to develop strong components
>> addressing (a) existing riparian conditions, (b) existing stream channel
>> conditions and geomorphic types, and (c) site potential for ecoregionally
>> appropriate vegetative communities.
>>
>> 2. Assessment -- Remote and Aerial Sensing: We strongly recommend the
>> application of multi-spectral aerial and/or satellite imaging to reveal
>> important details about the condition of stream channels and riparian
>> vegetation. This imaging should be at a resolution (pixel size) of
>> between one and three meters to allow relatively detailed site-specific
>> analysis of conditions, restoration opportunities, and management options.
>> Confer with the states in refining technical details, geographic
>> priorities, and timing.
>>
>> 3. Assessments - Waterbody Types: Be sure to include groundwater in
>> your assessments. Also, identify drinking water source areas.
>>
>> 4. TMDLs: We urge sufficient funding to allow the federal land
>> management agencies - particularly the Forest Service and Bureau of Land
>> Management - to take active leadership in TMDL development for their
>> lands, in partnership with the States. In Oregon, nonpoint source load
>> allocations will often call for the restoration of site potential and/or
>> late seral stage riparian vegetative communities. The federal land
>> managers often are in the best position to know what these potentials are
>> for their lands.
>>
>> 5. Collaboration: It is important that the federal agencies closely
>> coordinate with State geographic and programmatic priorities. For
>> example, Oregon has established a TMDL prioritization schedule that
>> concentrates our limited staff resources in a handful of sub-basins at any
>> particular time. A federal determination to align with these priorities
>> assures the best possible coordination.
>>
>> 6. Monitoring: In a general sense, water quality and watershed
>> condition monitoring on federal lands should always coordinate and
>> communicate closely with monitoring efforts on other lands. But
>> specifically, some types of information may be more important than others
>> in a given situation. For example, data on riparian vegetation condition,
>> channel shape and type, and stream flow are particularly important to have
>> in doing TMDLs for water temperature.
>>

>>
>> Please call or e-mail me if you have questions or require clarification.
>> Thanks again.
>>
>> Roger Wood
>> wood.roger.s@deq.state.or.us
>> (503) 229-6893 or 1-800-452-4011
>>
>
>
>
>Attachment Converted: "c:\eudora\attach\att1.unk"
>
>Attachment Converted: "c:\eudora\attach\Part20.002"
>
>Attachment Converted: "c:\eudora\attach\pic01418.pcx"
>

237

Please accept these remarks from the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, and thank you for the opportunity to comment.

I. Introduction and Goals

1. We appreciate the recognition of existing programs and the determination to build on these and enhance them.

2. We support the guiding principles in general, and particularly those calling for close cooperation and consistency with States and other local stakeholders.

II. Agency Objectives

1. Assessment -- Components: We urge you to develop strong components addressing (a) existing riparian conditions, (b) existing stream channel conditions and geomorphic types, and (c) site potential for ecoregionally appropriate vegetative communities.

2. Assessment -- Remote and Aerial Sensing: We strongly recommend the application of multi-spectral aerial and/or satellite imaging to reveal important details about the condition of stream channels and riparian vegetation. This imaging should be at a resolution (pixel size) of between one and three meters to allow relatively detailed site-specific analysis of conditions, restoration opportunities, and management options. Confer with the states in refining technical details, geographic priorities, and timing.

3. Assessments - Waterbody Types: Be sure to include groundwater in your assessments. Also, identify drinking water source areas.

4. TMDLs: We urge sufficient funding to allow the federal land management agencies - particularly the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management - to take active leadership in TMDL development for their lands, in partnership with the States. In Oregon, nonpoint source load allocations will often call for the restoration of site potential and/or late seral stage riparian vegetative communities. The federal land managers often are in the best position to know what these potentials are for their lands.

5. Collaboration: It is important that the federal agencies closely coordinate with State geographic and programmatic priorities. For example, Oregon has established a TMDL prioritization schedule that concentrates our limited staff resources in a handful of sub-basins at any particular time. A federal determination to align with these priorities assures the best possible coordination.

6. Monitoring: In a general sense, water quality and watershed condition monitoring on federal lands should always coordinate and communicate closely with monitoring efforts on other lands. But specifically, some types of information may be more important than others in a given situation. For example, data on riparian vegetation condition, channel shape and type, and stream flow are particularly important to have in doing TMDLs for water temperature.

Please call or e-mail me if you have questions or require clarification. Thanks again.

Roger Wood
wood.roger.s@deq.state.or.us
(503) 229-6893 or 1-800-452-4011

CAET RECEIVED
MAY 2 [illegible]