3/9

CAET RECEIVED
MAR 09 2001

Federal Agency Morning Session —

Question #1 Does the policy take the right approach? 25
Would you like to see anything changed? What is Missing?

— Q — Is USGS involved in this policy? Ans. — Yes
They don't have mgmt. responsibility themselves but they can contribute data to the decision makers

— Q — What do the shadings mean on the large map?
Answer — they were federal watersheds broken down by agency (diff. colors)

- UFP — is 1° for federal agencies to follow, as a unified approach
State/tribal + local partnerships will be fostered

Concern: Conflicting mandates from diff. agencies make projects difficult & this policy will help.
Concern: potential partners "scared" off by working w/ CERCLA sites.

Missing — what's in the UFP to move them to action? ie people + $ that would move them above + beyond what's being done?
What's new today? We've all heard this before? + Are already doing?
Where is the Action? new budget process? agency directives?

Answer from Warren — Draft 7 had ...
but now has ...

Answer Cont → Actions will need to be hammered out in Implementation plan.

- Warren H.: trying to use watersheds now as more than a Constraint, but as the basis for mgmt. Major Change in how business is done.

- EPA Comment: States are playing a much greater role in WQ + watershed mgmt under the CWAP. Therefore feds need to be aware of this & partner closely w/ the states. Why duplicate assessment activities? or supercede states' responsibilities? The UFP attempts to do this.

- Q - how are the federal responsibilities going to be divided up? ★★ What does "significant presence" mean? Needs to be defined more clearly.

- Already large collaborative efforts underway (Mississippi, Great Lakes, etc). Concern - the UFP is at a sub basin level & how will this effort relate to the existing macro-level efforts? Will resources be split? What is the <u>scale</u> the UFP will work on?

Same

- Scale loses its "punch" if you don't have something to focus on. Should be able to focus on a local issue / concern. Getting funding for larger scale is more difficult than getting $ for smaller/local issues.

☆ Q#2 blended in somewhere around here

- What is the relation of the UFP to other policies like the "Roadless" policy? How do they all fit together? Make this known to the public.

- What does the word "Incorporate" mean in the UFP goals? What are the expectations of the agencies?

- Have previous inter-agency efforts (ie Coastal America) been studied? Did they work? Did we learn anything? Why invent the wheel again? What is their track record?

- Q - What is the diff. btwn "Common" + "Consistent" when discussing assessment procedures - Should not have a one-size-fits-all "Common" methodology. Consistent approach is better ☆

Response — perhaps it should be more of an agreement of protocol for how to do an assessment. Everyone would follow the same procedure, but do what makes sense for the local conditions.

- Q - Does the UFP recognize differences btwn agencies & priority setting?

Q - Does UFP take into account private lands that are managed w/ Fed $? Or does it only address Federal lands? Answer - right now only looks federal lands. Thats why NRCS is isn't here today.

* Q#2 blended in somewhere around here

25 (3)

- What is the relation of the UFP to other policies like the "Roadless" policy? How do they all fit together? Make this known to the public.

- What does the word "Incorporate" mean in the UFP goals? What are the expectations of the agencies?

- Have previous inter-agency efforts (ie Coastal America) been studied? Did they work? Did we learn anything? Why invent the wheel again? What is their track record?

- Q - What is the diff. btwn "Common" & "Consistent" when discussing assessment procedures - Should not have a one-size-fits-all "Common" methodology. Consistent approach is better *

Response — perhaps it should be more of an agreement of protocol for how to do an assessment. Everyone would follow the same procedure, but do what makes sense for the local conditions.

- Q - Does the UFP recognize differences btwn agencies in priority setting?

Q - Does UFP take into account private lands that are managed w/ Fed $? Or does it only address Federal lands? Answer - right now only looks federal lands. That's why NRCS is isn't here today.

- The UFP should look at private lands w/ federal $$.
  NRCS should be here
- TMDL process – should be tied in to UFP implementation.
  Its a good opportunity.

- Federal lands should model this behaviour / approach to show others how it can be done.

- NRCS was invited, just couldn't be here. They do play a key role in watershed mgmt + restoration.
- What about FSA? FERC? DOE will be a signature on final UFP.

- Opportunities – DOD Regional offices can help w/ coordinating partnerships on/near installations.

Question #3 – What is the best way to develop partnership
What does collaboration mean?

- Easy to get "water" people together, + "land" people together; but not together at the same time at the same meeting. Hard to get continued sustainable interest from both parties.

- in the West – good collaborations w/ private mining companies
- White River, VT – successful partnership from all parties. Now using a business plan model to develop a watershed model.

Q#3 Continued Some examples

- in the White River example, the USFS play a small role; most partners are local landowners etc.

- Wayne NF in So Ohio — another good example of public / private interests collaborating on the "Monday Creek" watershed.

- Q - What role did USFS play in these collaboratives? What agenda did they have / carry in w/ them?
  A: unsure, but groups existed before USFS stepped in.

- Lesson learned — Feds shouldn't work into a watershed w/ a set agenda — often difficult & unsuccessful.

- Perhaps feds should look at ways to help / foster local efforts ie $, technical assistance, in-kind, be a facilitator
- And this will be different @ different scales

- Midwest NR Mgrs — a DOI initiative, w/ other federal agencies involved. One of their problems is not having common boundaries. Should make sure UFP involves the Midwest NRM! Since they are already involved in this sort of work

- Federal Agriculture Committee - (FAC) - should use this POC to help focus efforts
- (RAC's) in West too. — w/ BLM

- Problem w/ BLM is that they are not organized on watershed lines;

- Perhaps the UFP will help shake up agency cultures & approaches to traditional NR mgmt.

- How will field staff on ground be implementing the UFP? ☆ What will be the impact on the N forests? They impact maintence programs? It takes $ to "roll out" these new policies! NFs are understaffed & under-resourced. ☆ How does the UFP help the Nat'l Forest?

- Working collectively may take $ away in the short term; but will help in the long run as budgets stay constant or decrease

- OR egon example - private/public landfill partnerships.

Notes: Catherine Neiswender
UW-Extension
625 E. County Road Y
Oshkosh, WI 54901-8131
(920) 232-1990