Unified Federal Policy - 3/14/00

Notes from

29

Bill Hansen, USDA-Forest Service, 4931 Broad River Rd
Columbia, SC 29072 whansen/r8_fms@fs.fed.us

Bruce Jewell - welcome on UFP on Watershed Mgmt
Natural Resource Mgmt in South - must look at history of area. History of restoration due to past modification - 3-4 generations Almost total deforestation to 80% forest Agencies work well together in S. Man in Biosphere. SAA. SE Natural Leadership Group on Sustainability. Do these things on a watershed basis. We have always done things in watersheds, but seldom have we managed on a watershed basis.

Beverly Banister EPA Several cooperative efforts cited of multiagency WS cooperation. Multiple agency + public support. Issues sediment, nutrients, toxic chemicals Ability to expand current policies + share data & resources. Better stewardship + decisions on a WS scale. + States in S working hard to meet WQ goals. This may help.

Ruben Hernandez TVA Has worked well to develop WS resources - this may help accelerate working with stakeholders. Focus resources on specific hydrologic units

UFP – help to approve resources & stewardship

Bill Siegers / Lisa McKinnley (laison w/ EPA @ land grant colleges)

Ed Miller DOD
Steve Orchard BLM
Jessica Ogden Park Service
Carlos McData Army
Ruby Ford EPA
Shela Cola NPS Atlanta
Winnie Simson Landowner
Brian Sapson COE
David ____ COE
Suzanne Krieger USFS
Armond Harper COE
John Davis COE
Arch Millicum COE
Gary Maudin COE
Joe Soirbely COE toxicologist
Warren Harper USFS
Marjan Peltier EPA
Dave Glass Air Force + Army rep
Bruce Pruden EPA
Joel Holtrep USFS
John Vann
Bill Hansen
Karen Solari USFS / EPA laison
Leslie Watson USFS

Bill Siegers – Understanding Policy
Warren Harper – overview ~ Powerpoint Present.
Fed. Agencies need complete understanding
Unified Fed Policy 2000 – Part of CWA Action Pla
CWA Plan – accelerate cleanup of Nations Wate
1 of 111 actions.
UFP – all agencies will implement within their programs

Defs Watershed Nature's boundaries for Surface water resources
Watershed Assessment –
WS Approach
Goals ① WS approach ② cost Effective Objectives Collaboration WS Assessmen WS Mgmt Compliance
Cooperation – formal/informal agreements
Coordinate monitoring
Share training, resources
WS Assessments – Science based Define + implement Develop + U
WS Approach

Larger group discussion
Difference in UFP – WS Mgmt Concern – Effects constraint impact + then determine how to mitiga
Use WS functions to better define existing + potential of landscape + use that knowled to better plan + utilize capability of land
Develop + start implemeing by end of summer

Good science – what is it

Breakout Mtg Group 3 Hansen 5

Understand Policy 29

1. Has economic impacts been looked at
2. Incentives for doing work
3. What are real objectives WQ or WS approach
4. How are priorities identified
5. Lead agency in implementing
6. Security info concerns looked at?

Concerns

Used for other purposes not intended as regulatory
Prioritizing ~~the~~ objectives may change
from effects to watershed conditions
& tell us where to go, what to do, etc.
Are we going to be able to decide priorities
or someone else
Need flexibility for local need in landscape
How will this interface w/ local-State programs

Opportunities

- May reduce lawsuits
- collaboration - prioritizing
- WS Condition for focusing work - can be seen as addressing need of landscape
- analysis + information technology sharing, dialogue
- Bringing skills together to save money and do better job
- Common understanding
- Increase uniformity + degrease difference between agencies
- help w/ drainage management plans
- develop justification for actions in WS
- way to develop recognition for accomplishments

Head table response - we work best together
Build on coordination already in place and
look toward implementation
S Experience in large scale assessments
Many mechanisms already in place. We are
not going to be successful w/ just Federal lands
eg Conasauga WS
This ultimately ~~to~~ will become priority work

CAET RECEIVED
MAR 1 4 2000