note-taker: Joel Holtrop

(1)

30

Federal mtg Group 4 - Atlanta, GA 3/14/00

1. Does the proposed policy take the right approach?

What effect will this have on existing watershed efforts?

Strong concern over use of the term "good science." What does that mean? Suggest using "common sense."

The problem with "good science" is that good science is ~~in~~ the opinion of the individual. Science has much to learn from common sense.

Approach driven by a sound scientific approach but adjusted by the specific situation.

No benchmarks, quality indicators, no way to measure how we're doing. No substance. Eg. increased habitat diversity; bio-criteria numbers of species;

States have been identifying priority watersheds. We should show how this policy assessment relates to the ~~state's water priority watersheds~~ unified watershed assessments.

Any of the 111 CWAP actions should be considered to make sense of the UFP relative to the action.

CAET RECEIVED
MAR 14 2000

Policy does not close any doors, but articulates things we should be doing anyway in terms of working with others.

Does this policy relate to federal programs on non-federal lands? No. Over time, NRCS, etc will become a healthy player.

Need to consider how to implement, that will come later. Need to use or establish processes or groups that facilitate dialog, give and take.

CAET RECEIVED
MAR 1 4 2000