Small Group Sessions

Question #1: Approach

33

- Does the proposed policy take the right approach?

1). watershed approach appropriate, but whether top-down program is right is questionable. Funding under CWAP not distributed among feds to enhance policy. Policy not linked to implementation - policy might be detriment to implementation

2) Effect on end-users, mine operations, ranchers (how does it play out with local) Need to get more information about policy to lower levels -

3) Missing - incentives in policy to further encourage implementation and partnerships.

4). Need more details - watershed definition, assessment approach to be used. Many agencies already using watershed assessment approach - don't want to reinvent wheel

5) Policy needs to have multiple steps - delineation, assessment, procedures

6) Tribes - unified is issue. Concern about how this will look as trickle down approach. Interests and concerns vary so widely as they would among States. Wary of averaging - their interests might be diluted within individual tribes. Means to implement their own way -

7). We don't know what's going to happen - need to find way to incorporate flexibility

CAET RECEIVED
MAR 16 2000

Question # 1: con't 33

- What do you like & what needs to be changed?

Watershed approach right
Details about implementation

- What direction should we be pursuing?
  Building of framework
  Need something that all agencies can rely on
  consistency.
  Encourage development of watershed groups
  to implement within unified consistency.

- What is missing from the proposed policy?
  Details about implementation
  Details about public comment - getting info. to lowest levels
  Communication
  Need to blaze a path for implementation
  Need flexibility built in for implementation and not lose what agencies have already done
  Communication - website, fed register not enough - better communication

Question #2: 33

How can restoration & protection activities on Federal Lands be best coordinated?

Enabling / 1. Funding

1) Communicable goals need to be emphasized.
2) More success when link is made at lowest level of implementation. Need look at watershed level - not at national level -
3) Need funding to start making first links (ranchers, others) - get meetings organized, travel etc. Takes time for trust to be developed and achieve common goals.
4). Federal partners need to reach out to other entities with consistency.
5) Concern about unfunded stakeholders - people who funding need to have equal vote about solutions and implementation procedures.
6) Enabling

Question 2: con't

33

What are priorities the group has when taking into account funding?

1) Process for assessing resources after groups are set up. Look for grants, federal appropriation
2) Successful ones have had part-time people writing grants.
3) Enable groups at local level through funding to identify projects.
4) Data base and resource inventory. Monitoring might be first step.

Question 3:

Empowerment What is best way to develop partnerships w/others?

1) Empowerment
2). Role depends on place in situation
(broker, facilitator, ~~do~~ developer of ideas