190

Subject: Unified Federal Policy for Ensuring a Watershed Approach
Sender: badger /Internet (badger@theriver.com)
Attached Date: 04/24/00 09:18
Priority: normal
Sensitivity: normal
Importance: normal

Part 1

FROM: badger / Internet
DDT1=RFC-822; DDV1=badger@theriver.com;

TO: cleanwater / wo, caet-slc

Part 2

ARPA MESSAGE HEADER

Part 3

April 24, 2000

USDA Forest Service
Content Analysis Enterprise Tem
Attn: UFP, Building 2, Suite 295
5500 Amelia Earhart Drive
Salt Lake City, UT 84116
cleanwater/wo_caet-slc@fs.fed.us

Dear Sir/Madam:

Below are my comments on the "Unified Federal Policy for Ensuring a Watershed Approach to Federal Land and Resource Management" published for comment in the federal register on February 22, 2000.

I am opposed to the "Unified Federal Policy for Ensuring a Watershed Approach to Federal Land and Resource Management".

Watershed planning to achieve natural resource goals and objectives should be accomplished at the state and local level utilizing accurate science. The planning should be done by personnel who have to live long term with the consequences.

GENERAL COMMENTS:

There are several substantial concerns with the intent and purpose of this policy. These concerns are based on several factors, including, but not limited to the following:

1. The Wyoming Association of Conservation Districts, along with 67 other individuals/organizations, filed suit in June 1999 against the US Environmental Protection Agency, et. al. over the Administration's Clean Water Action Plan. The basis of this suit includes numerous violations of various federal laws. The WACD, other organizations and individuals endorses and promotes
natural resource management on a watershed basis, they opposes this policy. The purpose, outcome, and decisions related to this policy were predetermined upon the publication of the Clean Water Action Plan. In addition, the intent and affects of this policy were not collectively analyzed for cumulative impact collectively with the other 110 "key actions" contained in the plan. Further, the
agency has not, pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, identified what the "need" may be for this Federal action nor conducted any further NEPA analysis.

2. The narrative language contained in the Clean Water Action Plan prefacing this particular key

action, contains the following statement: "Activities such as road building, logging, mining, grazing, hydrologic modification, or excessive recreational use can degrade the integrity of these watershed and require actions to reduce their harm." (Clean Water Action Plan, page 30).

Comment: Based on the above language it is apparent that the purpose for this policy has been determined. The intent is obviously based on the notion that virtually all land use activities are degrading the watershed, regardless of the method in which they are conducted. The states develop Best Management Practices to ensure that all of the above activities are conducted in a manner so as to protect the resource while meeting multiple use objectives. The above language indicates that regardless of how the activity occurs it must be degrading the watershed. The focus of the policy is clearly geared toward elimination of multiple use activities.

3. The policy is extremely vague. In reading the policy, one would question why it has even been published it is so lacking in specifics. This is an issue that could have likely been addressed had adequate NEPA analysis been conducted to identify and define the specific issues.

4. The policy is calling for actions and processes to be completed that are redundant to initiatives already being mandated by EPA through "authority" directed by the Clean Water Action Plan. More specific comments will be provided under the applicable section of the proposed policy.

5. The policy completely ignores the primacy of state's that have delegated authority for implementing the Clean Water Act. Again, it appears the policy is yet another attempt, as can be seen in the proposed TMDL regulations, to circumvent the role and primacy Congress intended for the states in implementing the provisions of the Clean Water Act.

6. The policy appears to substantially modify the management approach to federal lands.

Specific comments on the policy:

1) Page 8837; Introduction The introduction states "Implementation of the following proposed policy will improve water quality and aquatic ecosystems on Federal lands and will further the use of a watershed approach to federal land and resource management activities."

Comment: It is troublesome that the introduction repeatedly refers to the Clean Water Action Plan as if it was a law that was enacted, investing additional authorities to the federal agencies. If the intent is truly to address resource planning and management on a watershed basis, then it is incomprehensible why the policy ignores the fact that it is highly unlikely that watersheds contain only federal resources and this watershed approach can be applied strictly to federal lands and still accomplish the intent of watershed planning. This leads to the next concern, which is the impact to private lands. The public has been reassured that the policy has no affect on private lands. After

reviewing the policy, it is obvious that it will affect private landowners.

2) Page 8837; Policy Goals - The policy refers to the "managing the Federal lands, resources, and facilities in our care".

Comment: The glossary section does not provide a definition of "resources". In order to clearly understand the intent and application of this proposed policy it is necessary that a definition be provided.

The policy goals recognize that there are existing programs for watershed protection and improvement currently underway and the policy is intended to enhance these programs. The policy goes on to identify guiding principals to achieve the two identified goals.

Principle A. "Use a consistent and scientific approach to managing federal lands and resources and to assess, protect, and restore watersheds."

Comment: The policy is completely lacking in any specific detail on how this will be accomplished. If the policy is truly intended to bring consistency among the federal agencies that the agencies incorporate the following:

A. Watershed Assessments: One of the basic fundamental challenges in efforts to pursue watershed assessments is the lack of consistency between local, state and federal entities on the level of science being collected for determination of watershed health. In addition, the federal agency monitoring process does not appear to consider geology, climate, soils, hydrology, stream succession, etc. Nor are the protocols, and ultimately the analysis of resource health, consistently applied. In addition, both the Forest Service and BLM monitoring activities are lacking in adequate science to determine water quality. The Bureau of Land Management tends to make determinations on water quality without any water quality data (Proper Functioning Condition). They utilize subjective physical information solely. The collection and use of information should not be misapplied to make water quality determinations or watershed health assessments.

B. Resources for collection of credible data - The agencies should provide adequate resources, if necessary redirected from other redundant programs, to allow their personnel to actively collect the necessary science for land and water resource management.

The policy goals state that there two basic goals to promote a watershed approach to prevent and reduce water pollution from federal land and resource management activities and accomplish this in a unified and cost-effective manner. The above comments should be given serious consideration if the agencies intend to remotely come close to achieving the above goals.

In addition, it is questionable why the process of evaluating, categorizing and prioritization for the focus of resources and actions will occur long before any effort is made to collect data and information. Based on the method proposed there will be no effort or activity to collect data until 5

years into the process.

Principal B: "Identify specific watersheds in which to focus our budgetary and other resources and accelerate improvements in water quality and watershed condition."

Comments: EPA directed states in May 1999 to complete "Unified Watershed Assessments". These assessments, as described in EPA's memos and directives, mirror the assessments described in the draft policy. Based upon the Association's review of various western states' Unified Watershed Assessments, the states included federal agency personnel. Obviously, based upon a sampling of these assessments the process was conducted regardless of jurisdictional boundaries.

The policy does not define the size of watersheds being discussed. It is assumed that the specific scale will be determined at the state level. There is a major problem with inconsistency from one agency to the next as to the size of the watershed. It is assumed that given this effort was initiated, and has been in the process for over a year, that this policy would recognize that existing approach.

Principle C. "Use the results of watershed assessments to guide planning and management activities in accordance with applicable authorities and procedures."

Comments: The ultimate actions that may be taken as a result of this policy may pose conflicts between applicable authorities and procedures.

Principle D. "Work closely with states, tribes, local governments, and stakeholders to implement this policy.

Comments: Again, it is questionable that this policy is even necessary given the actions and activities related to water quality and resource management on a watershed basis that have been initiated either by state or local governments.

Principle E. "Meet our Clean Water Act responsibility to adhere to Federal, State, Tribal, interstate, and local water quality requirements to the same extent as non-governmental entities."

Comments: It is obvious that the federal agencies clearly need to address their contribution to water quality impairments. However, it is unclear how this particular policy will result in federal agencies adhering to water quality standards. One example, the Yellowstone National Park has been issued notices of violations from the Wyoming DEQ for water quality violations as a result of sewage spills into surface waters in the park. These spills occur due to outdated and dilapidated treatment facilities, however the state can do nothing more than issue a notice of violation. The state cannot assess any monetary penalties against the federal government. The Association would recommend that if agencies are as committed to adhering to water quality standards as any other individual or entity would be, then the state's should be allowed to assess penalties just as they would to any other individual or entity.

Principal F. "Take steps to ensure that Federal land and resource management actions are consistent
with Federal, State, Tribal, and, where appropriate, local government water quality management programs."

Comment: It is unclear why the policy is necessary to achieve this means. Several local conservation
districts and other local and state governments have attempted to be involved in federal land
management planning activities. Vice versa, local governments, where federal lands are within
a watershed, invite and involve federal agency personnel. It is continually frustrating that although
the agencies purport to want to coordinate, they consistently ignore provisions of NEPA which
provide that where state and local governments have jurisdiction by law or special expertise, they
should be granted cooperating agency status on federal land management planning activities. Merely
following the intent and mandate of NEPA, coupled with encouragement and empowerment of local
field personnel to participate in locally initiated watershed planning efforts would accomplish this "principal."

As well, the language "where appropriate" is vague and if the policy is adopted it should be clarified.

Page 8837; II. Agency Objectives; 1st paragraph states: To accomplish these policy goals,.All
agencies will implement this policy as individual agency laws, missions, and fiscal and budgetary
authorities and resources permit."

Comment: It would seem logical that prior to developing and issuing this policy the agencies would
have ensured that the goals and actions proposed in the policy were permissible under individual
agency laws, missions, and fiscal resources were sufficient. The mere fact that this language is in
the policy indicates that there may be some conflicts or limitations that exist between the intent and
goals of the policy and current authorities.

Section A. 2. A through d; states: "We will conduct watershed assessments for watersheds that have
significant Federal lands and resources."

Comment: The term "significant" is not defined in the glossary provided. Unless "significant" is
defined as solely federal lands there will be an impact on private property. It is assumed that in
watersheds that are identified as "impaired", "high priority", or some other category indicating water
quality impairments, that some map or delineation will be published. If the federal agencies even
categorize a watershed as priority and there are private lands within that watershed, then this policy
does affect private lands. It is unfathomable how the agencies could even begin to suggest that there
would be no affect on private property. In Arizona, nearly all of the watersheds will contain mixed
ownership. Therefore, if the agencies truly intend for this policy to affect only federal lands then it
should apply to those watershed which include strictly federal lands. This approach however, would
obviously, in most instances defeat the purpose of a watershed approach. Therefore, suggest that the
policy be withdrawn. A commitment should be made by the agencies to

watershed planning efforts
initiated by state and local governments. The necessary resources to accomplish these watershed-
based efforts are provided to the state and local governments, without the top down edicts, which fail to
recognize local conditions. This would truly reflect what Congress intended to occur in the
implementation of the Clean Water Act. This is supported with the language in the CWA at §§ 101(b)
which states: "It is the policy of the Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary
responsibilities and rights of States to prevent, reduce, and eliminate pollution, to plan the
development and use (including restoration, preservation, and enhancement) of land and water
resources, and to consult with the Administration in the exercise of his authority under this Act.

Section B. 1 a through b.6; states: "We will work collaboratively to identify priority watersheds"

Comment: This section goes on to provide a list of criteria or the process in which the agencies will
determine priority watersheds. It is interesting to note that of the six criteria listed for determining
priority watersheds, not one is directly related to accurate scientific data indicating water quality
degradation. Even though the goal of the policy is for federal agencies to comply with the Clean
Water Act. Specifically one of the policy's goal state: "use a watershed approach to prevent and
reduce water pollution resulting from federal land.."

Section B. 1. b. (3) states: "Magnitude of water quality impairment, impacts to aquatic resources,
and/or changes to flow regime."

Comment: It is unclear what the intent is of the federal agencies to include flow regime. However the
Clean Water Act states the following: §§ 101(g): "It is the policy of Congress that the authority of
each State to allocate quantities of water within its jurisdiction shall not be superseded, abrogated or otherwise
impaired by this Act. It is the further policy of Congress that nothing in this Act shall be construed to
supersede or abrogate rights to quantities of water, which have been established by any State."

If the intent is to affect in any way, legally appropriated water rights, then this language should be
deleted.

Section B. 1. b. (4) This language was addressed above in comments related to duplication of
watershed assessments being conducted by state and local governments.

Section B. 1. b. (5) states "Vulnerability of the watershed to degradation".

Comment: How will the agencies determine a watershed's vulnerability to degradation.

Page 8838; B. 2. Through its entirety to section C.

Comment: Again, it is unclear, and this section solidifies this uncertainty, as to why the policy is
necessary. This section discusses addressing nonpoint source pollution, implementation of Best Management
Practices, total maximum daily loads, complying with state water quality

standards, etc. These efforts
are already occurring in various forms such as the large comprehensive Forest or BLM area planning
processes, timber management, grazing strategies and management, coordination with states on water
quality standards issues, etc. Recommend that the agencies merely make a commitment to watershed
planning and involvement in such efforts.

Page 8838; section C. in its entirety

Comment: This section is too vague to even provide meaningful comment. However, it is apparent
through this section that there are changes in multiple uses in store as a result of this policy. This is an
assumption based on current agency trends to phase out uses and management practices such as
timber harvesting, grazing, etc. and the language contained in the CWAP.

Section D. "We will enhance collaboration".

D. 3. b. states "Provide opportunities for interested stakeholders to participate in monitoring and
assessing watershed conditions and in implementing watershed restoration projects.

Comment: This statement clearly causes concern. On face value, given the lack of specifics contained
in the policy, one can interpret this statement that any interested public will be invited and encouraged
to monitor and assess watersheds. There is no mention, whatsoever, of any minimum qualifications
for participation from stakeholders. Again, it is imperative that the federal agencies consult with and
maintain consistency with the state's approach. Clearly, there must be some threshold established for
the level of expertise necessary for stakeholders to be involved in the collection of scientific data.

D. 3. d. states: "Seek early feedback on key decisions affecting watershed management through the
Watershed Forum process called for in the Clean Water Action Plan and carefully consider this
feedback in agency decision making."

Comment: This statement is a prime example of how the agencies are treating the Clean Water Action
Plan as an authorizing law, rule or regulation. The public input processes for federal planning
activities are clearly governed by the NEPA, Administrative Procedures Act, and other
federal laws. Yet, the policy sets forth that a "new" process will be followed. One contained in a Plan
that was not even subjected to Congressional review. The Clean Water Action Plan discusses the National
Watershed forum and indicates a "....Forum will be convened to provide a coordinating mechanism
for the development of watershed assessment, restoration, and protection efforts. The Forum will
include a total of about 20 members, including representatives of: federal agencies, state agencies,
tribal governments, local governments, other stakeholder organizations, and watershed partnerships
and citizens." (Clean Water Action Plan, page 87)

There is no discussion of these reviews and/or decisions being made at the local level within the
affected watershed. Further, there is no mention of private landowners

serving on this Forum. Given that fact that this policy will impact private lands, it is necessary to involve landowners.

D. 4. States: "We will expand opportunities for dialogue with private landholders in priority watershed with a mix of Federal and private lands, we will work with private sector landholders to involve them in the watershed management process. We will work closely to ensure that Federally funded projects involving private cost-share partners fully consider watershed management objectives for both public and private lands."

Comment: There was a the meeting held in Denver on this issue where agency representatives strongly assured attendees that the policy DOES NOT AFFECT PRIVATE LAND. (emphasis added) This was presented surely in anticipation of concern over a federal dictate of private land management. This concern is well founded based on the above. This policy will obviously affect private landowners. It is ironic that the policy does not discuss involving private landowners until the end of the policy. In addition, landowners are involved after the process of monitoring, assessing, prioritizing/categorizing, development and implementation of management practices, and collaboration with stakeholders. This demonstrates the clear lack of understanding and recognition that the federal agencies who prepared the policy, have of private property rights and working with private landowners voluntarily and cooperatively on resource management activities.

There are numerous examples throughout the west, where the majority of federal lands are located, that demonstrates private landowner commitment to sustainable resource management. This section sends a clear message that private landowners are an afterthought.

If the federal land management agencies are truly interested in resource management on a watershed basis, then a sincere commitment needs to be made to work with state and local governments. The federal agencies must recognize the primacy of states in implementing the Clean Water Act, and most importantly recognize and respect the rights of those landowners with property located within these watersheds.

Sincerely,

Rachel Thomas
Box 4637
Huachuca City, Arizona 85616

cc:
Senator Jon Kyl
Congressman Matt Salmon
Congressman John Shadegg
Congressman Jim Kolbe
Congressman J.D. Hayworth
AZ Senator Brenda Burns
AZ Speaker of the House Jeff Groscost
AZ Representative Gail Griffin

Les Thompson, Cochise County Board of Supervisors