

13 of all, I would like to acknowledge that we have some
14 members of our Science Advisory Panel with us today for
15 the Commission as a whole and certainly for the
16 Stewardship Working Group, and to thank them for a
17 stalwart attendance.

18 We also had a working group meeting here in
19 Washington on the 9th and 10th of January, a little
20 earlier this month, and had participation by our science
21 advisors and some other scientists at different times
22 who have provided input to our working group.

1 On January 9 and 10, we discussed and spent a
2 great deal of time working through issues related to
3 non-point source pollution, watershed management and
4 monitoring, essential fish habitat and marine mammal
5 interactions and noise in the sea. We will go into
6 those areas momentarily.

7 I think it is important for you to note,
8 Mr. Chairman, that Stewardship had to take over REMO
9 today, has had to routinely inform Governance, and now
10 we get our own turn to bring something before the
11 Commission and, to further your metaphor I believe it
12 was, today the Stewardship Working Group's missile
13 delivery system for our recommendations will be
14 Vice Admiral Gaffney, who chaired Wednesday's session in

15 my absence. I will turn it over to Admiral Gaffney.

16 CHAIRMAN WATKINS: I have to comment on, you

17 know, Stewardship has finally gotten to the point where

18 they have gotten serious about their work, and are

19 migrating toward the grade of A-, and that is about the

20 best we can say for it. With that, we will turn it over

21 to Admiral Gaffney.

22 ADMIRAL GAFFNEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1 Let the record show that we had 10 issues last time
2 approved, and we have five today, so we are well in the
3 lead, even though we did limp along on Wednesday without
4 Paul and a traffic director was relegated to the
5 position of acting chairman. Because only a traffic
6 director ran that meeting, the staff and science
7 advisors and other commissioners from the working group
8 should feel free to speak up and help me as I stumble
9 through.

10 What you are going to see are several view
11 graphs that, like the other two working groups, is in
12 shorthand form. Based on comments that come out today,
13 we will be able to make better, longer, more coherent
14 papers. I think you will find that, as our chairman has

15 already said, we are supportive of Mr. Ruckelshaus'

16 presentation this morning that these things do not

17 conflict, but actually fit nicely under what he has said

18 so far.

19 DISCUSSION OF WATERSHED MANAGEMENT

20 ADMIRAL GAFFNEY: The first one is watershed

21 management. A point we want to make now on this view

22 graph and the next one, which is watershed monitoring,

1 is that we see watershed management as critical to sound

2 coastal and ocean management. It is a fact of gravity.

3 They are, in fact, the same ecosystem.

4 Angela, will you show the picture?

5 (A slide presentation in progress.)

6 Okay. This is how we see the world, that

7 there is an integrated system where watershed monitoring

8 of essentially things above the high-tide mark and ocean

9 and coastal observing go hand in hand and the artificial

10 separation between the two right now should not stand in

11 the future.

12 With that in mind, we had several

13 recommendations. We had up until this morning been

14 using the term "national" and "regional coordinating

15 bodies." I think we would be happy, if we had a chance
16 to redo these, to make it "national ocean council" and
17 "regional ocean council," something like that, more
18 consistent with what Mr. Ruckelshaus said this morning.

19 We believe that those three levels -- the
20 national, the regional and the existing watershed
21 councils -- can be informed by one another. It is not
22 just a downhill flow from the national to the regional

1 and to the watershed, they can all inform one another

2 and iteratively do a better job, and we endorse that.

3 Regarding the national body, the national

4 ocean council, to use today's terms, it should develop

5 broad goals and strategies and periodically review or

6 assess performance, quality in using metrics whenever

7 possible. Beyond that, they should ensure that the

8 federal agencies are coordinated within, the federal

9 agencies at least should be coordinated within, the

10 various regions of the country. More on that in the

11 next slide.

12 They should provide either because they own

13 the money, you will hear more about that as well, or

14 arrange and coordinate Washington level funding

15 activities so that technical management and education
16 services can be provided to those folks in the region,
17 whether they be federal or non-federal, and that they
18 should see to the establishment of a best management
19 practices center, a BMP center, that takes the best
20 ideas from each region nationally and then propagates it
21 out, if you will, so others can learn from the successes
22 or failures of other regions or other levels.

1

2 Next slide, please.

3 Here there are some underlying words, and that

4 is to show some emphasis here on something that we think

5 is new, we think is a jumpstart on what Mr. Ruckelshaus

6 mentioned this morning about regional ocean councils.

7 If Ed Rasmuson was here, they do not override existing

8 authorities or responsibilities of regional fisheries

9 management councils.

10 We would have the federal agencies align

11 themselves to a common regional boundary. If you, one,

12 determine that there are certain watersheds, a finite

13 number of watersheds, there are large ones, that

14 essentially cover the whole United States and the

15 islands and Alaska, you should align the federal
16 agencies within those watersheds and match up pretty
17 well, I think we said last time we were in this room,
18 match up reasonably well with common ocean regimes and
19 coastal regimes.

20 We would put them all together. We would then
21 encourage, because we are not in the position yet where
22 we can direct states, local, tribal or other regional

1 councils to work with the federal council in the region.
2 We would try to encourage them. One way to encourage
3 them is to see that federal grants that go to performing
4 activities dealing with regional research on watersheds
5 goes through the regional center, and that will get the
6 recipients of that more likely to come to the table.

7 The same could be said for centrally directed
8 education, technical and other support management
9 assistance. How would we pay for this? Really two
10 ways. This first bullet is a work in progress. We
11 would try to develop some kind of funding stream from
12 fees, taxing, for example, the amount of water that goes
13 over a dam or something like that, details to be
14 determined. We would use that for regional grants and

15 for technical support.

16 We would also take existing funds for the

17 regions and see if we can coordinate those funds that

18 are already out there and in little pieces in various

19 agencies, trying to bring them together and coordinate

20 them at the regional area. A bullet that is not on here

21 is we would also gain \$160 million to build eight new

22 buildings at \$20 million each for eight regions.

1 (Laughter.)

2 ADMIRAL GAFFNEY: I'm sorry, I was just

3 checking to see if Commissioner Muller-Karger was awake.

4 It is not a recommendation. That is the management

5 scheme, and now I would like to go to the monitoring

6 scheme again.

7 DISCUSSION OF WATERSHED MONITORING

8 ADMIRAL GAFFNEY: We believe that a watershed

9 monitoring, now this (indicating) is the area -- if you

10 will show the diagram again, Angela -- watershed

11 monitoring is the area sort of inland of the high-water

12 mark. It must be comprehensive spatially and temporally

13 and it must be integral to and partnered with any

14 coastal ocean observing system. Because of gravity,

15 they affect each other. We see that a combination of
16 the two really makes an integrated, sustained
17 ecosystem-based observing and monitoring system, which
18 we think is important for the country.

19 The national body should oversee the many
20 federal efforts that go on in watershed monitoring. It
21 is not just the USGS that is doing this now. The Corps
22 of Engineers does some things, the National Weather

1 Service Hydrologic Forecasting Group does some things,
2 and we would bring those all together.

3 We believe that a lead federal agency, yet to
4 be determined, should have operational responsibility
5 for ensuring this network of monitoring stations is
6 coordinated, that there should be nationally determined
7 some core measurements that are made, but there will
8 certainly be some differences in addition to the core
9 measurements that need to be made in each region because
10 of geographic distinctions from one region to another.

11 Finally, we believe that as we discussed last
12 time in this room that there ought to be a single
13 clearinghouse, an operations center concept, where all
14 of the data comes in and can be fused and then

15 distributed in some good manner. It should be in a
16 single clearinghouse probably either at the same place
17 that you did an ocean observing clearinghouse or somehow
18 electronically connected to it.

19 I believe we can stop there in case there are
20 any questions.

21 DR. EHRMANN: Thank you.

22 Mr. Ruckelshaus, a question, a comment on

1 this?

2 MR. RUCKELSHAUS: Paul, let me really commend

3 you for this report and set of recommendations. I think

4 it is excellent and very relevant to the possibility of

5 recommending some sort of regional ocean policy councils

6 or whatever we end up calling them.

7 Making sure that these watershed management

8 efforts which are often citizen-led are tied into what

9 is happening at the federal and state level, and which

10 could be done through these regional ocean policy

11 councils is a very important function for them to

12 consider.

13 I would suggest one addition to what you are

14 recommending, and that is, what we have seen around the

15 country are any number of successful efforts dealing
16 with watershed-based issues or place-based issues
17 through the use of collaborative processes, where you
18 assemble all of the interests. For instance, in the use
19 of water in a watershed, make sure that those interests
20 and uses are put on the table and see if they can be
21 harmonized with one another.

22 Where those processes work, and we saw one

1 that works in an extraordinary fashion when we visited
2 Seattle -- I am personally familiar with a number of
3 other efforts in Puget Sound, as well as in the rest of
4 the state and in the state of Oregon -- which when they
5 are properly constructed, the people are trained to deal
6 with them, the federal government officials understand
7 what their role is to make them work as well the state
8 and other officials, the amount of progress that can be
9 made is really extraordinary.

10 They are particularly suited for issues like
11 non-point source pollution, issues that reside in
12 watersheds. Because it is impossible to get at those
13 issues through using lawsuits or a top-down approach, we
14 have made very little progress nationally on some of

15 these kinds of problems. I think there is tremendous
16 promise in the use of these watershed councils, as we
17 often call them in the Northwest.

18 I think we should give in our report, we
19 should highlight, the effectiveness of these kinds of
20 efforts. We should either charge the national council
21 or the regional councils with having an understanding
22 and increasing their knowledge of these processes and

1 how they work, spread an understanding of those
2 processes, celebrate the successes where they in fact
3 exist, and accelerate the way those processes are
4 extended around the country.

5 One element that is often missing is that
6 there needs to be training of federal and even state
7 officials as to how they should interact with these
8 watershed councils in order to make them successful.

9 If they come in and tell these councils that
10 if they are successful in coping with the mix of
11 problems associated with water use, for instance, they
12 will endorse the effort, obviously assuming it is within
13 the confines of their legislative responsibilities, and
14 they encourage these processes to go forward, that is a

15 terribly important element of their success.

16 Just as they can be helpful in encouraging

17 these processes to go forward, they can kill them. If

18 they come in and say, "Well, you can say whatever you

19 like about what you would like to do, but I am going to

20 continue to carry out my responsibilities and my

21 decision in this area is final." That is the end of the

22 effort of the people to voluntarily come together and

1 try to solve their own problems.

2 It seems to me we can highlight those

3 successes in our report, fit it neatly into what you are

4 doing here, and provide a useful role for these regional

5 ocean policy councils and accelerate the processes where

6 they worked.

7 They don't work for every problem obviously;

8 it is mainly place-based kinds of problems. I really

9 commend you for what you have done here, and I think

10 this addition would really be a contribution to pushing

11 these processes forward.

12 ADMIRAL GAFFNEY: Thank you, sir. I think you

13 know that Susan Hannah met with us and helped us and

14 kept an eye on us for a couple of days while we

15 discussed these things, and she brought up some of the
16 same points, which is one of the reasons for
17 emphasizing, among other things here, not only just
18 putting it in our report, but having a best management
19 practices center to take those successes like the
20 Seattle success and telling other people how it worked.

21 Also, I went over this quite quickly, but if
22 you read the first draft of the paper on this, if you

1 had had the opportunity, and you haven't, it talks about
2 educating people, both federal people at the regional
3 level and non-federal people and enabling better
4 communications through education. That is a part of it.
5 Thank you for emphasizing that.

6 DR. EHRMANN: Dr. Hershman?

7 DR. HERSHMAN: Yes. I echo what Bill just
8 said about the value of this. It is very clearly
9 organized. I am looking at and trying to understand the
10 incentives that would bring the players at the state,
11 local, tribal level into what would be generated by the
12 federal.

13 Now, what I see here is the funding mechanism,
14 a very important one, although you mentioned funding

15 stream from fees. I don't quite know who would pay the

16 fees, but that is sort of a minor point.

17 I am just wondering whether the monitoring

18 strategy and the information generated by the federal

19 becomes a sort of vehicle for enhancing coordination,

20 and whether that might be explained a little bit more?

21 ADMIRAL GAFFNEY: Yes. I think that is a good

22 point. We have talked on and off about, even since

1 New Orleans about, datacentric management and does that

2 bring people together for better public policymaking.

3 It is not in here. I think that is a great idea. If

4 there is transparency, availability of data, less likely

5 to be emotion, less likely to be politics, less likely

6 to be good public decision making, especially if it is

7 transparent, everyone can see it.

8 DR. HERSHMAN: There are some good examples of

9 how that might work. Again, it is a vehicle for

10 bringing others, more people, to the table.

11 ADMIRAL GAFFNEY: Right.

12 DR. HERSHMAN: Thank you. I agree, thank you.

13 I think we can add that, can't we, Malcolm?

14 MALCOLM: Yes.

15 DR. EHRMANN: Okay.

16 Paul, do you want to?

17 DR. SANDIFER: Thanks, John. These questions

18 I am going to ask and comments are from Chris Koch, who

19 couldn't be with us this afternoon. For just a moment,

20 imagine that I am a lot taller and just a bit grayer,

21 and I will proceed with his questions.

22 DR. EHRMANN: And handsomer?

1 DR. SANDIFER: Thanks a lot.

2 (Laughter.)

3 DR. EHRMANN: Let the record show --

4 DR. SANDIFER: The imagination is really being

5 stretched now, I can tell. Chris observes, and rightly

6 so, that every acre of the United States is in a

7 watershed, so we have got to be very, very conscious of

8 what we are talking about geographically.

9 Paul, I think that means for us and for staff

10 that means we need to truly define these regions very

11 carefully, what we mean by "large watersheds" and what

12 would be the purview of the major, the big council type

13 approach.

14 He also indicates that we need to define

15 exactly what we are monitoring. His question is, Is it
16 the quality of the water entering the oceans? If I
17 remember correctly from our previous discussions, it is
18 both the quality and the quantity because we were
19 concerned about stream flow monitoring.

20 There are lots of reasons to be concerned
21 about quantity and quality. Assuming his question of
22 quality, then he went on to say, then we need to define

1 what we are monitoring for. Assuming it is water
2 quality, does that mean we should be monitoring? These
3 are the core issues that you raised.

4 He wanted, again, for us to be as specific as
5 possible with things. Are we looking at sediment loads,
6 nitrogen loads, oxygen levels, specific chemicals and
7 temperature? What are the core kinds of variables? We
8 probably should be as specific as possible.

9 Finally, he concludes that the kind of
10 comprehensive monitoring that we are talking about and
11 its integration with the coastal observing system would
12 clearly require some estimate of cost for us to be able
13 to put forward what is being expended now, which of
14 course, Mr. Chairman, is a sore topic with us, since we

15 can't get that from the agencies, but what is being
16 expended now and then what we would anticipate the
17 additional cost of implementing the kind of monitoring,
18 his comments for the record.

19 ADMIRAL GAFFNEY: Okay. Let me address those
20 real quickly. First, we have already looked last time
21 at sort of a connection between major watersheds and
22 what is today the regional fishery management council

1 boundaries; they match reasonably well, like,

2 80 percent.

3 The most terrifying match is the central part

4 of the United States with the Gulf of Mexico. We

5 recognize that that is hard, but we are not afraid of

6 that. It is something we have to deal with, but we

7 don't define Iowa and Minnesota away from the problem.

8 We want them to be part of this particular issue, for

9 sure, and we have to refine that.

10 Secondly, on the what do you measure, how much

11 and what constituents? I think that is both a core

12 national set of parameters that are designated, and then

13 there will be some that are not. We may not want to, I

14 don't know what I am talking about here, but you may not

15 want to measure mercury in Alaska or in Hawaii, but you
16 might want to measure it in the Gulf of Maine, for
17 example.

18 So, there may be some of that list that you
19 mentioned are in fact regional, but there would
20 certainly be some core, and I think that would be a
21 national body, that sets standards would have to do
22 that.

1 Finally, on cost, like every recommendation
2 here we have been charged by the boss to try to cost all
3 of these things out. We have been quite worried for
4 several meetings now about what has happened to the
5 stream gauging system here in the United States. Some
6 of those programs have gone down significantly, some
7 have gone down and stabilized, some are okay. I think
8 we have to get a little bit better handle on that, but
9 we may need more money and new techniques, perhaps.

10 Dr. Muller-Karger, do you have a comment on
11 that?

12 DR. MULLER-KARGER: Thank you, just a
13 follow-up comment. You did say that there probably
14 needs to be a governance structure that defines what

15 core measurements need to be taken?

16 ADMIRAL GAFFNEY: Yes.

17 DR. MULLER-KARGER: There probably needs to be

18 a governance structure that defines what core

19 measurements need to be taken.

20 ADMIRAL GAFFNEY: Yes.

21 DR. MULLER-KARGER: I think that what we need

22 to focus on is the governance issue, and make sure that

1 there is a way to implement an infrastructure. However,
2 I am uncomfortable in making a list of variables that we
3 need to measure in our report.

4 ADMIRAL GAFFNEY: In our report, great. That
5 would be the job of the national body, right. Thank
6 you.

7 DR. EHRMANN: All right, thank you.

8 Dr. Rosenberg?

9 DR. ROSENBERG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

10 I have to say knowing as I do the members and
11 the capabilities of the Stewardship Working Group, I was
12 quite surprised by how good this paper was, but
13 Admiral Gaffney explained that Dr. Hannah participated,
14 and then it became clear.

15 (Laughter.)

16 DR. ROSENBERG: I had to say that because of

17 the chauvinism at the beginning about Stewardship's

18 accomplishments.

19 (Laughter.)

20 DR. ROSENBERG: I have three points. The

21 first one is I think that you need to explicitly include

22 in here the concept of adaptive management, because we

1 should assume that an awful lot of the things that we
2 need to do in watersheds are, first of all, extremely
3 hard; and, secondly, are data poor.

4 Just as we talked earlier about pilot programs
5 for regional management, I think we can imagine that an
6 awful lot of the work in these watersheds is going to be
7 incremental, and we want to make sure that it is
8 incremental based on acquiring new information. I know
9 that we defined adaptive management somewhere in the
10 documents, and we should carry that thread through.

11 I am trying to understand the relationship of
12 this proposal for watershed management to the
13 ecosystem-based management discussion earlier under
14 Governance because, as I am sure you are aware, I very

15 strongly believe that we should be moving toward
16 ecosystem-based management. This, of course, is in line
17 with that, and I don't want us to have parallel tracks
18 there; I think they need to be integral.

19 Watershed management, particularly with regard
20 to water quality and water quantity, is an extremely
21 important piece of that. This document indicates that
22 there would be a regional, a federal regional, council

1 whereas before I think we were talking about potentially
2 a broader regional council, a federal/state partnership.

3 It does seem to me that while you do want to
4 have all of the incentives to encourage people to
5 participate with that regional council, that setting it
6 up up front as a federal/state partnership may be a
7 better starting point than a federal council, a federal
8 regional council.

9 I would perhaps suggest to Stewardship that we
10 continue to sort of go back and forth on that issue and
11 think about it a little bit more, whether you can
12 motivate this kind of watershed management and do the
13 things that I think Bill Ruckelshaus talked about best,
14 if you set up the federal agencies and get them

15 coordinated and invite people in or if you set up up
16 front a federal/state partnership and do all of those
17 things, including the "incentivizing," and so on, if
18 that is a verb. I have some concern about that.

19 Finally, I do think that with regard to
20 watershed management, we need to think back to the issue
21 of consolidation of activities, which isn't explicitly
22 mentioned here, but I just want to note it, again, that

1 some of the activities at the federal level could
2 potentially be consolidated simply to try to sort of
3 clear the air before you try to bring everybody to the
4 table in the sense of easing the task of some of the
5 coordination of at least the federal activities.

6 You mentioned that with regard to
7 consolidation of some of the very small programs, but I
8 think it also is the functions and even possibly agency
9 programs, not just their funding programs, but their
10 internal operational programs that need to be considered
11 there.

12 When we come to consolidation of functions
13 under a new proposed structural model, I just think we
14 need to keep this issue of watershed management and

15 monitoring very clearly in mind. It is probably an area
16 where we have, you know, an awful lot of players and it
17 is a little hard to figure out why we have all of those
18 players as opposed to pulling them together, not just in
19 coordinating, but in actual restructuring.

20 Thank you.

21 ADMIRAL GAFFNEY: We agree with you
22 completely. On the last point, and I will go backwards,

1 that is really what we meant by "lead," a lead agency;
2 we agree. I didn't go into that deep enough when I
3 spoke.

4 As far as feds first and then everybody else
5 second or encouraging them fed/state together, first
6 step, we thought with an executive order without
7 legislation in view of time to make a jumpstart at what
8 Governance wants to do. We could quickly get the feds
9 together just by executive order without a "Mother may
10 I" from anybody, just to speed the ball along.

11 We know if you can before we meet again give
12 us some better ideas on how you could bring state and
13 federal together without wasting -- not wasting, taking
14 too much time, I think we would like to know more about

15 that. We weren't skillful in finding a way to make that
16 happen. And, finally, agree on adaptive management for
17 sure, just as we do on the ocean side.

18 DR. ROSENBERG: On the federal/state
19 partnership side, I am not sure I am the one to know the
20 legal mechanisms, but I think it is worth exploring
21 whether it doesn't mean -- certainly you can't create
22 one by fiat, but whether you try to set up in that

1 structure initially would seem to be worth some
2 exploration. We have a lot of examples of those
3 programs. I don't think they are always set up by
4 statute; they can be set up by, essentially, agreement.

5 ADMIRAL GAFFNEY: Yes. This may the case of
6 Bill's slide on pilot programs. You know, maybe some
7 place it is really easy to do that and we show people it
8 is easy, and then you propagate the faith through other
9 means and other people catch on.

10 DR. EHRMANN: Mr. Ruckelshaus, do you want to
11 come in on this point before I go on?

12 MR. RUCKELSHAUS: Let me just comment on that
13 last discussion. About two years ago, the state of
14 Washington created a Monitoring Oversight Committee,

15 which I was the chairman of, which was charged by the
16 legislature with coming up with a monitoring, a water
17 monitoring plan for the state.

18 While the statute didn't mandate it, we
19 included federal officials from all branches that were
20 interested in water out there. We included tribal
21 officials, citizen groups, and collectively we developed
22 this monitoring plan which has now been submitted to the

1 state. It has a lot more steam behind it, because all
2 of these other agencies were involved, and they worked
3 on coordinating their own monitoring activities in this
4 plan for the state. Actually the state of Oregon, that
5 was the hardest group to get to participate, but they
6 participated as well. That was all done by initiative;
7 it was not done by any statutory response.

8 DR. EHRMANN: Sure.

9 Mr. Kelly had his card up. If you would, go
10 ahead. Commissioner Kelly, go ahead.

11 MR. KELLY: I have one brief comment. Before
12 I do that, in the context of the competitive comments
13 about our various working groups, I just wanted to say
14 that the key to the success of the Stewardship Working

15 Group is obviously due to the fact that we have as a
16 member one of our two outstanding lady commissioners,
17 Ann D'Amato and with Ann's leadership supported by three
18 Pauls, which brings with those names a good deal of
19 sanctifying grace, we can't miss.

20 Although I am a member of the Stewardship
21 Working Group, I had not thought of this point until now
22 until when Paul Sandifer answered the question that

1 Chris left with us, Are we concerned about water quality
2 or water quantity? Paul correctly responded, both. It
3 reminded me of the fact that on some days there is no
4 water that arrives in the Gulf of Mexico from the
5 Rio Grande River. That is obviously a water quantity
6 problem, as well a water quality problem.

7 That in turn suggests that with respect to
8 watershed management there could be an international
9 implication of this in those regions of the country that
10 border on Mexico and Canada. There may be times when we
11 want to bring representatives of those governments into
12 the process. Indeed, I think we have a precedent for
13 that.

14 When we heard about the Gulf of Maine, the

15 rather informal Gulf of Maine Watershed Management
16 Program that the two maritime provinces, New Brunswick
17 and Nova Scotia, are invited to those meetings. That is
18 something we might, for staff we might, include in our
19 drafting.

20 DR. ROSENBERG: Certainly, the Great Lakes
21 Commission is another.

22 DR. KELLY: Right. Great Lakes, a good

1 example.

2 DR. ROSENBERG: I think there is one on the

3 Columbia.

4 CHAIRMAN WATKINS: There is also some

5 significant international linkages there, the Nile

6 River, for example, the degree to which you drain off

7 for farming and all that. If you don't have anything

8 running into the Mediterranean, the fishery people worry

9 a lot.

10 There is a lot of precedent for what Paul is

11 recommending here. It should be a component of the

12 international emphasis, too, that when we finally get to

13 that point, when we really talk about that as a way the

14 United States again can offer a leadership role in doing

15 the kinds of things you are doing in the watershed

16 monitoring and management programs here.

17 DR. EHRMANN: Yes, sir?

18 DR. SANDIFER: I just wanted to respond to

19 Andy's comment about getting the states involved right

20 along from the beginning.

21 DR. EHRMANN: Yes.

22 DR. SANDIFER: Andy, I don't think it will

1 have to wait for legislation, I agree with you entirely.

2 One of the things that Paul Kelly said earlier and

3 we said back in our November report -- Paul Gaffney,

4 about aligning the federal agencies on these regions

5 better, once the federal agencies are lined up, they

6 deal with the states in those regions.

7 We, as states, have to work normally through

8 the regional office on certain kinds of things to work

9 with the Fish & Wildlife Service or NOAA or anybody

10 else, USGS, so it is a very common thing.

11 If this were done by executive order, the

12 executive order should also include that the federal

13 agencies then work directly with the states in their

14 respective regions, and you have got it automatically in

15 place and then it can be later, hopefully, dealt with in
16 enabling legislation. It can be done immediately, and I
17 think it would be quite effective. Your point is well
18 taken.

19 DR. ROSENBERG: I certainly agree, but I think
20 that we should be thinking about that and setting up
21 regional councils broadly, not just for this watershed
22 issue because of course this does apply to the ecosystem

1 issue overall.

2 DR. SANDIFER: Again, I wasn't here on
3 Wednesday's discussion, but our previous discussion,
4 this is a subset of ecosystem-based management approach.
5 It is a subset of the regional management council kind
6 of approach. This happened to be one of those areas
7 where the working group felt strongly and where we had
8 some great examples of local kinds of watershed councils
9 and commissions and bodies that worked quite well.

10 If you could then take what they are doing at
11 small scale, in most cases relatively small scale, and
12 scale it up a bit, it could be quite effective on a
13 larger scale. That is what we were trying to do, to
14 include it as an element but not a replacement for, a

15 substitute, or competing with ecosystem-based management

16 as part of.

17 DR. EHRMANN: Okay. Just to summarize a few

18 key points and then we will turn to the marine mammal

19 protection topic. Clearly, an emphasis on the

20 place-based nature of these kinds of activities, a

21 number of examples of where that is operating already in

22 the country that can be learned from, and some good

1 input that has come into the working group on that
2 topic.

3 There is the need to recognize the role of
4 adaptive management in this process; the issues on
5 quantity and quality, water quantity and quality; and
6 then the associated range of data collection monitoring
7 issues were noted.

8 The fact is that this kind of process can
9 offer an additional opportunity for coordination in this
10 regional context, and obviously the need to integrate
11 the work of the Governance Working Group, as it relates
12 to the development of the regional council concept and
13 the work that is coming out of Stewardship on this
14 particular topic.