
2 0 0 2

S O U T H E A S T W A T E R S H E D F O R U M

R O U N D T A B L E

Final Report

July 11-12, 2002
Renaissance Vinoy Resort & Golf Club
St. Petersburg, FL



SPONSORED BY THE
Southeast Watershed Forum

HOSTED BY THE
Tampa Bay Estuary Program
and
Florida Department of Environmental Protection

SOUTHEAST WATERSHED FORUM ROUNDTABLE

2002 Goals

1. To showcase the impact of growth and development on urban and rural watersheds.
2. To provide a multi-state forum for the discussion of interstate issues relating to the long term implications of water supply issues to the entire Southeast.
3. To showcase innovative institutional structures which have evolved throughout the region to address complex watershed management.
4. To build greater cooperation among tribes, federal, state and local agencies, community leaders, industry, agriculture and non-profit organizations to strengthen watershed protection efforts in the Southeast.
5. To strengthen state and regional watershed programs and partnerships by facilitating breakout sessions where participants can further discuss issues of concern and build broader public-private partnerships that cross traditional jurisdictional boundaries.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Thank You...

The Southeast Watershed Forum would like to thank the many participants who helped to make this Roundtable possible, in particular, **Tom Singleton** with the **Florida Department of Environmental Protection**, and **Dick Eckenrod**, Executive Director of the **Tampa Bay Estuary Program**. Their program ideas and speaker suggestions strengthened the Roundtable and provided success stories in watershed planning that can be replicated region-wide. They were key to securing additional financial sponsorship and reviewing the site for the Roundtable. Thank you for being such gracious hosts.

In addition, the Forum would like to thank the **Florida Forest Management Bureau**, **PBS&J** and **Tetra Tech** for their support of the Southeast Watershed Forum Roundtable, and the **federal agencies** which continue to encourage dialogue and collaboration between the public and private sectors through their support of this Roundtable, especially the **Southeast Natural Resource Leaders Group**.

	Page
2002 Goals	1
Thank You	1
Executive Summary	2
Photo Collage	4
Pre-Roundtable Workshops & Field Trip	6
Welcome	8
Luncheon Keynote Presentations & Southeast Natural Resource Leaders Group Watershed Award	10
Plenary Presentations	14
Survey of Public Attitudes on Interbasin Water Transfers	22
Appendices	27
Flip Chart Notes from Breakout Sessions	28
Evaluation	32
Attendees	35

“... (M)any communities have banded together in regional alliances to help advance the protection of their watersheds, and watershed issues, on a larger scale. The Southeast Watershed Forum serves as a model for advancing this type of approach. Since 1998, ... you have played a leading role in ensuring that the “local voice” is heard at the national level.”

Benjamin Grumbles, EPA

Building Regional Partnerships

Watershed leaders from across the Southeast attended the 2002 Southeast Watershed Forum Roundtable in Tampa, Florida on July 12. The Roundtable was hosted by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection and the Tampa Bay Estuary Program and focused on “Building Regional Partnerships for Watershed Protection.” Speakers highlighted efforts at balancing water supplies and water quality, a hallmark of the Tampa Bay area. The Savannah River Compact and Lake Gaston-Virginia Beach Interbasin transfer dispute were analyzed for future directions in interstate water management. And innovative local initiatives, like pollution trading, Growth Readiness, Clean Marina Programs, riparian restoration efforts and state-based roundtables provided numerous replicable programs for attendees to take back to their communities. Dr. Bill Graham from NASA’s Earth Science Applications Directorate at Stennis Space Center, rounded out the day with a presentation of new remote sensing tools that can assist in local, as well as regional water management. One of the exciting outcomes from the regional Roundtable has been the development of state and basin-based roundtables in Mississippi, Tennessee and Kentucky, which have involved many hundreds of additional stakeholders in local watershed protection programs.

Fostering Regional Dialogue

Small facilitated discussion groups at the Southeast Roundtable elicited feedback from attendees on ways to increase interstate and intra-state watershed cooperation and the need for a national versus regional watershed strategy. Participants highlighted the need for consistent state water standards and state planning cycles for interstate watersheds. Watershed groups need to play a role in regional planning

efforts. Financial incentives could encourage greater watershed-level planning and other incentives are needed to foster better cooperation among agencies and policymakers to avoid turf battles. Participants noted the need for better communication across the region and the importance of a neutral regional convener to foster collaboration.

Defining Watershed Strategies

Opinions were mixed on the preference for a federal versus regional versus state watershed strategy, but most participants felt that local watershed strategies needed to be supported at a state, regional and national level. While participants acknowledged a value in a “national” watershed ‘vision,” the real emphasis needed to be a “bottom-up” approach.

In defining the key elements that should be included in a regional or national watershed strategy, participants identified the need for states to better coordinate across political boundaries. The need for flexibility in approaches was stated frequently. And there is a continuing need for greater public awareness of watershed issues to get both public and political buy-in to solutions. Participants suggested a more holistic approach to watershed management that encompassed environmental protection, flood control and water supply. More incentives are needed for property owners to implement best management practices and adequate funding is needed to implement good watershed management.

The Role of the Forum

When asked what role, if any the Southeast Watershed Forum and Roundtable serve to facilitate watershed strategies, participants encouraged the Forum to serve as a resource (effective go-between) and clearinghouse for watershed programs and information and sharing local successes and failures. More education and relationship-building was

encouraged, especially at the local level, and among diverse stakeholder groups –to encourage cooperation beyond the traditional partnerships. The Forum should encourage wider participation in watershed initiatives and promote and coordinate participation in national watershed Forums and agencies in Washington.

Interbasin Water Transfer Survey

In addition to the facilitated breakout session, Roundtable attendees were surveyed for their attitudes on interbasin water transfers. Some highlights from the Interbasin Transfer Survey include the following responses:

- Fifty-five (55%) percent of respondents said that they would not agree to diverting water supplies from their community to another state, while 33% said they would agree to such diversions.
- Respondents feel that it is wrong build the infrastructure for interbasin transfers without first having a process to minimize water use. In addition, respondents felt that compensation should be offered communities and watersheds from which water is exported. There is also concern that large urban cities would bully rural areas fro water supplies.
- Forty-Four (44%) percent of respondents feel that the Southeast needs more effective mechanisms for addressing interstate water issues, while only 6% feel they have adequate mechanisms.
- Comments centered on the need for organizations with mediation and facilitation skills to play a bigger role in interstate water management discussions to avoid litigation and a court-determined future. There is also a defined need for regional planning commissions and for greater “dialogue” among federal, state and local agencies about their respective roles and responsibilities and need for greater coordination.
- Fifty-nine (59%) percent of respondents say that their community/state would NOT be effective in addressing an interbasin transfer of water to another state, and only 14% believe that their community/state would be effective.

Watershed Awards

Three outstanding success stories were honored with Watershed Leadership Awards from the **Southeast Natural Resource Leaders Group** at the Roundtable luncheon.

The Leaders Group is made up of the regional directors of all federal agencies located in the Southeast region, and they have an interest in promoting public-private initiatives that improve the health and quality of watersheds throughout the region.

Robert Wright, Executive Director of the Upper Cullasaja Watershed Association, from Highlands, NC won the *Community Watershed Leadership* for the impressive array of rainfall and the watershed runoff measurements, which will help develop a water budget as a basis for their long term watershed protection efforts.

Billy Turner, President & Cliff Arnett, Manager of the City of Columbus Water Works in Columbus, Georgia won the *Community Watershed Leadership Award*.

Columbus Water Works completed three programs that led to cost effective treatment technologies for combined sewer overflows; a collaborative assessment for watershed monitoring and modeling, and alternative approaches to source water assessment and protection of drinking water supplies.

Peggy Weaver, Manager of Ditto Landing Marina – Huntsville, Alabama won the *Corporate Watershed Leadership Award*. Ditto Landing Marina is one of the first marinas to receive “Clean Marina” designation which requires compliance with all local, state and federal laws and they have implemented a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan.

These award winners continue to demonstrate the power, creativity and innovation of watershed planning and protection efforts at the local level. They demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between environmental quality and economic prosperity. They reflect a commitment to preserving their water quality and quality of life. The Southeast Watershed Forum celebrates them, and the other “success stories” featured on the Roundtable program. They represent some of the hundreds of local watershed initiatives throughout the region, which provide us with inspiration and give us hope that we can make a difference in each of our own communities.

Roundtable 2002

Photo Collage



Left: Cliff Arnett and Billy Turner from Columbus, GA Water Works visit with EPA Region 4 Watershed Coordinator Marjan Peltier. (Center) 89% of attendees value the opportunity to network with other organizations and agencies.

Right: The heart of the roundtable is the facilitated discussions among the diverse attendees.



Below: Thirteen success stories were presented at the 2002 Roundtable. Always popular, the sessions provide innovative programs to replicate throughout the region. Larry Oldham, MS State University Extension discusses the formation of the Mississippi State Watershed Roundtable.



Right: The Southeast Watershed Roundtable has been called the most unique gathering of regional stakeholders. Eleanor Godwin, West Florida Regional Planning Council, State Senator Robert Waldrep, Jr. (SC) and Don Freeman, Cape Fear River Assembly (NC) discuss issues with other Roundtable participants.



Left: Bill Graham, from Stennis Space Center caps off the Roundtable with a presentation on Remote Sensing.



Right: Dick Eckenrod, Executive Director, Tampa Bay Estuary Program Speaks to the Roundtable about integrating water quality and supply.



Left: SENRLG Watershed Leadership Award winners. Far left and far right are EPA and CEQ presenters, center is Christine Olsenius, Executive Director SEWF. Left to right: Ben Grumbles, EPA, Bob Wright, Upper Cullasaja Watershed Assoc., Peggy Weaver, Ditto Landing Marina, Christine Olsenius, Southeast Watershed Forum, Billy Turner, Columbus GA Water Works, Cliff Arnett, Columbus, GA Water Works, Bill Leary, Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ).

Pre-Roundtable Workshops & Field Trip

How to Make Regional Planning Work: Case Studies in Successful Partnerships

Moderators - Richard Eckenrod, Executive Director, Tampa Bay Estuary Program

Tom Singleton, Environmental Consultant, Florida Dept of Environmental Protection

Tampa Bay's Watershed Management Process - Holly Greening, Senior Scientist, Tampa Bay Estuary Program

Securing Commitments for Action - Renu Khator, Acting Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, University of South Florida

The Tampa Bay Nitrogen Management Consortium – Greg Williams, Director, EHS Management Systems and Auditing, IMC Global

Suwannee River Water Quality Partnership - Kirk Webster, Director, Department of Water Resources, Suwannee River Water Management District

Best Management Practices - Jerry Joiner, Assistant State Conservationist, USDA-NRCS

Research Activities - George Hochmuth, Ph.D. North Florida Research & Education Ctr.

University of Florida, Inst. Of Food & Agricultural Sciences

The CARES Program and Industry Involvement in the Suwannee River Partnership – Frankie Hall, Assistant Director of Ag Policy, Florida Farm Bureau

In both urban and rural areas across the Southeast, states, cities, counties, farmers, watershed associations and others are looking for ways to leverage limited financial resources and technical assistance to address the many, complex water quality problems related to nonpoint source pollution. In doing so, many communities have found the need to reach beyond the traditional jurisdictional boundaries of city or county, business or government, to create broad-based and diverse partnerships.

Two outstanding case studies in such partnerships have been chosen for analysis in this workshop. They offer interesting examples of public-private partnerships and resource leveraging. The process of building these partnerships, the issues that united them, how resources were leveraged, and programmatic barriers overcome will all be explored and discussed in this workshop. The discussions will have relevance to communities throughout the region and should offer specific ideas to replicate.

The Tampa Bay Estuary Program and the Tampa Bay Nitrogen Management Consortium comprise one of the largest and most ambitious urban watershed restoration projects in the country. While efforts to restore Tampa Bay were begun in the late 1960's, it wasn't until the creation of the Tampa Bay National Estuary Program in 1991 that a community-based plan for restoration and protection of the Bay was developed. Three counties, three large cities and 9 smaller ones, numerous special interest groups and an array of regional, state and federal agencies participated. Together they defined measurable goals and specific actions to address water and sediment quality, bay habitats, fish and wildlife, oil spills and dredging. The bay Program's public-private partners signed a landmark agreement pledging their commitment to implementing the plan. To further address the issue of future nitrogen loading associated with population growth, the Estuary Program created the Nitrogen Management Consortium, a coalition of local and state agencies and key industry representatives, to "hold the line" on future nitrogen loading.

In 1997, the Suwannee River Partnership (Suwannee River Basin Nutrient Management Working Group) was established in response to the increased awareness of nitrate concentrations in ground water, springs, and drinking wells in the Suwannee River basin. The partnership is a coalition of state, federal, and regional agencies; local governments; and private industry representatives working together to reduce nitrate levels in surface waters and ground water. To date, 33 of 44 dairies and 75 of 141 poultry farms have developed waste management conservation plans and have started implementing Best Management Practices as a result of this partnership. The program will be fully implemented by 2008.

BENCHMARKING FOR SUCCESS: Strengthening Your Organization for the Long-Haul

Peter Lane, Institute For Conservation Leadership

Would you like to build a stronger, more effective organization? The details of building your capacity to attract new members and develop new leaders, and to be financially sound are essential but often elusive. Using the Institute for Conservation Leadership's "Benchmarking Workbook," participants in this workshop will learn about an organizational self-assessment and how to set goals that will help them build a sustainable organization. The workbook includes 46 benchmarks against which to gauge performance and 21 indicators that help organizations monitor their progress over time. Completing the practical, easy-to-use workbook is the first step in developing a shared understanding of organizational strengths and challenges, and prioritizing goals. Everyone will receive a copy of the benchmarking workbook. Groups are encouraged to send staff, board members, and/or other volunteer leaders. This workshop is part of the Institute's Freshwater Leadership Initiative and supported by the C.S. Mott Foundation.

Fort De Soto Field Trip

Planned by the Pinellas County Environmental Foundation
Field Guide – Jake Stower, Pinellas County Administrator

Fort De Soto Park is located on Mullet Key at the entrance to Tampa Bay. This historic site was once visited by Spanish explorers, served as a strategic fortification in the Civil and Spanish American Wars and is now listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The area offers white sand beaches, wildlife habitat, fishing, boating and nature trails. It is also the site of an ambitious watershed restoration partnership between Pinellas County Commissioners and the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation. Once a group of separate islands, the Park's main island was connected to the smaller islands by dredging and filling for two causeways that were developed in the 1960's. These roads reduced water circulation and negatively affected plants and animals within the back bays. To correct this, the County is in the process of restoring water circulation to the back bays to improve ecological health. An estimated 200 acres of sea grass will be enhanced and hard bottom habitat created. Join a tour of this project, led by the Pinellas County Environmental Foundation, for a first hand look at watershed restoration work on the bay.



Deborah Getzoff
Director

*Florida Department of
Environmental Protection,
Southwest District*

On behalf of Secretary Struhs, it is my pleasure to welcome you to

the 2002 Southeast Watershed Forum Roundtable.

The Department is pleased to be a sponsor and participant in the Southeast Watershed Forum Roundtable. We know that the conference provides an unique opportunity for a broad spectrum of watershed leaders from nine states, including Florida, to meet and share success stories in watershed protection, discuss ways to improve current programs and policies, and enhance public-private partnerships and state action plans.

Here in the Southwest District, we have been implementing the watershed approach for some time now with a staff of scientific professionals dedicated to the watershed management approach to environmental protection.

With the state's growth, and the increased interest in implementing new approaches to water conservation and source protection, the Southwest District recognizes the importance of Watershed Management, and we have combined our water quality biologists, GIS experts, and land management staff into a Watershed Management section. In addition, the Department is committed to working very closely with the region's stakeholders in the development of a variety of assessment initiatives that help us better understand how to address the current and future concerns of the region.

In order to pursue effective Watershed Protection, all interested stakeholders must have a voice, and I am privileged to serve as the Chair of the Tampa Bay Estuary Program, which has been highlighted in this program. The Tampa Bay Estuary Program (TBEP), which was created in 1991, is the primary public forum for coordinating

water quality restoration for Tampa Bay. The estuary program efficiently and effectively communicates with 2700 stakeholders in the Tampa Bay area via email and mailings.

We are especially pleased that the Tampa Bay region has been chosen as the site for this Roundtable, and we look forward to sharing ideas and success stories with the many participants from throughout the region.

E. D. "Sonny" Vergara
Executive Director

*Southwest Florida Water
Management District*

Good morning! I'm Sonny Vergara, Executive Director of the Southwest Florida Water

Management District, one of five water management districts covering the State of Florida.

Welcome to our little part of paradise, which includes nearly 4 million of Florida's 16 million residents, over 90 incorporated communities, 10,000 square miles, and all or part of 16 counties.

As you may know, Florida's comprehensive water management system is unique in this country if not the world. Our responsibilities to manage the water within our jurisdictions, which include flood control, water supply, protection of water quality and protection of natural systems, places us in touch with almost every aspect of the lives of our residents.

As such, our challenge is to sensibly and efficiently keep people dry, undamaged, without thirst and provide protection for the unique natural systems of this state that mean so much to the quality of our lives.

It also is my honor and pleasure to welcome you to the beautiful Renaissance Vinoy Hotel, here in beautiful St. Petersburg, Florida. St. Petersburg is located on the Pinellas peninsular, home to over 900,000 residents and some of the



best restaurants and beautiful beaches in the world.

I ask you, where would you find a more fitting place to hold the fifth annual Southeast Watershed Roundtable than in Pinellas County, Florida, where we can see the future of Florida in stark reality, where all food and water must be imported from somewhere else, where there are more people per square mile than any where else in Florida, and where Florida's seemingly inevitable urban fate has already arrived?

As you enjoy yourself here, like you can no where else in this country, ask yourself if this is truly what we want Florida, or, indeed, anywhere, to be like in the future. The Southwest Florida Water Management District includes 11 major watersheds where land uses range from intensely urban to intensely agricultural, and where the natural systems and natural functions of our watersheds are under full assault.

Population growth and land development are rampant and impacts are accumulating. Competition for water among agriculture, public suppliers, the power industry and others is ratcheting-up to new heights despite some historic and precedent-setting partnerships that were forged in this region and intended to avoid it.

We must seek new ideas for meeting the challenges that threaten our, and our children's quality of life.

Let me suggest that each of you take this as a personal challenge.

You are here to examine new ways of working together: to forge newer and stronger alliances and partnerships, to find and learn how the new digital technologies can help us manage the enormous deluge of information brought on by the electronic revolution, to know and understand more than we ever have about the synergistic relationships between water and all the living things that must have it in unspoiled and adequate quantities, and, to know and understand more than we ever have about water and how it affects, and is affected by, other things, such as, well-intended actions, unintended actions, and not very smart actions.

While participating in this conference, I hope you will be at once, fearless, ingenious, relentless, strong, and enduring in your quest for solutions to the ever increasing-ly complex problems we face as a society.

Please have a very successful conference!

Christine Olsenius Executive Director

Southeast Watershed Forum

Thank you, Deborah and Sonny for such a warm welcome. And thanks to the staff at the Florida Department of Environmental Protection and Tampa Bay Estuary Program, who have worked to host this Roundtable.

The Southeast Watershed Forum is a cooperative effort among agencies, organizations and industries to enhance local watershed initiatives. We do this by facilitating partnerships and sharing information and success stories; providing watershed training, convening stakeholders from throughout the region and giving voice to local issues and concerns to the state and federal agencies in Atlanta and Washington.

Roundtables are different than conferences, because you are invited to participate in a process. This morning we have an opportunity to hear about new initiatives going on around the region that can be implemented in your community. At lunch, we will celebrate our Watershed Leadership Award winners. After lunch, you'll have an opportunity to share your ideas, wisdom and feedback on ways to improve inter-state and intra-state cooperation on watershed and water quality protection. This is the heart of the Roundtable. People at the local, state and federal level listen to voices from these Roundtables.

After the breakout sessions, we'll reconvene here for our wrap-up presentation by Bill Graham from NASA's Stennis Space Center. He will discuss their new cooperative community program for state, local, tribal and regional government which uses remote sensing as a tool for local and regional water management.

Our greatest watershed challenges are not technical, they are social, political and economic.

Our water resources are defined by different boundaries than our political institutions and there-in lies the challenge.

We all talk partnerships, but we don't do them very well! That is why we showcased some truly successful ones at yesterday's workshop on Regional Planning and we will explore other success stories in our morning sessions.

The point of all this is to provide ideas, processes and inspiration for you to go back and create real working partnerships in your own community.

*Luncheon Keynote Presentations &
Southeast Natural Resource Leaders Group
Watershed Award*



William Leary
Council on Environmental
Quality

“My own dream is that we will have our federal agencies meet in watershed regions around the country not only to discuss their

priorities for the region, but to meet with watershed groups like yours in that region and partner on projects.”

— William Leary, CEQ

I'm very pleased to have been invited back to speak to the Southeast Watershed Forum. I'm particularly pleased to share the luncheon duties with my good friend Ben Grumbles. Ben's a star at EPA and someone you need to get to know because he actually dispenses technical assistance and money. All I have is advice.

Here you are bonded by a common cause and a common passion. A lot of people come to Washington looking for solutions to their problems and I can assure you that the Bush Administration supports what you are doing. But we are here today meeting about something that is grass-roots, down home – right where you live. We have no intention of dictating to you how to solve your problems. You are the key to the solution. You need to set the pace.

There are important ways that we can be helpful. But you know that as dedicated as you are to your cause, it won't work if you cannot convince your local farmers that this approach can help them make better choices on their farms.

It won't work if you can't convince local developers that they are better off knowing where the sensitive lands and waters are and how to protect them.

It won't work if you can't convince local officials that there is a difference between growth at all costs and growth that pays.

It won't work until we understand our watersheds, how

they work and what services their resources provide. It won't work until we can explain what THAT means to people who don't have the time and dedication you have.

As I look across the national landscape at the importance of your work, I think of the many water issues facing this country. It used to be that when people talked about watersheds, they were talking about nonpoint pollution and how to better assign responsibility for the pollution of our waters, now that the end of the pipe regulation has largely run its course.

But it's a lot more than that now, Water supply is becoming an increasing problem. Worldwide it's becoming a security issue. Here at home, we are facing heavy losses from flooding but perhaps even more from severe drought.

We're drawing down our aquifers and not really sure how much we have in the bank. We need to address water efficiency in agriculture and urban settings.

You are going to be at the vanguard of helping resolve these important issues. I'm told that there are over 6,000 local watershed efforts in this country. That translates to a lot of people just like you. You've got to start listening for and clapping to the same watershed drum beat. You've got to invite more people to get behind the drummer. If you want your movement to truly take wing, to reach a crescendo that inspires national debate and attention, you've got to get louder. You've got to broaden your reach.

We're listening to you in Washington. Ben is going to talk to you in a minute about the things EPA is doing to help and they are wonderful.

We're working with other agencies, like the Corps, USDA, Interior, FEMA, TVA, Commerce and others to see what they can do as well. I think they all recognize the value of the watershed approach, but many of their programs were created at a time when the focus was on something quite different.

We're working through the 130 recommendations from the National Watershed Forum held in 2001 and I am optimistic that we will be doing more and more this year. It will not be easy, as the federal ship is hard to turn.

We find, for example, that as many as 10 federal agencies can be involved in a simple rural water supply project that may be a small part of a particular watershed effort. But we too are looking for efficiencies in the way we deliver federal assistance and make regulatory decisions. We very much favor helping local communities solve their problems locally.

My own dream is that we will have our federal agencies meet in watershed regions around the country not only to discuss their priorities for the region, but to meet with watershed groups like yours in that region and partner on projects. You will help them fulfill their programs and missions and they will help you fulfill your project and goals through your regional forums.

Think of the closing scene at the end of that wonderful movie *Casablanca* when Humphrey Bogart and Claude Rains are walking out onto the rain and fog swept runway.

This is the beginning of a beautiful friendship. Let's do great things together.



Ben Grumbles
Assistant Administrator

US EPA Office of Water

Thank you. It is a pleasure to have this opportunity to recognize some of the extraordinary watershed efforts underway in this region. EPA has

been, and will continue to be, a strong supporter of both the Southeast Watershed Forum and the Roundtables; and our Region 4 office in Atlanta continues to be an active participant in the Southeast Natural Resource Leaders Group as well. I know EPA looks forward to continuing these fruitful partnerships in the coming years.

As you well know, Americans depend on clean water for drinking, clean beaches for swimming, and a healthy environment to support fish and other wildlife. Government working alone can not solve all of the problems facing the tens of thousands of rivers, lakes and bays in local communities. The good news is that many communities around the country have united to protect their watersheds, using approaches that make sense for their local area. Those

efforts have yielded inspiring results in many areas - cleaner beaches, restored fish and wildlife populations, and waterways that attract visitors, businesses and families.

In addition, many communities have banded together in regional alliances to help advance the protection of their watersheds, and watershed issues, on a larger scale. The Southeast Watershed Forum serves as a model for advancing this type of approach. Since 1998, when you launched one of the first multi-stakeholder "roundtables" to identify and communicate local watershed needs and issues to state and federal agencies, you have played a leading role in ensuring that the "local voice" is heard at the national level. Your vision led federal agencies to sponsor the development of 12 other regional roundtables across the country, and laid the groundwork for the first National Watershed Forum, held last year in Arlington, Virginia.

The National Watershed Forum was an unprecedented event which brought together a wide range of watershed leaders from throughout the country to discuss issues, programs, policies and practices that help or hinder local watershed protection efforts. Work is underway in many areas to follow up on the more than 100 recommendations that came from the Forum. For example, one of the Forum's key recommendations was to "Implement a national media campaign to highlight the importance of, and foster general awareness of, watershed issues." I mention this item in particular because of a recent exciting step forward in making this recommendation a reality.

In February of this year, EPA and the National Environmental Education & Training Foundation, along with a number of other public and private partners, launched the *Watersheds and TV Weather Reporting* pilot with a local TV station in the Washington, DC greater metropolitan area. The *Watersheds and TV Weather Reporting* project is an innovative approach that uses advanced on-air and on-line technology to promote watershed education. The project conveys watershed and water quality information to millions of television viewers, as well as to visitors to the television station's web site. A step toward expanding this campaign to the rest of the country occurred last month at the American Meteorological Society's national meeting. Approximately 200 weather reporters from across the country joined the EPA Administrator in training designed to enhance weather broadcasters' understanding of watersheds, the natural and

man-made forces that impact them, and how the watersheds, in turn, affect human, animal, and plant life. The training also demonstrated to broadcasters the “hows” and “whys” of bringing watershed information to their TV viewers. In her remarks to the audience, EPA Administrator Whitman encouraged the meteorologists to redefine their role as the station scientist - the person to turn to when environmental issues arise.

The National Watershed Forum was an important inspiration for this media effort. This is a striking example of the types of things you and your colleagues from across the country can help make happen when you band together to make your voices heard at the national level.

The Southeast Watershed Forum’s groundbreaking efforts continue at the regional level as well, through your commitment to providing training opportunities, such as the Train-the-Trainer Academy with the Center for Watershed Protection, showcasing success stories, encouraging interstate dialogue on watershed issues, and your hosting of the annual Southeast Watershed Forum Roundtables.

The Roundtable serves a unique and important niche in the southeast region. It provides valuable opportunities to its constituents to network with other organizations and agencies, to create and share new approaches to watershed protection, to clarify state and national programs, and to provide a better understanding of local watershed issues, needs and concerns to decision-makers at all levels. Your efforts to educate Roundtable attendees on critical programmatic and administrative issues such as TMDLs, the links between land use planning, water quality and quantity, and financing play a key role in the ability of the region’s local watershed groups to be effective and successful. This Roundtable’s focus on the impacts of growth and development on urban and rural watersheds, water supply, and innovative institutional structures for addressing watershed management continues in that same forward-looking vein.

I also would like to acknowledge the role of the Southeast Natural Resource Leaders Group in helping advance the protection of this region’s natural resources. The Leaders Group provides the type of collaboration and coordination among federal agencies that I think is critical to the federal government’s efforts to protect the natural environment and enhance its support for the watershed groups that are making a difference at the state and local

levels. The Leaders Group’s efforts to support and undertake cooperative resource management initiatives, promote partnership opportunities, better use limited federal resources, and educate the public on the importance of the region’s natural resources recognize that federal government action will be more effective when it is streamlined, coordinated, and inclusive.

Today’s awards ceremony, which is sponsored by the Leaders Group, is another example of the many ways the Leaders Group supports watershed efforts. In particular, this awards ceremony recognizes and promotes public-private initiatives that improve the health and quality of watersheds throughout the region. The award criteria used by the Leaders Group – innovation, beneficial value, measurability, educational value, and cooperation – are remarkably similar to the principles included in EPA’s new, proposed Watershed Initiative. This Initiative proposes to catalyze the types of efforts encouraged by this awards ceremony and the work of the Southeast Watershed Forum by investing \$20 million in grants for community-based watershed approaches. This new Watershed Initiative, if approved by Congress, will support specific protection, restoration and preservation efforts in up to 20 local watersheds across the nation, and support other local communities in their efforts to expand and improve existing protection measures with tools, training and technical assistance. To date, EPA has held a series of listening sessions and published a Federal Register Notice to gain public input on the design of the Initiative. We plan to publish a final Federal Register Notice sometime in August to solicit applications.

In closing, let me thank you again for the opportunity to join you today. It is always refreshing and energizing to get beyond the Beltway and see firsthand the hard work and dedication of local communities and groups committed to protecting their environment.

Presentation of Awards

The recipient of this year's Local Watershed Leadership Award is the Upper Cullasaja Watershed Association from Highlands, North Carolina. The Association receives this award for laying the monitoring groundwork to develop a 5-year water resources management plan for the Upper Cullasaja watershed. The plan will be used in public education programs and to work with local county and municipal governments to achieve better visibility and planning for the watershed's water supply and waste water treatment infrastructure. The Association also initiated a Highlands School student intern project to engage a high school student in helping process the data gathered as part of this project.

The recipient of this year's Community Watershed Leadership Award is the Columbus Water Works of Columbus, Georgia. The Columbus Water Works has completed three programs that focused on the Middle Chattahoochie River, and addressed national wet weather water quality and environmental infrastructure needs. The information collected through its efforts will be invaluable to the watershed stakeholders in planning growth and managing the environmental health of their communities. The information gathered may further serve in a pilot project demonstrating point source permitting on a watershed basis to achieve maximum results in a time-effective, cost-effective manner.

The recipient of this year's Corporate Watershed Leadership Award is the Ditto Landing Marina in Huntsville, Alabama. Ditto Landing is one of the first marinas to receive "Clean Marina" designation from the Tennessee Valley Authority's Clean Marina Initiative and the national Marine Environmental Education Foundation. In order to receive Clean Marina designation, a marina must meet not only all federal, state and local regulations related to marina management, but must implement recommended practices that minimize pollution and encourage boaters to become effective stewards of their water resources. Examples of Ditto Landing's commitment to environmental stewardship include its Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, and an Environmental Policy that is included with each boat storage agreement. Ditto Landing also provides numerous educational opportunities to boaters in the area.



Bob Wright, Executive Director, Upper Cullasaja Watershed Association accepting the Local Watershed Leadership Award.



Billy Turner, President (left) and Cliff Arnett (right) of Columbus (GA) Water Works accepting the award from Ben Grumbles.



Ben Grumbles, EPA, presents the Corporate Watershed Leadership Award to Peggy Weaver, Ditto Landing Marina

Integrating Water Quality Protection & Water Supply Conservation in the Tampa Bay Region

Dick Eckenrod, Executive Director of the Tampa Bay Estuary Program

Patty Anderson, Director of St. Petersburg Public Works Department

In February 1998, the Tampa Bay Estuary Program capped nearly six years of scientific research and community dialogue about the future of Tampa Bay with the signing of a landmark agreement that commits local governments and regulators to the bay's long-term restoration and protection. As part of the Agreement, signed by fifteen local governments and public agencies, the TBEP became an independent entity responsible for overseeing implementation of Charting the Course, the far-reaching management plan adopted for the bay in April 1997. The cornerstone of Charting the Course is the goal of capping nitrogen loadings to the bay to allow the recovery of more than 12,000 acres of critical seagrass habitat. To achieve the goal, the parties to the Interlocal Agreement formed a Nitrogen Management Consortium with key industry representatives to develop a specific plan of action. The Nitrogen Management Action Plan approved by the Consortium sets forth more than 100 projects which collectively exceeded the nitrogen management target by more than 60 percent.

St. Petersburg is a leader in water reuse. We have a large urban reuse system that has been in service since 1978, with over 290 miles of reclaimed water pipeline and over 10, 150 connections. The wastewater treatment plant capacity is 68.4 million gallons per day. The current annual average flow is 36.5 million gallons a day, and reclaimed water urban use is over 20 million gallons per day. Excess reclaimed water is deep well injected. There is no discharge to surface water. There are 9,538 residential users of reclaimed wastewater and 615 non-residential users including; six golf courses, 86 parks and playgrounds and 57

schools. Approximately 7,616 acres are irrigated. In 2000, 14.4 billion gallons of wastewater was treated in the reclaimed water system and 7.9 billion gallons of reclaimed water was pumped (54.9%). In 2001, 13.5 billion gallons of wastewater was treated and 7.8 billion gallons of reclaimed water was pumped (57.8%).

Reclaimed water consistently meets most Federal and State drinking water standards. Geochemical risk assessment provides reasonable assurance that all federal primary drinking water standards are met. Extensive monitoring is in place to demonstrate compliance with federal standards.

Mechanisms for Sharing Regional Water Supplies

Savannah River Compact:

An Interstate Compact for Fair Use

State Senator Robert Waldrep, Jr. – South Carolina
Scott MacGregor, V.P. Community Development -
Augusta, GA Metro Chamber of Commerce

The management of South Carolina's waters has been studied since the early 1980s. Governor Dick Riley established the Governor's State Water Law Review Committee, for example, for the purpose of making recommendations regarding interbasin transfers and the management of surface and ground water in the state. In 1989 the Strom Thurmond Institute of Clemson University published a study making specific recommendations regarding the Savannah River Basin. This study went to so far as to say that South Carolina should consider entering into a Compact with the state of Georgia for the protection of the Savannah River Basin, not just for supply, but also for the overall management of the Savannah River Basin watershed as a whole.

Based on these recommendations that are more than a decade old, I introduced legislation to create such a compact with the support of the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources Department. I believe South Carolina needs to have an equal hand in the management of the

Savannah River Basin with Georgia, and in my opinion, only a compact can offer this type of management. I envision such a commission having authority to manage water quantity and flow of the basin, and water quality, recreational use, hydroelectric power generation equally with our Georgia Counterparts.

Others have suggested simply relying on Memorandums of Agreement through our respective Department of Natural Resources and Department of Health and Environmental Control to manage the Basin, but such an approach, in my opinion, is piecemeal. It only looks at portions of the Basin, at one specific project for a single project or industry, for only the lifetime of the project. In order for the Basin to be protected, all uses of the Basin should be considered. Each use could be weighed perhaps by the value it provides the user—such as the industry, the real estate owner, the state, or the nearby recreational user. Based on these values, then Georgia and South Carolina through its compact could ensure through law that the agreed upon uses were adhered to.

As you may know Georgia and South Carolina have been working on a Savannah River Basin Study for several years now, that should be completed in the next couple of years at a cost of \$2 million dollars. The purpose of the study is to gather all of the historical uses of the Savannah River Basin in order for Georgia and South Carolina to determine how all of the users of the Basin may equitably have access, enjoyment and receive value from the Basin. Once the study is complete outlining all of the uses, who then will determine how to proceed with use of Basin and its resources in the future? And I don't mean who will determine use of the water for industrial expansion over the next twenty years or expanded hydroelectric power,—but for all uses that protect the interests of Georgia and South Carolina. Only a compact can protect the Basin for future generations.

It's been my experience in the South Carolina General Assembly that reforms occur in insurance policy, education, and environmental protection policy when the state experiences a crisis. Insurance rates are skyrocketing, so we create a free market. Our education achievement scores are frequently the lowest in the US, and protection of pristine areas in the state only occurs when a bulldozer is threatening to fill the wetland. What does that mean for the enthu-

siasm for South Carolina and Georgia to get together to form a compact?

For starters, we are facing a three and a half year drought that has certainly impacted our lake levels in the basin. The Savannah River Drought Committee, consisting of representatives from the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers - Savannah District, the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources, and the Georgia Environmental Protection Division – has projected that lake level will be slightly higher than Level Three drought stages for Lakes Thurmond and Hartwell through July, 2002. Lake Thurmond remains at 316 feet and Lake Hartwell is 646 feet. Since 1998 South Carolina's lake levels have declined 2-3 feet each year with last year's levels dropping more than 5 feet since July, 2001. Unfortunately, there is no expectation that conditions will improve in the near future. The Climate Prediction Center's forecast for June, July, and August calls for above-normal temperatures and only near-normal precipitation.

Georgia may continue to deny that Atlanta has its sights set on the Basin for its water, but Atlanta's recent overuse of water and problems with the Corps tell me they still have a thirst for an interbasin transfer. Georgia's Savannah Harbor expansion could certainly cause further salt-water intrusion and negatively impact the ecosystems of the Savannah River Basin. And in the long-term, I am worried about South Carolina's ability to ensure: 1) equitable use of the Lower Savannah River, 2) the river's assimilative capacity, and 3) the money trail to the Corps. How much is South Carolina paying for dams and our access to this information?

All of these issues scream "CRISIS" to me. However, all legislators or persons who don't use the Basin or its lakes regularly have not received the message. The drop in lake levels has not impacted their daily lives, so they may not see the value or the need for a compact to protect future interests in the Basin. The question of who is really managing the Basin leads me back to the notion that South Carolina and Georgia need to create one commission to manage all aspects of the River. So now that it seems there is a need at least on the part of South Carolina, the question is "How does Georgia feel about creating a compact?"

I've been in frequent contact with several legislators. In fact I just met with Representative Alan Powell this week to discuss how to proceed. Alan represents Hartwell, Georgia,

so he knows there is need for a compact. He sees his lake levels dropping, and he is quite aware that Georgia does continue to have an interest in an interbasin transfer. Moreover, there has been a shift in representation with the reapportionment process that has given Atlanta metropolitan area more power than it has ever had, so I would not be surprised if there is an effort to change the current law to allow for interbasin transfers. Right now they are not allowed.

Correspondence from Georgia's Director of the Department of Natural Resources, Harold Reheis, affirms that "there are no plans for any portion of metropolitan Atlanta to use water from the Savannah River." and that use of the River "for portions of metropolitan Atlanta does not make sense politically, economically, or environmentally." Nevertheless, you and I know that new laws are enacted every year to mirror the change in political, economic and environmental landscapes.

Creating an interstate compact between South Carolina and Georgia remains a high priority for me and a small minority in South Carolina. My job now is to continue to work with Georgia and to show them why it and how it will benefit Georgians not just South Carolinians. I am working on my message to them to ensure them that they may protect the riparian rights of Georgians and to ensure that they have equal value and access to the waters of the Basin.

Scott MacGregor focused on the difficulties of bringing together multiple stakeholders to create locally driven solutions to local and inter-state water allocation issues. He discussed roadblocks and possible solutions to issues that occur in large, diverse river basins, lacking resources and commonality of community. Scott emphasized the need for local leadership and participation in decisions affecting local water resources.

Lake Gaston (NC) –

Virginia Beach (VA) Interbasin Transfer Dispute

Marc Bernstein – NC Assistant Attorney General

Tom Brawner, Executive Director – Roanoke River Basin Association

Prior to the modern era of environmental law, interstate water allocation disputes were refereed by the U.S. Supreme Court as "equitable apportionment" actions. Warring States brought their claims directly to the high court and the Justices allocated the waters after taking into account the needs of each State for various purposes.

With the passage of such statutes as the Clean Water Act, the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA), and amendments to the Federal Power Act, various aspects of water allocation are now regulated more specifically and individually. This requires complex water allocation cases to be litigated piecemeal, which tends to increase risk for both parties and therefore may foster settlement. However, it also draws the parties' attention to the "trees" instead of the "forest." The Supreme Court has further raised the primacy of detailed federal litigation by generally requiring States to resolve all potentially dispositive causes of action before filing a traditional equitable apportionment case. Thus, parties are forced into a detail-oriented litigation posture that diverts their attention from holistic settlement opportunities that may creatively satisfy all of the States' needs.

In the Virginia Beach pipeline dispute, the federal court hearing the CZMA issues suggested that the parties submit to mediation. This pause in the litigation provided an opportunity for the parties to refocus. The mediation resulted in a comprehensive settlement. Unfortunately, unrelated political issues derailed the settlement.

The Roanoke River Basin Association (RRBA) opposed the Virginia Beach pipeline as well as the proposed 1995 settlement that was negotiated between the State of North Carolina and Virginia Beach.

RRBA viewed the pipeline controversy not as a fight between North Carolina and Virginia, but rather as a fight for the lifestyle and economic future of the Roanoke River Basin, which is largely rural and economically stressed, against the politically powerful urban areas of North Carolina and Virginia. RRBA's view is that a significant, but overlooked, aspect of the fight was the precedential

impact the interbasin transfer from the Roanoke River Basin would have on the riparian rights doctrine and on future efforts by out-of-basin communities to take water from the Roanoke River Basin. Ultimately, the Roanoke River Basin resisted Virginia Beach's efforts in order to protect the basin's waters against all of the politically powerful urban communities within pipeline reach of the Roanoke River Basin.

Even though the basin lost its fight against Virginia Beach, the basin established that it would fight zealously to preserve and retain its waters, even at great expense and against substantial odds. This, in and of itself, may dissuade other communities, such as the heavily populated areas of North Carolina, from seeking to take water from the Roanoke River Basin.

A properly formulated cooperative resolution of the dispute, whether by interstate compact or otherwise, could have benefited the Roanoke River Basin. The settlement proposed in 1995 in the Virginia Beach pipeline fight, however, would not have benefited the basin. Among other things, that settlement would have given Virginia Beach all of the water it was seeking, and would have allowed additional interbasin transfers to communities in North Carolina, all without sufficient mitigation compensation to the Roanoke River Basin. Neither RRBA nor any other entity representing the Roanoke River Basin itself was a party to the settlement negotiations. The State of North Carolina, a party to the proposed settlement, represents the populated urban areas of North Carolina more than it represents the sparsely populated North Carolina portions of the Roanoke River Basin. And the Commonwealth of Virginia chose to support the politically powerful Virginia Beach over the politically powerless Virginia portions of the Roanoke River Basin. Without the basin having a "seat at the table," no fair settlement could be reached.

If a controversy such as that between the Roanoke River Basin and Virginia Beach is to be settled, there are some guidelines that should be followed:

- (1) The interests of the river basin itself (as distinguished from the interests of the states in which the basin is located) must be represented in an open and fair process. In the Virginia Beach controversy, the basin was not represented in the settlement.
- (2) Settlement should occur early in the controversy, before

positions have hardened and substantial money has been spent in battle. By 1995, when the settlement was proposed in this case, hundreds of thousands of dollars had been spent and positions for and against the pipeline had hardened after almost 15 years of litigation.

- (3) Settlement should be based upon the true needs (and absence of reasonable alternatives) of the community seeking the water and adequate mitigation compensation for impacts on the source river basin and should consider the precedential impact of the settlement. Without this understanding, it will be difficult for the parties to reach a fair and informed settlement.
- (4) The parties should engage in settlement discussions without conceding their arguments. The proposed settlement in this case — wherein not only Virginia Beach, but also communities in North Carolina, were to receive interbasin water transfers from the Roanoke River Basin — was later used by Virginia Beach as an admission by North Carolina that the Virginia Beach withdrawal would not materially impact the Roanoke River Basin. In this way, the proposed settlement itself may even have been a key, though unstated, reason for the ruling by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission allowing the interbasin transfer.

Success Stories in Partnerships for Watershed Protection

Synopses from Concurrent Sessions

Session 1

Partnerships for Watershed Protection

Seven-State “Clean Marina Initiative” – Industry Partners for Watershed Protection

Regina McCoy – Watershed Stewardship Team, Tennessee Valley Authority

Peggy Weaver – Ditto Landing Marina, Huntsville, Alabama

The Tennessee Valley Clean Marina Initiative is a voluntary program developed by Tennessee Valley Authority and its watershed partners to provide information, resources, and support to marina owners and operators who are striving to preserve and protect the water quality of the Tennessee Valley. In order to receive Clean Marina designation a marina must meet not only all federal, state, and local regulations related to marina management, but must implement a number of recommended practices that minimize pollution and encourage boaters to become effective stewards of their water resources. Ditto Landing Marina is one of two marinas in the Tennessee Valley which have recently accomplished these high standards of marina management, and their achievements were officially recognized by TVA to a national audience attending the National Clean Boating Celebration, held June 22, 2002 in Chattanooga, Tennessee. Over 40 marinas throughout the Tennessee Valley are currently working toward Clean Marina designation.

Community Riparian Reforestation Partnership

H David Gabbard, P.E. – Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government

In 1992, Lexington, Kentucky, was a Phase I city that was required to file for an NPDES permit to address non-point source pollution from stormwater dis-

charges. The permit required the Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government (LFUCG) to assess the environmental damage to its water resources and develop urban stormwater pollution prevention programs using best management practices (BMPs) to the maximum extent practicable.

During the assessment of the urban watershed, the county found that floodplains had been filled and developed utilizing engineering designs that forced flow through narrower channels, altering and reducing aquatic habitat. Tree canopy over the streams had either been eliminated, or consisted of invasive bush honeysuckle. Because of the high phosphorus content of the soil, the concentrations of phosphorus in the stormwater runoff quickly triggered algal growth. However, anywhere there was tree canopy, the stream was void of algae. Lexington is situated on a hill. Six 11-digit HUCs (watersheds) drain from the central part of the city out to the county line. Because all urban streams are small headwater streams, the impacts of thermal pollution, heavy metals, and low dissolved oxygen have resulted in frequent fish kills and poor habitat.

The LFUCG Division of Engineering did not have a stormwater budget that would allow for large public works projects to address major riparian restoration programs. The solution was to create the “Reforest the Bluegrass” program in the spring of 1999. This program empowers citizens to protect their own water resources. By using citizens to plant the forests, there is a sense of ownership of the project and it educates and trains citizens why to plant trees to protect their properties along streams or “ditches.” “Reforest the Bluegrass” is a cooperative effort of the LFUCG Divisions of Engineering (Watershed Management), Parks and Recreation, and Planning (Urban Forestry). The success of the “Reforest the Bluegrass” program has been phenomenal! Since April 1999, 3,900 volunteers have been trained as urban watershed managers in seven different events. They have planted over 108,000 trees in 138 floodplain acres. The LFUCG has spent approximately \$85,000 of taxpayer dollars and \$50,000 has been raised via donations or grants. If the project had been contract out (as many first suggested), the project would have cost over \$650,000!

Session II

New State Initiatives

State-based Watershed Roundtables: Building Stakeholder Participation

Larry Oldham – MS State University Extension Service & MS Watershed Forum Coordinator

Mark LaSalle – MS State University, Coastal Research & Extension

Steve Goff – Basin Coordinator – Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality

Watershed Forums are cooperative efforts among agencies, industries, and organizations to enhance local watershed initiatives, communicate watershed news; and facilitate cooperation between the public and private sectors. One of the mechanisms for achieving these goals is through Roundtables which assemble disparate watershed stakeholders for dialogue, networking, and education.

Stakeholders representing various interests convened the Mississippi Watershed Forum Roundtable in September, 2001 with the hope of accomplishing three goals: 1) to provide an opportunity for dialogue and networking among agencies, organizations and industries; 2) to inform stakeholders about water issues that impact their quality of life, and 3) to enlarge the number and diversity of stakeholders participating in water management. Various watershed protection success stories from around the state were presented. Five watershed-based breakout sessions considered protection efforts working, or not working at the local level, needed improvements to current efforts, and future directions for the State.

Most participants thought the Roundtable had potential to change the way they operate. It was decided to hold a series of basin-level roundtables throughout 2002 to encourage greater dialogue and engage more local stakeholders in watershed management efforts. The first basin-level roundtable to be held was in Gulfport, where 175 citizens attended the Mississippi Coastal Basin Roundtable. In August, another 190 people attended the North Mississippi Watershed Forum Roundtable in Abbeville. These basin-level meetings have moved the watershed planning process closer to the local level and dramatically increased local par-

ticipation in the planning and implementation processes. Another statewide Roundtable is planned for 2003..

Steve Goff will discuss why the watershed management process is necessary to bridge the “span” between stakeholders and “moneyholders,” and the role that the Mississippi Watershed Roundtable played in that process.

TN Growth Readiness: Building Consensus for Watershed-Friendly Development

John Lamb, Planner – Blount County, Tennessee

The Tennessee Growth Readiness project focuses on water quality issues of land use and growth, particularly nonpoint source pollution. The project is designed to help local community decision makers learn how land use affects water quality, how new regulatory requirements may affect local actions, and how informed decisions can balance growth and water quality concerns. The project was funded by EPA and the Tennessee Department of Agriculture Nonpoint Source Program, and was supported in pilot development by the Tennessee Valley Authority, University of Tennessee Water Resource Research Center, University of Connecticut NEMO program, and the Center for Watershed Protection.

The program developed a set of nine power point presentations geared to different stakeholder groups like elected officials, developers, farmers and homeowners. The project developed leadership training modules and a toolkit of background information to support the presentations and other activities relating to water quality issues. The final element in the Tennessee Growth Readiness project is a community-based, consensus-building process that takes community leaders through an ordinance review to evaluate the effectiveness of current ordinances to protect water quality in the face of growth and development pressures.

The project had its start in the pilot communities of Maryville, Alcoa, Knox County and Blount County in Tennessee. The Tennessee Growth Readiness project became a part of the Blount County planning process. It was easily adaptable to local priorities and provided education components for the planning process, as well as baseline information for a variety of local audiences. The materials enhanced citizen participation in 22 workshops

throughout the county. The program can be used as a building block for future decision making processes, especially for mandated programs and provided ongoing education components for programs like Phase II Stormwater requirements. The Tennessee Growth Readiness project will be extended statewide in Spring of 2003 and offers a template that could be replicated in communities throughout the Southeast.

Pollution Trading Between Point & Nonpoint Sources in the City of Montgomery

Thomas "Buddy" Morgan, Gen. Manager – Water Works & Sewer Bd. Of Montgomery

The City of Montgomery has EPA approval to pilot an innovative program to use pollution trading among point and nonpoint sources to attain state and federal water quality goals. Many existing problems are not addressed through a "stovepipe approach." The non-profit Alabama Clean Water Partnership encompasses stakeholders from 10 basins and was developed to protect waterways currently meeting standards; to allow point and nonpoint contributors to work together to identify and prioritize problems, and to better address recurring nonpoint source loadings. A potential solution was water quality trading. EPA posted draft guidelines in Spring 2002, that allow the exchange of pollutant reduction credits between sources to meet regulatory objectives or water quality goals. This approach acts as a supplement to regulations, by working within the existing statutory and regulatory framework and encouraging the most cost effective pollutant reductions within a watershed.

Buyers pay or arrange for someone else to exceed obligations, and sellers exceed environmental obligations and benefit from it. Sellers create credits that may be sold, banked or retired. They can target the location of reductions to priority areas, and they provide broader environmental benefits such as improved habitat and recreation. Such a process can secure reductions in pollutants sooner to improve overall water quality, expanding the range of watershed improvement options. In addition, it offers economic benefits by generating market demand for new, innovative technologies.

The Clean Water Partnership offers a framework to ensure successful trading programs in Alabama. Trading must be stakeholder-managed. Active stakeholder participation will prevent backsliding from occurring under a trade. No one watershed has yet been targeted, but the site will be near Montgomery in the Alabama, Coosa or Tallapoosa River Basins. Stakeholders will guide the decisions. The program design will consider such questions as, who are the likely buyers and sellers; what is being traded; who is responsible/liable, and who evaluates performance. The pilot will have three phases: program design, demonstration, and full program. All phases will include education and outreach, development of the market infrastructure and trade implementation. This program offers the opportunity for watershed-based permitting which would bring point and nonpoint sources under a single permit to implement a TMDL or a trade. It also offers an opportunity for multi-credit trading, which could benefit multiple watershed issues like water quality, wetlands protection, air quality and habitat improvement.

Final Plenary Presentation

Remote Sensing – Tools to Assist in Local & Regional Water Resource Management

William Graham
NASA Earth Science Applications Directorate
Stennis Space Center

The Earth Science Applications Directorate is part of NASA's Earth Science Enterprise (ESE). The ESE is dedicated to understanding the total Earth system and the effects of natural and human-induced changes on the global environment.

Applications projects are organized along four theme areas: resource management, disaster management, community growth and infrastructure, and environmental assessment. NASA Headquarters' Office of Earth Science establishes program priorities; the Applications Division at NASA Headquarters conducts program planning and solic-

itations; and the Earth Science Applications Directorate at Stennis Space Center contracts with competitively selected partner organizations and implements the projects on which the partners work.

At its most basic, “remote sensing” merely means learning about an object without touching it. To scientists studying the Earth, remote sensing usually refers to a set of imaging technologies designed to collect information about features on the ground without being in direct contact with those features. NASA scientists use remote sensing tools to acquire detailed information about the Earth and other planets, the sun, the stars, and other features in our galaxy and in the universe at large. To gather remotely sensed data about the Earth, scientists mount special cameras, called sensors, onto satellites or aircraft. These sensors are flown over the areas of interest to collect reflective or emissive electromagnetic energy, or light. In many cases, these sensors detect and record information that isn’t visible to the human eye. Scientists analyze the image data recorded by the sensors to make maps of surface features, such as mountain ranges, water bodies, and road networks. Such maps are often used to answer questions about environment, natural resources, community growth, or natural disasters occurring here on Earth. For example, remotely

sensed imagery can be used to map forests, to detect pollution in our air or water, to measure elevation, to pinpoint a diseased section in a farmer’s crop, and to analyze weather patterns.

The Directorate has been assisting selected local, state, tribal and regional governments with the adoption and integration of remote-sensing technologies for purposes of water management and conservation, as well as development planning, growth and sprawl. Fifteen teams are involved in projects nationwide. Southeastern projects range from efforts to identify forest type, measure tree canopy and its change over time to identify and prioritize remaining critical forest land in northeast Georgia. In Kentucky, a program to develop baseline land cover maps with forest cover and urban land use is underway. In North Carolina, a project is underway to develop the methodology for mapping and characterizing the extent of impervious surfaces in the state. The GIS-based information will be used for planning and assessments on water quality, smart growth and water management. In the St. Johns River Water Management District, efforts are underway to map sea grasses by aerial photography for monitoring and improving water quality in Florida.

Survey of Public Attitudes on Interbasin Water Transfers

Would you agree to diverting water supplies from your community to another state?

33% Yes 55% No 10% Undecided or Maybe

If Yes, would you require any conditions on the export of water.

There should be mandatory and enforced water conservation. It's wrong to build the infrastructure for interbasin transfers without taking full measures to minimize water use. A plan must be present before there is a transfer. There should be some limitations on the quantity of the water exported, as well as the time frame for transfer and significant compensation should be offered to the community and watershed from which the water came. Strict conditions are necessary to preserve areas from which the water is taken and growth management practices should be used in areas where the water is transferred. Many feel that interbasin transfer should only take place within the same watershed.

If No, why would you not agree to the export of water from your community?

There are many environmental impacts and larger cities will bully rural areas. Instead of billions to build a pipeline, we should institute more stringent water conservation efforts; reuse wastewater where ever possible, and provide refunds to residents for buying water-saving appliances and implementing xeroscape landscaping. We should restructure water billing so that high water users pay more. Interbasin transfers have a huge potential to do wrong, even for the right reasons. The hydrologic integrity of a watershed is essential for its long term sustainability. We need to link growth to water supply. Live within your resource. If the resources will not support additional development, limit development to what it will support. More growth to water, not water to growth!

Do you feel the Southeast needs more effective mechanisms for addressing interstate water issues (both quantity and quality)?

44% Yes 6% No

What form should those mechanisms take?

There should be mandatory water conservation before transferring any water. We need technical assistance and personnel with mediation and facilitation skills. Mediation would be a starting point, but there need to be incentives that compel parties to reach solutions. We need more face-to-face agreements – memos of understanding or interstate compacts, With all the ongoing litigation, it is more likely the courts will determine our future! We need comprehensive multi-use management. There needs to be a dialogue among federal, state and local agencies that improves understanding of each other's roles and responsibilities and provides effective inter-agency coordination. We need sustainable regional planning commissions for the purpose of long term planning and water allocations based on projected needs while maintaining acceptable water quality. Federal funding should be directed to the Forum to look at and develop a mechanism.

How would you rate the effectiveness of your community/state in addressing an interbasin transfer of water to another state?

59% Not Effective 14% Effective
2% Very Effective 4% Not an Issue

Would you agree to diverting water supplies from your community to another state?

IF YES, would you require any conditions on the export of water.

- Water exports need to remain flexible. Water use is not a right and must be shared.

- If it could be justified ecologically.
- Mandatory and enforced water conservation. It's wrong to build the infrastructure and a waterflows without taking full measures to minimize water use.
- At a cost, purchase at the value rainwater and a cost for loss of use and/or some means to return treated wastewater/other water back to basin.
- Many of the communities adjacent to the watershed are rural and the areas wanting the water are urban centers. The communities will ultimately be limited for future growth.
- If there is vision for planning and future exploration, distribution and education on usage.
- A plan must be present before transfer.
- Only with appropriate agreements if all stockholders and a strong contract to oversee and monitor the process. All alternatives need to be exposed before interbasin transfers are made, especially where multiple states are concerned.
- Yes, maintenance of sufficient flow for in stream uses of future consumptive users, require water conservation to minimize quality of interbasin transfer.
- Only if you have exhausted all alternatives – recycling, etc.
- Yes, but only within a given watershed. That way you can avoid issues of cross watershed imports
- Limitations on export quantity, evaluation of alternatives and why they don't work; recompense of some form to the community's time frame/time limit on the withdrawal.
- Within same watershed or, if not, aggressive drought index and mitigation via payment of significant cash that is distributed up and down the source basin.
- 1. Scientific basis to establish surplus water availability. 2. Defined limits for both current w/o request and total max (ever) withdrawal qtys.
- Clear understand of lack of the water would impact each party and area. Continuous available data and information.
- Adequate growth management where the water will be used.

- Strict conditions are necessary to preserve areas from which water is taken.
- If it is the most ecologically beneficial and economical course factors.

IF NO, why would you not agree to the export of water from your community?

- Environmental impacts, larger cities will bully rural areas-the city people tend not to care about the lost to others.
- My community is already pulling water from as many places as they can (Atlanta). Being that I live in Atlanta we are more likely to need water than provide it. What I would love to see are more stringent water conservation efforts. Before we spend billions of dollars to build a pipeline I would rather have see the following:
 1. Reuse of wastewater where ever possible.
 2. Refund to residents that buy water saving appliances; put in xeroscape, etc.
 3. Restructure the way water billing is done so that high water users pay more; do away with a flat rate.
 4. Limits on industry water use.
 5. Etc.
 For a basin that is targeted for use of their water, they should require that the receiving community put in such measures. Hopefully this will reduce the chances that the receiving community will come back for more water.
- No, if it could not.
- Too valuable and resource.
- Water in Eastern watershed is central to environmental resources and will be the subject of increasing competition in each watershed-inter-basin transfers are not a solution.
- Interbasin transfers have a huge potential to the done wrong, even if it is for the right reasons. The hydrologic integrity of a watershed is essential for the long-term sustainability and the ecosystems move to that watershed.

- Need to link growth to supply.
 - Need the water locally to meet WQ standards.
 - Depletion of a central natural resource.
 - Political fireball.
 - Live within your resource. If the resources will not support additional development, limit development to what it will support.
 - Not reasonable – state Bd 7 too far away.
 - Local sources first – there are many options for communities in other basins.
 - I fundamentally disagree with this concept. These other innovative technologies that can be used before draining another state resources.
 - Interbasin transfers would open a Pandora's Box of ecological impacts that we presently could not anticipate.
 - Have no water to export, all our water comes from other communities in the state.
 - Because factors creating water shortage are not being addressed as the root cause – gets back to integrating carry capacity to growth management.
 - We need to develop and live with water budgets. If the resource is not available to some increasing populations or activities, we should accept the limitations and not manipulate natural systems – there are too many long-term consequences of manipulatory – there is a domino effect.
 - The Middle Chattahoochee River is a highly regulated river with nine run of the river impoundments. Power generation already restricts releases. Minimum flows are marginally maintenance.
 - I believe that each community should be responsible for managing/sustaining the resources within their our basin.
 - Uncontrolled development in parts of Florida and drought conditions for the past several years have greatly diminished surface water and ground water supplies. Florida can not afford to export water.
 - Because it induces irresponsibility by the “other” recipients of the water.
- More growth to water, not water to growth!
 - My community is a basin so I'm probably not who this is directed to. However, I think interbasin transfers only further “bad” watershed practice. To wit: We should use less water than what we have for any given area. (You can use this logic to supply to other areas of living as well). To wit: We must recognize that water is a non-renewable resource and treat it with greater care to protect resources for any given area. In short we must recognize our H2O capacity and act accordingly. To wit: If interbasin transfers are allowed then adjacent behaviors (road building development, etc.) to direct water consumption behaviors are ill managed.
 - Due to drought conditions, all water should stay. If transfer occurs, should return the water to the basin of origin.
 - Degradation of our watershed's ecosystem.
 - Down-Stream effects.

What form should those mechanisms take?

- Laws – local sources first, mandatory water conservation before transferring any water.
- Technical assistance and identification of personnel with mediation/facilitation experience particularly in water disputes.
- More federal dollars going to forum to look at and develop mechanism. Needs legal framework.
- Same forms as individuals deal with now in permitting-just larger scale.
- Comprehensive multi-use management.
- Need more information on effects of transfer from an ecological standpoint.
- A regional coalition of State and Federal entities.
- If reasonable minds would prevail, I believe face to face agreements could be reached. With all the litigation ongoing within environmental agenda (whether necessary or not), it is more likely the courts will dictate our future!
- There needs to be a dialogue between federal, state

and local agencies that improve understanding of each one's role and responsibility as well as coordination between groups.

- Memorandum of Understanding or Interstate compacts.
- Education – Recycling – Conservation
- Provide “how to” training/info on mediation.
- Education for politicians.
- Umbrella type committees.
- Partnerships and facilitated/mediated forums with lots of stakeholder involvement.
- Regional authorities based on watershed boundaries, rather than state lines.
- Collaborative but address the “root” cause of the shortage and identify the failure in the system that generate the “band aid” management approach (a.k.a. crisis mgmt.)
- Beats me – I’m new to the conversation.
- Sustainable regional planning commissions for the purpose of long term planning and allocation based on projected needs while maintaining acceptable water quality.
- After observing the AFC process/lack of progress,

I cannot come up with a solution. These issues are so complex. Mediation would be a starting point but there needs to be incentives that compel parties to reach solutions.

- Stay out of the courts for as long as possible. Local agencies and stakeholders need to research issues, including impact to ecosystems etc., to determine if water transport can be successful.
- Legally binding agreements.
- Should be locally driven, based on in-basin leadership with accompanying state level communication structure.
- Move toward all southeastern states using the same parameters for monitoring water quality!! There are many others but this would be a great start as it would help play a foundation for us to all speak about water in the same language.
- Better understanding of how declining water quality and quantity negatively impact the biological integrity of aquatic ecosystems.
- Better public information and education.

Appendices

Flip Chart Notes from Breakout Sessions

Evaluation

Attendees

Flip Chart Notes from Breakout Sessions

1 What is needed to increase intra-state and inter-state cooperation on watershed protection in your state and region?

More lawsuits that force the discussion leading to resolution

Involve permittees/private sector users (potentially affected parties) to focus –promote politically cooperative discussions

Translate issues to “real dollars” to focus attention & promote discussion

Dry-weather/wet-weather permits

Watershed permits

Base decisions on real science

Load trading – politics ahead of the science.

Must be determined site specifically.

Look at economic impacts pf “no action” –

Futures analysis

Communicate value of the resource more to the public – in terms they care about; and have the message come from “messenger” they can relate to and trust.

E.g. youth groups

Using regional approach in Question 3, define goals, designated uses – flows, quality criteria, etc. Source water – surface & groundwater recharge zones

While quantity, supply & quality are separate, very difficult to merge

Refine quantification of biological criteria, integrate in “assessments” with chemical criteria, then decide on status and goals for the waterbody.

Need to engage officials and the broader public in watershed efforts

More funding for NGO’s (at the watershed level) for base operational watershed efforts

More education on watershed concepts/approach- show-

case examples, good visual products-better understanding of what a watershed is.

Better coordination of activities by all agencies and groups

Incentives for watershed level efforts

Consistent state planning cycles for interstate watersheds

Consistent water quality standards for interstate waters

Visual tools to emphasize watersheds

Unfamiliarity with watersheds – more education

More watershed-focused meetings

Need to engage officials and the public (broader)

Incentives (\$) for watershed-level efforts

Patience, stay on course

Showcase examples – high quality, broad audience

Coordinated state planning cycles

Consistent water quality standards across state lines

Better coordination among federal, state and others (all parties)

Need more clarity on agency’s roles/responsibility

Better channels for pro-actively getting public input to agencies

Need bottom-up approach

Funding for NGO watershed partnerships base operational functions

Better understanding of issues by the “other side” (different states or different parts of state) areas of distrust

Determine areas of common interests

Increase watershed awareness to get public and political “buy-in”

Funding for initiative implementation

No more unfunded mandates

Clearly identify responsibility and hold those responsible

accountable – especially with multi-jurisdictional areas

Bring in the stakeholders at the very beginning – “bottom-up” rather than “top-down”

Figure out how to get better and more equal representation for watersheds

Creation of political entity for watersheds in SE that cross traditional boundaries and jurisdictions (Use virtual watershed before tackling real entity)

Community trust-building process needs to be implemented in order to create

Identification of the stakeholders is a process that is critically important and will determine the ultimate success

Watersheds need to be included as part of regional planning efforts (like MPO’s)

Better and more increased use of latest technology and data resources; awareness; education (visualization) and decision-making

Standardization of data among systems and jurisdictions

Defining “watershed” to local officials and others (i.e. everyone lives in a watershed – it’s not just the houses and the lake)

Quantify (in dollars) cost of doing/not doing watershed protection

Determine goal (don’t meet just for the sake of meeting)

Basin-wide organizations are needed in each basin

Accurate, unbiased research necessary for decision-making

Consistent ways of monitoring

Commonality regarding rules/regulations

Commitment of resources (i.e. data collection, organizational operations, communication) on a sustainable basis

Educating public to empower them to act (i.e. public informing/ motivating public officials to then act on their behalf

Incentives for agencies & policymakers to cooperate (avoid “turf”)

Environmental foresight process needed

Use analogy of “living within our means” when dis-

cussing water resources

Available data often not disseminated nor put in layman’s terms

Use local weathermen/women to get the word out

Maintaining integrity of watershed protection activities

Sustainable process/entity/mechanism needed to begin planning efforts across jurisdictional lines (“someone needs to be in charge”)

Need better communication across regions/states

Communication among the agencies involved – communication needs to be two-way

All stakeholders, not just agencies - Need a “catalyst” as a neutral convener

Technical and scientific understanding is critical – need to educate stakeholders on these issues at the beginning; Need agreement on the facts - Model can serve as a neutral convener if agreement to model.

Group that acts as an “honest broker” – technical and non-technical; not beholden to one group.

How \$ can be used- more flexibility for crossing political boundaries

Need a reorganized entity that can share \$\$ across state/political boundaries – federal grant availability to small watershed groups – how to facilitate? Need to be understandable.

Build a strong base at local levels - use existing groups framework at small scale, then build.

Build aspiration and values – develop goals (long term).

2 Delegates to the 2001 National Watershed Forum called for the creation of a national watershed strategy. Do you think there should be a national strategy? Do you think there should be a regional strategy?

National: Qualifies yes – “Promote the watershed approach.”

Region; No – need to proceed to watershed level

Regional	100%	National	91%
----------	------	----------	-----

National: Could cut through a lot of current multi-jurisdictional issues and barriers.

Serve as a generic (philosophy) statement for consistent watershed practices

Could be a conduit to funding if you meet the criteria

Watershed strategy should be consistent with other national strategies

DOWNSIDE; could be a deterrent to funding or efforts to smaller more localized efforts

Yes...if the strategy supports regional, basin and local efforts (funding, technical assistance, etc.) and

Yes...if all federal agencies fall under the strategy.

National: too broad, SE different than the West

Maybe need a National Vision?

The National Strategy is to support regional/local.

May be important to Feds, but not to local/regional.

Regional: No – need local strategy with regional and national support.

Same as for national; promote watershed awareness – technical support for local initiatives – report both success and failures.

3 What key components do you think should compose a regional and/or national watershed strategy?

NATIONAL:

Find impedances – air/waste/water are separate

No recognition of the need for states to coordinate

Tie watershed issues to land use and inter-agency communication

Within each agency, headquarters, region –

Communication must improve

Provide educational tools to local governments

Tie sub-watershed projects together to form watershed/basin/national goals, etc.

Use federal dollars as a hook to catalyze land use, growth planning at local level.

Highways/wetlands/agriculture/FERC/infrastructure...

Broad policy toward watershed approach

Flexibility

Allow/promote bottom-up effort

Continued implementation of various environmental programs/legislation

Watershed approach as a means of implementing specific programs

Comprehensive "benchmarks" for condition

Creation of political entity for watersheds in the SE that cross traditional boundaries and jurisdictions

Better and more increased use of latest technology and data resources, awareness, education and decision-making

Elements of public education and information dissemination must be low tech and high tech. High tech must be flexible, adaptable and understood by diverse populations.

Watershed Bill of Rights (water users and ecosystem Bill of Rights)

Use easily understood and resource-based indicators (specifically biological) for measuring success

Define base-level flow measurements and criteria (and re-charge areas – surface and groundwater areas)

National and regional strategy need to address and prioritize biological criteria and condition

Definition of region

Vision/goals

Demographics regarding water resources

Encompass environmental protection, flood control, water supply

Impervious surface limit for each basin (based on geology, hydrology, etc.)

Include conflict resolution process

Conservation goals (land and water)
Riparian buffer goals
Incentives for property owners to implement best management practices for watersheds
Rules for interbasin transfer of water/equity
Public education
Provide adequate funding for implementation
Each Federal agency should have a defined role.

REGIONAL Strategy

Region = River Basin-Smaller than the MS- Maybe 8-digit HUC Not EPA Region 4
“One” federal watershed voice
One-stop shopping for data, \$\$\$ (grants) and technical support. (Increase watershed assistance grants.)
Timing of monitoring/beyond the boundary
Consistent methodology
(for assessment, not what, just how)
Don't emphasize regulations
DO NOT: Fall into the 70's Basin Commissions mode;
Don't be overly prescriptive
Data collection only without use;
Top-down, No accountability
Start with designated uses
No regional policy
Strategy Element – LOCAL; be inclusive and keep trying to be so
Be flexible – talk about emerging issues as well as basic elements.
Promote awareness of critical issues and prioritize issues
Work on consensus basis if possible, but listen to all points of view.
Set ground rules – all opinions are valid
Define and prioritize issues – let stakeholders do this
Watershed Awareness

4 What role, if any, can the Southeast Watershed Forum and Roundtable serve to facilitate that regional and/or national strategy?

Take it back to the local level and educate-educate-educate, so the political power feeds the message to the national level.

Push bottom-up, grass roots

Continue to communicate what we want and need to Washington

Push down to local level decisions on “protected” allocation of infrastructure funds

Communication and education among diverse groups; beyond traditional partnerships

Sharing experiences/failures

Promote and coordinate participation in National Forums

Serve as a resource (i.e. effective “go-between”) and clearinghouse (communication and coordination)

Serve as a review body for final national strategy

Clearinghouse

Identify losers, as well as winners – what hasn't worked.

Address issues that watersheds hold in common – (low flow requirements, planning issues, fecal coliform, others) consensus on questions, next steps

Generate a database of projects addressing these issues.

Relationship building – facilitate cooperation/encourage wider participation in watersheds.

Southeast Watershed Forum Roundtable 2002

Evaluation

What purpose does the Roundtable serve for your organization or agency?

- 89% Gives me a chance to network with other organizations and agencies
- 59% Helps clarify state and national watershed programs
- 51% Gives me a better sense of local watershed needs/concerns/issues
- 70% Gives me new ideas for implementing watershed programs
- 49% Provides innovative programs that can be replicated in my city or watershed
- 11% Other _____
- ____ None

Do you feel the information, programs or networking at the Roundtable will change the way you do business in your community, organization or company?

- 57% Yes
- .05% No
- 38% Maybe Please explain: *See Notes page 29*

What do you like most about the Roundtable program? (check all that apply)

- 57% Training Workshops
- 84% Success Story Presentations
- 43% Facilitated Breakouts

Do the Training Workshops offer practical applications for addressing your city/agency/group watershed needs?

- 75% Yes
- .02% No
- 15% Not Applicable

How would you rate the effectiveness of your training workshop?

- Regional Planning:
0% Not Effective 59% Effective 41% Very Effective
- Benchmarking:
0% Not Effective 48% Effective 52% Very Effective
- Field Trip:
0% Not Effective 64% Effective 0 Very Effective

How would you rate the effectiveness of your afternoon breakout session?

- .5% Not Effective 43% Effective 30% Very Effective

What role would you like to see the Southeast Watershed Forum play in the region? Check all that apply.

- 85% Serve as a neutral forum/convener on regional water issues
- 80% Serve as a clearinghouse of watershed information
- 62% Provide continuing watershed training
- 77% Facilitate state-based watershed Roundtables
- 79% Enhance partnerships between state & federal agencies and local initiatives
- 56% Serve as an advocate for local watershed interests to state & federal agencies
- 31% Improve coordination of regional water issues (Give an example below.)
- .02% Other _____

How could the Southeast Watershed Forum Roundtable be improved? See Notes page 30

Should the Southeast Watershed Forum Roundtable be an annual event?

- 79% Yes 0% No 18% Biennial 0% Other

What purpose does the Roundtable serve for your organization or agency? Other:

- Present + discuss how youth can be an important part / membership of programs and teens focusing on watershed issues.
- Provides ideas for industrial solutions for site water quality problems that will affect our adjacent watershed (interstate)
- Helped me learn more about national & regional watershed issues.
- Provides information of the states of watershed work in other areas.
- Business Marketing.

Do you feel the information, programs or networking at the Roundtable will change the way you do business in your community, organization or company? Please explain:

- With the new programs and partnerships
- I plan to use the ICL's Benchmarking exercises to improve our internal organization. Generally, good ideas for partnerships that will probably find their way into our programs at some point.
- Provides ideas on how to do outreach from my position. Also, success stories provide insight to how I can address some issues in my work.
- Great ideas on how to replace SURI with an ongoing entity.
- Ideas may be implemented at a future date.
- I need to relay the information to my client. They are the ones that will do the implementing.
- More information, resources + contacts available, new ideas to at least consider.
- The session on Benchmarking for success will be a valuable tool for several organizations & entities I work with or provide financial/tech support.
- Some refinements.
- Everything begins with an individual-sharing / passion
- A way to talk to individuals who have experienced similar problems.
- Provides tools and tidbits for use in my program.

- Helps to validate much of our work 7 helps to inspire me.
- Depending on whether the scale will be appropriate to a federal facility.
- Ideas for a new or improved programs.
- New ideas for implementation.
- Network / CCL Benchmarking and marina information will address current needs.
- I'm a member of several watershed org. & many ideas from other partnerships will help.
- Georgia Power + Southern Company are heavily focused on working with communication to meet their needs while continuing to serve the electrical needs of GA + the southeast the. The roundtable is another means by which we continue to facilitate these needs.
- Ideas presented help focus (refocus) on what works
- Introduction to how partners, especially from shared watersheds of neighboring states.
- I will try to use some of the ideas and programs to enhance watershed activities in the area I work in.
- The overall format of the Roundtable and many of the bits of wisdom passed on w/ be used by our SWFWMD CWM effort in the future.
- Can provide new ideas for putting together stockholder involvement programs.
- Provides mediation + confidence to initiate plans that have worked elsewhere
- I always gain new perspectives from meeting like this.
- Will propose novel initiatives demonstrated at the Roundtable.
- Our organization is new and we've organized ourselves accordingly to all the "right" tenants. Now we need to implement our plans.
- Most programs discussed focus on areas driven by major problems or issues. The issues in my area are less focused with many active groups.
- The idea of including stakeholders to formulate goals.
- Conference was just a sampling – a bit too short – quality of presentations varied quite a bit.
- The Benchmark workshop will help focus our mission and vision.

- Providing possibility of different approaches as detailed by some participants.
- Good ideas, now can we translate into action?
- We don't have much to change yet, our organization is new and we've organized ourselves accordingly to all the "right" tenants. Now we need to implement our plans.

What role would you like to see the Southeast Watershed Forum play in the region? Other:

- Interact with other U.S. watershed forums + select international forums or related-initiatives (e.g. MAB Program).
- Facilitate multi agency/state/regional water management
- Promote basin wide organizations.
- Assist as a source w/ youth development-education
- Presentations
- Be the org that communicates local/regional issues / recommendation to the federal level.

How could the Southeast Watershed Forum Roundtable be improved?

- Something more interactive in the morning.
- Greater visibility in the region.
- More Q+A on specific projects
- More local government (mayors, co executives, chamber).
- More training on water quality issue/TMDLs/ technical resources.
- More interaction opportunities.
- Allow more time in sessions on success stories or increase rooms allocated with fewer presentations-Great Programs out there!! Web Site please.
- More success stories.
- It was excellent.
- Web site!!
- Get more local officials & diverse groups.
- Advertise better so more federal & state as well as local & industrial entities could participate.
- Great speakers + location – few changes needed.
- Make 2-3 days in length – more examples.
- End conference on noon Friday... hard to get home in

reasonable time on Friday evening.

- Expand invitees to include local politicians – especially in rural counties
- The Forum Roundtable could be very helpful as the facilitators in addressing a regional strategy on water issues.
- Allow contributed posters to the program for programs to showcase their success + in some cases, failures.
- More into an watershed assessment + monitoring tools and access to him like remote sensing / advanced GIS.
- Help compile research and studies past and present.
- Get more people to come to meeting. Invite folks from American Fisheries Society and National Lake Management Society.
- Identify one or two issues of importance and monitor progress for next time.
- A more intense 2-day conference.
- Give more time for participant discussions related to presentations.
- More case study examples.
- Each speaker should submit a summary or outline of his/her presentation – it should be placed in the notebook.
- Go to a full two-day session.
- Add more participants from other stakeholder groups, ex-elected officials.
- Provide some time for every entity present to share information and/or better yet produce a document (Who, what, where – paragraph 1, Challenges it currently faces – paragraph 2) with one or two paragraphs about each entity and distribute it ahead of time to facilitate networking. There are so many people here I'd like an opportunity to figure out who I should make sure I meet!

Should the Southeast Watershed Forum Roundtable be an annual event?

- But consider that there might be disadvantages to repeated "invitation only" format. Discourages novices + other from coming. No – makes it impossible.
- Encourage states to have roundtable.

Roundtable 2002

Attendees

John Abendroth
Environmental Consultant
Florida Dept. of Environ. Protection
2600 Blairstone Road - TT
Tallahassee, FL 32399
Ph: 850-488-5509 Fax: 850-921-5217
john.abendroth@dep.state.fl.us

Patricia Anderson
Director, Public Utilities
City of St. Petersburg
1635 3rd Avenue
St. Petersburg, FL 33713
Ph: 727-892-5600 Fax: 727-823-9152
pjanders@stpete.org

Donald Anderson
Water Quality Specialist
Tennessee Valley Authority
1101 Market St., PSC 1X
Chattanooga, TN 37402-2801
Ph: Fax:

Elie Araj
Seniro Vice President
Berryman & Henigar, Inc
1412 Tech Blvd.
Tampa, FL 33619
Ph: 813-623-2230 Fax: 813-623-2110
araj@bhiinc.com

Mahshid Arasteh
Public Works Administrator
City of Clearwater
P. O. Box 4748
Clearwater, FL 33758-4748
Ph: 727-562-4783 Fax: 727-562-4755
marasteh@clearwater-fl.com

Cliff Arnett
City of Columbus Water Works
1421 Veterans Parkway
Columbus, GA 31901
Ph: 706-649-3455 Fax:
carnett@cwvga.org

Beverly Banister
Acting Director, Water Management
Division
U. S. EPA - Region IV

61 Forsyth Street, S.W.
Atlanta, GA 30303
Ph: Fax:

Chip Bentley
Appalachian Council of Governments
P. O. Drawer 6668
Greenville, SC 29606
Ph: 864-242-9733 Fax: 864-242-6957

Suzi Wilkins Berl
River Network
12 Creekside Way
Asheville, NC 28804
Ph: 828-250-0017 Fax: 828-250-0017
ennalls@att.net

Marc Bernstein
Assist. Attorney General
NC Dept. of Justice
P. O. Box 629
Raleigh, NC 27602-0629
Ph: 919-716-6400 Fax: 919-716-6767
mbern@mail.jus.state.nc.us

Gary Boring
New River Highlands RC&D
100 USDA Drive #F
Wytheville, VA 24382-5133
Ph: 540-228-2879 Fax: 540-228-2879

Tom Brawner
Roanoke River Basin Association
P. O. Box 27
Gasburg, VA 23857
Ph: 336-294-0744 Fax: 336-294-9313
tbrawner@mindspring.com

Kevin Brice
Director, Southeast Program
Land Trust Alliance
711 Iredell St.
Durham, NC 27705
Ph: 919-286-9260 Fax: 919-286-1560
kbrice@lta.org

Susan Brookman
Secretary
SW Florida Watershed Council
18060 Otter Water Way

Alva, FL 33920
Ph: 239-694-7572 Fax: 239-694-7572
sbrookperson@earthlink.net

Moris Cabezes, PhD
Technical Manager
PBSJ
5300 W. Cypress St. #300
Tampa, FL 33607
Ph: 813-282-7275 Fax: 813-281-0954
mcabezes@pbsj.com

John Cassani
SW Florida Watershed Council
14370 Orange River Road
Fort Myers, FL 33905
Ph: 239-694-5844 Fax:
jcassani@peganet.com

Jenifer Christman
Corporate Communications/Forestry
International Paper
6400 Poplar Ave., Tower 1
Memphis, TN 38197
Ph: 901-419-4010 Fax: 901-419-4088
jenifer.christman@ipaper.com

William Davis
Director, Dept. of Envir. Mgmt.
Pinellas County
512 S. Fort Harrison Ave.
Clearwater, FL 33756
Ph: 727-464-4761 Fax: 727-464-3174
wdavis@co.pinellas.fl.us

Dodd Dixon
Mayor
City of Winchester-City Hall
32 Wall Street
Winchester, KY 40391
Ph: Fax:

Clark Dorman
Coordinator
Salt River Basin
557 Tanglewood Drive
Taylorsville, KY 40071
Ph: 502-477-5687 Fax: 502-477-5687
cdorman@uky.edu

Rick Durbrow
US EPA Region 4
Planning Branch
60 Forsyth Street SW
Atlanta, GA 30303
Ph: Fax:

Richard Eckenrod
Executive Director
Tampa Bay Estuary Program
100 8th Avenue SE
St. Petersburg, FL 33701
Ph: 727-893-2765 Fax: 727-893-2767
reckenrod@tbep.org

Danny Ellis
Office of Surface Mining
530 Gay St., Suite 500
Knoxville, TN 37902
Ph: Fax:

Robert Fairbank
Wolf River Conservation Society
P. O. Box 447
Pass Christian, MS 39571-0447
Ph: Fax:

Margo Farnsworth
Cumberland River Compact
P. O. Box 41721
Nashville, TN 37204
Ph: Fax:

Clell Ford
Lakes Manager
Highlands Cty Natural Resources Dept.
4505 George Blvd.
Sebring, FL 33875
Ph: 863-402-6545 Fax: 863-385-7028
cford@bcc.co.highlands.fl.us

Tom Forsythe
Jackson Purchase RC&D Foundation
1702 Park Avenue
Benton, KY 42025
Ph: 410-436-8958 Fax: 410-436-7442

Nancy Forsythe
Jackson Purchase RC&D Foundation
1702 Park Avenue
Benton, KY 42025
Ph: 410-569-6629 Fax:

Don Freeman
Cape Fear River Assembly

P. O. Box 1089
Fayetteville, NC 28302
Ph: 910-223-4920 Fax: 910-486-9057
cfra@faynet.com

Lynn French
Environmental Specialist
Florida Power & Light
19050 State Road 62
Parrish, FL 34219
Ph: 941-776-5269 Fax: 941-776-5219
Lynn-French@fpl.com

Pasquale Fricano
Environmental Consultant
Florida Dept. of Environ. Protection
2600 Blairstone Road - TT
Tallahassee, FL 32399
Ph: 850-488-5509 Fax: 850-921-5217
pat.fricano@dep.state.fl.us

H. David Gabbard
Lexington-Fayette Urban County Gov.
200 E. Main St.- 8th Floor
Lexington, KY 40507
Ph: 859-258-3410 Fax: 859-258-3458
davidg@lfucg.com

Chris Garovich
County Technical Services
University of Tennessee
25 West Board, Suite 9
Cookeville, TN 38501
Ph: Fax:

Richard Garrity, PhD
Executive Director
Envir. Protection Div. of Hillsborough Cty
1900 9th Avenue
Tampa, FL 33605
Ph: 813-272-5960 Fax: 813-272-5157
garrityr@cpchc.org

Deborah Getzoff
Director, Southwest District
Florida Dept. of Environ. Protection
3804 Coconut Palm Drive
Tampa, FL 33619
Ph: 813-744-6100 x352 Fax:

Eleanor Godwin
Regional Planner
West Florida Regional Planning Council
P. O. Box 9759
Pensacola, FL 32513-9759

Ph: 850-595-8910 x223 Fax: 850-595-8967
godwine@wfrpc.dst.fl.us

Steve Goff
Basin Coordinator
MS Dept. of Environmental Quality
P. O. Box 10385
Jackson, MS 39289
Ph: 601-961-5238 Fax: 601-961-5357
steve_goff@deq.state.ms.us

Marykatherine Gonzalez
Office of Surface Mining
1951 Constitution Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20240
Ph: 202-208-2585 Fax: 202-219-0239
mgonzale@osmre.gov

William Graham
NASA Earth Science Applications
Building 1100- Mail Code MA00
Stennis Space Center, MS 39529
Ph: 228-688-1889 Fax: 228-688-7455
William.Graham@ssc.nasa.gov

Holly Greening
Senior Scientist
Tampa Bay Estuary Program
100 8th Avenue SE
St. Petersburg, FL 33701
Ph: 727-893-2765 Fax: 727-893-2767
hgreening@tbep.org

James Griffin
Environmental Scientist
SWFWMD
2379 Broad Street
Brookville, FL 34604-6899
Ph: 800-423-1476 Fax: 352-797-5806
jum.griffin@swfwmd.state.fl.us

Elliott Grosh
Seniro Vice President
PBS&J
5300 Cypress St., Suite 300
Tampa, FL 33607
Ph: 813-282-7275 Fax: 813-281-0954
elgrosh@pbsj.com

Benjamin Grumbles
Deputy Assist. Admin.-Office of Water
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave, NW-4101M
Washington, DC 20460
Ph: 202-564-5700 Fax: 202-564-0488

grumbles.benjamin@epa.gov

Blake Guillory

Division Manager
PBS&J
2001 N.W. 107th Ave.
Miami, FL 33172
Ph: 305-514-3528 Fax: 305-594-9574
13994@pbsj.com

Frankie Hall

Assist. Director of Ag Policy
FL Farm Bureau Federation
Ph: Fax:

Michael Harvey

Environmental Specialist
Mississippi Power Company
P. O. Box 4079
Gulfport, MS 39502-4079
Ph: 228-865-5020 Fax: 228-865-5085
mrharvey@southernco.com

Richard Harvey

U.S. EPA
400 No. Congress Avenue
West Palm Beach, FL 33401
Ph: Fax:

Richard Hicks

Florida Dept. of Environmental Quality
2600 Blairstone Road
Tallahassee, FL 32399
Ph: Fax:

Jamie Higgins

Army Southern Reg. Environmental Office
Centennial Towers
101 Marietta Street, NW #3120
Atlanta, GA 30303
Ph: Fax:
jhiggins@sreo.army.mil

Linda Hixon

North Chickamauga Creek Conservancy
Two Northgate Park, #411
Chattanooga, TN 37415
Ph: 423-870-8575 Fax: 423-870-8579
lkhixon@bellsouth.net

George Hochmuth, PhD

Director, No. FL Research & Education Ctr
University of Florida
Ph: Fax:

B. Terry Johnson
Planning Manager
SWFWMD
2379 Broad Street
Brooksville, FL 34604
Ph: 352-796-7211 x4408 Fax: 352-754-6749
terry.johnson@swfwmd.state.fl.us

Jerry Joiner

Assist. State Conservationist
USDA-NRCS
2614 N.W. 43rd Street
Gainesville, FL 32606
Ph: 352-338-9508 Fax: 352-338-9574
jerry.joiner@fl.usda.gov

Mike Jones

Alabama Dept. of Environ. Management
1400 Coliseum Blvd.
Montgomery, AL 36110
Ph: Fax:

Terry Joseph

Director, Comprehensive Planning
West Florida Regional Planning Council
P. O. Box 9759
Pensacola, FL 32513-9759
Ph: 850-595-8910 x206 Fax: 850-595-8967
joseph@wfrpc.dst.fl.us

Anne Keller

St. Johns River Navigator
1733 Heatherwood Road
Jacksonville, FL 32259
Ph: 706-355-8767 Fax: 561-818-6119(cell)
keller.anne@epa.gov

Renu Khator, PhD

Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences
University of South Florida
Tampa, FL
Ph: Fax:

Mel Klein

Florida Power & Light
P. O. Box 1119
Sarasota, FL 34230
Ph: 941-316-6399 Fax: 941-316-7104
mel_klein@fpl.com

Charles Kovach

Environmental Manager
Florida Dept. of Environ. Protection
3804 Coconut Palm Drive
Tampa, FL 33619

Ph: 813-744-6100x.329 Fax: 813-740-3906
charles.kovach@dep.state.fl.us

Janet Kovach

SWFWMD
2379 Broad Street
Brooksville, FL 34604
Ph: 352-796-7211 x4610
Fax: 352-754-6874
jkovach@cfifl.com

Craig Kovach

Superintendent, Environmental Affairs
CF Industries, Inc.
P. O. Box 1480
Bartow, FL 33831
Ph: 863-533-3181 Fax: 863-534-1841
ckovach@cfifl.com

Peter Lane

Institute For Conservation Leadership
6930 Carroll Ave., Suite #420
Takoma Park, MD 20912
Ph: 301-270-2900 Fax: 301-270-0610
peter@icl.org

William Leary

Associate Director for Natural Resources
Council on Environmental Quality
360 Old Executive Office Bldg.
Washington, DC 20501
Ph: 202-395-5750 Fax:

John Lamb, Planner

Blount County Planning Department
327 Court Street
Maryville, TN 37804
Ph: 865-273-5750 Fax: 865-273-5705
planning@mail.blount.state.tn.us

Scott MacGregor

V.P. for Community Development
Augusta Metro Chamber of Commerce
P. O. Box 1837
Augusta, GA 30903
Ph: 706-821-1314 Fax:
smacgregor@augusta.com

Gale Martin

MS Soil & Water Conservation
Commission
P. O. Box 23005
Jackson, MS 39225
Ph: Fax:

Regina McCoy
Watershed Specialist
Tennessee Valley Authority
P. O. Box 1010, SB 1M
Muscle Shoals, AL 35662-1010
Ph: 256-386-3550 Fax: 256-386-2559
rlmccoy@tva.gov

Cece McKiernan
Environmental Administrator
Florida Dept. of Environ. Protection
3804 Coconut Palm Drive
Tampa, FL 33619
Ph: 813-744-6100 x364 Fax: 813-740-3906
cece.mckiernan@dep.state.fl.us

Gene Medley
City of Lakeland Public Works
407 Fairway Avenue
Lakeland, FL 33801
Ph: 941-603-6307 Fax: 941-603-6307

Vicky Mitchell
Facilitator
Tennessee River Basin CWP
4511 US Highway 31 South
Decatur, AL 35603
Ph: 256-353-6146 Fax: 256-355-8285
sobroke@aol.com

James Moore, III
Chief, Office of Education & Outreach
Alabama Dept. of Environ. Management
1400 Coliseum Blvd.
Montgomery, AL 36110
Ph: 334-394-4359 Fax:

Thomas Morgan
General Manager
Water Works & Sewer Bd. of the City of
Montgomery
22 Bibb Street
Montgomery, AL 36104
Ph: 334-206-3400 Fax:

Bruce Morton
West Atlanta Watershed Alliance
2146 Bollingbrook Dr.
Atlanta, GA 30311
Ph: 404-752-6056 Fax:
bnpeace@earthlink.net

Allison Newell, Coordinator
Alabama Clean Water Partnership
229 Old Jasmine Hill Road

Wetumpka, AL 36093
Ph: 334-514-8326 Fax: 334-514-8325
ARNAWWA@aol.com

Carla Norwood
Director
Little Tennessee Watershed Assoc.
197 Thomas Heights Road
Franklin, TN
Ph: 828-369-6402 Fax:
ltwa@dnet.net

Larry Oldham
Depart. of Plant & Soil Services
Mississippi State Univ. Extension
Mississippi State Univ., Mail Drop 9555
Mississippi State, MS 39762
Ph: 662-325-2311 Fax: 662-325-8742
loldham@pss.msstate.edu

Christine Olsenius
Southeast Watershed Forum
435 Powell Drive
Annapolis, MD 21401
Ph: 410-849-2975 Fax: 410-849-2976

Marjan Peltier
Water Planning Coordinator
U.S. EPA Region 4
61 Forsyth St., SW
Atlanta, GA 30303
Ph: 404-562-9420 Fax:
peltier.marjan@epa.gov

Judy Peterson
Kentucky Waterways Alliance
854 Horton Lane
Munfordville, KY 42765
Ph: 502-524-1774 Fax: Same

Elizabeth Ross
Tennessee Environmental Council
One Vantage Way, Suite A-105
Nashville, TN 37828
Ph: 615-248-6500 Fax: 615-248-6545
elizabeth@tectn.org

Cynthia Sarthou
Gulf Restoration Network
P. O. Box 2245
New Orleans, LA 70176
Ph: Fax: 504-525-0833

Andy Squires
Division Administrator

Pinellas County Dept of Envir. Mgmt
300 So. Garden Avenue
Clearwater, FL 33756
Ph: 727-464-4425 Fax: 727-464-4406
asquires@co.pinellas.fl.us

Geri Spring
2001 Wisteria
Hixson, TN 37343
Ph: 423-843-3001 Fax: 423-843-3009
gerispring@aol.com

Jake Stower
Administrator
Pinellas County
300 So. Garden Avenue
Clearwater, FL
Ph: Fax:

Candance Stoughton
Upper Etowah River Alliance
341 E. Main St.
Canton, GA 30114
Ph: Fax:
cstoughton@tnc.org

Billy Turner
President
Columbus Water Works
1421 Veterans Parkway
Columbus, GA 31901
Ph: Fax:

Robert Waldrep, Jr.
State Senator
Gressette Senate Office Building
P. O. Box 142
Columbia, SC 29202
Ph: 803-212-6230 Fax: 803-212-6299

E. D. "Sonny" Vergara
Executive Director
SW Florida Water Managemt. Dist.
2379 Broad Street
Brookville, FL 34604
Ph: 352-796-7211 Fax: 352-754-6874

Kirk Webster
Suwannee River Water Mangt. District
9225 County Road 49
Live Oak, FL 32060

Peggy Weaver
General Manager
Ditto Landing Marina

P. O. Box 14250
Huntsville, AL 35815
Ph: 256-882-1057 Fax: 256-880-7620
ditto@hiwaay.net

Dr. Dehlia Rae Wilkinson

4-H Specialist
MS State Univ. Extension Service
Box 9641
Mississippi State, MS 39762
Ph: 662-325-3350 Fax: 662-325-5207
raew@ext.msstate.edu

Burns Wetherington

Senior Environmental Specialist
Georgia Power Company
241 Ralph McGill Blvd, Bin 10221
Atlanta, GA 30308-3374
Ph: 404-506-7755 Fax: 404-506-1499
jbwether@southernco.com

Diana Williams

Florida Dept. of Environ. Protection
3804 Coconut Palm Drive
Tampa, FL 33592
Ph: 813-744-6100 Fax: 813-740-3906
diana.williams@dep.state.fl.us

Greg Williams

IMC-Phosphates
P. O. Box 2000
Mulberry, FL 33860
Ph: Fax:

Angela Young

Americorps Vista
No. Chickamauga Creek Conservancy
P. O. Box 358
Hixson, TN 37343
Ph: 423-877-0779 Fax: 423-870-8579
vista@nothchick.org

Robert Wright

Executive Director
Upper Cullasaja Watershed Assoc.
P. O. Box 1508
Highlands, NC 28741
Ph: 828-526-9938, x23 Fax: 828-526-0066
twodogs01@earthlink.net

Frank Metzler

Tetra Tech
1401 Oven Park Drive, Suite 201
Tallahassee, FL 32308
Ph: 850-385-9899 Fax: 850-385-9860

Frank.metzler@tetrattech-ffx.com

Arthur Gould, Jr., Director

U. S. Department of Energy
Savannah River Operations Office

MaryJo Bragan

U. S. EPA Region 4
Planning & Analysis Branch
61 Forsyth St. SW
Atlanta, GA 30303
Ph: 404-562-8323
Bragan.maryjo@epa.gov

Anthony Janicki, President

Janicki Environmental, Inc.
1155 Eden Isle Drive N.E.
St. Petersburg, FL 33704
Ph: 727-895-7722 Fax: 727-895-4333
JanickiEnv@aol.com

William White

Georgia Soil & Water Conservation Society
P. O. Box 8024
Athens, GA 30603
Ph: 706-542-3065

J. Kevin Henderson, P.E.

St. Lucie River Initiative
P. O. Box 2082
Stuart, FL 34995
Ph: 772-223-1005 Fax: 772-781-0519
egreen@gate.net

Kathy Meaux

Sarasota County Pollution Control
2817 Cattlemen Road
Sarasota, FL 34232

Mark LaSalle

Mississippi State University – Coastal
Research
2710 Beach Blvd., Suite 1-E
Biloxi, MS 39531
Ph: 278-388-4710 Fax: 278-388-1375
markl@ext.msstate.edu

Gary Boring

New River Highlands RC&D
100 USDA Drive #F
Wytheville, AV 24382
Ph: 540-228-2879 Fax: 540-228-2879
Gary.boring@vawythevil.fsc.usda.gov

MaryJo Bragan
U. S. EPA Region 4
Planning & Analysis Branch
61 Forsyth St. SW
Atlanta, GA 30303
Ph: 404-562-8323
Bragan.maryjo@epa.gov

Richard Eckenrod, Executive Director

Tampa Bay Estuary Program
100 8th Avenue SE
St. Petersburg, FL 33701
Ph: 727-893-2765 Fax: 727-893-2767
reckenrod@tbep.orgBlake Guillory, Division
Manager

PBS&J

2001 N.W. 107th Avenue
Miami, FL 33172
Ph: 305-514-3528 Fax: 305-594-9574
13994@pbsj.com

Terry Joseph

Director, Comprehensive Planning
West Florida Regional Planning Council
P. O. Box 9759
Pensacola, FL 32513
Ph: 850-595-8910 x. 206 Fax: 595-8967

Christine Olsenius, Executive Director

Southeast Watershed Forum-Business Office
535 Poweel Drive
Annapolis, MD 21401
Ph: 866-902-7300 Fax: 410-849-2976
co@southeastwaterforum.org

E. D. "Sonny" Vergara, Executive Director

SW Florida Water Management District
2379 Broad Street
Brookville, FL 34604
Ph: 352-796-7211 Fax: 352-754-6874

Eli Landrau

FL Department of Environmental
Protection
2600 Blaaire Stone Road – Mail Stop 356
Tallahassee, FL 32399



2 0 0 2
S O U T H E A S T W A T E R S H E D F O R U M
R O U N D T A B L E

Financial Support was provided by

Tampa Bay Estuary Program

Florida Dept. of Agriculture-Forest Management Bureau

Florida Department of Environmental Protection

PBS&J

Tetra Tech

U.S. Department of Agriculture – Forest Service

U.S Department of Interior, Fish & Wildlife Service

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

and

Southeast Natural Resource Leaders Group

Federal Highway Administration

Department of the Army

National Park Service

Tennessee Valley Authority

USDA Forest Service

USDA NRCS

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

U.S. Geological Survey

U.S Department of Interior, Fish & Wildlife Service

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
