
ARKANSAS/MISSOURI INTERSTATE WATERSHED SUMMIT REPORT

Proceedings of the Summit – October 12 & 13, 2005

Convened by:

The Upper White River Basin Foundation

Sponsored by:

Arkansas Audubon
Beaver Lake Watershed Partnership
James River Basin Partnership
Kings River Watershed Partnership
Leatherwood Creek Watershed Association
Table Rock Lake Water Quality, Inc.
Watershed Committee of the Ozarks
Upper White River Basin Foundation

Underwritten by Grants from:

*The Environmental Protection Agency –
Targeted Watershed Grants Program*

The Upper White River Basin Foundation



OUR THANKS

The Foundation wants to thank the outstanding group of civic, professional and community leaders who set aside their demanding schedules and professional responsibilities to focus on how to protect the quality of water in the Upper White River Basin. In a world where most people schedule every moment and most organizations have down-sized to insure the highest possible return on every minute, the attendance of all these people says a lot about the importance of this issue not only to the delegates who invested their time, but also to the businesses, governmental agencies and organizations that gave them the freedom to do so.

The issues discussed have been talked about in courthouses and statehouses, and maybe even a few school houses as well. Elected officials and concerned citizens of every stripe have become involved, and the Summit benefited tremendously from the varied viewpoints brought to the tables – and even more so by the respect everyone showed for them all.

Water quality issues are complicated, and we all have a part in addressing those issues. While some states have chosen to fight, the Foundation is committed to doing everything possible to avoid a border war. The pressures of rapidly growing populations, robust agriculture and tourism economies, and the recreational opportunities in the beautiful Ozark Mountains all combine to make the Upper White River Basin a special place to live, work and play.

The Summit was successful because the delegates also chose to take this opportunity to seek ways to improve communication among everyone in the basin, to raise difficult questions and discuss ways to find answers. Most importantly, everyone was able to listen and learn that we all are trying to help make the Upper White River Basin the home of the cleanest lakes in North America.

On behalf of the Upper White River Basin Foundation, I want to thank everyone who made this event not only possible, but a success. We look forward to continuing our efforts for the good of the Upper White River Basin, and to working with outstanding leaders such as the delegates at this Summit.

Steve Stewart

Steve Stewart
Executive Director

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROCESS

BY SHAWN GRINDSTAFF, LEAD PROCESS DESIGNER AND SUMMIT FACILITATOR

The process surrounding the Arkansas/Missouri Interstate Watershed Summit is based on theories of consensus-building and long-term construction of community capacity. The Summit, held on October 12th and 13th, was a very spirited and high profile event in Branson that exposed many people to the basic underpinnings surrounding the concepts of “consensus” and dialogue. However, the “Summit” consensus processes in both states have been going on since 2002 and are still going on as we approach 2006. The Summits at Springfield, Eureka Springs, and Branson are but a mere step in a series of events designed to achieve actionable consensus on regional water quality. In broader terms, the consensus process is not the Summit events themselves, but a carefully planned dialogue to a much more ambitious, long-term process of decisions and cross-border understanding.

Consensus is defined as the process by which we seek unanimity of agreement on a particular issue. Typically, all stakeholders in the process approve of the discussions, are accountable for themselves, and have shared control and input into how ground rules and action items are developed and carried out.

Consensus is a newer, bolder approach to policymaking than the typical methods of holding meetings and seeking agreement previously used in Arkansas and Missouri environmental policy settings. Generally, two other methods dominate the landscape:

The Communications method of stakeholder engagement features the classic “public meetings” model. This method, used constantly by environmental agencies at all levels of government, seeks outcomes like information exchange, hearing the concerns or options of others, and gaining better understanding of a proposed action or policy. The sponsoring agency determines the policy outcome, steers the process, and is the primary driver of action.

The Consultation method of stakeholder engagement features the agency “advisory group or board” models. This method, commonly used in state government circles, seeks more from their stakeholders in the process. Here, a stakeholder “advisory” body drafts opinions or recommendations for action. The actions are developed and refined in a plan or “report”, then circulated to the appropriate group. The sponsoring agency, though, still controls the process and produces the policy outcome from such efforts.

The Consensus process of this Summit expands on the concepts of these models by bringing the stakeholders together as equals with the intent of crafting, agreeing to, and implementing actions or policies as one body. A convening organization may bring them together, but the stakeholders decide their own process, ground rules, and acceptable limits of their participation. Most importantly, they control their own outcomes, and are accountable to steer themselves in policy actions where they can find agreement. The stakeholders never totally get what they want, but agree to find areas of agreement to save time, energy, and resources wasted against each other. They agree to work together, learn from one another, and strengthen relationships so that mutual gains can be realized.

With this in mind, we crafted a very exciting and fascinating interstate summit to introduce policymakers and citizens to the benefits of such collaborative processes, when they are possible, across state lines. This effort, as the organizers have learned, is one of the most ambitious and daunting consensus tasks ever attempted. The geographic and political hurdles of meaningfully bringing this far-

flung group of “delegates” together across two states makes this process all the more interesting and significant as time and processes move ahead. It was understood by the delegates of both states that the same level of consensus they were able to achieve in their respective state summits may not be possible in an interstate context at the outset, but that this summit would prove to be a positive start to the journey.

The delegates were selected by the Upper White River Basin Foundation and its partnering sponsors as “composite” representatives from the Upper White River Basin. The entire Upper White River Basin in northwest Arkansas and southwest Missouri includes numerous counties in both states, the major urban areas of Fayetteville, Branson, and Springfield, and represents an extremely wide population and divergence of views. Observers were allowed to view the delegation and submit written comments at the close of the proceedings. The process was deliberately designed to be inclusive of citizens, particularly the “unheard voices” of the Upper White River Basin.

This delegation, which consisted of 44 extraordinary individuals, worked to create the ground rules and expectations for the Interstate Summit, and has agreed to continue its efforts and work through the larger process.

The following proceedings reflect their hard work in preparing for this process, and their teamwork in seeking out important common ground for future discussions. The mission, structure, and consensus statements, as follows, were crafted and agreed to by the delegates at the opening and closing sessions of the Summit. These statements create the backdrop for the detailed proceedings, and serve as a guidance to future efforts:

Mission of the Summit: To seek insights, perspectives, and common ground between delegates on specific issues related to water quality improvement across the region. This will provide the foundation for consensus-based strategies and solutions to many problems associated with regional water degradation. The Summit will use consensus, when possible and appropriate, to help identify and ratify areas of agreement across the Upper White River Basin region.

Summit Structure: The Summit is organized as a delegate-centered exercise where a mix of general and sub-group sessions will be utilized to advance the goals of the summit. The sub-groups will be divided into groups focusing on the following subjects:

Watershed Districts in Arkansas and Missouri

Future of Bi-State Cooperation/Action

Demonstrating Improvements in Water Quality

Water Quality Monitoring

Coordinating a Bi-State Watershed Management Plan

CONSENSUS STATEMENTS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY BY THE DELEGATES

1. The time for initial awareness and blame for water quality degradation in the basin has passed. Finger pointing and blame-shifting must stop between local citizens, stakeholders, and entities. The focus must now shift to solutions through this interstate dialogue summit.
2. No one party is to blame for the degradation of water quality in the Upper White River Basin. In fact, all people share in the negative contribution and the positive solution. The search for improvements must reflect this recognition and proceed forward to the more significant challenges of prioritization, resources, and commitment.
3. There is a close link between the quality of regional waters, businesses, recreation, agriculture, and the communities that reside within the watershed. That connection and the consequences of lack of consensus are recognized to be threats to all interests, not just one party or geographic location.
4. Continued education and communications between local stakeholders are essential at this early stage of the interstate water quality dialogue.
5. Each delegate recognizes, acknowledges, and respects one another's perspectives based on their individual life experiences and lessons learned. Nonetheless, we will continue this dialogue beyond the summit and continue to search for consensus-based solutions that will effect real change and improvement in the watershed.
6. Delegates recognize that the precious resource of water is at stake now and in the future. We believe that consensus (and where possible, commitment) can provide realistic hopes for improvement, and that tougher issues for resolution must be discussed and solved in an incremental, sensible fashion to ensure success.

At the conclusion of the Summit, it was also agreed that many of these complex issue dialogues should first begin at the local level as they progress into regional discussions and longer term initiatives. This helps ensure that the summit discussions take a logical course of inclusiveness and realism as they move ahead to possible future implementation.

SHAWN GRINDSTAFF
PRINCIPAL and SENIOR MEDIATOR
p 636.728.1034 ext 216
shawn@forrestergroup.com

THE FORRESTER GROUP
Insightful Environmental Solutions
500 Chesterfield Center, Suite 300
Chesterfield, Missouri 63017
p 636.728.1034 f 636.728.1035
www.forrestergroup.com

FINAL CONSENSUS STATEMENTS

WATER QUALITY MONITORING

1. Water quality monitoring data/knowledge is very important to target solution and to prioritize funding.
2. A monitoring ideal would be a master network of testing stations with an appropriate geographic spread and consistent methodology.
3. A first step would be to put all existing stations on a layered GIS map coded by type of station with links to tests performed, methodologies, and where tests can be obtained.
4. Identify gaps and overlaps in testing and information.
5. Prioritize needs for additional testing stations and procedures.
6. Form collaborative partnerships to do additional testing based on priorities and funding.
7. Share knowledge and act to improve water quality.

DEMONSTRATING WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS

1. Kings River Watershed Partnership will explore collaborating with James River Partnership in order to reduce sediment in the watershed.

COMBINED STATEMENT FROM WATER QUALITY MONITORING AND DEMONSTRATING WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS

1. Monitoring information coordination should be based on efforts already begun in Arkansas & Missouri.
Ideas for items to be included on a website:
 - Reports in PDF format
 - Agreed upon maps
 - Recommendations and responses/action taken
 - Calendar of events
 - Links to other agencies/organizations (with cross links on those sites as well)
 - Place to submit monitoring information and an interactive map to identify where and what type of testing is taking place

FUTURE OF BI-STATE COOPERATION/ACTION

1. Arkansas & Missouri are committed to annual forums that allow for the exchange of ideas and information. We will work to include the voices of local governments and citizens through the establishment of an ongoing delegate process in each county within the watershed.
Implement an internet-based communication forum or listserv to help participants remain engaged in processes emerging from this summit.

COORDINATING A BI-STATE WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN

Consensus Statements on overall concept of a watershed management plan:

1. Progress is currently being made to improve water quality in the lakes and streams of the Upper White River Basin. Coordination among sub-watershed plans is recommended versus a single, basin-wide plan. Sub-watershed plans and process will place the primary emphasis on local stakeholder involvement. Common water quality goals are recommended for the Upper White River Basin by a representative group of local stakeholders.

How can we be more effective in coordinating sub-watershed plans?

1. Identify a lead entity to coordinate in developing a “boiler-plate” sub-watershed management plan and provide assistance when requested
2. Make sure that there is periodic forum to exchange concepts
3. Lead entity sets up a list-serve, message board to exchange information
4. Lead entity establishes database of existing watershed management plans with an established, credible method of evaluation
5. Consult successful watershed groups with experience developing locally-based watershed management plans
6. Offer basic guidance for and technical assistance to local stakeholders

How to be more effective in including local stakeholders in sub-watershed management plans?

1. Communicate effectively with stakeholders the need to participate through direct contact.
2. More public, open meetings in local areas
3. Approach with meaningful factual information.
4. Feed them and they will come

How can we be more effective in providing recommendations for basin-wide, water quality goals?

1. Establish multiple locations to determine current water quality baseline.
2. Expand water quality monitoring if inadequate
3. Examine what data has already been collected
 - Hydrologic atlas for Illinois and Beaver watersheds in Arkansas
 - Basic geology
 - Basic data sets
 - Water quality

Similar work underway in Missouri

LISTING OF ALL DELEGATES

In Alphabetic Order:

Kevin Barnes, Greene County Commission
Troy Cline, Cattle Industry
Jim Craig, Citizen
Ralph Davis, University of Arkansas
Luanne Diffin, City of Rogers
Mike Faupel, Sierra Club
Alan Fortenberry, Beaver Water District
Janice Greene, Missouri State University
Gene Groseclos, Cooper Realty Investments
Margaret Hall, City of Bull Shoals, Mayor
Rick Helms, White River Valley Environmental
Peter Herschend, Upper White River Basin Foundation
Jerry Hunton, Washington County Judge
Kevin Igli, Tyson Foods
Ann Jones, Yellville Arkansas Schools
Herman Jones, Cattle Industry
Bryan King, Poultry Industry
Mary Leath, Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality
Bruce Martin, Missouri Department of Natural Resources
Ryan Mooney, Springfield Area Chamber
Matt Morrow, Home Builders Association
Rita Needham, Southwest Area Manufacturers Association
Holly Neill, James River Basin Partnership
Debbie Redford, City of Branson Public Works
Alane Roy, Ozark Missouri Schools
Bob Schaefer, City of Springfield Public Works
Jan Skopecek, Northwest Arkansas Homebuilders Association
Page Shurgar, Kings River Watershed Partnership
Earl Smith, Arkansas Natural Resource Commission
John Souttee, Taney County Sewer District
Mike Sowders, Fishing Guide
Steve Stewart, Upper White River Basin Foundation
Randy Swanson, Marina Owners Association
Evan Teague, Arkansas Farm Bureau
Melissa Terry, Arkansas Audubon
Sonny Varnell, Arkansas Game & Fish Commission
Dave White, Watershed Committee of the Ozarks

BRAINSTORMING COMPENDIUM WITH NOTES

WATER QUALITY MONITORING

Facilitator: Ruth Crow

Recorder: Amy Wilson

Knowledge is important

- Be proactive instead of reactive to improve water quality – prevent pollution or stop at an early stage
- Modeling can be a useful tool, but only if there is sufficient, good quality data
- Need monitoring for knowledge as well as compliance
- Accurate information is necessary to persuade individuals and organizations that they contribute to pollution and need to change

Present information is inadequate

- Limited funding constrains areas tested and number/types of tests
- Protocols and methodologies not consistent among various agencies & organizations – may be driven by different funding sources
- Local government and private businesses must deal with confusing, sometimes contradictory requirements of different state & federal agencies

Ideal: Master network of monitoring stations

- Establish baseline information
- Determine changes – positive and negative
- Formulate action plan

Map all testing station (AR/MO agencies have begun this)

- Federal, state, county, city governments
- Universities
- Watershed & other groups
- Other volunteers
- Recommend that UWRBF coordinate agency or universities to create and maintain map

Identify gaps

- Apparent needs are for more stations in Missouri and more volunteer efforts in Arkansas

Prioritize needs

- General goal – Overall monitoring throughout watershed including strategic use of volunteers
- Flexible procedures providing for site-specific monitoring based on perceived likelihood of problems
- Uses of lakes, streams, and rivers factor into establishing monitoring priorities

Form collaborative partnerships to increase monitoring

- Continue to encourage funding from all sources – public & private
- Consider tax incentives to encourage participation by businesses
- Create partnerships to collaborate on projects & funding proposals
- Encourage dialogue between Arkansas & Missouri staff who coordinate volunteers, such as stream teams – AR can learn from MO to use volunteers more effectively

Share knowledge and take action

- Educate public about sources of pollution
 - o Steam team & other volunteers are effective educators, spreading information in communities
 - o We all contribute to water pollution
- Formulate action plans based on water quality information and uses (Beaver Lake – Drinking; Taneycomo – Recreation/Tourism)
- Use incentives as well as regulation

DEMONSTRATING WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS

Facilitator: Ann Faitz

Recorder: Melissa Bettis

E. coli sources

- Failed septic tanks
- Wastewater treatment plants
- Migration
- Agriculture
- All runoff

Nutrient sources

- Same as E. coli sources above
- Residential home owners
- Golf courses
- Industry discharge
- Fertilizers

Sediment sources

- Rural roads
- Failed stream banks/erosion
- Construction
- Rural runoff
- Stormwater runoff
- Lack of management practices

Ways to mitigate rural runoff

- Riparian buffer
- Education/tax incentives
- Conservation easements

Ways to mitigate E. coli

- Ordinance to regulate septic systems (by county)
- Regulate maintenance through contracts

Ways to mitigate sediment

- Put funds from drinking water fees into water quality projects
- Formulate BMPs for each stream
- Strategy to address watershed stream restoration

Other Ideas:

- Communication between all of the AR/MO entities to create a Master Plan
- Construction project
- City & County planning
- Better design
- Better enforcement
- More green space
- Conservation easements
- Land use plan
- Duplicate Benton County, AR land use setbacks in Missouri
- Duplicate AR NRD study in MO
- Master plan can be delegated by EPA? – should be implemented locally
- Get local entity to obtain/gather common database
- Form separate group/task force to gather information
- MDNR & ADNR consult to see if funding is available to do a joint 319 project
- Explore EPA funding from targeted watershed funds for AR/MO projects

COORDINATING A BI-STATE WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN

Facilitator: Drew Holt

Recorder: Shawna Miller

How do we effectively recommend goals for water quality?

- Establish multiple locations to determine current water quality baseline
- Expand water quality monitoring if inadequate
- Examine what data has already been collected: Ex. – Hydrologic atlas for Illinois & Beaver in AR, basic geology, basic data sets, water quality

How to better include local stakeholders?

- Communicate effectively the need to participate – direct contact
- More public/open meetings in local areas
- Make sure that local schools are involved in planning process
- Approach with meaningful factual information – Avoid “sky is falling”
- Identify and call...
- Feed them and they will come
- Database of existing watershed management plans with an established, credible method of evaluation
- Consult with successful local watershed groups: Ex. – Table Rock Lake Water Quality
- Offer basic guidance/technical assistance for local stakeholders
- Local governments should be involved as soon as possible (asked to endorse plan?)
- Government members involved in writing the watershed management plan!
- Local government involved as a stakeholder in the watershed planning process from day 1
- Local government resolution and/or actions to support the watershed management plan

How can we be more effective in 1) coordinating sub-watershed plans, 2) including local stakeholders, and 3) providing recommendations for water quality goals?

1. Coordinate in developing a boilerplate sub-watershed management plan & provide assistance when requested
2. Make sure that there is a periodic forum to exchange concepts
3. Lead entity will set up a listserv/message board to exchange information

Development

- Developers do have some regulations
- No regulations on homeowners
Ex. Homeowners can remove stormwater berms, no restrictions on fertilizing lawns
- Some restrictions actually cause water quality issues, e.g. curbs

Bi-State watershed management planning

- Progress not quantifiable
- In some areas lots going on, but some segments being left out
- Should be sup-plans under a coordinated effort
- Unrealistic that every resident treated equally because of “hotspots”
- At present course, it’s going to take a long time
- All areas not equal – very diverse in needs

Strategies for making current activities more effective

- Education/Outreach
- Support recommendation for formation of watershed entity
- Clearinghouse of proven BMPs

A basin-wide watershed management plan can be accomplished by taking the following steps

- Set water quality goals (common to the White River Basin) at the bi-state level
- Establish sub-basin watershed management plans & processes at the local level to meet the water quality goals
- Compile into a single basin-wide watershed management plan

FUTURE OF BI-STATE COOPERATION/ACTION

Facilitator: Elton Chartrand

Recorder: Jennifer Hershberger

Why We're Here

- To avoid problems similar to AR/OK
- As stakeholders tied to economy of the area
- To maintain and improve relationships between states – to utilize each states' strengths & stay positive
- To discuss how we motivate states to continue talking to get results?
- To be able to take ideas back to citizens – find a balanced approach with continuity and ability to get buy in (important that continuity continue in successive generations)

How to utilize states' strengths

- Communities/Counties in MO could be more open-minded to learn from AR – don't repeat mistakes
- Phosphorus is phosphorus (whether in litter or commercial fertilizer) – Needs to be regulated equally
- MoDNR has implemented an Ombudsman program that puts a person “on the ground” as a Director's representative to local citizens – Possibly use this program as a the basis for a “Water Ombudsman”?
- Missouri has used education to link a healthy environment with a good economy

How states see water quality differently

- AR associates with litigation (less cooperation?) because of AR/OK
- AR feels they are not listened to with respect to OK, but feel they are doing things to solve water quality issues
- AR perceived to have better cooperation between communities – more progressive with respect to waste treatment

Barriers between states

- Many times map views of watershed show state lines – take out state lines to help understanding that water doesn't know state lines
- Funding barriers – how to tap into funds & make available equally for the watershed
- Lack of support (non-monetary) – how to motivate not only understanding, but also support for what you're doing
- Each state still interested (at some levels) in protecting their own area – it's better to promote seamless cooperation & mutual benefits; Need to understand/agree that there are various inputs – no one sector is responsible for water quality concerns
- States need to know/agree to what needs to be done to improve water quality – what areas need to be monitored, what inputs (P, sediment, etc) need to be monitored?
- Maybe it's not an AR/MO issue, possibly a Rural/Urban (existing & developing) issue

Overcoming barriers

- Engage those who don't understand/disagree
 - o Find common areas no matter how small
 - o Involve those people in change
- Communication, education, involvement, finding common ground
- Recognize that farmers are naturally aware of the natural environment
- Cultivate relationships with key individuals/groups, gain trust (through agency meetings), overcome past bad relationships
- Education within stakeholder groups to understand how everyone is doing something to improve water quality (rural & urban)
- Need to understand philosophy in each state – how governments work together at the landowner level to continue progress
- Help all stakeholders understand each other's perspectives to find commonality
- Work to create buy-in from the ground up
- Create strategies to recognize those working to improve water quality
- Find trusted educational sources – don't wait for them to come to you; take information to them. Also, be patient – education is a slow process
- Challenge – Differences exist just between individual counties
 - o Some understand issues, some don't
 - o Education must come from trusted individuals/organizations
 - o Everything can't come from ADEQ/MoDNR (sometimes met with skepticism)
 - o Utilize grants from trusted organizations
 - o Press/Media is influential – need to cultivate cooperation

- PERCEPTION IS REALITY

Actions (that we can be champions for)

- Update and come to agreement on a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between executive levels of both states (but, must include local government participation)
- AR/MO agencies meet with county judges/commissions as part of MOU process
- Follow MOU once it is agreed to
- Continue dialogue in settings similar to this summit
- Understand issues don't stop at the state line – states have more in common than not in common
- We can take ideas back and start the process
- How to identify actions (true bi-state cooperation)
- Classes & recognition as a strategy to involve farmers between states
- Task force
- Bring communication & involvement to local level – take communication through a chain of command to increase possibility of success
- Coordination of what's been done/being done to learn from each state's strengths/weaknesses
- Find a way to seek funding for bi-state action – Who asks for it? How to coordinate between states? How to get “neutral” funding?

How to ensure future action

- Form a committee
- Through executive order directing an agency to act – an executive order is more binding because agencies must answer directly to the governor
- Create a listserv for communication
- Form a speakers bureau
- Conference calls
- Educate students (future decision makers)
- All must be mirrored for continuity between states

WATERSHED DISTRICTS IN ARKANSAS/MISSOURI

Facilitator: DeDe Vest

Proposed resolution – Consensus not reached

- 1) Watershed “entities” should be organized by local people to address water quality problem, as needed
- 2) If & when organized, said “entities” should be non-regulatory
- 3) “Entities” should have education as a major focus
- 4) “Entities” should include a broad representation of community interests
- 5) Need funding
- 6) No one size fits all

Possible ways to create watershed entities

- 1 – District (quasi-governmental)
- 2 – Private (non-profit)
- 3 – County/Municipal (traditional government)
- 4 – Do nothing

Should be a public process with comments & decided by local people

Background

Current status of watershed districts in Missouri

- Counties may vote themselves out (or back in)
- District could own & operate domestic waste plants
- Capable of suing or being sued
- Capable of holding real & personal property
- May borrow money & incur indebtedness
- Taxing authority to fund operation (with election by county)
- Nine board members (1 from each county currently within the district)

Concerns when forming an entity

- Use of the word “District”
- How to create a voluntary entity
- What about using a substructure like DEQ
- Education – people do things out of ignorance
- Funding mechanism – ability to tax
- Cross section of citizens – different training
- Quasi-governmental – not regulatory, but ministerial implement regulations
- Action-oriented – don’t just talk about it
- Include all groups on decision-making body – educators, leaders, conservation, recreation, government, agriculture; could include elected seats & members selected by group interest (nominations)
- Non-profit collaboration – partnerships with quasi-governmental & governmental
- Explicitly non-regulatory – not a rule making body
- Some appointed, some elected, some volunteer on board – needs to be an important position; submit applications
- Scope of authority defined – what can/can’t do, limits defined by state legislation prior to creation
- Proven results – need testimony & examples
- Set standard for project implementation – sound science; background information for evaluation of success later

- Evaluation mechanism – accountability; determine successes (sunset clause in legislation)
- Utilize existing bodies – avoid additional layers of government
- Ways to determine existing resources – don't reinvent the wheel; how to share across government boundaries
- Well defined committee structure – informed before making decisions

Miscellaneous thoughts

- What use is the watershed?
- What has the state of Missouri identified as the water quality issue?
- Need information from Missouri as to proposed BMPs and implementation – how to fund, how to chart progress
- Drinking water concerns
- Sewage leakage/leach fields
- E. coli concerns – Poultry/confined feed lots in AR/MO
- More consistent regulation, enforcement, and education – less regulation overall
- Local control!
- Ways to fund stormwater runoff pollution
- Commitment from other entities
- Predominant pollutant is sediment - sediment carries P, N

LISTING OF ALL REGISTERED OBSERVERS

Name	Organization
Terry Campbell	Senator Talent's Office
Steve Drown	Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality
Jaci Ferguson	US Environmental Protection Agency
Gail Hauss	Citizen (Bull Shoals, AR)
Anne Lichti	Citizen (Mountain Home, AR)
Christine Mosier	Citizen (Carroll County, AR)
Mary Rivera	Citizen (Fulton County, AR)
Candy Schilling	Environmental Resources Coalition