

# ***THE WATER UPDATE***



Issue 1, July 2006

***THE WATER UPDATE*** is a newsletter issued by the CSL (Committee for Shared Leadership) periodically. R. L. Mahler is the editor – all comments should be addressed to him ([bmahler@uidaho.edu](mailto:bmahler@uidaho.edu)).

The purpose of this newsletter is to provide information about water quality programs and activities to the 300+ subscribers on our water quality list server. All issues of the newsletter can be found on our national water web site (<http://www.usawaterquality.org/news>).

In the future we expect to provide information about and announcements from national facilitation projects and our regional liaisons. If you have any materials for inclusion in the next newsletter scheduled for September 2006 please send them directly to the editor ([bmahler@uidaho.edu](mailto:bmahler@uidaho.edu)).

## ***In this issue:***

This issue contains the results of the land grant water quality coordinator survey which was conducted at our national water conference in San Antonio, Texas in February 2006. The survey was completed by 45 water quality coordinators. The CSL feels that the results provide insight about the perceptions of both the national and regional programs. Any comments that were considered non-constructive or potentially targeted at a specific person (less than 3% of the comments) were not included in the summary below.

---

## **2007 National Water Conference**

- \* Remember the 2007 National Water Conference takes place January 28 – February 1, 2007 in Savannah Georgia
- \* The Conference web site is:  
<http://www.soil.ncsu.edu/swetc/waterconf/2007/home07.htm>
- \* Call for papers and posters. Abstracts for oral and poster presentations are now being accepted – see the web site above for details. After September 15<sup>th</sup>, only abstracts for posters will be accepted.

## LAND GRANT WQ COORDINATOR SURVEY RESULTS 45 SURVEYS WERE COMPLETED

*What type of institution are you associated with?*

1862	37	(82%)
1890	2	( 4%)
1994	6	(14%)

*How long have you been the water quality coordinator at your institution?*

0 – 2 years	10	(22.7%)
3 - 6 years	14	(31.8%)
7 – 10 years	9	(20.5%)
11 – 15 years	4	( 9.1%)
16+ years	7	(15.9%)
not a coordinator	1	

*What is your institutional appointment?*

100% Extension	22	(50.0%)	
More than 50% Extension	27	(61.4%)	
Split appointment	18	(40.9%)	
0% Extension	6	(13.6%)	(all 1994's)
Have research time	15	(34.5%)	
Have teaching time	18	(40.9%)	
Have a 3-way split	12	(27.3%)	
Have some administration	9	(20.5%)	

*What is your primary professional area?*

Soil Science	16	(35.6%)
Natural Resources	10	(22.2%)
Ag. Engineering	7	(15.6%)
Water Science	4	( 8.9%)
Gen. Agriculture	3	( 6.7%)
Env. Science Ed.	2	( 4.4%)
Generalist	2	( 4.4%)
Economics	1	( 2.2%)

***How good of a job is the National Water Resource Program and your Regional Water Resource Program doing at meeting and supporting your needs?***

<b>Rating</b>	<b>National Program</b>		<b>Regional Program</b>	
<b>Outstanding</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>( 7.1%)</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>(27.9%)</b>
<b>Very Good</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>(35.7%)</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>(39.5%)</b>
<b>Good</b>	<b>11.5</b>	<b>(27.4%)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>(11.6%)</b>
<b>Fair</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>(22.6%)</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>(13.9%)</b>
<b>Poor</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>( 0.0%)</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>( 2.3%)</b>
<b>N/A</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>( 7.1%)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>( 4.6%)</b>

***Rank the following potential partners from most (1) to least important (6) in the development and delivery of water educational programs.***

<b>Ranking</b>	<b>EPA</b>	<b>State ENV. Agency</b>	<b>State AGR. Agency</b>	<b>Health District</b>	<b>USDA ARS</b>	<b>USDA NRCS</b>
	<b>#</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>#</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>129</b>
<b>SCORE</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>3.4</b>

***Weighted Scores:***

<b>1</b>	<b>State Environmental Agency</b>	<b>2.1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>EPA</b>	<b>2.7</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>USDA-NRCS</b>	<b>3.4</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>State Agriculture Agency</b>	<b>3.8</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>State/Local Health Agency</b>	<b>4.2</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>USDA-ARS</b>	<b>5.2</b>

***Rank your water programming expertise from highest (1) to lowest (9):***

<b>RANK</b>	<b>AN WSTE</b>	<b>DW</b>	<b>ENV RES</b>	<b>NUT PES</b>	<b>POL ASS</b>	<b>WAT MGT</b>	<b>WAT CON</b>	<b>WAT POL</b>	<b>WAT SEC</b>
	<b>#</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>#</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>TOT</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>302</b>	<b>335</b>
<b>SCORE</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>8.0</b>

***Weighted Scores:***

<b>1.</b>	<b>Watershed Management</b>	<b>3.5</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Drinking Water and Human Health</b>	<b>3.6</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Pollution Assessment</b>	<b>4.1</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Nutrient and Pesticide Management</b>	<b>4.6</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Water Conservation and Management</b>	<b>4.7</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b>Animal Waste Management</b>	<b>5.0</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b>Environmental Restoration</b>	<b>5.3</b>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Water Policy and Economics</b>	<b>7.2</b>
<b>9.</b>	<b>Water Security</b>	<b>8.0</b>

***Rank your water programming needs from highest (1) to lowest (9):***

<b>RANK</b>	<b>AN WSTE</b>	<b>DW</b>	<b>ENV RES</b>	<b>NUT PES</b>	<b>POL ASS</b>	<b>WAT MGT</b>	<b>WAT CON</b>	<b>WAT POL</b>	<b>WAT SEC</b>
	<b>#</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>#</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>TOT</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>326</b>
<b>SCORE</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>5.8</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>7.8</b>

***Weighted Scores:***

<b>1.</b>	<b>Drinking Water and Human Health</b>	<b>3.7</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Watershed Management</b>	<b>3.9</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Pollution Assessment</b>	<b>4.3</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Environmental Restoration</b>	<b>4.6</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Water Conservation and Management</b>	<b>4.6</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b>Animal Waste Management</b>	<b>5.3</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b>Water Policy and Economics</b>	<b>5.6</b>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Nutrient and Pesticide Management</b>	<b>5.8</b>
<b>9.</b>	<b>Water Security</b>	<b>7.8</b>

***Each of our 10 regions now employs a liaison. Do you consider the resources (dollars) used to support a regional liaison as money well spent?***

<b>This money is well spent.</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>(62.9%)</b>
<b>Only time will tell if the money is well spent.</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>(20.9%)</b>
<b>This money would be better spent in individual states.</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>(13.9%)</b>
<b>No opinion/not answered.</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>( 2.3%)</b>

***How do you feel about the state of our current land grant institution – USDA/CSREES partnership in water programs?***

- The national/regional network has been greatly strengthened.
- State level coordination and information sharing still needs improvement...what do state water quality coordinators do? What could they do?
- Good!!!
- Good overall, but the apparent annual attempts to move 406 into NRI do not send a message that extension and outreach functions of LGIs are a primary focus of CSREES. Regardless of claims about the integrated NRI, by its title, it is a research program.
- Needs strengthening in some areas.
- The partnership is with the regional program, not with USDA-CSREES, and it is great, educational and of course funds for projects are important!
- We are making very good progress in the development of partnerships.
- Good.
- Great.
- Better than any other USDA program I have been associated with.
- The funding and support from USDA is critical to our visibility and success at the state level. Regional and national (CSL) programs fill in the blanks in our state tool kit and push us out of our comfort zone. In sum, the current state is better than in the past and hopefully will improve.
- Could be stronger.
- Very good.
- Need more proactive attention to needs and issues in Indian country: training, education and resources.
- SUCKS!!! But may be improving! This conference is giving me some hope.
- It is a lot of busy work, travel, networking, and self promotion and not much effort to protect the water resource.
- I feel like CSREES is abandoning ES. It seems like USDA-CSREES is slowly but surely eroding the model of Extension for the model of research. However, the water program seems to have the support of the administration. I believe in the Extension model. I don't feel that USDA-CSREES does and hasn't for 20 years as evidenced in the continual reduction in funds to LGUs and their programs.
- It seems to be working, though it is unclear where it is going. I think that our leadership does a fantastic job fighting for the program, but it remains a difficult program to characterize, especially in terms of benefits/dollar spent. I have seen the program evolve from early efforts with the Hydrologic Units and Demonstration Projects,

through state allocations to the present form. The issues of products and effects have been difficult to resolve throughout.

- It is doing okay with the resources it has. It needs to be more competitive at the Washington DC level especially in competition with NRCS.
- The expectations of USDA-CSREES are unrealistic.
- Water programs in my state are good.
- National priorities do not mesh with local priorities within my state.
- We need to have competitive programs in urban areas – when is CSREES going to wake up and realize this???
- Our focus is primarily on building programs at the regional level, which has been very helpful and important to each of our institutions. We interact with national programs mainly through our regional coordinator/PI and her interaction with CSL.
- Good, considering the cap on funding
- I feel that CSREES is doing great work in partnering with the land grants.
- Our partnership should not ignore the urban focus – we act as if 220,000,000 Americans do not exist!
- They are doing a good job to increase collaboration between regional institutions. The increased collaboration and regional programming is by far the most important change in my water programming in the last four years. On the down side they need to improve the annual national meeting with an ongoing evaluation of presentations. How can CSREES evaluate the relevance of this meeting without any feedback?
- I think that it is working pretty well. However, USDA-CSREES needs to understand and remember that without land grant institutions they have very little credible access to sell their programs to the general public.
- Needs to be strengthened! LGs need to understand what role water quality plays in overall programming for ag production. Also, needs to understand how the relationship between LG, WQ coordinators and CSREES can benefit everyone.
- Our state lacks core programming capacity making it difficult to fully engage in the national program, Lack of sufficient core capacity and diversity of water programs from state to state make multi-state programming difficult.
- I believe that we had better partnership potential when we had hard-dollar support.
- The partnership is good; however, the lack of hard dollar support makes the future uncertain. This creates instability for outstanding people we want associated with the program – they are always looking for next year’s salary dollars.
- Things have improved greatly over the last six years.

- I give the partnership a grade of C+.

***What should the National Water Quality Program (USDA-CSREES and CSL) do to better support your institutional water quality program?***

- **Keep the funding rolling. Provide more grant opportunities.**
- **Continue as is.**
- **Increase funding.**
- **More communication.**
- **For each of the Pacific Islands visit each of the water quality coordinators to really understand situations and possible remedies. For region 9 there needs to be additional funding resources as the area is spread very far and wide.**
- **Continue to support us!**
- **Restore and increase Extension Education grants.**
- **Assure that National Facilitation grants are focused on supporting state and regional water programs. These grants are not for building personal programs – they are part of NIWQP!!**
- **Stronger support for water theme working groups – or keep up the support for the most important themes.**
- **Active building of connections between land grant water programs and agency programs, especially making the connections to federal agency efforts.**
- **Re-establish a partnership between USDA-CSREES and the land grant Extension programs. Establish MOU between LGUs and CSREES.**
- **Continue to support regional coordination and CSL.**
- **Revise RFA to put Extension into the lead in Integrated Research projects. Instead of hypothesis-led research integrated with Extension or teaching, it should be Extension led research.**
- **My institution would rather just get the operating dollars – and forget the CSL and regional coordination.**
- **Somehow the national program needs to better communicate with the state water quality coordinators. I do not know the mechanism by which this would best happen. Perhaps a regular (monthly) newsletter – it does not have to be long, but it should be regular.**
- **Money is always a plus. Recognize that prevention measures are as important as crisis management.**
- **Provide water quality coordinators with adequate funding to carry out the programs that are expected.**
- **Have more representation from the 1890's.**
- **Continue to support and promote national and regional programs.**



- **Maintain support (\$) for national and regional meetings to enhance networking.**
- **Continue to build relationships with other federal agencies – esp NRCS – so that we are seen and funded as the education and outreach arm for them (where appropriate).**
- **The current regional makeup is not watershed-based, so targeting a watershed is somewhat problematic. An example is the upper Ohio River, with West Virginia and Ohio on each side of it. We are in different regions and tend not to plan or coordinate programs that address watersheds. A difficult problem to overcome, but watershed-based programming should be encouraged over time.**
- **Besides financing – congressional needs being identified and supporting this to LGs so they can provide needed resources.**
- **Expand focus of the water resources program to provide opportunities to work in overlap with Extension fisheries, wildlife and natural resources programs. Need to expand beyond water quality, to water quantity and expand the physical/chemical focus to incorporate biology and ecology.**
- **Provide the following resources: information, education, training, financing, research opportunities, undergraduate internships at tribal colleges on reservations.**
- **Move back to block grant funding.**
- **Legitimize our work by making conscious efforts to contact deans and directors to help us maintain visibility.**
- **Support our work by providing resources – solid waste management started as a national effort about this time we started, we continue while that effort does not in large part due to the resources provided through the national program.**
- **Foster and support technology transfer through this conference, our regional conference, special interest meetings, websites, etc.**
- **I am not convinced that a national level program can do more than provide funds for state-level work. One of the difficulties of trying to develop national or even regional approaches to water quality programs is that water quality coordinators have diverse training, diverse roles within their institutions and diverse issues within their states. Even those who have 100% Extension appointments can only focus on a limited number of topics. As a result, I think it would be a stroke of good luck if anything developed at the national level that was useful without a lot of retooling at the state level. As an example, I worked longer on our version of Farm\*A\*Syst (which is not used in Nevada) than on many other products that were more useful.**
- **Our single highest priority need is people, so that equilibrates to dollars to hire and sustain positions. Since federal support dollars from USDA-CSREES are going to be harder and harder to get and made available to more institutions and organizations, efforts to**

convince state leadership as to the importance of having a strong water program should help the entire system. EPA has a strong interest in strengthening their programs with land grants and WRRI's located at most land grants to move toward watershed-based assessment management, restoration and education programs – but our CSREES support may be going away at this critical time for a great potential partnership.

- It is important to understand that the water quality programs are a lot like politics – they are local. It is important that the national water quality program continue to provide the mechanisms and funding support to empower state and local success in water quality programming.

*What new water resource priority issues do you see over the next five years?*

- Ecosystem management
- Improving understanding of local government professionals and community leaders.
- Maximize distribution and use of resources developed by other agencies – build active partnerships.
- Radionucleides in drinking water.
- Non-traditional organic contaminants (hormones, steroids, antibiotics, endocrine disruptors, etc.)
- Water quantity use competition among sources in humid climates – particularly in regions 1, 2, 3 and 4.
- Reducing air deposition of N from all sources.
- Determining if currently accepted and implementable NPS practices are capable of achieving needed levels of nutrient reductions in the Mississippi River Basin, Cheasepeake Bay and other areas.
- Water rights policy.
- Water security issues.
- Solid waste.
- Drinking water.
- Coastline testing for chemicals and bacteria.
- Urban/rural water management issues.
- Stormwater and drainage.
- Water quantity.
- Water security will become increasingly important.
- TMDL research and education.
- Water resources in terms of both quality and quantity.
- Pesticide and nutrient management.
- Watershed management.
- Water conservation and management.

- **Pollution assessment and prevention.**
- **Competition between agriculture and municipal use of water.**
- **Interstate water conflict.**
- **Drought.**
- **Water policy and institutions.**
- **Interaction of water quality and quantity.**
- **Consideration of other funding sources than CSREES for future coordination of integrated water programs.**
- **Please provide more information on the potential for integrating our water programs into the next Farm Bill.**
- **Water use for agriculture versus non-agricultural water use.**
- **Endocrine disruptors in ag runoff or as aerosols.**
- **Pharmaceuticals in ag runoff.**
- **Water availability.**
- **Drug additions (livestock and human) to water quality.**
- **Pharmaceuticals.**
- **Effluent dominant streams**
- **Water safety/security**
- **Bioterrorism**
- **Irrigation systems efficiency.**
- **Allocation of limited water supplies.**
- **Water policy/water economics**
- **Water supply on reservations.**
- **Pollution prevention/cleanup on reservations.**
- **Antibiotics, endocrine disruptors, pharmaceuticals.**
- **Water scarcity in the West.**
- **Water quantity/quality interactions.**
- **Water quality and reuse.**
- **Water re-use.**
- **Stormwater management.**
- **Water policy in the West.**
- **Hypoxia.**
- **Breakdown of pharmaceuticals within water bodies.**
- **Nutrient/pesticide contamination.**
- **Ecosystem integrity, viability and sustainability.**
- **Water quantity, water conservation and stream flows.**
- **Endocrine disruptors and credibility of chemical licensing and regulatory programs.**
- **Interbasin water transfer and water rights issues.**
- **Water quantity issues including allocations among competing users in urban and rural areas.**
- **Educating and empowering citizen-led watershed management groups.**
- **Groundwater.**

- Working in watersheds that cut across political boundaries.
- Groundwater depletion due to excessive use by agriculture.
- The continuing deterioration of systems that capture slow or impede runoff rain events; this includes wetlands, beaver dams, small impoundments on private lands and rain gardens.
- Holistic approach to watershed management.
- Water conservation.
- Drinking water supply.
- Water recycling.
- Water allocations and re-allocations.
- Water policy and management issues.
- Water quality and quantity.
- Water security.
- State/regional water rights issues.

*Now that the National Water Resource Conference is much bigger than just the land grant water quality coordinators, what should be done at future meetings to specifically support the interests and needs of the coordinators?*

- Define roles for state water quality coordinators – assess their needs and interests.
- Plan meetings at annual conference to meet identified coordinator needs.
- Consider short (1to 2 day) meetings on specific needs and support for smaller groups of interested coordinators at times other than at the bigger national conference.
- Keep the conference LGU based with separate sessions focused on Extension, Research and Teaching.
- Actual meeting of the coordinators at national meeting.
- I'd like to see the state coordinators have more time to share their experiences and have a greater opportunity for networking.
- Nothing different beyond a breakout meeting – like what was done here.
- Continue to carve out time to meet with state coordinators. Keep time for state coordinators to meet with national facilitation projects.
- Continue to engage state coordinators in dialog.
- Provide travel support for coordinators to attend the meeting.
- Special session on coordination grants expanded at most. More recognition to rest of importance of the Extension regional role in both the conference and in the 406 program (NRI?).
- There still needs to be time for this group, even if it's just to network. I'm struggling with it because if the regional project is

doing their job, then the WQ coordinators within the region should be meeting. But we are a national program and need to remind folks that we are greater than the sum of our parts.

- **Make some effort to identify NEEDS of coordinators.**
- **Clarify the expected ROLE of coordinators.**
- **Identify benefits to extension program/LGU of having a WQ coordinator and facilitate communication of those benefits to Extension deans/directors.**
- **Show case where coordinator has made a real difference, with transferable strategies.**
- **Facilitate networking among coordinators with similar situations → sea grant + USDA ext + same LGU; small program with only one or two water faculty; etc.**
- **Improve support in all aspects to 1994 tribal colleges and universities. Provide information, travel subsidies, training/education, and bring more students!**
- **Half day session specifically targeted toward our group needs. Perhaps an individual poster session to share our work. A social hour could be attached to this poster session to give us time to interact and network.**
- **More time to meet with our regional colleagues. Keep these times exclusive to water quality coordinators or closely related job descriptions.**
- **I think that starting a day earlier than the rest of the conference works well. We should keep doing it like we did it this year.**
- **Collaborative sharing with other agencies with water quality responsibility such as EPA and USGS.**
- **Need to address biology and ecology, not just physical aspects of water resource protection.**
- **Nothing new needs to be done for this group. Just make the National meeting relevant to a wide variety of disciplines by insisting that the topic speakers present in a manner that is understandable or relevant to all attending. Evaluate the presenters so you can tell what works and what does not. For instance, too many speakers this year had preliminary or no data to share – just a funded project and plan of action.**
- **I like the idea of developing a conference for water and water-related professionals. It should include the mini symposia with research summaries and discussion.**
- **The current conference is a good model, although I thought there was too much shuttling between concurrent sessions. Paper presentation length was good, but the people moving from session to session was distracting.**
- **This conference should focus on the BIG issues, NEW CONCEPTS and PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT. The national facilitation projects and integrated research projects should be highlighted.**

- **WE need to carve out more time for us to meet at the national and regional levels and to have more interaction.**
- **Build in breaks between sessions and provide coffee-tea-soft drinks. We do lots of interaction with our coffee cups.**
- **A time to get together to discuss opportunities for collaboration, working together, sharing of programs. This could be a session at the beginning or end with a REQUEST BOARD where collaborative concepts could be shared.**
- **In my opinion, much success has been realized in recent years concerning the national and state water quality program. As the national program has matured, it has come with a better understanding of the roles and responsibilities of the two entities. It is important that this relationship continue to be strengthened as we strive for the continued success of state water quality programs. Budget updates, legislative updates and deadlines, are important and useful information for state water quality coordinators. Continued stability in federal programs (ie administration, contacts, budget support) are of course important as well.**
- **I believe that part of the reason the conference has grown is because it is a command performance for most of the participants. This idea has strengths and weaknesses. Theoretically, coordinators get a clear picture of the types of active research being sponsored by CSREES. However, I've noticed that many of the talks that I have attended either repeated information presented in last year's conference or added slight bits of information. That is the nature of research – it progresses slowly. However, the obligatory nature of the conference forces people to present something whether they have anything new to say or not .**
- **I think that if the meetings are to accomplish the goal of better communication between coordinators, the meeting should have a focus. That might mean that conference planners search for a theme – like one of the national themes – and they invite USDA sponsored researchers and coordinators that have an interest in the theme or are actually working on the theme. I am not convinced that the current format leads to productive relationships across regional boundaries that are lasting. Maybe a one or two theme-based conference would help accomplish this – smaller group, common interests and focused research presentations. Here is an idea that is probably a bad one, but what if you structured research presentations less (do away with the 20 minute formats) and let sessions devoted to research summaries have more of a free-form format? Let the researchers specify the amount of time they need, within a set of bounds ( say 5 to 40 minutes) and structure sessions according to what people have to say. One of the advantages of a smaller meeting is that this type of session could work because there would be fewer concurrent presentations on the menu and, besides,**

a smaller group with more focus and chances to catch up informally wouldn't be forced to miss much by choosing between competing sessions. In my opinion, smaller and more focused is better.

- **Most college and Experiment station administrators still view this as an Extension effort. Some states have close ties between their general water programs and those programs coordinated through the water resources research institute (WRRI) program that is supported by DOI-USGS. Most do not, however. These ties should be strengthened. If we are going to call this a national water resource conference, we should move to make it that by establishing meaningful interaction, first at the top and then at the state level by pulling appropriate leadership together.**
- **I do not have a good feeling for where water program coordinating positions will or should go now that monies will be going through the NRI. The program was established on the Extension side of USDA and land grants but is moving rapidly toward being primarily a research-driven program. I have always thought that this would happen. Most state-level Extension leadership places a low priority on water issues in my area.**



*This material is based upon work supported in part by the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the view of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.*

