

CEQ WEBINAR Q&As from Notes

Monday, July 13, 2009

First Name	Last Name	Questions Asked by Attendee	Answer
Robert	McCaw	<p>Q1: Besides the recent federal register notice, what other documents or notifications have been published which mention the PNG Revision process? Does the new administration have any goals which differ from the prior?</p>	<p>A1. This whole revision process began last year with a listening session held by the Assistant Secretary of Army for Civil Works to get comments on the 1983 P&G. This is the first notice about potentially expanding the agencies covered by the P&G and requesting comments on the 1983 P&G. Goals of the new Administration with regard to the P&G are similar to what are identified in section 2031 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007.</p>
Steve	McIntosh	<p>Q1: Positive that you have included all federal water development agencies. Previous CORP P&G omitted forecasts from P&G steps. Recommend that a desired future condition be included in objectives and forecast remain in P&G steps.</p> <p>Q2: How do you anticipate comparing NED and RED benefits with non-economic benefits?</p>	<p>A1. Thank you for the comment.</p> <p>A2. This will be one of the biggest challenges; it will require the expertise of an interagency group who can bring their talents together when they begin preparation of the guidelines/procedures portion of the P&G which will follow the current effort.</p>
William	Hunt	<p>Q1: There are other ways to incorporate non-market effects (environmental, other) than monetizing on a project by project basis, and should be considered.</p> <p>Q2: Some comments on Chapter I of the P&G could overlap with later chapters</p>	<p>A1. Agreed, and they will be evaluated. Environmental functions and services is one area of particular interest.</p> <p>A2. Agreed, that is why we plan to start with the first chapter.</p>

Clyde	Martin	<p>Q1: It appears that you are looking for one size fits all. We have found that this does not work for all states. Will local laws and state laws be taken into consideration?</p> <p>Q2: We have found that the social effects of low property values effect the flood safety by giving low damage reduction benefits and a low B/C ratio to these communities.</p> <p>Q3: Do all studies have to pass thru the OMB?</p>	<p>A1. All will be considered</p> <p>A2. Will be reviewed</p> <p>A3. Yes, with any project that must go to Congress for authorization or with a recommendation for construction.</p>
Terry	Sullivan	<p>Q1: How will the P &G ultimately be approved and adopted?</p>	<p>A1. Same process as 1983, Federal agencies will look at it and vote and it will go to the Executive Office of the President for signature.</p>
Bill	Rinne	<p>Q1: Will the P & G requirements be applied to all water resource projects regardless of size or value?</p> <p>Q2: What are the major areas in the current document that this review will focus on for possible revision?</p>	<p>A1. If they fall into one of the categories of one of the original agencies covered by the current P&G, it's likely that they will be covered. Level of detail and complexity will depend on size and value of project.</p> <p>A2. More balanced approach than current P&G, current - national economic development plan and "consider" the environment, we should include all benefits both monetary and non-monetary.</p>
Amy	Guise	<p>Q1: Will collaborative planning be supported by collaborative implementation? We routinely run into policy constraints that prohibit Federal agencies, for example, from cost sharing with each other. Collaborative planning is only a partial answer when we desire integrated solutions and implementation.</p>	<p>A1. Collaborative planning is a one of the main thrusts we will be looking at in any revision. We are looking at all agencies not only to collaborate in the planning, but also to cost share in portions of a project that is within their authority.</p>
Julie	Lemmon	<p>Q1: There is proposed federal legislation for national watershed planning - how would this effort be affected by that legislation?</p>	<p>A1. We will have to wait and see if it passes. Right now we are proceeding with P&G based on current legislation.</p>

Dennis kern	<p>Q1: In developing the new P&G, is CEQ committed to maintaining flexibility in partnering with local sponsors and state/local governments to maximize all possible benefits?</p> <p>Q2: describe the nexus between plan formulation and budgetary policy. will it be possible to keep them separate?</p> <p>Q3: Hard to hear Rich. Will a transcript be made available? When?</p> <p>Q4: possible benefits?</p>	<p>A1. No reason why we wouldn't, collaborative planning is an important part of the process</p> <p>A2. They are two separate processes and decisions are made using different criteria. We are proceeding with them as separate processes.</p> <p>A3. there is no transcript, but the notes and other elements will be made available by email as soon as possible if we do not get them on a CEQ website soon.</p> <p>A4. Benefits categories will be looked at more closely in the development of the guidelines/procedures following this effort.</p>
John Burns	<p>Q1: urban rivers generally suffer from complex water quality issues along with other water resource issues. How do we attack these complex water resources issues for urban rivers if we don't integrate water quality and water quantity issues and planning?</p> <p>Q2: how will the revisions to the P&G promote collaborative planning?</p>	<p>A1. Again, collaborative planning is necessary. While, for example, the Corps may be doing a flood control project on a river that has problems with combined stormwater runoff there is no reason why EPA could not be part of a planning effort.</p> <p>A2. It is envisioned that the revised P&G will specifically identify collaborative planning as a policy.</p>

Rebecca Garvoille

Q1: Who will be spearheading the revisions to the Guidelines?

A1. Terry Breyman at CEQ is coordinating this effort with representatives from other agencies. This is envisioned as being a joint document of all Federal Agencies.

Q2: Can you please speak more specifically to what role the National Academy of Sciences will play in revising the Principles and Standards?

A2. NAS will not be revising P&G. They will submit comments in the form of a report which will be taken into consideration.

Q3: I have one clarifying question about the process. Am I correct in understanding that CEQ and NAS will each issue a revised Principles and Standards and then the Army Corps of Engineers will work to issue a revised set of Guidelines?

A3. There will be one P&G issued for everyone and produced by the Administration.

Q4: If the revised Principles and Guidelines will be applied on a project basis, how is a "water resources project" defined?

A4. Look to the projects of the 4 agencies that are already covered by the 1983 P&G.

Q5: I am sorry but I missed what was said about how CEQ's revisions will or will not adhere to the guidance given in WRDA 2007. Can you please repeat?

A5. CEQ is much in support of WRDA 2007, we heard it from environmentalists, industry, and Congress, they are all behind that direction and we will follow that in drafting the revision of the P&G.

Eugene Dashiell

Q1: But EPA can't have their cake and eat it to. They have a sort of rigid attitude strictly focused on WQ and at the same time can conveniently ignore NEPA which includes a national objective of preserving/enhancing the human environment

Q2: WQ is linked to any flow modes proposed in flood control projects....don't be naive.

Q3: Please add EPA to the list of agencies covered by P&G. EPA has major watershed planning initiatives, but if you read their latest guidance they do barely mention flood control. Their initiatives work against the protection of local communities. We are in an increasingly urban situation, but it seems as if EPA is not cognizant of the need to protect communities from flooding. Plus, climate change and sea level rise will endanger many coastal communities and islanders.

Q4: We need EPA in the process just because they are the WQ mavens.

Q5: The purpose and scope of P&G is to "..ensure consistent planning..", yet EPA does not have to be consistent in its watershed planning guidance. At a minimum, have EPA retract its current guidance and redo it to reflect the national objectives of human health and safety.

A1. No Response

A2. No Response

A3. We have not sorted through the projects of which agencies may be covered. We will be sitting down with everything and going through the process of identify what is covered. If the program looks like one of those that are in the four existing agencies than it is likely to be covered. We are not expanding the scope of projects we are only saying that any agency that engages in this type of project will be covered.

A4. They are part of the writing team

A5. No Response

James	Smyth	<p>Q1: Would you please list the agencies and/or programs that might be covered by this P&G.</p>	<p>A1. Can't say what will be covered and not, if it is in the four areas covered by the existing P&G agencies already than it will be covered</p>
		<p>Q2: Budgets have more difficult criteria (B/C) than the P&G allows. Unless the Federal Government is able to actually implement the project, then they are doing studies that no value. To the extent this difference exists it needs to be addressed in the revised P&G. Jim Smyth</p>	<p>A2. Thank you A3. Can't anticipate right now, we will be looking at net benefits which will include both monetary and non monetary benefits. A4. Can't say yet.</p>
		<p>Q3: Would the concept of optimizing outputs still be a governing principal in the revised P&G?</p>	
		<p>Q4: Would the revised P&G consider having more than one Federal objective as the existing P&G does.</p>	
George	Dickey	<p>Q1: How can effective ecosystem restoration be accomplished by the continued separation of water quality and quantity issues? Why is this opportunity not being taken advantage of?</p>	<p>A1. Through a collaborative planning process. A2. Yes, the budgetary process is dependent on the availability of money in any given year while you need a stable decision point for a planning study which consumes multiple years.</p>
		<p>Q2: Is Federal interest different from budgetary eligibility? If so, what is that difference?</p>	<p>A3. I do not anticipate P&G going into the water quality business, that's EPA's.</p>
		<p>Q3: Modern water planning requires integration of water quality and quantity, will these apply to water quality planning ?</p>	<p>A4. The P&G will set the planning framework, but it will be able to work within, and will work within any existing state watershed plan.</p>
		<p>Q4: How can there be effective collaborative planning when there is no common planning framework?</p>	<p>A5. It is separate as it relates to the agencies as all agencies have different missions, but water quality will be part of the process as it relates to other missions, but not as the main mission for the agency doing the planning under the P&G.</p>
		<p>Q5: What is the rationale for continuing to keep water quantity and water quality separate?</p>	<p>A6. Congressional decision</p>
		<p>Q6: Why is continuing separation of authorization and appropriation processes a good idea? Why</p>	

Peter	Evans	<p>Q1: In the last draft of the revisions, Section 9.1 points us toward an "implementable national water resources plan" without really saying what that is OR how that might be reconciled with an increase of the BCR to 1.5. Can you explain these?</p> <p>Q2: In many recent and ongoing watershed planning efforts, it is often appropriate and necessary to stretch the surface water notion of a "watershed" to encompass GW hydrology, transbasin diversions and other "integrated" influences. How do you interpret the term "watershed?"</p> <p>Q3: Thank you for putting this together and for your openness. This was very helpful!</p> <p>Q4: Given the historic primacy that states have had in water resource planning, is it possible to give their plans and priorities (and those developed by the interstate organizations created by the states) explicit and substantial recognition in the formulation and evaluation of plans?</p> <p>Q5: Would the NEPA approach for addressing uncertainties be useful in this context, or are there reasons for a specialized approach in the P&Gs?</p>	<p>A1. What we are asking here is for comments on the 1983 P&G not the previous draft Principles from last year.</p> <p>A2. Will be defined at a later date</p> <p>A3. No response</p> <p>A4. The plans of states or multiple states will always be a backdrop for the planning processes.</p> <p>A5. We will certainly be looking to make the P&G and NEPA compatible, but specifics will have to wait until the writing is complete.</p>
Lara	Beaven	<p>Q: Can you clarify what the revised draft P&G document will contain? Will it include both principles and standards? How will NAS be able to review the document if it does not include standards?</p>	<p>A1. Yes, what the Corps did was only the principles. This effort will produce both the Principles and Standards portion of the P&G. The Guidelines/Procedures portion will come separately after completion of the Principles and Standards portion so there will not have to be major rewrites should something change during the review of the Principles and Standards.</p>

Don	Rayno	Q1: Does the ordering of required accounts in Section 8.2 of the draft indicate an implied hierarchy of consideration in decision making?	A1. You are referring to the Corps draft of the Principles, we would like to get your comments on the 1983 P&G. We will be drafting a new Principles section along with the Standards during this next effort.
David	McLain	Q1: how do the guidelines address interstate watersheds? Q2: understand post authorization changes are also to be a focus? - Q3: do I understand that ecosystem services are to be evaluated Q4: state primacy for water management also holds for interstate watersheds? the water control manual's update process is directly affected	A1: It hasn't been done yet, if there is a plan that exists we will surely follow it A2: We anticipate post authorization changes will also be covered. Please note the 1983 P&G identifies that they cover both pre-authorization as well as post-authorization reports. A3: Looking to do that A4. Ok
Steve	Fitzgerald	Q1: Recommend that the Principles be general, clearly written for non-federal people to understand, and give overall direction. Do not mix in standards and details. Q2: Do you anticipate the revised P&G to impact the current project identification process used by FEMA's Hazard Mitigation Grant? Program Q3: Can Principles and standards be structured so the current Corps planning process can be improved, that is, take less time and cost, but still result in good local/federal projects? Q4: I like the idea of allowing each agency to develop there own implementation guidance. Just for clarification, will they base it on the Principles and Standards only, or will their be an overall set of Guidelines for all agencies to follow?	A1. Thank you A2. Can't speak to that program. A3: Can't speak to the Corps particular planning process in the future as they write implementation guidance for a new P&G . A4. The whole P&G will be developed, though in two portions...Principles and Standards first followed by the Guidelines. Each agency will write there own implementation guidance based on the complete P&G.
Nathaniel	Kane	Q1: Will there be public comment on the question of what agencies will be subject to the P&G?	A1: It is anticipated that that any agency who does a water resources development project similar to the four currently covered agencies will be covered by a revised P&G.

Thomas	Hodson	Q1: Is it still the case that the P&G is about how to decide what is or is not an appropriate federal investment in water resources? Is it to be about anything else? If so, what?	A1. It is still about if there is a Federal interest in a water resources development project.
Clark	Frentzen	Q1: Will the new P&G apply to all Federal agencies and/or Federal grant recipients (e.g. State and local government agencies) conducting planning and implementation of Federal recreation projects associated with land and water resources?	A1: We cant say now as we are still in the drafting phase. Whatever direction it goes will be open to public for review and comment.
Peter	Blum	Q1: Will criteria for completeness, effectiveness, efficiency and acceptability remain in effect and if so, will this be considered outside of the benefit-cost ratio in justifying projects? Q2: how will planning and policy considerations be separated from budget criteria?	A1. The four existing P&G criteria will likely be retained. They are part of the planning criteria in formualtion, benefit cost ratio has to do with selection of a recommended plan. A2. This is still being worked on and no decision has been made.
Cecelia	Linder	Q1: I am interested in the criteria of projects that would fall under this e.g. just congressional identified or are there any known size thresholds	A. The type of project will determine if it is covered. If it is a type similar to the four agencies that are currently covered it is anticipated that a revised P&G will cover it. Until a draft is complete, I cannot answer this question, but I do know the Corps uses the P&G even for its small continuing authority projects.
Rich	Worthington	Q1. I am interested in provisions for grandfathering. There are some feasibilities studies in new reports, should be some provision for making these projects exempt from new P & G Q2. Public safety had strong criteria in last P&G, we urge that that continue to be the case	Q1. There will be some grandfathering provisions, the extent will be determined as a draft is completed. Q2. Public saftey will be prominent.