



NESP-EMP Strategic Planning

Eleven Issues

✓ *Complete (11-05)*

Future of LTRMP

✓ *Complete (11-05)*

Ecosystem restoration program authority

✓ *Complete (2-06)*

Cost sharing

✓ *Complete (2-06)*

Total price tag

✓ *Complete (2-06)*

Annual vs. total funding authority

✓ *Complete (2-06)*

Funding transfer

✓ *Complete (2-06)*

Partnership provisions

May 06

The role of “advisors”

May 06

Reports to Congress

Table

Comparable progress provisions

Table

Goals and performance measures



NESP-EMP Strategic Planning **Process**

- Steering Committee
- UMRBA, EMP-CC, NECC/ECC Meetings
(Nov 05....Feb 06...May 06)
- Comments to UMRBA representatives or staff
- Consider comprehensive proposal in August 2006



Expedite the Process.....

Senate may take up WRDA in April

What issues pose the biggest problems?

- *Monitoring*
- *Consultation and Funding Agreements*

UMRBA Proposal for WRDA amendment



Monitoring

Problem:

- No monitoring provision in NESP
- LTRMP needs to continue if EMP no longer funded

Solution:

- Add monitoring authority to NESP
- Link it directly to 1986 LTRMP authority
- Authorize \$\$ if not funded through 1986 authority



Consultation and Funding Agreements

Problem:

- NESP does not recognize need for consultation
- NESP has no provisions for interagency agreements

Solution:

- Add provision requiring consultation with Interior and the States
- Add authority for funding transfer agreements with Interior, UMRBA and States



Issue #6 Reporting to Congress & Role of Advisors

The Issue...

- EMP and NESP each have provisions requiring Congressional reporting and advisors
- But the provisions are not identical
- What are the differences? are the two approaches compatible? is one preferred over the other?



EMP Legislative Provisions

Congressional Reporting

Required since the original 1986 authorization

WRDA 99 established six-year reporting cycle, with first report due December 2004

COE must consult with DOI and the States

Reports must

- evaluate HREP and LTRMP components
- describe accomplishments
- update systemic HNA
- identify needed adjustments



EMP Legislative Provisions

Role of Advisors

No advisors in original authorization

99 WRDA requires an “Independent Technical Advisory Committee” (ITAC)

Charge = review projects, monitoring plans, & needs assessments

Size & composition not specified

\$350k/yr authorized FY 99-09 for ITAC



NESP Legislative Provisions

Congressional Reporting

Periodic implementation reports as part of the ecosystem restoration authority

House = 4 year cycle starting June 07

Senate = 5 year cycle starting June 08

Reports must address

- baselines, milestones, goals, & priorities
- progress in meeting the goals

Implicit requirement for a report near the end of the 1st 15 years addressing extension of authority



NESP Legislative Provisions

Role of Advisors

Advisory panel required

Sole charge = provide independent guidance in development of implementation reports

One member from each of the five states, USDA, DOT, USGS, FWS, EPA & affected landowners

Two members each from environmental and agriculture/industry groups

FACA exempt



Options for Reporting to Congress

- A. Retain separate Congressional reporting requirements for NESP's ecosystem restoration component and the EMP
- B. Replace the separate reporting requirements with an integrated approach



Options for Role of Advisors

- D. Don't seek to modify or reconcile the two programs' provisions related to advisory groups
- E. Establish a single advisory panel that would work with both the EMP and NESP
- F. Eliminate one or both of the advisory groups



Considerations

Reporting Schedule—EMP's 6-year cycle less burdensome and better suited to pace of ecological change

Scope of Reports—required content of EMP & NESP reports quite similar

Role of Advisors—ITAC charged with active review; NESP panel provides guidance on reports; do partners have a view on desired role?



Considerations

Composition of Advisors—ITAC not specified, but name suggests members are outsiders; NESP panel composed of agency & stakeholder reps; composition should parallel role

Need for/Redundancy of Advisors—do the advisors add anything to the EMP and NESP's non-mandated policies and practices?

Program Integration—enhanced by combining reporting requirements & having a single advisory group



Considerations

Standing and Credibility—partner efforts to alter reporting or advisor requirements may be viewed with skepticism

Programs' Futures—need to integrate is limited if separate EMP & NESP programs are not maintained over time