To: Conde, Rosaura[Conde.Rosaura@epa.gov]
Cc: Monschein, Eric[Monschein.Eric@epa.gov]
From: Wooster, Richard
Sent: Wed 3/28/2018 4:11:53 PM
Subject: RE: For Tom - - FW: For Richard - Correction suggested in IRW paper

Hey Rosaura. Got your message, thanks!

Thanks for giving me an advance notice . . . I still haven't heard from my management about the project or any anticipated briefings. If John is concerned that the AA does not know about the factual clarification we've tried to have made in the paper, he may need to elevate above me. I've done what I think I can to make decision-makers aware of the nuance between 4B and 5.

From: Conde, Rosaura
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2018 9:55 AM
To: Wooster, Richard <Wooster.Richard@epa.gov>
Cc: Monschein, Eric <Monschein.Eric@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: For Tom - - FW: For Richard - Correction suggested in IRW paper

I just left you a voice mail. Here is the information that I have. Give me a call if you want to chat.

Rosaura Conde
EPA's Office of Wetlands, Oceans & Watersheds
Phone: 202-566-1514

From: Wall, Tom
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2018 10:48 AM
To: Monschein, Eric <Monschein.Eric@epa.gov>
Cc: Havard, James <Havard.James@epa.gov>; Conde, Rosaura <Conde.Rosaura@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: For Tom - - FW: For Richard - Correction suggested in IRW paper

So: if I heard John correctly: LeeF told him yesterday here's another R6 meeting with the Administrator next week. Has Richard heard about that?

From: Monschein, Eric
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2018 8:58 AM
To: Wall, Tom <Wall.Tom@epa.gov>
Cc: Havard, James <Havard.James@epa.gov>; Conde, Rosaura <Conde.Rosaura@epa.gov>
Subject: For Tom - - FW: For Richard - Correction suggested in IRW paper

Tom – see Richard response below.

From: Wooster, Richard
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2018 6:24 AM
To: Monschein, Eric <Monschein.Eric@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: For Richard - Correction suggested in IRW paper

Hey amigo,

I never got a response to my email, nor have I heard any post-ECOS report. When I spoke to the Acting DRA last Friday, he acknowledged my comment about the needed clarification and responded that "they" were still making changes in the paper. If I do receive an updated version, you're on the top of my sharing list.

Sent from my iPhone
On Mar 27, 2018, at 4:58 PM, Monschein, Eric <Monschein.Eric@epa.gov> wrote:

> Hi Richard. Tom asking (below) if there's an updated version of the issue paper. If so, can you send along to me?
> Cheers, Eric

From: Wall, Tom
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2018 5:10 PM
To: Goodin, John <Goodin.John@epa.gov>
Cc: Havard, James <Havard.James@epa.gov>; Monschein, Eric <Monschein.Eric@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Correction suggested in IRW paper

John – here is what I have re: correction re: which segments listed. Eric will check with the Region to see if there's an updated version of their issue paper - TomW

From: Havard, James
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2018 9:48 AM
To: Goodin, John <Goodin.John@epa.gov>; Wall, Tom <Wall.Tom@epa.gov>; Monschein, Eric <Monschein.Eric@epa.gov>; Conde, Rosaura <Conde.Rosaura@epa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Correction suggested in IRW paper

Sent from my iPhone
Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** "Wooster, Richard" <Wooster.Richard@epa.gov>
> **Date:** March 26, 2018 at 9:00:34 AM EDT
> **To:** "Gray, David" <gray.david@epa.gov>
> **Cc:** "Dwyer, Stacey" <Dwyer.Stacey@epa.gov>, "Garcia, David" <Garcia.David@epa.gov>, "Shaikh, Taimur" <Shaikh.Taimur@epa.gov>
> **Subject: Correction suggested in IRW paper**
>
> Good morning, sir,
>
> I'm following up on an observation I mentioned to you last Friday concerning the IRW discussion paper which remains in development.
>
> My HQ program counterparts and I agree there is a point of factual clarification needed with respect to whether any of the IRW waters (Illinois River or tributaries) are "listed" in Arkansas. Notwithstanding a statement included in the "Background" section of the discussion paper, neither the Illinois River nor any of its tributaries are on the current Arkansas Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list of impaired waters (Category 5). Rather, as discussed in EPA's July 19, 2017, record of its decision on the Arkansas Section 303(d) list, there are four (4) assessment units in the watershed (Spring Creek; Muddy Fork of the Illinois; and, two segments of Spring Creek) which EPA considered "appropriate for Arkansas to designate as Category 4b", rather than Category 5. Should there be further discussions at the Agency decision-making levels, I would recommend sharing this point of clarification.
>
> If you have any questions, I would be happy to discuss the similarities and differences between the two categories, and the possible implications thereof.
>
> richard
>
> Richard A. Wooster, Chief
> Assessment, Listing and TMDL Section
> (214)665-6473