Message

**From**: Calli, Rosemary [Calli.Rosemary@epa.gov]
**Sent**: 11/27/2020 5:46:51 PM
**To**: Eisenberg, Mindy [Eisenberg.Mindy@epa.gov]; Gettle, Jeaneanne [Gettle.Jeaneanne@epa.gov]; Palmer, Leif [Palmer.Leif@epa.gov]
**CC**: Beck, Whitney [beck.whitney@epa.gov]; Creswell, Michael [Creswell.Michael@epa.gov]; Ghosh, Mita [Ghosh.Mita@epa.gov]; Hicks, Matt [Hicks.Matthew@epa.gov]; Hurld, Kathy [Hurld.Kathy@epa.gov]; Kupchan, Simma [Kupchan.Simma@epa.gov]; Laycock, Kelly [Laycock.Kelly@epa.gov]; Mcgill, Thomas [Mcgill.Thomas@epa.gov]; Morgan, James [Morgan.James@epa.gov]; Nagrani, Kavita [Nagrani.Kavita@epa.gov]; Parker, Christopher [Parker.Christopher@epa.gov]; Speir, Jeffrey [speir.jeffrey@epa.gov]; Wade, Alexis [Wade.Alexis@epa.gov]
**Subject**: RE: Drafts: Decision Document & 3 comment summaries
**Attachments**: Decision Document - Action Memo_CLEANv2.docx

Hi, all – I incorporated Mindy's edits* into the working version on SharePoint, verified that Matt's and Mita's comments were included this time (!), and saved the attached as a second clean copy.
*I copied everything but the changes of "state" to lowercase where it stands in for Florida. Lots of different perspectives here and we could spend some considerable energy editing back and forth. :) Last time around on the FR Notice and kickoff document editing, we ultimately went with using uppercase where the word stands in for Florida specifically, so I suggest being consistent with those previous documents (although I might personally be on the same page about using plain English lower case), but am holding off on editing back and forth meanwhile.

~ Rosemary

---

**From:** Eisenberg, Mindy <Eisenberg.Mindy@epa.gov>
**Sent:** Friday, November 27, 2020 12:05 PM
**To:** Calli, Rosemary <Calli.Rosemary@epa.gov>; Gettle, Jeaneanne <Gettle.Jeaneanne@epa.gov>; Palmer, Leif <Palmer.Leif@epa.gov>
**Cc:** Beck, Whitney <beck.whitney@epa.gov>; Creswell, Michael <Creswell.Michael@epa.gov>; Ghosh, Mita <Ghosh.Mita@epa.gov>; Hicks, Matt <Hicks.Matthew@epa.gov>; Hurld, Kathy <Hurld.Kathy@epa.gov>; Kupchan, Simma <Kupchan.Simma@epa.gov>; Laycock, Kelly <Laycock.Kelly@epa.gov>; Mcgill, Thomas <Mcgill.Thomas@epa.gov>; Morgan, James <Morgan.James@epa.gov>; Nagrani, Kavita <Nagrani.Kavita@epa.gov>; Parker, Christopher <Parker.Christopher@epa.gov>; Speir, Jeffrey <speir.jeffrey@epa.gov>; Wade, Alexis <Wade.Alexis@epa.gov>
**Subject:** RE: Drafts: Decision Document & 3 comment summaries

Hi All,
I've finished my review of the draft decision document, streamlining and resources. They look good and the contractor did a good job with the summaries! For the streamlining section, I broke it into those supporting assumption and streamlining benefits vs. those concerned. For the resources one, I did some shifting of comments around to better group them so it looks more heavily redlined. I also added in some comment bubble suggestions. I will send you all the ESA comments shortly.

Nice job!
Mindy

Mindy Eisenberg
Associate Director, Oceans, Wetlands & Communities Division
Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, mailcode 4504T

Washington, DC 20460
Cell - Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)
eisenberg.mindy@epa.gov

**From:** Calli, Rosemary <Calli.Rosemary@epa.gov>
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 25, 2020 5:25 PM
**To:** Gettle, Jeaneanne <Gettle.Jeaneanne@epa.gov>; Palmer, Leif <Palmer.Leif@epa.gov>; Eisenberg, Mindy <Eisenberg.Mindy@epa.gov>
**Cc:** Beck, Whitney <beck.whitney@epa.gov>; Creswell, Michael <Creswell.Michael@epa.gov>; Ghosh, Mita <Ghosh.Mita@epa.gov>; Hicks, Matt <Hicks.Matthew@epa.gov>; Hurld, Kathy <Hurld.Kathy@epa.gov>; Kupchan, Simma <Kupchan.Simma@epa.gov>; Laycock, Kelly <Laycock.Kelly@epa.gov>; Mcgill, Thomas <Mcgill.Thomas@epa.gov>; Morgan, James <Morgan.James@epa.gov>; Nagrani, Kavita <Nagrani.Kavita@epa.gov>; Parker, Christopher <Parker.Christopher@epa.gov>; Speir, Jeffrey <speir.jeffrey@epa.gov>; Wade, Alexis <Wade.Alexis@epa.gov>
**Subject:** Drafts: Decision Document & 3 comment summaries

Jeaneanne, Mindy, Leif – Attached are four draft documents for your review.

Decision Document – Outline and much of the text that we can anticipate at this point. This is to give a sense of what we anticipate the document will cover in documenting the decision at a high level.

Comment Summaries/Responses – These will ultimately be three of the ~12 major categories for the Response to Comments (RtC) document, but given that I expect consolidation once we get a chance to review summaries that came in late last night, it seemed a lot cleaner to just work with and send these as separate documents for now. The rest of the RtC document will simply frame the context (usual Florida assumption language) and describe where the comments came from (public hearings and submissions to the Docket).

- Funding/Staffing [Code 1g]
- Streamlining [Code 1h]
- EPA's policy on ESA consultation re: Florida assumption [Code 10c]

Have a safe and happy Thanksgiving!
` Rosemary

**Rosemary (Hall) Calli**
**Section Chief, Wetlands & Streams Regulatory Section**
Aquatic Ecotoxicologist
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IV

404.562.9846
Calli.Rosemary@epa.gov