From: Mike Josselyn
To: ljohnson@d.umn.edu
Cc: rpb2@psu.edu; Robert Brooks; emily.bernhardt@duke.edu; mgooseff@engr.colostate.edu; hassy@cox.net; Goodman, Iris; Amanda D. Rodewald; Genevieve Ali; Armitage, Thomas
Subject: RE: Teleconference to discuss the draft responses to charge questions 5(a) and 5 (b)
Date: Thursday, January 30, 2014 6:15:10 PM

I am in concurrence with Genevieve's second option as it links to the conceptual framework that will be proposed by the Panel.

Mike

From: Genevieve Ali [mailto:Genevieve.Ali@umanitoba.ca]
Sent: Thursday, January 30, 2014 11:17 AM
To: ljohnson@d.umn.edu; Armitage, Thomas
Cc: Mike Josselyn; rpb2@psu.edu; Robert Brooks; emily.bernhardt@duke.edu; mgooseff@engr.colostate.edu; hassy@cox.net; Goodman, Iris; Amanda D. Rodewald
Subject: RE: Teleconference to discuss the draft responses to charge questions 5(a) and 5 (b)

Hi Lucinda,

I think that it is difficult at this stage to make a clear statement without knowing how the (whole panel) discussion of terminology will go and which (whole panel) consensus will be reached in response to the draft response of sub-group 2. Two quick suggestions:

1) If the idea is to let sub-group 2 suggest new terminology for the whole panel to discuss later, then we should just express our discomfort with the new terms but not suggest any terminology ourselves (i.e., go with the current paragraph without the last sentence that reads: "*The panel recommends that terminology that categorizes the bidirectional wetlands as those within floodplains and unidirectional wetlands as those not within a floodplain, e.g. non-floodplain wetlands.*")

2) If we want to express our discomfort with the new terms AND push for the floodplain versus non-floodplain terminology at the same time, then we can keep the whole paragraph and maybe just alter the last sentence along the lines of: "*In accordance with its response to charge question 2 that recommends the use of a conceptual framework with a flowpath focus, the panel suggests that terminology that categorizes the bidirectional wetlands as those within floodplains and unidirectional wetlands as those not within a floodplain, e.g. non-floodplain wetlands, be used and explained in the context of that revised conceptual framework.*"

I am OK with both options as any of the statements will likely need to be revised after the whole panel discussion some time in April.

G.

--

Genevieve Ali, BSc Hons, PhD

Junior Chair, Watershed Systems Research Program
Assistant Professor, Department of Geological Sciences
Center for Earth Observation Science (CEOS)
Clayton H. Riddell Faculty of Environment, Earth and Resources
232 Wallace Building, Fort Gary Campus
University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, R3T 2N2 Canada

Email: Genevieve.Ali@ad.umanitoba.ca
Phone: +1 (204) 474-7266
Fax: +1 (204) 474-7623

Websites:
http://galiresearch.com/
http://www.wsrp.ca/

General Inquiries about the Watershed Systems Research Program (WSRP):
wsrp@cc.umanitoba.ca

From: (b) (6) [redacted] [mailto:(b) (6) [redacted] **On Behalf Of** Lucinda Johnson
Sent: January-30-14 12:55 PM
To: Armitage, Thomas
Cc: Genevieve Ali; Mike Josselyn; rpb2@psu.edu; Robert Brooks; emily.bernhardt@duke.edu; mgooseff@engr.colostate.edu; hassy@cox.net; Goodman, Iris; Amanda D. Rodewald
Subject: Re: Teleconference to discuss the draft responses to charge questions 5(a) and 5 (b)

ge 2, Paragraph 2:

The Panel recommends that the conceptual framework as discussed below (see Figure X) be utilized as a means to discuss the types of hydrologic connections that occur within unidirectional wetlands. It may be preferred to move away from adopting a new classification or terminology as used in the Draft Report as it implies a one way flow pattern, when in fact, there may be many dimensions to connectivity, not only in relation to surface and shallow subsurface water flows, but to chemical and biological connectivity as well. It may be best to utilize a terminology that is already well ensconced in the scientific literature such as "geographically isolated wetlands" or the hydrogeomorphic classification system that focuses on depressional and slope landscape features. The panel recommends that terminology that categorizes the bidirectional wetlands as those within floodplains and unidirectional wetlands as those not within a floodplain, e.g. non-floodplain wetlands.

The latter part of the paragraph is making two contradictory recommendations regarding terminology: First: move away from use of new terms: unidirectional and bidirectional in preference of geographically isolated or the hydrogeomorphic classification system terminology. Second: replace bidirectional wetlands with floodplain wetlands, and unidirectional as "non-floodplain" wetlands..
What should we recommend? Our discussion yesterday seemed to favor the second.

thanks

Lucinda

Lucinda B. Johnson
Interim Director, Natural Resources Research Institute
Director, Center for Water and the Environment
Natural Resources Research Institute
University of Minnesota
Duluth, MN 55811
218 720-4251

On Tue, Jan 21, 2014 at 11:10 AM, Armitage, Thomas <Armitage.Thomas@epa.gov> wrote:

Dear Charge Question 5(a)/5(b) subgroup members,

I have scheduled a subgroup teleconference on **Wednesday, January 29th from 1:00 - 2:00 p.m. (Eastern Time)** to discuss the draft responses to charge questions 5(a) and 5(b).

The teleconference call-in number is: **1-866-299-3188**. After calling in, please enter the following conference code at the prompt: **2023439995# .**

I look forward to talking with you on the call.

Tom Armitage

****

Thomas Armitage Ph.D.

Designated Federal Officer
EPA Science Advisory Board Office
202-564-2155 (phone/voice mail)
202-565-2098 (fax)
armitage.thomas@epa.gov