From: (b) (6) [redacted] on behalf of Emily Bernhardt
To: ljohnson@d.umn.edu
Cc: Armitage, Thomas; Goodman, Iris
Subject: Re: Outcome of Wednesday"s discussion - requires urgent attention.
Date: Friday, January 31, 2014 2:05:40 PM
Attachments: esb_Users_tarmitag_Documents_Wetland Connectivity_Subgroup responses to charge _questions_Lentic_systems_5A_and_5B_1_29_14_clean.docx

---

Lucinda and Tom and Iris

I am so sorry for missing the call. (b) (6) [redacted]

I think this looks really great, I made just a few minor edits and responses and I changed the figure to remove the chemistry arrows. I still think its an important point, but perhaps it is one that is equally true for any part of the landscape and not specific to non-floodplain wetlands.

again, my apologies. I will look forward to the full group call.

Emily

On Fri, Jan 31, 2014 at 1:27 PM, Lucinda Johnson <ljohnson@d.umn.edu> wrote:

> Emily;
>
> The group met via conference call on Wednesday. Sorry you couldn't be on the call; I imagine you were affected by the weather.
>
> The group reviewed the attached document and recommended some subtle changes on the text here and there. There was a considerable amt of discussion about the figure, with some discomfort on the novelty of chemistry component of the upper panel. I think Tom and Iris were taking notes, and they can provide you with the context and content of that discussion if you wish--- the conclusion was that the group would prefer to delete the chemistry arrow. In essence it was felt that the fluxes of volume / mass of inputs would cover the input of change in dissolved constituents, as well as particulate, so there was not a need to call that out separately. HOWEVER, EVERYONE AGREED IT WOULD BE YOUR CALL, SINCE YOU MAY HAVE A DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVE ON THIS ISSUE.
>
> Leading from that change in the diagram, there is now a hanging sentence referring to novel chemistry that is flagged on page 4. Please also suggest how to deal with that in the context of the change to the diagram (if you agree to change it).
>
> Tom and Iris encouraged us to frame the recommendations strongly, so we reworded and reformatted the whole section to that effect (e.g., The Panel recommends...).
>
> We also reformatted the 5B section to be consistent with the other group submissions. (Instead of repeating the report text, we just refer to it.).
>
> Please take a quick look at this and get back to the group if you have comments / suggestions about handling the figure. Once that is resolved, we will edit the document sequentially until everyone in the Charge 5A, B group has had their final say. Genevieve is

the first on the list. She will forward it on to the next person in order, so that all the comments are embedded in the same document using track changes. The final document will be sent to me. We will then decide if it is ready for Tom to send out to the other groups at that time. Tom and Iris would like to get the final draft of our sections incorporated into a draft report as soon as possible. (see email from Tom about this deadline).

Thanks for your help.

Stay warm.

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

--

><<<*> ~~~~~ <*>>><

Emily Bernhardt
Associate Professor
3313 French Science Building
Department of Biology
Duke University
Durham, NC 27708
emily.bernhardt@duke.edu
646-825-1278 (cell)
919-660-7318 (office)