From: Mike Josselyn
To: ljohnson@d.umn.edu; Armitage, Thomas
Cc: Genevieve Ali; 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)
Date: Friday, January 31, 2014 9:57:17 AM

Lucinda:

As I needed to drop off before the end of the call, I wanted to suggest two clarifications:

1. As I mentioned on the phone, I believe that the current draft report should acknowledge and address that many wetlands and other water bodies occur in hydrologically altered or developed situations. The scientific literature used for the Draft Report focuses on natural wetland systems, for the most part, and therefore does not analyze the alterations that may occur as a result of flood control projects, impoundments, groundwater depletion, and other anthropogenic changes within watersheds. In addition, many wetlands throughout the country are not natural features as they are the result of mining, salt production, levees, rice farming, sediment and storm water detention, and a variety of development activities. These types of non-natural wetlands may not have any past or current connectivity to downstream waters and are not discussed within the context of the report. It is not possible to find sufficient scientific information to reach any conclusions on these wetland types and I believe that the draft report should acknowledge that limitation.

2. I also suggested that in the text where we refer to “bodies of water”, it should be stated “wetlands” and open water. There is a distinction in the regulatory environment between the two and I think we should discuss that distinction under terminology. They also have different functions and roles in the watershed and keeping them separate is important.

Mike Josselyn