

Comments from Dr. Elaine Faustman

1. Were the charge questions to the committee adequately addressed?

The SAB did an excellent job of reviewing this very detailed draft report from ORD. I reviewed both the SAB report as well as the base draft on connectivity of streams and wetland. I found both to be very detailed and thorough. I agreed with the comments by the SAB that stated that more discussion on the potential utility in using gradients to describe these processes to be compelling but requiring more details.

2. Are there any technical errors or omissions or issues that are not adequately dealt with in the draft report?

I would emphasize two points. One is for the section of EPA's report that addresses chemical contaminants (Section 4). I think some examples of how salmon and other fish that move upstream at the end of their life should be specially addressed within the EPA framing of connectivity. For example, with fish contaminated with persistent bio-accumulative toxicants, the load of the fish after spawning is a significant path for increasing contaminant load to the streams. This example of chemicals moving upstream against the downstream gradients seems like an important example to include which reinforces the text on connectivity. Second I do like the suggestions to add a few more decision modeling references and I think the reference by R. Gregory et al 2012 (provided by Dr. Arvai) is a seminal book to help provide additional framing considerations.

3. Is the draft report clear and logical?

The SAB report is very clear and logically presented. The executive summary reflects what is in the report

4. Are the conclusions drawn or recommendations provided supported by the body of the draft report?

There is very extensive documentation within the SAB report for their recommendations.9/26/14