

**Summary Minutes of the
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Science Advisory Board
Panel for the Review of the EPA Water Body Connectivity Report
Public Teleconference
April 28, 2014**

Date and Time: Monday, April 28, 2014, 1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Location: By teleconference

Purpose: To discuss the Panel’s draft report (4/23/14) on the review of the EPA document *Connectivity of Streams and Wetlands to Downstream Waters: A Review and Synthesis of the Scientific Evidence (September, 2013 External Review Draft, EPA/600/R-11/098B)*

Participants:

Members of the EPA Science Advisory Board (SAB) Panel for the Review of the EPA Waterbody Connectivity Report (Panel roster is provided in attachment A):

Dr. Amanda Rodewald
Dr. Allison Aldous
Dr. Genevieve Ali
Dr. J. David Allan
Dr. Lee Benda
Dr. Emily Bernhardt
Dr. Robert Brooks
Dr. Kurt Fausch
Dr. Siobhan Fennessy
Dr. Michael Gooseff
Dr. Judson Harvey
Dr. Lucinda Johnson
Dr. Michael Josselyn
Dr. Latif Kalin
Dr. Kenneth Kolm
Dr. Judith Meyer
Dr. Mark Murphy
Dr. Duncan Patten
Dr. Mark Rains
Dr. K. Ramesh Reddy
Dr. Emma Rosi-Marshall
Dr. Jack Stanford
Dr. Mazeika Sullivan
Dr. Jennifer Tank
Dr. Maurice Valett

SAB Staff:

Dr. Thomas Armitage, Designated Federal Officer
Ms. Iris Goodman, Designated Federal Officer
Mr. Christopher S. Zarba, Acting Director, EPA SAB Staff Office
Mr. Thomas Brennan, Deputy Director, EPA SAB Staff Office

EPA Representatives:

Dr. Laurie Alexander
Dr. Jeffrey Frithsen

Other Attendees:

A list of others who requested access to the meeting by teleconference or webcast is provided in attachment B.

Teleconference Summary:

Convene the Teleconference

Dr. Thomas Armitage, Designated Federal Officer (DFO) for the Panel, convened the teleconference at 1:00 p.m. Eastern Time. He identified Panel members who were on the call. He noted that the Panel operated as part of the EPA Science Advisory Board, which was a chartered Federal Advisory Committee under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) and was empowered to by law to provide advice to the EPA Administrator. He stated that summary minutes of the teleconference would be prepared and certified by the Chair. He noted the Panel's compliance with ethics requirements. Dr. Armitage indicated that meeting materials were available on the SAB web site and that they included: the Federal Register Notice announcing the meeting¹, meeting agenda,² Panel roster³, two drafts of the Panel's report⁴, and individual comments from Panel members on the Panel's report⁵. He also noted that four requests had been received from members of the public to provide oral comments (the list of public speakers⁶ was posted on the SAB website) and that time had been provided on the agenda to hear these public comments. In addition, he noted that written public comments had been received through the EPA docket and that the written comments were available to the public on the EPA docket website⁷.

Review of Agenda and Purpose of the Teleconference

Dr. Amanda Rodewald, Chair of the SAB Panel, reviewed the teleconference objectives and agenda. She indicated that the Panel was holding teleconferences on April 28th and May 2nd to discuss its draft report responding to charge questions for the review of the EPA document *Connectivity of Streams and Wetlands to Downstream Waters: A Review and Synthesis of the Scientific Evidence*. She noted that on the calls the Panel would discuss each section of its draft report to reach agreement on any changes needed. Dr. Rodewald noted that sections of the draft report had been developed by Panel subgroups following a Panel meeting on December 16-18, 2013. These sections had been included in the first draft of the report (dated March 25, 2014) that had been posted on the SAB website and sent to Panel members for review. Editorial changes and specific comments provided by individual Panel members had then been incorporated into a second draft (dated April 23, 2014) that had also been posted on the SAB website and sent to the Panel for review. Dr Rodewald indicated that on the two teleconferences (April 28th and May 2nd) she wanted to focus the discussion of the Panel's report on issues that may: 1)

lack consensus, 2) be inaccurate or problematic, 3) need additional explanation or context, or 4) need to be added to the report.

Dr. Rodewald noted that time had first been provided on the agenda to hear remarks from the EPA. She noted that following EPA remarks, the Panel would hear public comments. She indicated that the time for public comments would be limited to three minute per speaker. She noted that after hearing public comments, the Panel would discuss Sections 3.1 through 3.4 of the draft report – these sections contained the Panel’s responses to charge questions 1, 2, 3(a), and 3(b). Dr. Rodewald indicated that on the call on May 2nd the Panel would discuss Sections 3.5 thorough 3.8 of the report – these sections contained the Panel’s responses to charge questions 4(a), 4(b), 5(a), and 5(b). She also noted that the agenda for the May 2nd teleconference included discussion of the executive summary and letter to the Administrator. She asked Panel members to refer to the page and line numbers in the April 23rd draft during the discussion on the call. In addition, Dr. Rodewald indicated that if further discussion of the Panel’s draft report was needed after the two scheduled calls, another teleconference would be scheduled.

EPA Remarks

Dr. Rodewald introduced Dr. Jeffrey Frithsen, Senior Scientist and Special Projects Coordinator in the EPA’s National Center for Environmental Assessment, to provide remarks to the Panel. Dr. Frithsen thanked the Panel for reviewing EPA’s draft report and referred to some Panel recommendations where more specificity would be helpful to the EPA: 1) he noted that, if possible, it would be helpful to indicate which of the Panel’s recommendations were of the highest priority; 2) he commented that it would be helpful to clarify the Panel’s recommendations concerning the concept of connectivity gradients for all waters; 3) he commented that it would be helpful to receive suggestions concerning approaches to measure and quantify connectivity; 4) he noted that the Panel’s draft report indicated that over long periods of time, all waters were connected and he indicated that it would be helpful to clarify how temporal scale should be considered by the EPA; and 5) he indicated that it would be helpful to receive additional information addressing cumulative and aggregate effects of waters and wetlands on the integrity of downstream waters.

Dr. Rodewald thanked Dr. Frithsen for his remarks.

Public Comments

Dr. Rodewald stated that four members of the public had registered to provide public comments. She indicated that each individual had three minutes to present an oral statement. Dr. Rodewald then asked the speakers to provide comments in the order that the requests to speak had been received by the SAB Staff Office.

Mr. Robin Reash of American Electric Power spoke on behalf of the Utility Water Act Group. He commented that the EPA’s proposed rule defining waters of the United States expanded jurisdiction in ways that would increase costs and impede reliable provision of electricity. He commented that the EPA’s Report should recognize the importance of considering strength and duration of connections. He also commented that the EPA’s Report should contain more discussion of hydrologic isolation and how human alteration can remove or diminish connectivity.

A Panel member asked for clarification of how man-made influences were defined. Mr. Reash indicated that man-made influences covered a broad range of disturbances.

Ms. Susan Bodine of Barnes and Thornburg, LLP spoke on behalf of the Federal Water Quality Coalition. She thanked the Panel for recognizing that the EPA Report would be used in the context of federal regulation. She commented on the importance of considering the degree of water body connectivity and, in particular, the temporal scale of connectivity. She also noted that the EPA had included the Cowardin definition of a wetland, not the regulatory definition, in its Report. She further commented that it was important to distinguish between the effects of connectivity on biota and water quality.

Several Panel members commented that the Clean Water Act called for restoration and protection of the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of waters and noted that the biological component was important.

Ms. Jeanne Christie of the Association of State Wetland Managers thanked the Panel for its report and provided comments. She indicated that she agreed with much of the report. She expressed agreement with the recommended changes in terminology concerning unidirectional and bidirectional wetlands. She commented that geographic isolation of wetlands did not mean functional isolation and that there was a gradient of connectivity. She commented on the connectivity of wetlands outside floodplains, noting that it was appropriate to assess connectivity in terms of wetland complexes. She also commented that it was important to discuss regional groundwater connectivity and the extent of human alteration of waters and wetlands. She commented that use of the Cowardin definition of a wetland in the EPA's Report would not expand Clean Water Act Jurisdiction. She indicated that wetlands were delineated in specific ways and that states could use their own delineation techniques.

Mr. Robert Gensemer of GEI Consultants spoke on behalf of the Waters Advocacy Coalition. He commented that the EPA Report needed revision. He noted that in order to provide a useful report it was necessary to ask the right questions and consider not just at the presence of connectivity, but the significance of connectivity. He also commented that changes were needed in the definitions in the report.

Panel Discussion

The Chair thanked the speakers for their input and called for the Panel's discussion of the sections of its draft report. She asked members to raise any substantive issues that required discussion. She indicated that if changes were needed in the report, she would make assignments to Panel members to develop specific revisions or would work with the DFO to develop and incorporate specific revisions.

Discussion of Section 3.1 (Response to Charge Question 1 - Overall Clarity and Technical Accuracy of EPA's Report)

Members discussed Section 3.1 of the Panel's draft report. Members discussed the level of detail in this Section. Some members commented that there was too much detailed information in the Section. They noted that the section should contain findings and recommendations on the overall clarity and technical accuracy of the EPA Report and that some issues could be discussed in more detail in other sections of the Panel's report. Panel members indicated that throughout the report, downstream water quality should be referred to as physical, biological, and chemical integrity of downstream waters. A member commented that the key recommendations listed in the Section 3.1 should clearly identify central issues that the EPA needed to address.

The Panel discussed whether the recommendations in the report should be ranked or prioritized. Dr. Rodewald indicated that it would be difficult to rank all of the recommendations and that this might not be necessary. She noted that key recommendations should be listed after each section of the Panel's report. She asked members to make sure they agreed with the key recommendations that were listed.

Panelists discussed the recommendations pertaining to the case studies in EPA's Report. Some members commented that the Panel's report should state that the case studies needed more geographic specificity. Some members commented that the case studies should be related to the conceptual framework in EPA's Report and that the case studies could provide examples of systems with different levels of connectivity along a gradient. Some members recommended that the case studies be presented as boxes in EPA's report.

The Panel discussed its recommendations concerning consideration of the spatial and temporal scale of connectivity and the predictability of effects on downstream waters. Some members commented that spatial and temporal scale and predictability should be discussed in more detail in the other sections of the Panel's report. A member noted that the importance of predictability could be discussed in more detail in Section 3.2. Members also discussed the Panel's recommendations concerning specific edits and revisions to improve the clarity of the EPA Report.

The panel discussed the topic of measuring and quantifying connectivity. Panel members commented that the EPA report had not addressed the topic of quantitative metrics for evaluating connectivity. Members noted that this was an omission. A member commented that the Panel's draft report briefly mentioned this topic in the section on the conceptual framework, but the member noted that this discussion could be expanded. Other Panelists discussed the challenges associated with developing connectivity metrics and noted that further research on was needed. A member commented that the EPA Report should discuss research that had been conducted on this topic. Other members commented that the Panel should not recommend the use of specific metrics but suggest approaches that might be considered. Members discussed modeling as an approach that could be used to evaluate connectivity more quantitatively. Members suggested that modeling be discussed in the Panel's report. A Panelist commented that probabilistic ecological risk assessment approaches provided useful information for considering how connectivity could be quantified. Dr. Rodewald suggested that several paragraphs on approaches to measuring and quantifying connectivity be added to the Panel's report. Other Panel members agreed, but indicated that it should be clear in the report that the Panel was providing examples of approaches and not recommending specific methods. Some members discussed including a table or matrix of methods. Other members commented that it would be preferable to include a brief discussion of approaches with literature citations. Members discussed some of the literature that could be cited.

Members discussed including additional text in the Panel's report to emphasize the importance of biological connectivity and consideration of temporal scale. In this regard, some members commented that various processes operated on different time scales (e.g., surface and groundwater connections do not have the same temporal component). Dr. Rodewald indicated that additional information could be included in the Panel's report to address these issues. Members discussed the time frame for consideration of groundwater connectivity.

There were no additional comments from Panel members on Section 3.1 so Dr. Rodewald called for discussion of Section 3.2.

Discussion of Section 3.2 (Response to Charge Question 2 - Conceptual Framework)

Members discussed a number of revisions in Section 3.2 of the Panel's draft report. The Panel discussed whether more detailed recommendations concerning spatial and temporal scale should be provided in this Section. Members commented that, while spatial and temporal scale should be discussed in Section 3.2, the other sections of the Panel's report should also focus on this issue. The lead writer for Section 3.2, Dr. Rains, indicated that he would develop additional text concerning spatial and temporal scale. The Chair noted that it would be helpful to include additional literature citations and asked members to send them to Dr. Rains. She also asked the lead writers of the other sections to consider expanding the discussion of spatial and temporal scale in the other sections of the report.

The Panel discussed including additional text in Section 3.2 to expand the discussion of the gradient of connectivity. Some members commented that Figure 1 in the Panel's report could be moved into Section 3.2 to provide a conceptual illustration of connectivity gradient. Other members commented that Figure 1 should be kept in Section 3.7 of the report and referenced in Section 3.2.

A member commented that in Section 3.2 it would be useful to discuss conditional probability as an approach that could be used to describe the effects of different parts of watersheds on downstream waters. Dr. Rodewald asked Drs. Rains and Dr. Murphy to develop a new subsection on approaches to measuring and quantifying connectivity and noted that conditional probability could be mentioned in this subsection.

Members indicated that the Panel's report should recommend that the EPA Report clearly define connectivity. Members discussed various aspects of the definition of connectivity. A member commented that the EPA Report should address the effects of interruption of connectivity on populations of fish and other aquatic species. Members indicated that consideration of biological connectivity was very important and noted that that this was an essential part of the definition of connectivity. A member commented that he had compiled extensive references on biological connectivity and recommended that these references be included in the Panel's report. A member commented that the transfer of nutrients and organisms was a useful illustration of how biological, chemical, and hydrological connectivity were linked.

Members discussed a number of additional revisions and additions to the Panel's draft report. A member commented that the subsection on streamside vegetation should focus on the importance of such vegetation to connectivity between water bodies. Members commented that the Panel's report should emphasize the importance of considering the aggregate and cumulative effects of the connectivity on downstream waters. A member noted that the Panel's report should indicate that predictability (i.e., events occurring at fairly regular time intervals in a predictable manner) was an important way to evaluate connectivity. Another member commented that even infrequent events could have a significant effect on downstream waters. Panel members agreed that consideration of frequency, duration, magnitude and predictability was important in evaluating connectivity. A member commented that the Panel's report should recommend that the EPA draw upon disturbance ecology literature to understand relevant spatial and temporal scales of connectivity. Dr. Murphy indicated that he would provide additional text and references on this topic for the Panel's report. The Panel then briefly discussed whether Figure 1 in the report should be revised. Some minor revisions were suggested to clarify the figure. Dr. Rodewald then indicated that it was time to end the teleconference for the day.

Summary

Dr. Rodewald thanked the Panel members for their comments and indicated that the teleconference would adjourn. She noted that the Panel would continue the discussion of its report on a teleconference on May 2nd. The DFO then stated that the teleconference was adjourned and that the Panel would meet by teleconference on May 2nd at 1:00 p.m. Eastern Time to continue the discussion.

Respectfully Submitted:

Certified as Accurate:

/signed/

/signed/

Dr. Thomas Armitage
Designated Federal Officer

Dr. Amanda D. Rodewald, Chair
SAB Panel for the Review of the EPA Water Body
Connectivity Report

NOTE AND DISCLAIMER: The minutes of this public meeting reflect diverse ideas and suggestions offered by Panel members during the course of deliberations within the meeting. Such ideas, suggestions and deliberations do not necessarily reflect consensus advice from Panel members. The reader is cautioned to not rely on the minutes to represent final, approved, consensus advice and recommendations offered to the Agency. Such advice and recommendations may be found in the final advisories, commentaries, letters or reports prepared and transmitted to the EPA Administrator following the public meetings.

ATTACHMENT A: PANEL ROSTER

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Science Advisory Board Panel for the Review of the EPA Water Body Connectivity Report

CHAIR

Dr. Amanda D. Rodewald, Director of Conservation Science, Cornell Lab of Ornithology and Associate Professor, Department of Natural Resources, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY

PANEL MEMBERS

Dr. Allison Aldous, Freshwater Scientist, The Nature Conservancy, Portland, OR

Dr. Genevieve Ali, Junior Chair, Manitoba's Watershed Systems Research Program, Department of Geological Sciences, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB, Canada

Dr. J. David Allan, Professor, School of Natural Resources & Environment, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI

Dr. Lee Benda, Research Geomorphologist, Earth Systems Institute, Mt. Shasta, CA

Dr. Emily S. Bernhardt, Associate Professor of Biogeochemistry, Department of Biology, Duke University, Durham, NC

Dr. Robert P. Brooks, Professor of Geography and Ecology, Department of Geography, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA

Dr. Kurt Fausch, Professor, Department of Fish and Wildlife and Conservation Biology, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO

Dr. Siobhan Fennessy, Jordan Professor of Environmental Science, Biology Department, Kenyon College, Gambier, OH

Dr. Michael Gooseff, Associate Professor, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO

Dr. Judson Harvey, Research Hydrologist, National Research Program, U.S. Geological Survey, Reston, VA

Dr. Charles Hawkins*, Professor, Department of Watershed Sciences, and Director, Western Center for Monitoring and Assessment of Freshwater Ecosystems, Quinney College of Natural Resources, Utah State University, Logan, UT

Dr. Lucinda B. Johnson, Center Director, Center for Water and the Environment, Natural Resources Research Institute, University of Minnesota Duluth, Duluth, MN

* Resigned from Panel March 2014

Dr. Michael Josselyn, Principal and Senior Scientist, Wetlands Research Associates, Inc., San Rafael, CA

Dr. Latif Kalin, Associate Professor, School of Forestry and Wildlife Sciences, Auburn University, Auburn, AL

Dr. Kenneth Kolm, President and Senior Hydrogeologist, Hydrologic Systems Analysis, LLC, Golden, CO

Dr. Judith L. Meyer, Professor Emeritus, Odum School of Ecology, University of Georgia, Lopez Island, WA

Dr. Mark Murphy, Principal Scientist, Hassayampa Associates, Tucson, AZ

Dr. Duncan Patten, Professor Emeritus, School of Life Sciences, Arizona State University, Bozeman, MT

Dr. Mark Rains, Associate Professor of Ecohydrology, School of Geosciences, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL

Dr. Ramesh Reddy, Graduate Research Professor & Chair, Soil and Water Science Department, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL

Dr. Emma Rosi-Marshall, Associate Scientist, Cary Institute of Ecosystem Studies, Millbrook, NY

Dr. Jack Stanford, Jessie M. Bierman Professor of Ecology, Flathead Lake Biological Station, University of Montana, Polson, MT

Dr. Mazeika Sullivan, Associate Professor, School of Environment & Natural Resources, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH

Dr. Jennifer Tank, Galla Professor, Department of Biological Sciences, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN

Dr. Maurice Valett, Professor of Systems Ecology, Division of Biological Sciences, University of Montana, Missoula, MT

Dr. Ellen Wohl, Professor of Geology, Department of Geosciences, Warner College of Natural Resources, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO

SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD STAFF

Dr. Thomas Armitage, Designated Federal Officer, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC

Ms. Iris Goodman, Designated Federal Officer, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC

ATTACHMENT B: OTHER ATTENDEES

List of others who were present at the meeting or requested access by teleconference or webcast.

NAME	AFFILIATION
Don Anderson	Bureau of Reclamation
Paul Anderson	
Sarah Ball	
Henri Bartholomot	Edison Electric Institute
Erin K. Bartlet	VanNess Feldman, LLP
Karen Bennett	
Susan Bodine	Barnes and Thornburg, LLP
Wyatt Boutwell	
Bridget Brown	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Tim Capps	Alan Plummer Associates, Inc.
Kenny Carothers	SWCA Environmental Consultants
Jeanne Christie	Association of State Wetland Managers
James N. Christman	
Jean Coleman	Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
Molly Connerton	
Beth Connors	Maine Department of Environmental Protection
Claudia Copeland	Congressional Research Service, U.S. Library of Congress
Stephen A. Covell	USDA Forest Service
C. M. Crawford	
Brian Dailey	
Jill Davidson	Archer Daniels Midland Company
Jim Dederick	Douglas County, Colorado
Kia Dennis	
Steve Detwiler	

NAME	AFFILIATION
Jon Devine	
Bridget DiCosmo	
Jeanne DiFranco	
Lauren Driscoll	Washington Department of Ecology
Jason Ferrin	
Rachel Fertik	U.S. EPA
Kari Fisher	California Farm Bureau Federation
Patrick I. Flowers	Xcel Energy, Inc.
Robert Gensemer	GEI Consultants
Ganesh L. Ghurye	Exxon Mobil Corporation
Kate Gibson	
Ben Gleason	
Mark Gronceski	
Jimmy Hague	Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership
Tim Harden	
Donna Hill	
Erin Huston	California Farm Bureau Federation
Monica Jacobs	
Fred Jacobsen	San Diego Gas & Electric Company
Joanna Jensen	
Rick Johnson	
Christine Johnson	
Rachel Jones	Professional Staff, U.S. House of Representatives Science, Space, and Technology Committee
Ilan Kaufer	
Leslie Kaufman	
Jill Piat Kemper	
Hadas Raanan-Kiperwas	
Byron Kirkpatrick	

NAME	AFFILIATION
Rose Kwok	U.S. EPA
Chuck Lane	
Steve List	NewPage Corporation
Kelly A. Love	Tennessee Valley Authority
Lauren C. Lurkins	Illinois Farm Bureau
Brendan Mascarenhas	ACC
T.J. Mascia	Troutman Sanders, LLP
Brian S. Mast	San Antonio River Authority
Lahne Mattas-Curry	U.S. EPA
Julia McCarthy	
Matthew J. McFarlane	Xcel Energy, Inc.
Kerry L. McGrath	Hunton and Williams, LLP
Mike McManus	U.S. EPA
Susanne K. Meidel	Maine Department of Environmental Protection
Maximilin Merrill	
Justin Moffett	
David Moore	
Timothy J. Morrison	Campbell County Conservation District
Karen Mulligan	
Andre Nakazawa	Office of Senator Ron Wyden
K. Nelson	
Bill Orme	
Becky Pierce	Colorado Department of Transportation
Brent Plater	Wild Equity Institute
Robin Reash	American Electric Power
Thomas Repp	Douglas County Department of Public Works Engineering
Julie Rimbault	
Pam Russell	

NAME	AFFILIATION
Amena Saiyid	Bloomberg BNA
Abby Schneider	
Michelle Simms	Mosaic Fertilizer, LLC
William Skaff	NEI
Kay Skipper	Hopping, Green, & Sams, PA
Michael Smith	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Terrance P. Smith	Tufts University
Annie Snider	
Eric Somerville	U.S. EPA
Jennifer A. Stenger	Duke Energy
Susan Stephens	
Randy E. Stookey	Kansas Grain and Feed Association
Keith Tollenaere	Golder Associates, Inc.
Chris Treanor	Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer, & Feld, LLP
Paul Wetzel	
Mindy Wheeler	
Linda M. Wilson,	New York State Office of the Attorney General
Sally Yost	

Materials Cited

The following meeting materials are available on the SAB website, <http://www.epa.gov/sab>, on the April 28th meeting page of the Panel for the Review of the EPA Water Body Connectivity Report:

<http://yosemite.epa.gov/sab/sabproduct.nsf/MeetingCal/F11684C10D9F699285257CA2005EA581?OpenDocument>

¹ Federal Register Notice

² Agenda

³ Panel Roster

⁴ SAB Review of the Draft EPA Report Connectivity of Streams and Wetlands to Downstream Waters: A Review and Synthesis of the Scientific Evidence (March 25, 2014 draft and April 23, 2014 draft).

⁵ Individual Comments from Panel Members

⁶ List of Public Speakers

⁷ Public Comments received

- Availability of Public Comments.
- Public comment transmitted through the EPA docket
- Table of public comments received by the EPA Docket as of April 18, 2014.
- Table of additional public comments received by the EPA Docket as of April 25, 2014.
- Table of additional public comments received by the EPA Docket as of May 1, 2014