

Thank you for your comment, Daniel Injerd.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GLMRIS2AP50001.

Comment Date: September 19, 2012 11:04:20AM
Great Lakes and Mississippi River Interbasin Study (GLMRIS)
Comment ID: GLMRIS2AP50001

First Name: Daniel
Middle Initial: A
Last Name: Injerd
Organization: IL DNR, Office of Water Resources
Address:
Address 2:
Address 3:
City:
State:
Zip: 60601
Country:
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record
Attachment:

Comment Submitted:

The interagency group that evaluated the Focus Area 2 sites concluded that a potential pathway that would be created with a one percent annual recurrence interval storm event presented a “tolerable” low level of risk, and thus could be excluded from further analysis (page 10). While this may be appropriate guidance, it raises some very interesting questions about the subject of risk, which also applies to Focus Area 1.

The report does not define what is meant by “tolerable”, which apparently is left to the reader to decide. And while the report clearly indicates that the risk analysis, the qualitative assessment of the four elements of the equation, only apply to aquatic pathways, one can’t help but question the value of the analysis when all other possible vectors are not considered. It would be helpful to include a discussion on the prevalence, if known, on how these other vectors have served in spreading ANS throughout the country. It would help to put the issue in perspective.

The same comment applies to the ‘Results and Discussion’ section of the report. There certainly is agreement that the CAWS is the area of highest probability for the spread of ANS through an aquatic pathway. That said, I don’t understand the significance of comparing flow data at the one percent annual recurrence interval flow, illustrated in Figure 3. During these rare occurrences when there is a backflow from the CAWS to the lake, water is also leaving the CAWS going downstream. Water is moving in both directions, so it is less likely to serve as an aquatic pathway during a high flow event. Figure 3 is very misleading, and does not represent a fair assessment of the increased risk of ANS transfer through the CAWS. The same misleading analysis also appears in the discussion on Eagle Marsh (page 21).