

The Department of Ecology's Response to: Josh Johnson – City of Longview (Comment 35)

Thank you for the comments pointing out the errors in our assessment of data from the Longview ditch system. The inconsistencies between policy and the calculated outcomes from submitted data caused us to reassess the data that was analyzed in the same batch with your data from EIM. The underlying problem was incomplete data entry in optional fields in EIM that are usually considered related to QA but in this case, are essential for correct analysis of field replicates or duplicates. As a result, bases statements have been revised and in three cases, the category has changed.

Listing 10437

The replicates are now averaged and treated as one data point, resulting in a geometric mean that meets the water quality criterion and only one in five samples exceeds 200 cfu/100ml. The new data supersedes the old data from 1992 and 2002, and the segment is placed in category 2.

Listing 46979

The replicates are now averaged and treated as one data point, resulting in a geometric mean that meets the water quality criterion and none of the five samples exceeds 200 cfu/100ml. The segment shows no exceedances of the criteria, but lacks enough data to conclude that it should be placed in category 1. The segment is moved to category 3.

Listing 46984

The replicates are now averaged and treated as one data point, so that none of the two samples exceeds 200 cfu/100ml. The segment shows no exceedances of the criteria, but lacks enough data to conclude that it should be placed in category 1. The segment is moved to category 3.