

From: Stark, Kimberle [Kimberle.Stark@kingcounty.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2011 3:19 PM
To: 303d
Cc: Cooper, Betsy
Subject: 2010 Water Quality Assessment marine listings comments-1013
Attachments: 2010 Final KC comment letter 8 16 2011.pdf

Dear Ken,

Sorry to turn in our comments at the last minute, but here are King County's comments for the draft 2010 WQA marine listings. Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the listings as well as the draft listing policy document. Feel free to contact me with any questions or clarifications.

--Kim

Kimberle Stark
Marine Biologist
King County Dept. of Nat. Res. & Parks
201 S. Jackson St., suite 600
Seattle, WA 98104
206.296.8244
<http://green.kingcounty.gov/marine/>

Water listings

Listing ID	Proposed category	Parameter	Comments
66090	5	DO	Listing is for DO in Colvos Passage and says will wait for modeling results. Please reword this listing, as well as others for DO, to reflect that DO is under further evaluation and remove the language regarding modeling results.
15395	5	bacteria	Listing is based on 2004 exceedence of peak criterion from NTAK01 but 2005 data met both standards. Say more recent data from DOH is insufficient to show if meeting WQ standards. This is because DOH collects 6 samples/yr and DOE listing policy says need 10 bacteria samples, although the DOH data from 2007-2009 shows no exceedences.
15802	5	bacteria	Listing is based on 2003 FC data from LTAB01. The 2004 & 2005 data meet standards.
15803	5	bacteria	Listing based on 1987-1991 FC data from LTEH02. Have newer data from 2004-2008 that would still result in a Cat 5 but listing should be based on most recent data. Listing 42496 is based on the newer data so these 2 listings should be combined and/or listing 15803 removed as Section 6 of the listing policy states that "Data older than ten years will be used only if no more recent data exists to conduct the assessment".
42492	5	bacteria	Two different locations have been combined for this listing: NSEX01 and KSYV02. NSEX01 results should be in the South Central/East Passage area and 2007-2008 results from this station did not exceed standards. Listing should be based solely on KSYV02.
45090	5	bacteria	Listing is based on 2006 data from KSSN04. Say more recent data is not sufficient to determine if site meeting WQ standards, however, there are 24 data points from 2007-2008 which are sufficient data according to Policy 1-11. The 2007-2008 meets WQ standards so this should be a Category 1 listing.
15804	5	bacteria	Listing based on 1989-1990 data from MTEC01. Have data through 2008. The 2007 data exceeded the peak criterion but the 2008 data met both standards. Listing 60141 is for the 2007-2008 data.
15807	5	bacteria	Listing is based on LSRV01 data from 1987-1990. Have data to 1996. Data exceeded the peak criterion in 1995 but met both standards in 1996.
15808	5	bacteria	Listing is based on LSTU01 data from 1991. Have newer data though 2004 and the more recent data meets standards.
15809	5	bacteria	Listing is based on 1987-1991 FC data from LSVW01 and LSVW03 data from 1987-1990. Have newer data for LSVW01 through 2008 and the 2007 & 2008 data exceeded the peak criterion so listing should be based on newer data.
45435	5	bacteria	Listing is based on 2007 FC data from MTL03. The 2008 data met standards. There are >10 data points in 2008 that met standards, yet listing is based on the 2007 data. The listing policy for bacteria needs clarification on how multiple years data are combined and/or if listings are based on the most recent 12-month period.
60140	5	bacteria	Listing is based on 2007 FC data from MTUJ01. The 2008 data met standards.

Listing ID	Proposed category	Parameter	Comments
60141	5	bacteria	Listing 15804 is for older data from MTEC01. The 2007 data exceeded the peak criterion but met both standards in 2008.
		bacteria	General comment: As an example, bacteria listings are worded "In 2008, 1 out of 12 (8.3%) samples exceeded the % criterion (43 cfu/100ml)." Although a specific sample exceeded 43 cfu/100ml, if the overall percentage of samples did not exceed 10%, then the peak criterion was not exceeded. Suggest rewording to say "In 2008, 1 out of 12(8.3%) samples exceeded the 43 cfu/100ml threshold, but the peak criterion was met."
	3	bacteria	General comment: Several category 3 listings with no bacteria exceedences of either criterion are based upon DOH data as they collect 6 samples/yr to classify shellfish beds per the NSSP guidelines. However section 8a of the listing policy states that "Fecal coliform samples will be assessed by Ecology staff in the manner described below unless the assessment is conducted by the state Department of Health (DOH) as part of its requirements under the National Shellfish Sanitation Program for approving shellfish beds." These category 3 listings conflict with DOH's classification. An example is listing 60158.
42475	3	ammonia	The 2 samples listed were calculated incorrectly and they did meet the WQ standard. There is sufficient recent data beyond 2002 (through 2008) to warrant a Category 1 listing.
66128	3	DO	Listing is based on 0 of 5 samples meeting DO standard but say insufficient data. There is data for this site through 2008 with 2 fall months in 2008 having DO values below 6.0 mg/L.
66483	3	DO	Listing is based on 6 samples from NSAJ02 in 2006 but there is more recent data that shows this should be a category 5 listing.
		DO	Station MSWH01 in Quartermaster Harbor should receive a Category 5 listing due to 2 values way below the WQ standard for 2008. Also have WQ standard excursions in 2006 and 2007.
10160	3	pH	Besides the question around the accuracy of the data point below the standard, this is a core DOE monitoring station so there should be more recent data beyond 2005. Listings for any category should not be based on questionable data, as is the case with any pH value in open waters below the WQ standard, particularly given the issues with any pH sensor except for a SAMI.
10164	3	pH	same comment as above and questionable data should not be used for any categorical determination.
12647	3	pH	same comment as above and questionable data should not be used for any categorical determination.
65267	3	temperature	Listing is for LTEH02 and say insufficient data but there is sufficient monthly data to warrant a Category 1 listing.
65268	3	temperature	Listing is for LTED04 and say insufficient data but there is sufficient monthly data to warrant a Category 1 listing.

Listing ID	Proposed category	Parameter	Comments
65271	3	temperature	Listing is for LTBC43 and say insufficient data but there is sufficient monthly data to warrant a Category 1 listing.
65219	3	temperature	Listing is for LSGY01 and say insufficient data but there is sufficient monthly data to warrant a Category 1 listing.
7034	3	temperature	Listing is based on station 305 temp values above criterion from 1998-2001. Have data from 2002-2004 so should not be placed in insufficient data category.
7035	3	temperature	Listing is based on station 307 temp values above criterion from 1998-2001. Have data from 2002-2004 so should not be placed in insufficient data category.
45583	2	bacteria	Listing is based on LTAB01 data. Older data from this site is already used for Category 5 listing 15802 and the 2004 and 2005 data referred to in this listing meet both standards & there are sufficient data. Listing should be removed.
60182	2	bacteria	Listing is based on one exceedence in 2008 at LTBD27 but there are no exceedences for 2007 or 2008 of either standard and they are sufficient data for a Category 1 listing.
42478	2	DO	Listing is based on 2002 and 2003 CK200P data. There are more recent data to base listing upon and other stations with DO excursions in the fall which may or may not be due to natural conditions have been placed in Category 3 rather than category 2.
48944	2	DO	There are more recent data than 2006 on which to base listing.
48995	2	DO	There are more recent data than 2005 on which to base listing.
8183	2	ammonia	Listing is based on 2 very old data points from 1988. Limited spatial and temporal data this old is not useful particularly when there is ammonia data at other locations throughout the Sound. There are ammonia data from stations LSVV01 and LSVW01 located in the same area as these 2 data points so suggest using those data rather than 2 points >20 yrs old.
45582	2	bacteria	This listing should be a category 1 listing as there was not an exceedence of the peak criterion in 2008 . One sample exceeded the threshold value but not more than 10% of the samples collected for the year exceeded the criterion.
60091	2	bacteria	This listing should be a category 1 listing. The listing is based on one exceedence of the peak criterion in 2009, however, the peak criterion (10% of the samples used to calculate the geomean) was not exceeded.
8190	2	Bis (2-thylhexyl)Phthalate	Listing is based on very old 1982 data. There are more recent data to base listing.
8195	2	Bis (2-thylhexyl)Phthalate	Listing is based on very old 1982 data. There are more recent data to base listing.
8650	2	Bis (2-thylhexyl)Phthalate	Listing is based on very old 1982 data. There are more recent data to base listing.
42485	2	DO	Listing is based on NSEX01 data from 2004-2006. Have 2007-2008 data which listing should be based upon.
15801	2	Endosulfan	Listing is based upon a single data point from 1977. This is stretching the use of old data!

Listing ID	Proposed category	Parameter	Comments
60090	2	bacteria	This listing should be a category 1 listing. The listing is based on one exceedence of the peak criterion in 2008, however, the peak criterion (10% of the samples used to calculate the geomean) was not exceeded.
40162	2	bacteria	This listing should be a category 1 listing as there was not an exceedence of the peak criterion in 2001 and the more recent data are sufficient for a category 1 listing (see comment in row 18).
40171	2	bacteria	same comment as above in row 46
45438	2	bacteria	This listing should be a category 1 listing as there was not an exceedence of the peak criterion in 2008 and the more recent data are sufficient for a category 1 listing (see comment in row 18).
60093	2	bacteria	This listing should be a category 1 listing. The listing is based on one exceedence of the peak criterion in 2008, however, the peak criterion (10% of the samples used to calculate the geomean) was not exceeded.
60109	2	bacteria	This listing should be a category 1 listing as there was not an exceedence of the peak criterion in 2008 . One sample exceeded the threshold value but not more than 10% of the samples collected for the year exceeded the criterion.
60156	2	bacteria	This listing should be a category 1 listing as there was not an exceedence of the peak criterion in 2008 . One sample exceeded the threshold value but not more than 10% of the samples collected for the year exceeded the criterion.

Sediment Listing	Comment
505989 – Sediment Bioassay	<p>This listing is based on bioassay data collected in 1992, prior to a sediment remediation that was performed at the Pier 53/55 site. The site was capped in 1992 by the Army Corps of Engineers and monitoring was performed by King County for 10 years. Data from the monitoring program suggest that the remediation was successful and significant recontamination of the cap material does not appear to be occurring. The final report may be found at http://your.kingcounty.gov/dnrp/library/wastewater/sedman/Pier53/Pier53-55_201006_SedCapRemediation2002DataFinalRpt.pdf. Recommend that the listing be changed to a Category 1.</p>
500016 – Sediment Bioassay	<p>This listing is for a site located in Lake Union and, as such, should not be included on the proposed Marine Listings.</p>
500009 – Sediment Bioassay	<p>This listing is for a site located in Lake Washington and, as such, should not be included on the proposed Marine Listings.</p>
500010 – Sediment Bioassay	<p>This listing is for a site located in Lake Washington and, as such, should not be included on the proposed Marine Listings.</p>
512102 – Silver	<p>This listing is based on three King County samples, none of which are sediment. Samples L9012-11 and L6416-11 are butter clam tissue and sample L6416-12 is green algae (<i>Ulva sp.</i>). Please delete this listing.</p>
511841 – Benzo(a) anthracene	<p>These 5 listings were all previously a Category 2, Rank 2, based on a single sample collected in the vicinity of the West Point Emergency Bypass Outfall in 1996. The proposed Category 5 listing for all 5 parameters appears to be the result of the inclusion of 2 “samples” collected in 1982. However, the data from EIM cannot be verified on King County’s database. The sample numbers shown on EIM match King County sample numbers, however, organic parameters were not analyzed on these two samples. Recommend that these 5 listings remain Category 2, Rank 2 unless Ecology can provide verification that these data are legitimate. Also recommend that the sudden inclusion of 29-year-old data not be a basis for changing something to a Category 5.</p>
511842 – Benzo(a) pyrene	
511845 – Benzo(g,h,i) perylene	
511849 – Chrysene	
511858 – Indeno (1,2,3-cd) pyrene	

Habitat listings

Listing ID	Proposed category	Comments
21695	4C	The following 7 listings are all based on a 2000 'Ulvoid Blooms in Puget Sound' report. The information presented is very generic and no study was done at any of the sites to determine the cause of ulvoid accumulations, if seen at all. At several of the sites listed, such as Alki South, and Quartermaster Harbor, no blooms were observed. It is not appropriate to categorize these sites as 4C, based on general observations and no causal factors, other than the presence of a freshwater input, stormwater or outfall pipe in the vicinity of the site. If necessary to use the basic information in this report, than a category 3 would be the most appropriate.
21696	4C	
21697	4C	
21699	4C	
21722	4C	
21723	4C	
21724	4C	
36188	4C	This listing is based upon a 1998 report saying that eelgrass at the Vashon Ferry dock is impaired due to nitrogen loading. WDNR conducts Sound-wide eelgrass surveys and their data should be used for eelgrass listings where data are available.