Hakowski, Denise

From: Cooper, Laura K <Laura.K.Cooper@wv.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 3:16 PM
To: Hakowski, Denise
Cc: Mandirola, Scott G; Smith, Chris B
Subject: RE: CSB data

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

The reason it went from ND to 0.57 is because we (Kevin) asked them to use the MDL (in his comments). Without the MDL, they were reporting non-detect, but when they correctly used the MDL of 0.20, it resulted in a result for TOC of 0.57; likewise, using the MDL of 0.0010 for Cu resulted in a Cu result of 0.0011.

Arguably, you could say there should be 2 more sig digits on the 1.68mg/L, but that doesn't make them wrong, just less precise than they could've been.

Chris, you field the other question--I'm not sure of that myself. I had noticed that Dissolved is what was requested, and Total is what is reported, but I don't know how the lab test works.

Laura K. Cooper
Assistant Director - Water Quality Standards
Division of Water and Waste Management
WV Department of Environmental Protection
Office: 304-926-0499 x1110
Mobile: 304-206-8901
Email: Laura.K.Cooper@wv.gov
Room 2169, 601 57th St SE; Charleston, WV

From: Hakowski, Denise [mailto:Hakowski.Denise@epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 3:06 PM
To: Cooper, Laura K
Cc: Mandirola, Scott G; Smith, Chris B
Subject: RE: CSB data

See, this is where it is getting weird for me.

Although Kevin/Chris called them out on the wrong date, in the submittal I got, in the letter dated 2/10/14 they only sent in the corrected field blank, not the upstream analytical report that had the wrong date too. And, not only did they correct the date on the field blank, all of a sudden TOC went from "ND" in December (see attached) to 0.57 in February, and copper went from "ND" to 0.0011. So, then it makes you start to wonder when the upstream TOC for both WER #1 and WER #2 are 1.68 mg/l.

Hey, and Chris, could you answer this question: In the analytical reports, they report for Total Organic Carbon. The Streamlined WER guidance asks for Dissolved Organic Carbon. The Chain of Custody forms indicate that they should be analyzing for DOC, and that the sample is field filtered. Does analyzing for TOC in the lab on a field filtered sample give you DOC?

Thanks,

D.

From: Cooper, Laura K [mailto:Laura.K.Cooper@wv.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 2:09 PM
To: Hakowski, Denise <Hakowski.Denise@epa.gov>
Cc: Mandirola, Scott G <Scott.G.Mandirola@wv.gov>; Smith, Chris B <Chris.B.Smith@wv.gov>
Subject: RE: CSB data

Hey Denise,

I talked to Chris, our WQS program's resident lab data expert (and the guy who found the discrepancies mentioned in Kevin's comments)…

The difference you're seeing between the 1.68 and 0.57 is because 0.57 (in the corrected data sheet for 11/22/13, last page of the attached "WVDEP…" document) is the TOC for a blank, not for "Upstream 001" sample. Notice that the "Site ID" field on that page is blank, indicating the sample resulting in 0.57 TOC and 0.0011 Cu is a blank, not a field sample.

The correct result for WER #2 Upstream is indicated on the "wrong date" data page you have in the info that Kevin sent you (page 5 of the attached "CSB WER…" document). Chris has highlighted the incorrect date on this page, and you can see that for this sample, "UPSTREAM OUTLET 001," the TOC result is 1.68 mg/L.

Does that make sense? If not, give me a call and we can muddle through it together. ☺

Thanks,

Laura K. Cooper
Assistant Director - Water Quality Standards
Division of Water and Waste Management
WV Department of Environmental Protection
Office: 304-926-0499 x1110
Mobile: 304-206-8901
Email: Laura.K.Cooper@wv.gov
Room 2169, 601 57th St SE; Charleston, WV

From: Hakowski, Denise [mailto:Hakowski.Denise@epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 11:31 AM
To: Cooper, Laura K
Subject: CSB data

Hi Laura,

I imagine my voicemail is a little confusing. I'm hoping this table helps. Basically, I'm trying to pull out of the CSB data submitted the information needed to calculate a BLM. The data in question is the WER #2 Upstream. In the WER package submitted with the WV WQS submittal, Kevin questioned the incorrect date on the analytical report. In response, CSB sent a corrected page. My problem is, when I look at the analytical report Kevin was questioning (Kevin sent it to us by 12/31/2013 email, the actual report is dated 12/11/2013), it indicates that the organic carbon was 1.68, whereas the date corrected sheet says 0.57, not to mention other info on the 12/11/13 version changes (and the corrected version indicates the upstream organic carbon was the same as reported for WER #1). It's all a little hinky to me. How can we get this clarified?

	pH	Temp (°C)	Organic Carbon (mg/l)

WER #1 Outlet #001	6.76 (lab measured)	1.6	9.98
WER #1 Upstream	7.25 (field measured)	1.6	1.68
WER #2 Outlet #001	6.4 (lab measured)	2.0	8.28
WER #2 Upstream	7.04 (field measured)	2.0	0.57 *