Message

From: Nordine, John [nordine.john@epa.gov]
Sent: 4/22/2013 4:49:55 PM
To: Kay, Robert [rtkay@usgs.gov]
Subject: RE: FW: Sample of Revised/Updated Plot for Your Review & Comment

Bob;

Thanks, I will send Jack the comment and you. I agree with your view.

John

From: Kay, Robert [rtkay@usgs.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 22, 2013 10:45 AM
To: Nordine, John
Subject: Re: FW: Sample of Revised/Updated Plot for Your Review & Comment

John--I can live with this, but would still prefer (not require, but it's up to you) a couple changes

1. an actual dot associated with each sampling date ON THE GRAPH so the reader will know when the samples were collected. this dot is especially important because many of the results are non-detect so the reader may have a comparatively difficult time assessing the data, especially without the accompanying table (figures should be fully self-explanatory). the fact that the sampling date and month are explicitly listed on the y-axis reduces (eliminates?) the need for the dots because it states when the sampling occurred but as a practical matter it'd probably be a bit clearer to a reader to understand the sampling dates and the trend in concentration through time if the y-axis was set to a consistent interval. i'm a bit leery that the typical cursory reader will read and actually understand that the sampling dates are presented on the graph, particularly if the actual data isn't presented right next to the graph, as it is here.

2. also not critical, but IMO preferred, is to the have some sort of identification for the graph included in the caption (fig. 1, fig. 21, whatever is appropriate) and to have the caption outside of the boundaries of the graph. again, i can live with it as is, but i think it's a bit cleaner (and more common) to separate the caption from the data.

3. somewhat critical--add "...Techalloy site, Union, Illinois." to the figure (and table?) caption so the graph is fully explained. because this plot will most likely be presented within a site document, noting the site for each table and figure is not absolutely essential, but again, you never know how this information is going to be presented in the future, so it's best to have the site named in the caption so future readers know where it came from.

4. just to be clear, does Jack intend to put the table of the data alongside the graph? i think it makes for a better presentation, but if it's going to be presented the table also needs brief description to it also is fully self-explanatory (Table 66. Concentration of VOCs detected above MCLs in well MW-2, June 1996 to December 2012, Techalloy site, Union, Illinois. also note units of concentration)

On Fri, Apr 19, 2013 at 1:13 PM, Nordine, John <nordine.john@epa.gov> wrote:

> What do you think?

John

From: Jack Thorsen [mailto:jack@autumnwoodesh.com]
Sent: Friday, April 19, 2013 1:49 PM
To: Nordine, John
Cc: Gerald Ruopp
Subject: Sample of Revised/Updated Plot for Your Review & Comment

John:

If you could take a look at this file, I would appreciate it. I want to make sure that these revised plots have everything you want before I get too far along with this.

Thanks!

Regards,

Jack

John W. Thorsen, P.E.

Autumnwood ESH Consultants

262.237.1130