



State of Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

Integrated Report Work Group Meeting #2

**Integrated Report Work Group Meeting #2 make up meeting
 January 12, 2018, 2:00 to 3:30 p.m.
 700 NE Multnomah St., Room 610**

Attendees: DEQ - Jennifer Wigal, James McConaghie, Becky Anthony, Kathryn Van Natta (NW Pulp and Paper)

By Phone: Mary Anne Cooper (Oregon Farm Bureau); Heath Curtiss (Oregon Forest Industries Council)

Topic	Work Group Member	Input
Binomial Distribution	Heath Curtiss	<p>Where will these proposed changes ultimately go?</p> <p><i>DEQ Response: The details of the changes that were made will be documented in the final white paper. The basics for listing (hypotheses, lookup tables, etc.) will be contained in the Assessment Methodology.</i></p>
	Heath Curtiss and Mary Anne Cooper	<p>The percentiles that are chosen for the binomial test are more of a policy decision, not a scientific decision for peer reviewers. Expressed reservation about the peer review panel determining what level of risk is appropriate. The approach evaluating the number of excursions is what should be peer-reviewed.</p> <p><i>DEQ Response: The questions being asked of the peer reviewers pertain to whether DEQ's proposed use of the exact binomial statistical test is valid and defensible for assessment of: chronic aquatic life toxics criteria and conventional pollutants. The core of the review is focused on whether the statistical methodology is being applied correctly in order to calculate the number of allowable excursions that meet the criteria of the test, and whether decision error rates have been sufficiently controlled. The levels of risk being proposed to meet the magnitude/duration/frequency components of the standard have mainly been set by EPA guidance and DEQ will have limited ability to change the allowable proportion of excursions if changes are suggested by the review panel, unless they are recommended to be more stringent.</i></p>

Topic	Work Group Member	Input
Binomial Distribution	Heath Curtiss	<p>Can DEQ be more discerning about what goes on the 303(d) list and less about what segments are removed from the list?</p> <p><i>DEQ Response: DEQ's proposed approach to use the binomial test instead of any two sample excursions to determine impairment status is a more discerning approach to adding waterbodies to the 303(d) list. Setting too high of a bar for adding segments to the 303(d) list increases the probability of making an error of not listing a segment that is actually impaired. This could create an expanding list of waterbodies identified as Category 5 or 3B that TMDL and monitoring resources would not be able to address in a timely manner. In a related manner, DEQ wishes to balance this approach with ensuring that waters are indeed attaining water quality standards prior to removing them from the impaired waters list. Moving forward with the next assessment, DEQ intends to take a closer look at waterbodies that may have been listed in the past based on the more conservative methodology that had a higher probability of listing waters that are not actually be impaired.</i></p>