

**Comment Response Document
Regarding the Water Quality Analysis of Heavy Metals for the
Loch Raven Reservoir Impoundment
Baltimore County, MD**

Introduction

The Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) has conducted a public review of the proposed Water Quality Analysis (WQA) of heavy metals for the Loch Raven Reservoir impoundment. The public comment period was open from August 1, 2003 through August 30, 2003. MDE received one set of written comments.

Below is a list of commentors, their affiliation, the date comments were submitted, and the numbered references to the comments submitted. In the pages that follow, comments are summarized and listed with MDE’s response.

List of Commentors

Author	Affiliation	Date	Comment Number
Robert Koroncai	Office of Watersheds, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	August 13, 2003	1 through 4

Comments and Responses

1. The commentor requested that the document include a clarification regarding whether or not the sediment samples that were tested for sediment toxicity were also chemically analyzed, or if chemical analyses were not performed because the samples did not exhibit toxicity to the test species (or another reason).

Response: Maryland conducted toxicity tests of the bottom sediments, which involves exposing test organisms to the sediments. The results of the toxicity tests indicated no toxicity. Consequently, it was not necessary to conduct sediment chemistry analyses. The following statement has been included in the second paragraph of Section 3.0 (Water Quality Characterization): "Sediment chemistry analysis was not conducted because toxicity was not observed in the ambient sediment bioassay."

2. The commentor requested that the document include a clarification regarding whether any relevant fish and benthic indices of biological integrity (IBI) data exist, as well as an evaluation of such data, as applicable.

Response: Such data does not exist because the fish and benthic IBIs developed by the Maryland Biological Stream Survey are not applicable in reservoirs, such as Loch Raven Reservoir.

FINAL

3. The commentor stated that an additional arsenic criterion of 41 µg/l exists based upon fish consumption which should be included in the criteria table, as it is the most conservative of the criteria.

Response: The document has been revised to include the human health (fish consumption) water quality criterion for arsenic as the most stringent and applicable numeric criterion.

4. The commentor stated that references in the text and tables to the mercury standard should be removed, as the document does not contain a data evaluation for that standard and the mercury impairment has been addressed separately through fish tissue monitoring.

Response: All reference in the text and tables to the mercury standard have been removed.