From:	Jay Field
To:	Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc:	Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA; Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA; Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA; Robert Neely; Jennifer Peterson; POULSEN Mike
Subject:	Re: Hit/No-Hit Classifications
Date:	10/31/2010 11:47 AM
Attachments:	PH_RefTox_Thresholds_101031.doc

Eric,
I've completed my review of the hit/no-hit classifications that I used in model development and evaluation. I found 3 stations (listed below) incorrectly classified as Level 1 hits for Chironomus: these stations had level 1 hits for survival that were not significant and level 0 for biomass that were significant. In the tables that I sent you previously, the individual threshold levels (shown as rtox_hy28s, rtox_hy28b, rtox_ch 10s, rtox_ch 10b) were based on the reference tox thresholds and did not take into account significance. This misunderstanding of the contents of the tables that I provided is probably the primary reason for the "discrepancy" in Chironomus toxicity classifications identified by LWG. Although I do not have LWG's T/C values to compare, any differences are likely due to rounding. As you can see from the bioassay data in our Query Manager tables, we maintained more decimal places in the response and control-adjusted values. We did this because of the subsequent calculations in an attempt to limit multiple rounding of values (we prefer to round at the end of the calculations).

The endpoints that I used in model development and evaluation (the combined survival/biomass) endpoints (shown as rtox_hy and rtox_ch) were adjusted for significance, with the exception of the three errors for Level 1 Chironomus. Since all model calibration and evaluation was based on Level 2 and greater hit levels, the three incorrectly classified Level 1 hits would have at most a trivial effect on the Level 1 models or the multi-chemical Pmax model development and evaluation.

Incorrectly classified stations as Level 1 hits for Chironomus: G011, G230, G142
The attached file has the thresholds used for the toxicity classifications.

Please let me know if you need any additional clarification.
Jay

Jay Field wrote:
> Eric,
> I am reviewing the hit/no-hit classifications. At the meeting at
> Windward with LWG, I requested a table of LWG's test results (a table
> with response values for test and control, control-adjusted values,
> statistical significance, and toxicity classification level for all 4
> endpoints (as I provided). I need this file to complete my review.
> Also, it would be helpful if LWG provided a detailed listing of the
> discrepancies they have identified. As I mentioned on the phone, I
> did not use the tox classifications for the individual endpoints in my
> model development or evaluation (in the files I sent, rtox_hy and
> rtox_ch are the relevant endpoints for comparison with LWG's results).
> thanks,
> Jay
>
>
> Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov wrote:
>> All, I forwarded the hit/no-hit classifications that Jay prepared in
>> February (attached) to John Toll so we can resolve any differences.
>> Yesterday, John and Jim McKenna called me. Apparently, they were unable
>> to verify the results. They identified two discrepancies with Jay's hit
>> classifications.
>>
>> 1) Though it seemed that Jay tested for statistical difference from
>> control, it did not appear that any hit classifications were eliminated
>> based on this (i.e., based on no statistical difference from control).
>> This affected 50 Chironomus survival results.
>> 2) The T and C data match but the T/C does not match. At least 22
>> Hyalella biomass stations are affected.
>>
>> I understand from Burt that this data has been verified in some way by
>> the government team. However, I have not seen the results of the
>> verification. I someone has an email or something that documents this,
>> please send it to me.
>>
>> John left a voice message with Jay. However, I am not sure Jay is
>> around. Jay if you are checking email, can you provide some
>> illumination. It might be good to give John Toll a call. He is at
>> 206-812-5433. I would like this resolved asap. It seems that we should
>> be able to quickly resolve any discrepancies on this fairly basic topic
>> very quickly.
>>
>> Thanks, Eric
>>
>> (See attached file: CH10_Tox_100117.DBF)(See attached file:
>> HY28_Tox_091001.DBF)
>

--
Jay Field
Assessment and Restoration Division
Office of Response and Restoration, NOAA

7600 Sand Point Way NE
Seattle, WA 98115-6349
(P) 206-526-6404
(F) 206-526-6865
(E) jay.field@noaa.gov