

1           **Preliminary Comments on the REA Planning Document from Dr. Lianne Sheppard**

2  
3  
4   No preliminary comments on Chapter 3.4

5  
6   **Preliminary comments on Chapter 4**

7  
8   Overall I thought the chapter was straightforward to follow, easy to read, and covered the  
9   important issues. I have a few suggestions for changes that I hope will improve the document  
10   and ultimately the REA.

- 11
- 12   • Table 4-1, pdf p 64: I suggest adding the number of source-oriented monitors in parentheses  
13   to the number of monitors column.
  - 14   • Pdf p 70: I suggest (if feasible) the approach to filling in missing monitor data consider  
15   using local data, e.g. from the nearest monitor of the same type. This will be less smooth  
16   than the approach described.
  - 17   • Pdf p 70: The discussion of why the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile is lower once the missing data have been  
18   filled in is reasonable. It would be worth having a bit more documentation of this assertion  
19   since the focus of this work is on modeling exceedances.
  - 20   • Pdf p 74, 4-17: It will be interesting to learn what the preliminary model runs show about  
21   how to best capture concentration gradients.
  - 22   • P 4-20, pdf p 77: I don't follow how Table 4-1 shows the ambient air concentration  
23   adjustments will be small.
  - 24   • Figure 4-6: I suggest ensuring the axes are identical and adding 1:1 lines so the multiple  
25   plots on a page can be interpreted more easily visually.
  - 26   • Pdf p 82: The balance of benefit with practical considerations seems appropriate.
  - 27   • Pdf p 83: Something is wrong with the wording of the last sentence in the first paragraph.
  - 28   • Pdf p 86: It would be helpful to provide the reader with some context for the scale or range  
29   and interpretation of typical values for A and D.
  - 30   • P 87 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph: Is there something missing before "several"?
  - 31   • P 87: While I agree the person-occurrences statistic is less informative than the count,  
32   including it would provide complementary information and should be considered for  
33   inclusion.
  - 34   • Pdf p 93: Given the sensitivity to the E-R function used, I agree with the plan to incorporate  
35   sensitivity analyses to better understand the result of different E-R estimates.
  - 36   • P 98: While there is good experience with the models and results from previous REAs, it  
37   would be worthwhile to list our expectations for the most important sources of variability?  
38   Also, is it worth considering some sensitivity analyses to address important sources of  
39   variability, particularly for quantities that are modeled based on assumptions?
- 40