

**Comment Response Document Regarding the Water Quality Analysis of Cadmium in Lower Susquehanna River, Cecil and Harford County, Maryland**

The Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) has conducted a public review of the proposed Water Quality Analysis of Cadmium in Lower Susquehanna River, Cecil and Harford County, Maryland. The public comment period was open from June 13, 2008 through July 14, 2008. 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**

<b>Author</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>
Elizabeth Weisengoff	Harford County, Dept. of Public Works, Water Resources Engineering	June 25, 2008	1 through 8

**Comments and Responses**

1. The commentor states that the Department agrees with MDE’s findings of the water quality analysis that the data support changing the cadmium listing for the Lower Susquehanna River from Category 5 to Category 2.

**Response:** MDE appreciates that the Department reviewed the information.

2. The commentor asks that on page i, Table 1: Remove the asterisk from the first table title.

**Response:** The correction has been made.

3. The commentor states the footers on pages 1- 14 , should states “Lower Susquehanna River WQA Cadmium”.

**Response:** The correction has been made.

4. The commentor articulates that Figures 1 and Figure 4 present the same information and recommends eliminating Figure 4.

**Response:** Figure 4 has been eliminated.

5. The commentor states that on page 3 there are stations labeled LSR-10 and no station labeled LSR-1.

**Response:** The figure has been corrected.

6. The commentor refers to page 9, Table 4 stating that the table is missing data for stations LSR-7, LSR-8, and LSR-9.

**Response:** The referenced stations are non-tidal stations and have been removed from Figure 1 and are not represented in Table 4.

7. The commentor suggests that since Figure 5 on page 10 is not a time-series, a bar graph may be more appropriate and also requests that a horizontal line be added showing the detection limit.

**Response:** The figure has been changed to a bar graph and a footnote has been added regarding the detection limit.

8. The commentor suggests inserting “is presented in” between ...”tests” and “Table 5” in the 7<sup>th</sup> sentence, first paragraph, Section 3.2, page 10.

**Response:** The edit has been made as suggested.