

Water Quality Data Reliability



EPA 2nd 6-Year
Review Data

Background

- 30,000 Small systems
- 4 quarterly Measurements
- Non-compliance - treatment

AWWA Article

Four NRW White Papers

Data

- ~ **1000 Data Sets**
- **10 Contaminants**
 - Dichloromethane
 - Mercury (inorganic)
 - Thallium
 - Benzene
 - Tetrachloroethylene
 - Alpha particles
 - Radium-226 and -228
 - Trichloroethylene
 - Arsenic
 - Fluoride

Results of Statistical Analysis

**Use Confidence Interval
Around Mean**

95% Confidence Interval (CI) = $2E$
Where $E = 1.59 \times \text{Std Dev}$

Results of Statistical Analysis

Avg CI for all sets = 105% of mean
Avg when mean near MCL = 193%

Question?

Would additional sampling improve data reliability?

Answer

Mixed – See Table

Number of Samples per Quarter Required for Estimation Errors of 10% or 25%

Analyte	Estimation Error for Annual Mean	
	25%	10%
Dichloromethane (Methylene chloride)	40	–
Mercury (inorganic)	18	–
Thallium	16	–
Benzene	8	40
Arsenic	4	24
Tetrachloroethylene (PCE)	3	16
Trichloroethylene (TCE)	2	10
Alpha particles	2	9
Radium-226 and -228	2	9
Fluoride	1	1.25

Question?

Does variability change
with geography ?

Answer

No discernable influence

Summary & Conclusions



- Width of 95% CI greater than mean in over $\frac{1}{3}$ of cases
- When mean is near MCL, uncertainty is twice as large
- Increasing number of samples may help with some contaminants
- No geographical influence

What's Next?



- Increase System Awareness
 - Presentations
 - Peer reviewed publication – AWWA
- Evaluate Variability and Correct ?