



STATE OF NEVADA
Department of Conservation & Natural Resources
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Jim Gibbons, Governor
Allen Biaggi, Director

Leo M. Drozdoff, P.E., Administrator

August 9, 2010

Matt Paque
Tronox LLC
PO BOX 268859
Oklahoma City, OK 73134

Re: **Tronox LLC (TRX)**
NDEP Facility ID #H-000539
Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) Response to:
Technical Memorandum: Background Comparisons for Metals in Remediation Zones B through E, Compared to Remediation Zone A
Dated: July 22, 2010

Dear Mr. Paque,

The NDEP has received and reviewed TRX's above-identified Deliverable and provides comments in Attachment A, which should be incorporated into the Human Health Risk Assessment(s) (HHRA) for the Site. TRX should additionally provide an annotated response-to-comments letter as part of the HHRA.

Please contact the undersigned with any questions at sharbour@ndep.nv.gov or 775-687-9332.

Sincerely,

Shannon Harbour, P.E.
Staff Engineer III
Bureau of Corrective Actions
Special Projects Branch
NDEP-Carson City Office
Fax: 775-687-8335

SH:sh

EC: Jim Najima, Bureau of Corrective Actions, NDEP
Greg Lovato, Bureau of Corrective Actions, NDEP
Mike Skromyda, Tronox LLC
Michael J. Foster, Tronox LLC
Keith Bailey, Environmental Answers LLC
Susan Crowley, Tronox LLC (Contractor)
Deni Chambers, Northgate Environmental
Brian Rakvica, McGinley and Associates



Barry Conaty, Holland & Hart LLP
Brenda Pohlmann, City of Henderson
Mitch Kaplan, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
Ebrahim Juma, Planning Manager, Air Quality and Environmental Management
Joe McGinley, McGinley & Associates
Ranajit Sahu, BRC
Rick Kellogg, BRC
Mark Paris, Landwell
Craig Wilkinson, TIMET
Kirk Stowers, Broadbent & Associates
Victoria Tyson, Tyson Contracting
George Crouse, Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc.
Nick Pogoncheff, PES Environmental
Lee Erickson, Stauffer Management Company
Michael Bellotti, Olin Corporation
Curt Richards, Olin Corporation
Paul Sundberg, Montrose Chemical Corporation
Joe Kelly, Montrose Chemical Corporation of CA
Jeff Gibson, AMPAC
Larry Cummings, AMPAC
Paul Black, Neptune and Company, Inc.
Kelly Black, Neptune and Company, Inc.
Teri Copeland, Neptune and Company, Inc.
Kurt Fehling, The Fehling Group, LLC
Joanne Otani

CC: Ebrahim Juma, Planning Manager, Air Quality and Environmental Management
Susan Crowley, C/O Tronox LLC, PO Box 55, Henderson, NV 89009
Lee Erickson, Stauffer Management Company

Attachment A

1. General comment, TRX should provide plots of the BRC-TIMET McCullough Range background data and the RZ-A data (e.g., in Appendix A).
2. Footnote 1, page 1, NDEP provides the following comments:
 - a. 1st sentence, NDEP has not challenged the correctness of the analytical methods used for the Phase B data. NDEP has suggested that the methods used in one laboratory are different than the methods used by another laboratory (in particular the laboratory that was used for the Phase A data, the TRX Parcels A and B data, and the BRC-TIMET background data). NDEP acknowledges that the method definition for Method 6020 allows for some flexibility. Specifically, CAS-Kelso has confirmed use of 10% HNO₃. However based upon similar issues at the BMI Common Areas, review of the DVSRs for the referenced data, and discussions with TestAmerica, NDEP currently believes that TestAmerica used 10% HNO₃ / 2% HCL. While both methods are correct, they are different and may be potentially different enough to generate relative differences in the reported concentrations between the two labs. This issue is under on-going investigation. NDEP will advise as soon as the requisite information is available; however, neither TRX nor TestAmerica has been able to produce the SOP for the preparation method to facilitate this review.
 - b. Last sentence, NDEP is not sure what direction TRX is still expecting from NDEP other than information regarding extraction at TestAmerica and provides the following comments:
 - i. In a letter dated April 30, 2010, NDEP provided direction for the use of RZ-A data as local background for TRX Site data from CAS-Kelso (e.g., Phase B data) and use of Parcels A and B data as local background for TRX Site data from TestAmerica (e.g., Phase A data).
 - ii. NDEP notes again that the Parcels A and B arsenic data are, in general, less than the BRC-TIMET McCullough arsenic data, suggesting the possibility of a geologic difference. Also, the RZ-A data are lower than the Parcels A and B data, which possibly suggests an analytical difference. Either way, NDEP finds that it is inappropriate to suggest that the BRC-TIMET McCullough Range background data be used for background comparisons for the RZ's data when the data for RZ-A are considerably different than the BRC-TIMET McCullough Range and where different mostly means less than (e.g., arsenic).
 - iii. Since the RZ-A data are often statistically less than the BRC-TIMET McCullough Range, then either the sampling and analysis for the RZ's should be repeated (because Site data cannot be less than background if background is properly characterized) or the RZ-A should be accepted as local background for CAS-Kelso data and the Parcels A and B data should be accepted as local background for TestAmerica data at TRX sites.
3. Background Dataset, pages 2-3, NDEP provides the following comments:
 - a. TRX describes the comparisons between BRC-TIMET McCullough range background data in shallow soils (0-10 ft bgs) and the RZ-A shallow soils data (0-10 ft.). However, the analysis is incomplete given that the results show clear differences for several metals, indicating that the two datasets are different whether the differences are geological, chemical analytical or other. NDEP does not concur with the conclusions that the BRC-

TIMET background data would be better suited to background comparisons for RZ-B through RZ-E.

- b. 2nd and 3rd paragraphs, NDEP has observed that the statistical analyses are not presented. TRX should note that comparison of maximums and means is not sufficient to draw conclusions. Proper statistical tests should be run and presented with conclusions based on lines of evidence such as the statistical results, plots of the data, and the conceptual site model (CSM) for this area.
- c. 4th paragraph, NDEP provides the following comments:
 - i. The small number of data points in the RZ-A background dataset is not sufficient reason to suggest that BRC-TIMET background data are more representative of site conditions.
 - ii. NDEP is willing to acknowledge differences in depth intervals and performing analysis based on reasonable depth ranges. For example, surface samples in the BRC-TIMET background dataset are 0-6 in bgs, whereas in the RZ-A data the surface samples are 0-2 ft bgs. Consequently, NDEP is comfortable with ranges of 0-2 ft bgs and 2 – 10 ft bgs for comparison purposes, while acknowledging that the statistical analysis is only one line of evidence in conclusions that are drawn (plots of data and CSM being other lines of evidence).
 - iii. The much smaller geographic area is also not a sufficient reason to suggest that BRC-TIMET background data are more representative of site conditions. The BRC-TIMET background data are not collected as near to the other remediation zones (RZ-B through RZ-E) as the RZ-A data and the Parcels A and B data.
 - iv. Although incomplete, the analysis that TRX has performed adequately demonstrates statistical differences between the RZ-A data and the BRC-TIMET background data (excepting further comments on statistical methodology herein). NDEP agrees that these two datasets are statistically different whether the reasons are geological, analytical, both, or other.
4. Depth Interval Determination, page 3, NDEP provides the following comments:
 - a. NDEP finds that the use of depth intervals in the RZ-A and BRC-TIMET background data comparisons is confusing. In some cases, the RZ-A data has been broken into different depth intervals and in other cases, the BRC-TIMET data has been broken into different depth intervals. On their own, these depth distinctions are reasonably based on statistical differences for each metal. However, combined, the statistical analyses should be presented for common depth intervals (e.g. 0-2 ft bgs for surface, and 2-10 ft bgs for near surface). Instead, analyses are not performed when depth distinctions are different for the two data sets (NA in Table A1). Another way of looking at it is that, for example for arsenic, the RZ-A data are different by depth interval, whereas the BRC-TIMET data are not different by depth interval; therefore, the arsenic data for RZ-A are different than the arsenic data for BRC-TIMET. This logical approach would indicate more metals that are different between the two datasets. However, a more complete statistical approach is needed to compare the two data sets.
 - b. NDEP also noted that the statistical analyses for the differences by depth are not presented. The conclusions should be supported by the analyses, which should be included in an Appendix.

5. Site Data, page 3, 5th line, NDEP noted that the non-detects (NDs) were set to half the detection limit (DL) for statistical analysis. However, this is not necessary for the non-parametric tests. Please clarify for which statistical analyses ½ DL was used.
6. Statistical Comparisons, pages 4-5, NDEP provides the following comments:
 - a. Several chemicals have a low frequency of detection (less than 25%). The TM should address issues with DLs, which might render some statistical analyses inappropriate simply because there are not enough detects or because of lack of comparability of detection limits between datasets. TRX should note that lack of comparability can lead to poor decisions based on statistical analyses that should not be performed. NDEP has provided guidance to BRC on how to deal with NDs and can review this with TRX as well. There are options to statistically compare the frequency of detection for the two competing datasets, which is reasonable if the detection limits are similar (comparability issue) and if the frequencies are statistically similar, to then consider the detected values only.
 - b. Paragraph under bullets, last sentence, a directional determination can also be made the other way. When p-values for 1-sided tests are one (or near one), this suggests the test is set up the wrong way round or in this case, that site data are statistically less than background.
 - c. Results for each remediation zone, pages 5-6, TRX should tie the results back to the CSM to answer the following questions:
 - i. Do these results match what might be expected?
 - ii. Can they be explained?
7. Conclusions, page 7, NDEP provides the following comments:
 - i. 1st sentence TRX should note that the fact that the BRC-TIMET and RZ-A datasets are different for several metals is enough to acknowledge that these data sets are different and because RZ-A data are often less than BRC-TIMET data, that RZ-A probably represents local background conditions (for CAS-Kelso analyzed data).
 - ii. 3rd sentence, NDEP agrees that the greatest impact will be for arsenic. However, the intent of using the most appropriate background dataset is to address CSM issues in evaluating the potential releases that have occurred at the site.
 - iii. Last sentence, NDEP is not clear as to what further supporting documentation is needed as NDEP provided direction for background comparisons in a letter dated April 30, 2010. However, when the extraction method SOPs are made available and if the extraction methods are confirmed to be different between CAS-Kelso and TestAmerica, then NDEP will compare data from RZ-A with data from Parcels A and B.