



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

Brian Sandoval, Governor
Leo M. Drozdoff, P.E., Director
Colleen Cripps, Ph.D., Administrator

October 7, 2013

Jay A. Steinberg
Nevada Environmental Response Trust
35 East Wacker Drive, Suite 1550
Chicago, IL 60601

Re: **Tronox LLC (TRX) Facility**
Nevada Environmental Response Trust (Trust) Property
NDEP Facility ID #H-000539
Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) Response to: *Data Validation Summary Report, January to June 2013 Annual Remedial Performance Sampling Nevada Environmental Response Trust Henderson, Nevada*

And

NERT's Data Validation Summary Report and EDD for the January to June 2013 Annual Remedial Performance Sampling

Dated: August 19, 2013

Dear Mr. Steinberg,

The NDEP has received and reviewed the Trust's above-identified Deliverable and provides comments in Attachment A. A revised Deliverable should be submitted **by 11/07/2013** based on the comments found in Attachment A. The Trust should additionally provide an annotated response-to-comments letter as part of the revised Deliverable.

Please contact the undersigned with any questions at wdong@ndep.nv.gov or 702-486-2850 x252.

Sincerely,

Weiquan Dong, P.E.
Special Projects Branch
Bureau of Corrective Actions
NDEP-Las Vegas City Office

WD:jd



EC: Greg Lovato, Bureau of Corrective Actions, NDEP
James Dotchin, NDEP, BCA LV
Adam Baas, Edgcomb Law Group
Allan Delorme, ENVIRON
Andrew Barnes, Geosyntec
Andrew Steinberg, Nevada Environmental Response Trust
Ashley Katri, McGinley & Associates
Betty Kuo, MWDH2O
Brenda Pohlmann, City of Henderson
Brian Rakvica, McGinley & Associates
Brian Waggle, Hargis + Associates
Cassandra Joseph, AG's Office
Catherine Sties, MWDH2O
Charles K. Hauser, Esq., Southern Nevada Water Authority
Chuck Elmendorf, Stauffer Management Company, LLC
David Johnson, Central Arizona Water Conservation District
Ebrahim Juma, Clean Water Team
Ed Modiano, de maximis, inc.
Eric Fordham, Geopentech
George Crouse, Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc.
Jay Gear, Olin Co
Jeff Gibson, AMPAC
Scott Bryan, Central Arizona Project
Jill Teraoka, MWDH2O
Joanne Otani
Joe Kelly, Montrose Chemical Corporation of CA
Joe Leedy, Clean Water Team
John Pekala, Environcorp
Kirk Stowers, Broadbent & Associates
Kurt Fehling, The Fehling Group
Kyle Gadleym, Geosyntec
Lee Farris, BRC
Marcia Scully, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
Mark Paris, Landwell
Matt Pocernich, Neptune & Company Inc
Michael Long, Hargis + Associates
Mickey Chaudhuri, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
Nicholas Pogoncheff, PES Environmental, Inc.
Paul Black, Neptune and Company, Inc.
Paul Hackenberry, Hackenberry Associates, LLC
Peggy Roefer, Southern Nevada Water Authority
Ranajit Sahu, BRC
Rebecca Shircliff, Neptune and Company, Inc.
Richard Pfarrer, TIMET
Rick Kellogg, BRC
Ron Zegers, Southern Nevada Water Authority
Scott Bryan, Central Arizona Project
Stephen Tyahla, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
Tanya O'Neill, Foley & Lardner LLP
Teri Copeland
Wayne Klomp, AG's Office

Attachment A

1. General, Level of Data Validation. Section 1.0 and the EDD indicate that 90% of the data was validated to level Stage 2A, which excludes data validation due to instrument-related QC (e.g., calibration, interference checks, etc.). The April 13, 2009 Data Validation Guidance issued by NDEP requires that all data collected at the BMI Complex and Common Areas should be validated at least to Stage 2B. The remaining 90% of data (less the Stage 4 validation), needs to be validated to Stage 2B.
2. Section 1.0, Percent Validation. Indicate the total number of samples and break this up into the two levels of validation to clearly show how the 90/10 percentages were attained.
3. Section 1.0 and General, Blank Guidance. The DVSR does not reference the 2012 NDEP Guidance for Blank Contamination. The DVSR needs to indicate the guidance(s) followed for handling blank contamination issues.
4. Section 1.0 and General, Sensitivity. The DVSR needs to discuss sensitivity in terms of MDL, SQL or PQL and indicate how they apply to the samples and data quality.
5. Sections 2 and 3, Acceptance Limits. The acceptance limits/criteria need to be listed for each QC measure. Presently, only a couple of the QC measures have the acceptance criteria listed.
6. Section 3.2.2.2, Table III and Attachment B (Section IV), Blank PQLs. The PQLs need to be listed for the samples where blank contamination was found. This allows one to easily compare the level of blank contamination to the PQL.

EDD Review:

1. There were 77 records where the result_reported was NULL and the detect_flag_fod="U". According to the EDD guidance, "for non-radionuclide, non-detected results, the result_reported should equal the SQL." The SQL should be entered in the result_reported field for these records.
2. There are 12 records where the sample_top_depth and sample_bottom_depth are NULL. These depths should be entered.
3. In the *results* table, the field "minimal_detectable_activity" should be changed to "minimum_detectable_activity" to be consistent with the EDD guidance.
4. In the table *cas_id_new*, "Specific Conductance" was listed twice, each occurrence with a different cas_id. We have used the cas_id="CONDUCTIVITY" for all records where the parameter="Specific Conductance".