

OFFICE OF THE NEVADA ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSE TRUST TRUSTEE

Le Petomane XXVII, Inc., Not Individually, But Solely as the Nevada Environmental Response Trust Trustee
35 East Wacker Drive - Suite 1550
Chicago, Illinois 60601
Tel: (702) 357-8149, x104

January 11, 2018

Mr. Weiquan Dong, Ph.D.
Bureau of Industrial Site Cleanup
Nevada Division of Environmental Protection
2030 E. Flamingo Rd, Suite 230
Las Vegas NV 89119

RE: Response to Comments – Data Validation Summary Report and Electronic Data
Deliverable for Parcel C Health Risk Assessment
Nevada Environmental Response Trust
Henderson, Nevada

Dear Mr. Dong:

The Nevada Environmental Response Trust (NERT) is pleased to present the Revised Electronic Data Deliverable (EDD) for Parcel C Health Risk Assessment for Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) review. The revised EDD has been prepared in response to NDEP’s comments dated January 10, 2018. In addition, NERT is also providing an annotated response to comments.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this matter, feel to contact me at (702) 960-4309 or at steve.clough@nert-trust.com.

Office of the Nevada Environmental Response Trust



Stephen R. Clough, P.G., CEM
Remediation Director
CEM Certification Number: 2399, exp. 3/24/19

Cc (via NERT Sharefile Distribution):

Jeff Kinder, NDEP, Deputy Administrator
James Dotchin, NDEP, Chief, Bureau of Industrial Site Cleanup
Carlton Parker, NDEP, Bureau of Industrial Site Cleanup
Alan Pineda, NDEP, Bureau of Industrial Site Cleanup
Christa Smaling, NDEP, Bureau of Industrial Site Cleanup
Frederick Perdomo, Nevada Attorney General’s Office
Alison Fong, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
Mark Duffy, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
Jay Steinberg, as President of the Nevada Environmental Response Trust Trustee and not individually
Andrew Steinberg, as Vice President of the Nevada Environmental Response Trust Trustee and not individually
Tanya C. O’Neill, Foley and Lardner, LLP
Allan DeLorme, Ramboll Environ
John Pekala, Ramboll Environ

Office of the Nevada Environmental Response Trust Trustee
January 11, 2018

Derek Amidon, Tetra Tech
Dan Pastor, Tetra Tech
Kirk Stowers, Broadbent Inc.
Kurt Fehling, The Fehling Group

Cc (via NERT Stakeholder Sharefile Distribution):

Betty Kuo, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
Brenda Pohlmann, City of Henderson
Carol Nagai, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
David Johnson, Central Arizona Water Conservation District
Dave Johnson, LV Valley Water District
Eric Fordham, Geopentech
Jill Teraoka, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
Kevin Fisher, LV Valley Water District
Marcia Scully, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
Maria Lopez, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
Mickey Chaudhuri, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
Peggy Roefer, Colorado River Commission
Scott Bryan, Central Arizona Water Conservation District
Steven Anderson, LV Valley Water District
Todd Tietjen, Southern Nevada Water Authority

Cc (via NERT BMI Companies Sharefile Distribution):

Anna Springsteen, Neptune Inc.
Kirk Stowers, Broadbent Inc.
Kristen Lockhart, Neptune Inc.
Kurt Fehling, The Fehling Group
Patti Meeks, Neptune Inc.
Paul Black, Neptune Inc.
Paul S. Hackenberry, Hackenberry Associates
John Edgcomb, Edgcomb Law Group
Andrew Barnes, Geosyntec
Brian Waggle, Hargis + Associates
Chinny Esakkiperumal, Olin Corporation
Chuck Elmendorf, Stauffer
Curt Richards, Olin Corporation
Dave Share, Olin Corporation
Ebrahim Juma, Clean Water Team
Ed Modiano, de maximus
Gary Carter, Endeavour LLC
George Crouse, Syngenta
Harry Van Den Berg, AECOM
Jeff Gibson, Endeavour LLC
Joanne Otani, Joanne M. Otani LLC
Joe Kelly, Montrose Chemical
Joe Leedy, Clean Water Team
Kelly McIntosh, GEI Consultants
Kevin Lombardozzi, Valhi
Kyle Gadley, Geosyntec
Lee C. Farris, Landwell
Mark Paris, Landwell
Michael Bogle, Womble Carlyle Sandridge & Rice, LLP
Michael Long, Hargis + Associates
Nick Pogoncheff, PES Environmental, Inc.
Ranajit Sahu, BRC

Office of the Nevada Environmental Response Trust Trustee
January 11, 2018

Richard Pfarrer, TIMET
Rick Kellogg, BRC

Attachment A

DVSR Review

1. **Section 1.0, sensitivity:** The text states the laboratory reports results down to the MDL. This statement should be revised to state that the results are reported to the SQL.
NERT Response: *The statement has been changed to state that the laboratory reports results to the SQL.*

NDEP Reply: The sentence that follows the revised sentence still indicates the laboratory reports results to the MDL; however, as the previous sentence properly states the reporting basis as the SQL, no further edits are requested.

NERT Response: The sentence that follows the revised sentence is, "The laboratory uses a formatter that reports estimated values down to the MDL." This sentence is similar to the revised sentence and will not be used in future DVSRs.

2. **Sample and analyte counts:** The sample and total result counts in the following sections did not match the EDD. Please correct the text and/or EDD as necessary. As these discrepancies may be related, they are reported together.
NERT Response: *The previous EDD submittal contained additional "samples_Obsolete" and "results_Obsolete" tables. The obsolete samples and results were included in the submittal because they had been validated and included in the DVSR. When the obsolete samples and results are included with the remaining samples and results, the majority of the discrepancies below are resolved.*

For clarity, in this revised EDD submittal, the two obsolete tables have been removed. The obsolete samples and results are now included in the samples and results tables, respectively. Both tables have an additional "Obsolete" column that is defined as a Boolean. It is marked as True for samples and results that have been removed. Combining the existing results with the obsolete sample results should make revising the EDD and DVSR easier.

NDEP Reply: Thank you for the explanation. Although some counts still do not match (see below), no further revisions to the DVSR are requested. However, it would be good to document the final resolution to the discrepancies noted below (**bold text**). If any of the counts noted below are found to be incorrect, we request a final response in order to document the actual counts.

NERT Response: Please see responses below.

- a. **Section 2.0, VOCs:** The text states there were 63 soil samples analyzed for VOCs; however, the EDD has 61 soil samples. The total analyte count (soil+water) in the text (4,695) also does not match the EDD (4,559 without surrogates).
NERT Response: *There are 61 existing soil samples and 2 obsolete soil samples, equaling 63 soil samples. There are 4,559 existing results and 136 obsolete results, equaling 4,695 total (soil+water) results.*

NDEP Reply: Agree with all except the number of existing samples. There appear to be **64 existing soil samples**.

NERT Response: The number of samples analyzed for VOCs has been checked in two ways. The first is by listing samples that have results analyzed under method SW-8260. The second is by listing samples that have results with the analytical suite of "VOC". Both methods yield a total of 61 existing soil samples and 2 obsolete samples, for a total of 63 soil samples.

- b. **Section 3.0, SVOCs:** The text states 36 soil samples were analyzed for SVOCs; however, the EDD has 35 soil samples. The total analyte count (soil+water) in the text (2,432) does not match the EDD (2,367 without surrogates).

NERT Response: *There are 35 existing soil samples and 1 obsolete soil samples, equaling 36 soil samples. There are 2,367 existing results and 64 obsolete results, equaling 2,431 total (soil+water) results. The text has been updated to 2,431 results.*

NDEP Reply: Agree with all except the **existing soil result count in the EDD appears to be 2,368 and the total result count is 2,432.**

NERT Response: After reviewing the EDD, we agree that the total result count is 2,432. It appears the octachlorostyrene result for sample RISB-45-10.0-20141121-EB added to the revised EDD in response to NDEP comment 10c, had not been included in the response totals.

- c. **Section 10.0, dioxins:** The text states 35 soil samples were analyzed for dioxins; however, the EDD has 34 soil samples. The total analyte count (soil+water) in the text (925) does not match the EDD (900, excluding internal standards and results qualified DNR).

NERT Response: *There are 34 existing soil samples and 1 obsolete soil sample, equaling 35 soil samples. There are 900 existing results and 25 obsolete results, equaling 925 total (soil+water) results.*

NDEP Reply: The number of existing and obsolete samples in the EDD matches the text and above. The **EDD, however, has 905 existing results and 930 total results.**

NERT Response: After reviewing the EDD, we agree that there are 905 existing results and 930 total results.

3. **General, field duplicate qualifications:** A number of nondetect results and results detected below the PQL were qualified for field duplicate RPD outliers. Given the additional uncertainty in results reported below the PQL, these seem like unnecessary qualifications. As a specific example, hexachlorobenzene results (Section 3.1.6) were qualified as estimated, but both results were less than the PQL. Please consider removing the qualifications from, at a minimum, the hexachlorobenzene results.

NERT Response: *The qualifications for nondetect results and results detected below the PQL associated with field duplicate outliers have been removed from the text. The DVSR and EDD have been updated.*

NDEP Reply: There appear to be single samples that retain the field duplicate qualification while the other half of the pair is not qualified. Please check **PCB 1 in M-191-1.0-20141201-FD, PCB 159 in M-189-5.0-20141202, PCB 169 in RISB-41-0.5-20141121 and PCB 209 in RISB-43-5.0-20141121.** One metal result appears to be similarly affected. Please check **boron in RISB-39-5.0-20141121.** If it is confirmed these results should not be qualified, the qualifier (if necessary) and code can be corrected prior to upload to the BMI database.

NERT Response: After reviewing the above mentioned samples it is confirmed that those results should not have been qualified in the EDD. In the revised EDD, the field duplicate qualification has been removed from final_validation_reason_codes and final_validation_qualifier. The same correction has been made in the Trust's database.

4. **Qualification counts:** The number of results reported as qualified did not match the EDD in a number of cases. Please correct the text and/or EDD as necessary.

NERT Response: *The previous EDD submittal contained additional "samples_Obsolete" and "results_Obsolete" tables. The obsolete samples and results were included in the submittal because they had been validated and included in the DVSR. When the obsolete samples and results are included with the remaining samples and results, the majority of the discrepancies below are resolved.*

For clarity, in this revised EDD submittal, the two obsolete tables have been removed. The obsolete samples and results are now included in the samples and results tables, respectively. Both tables have an additional "Obsolete" column that is defined as a

*Boolean. It is marked as True for samples and results that have been removed.
Combining the existing results with the obsolete sample results should make revising the
EDD and DVSR easier.*

NDEP Reply: Thank you for the explanation. There are still a few discrepancies (**bold text**). These are the result of differing numbers of specific qualifications (e.g., J+ and J-). To eliminate this problem but retain the primary information, in the future, we suggest only reporting the total number of qualifications for an issue (i.e., calibration). No text revisions are requested.

NERT Response: In future DVSRs, only the total number of qualifications will be reported for an issue.

- a. **Section 12.1.2, metals:** The text states that 180 results were qualified for MS/MSD recovery outliers and that 33 results were rejected. The EDD has 179 results qualified and 32 results rejected.

NERT Response: *The text was revised to note 140 results qualified as detected estimated (J-) or non-detected estimated (UJ) due to MS/MSD recovery outliers, and 41 results qualified (J+) due to MS/MSD recovery outliers. These qualified results total 181. The EDD has 176 results and 5 obsolete results qualified due to MS/MSD recovery outliers. These total 181 results, which is consistent with the text. There are 32 existing results and 1 obsolete result, qualifying 33 rejected results.*

NDEP Reply: Agree with the total count. **There are 133 results qualified J- or UJ and 34 results qualified J+.** The text does not account for the 14 results qualified J.

NERT Response: The text in this section only discusses qualifiers applied due to MS/MSD recovery outliers. The 14 results were qualified J after other qualifiers were applied to these results using the qualifier hierarchy. Consistent with Neptune's response to Comment 13, in future DVSRs, only the total number of qualifications will be reported for an issue.

EDD Review

1. 6 results for demeton, demeton-o and demeton-s in samples M-191-1.0 and M-191-5.0 were qualified as nondetected by the laboratory, but do not have a "final_validation_qualifier" of "U".

NERT Response: *The "final_validation_qualifier" of "U" has been added to the EDD.*

NDEP Reply: These qualifications have been corrected. In the process of verifying this correction, **302 records were identified with the same issue (qualified nondetect by the laboratory but lacking a "U" final_validation_qualifier).** The "U" qualifiers can be added prior to upload to the BMI database.

NERT Response: In the revised EDD, the 302 records that had a lab qualifier of "U" but did not have a "U" final validation qualifier have been updated. The field final_validation_qualifier has been updated with "U" and final_validation_reason_code has been populated with "nd". The same correction has been made in the Trust's database.

2. The results table has 272 records where the analytical suite is RADS, but the result_uncertainty and minimum_detectable_activity fields are null. Please provide the result_uncertainty and minimum_detectable_activity for all radionuclide results.

NERT Response: *Result_uncertainty and minimum_detectable_activity have been populated for all RADS results.*

NDEP Reply: This comment has been appropriately addressed.

NERT Response: While reviewing the EDD it was discovered that result_uncertainty had been populated with an incorrect value. It has been corrected in the revised EDD.

Additional EDD Comments

3. The percent moisture results have a "validation_flag" of "T", and "validation_stage" of Stage 2B or Stage 4. There is no documentation in the DVSR to support the validation of this analyte – the method is not listed in the introduction nor are the validation results discussed in the text. Please verify the percent moisture results have been validated. If these results were not validated, the EDD can be corrected, prior to upload to the BMI database. In the future, if the percent moisture results are validated, please list the method and discuss the results.

NERT Response: Percent moisture results were not validated. In the revised EDD, validation_flag has been set to "F" and validation_stage to NULL for percent moisture results. The same correction has been made in the Trust's database.

4. The dioxin and PCB congener TEQs and percent moisture results have "validation_flag" of "T", and "validation_stage" of Stage 2B or Stage 4. As these "analytes" are planned and have been validated, the results should be included in the total analyte counts and the calculation of percent complete. In the future, please include all validated analytes in the analyte counts and percent moisture calculation.

NERT Response: In future DVSR submittals, dioxin and PCB congener TEQs will be included in the total analyte counts and the percent complete calculation. For dioxin and PCB congener TEQs, no EDD changes were necessary and none were made.

Percent moisture results were not validated. In the revised EDD, validation_flag has been set to "F" and validation_stage to NULL for percent moisture results. The same correction has been made in the Trust's database.