

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 690
Chicago, Illinois 60601
Tel: (702) 960-4309

December 8, 2022

Dr. Weiquan Dong, P.E.
Bureau of Industrial Site Cleanup
Nevada Division of Environmental Protection
375 E. Warm Springs Road, Suite 200
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119

RE: Data Validation Summary Report for Phase 3 Remedial Investigation Modification No. 10, Rev 1
Nevada Environmental Response Trust
Henderson, Nevada

Dear Dr. Dong:

The Nevada Environmental Response Trust (NERT) is pleased to present the revised Data Validation Summary Report (DVSR) associated with Phase 3 Remedial Investigation Modification No. 10 for Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) review. This revised DVSR addresses NDEP's comment in your November 9, 2022 correspondence. As requested, an annotated response to comments is attached to this letter.

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. 3/24/23

Cc (via NERT Sharefile Distribution):

Jeff Kinder, NDEP, Deputy Administrator
Frederick Perdomo, 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
Danielle D. Ward, NDEP, Bureau of Industrial Site Cleanup
William Frier, 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
Brian Loffman, Le Petomane, Inc.
Tanya C. O'Neill, Foley and Lardner, LLP
Dan Peterson, Ramboll
Chris Stubbs, Ramboll

Office of the Nevada Environmental Response Trust Trustee
December 8, 2022

Kim Kuwabara, Ramboll
David Bohmann, Tetra Tech
Dana Grady, Tetra Tech

Cc (via NERT Stakeholder Sharefile Distribution):

Betty Kuo, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
Carol Nagai, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
Christene Klimek, City of Henderson
Christine Nobles, Central Arizona Project
Daniel Chan, LV Valley Water District
Dave Johnson, LV Valley Water District
Deena Hannoun, Southern Nevada Water Authority
Eric Fordham, Geopentech
Jill Teraoka, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
Katherine Callaway, Central Arizona Project
Laura Dye, Colorado River Commission
Marcia Scully, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
Maria Lopez, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
Mauricio Santos, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
Mickey Chaudhuri, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
Orestes Morfin, Central Arizona Project
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.
Chinny Esakkiperumal, Olin Corporation
Chuck Elmendorf, Stauffer
Curt Richards, Olin Corporation
Dave Share, Olin Corporation
Ebrahim Juma, Clark County Water Quality
Ed Modiano, de maximus
Jeff Gibson, Endeavour LLC
Joe Kelly, Montrose Chemical
Joe Leedy, Clark County Water Quality
John Solvie, Clark County Water Quality
Kevin Lombardozi, Valhi
Lee C. Farris, Landwell
Mark Paris, Landwell
Nick Pogoncheff, PES Environmental, Inc.
Ranajit Sahu, BRC
Richard Pfarrer, TIMET
Roy Thun, GHD
Keenan Sanders, EMD
Sonia Lewandowski, EMD

NDEP Comment	Response to Comment
DVSR Review	
<p>1. Several SDGs report a cooler temperature outside of acceptance limit with no explanation either in the SDG or DVSR for the exceedance. When reviewing the COCs there are a series of temperatures recorded that are within acceptance limit. Then there is a single entry of a cooler temperature that is outside the acceptance limit. The laboratory lists all the recorded temperatures in the Job Narrative. Looking at traceability, is there a sample inventory to know which samples were placed in each cooler? From information provided, there is no way to tell which samples were preserved properly and is totally dependent on the lab to identify samples that are received outside required cooler temperature acceptance criteria.</p> <p>For SDG 550-168578-1, the following cooler temperatures were recorded; 0.9, 2.4, 3.3, 4.4, 5.0, 13.9 and 17.2 °C. The Job Narrative indicates that "All perchlorate containers were received at 13.9 C. The unpreserved containers for 314.0 was also received at 13.9 C for sample 3 thru 6, and 8 thru 10." There is no discussion in the DVSR regarding this outlier. Why weren't the samples in the cooler received at 17.2 C included in the Job Narrative as well?</p> <p>NERT Response: The single high cooler temperature reading listed on the COC is the temperature recorded at the time of drop-off at the laboratory service center in Las Vegas, not the temperature recorded at the time of receipt at the laboratory. When the samples are received at the service center, they have generally not had sufficient time to cool to below 6 degrees C. The samples are repacked with wet ice and shipped overnight to the laboratory, where the temperature of each</p>	<p>Section 2.2.1 of the DVSR has been revised to include text to address the cooler that was received at the laboratory at an elevated temperature:</p> <p><i>Temperature preservation is not required for the methods evaluated as part of this DVSR. However, the samples were shipped on ice and one cooler that contained sample fractions for SDGs 550-168577-1 and 550-168578-1 arrived at the laboratory at 13.9 degrees Celsius. The laboratory noted the cooler was received above 6 degrees Celsius in the case narratives but did not correctly identify the sample fractions affected for SDG 550-168578-1. All of the chlorate samples and six samples submitted for perchlorate analysis for SDG 550-168578-1 were received above 6 degrees Celsius. No data were qualified.</i></p>

cooler is measured. The laboratory's procedure is to list any individual bottles within coolers received above 6 degrees C in the case narrative and/or the login sample receipt checklist. Unless individual bottles are specifically noted by the laboratory, all sample bottles were received at the laboratory preserved on ice and at less than 6 degrees C. The analytical laboratory is revising their procedures so that the case narratives will not list temperatures measured at the service center in the future.

The case narrative for SDG-168578-1 should have stated "All chlorate containers were received at 13.9 C. The unpreserved containers for 314.0 was also received at 13.9 C for sample 3 thru 6, and 8 thru 10." This is consistent with the documentation on the COC. Temperature preservation is not required for perchlorate and chlorate by Methods 314.0 and 300.1; therefore, the temperature exceedance above 6 degrees C was not discussed in the DVSR, and no data were qualified.

The temperature reading at 17.2 degrees C for this SDG is the reading recorded at the time of drop-off at the laboratory service center and not representative of the temperature of the samples when they were received at the laboratory. The service center measured temperature is not used to assess sample temperature preservation; therefore, it is not discussed in the case narrative as a receipt exception or discussed in the DVSR.

No changes have been made to the DVSR.

NDEP Response: The explanation for the elevated cooler temperature at the time of drop-off at the laboratory service center (17.2 degrees C), that the measured temperature at the service center is not representative of the sample temperature and not used to assess sample preservation, is adequate. The explanation of the elevated temperature received by the laboratory needs to be included in the DVSR. Since the

<p>laboratory case narrative does not provide sufficient clarity and the details noted are in error, the DVSR must be revised to provide this clarity. The laboratory reported all samples for the respective cooler as being outside acceptable temperature range without regard to sample fraction (TDS, chlorate, or perchlorate).</p>	
EDD Review	
<p>1. <u>File "NERT 2202 EDD Rev 0.accdb"</u> The EDD is acceptable.</p>	<p>No response required.</p>