



# STATE OF NEVADA

Department of Conservation & Natural Resources

DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Jim Gibbons, Governor

Allen Biaggi, Director

Leo M. Drozdoff, P.E., Administrator

**May 3, 2006**

Mr. Mark Paris  
Basic Remediation Company  
875 West Warm Springs Road  
Henderson, NV 89105

Ms. Susan Crowley  
Tronox LLC  
PO Box 55  
Henderson, NV 89009

Mr. Sam Chamberlain  
Pioneer Companies, Inc.  
700 Louisiana St, Suite 4300  
Houston, TX 77002

Mr. Joe Kelly  
Montrose Chemical Corp of CA  
600 Ericksen Ave NE, Suite 380  
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110

Mr. George Crouse  
Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc.  
410 Swing Road  
Greensboro, NC 27409

Mr. Craig Wilkinson  
Titanium Metals Corporation  
PO Box 2128  
Henderson, NV 89009

Re. **BMI Plant Sites and Common Areas Projects, Henderson, Nevada**  
*NDEP Guidance on Data Validation*

Dear Sirs and Madam:

Attachment A contains the NDEP's guidance on the level of data verification and validation that is required for your respective projects. Please be advised that this applies to all historic data that is planned to be used for any purpose as well as all data collected in the future. Your respective project schedules should reflect this effort and all companies are requested to initiate this effort as soon as possible. The NDEP is willing to meet with each company individually to discuss your specific questions and concerns.

If you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Brian A. Rakvica, P.E.  
Supervisor, Special Projects Branch  
Bureau of Corrective Actions

BAR:s

CC: Jim Najima, NDEP, BCA, Carson City  
Marysia Skorska, NDEP, BCA, Las Vegas

This Document is for Electronic Distribution

Shannon Harbour, NDEP, BCA, Las Vegas  
Brian Rakvica, NDEP, BCA, Las Vegas (7 copies total)  
Barry Conaty, Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer & Feld, L.L.P., 1333 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.,  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Brenda Pohlmann, City of Henderson, PO Box 95050, Henderson, NV 89009  
Mitch Kaplan, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9, mail code: WST-5,  
75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105-3901  
Rob Mrowka, Clark County Comprehensive Planning, PO Box 551741, Las Vegas, NV, 89155-  
1741  
Ranajit Sahu, BRC, 311 North Story Place, Alhambra, CA 91801  
Rick Kellogg, BRC, 875 West Warm Springs, Henderson, NV 89015  
Craig Wilkinson, TIMET, PO Box 2128, Henderson, Nevada, 89009-7003  
Kirk Stowers, Broadbent & Associates, 8 West Pacific Avenue, Henderson, Nevada 89015  
George Crouse, Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc., 410 Swing Road, Greensboro, NC 27409  
Susan Crowley, Tronox, PO Box 55, Henderson, Nevada 89009  
Keith Bailey, Tronox, Inc, PO Box 268859, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73126-8859  
Sally Bilodeau, ENSR, 1220 Avenida Acaso, Camarillo, CA 93012-8727  
Lee Erickson, Stauffer Management Company, 400 Ridge Rd, Golden, CO 80403  
Chris Sylvia, Pioneer Americas LLC, PO Box 86, Henderson, Nevada 89009  
Paul Sundberg, Montrose Chemical Corporation, 3846 Estate Drive, Stockton, California  
95209  
Joe Kelly, Montrose Chemical Corporation of CA, 600 Ericksen Avenue NE, Suite 380,  
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110  
Jon Erskine, Northgate Environmental Management, Inc., 300 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, Suite 510, Oakland, CA  
94612  
Karleen O'Connor, Cox Castle Nicholson, 555 Montgomery Street, Suite 1500, San Francisco, CA 94111  
Brian Walsh, Centex Homes, 3606 North Rancho Drive, Suite 102, Las Vegas, NV 89130  
Michael Ford, Bryan Cave, One Renaissance Square, Two North Central Avenue, Suite 2200, Phoenix, AZ 85004  
Vincent Aiello, Beazer Homes, 4670 South Fort Apache, Suite 200, Las Vegas, NV  
David Gratson, Neptune and Company, 1505 15<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite B, Los Alamos, NM 87544

This Document is for Electronic Distribution

## Attachment A

### **NDEP Data Verification and Validation Requirements**

The intent of this document is to specify the level of data verification and validation that is required for all data collected for the BMI Complex area. Data verification and validation fit into the USEPA overall Quality System as described in *Guidance on Environmental Data Verification and Data Validation, (QA/G-8) (EPA 2002)*. Data verification and validation are performed using sample results and the process provides the output necessary to perform data quality assessment. This document only describes the verification and validation requirements and does not address data quality assessment further.

Data verification and validation should be performed in a manner that materially follows the Tiered approach outlined in the draft *Region 9 Superfund Data Evaluation/ Validation Guidance (R9QA/006.1)*. More specifically, Tier 2 described in that document should be followed for the organic and inorganic data. In general, radiochemistry can only be reviewed at the Tier 1A level due to the lack of raw data. Following the Tier 2 approach, it is required that **100% of all data collected be reviewed** (per Tier 1A/1B) for the following components (where applicable):

- Completeness Check.
- Chain of Custody (signatures, sample conditions, preservatives, sampling handling/filtering).
- Holding Times.
- Random check (10-20%) of Initial and Continuing Calibration.
- Review of Quality Control Summaries including negative control (blanks) and positive control (LCS) along with Sample Specific Controls (replicates, matrix spikes, surrogates, tracers/ yields).
- Overall assessment.

In addition to this 100% review, **at least 10% of the data must be validated to the level of raw data**. Ideally this level of validation should be focused on a class of compounds that has been identified as significant for the area of interest, based upon previous data; or that represent special cases (e.g. non-standard methods specifically applied to the site). This validation should include the following items (in addition to those listed above):

- 100% validation of Initial and Continuing Calibration, including GC/MS tuning (data reporting forms).
- Random recalculation (10-20%) of reported results versus raw data.
- 100% validation of Interference Check Sample (data reporting forms), ICP Serial Dilution (data reporting forms), GC/MS instrument performance check, Reporting Limits (ensure they include appropriate sample weights, moisture, dilution).
- Internal Standards, Compound Identification, and TICs (where appropriate).
- Random check (5%) of integration and mass spectrum matches (where available and appropriate).
- When project or sampling specific items have been identified in the planning documents for review, these should be added.
- Overall assessment.

To clarify how the percentages should be calculated the following guidelines should be used. When determining the set of data that will meet the 10% requirement for raw data, this should be based on the number of data packages validated compared to the total number of data packages. This is advised since reviewing a complete data package to the raw data level requires a very similar amount of time than if only a part of a data package is validated to this raw data level.

This Document is for Electronic Distribution

When determining the percentage of a data package that should be randomly (5-20%) checked, this should be on a sample basis. For example, to check 5% of the mass spectrum matches, a single sample out of 20 would meet this criterion.

If full raw data validation activities indicate a systemic problem or repeated non-compliance the level of raw data validation should be increased to adequately determine the level of impact associated with the non-compliance. This increased validation activity should also be used to determine any root cause and necessary corrective actions.

The output of the data verification and validation process described above should include a detailed Data Validation Summary Report (DVSR) to include the following:

- Introduction with Purpose/Objective/Process.
- Applicable Samples, SDG ID, sample ID link to sample location, analyses.
- Level of validation for each sample or SDG and the calculation used to determine the percentage of data reviewed/validated.
- Data validation qualifier definition.
- Definitions for the reason codes that link results in the database to a specific qualifier logic.
- Data validation findings for each parameter based on the level of review. When non-conformances are identified they should be linked to the appropriate sample(s) and SDG.
- Evaluation of PARCCS parameters.
- Conclusions/Recommendations.
- References.
- Electronic database of the dataset that is being addressed by the report including all raw data and laboratory report (on CD in Microsoft Access database).