



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 14, 2008

Mr. Craig Wilkinson
TIMET
PO Box 2128
Henderson, Nevada 89009

Re.: Nevada Division of Environmental Protection Letter Regarding:
2007 Conceptual Site Model (CSM), Response to NDEP Comments dated February 10, 2008; dated May 23, 2008
NDEP Facility ID# H-000537

Dear Mr. Wilkinson:

The Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) has completed a review of the aforementioned document and provides comments in Attachment A. It is expected that these comments will be considered and addressed in the development of area-specific conceptual site models as TIMET defines exposure areas at the Site. These comments should be included in a response-to-comments (RTC) appendix in all future conceptual site models until they are fully resolved. The NDEP believes that it is unproductive to continue to discuss these comments at this time.

Should you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at (702) 486-2850 x247.

Sincerely,

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

BAR:s

cc: Jim Najima, NDEP, BCA, Carson City
Jon Palm, BWPC, Carson City
Barry Conaty, Holland & Hart LLP, 975 F Street, N.W., Suite 900, Washington, D.C. 20004
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
Ebrahim Juma, 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
Kirk Stowers, Broadbent & Associates, 8 West Pacific Avenue, Henderson, Nevada 89015
George Crouse, Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc., 410 Swing Road, Greensboro, NC 27409
Nicholas Pogoncheff, PES Environmental, Inc., 1682 Novato Blvd., Suite 100, Novato, CA
94947-7021
Susan Crowley, Tronox, PO Box 55, Henderson, Nevada 89009
Keith Bailey, Environmental Answers, 3329 Persimmon Creek Drive, Edmond, OK 73013
Sally Bilodeau, ENSR, 1220 Avenida Acaso, Camarillo, CA 93012-8727
Lee Erickson, Stauffer Management Company, P.O. Box 18890, Golden, Co 80402
Michael Bellotti, Olin Corporation, 3855 North Ocoee Street, Suite 200, Cleveland, TN 37312
Curt Richards, Olin Corporation, 3855 North Ocoee Street, Suite 200, Cleveland, TN 37312
Cindi Byrns, Olin Corporation, PO Box 86, Henderson, NV 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
Deni Chambers, Northgate Environmental Management, Inc., 300 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, Suite
510, Oakland, CA 94612
Robert Infelise, Cox Castle Nicholson, 555 California Street, 10th Floor, San Francisco, CA
94104-1513
Michael Ford, Bryan Cave, One Renaissance Square, Two North Central Avenue, Suite 2200,
Phoenix, AZ 85004
Paul Hackenberry, Hackenberry Associates, LLC, 550 W. Plumb Lane B425, Reno, NV 89509

Attachment A

1. Page 1, Comment 2, NDEP appreciates the format of this document and the ease of its use.
2. Page 1, Comment 4, this response does not clearly answer the original question. It is the NDEP's understanding that the lenses with the Upper Muddy Creek formation (UMCf) may or may not be continuous, however, communication between these lenses is evident based on contaminant concentrations throughout the region. TIMET should address this issue plainly in future Deliverables.
3. Page 2, Comment #5, this response is acceptable and TIMET is advised to consult with a risk assessor during the development of are-specific conceptual site model (CSMs) once exposure areas are defined. In addition, the NDEP requests that TIMET plainly discuss the schedule for defining exposure areas and continuing with the characterization process. It is expected that this issue can be discussed in NDEP and TIMET's project management meetings and that appropriate Deliverables can be defined therein.
4. Page 4, Comment #10, 1st column, last response on page, it is the expectation of the NDEP that during the development of area-specific CSMs and related sampling and analysis plans (SAPs) that some level of broad suite analysis will be conducted in all source areas.
5. Page 5, Comment #12. This statement is not a commitment to compliance with NDEP request and it is the expectation of the NDEP that all future area-specific CSMs will include a decision tree; data usability (DU) evaluation; and data gap analysis.
6. Page 7, Comment #15. It is noted that TIMET could answer this question by conducting a DU evaluation on the data set in question. It is also noted that this response is not responsive and is ostensibly the same as the response provided on December 7, 2007. This is not productive.
7. Page 7, Comment #16. By TIMET's admission waste stream characterization is not being conducted per RTC #10 ergo broad suite analyses will be needed in all source areas.
8. Page 7, Comment #17. Refer to NDEP Comment #19 below. TIMET needs to split out current operating conditions and future conditions in the CSM.
 - a. Explain why the trespasser scenario is incomplete (fencing, security personnel, etc.). NDEP notes that fencing alone at some areas of the BMI Complex is not adequate to address trespassers.
 - b. TIMET's second point remains unclear that is "open soil scenario (unlikely, given the administrative controls assigning workers to indoor duties)..." The question that remains is "are there exposed soil areas at the facility and are any workers assigned to outdoor activity?" Also, could exposed soil contribute to a wind blown dust pathway at the facility or downwind? It is noted that some fraction of workers time is spent on open soils at the facility dealing with the ponds and other waste accumulation areas.
9. Page 7, Comment #18, 1st paragraph, 1st sentence. Refer to NDEP's response above to Comment #17. This response assumes that there are no outdoor workers and there is not a wind blown dust pathway.

10. Pages 7 and 8, Comment #18, 1st paragraph, 2nd sentence. This statement does not make sense. DU has nothing to do with "the dynamic nature of dust resuspension and deposition..."
11. Page 8, Comment #18, 1st paragraph, 3rd sentence. What is the connection between conducting a DU evaluation on surface soil data and the vertical delineation characterization?
12. Page 8, Comment #18, 2nd paragraph. What does TIMET mean by "address other components of data usability in future reports?" The DU evaluation for a data set should be contained within one document.
13. Page 8, Comment #19, 1st sentence. Refer to NDEP response to RTC #17 above.
14. Page 8, Comment #19, last sentence of response. If the intention is to do a risk assessment then the future scenario needs to be included in the CSM (EPA, 1989).
15. Page 8, Comment #20, 1st paragraph of response. As noted above (RTC #17), this response appears to indicate that there are no outdoor workers at the TIMET facility.
16. Page 9, Comment #20, response at top of page. Please note that the pavement map is support for identification of pathways for the CSM, *i.e.*, useful now.
17. Page 10, Comment #23, last sentence in response. Is the residential exposure scenario really the end point for TIMET? It is the understanding and expectation of the NDEP that the facility will remain as commercial/industrial in the future.
18. Page 10, Comment #25. This response is taken out of the context of the human health risk assessment (HHRA) Guidance (EPA, 1989) and Soil Screening Guidance (EPA, 1996). Also, it is noted that air data has been collected by a downwind receptor (BRC) and additional data continues to be collected. This data should be reviewed and included in future discussions.
19. Pages 12 and 13, Comment 30, the NDEP has the following comments:
 - a. Please provide the analytical data for the "coke" to the NDEP. If this data does not exist, please provide a stamped report by a licensed metallurgical or chemical professional engineer which explains the content of the coke.
20. Page 13, Comment #31. TIMET states "At this time, TIMET is not seeking a NFA for future unrestricted (open soil) scenarios."
 - a. Please note that exposure assessments are conducted for both current and future land use (EPA, 1989).
 - b. Please note that it is important for TIMET to identify what they are requesting (seeking) from the NDEP, in terms of closure.
21. Page 14, Comment #31, top of page. As previously commented upon, TIMET indicates by this statement that there are outdoor workers at the site.
22. Page 14, Comment #31. TIMET states "Given the choice to screen data in either the CSM or HRA..." Please note that site data are not screened in the CSM.
23. Page 14, Comment #31. TIMET states "...TIMET agrees that site data will be used to eliminate exposure pathways in the forthcoming HRA..." Please note that site data are used to develop the CSM, not eliminate exposure pathways.

References

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1988. Guidance for Conducting Remedial Investigations and Feasibility Studies Under CERCLA. Office of Emergency and

Remedial Response, October.

<http://www.epa.gov/superfund/policy/remedy/sfremedy/rifs/overview.htm>

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1989. Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund: Volume I—Human Health Evaluation Manual (Part A). Interim Final. Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, Washington, D.C. USEPA/540/1-89/002. December.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1992. Guidance for Data Usability in Risk Assessment (Part A), Final. Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, April.
<http://www.epa.gov/oswer/riskassessment/datause/parta.htm>