

Meeting Minutes

Project: Tronox (Trx)
Location: Tronox - Henderson
Time and Date: 1:30 PM, Tuesday, April 11, 2006
Meeting Number: ---
In Attendance: NDEP-BCA – Brian Rakvica, Shannon Harbour
Tronox – Keith Bailey, Tom Reed (via telephone), Rick Stater,
Susan Crowley (via telephone)
ENSR – Dave Gerry
AIG – Joe Guerriero
GEI – K. Savaranan
Malcolm Pirnie – Bruce Nelson, Rich Califano

CC: Jim Najima, Todd Croft, Teri Copeland, Paul Black

1. Meeting was held to discuss the Phase A Work Plan.
2. Discussed COPC selection. Additional details are provided below under risk assessment.
 - a. NDEP noted that the guidance provided in USEPA RAGS should be followed.
3. Discussed radionuclide analyses.
 - a. NDEP and Trx agreed that it would be acceptable to analyze for the parent radionuclides and calculate the daughter products assuming secular equilibrium.
 - b. It was agreed that a few samples would need to be taken to verify that secular equilibrium exists.
 - c. NDEP also noted that Trx should review the parent radionuclides and the daughter products to verify which radionuclides drive risk calculations.
4. Discussed field screening. Additional details provided below under sampling optimization discussion.
 - a. NDEP noted that Trx is encouraged to find field screening methods that can help to reduce analytical costs. These methods should be correlated to fixed laboratory data.
5. Discussed compounds that may be related to other companies (e.g.: pesticides)
 - a. NDEP noted that Trx does not have to look for these compounds, however, risk assessment will be delayed until the site is characterized.
 - b. Trx can pursue cost recovery if they so choose or they can initiate discussions with neighboring companies.
6. Reviewed Plate 1 and hypothetical placement of borings.
 - a. Noted that a few of the requested borings appear to be addressed by existing proposed borings. Notations were made on the figure to show this.
 - b. It was noted that the boring requested by LOU #34 could be stricken as it is covered by two other proposed borings in the area. One in the Leach

Plant and one in the tailings. These combined borings will be representative of LOU #34.

- c. It was noted that the boring located by WC-East could be stricken as the one located by WC-West would be conservative. It was noted that both ponds served the same process and WC-West would be more of a concern.
- d. It was noted that the Mystery Ditch is located on TIMET and did not need to be addressed.
- e. NDEP noted that there are some other areas of the site (e.g.: the former asphalt emulsion plant) that may require special consideration for sampling in the future.
- f. Some maneuvering of proposed borings was made (e.g. placement of borings into the ditches and placement of borings close to property boundaries).

7. Discussed risk assessment.

- a. Trx asked if it would be possible to perform a risk assessment after the round of sampling (assuming that all of the new hypothetical borings were implemented).
- b. NDEP noted that a data adequacy evaluation and SRC screening for COPC would seem to be more appropriate.
- c. NDEP also noted that the data adequacy evaluation would also depend on how the site was divided into exposure areas and where the borings were placed. This would be helpful to know during work plan development. NDEP suggested that Trx review the data adequacy calculations that were performed for TRECO by Neptune. It was noted that Neptune only evaluated a few compounds, however, this provided some insight into what would be expected for a calculation.
- d. NDEP noted that Trx should look into the Neptune software known as GiSdT. NDEP also noted that if ENSR had software in house that they felt was acceptable that the NDEP is open to reviewing that as well.
- e. NDEP also noted that the NDEP risk assessment team would need to be consulted on the idea that Trx has presented.
- f. NDEP asked if Trx had reviewed the guidance that NDEP had provided via e-mail regarding “full characterization of the site”. Trx had and through consultation with their risk assessment team felt that the above approach was acceptable. NDEP to review.
- g. Trx thought that if these ~25 borings were installed across 4 soil depth increments with the full suite that enough data could be collected to do the following:
 - i. Perform a risk assessment to determine what the driver chemicals are.
 - ii. Target these driver chemicals for full delineation at the site.
 - iii. Implement remedial actions to address these driver chemicals.
- h. NDEP to discuss with internal risk assessment team.
- i. NDEP noted again that adequacy of the data may be an issue and Trx would be well served by validating the historic data to make the data sets more robust.

8. Discussed sampling optimization.
 - a. NDEP noted that Trx should review the depositional patterns that could be historically expected at the site and apply this to the sampling scheme. This could result in significant cost savings.
 - b. NDEP inquired as to what analyses Trx thought would drop off through a screening and what cost savings could be realized. For example, if select VOC and SVOCs were screened out the cost savings might be zero or negligible.
 - c. NDEP requested that Trx review the wet chemistry analyses and determine if the NDEP Certification Program is driving the various methods that are proposed. NDEP requests a summary of this and what solution Trx would propose.
 - d. NDEP noted that it is necessary for Trx to innovate with ideas and methodologies on this project.
 - e. NDEP asked Trx to verify that the elutriator method is specified for asbestos.
 - f. NDEP suggested that Trx look into immunoassays as one means of optimization.
9. Next meetings:
 - a. Phone Call: April 27, 2006, 1:30 PM, Trx to provide call in information.
 - b. Meeting: May 16, 2006, 1:00 PM at Trx
 - c. Trx or ENSR to contact NDEP at any time if additional information is needed.