

## Meeting Minutes

Project: Kerr-McGee  
Location: NDEP Las Vegas Conference Room  
Time and Date: 1:00 PM, Thursday, April 1, 2004  
Meeting Number: ---  
In Attendance: NDEP-BCA – Las Vegas – Brian Rakvica, Todd Croft  
NDEP-BCA – Carson City –Jeff Johnson (by phone)  
Kerr-McGee (KM) Susan Crowley, Ed Krish, Tom Reed  
ENSR- David Gerry

CC: Jennifer Carr

1. Meeting was held in order to clarify expectations of the 2/11/04 NDEP letter to KM.
2. Reviewed the concept of a site-related chemicals list.
  - a. Brian distributed the current version of the BMI site-related chemicals (SRC) list, the TIMET SRC list and the NDEP comments to the TIMET document. Brian also distributed his draft review of site-related chemicals at the KM site. Noted that this list is not likely to be comprehensive, is not formatted like a list of site-related chemicals and is a working copy.
  - b. NDEP noted that the current format of the BMI list is acceptable, however, other formats would be acceptable as well.
  - c. NDEP noted that it is important that everything is documented so that a casual reader can understand why certain chemicals were eliminated from consideration.
  - d. NDEP noted the difference in terminology between site-related chemicals and chemical of potential concern.
3. KM noted that they have no plans of closing the site. The site will remain an active industrial site. NDEP's concern is that KM must characterize the extent of off-site impacts and remediate the off-site areas to residential standards. The plant site can be dealt with as an industrial scenario.
4. Discussed the conceptual site model (CSM).
  - a. NDEP noted that the BMI CSM that was submitted was not approved and is still in development. It is believed that a majority of the topics were included in this report but there were deficiencies in format.
  - b. KM noted that they do have some existing deep wells that could be sampled. These are the TR series wells.
5. Discussed background.
  - a. Discussed the difference between background conditions and upgradient conditions.
  - b. Noted that this may be an issue that can be worked out with the other companies, however, each company must evaluate the site-specific geology and the potential to obtain upgradient samples. If there are not

upgradient areas that have not been impacted, it may be necessary to go to another geologically similar area to get background samples.

6. Discussed Data Quality Objectives (DQOs)
  - a. NDEP agreed that KM could develop DQOs prior to developing a CSM if desired. KM could also perform additional characterization prior to developing a CSM (if desired).
  - b. NDEP noted that it may not be necessary to perform steps 6 and 7 of the DQO process for the plant site area. It may only be necessary to perform these steps for the off-site impacts. At this time it may only be necessary to perform steps 1-5.
7. Discussed major deliverables.
  - a. SRC list
  - b. CSM
  - c. DQOs (CERCLA –style)
  - d. Personnel memo and organizational chart
  - e. Background analysis
  - f. Other items as outlined in the NDEP letter.
  - g. Still need to determine when KM will submit a schedule to NDEP to respond to the 2/11/04 letter. Brian followed up on this item via email after the meeting with Susan.. Susan to reply by 4/5/04.
8. Discussed other topics.
  - a. In response to an NDEP question, KM noted that they had not sampled for platinum in groundwater. NDEP noted that there had been some sampling in the Western Ditch area recently and platinum had been found.
  - b. KM requested e-copies of several documents. Brian to email.
  - c. KM may desire to review NDEP's files in the future. Discussed procedures for copying of documents.