

Meeting Minutes

Project: Kerr-McGee
Location: Kerr-McGee
Time and Date: 1:00 PM, Tuesday, July 6, 2004
Meeting Number: ---
In Attendance: NDEP-BCA – Las Vegas – Brian Rakvica
Kerr-McGee (KM) Susan Crowley
ENSR- David Gerry, Sally Bilodeau

CC: Jennifer Carr, Todd Croft, Jeff Johnson

1. Meeting was held in order to clarify expectations of the NDEP and discuss the project.
2. Introductions.
3. Discussed ENSR corporate structure and project organizational chart. Revised organizational chart and resumes will be submitted to NDEP today. NDEP noted that preliminarily this looks ok.
4. Reviewed project history.
5. Discussed revised schedule. Susan provided Brian with a draft revised schedule. Brian to review.
6. Discussed submittal of documents and drafts.
 - a. KM would like to submit drafts for NDEP review. Brian indicated that he would try to review these and that email would be the best way to submit these.
7. Discussed CSM.
 - a. ENSR views this as a 12-15 page document that would be conceptual in nature and would not include a lot of cross-sections or detailed figures.
 - b. NDEP noted that this may be possible if the document is going to reference other reports submitted previously which have provided this information. Any assertion made in the document must be based on information previously submitted or provided in the CSM.
 - c. NDEP noted that Km has completed a vast amount of hydrogeological characterization to date, however, this work must be referenced and discussed in the CSM.
 - d. Brian will loan ENSR a copy of the TIMET CSM. Brian noted that this document is still draft and has not been reviewed by NDEP yet. ENSR will provide a Fed Ex account number.
 - e. NDEP acknowledged that KM intends to maintain the site as an industrial exposure scenario and that the NDEP is concerned with containment and management of the off-site migration of contaminants.
8. Discussed site-related chemicals (SRC).
 - a. ENSR does not view this document as a report and does not see the basis for the need to provide such a detailed document. NDEP noted that the US EPA guidance (RAGS Chapter 5) is not prescriptive in what needs to

be included in this document. NDEP believes that this level of detail is needed for a project of this complexity.

- b. Brian suggested that KM/ENSR discuss what parts of the NDEP letter were an issue. KM/ENSR did not have anything to discuss.
 - c. NDEP noted that unknowns are not an SRC, however, the document must have some sort of discussion as to how the unknowns will be addressed at the site.
 - d. NDEP noted that the SRC document must provide justification for the list. Simply presenting a list of chemicals will not be sufficient for this document. NDEP also acknowledged that there will always be unknowns at the site, however, we must try to get these unknowns down to a reasonable level.
 - e. KM believes that a vast majority of the SRC have been identified in previous reports. NDEP acknowledged that this may be true, however, the list of SRC has never been developed and none of the processes outlined in Chapter 5 of RAGS have been documented.
9. Discussed data usability evaluation. NDEP noted that this should include all of the project data collected to date.
 10. Discussed the FSP/QAPP. This will likely be included as part of the background work plan.
 11. Agreed that it is not necessary to re-submit the ECIA report as all of the other submittals will address the issues raised by NDEP.
 12. Scheduled the next meeting for August 4, 2004 at 1:00 PM at the KM facility.