

## Meeting Minutes

Project: Kerr-McGee  
Location: Kerr-McGee  
Time and Date: 1:00 PM, Wednesday, August 4, 2004  
Meeting Number: ---  
In Attendance: NDEP-BCA – Las Vegas – Brian Rakvica, Jeff Johnson (via telephone)  
Kerr-McGee (KM) Susan Crowley, Rick Stater, Tom Reed (via video phone)  
ENSR- David Gerry, Ed Krish

CC: Jennifer Carr, Todd Croft

1. Meeting was held to review ECA progress.
2. Discussed GW-11 characterization.
  - a. KM provided an analytical list of what is being analyzed. Includes the following classes: VOCs, TPH, Metals (including hexavalent chromium, cyanide, mercury), SVOCs, PAHs, OP Pests, OC Pests, PCBs, Dioxins/Furans, Herbicides, Radionuclides, water quality parameters, perchlorate, octachlorostyrene.
  - b. Document is due August 30, 2004, KM noted that the radionuclide analysis may not be complete by then. Brian noted that it would be okay to delay for a couple of weeks if necessary. Brian requested that Susan notify him by email.
  - c. KM noted that the sample was taken from the area known as the existing penetration through the berm. This is approximately ½ way north and south on the eastern berm and about 2/3 of the way down the water column.
  - d. Analyses are being completed by MWH with a subcontracted radionuclide laboratory.
3. Discussed GW Monitoring Assessment due 8/15/04.
  - a. KM provided an example format. NDEP noted that the format meets the needs of the project.
4. Discussed Performance Reports.
  - a. Brian noted that he had not had time to complete his review of the chromium or perchlorate reports. Brian had skimmed through the chromium report and would have some comments, however, the plume map was very helpful.
  - b. Susan noted that she will forward a copy of the chromium report to Leslie Palencia at MWD.
5. Discussed SRC list.
  - a. It was requested that Brian fax his comments to Susan and Dave (ENSR).
  - b. Brian noted that he is hoping to have his comments out in one week or so.
  - c. Brian reviewed some of his specific comments on the report.

- d. Brian noted that there are still many QA/QC problems with the report which make the report very time consuming to review. NDEP also noted that this is not desirable and is not efficient.
  - e. KM noted that they will be dealing with the issue of elevated detection limits in the DQOS and in future sampling plans.
6. Discussed CSM.
- a. ENSR asked if the format of the TIMET CSM was what NDEP expected. NDEP explained that the TIMET CSM was “draft, preliminary and conceptual” and was focused at a very specific task as requested by NDEP. NDEP noted that this may not be obvious to most readers unless they review the correspondence on “accelerated work” (as referenced in the CSM).
  - b. NDEP’s main issue with the document is that there are heavy inferences in the report that are not clear to the reviewer. For example, derivation of contours, paleochannels, etc. are heavily qualified and these qualifications need to be pointed out in the CSM.
  - c. Another issue with the CSM is that there are references to a number of “other site features” which are not clearly relevant to the site.
  - d. Brian noted that he hopes to have comments out in the next two weeks or so. It looks like comments will be in the 10-20 page range, however, all comments are not critical. Some comments are suggestions for the next iteration and/or explanations of expectations.
7. Discussed DQOs.
- a. KM asked if NDEP had an example of a format that was acceptable. NDEP noted that the BRC format is generally acceptable. NDEP cautioned that the BRC document is very draft and is not complete. Also, the content may not be acceptable.
  - b. Brian will email the draft BRC DQOs to Susan and David.
8. Discussed regional issues.
- a. Brief discussion on background. Susan will be discussing with other BMI Companies.
9. Next Meeting: Tuesday, September 14, 2004, 1:00 PM at K; call-in number to be provided