

## Meeting Minutes

Project: Kerr-McGee  
Location: Kerr-McGee  
Time and Date: 1:00 PM, Thursday, February 17, 2005  
Meeting Number: ---

In Attendance:  
NDEP-BCA – Las Vegas – Brian Rakvica  
Kerr-McGee (KM) Susan Crowley; Tom Reed (via videophone),  
Keith Bailey (via videophone)  
ENSR- David Gerry, Sally Bilodeau

CC: Jennifer Carr, Jeff Johnson, Todd Croft

1. Meeting was held to review ECA progress.
2. Discussed Conceptual Site Model
  - a. Reviewed revised format of section 3 and 4. Text is not finalized so NDEP will not review as a pre-submittal. It was noted that the revised format appears to be logical.
  - b. Reviewed revised figures. NDEP noted that the figures did a good job of reducing the information to an understandable format. NDEP inquired if it would be possible to add soil data at a later date. KM indicated that they thought it would be too busy. Brian noted that the latest TIMET ECIA report did a good job of incorporating soil and groundwater data on a figure and that it was helpful.
  - c. Discussed project database. KM noted that they are in the process of migrating to an EQUIS database.
  - d. Brian inquired if there was any information on U.S. Vanadium because it has been absent from most reports. KM noted that the information that is available was provided in the October 1996 response to NDEP. Brian to review.
  - e. KM discussed data gaps.
    - i. KM discussed a phased approach for investigating data gaps in groundwater. NDEP agrees with a phased approach.
3. Discussed chromium semi-annual performance report.
  - a. KM asked if the entire cc list still needs to receive hard copies or if some can receive CD copies. Brian will verify with NDEP personnel on cc list.
  - b. KM noted that they hope to have the report finalized by the submittal of the 1<sup>st</sup> half of 2005.
  - c. Brian noted that NDEP would likely want to discuss combining the chromium and perchlorate consent agreements at some time in the future. KM noted that they would also like to discuss this. Brian noted that this would allow for combined reporting and would likely result in a cost savings for KM (from a reporting standpoint).
4. Discussed background.

- a. NDEP noted that the other companies are investigating for metals, radionuclides and dioxins.
5. Discussed GW-11 analytical issues.
  - a. KM noted that they are not satisfied with the answers that the laboratory has provided. KM will discuss with their internal expert.
  - b. Brian noted that the NDEP does not want KM to reanalyze and that an e-mail response is fine.
6. Brian noted that there would likely be an all companies meeting on 3/1/05.
7. Reviewed future submittal dates.
  - a. Noted that KM may need to rearrange their submittal schedule, as it may not make sense to submit DQOs or the data usability evaluation at this time.
  - b. KM requested copies of documentation relating to TIMET's screening levels and data usability. Brian to provide for Legal Copy Cats.
8. Next Meeting: Wednesday, March 16, 2005 at 1:00 PM at KM.