

Meeting Minutes

Project: Kerr-McGee
Location: Kerr-McGee
Time and Date: 1:00 PM, Wednesday, June 22, 2005
Meeting Number: ---
In Attendance:
NDEP-BCA - Brian Rakvica, Jennifer Carr (via phone), Jeff Johnson (via phone)
Kerr-McGee (KM) Susan Crowley; Rick Stater, Tom Reed (via phone), Keith Bailey
ENSR- David Gerry

CC: Todd Croft

1. Meeting was held to review ECA progress (agenda provided).
2. Discussed data usability.
 - a. It was discussed that a conference call would be set up to discuss the amount and types of laboratory data that the NDEP would like to receive.
 - b. NDEP will verify availability with the NDEP's consultant.
 - c. NDEP noted that review will likely take ~1 month after the data has been received.
 - d. NDEP provided an example of a data transmittal that worked well in the past.
 - e. Susan to provide a response to the NDEP email comments.
3. Discussed the background workplan.
 - a. KM is working towards the 7/22/05 RTC deadline.
 - b. KM noted that the workplan intends to assess upgradient conditions as well as background.
 - c. KM is reviewing the location of well M-103 with respect to perchlorate impacts and may locate a well further south. KM is also concerned about the proximity of the storm drainage ditch to the south.
 - d. NDEP will transmit the data collected by Ninyo and Moore at the TRECO property as well as the data collected by BRC at the TRECO property.
Post-Meeting note: data transmitted on 6/22/05.
 - e. KM noted that the resubmission of the workplan will be determined after the NDEP comments have been resolved.
 - f. NDEP noted that Montrose is developing a background workplan as well.
4. Discussed the CSM.
 - a. KM is on-track for the 8/31/05 deadline for the RTC letter.
 - b. KM provided an example of a response regarding table format. NDEP noted that this revised format was acceptable.
 - c. KM presented a revised map that showed soils and groundwater data. NDEP noted a typical aversion to text boxes on figures but agreed that it worked in this application.

- d. NDEP noted that a revised CSM is not required or expected at this time. NDEP suggest that we resolve the comments, complete the background workplan and source area evaluation work plan and then update the CSM.
5. Discussed DQOs.
 - a. It was noted that DQOs will be issued after CSM comments are addressed.
6. Discussed Source Area Evaluation Workplan.
 - a. KM noted that the submittal of this workplan will be submitted after the comments to the CSM are resolved as they are linked. The workplan is intended to fill the data gaps identified by the CSM.
7. Discussed quarterly reports.
 - a. Perchlorate reports have not had any comments.
 - b. KM discussed new mapping for the chromium report.
 - c. KM is having some challenges with some of the mapping and the necessary intervals for potentiometric surface.
 - d. Issues may be discussed at the July meeting.
 - e. Briefly discussed the goal to combine the chromium and perchlorate reports in the future.
8. Fact Sheet.
 - a. KM will likely submit two fact sheets; one for perchlorate and one for the ECI project.
 - b. NDEP noted that the format is flexible so long as the fact sheets address the project history, where the project currently is and where the project is going.
9. Other.
 - a. KM inquired as to the status of NDEP's response on the ferrous sulfate response from KM. NDEP noted that a letter was sent stating concurrence with the response.
 - b. Discussed comment in CSM letter re: sediment sampling. NDEP noted that this is a task that may or may not be needed in the future. If it is needed in the future it would be better handled as a joint effort by all companies. NDEP also noted that SNWA collects data in the Wash that should be used in the CSM development. NDEP also noted that sediment sampling is a difficult issue and discussion should begin now between NDEP and the companies as well as between the companies.
10. Regional Issues.
 - a. KM has had some discussion with TIMET and BRC regarding their current background study and they will continue to monitor its progress. NDEP noted that the field work was done over the past week. NDEP noted that Pioneer/Stauffer/Syngenta is more focused on the GWTS, source areas and GW migration right now, rather than background issues.
 - b. NDEP noted that Neptune and Company (an NDEP contractor) has freeware available for statistical evaluation of data sets. NDEP will provide the link to that site for KM's use.
 - c. KM noted that they believed that their billings were up to date. NDEP noted all the companies were finally up to date and that NDEP is attempting to get the next billing out by the end of the week. After the next fiscal year (July 1)

NDEP is seriously considering sending out company-specific billings rather than the old "HISSC style" ones. KM is in support of that, but noted that the Perchlorate reimbursements and the site reimbursements come out of different pots of money and need to be kept separate. NDEP concurred.

Next meeting 1:00 pm Tuesday, July 12, 2005.