

Meeting Minutes

Project: Kerr-McGee (KM)
Location: KM
Time and Date: 1:00 PM, Tuesday, July 11, 2005
Meeting Number: ---

In Attendance:

NDEP-BCA - Brian Rakvica, Teri Copeland (consultant, via telephone)
Kerr-McGee (KM) Susan Crowley, Keith Bailey, Rick Stater
ENSR (via telephone)- David Gerry, Sally Bilodeau, Debbie McGrath, Ed Krish

CC: Jennifer Carr, Jeff Johnson

1. Meeting was held to review progress of ECA activities.
2. Discussed TIMET screening levels tech memo. Brian will forward a copy of the meeting minutes that closed out this document. Post-meeting note: item completed.
3. Discussed CSM.
 - a. It was agreed that the CSM would not be resubmitted until new data had been collected and the NDEP/KM agreed that an updated versions was necessary.
4. Discussed Data Usability (DU) Assessment.
 - a. NDEP recommends that the DU be deferred at this point and not be completed until site characterization is more complete. DU should be completed as part of risk assessment but as a stand-alone document prior to completing the risk assessment.
 - b. NDEP requests that KM complete a data validation (DV) report on the historic data and present this in a stand-alone report for NDEP review. KM should complete DV on new data sets, as they are collected. NDEP also recommended that KM review the latest version of the DV report generated by TIMET, as there are virtually no NDEP comments on this report. As stated previously, it is recommended that the DV focus on source areas and risk driver chemicals.
 - c. NDEP will generate a brief comment letter on the DU and will provide to KM for future reference. NDEP will note that a revised DU is not required at this time.
 - d. NDEP provide some comments on the DU:
 - i. DU must specify usable versus unusable data. It was also noted that some data might be partially usable. It may be helpful to break the data out by media or some other subset.
 - ii. Teri will provide an example worksheet that she uses to complete DU.
 - iii. DU should not be completed until: site characterization is reasonably complete and a risk assessment is expected to be completed; and data validation is complete.

- iv. DU should include a figure(s) that shows all of the sample location referenced in the report.
 - v. DU should be a stand-alone document and should not reference tables or figures in other reports.
 - vi. DU should provide all data discussed in the report (electronically is okay).
5. Discussed Background Study Response to Comments letter (RTC).
- a. This is due on 7/22/05.
 - b. Discussed the difference of upgradient versus background.
 - c. Noted that the BMI/TIMET background data set is applicable for use once approved by the NDEP.
 - d. KM plans on comparing any data collected to the ENVIRON and BMI/TIMET data sets.
 - e. It was noted by NDEP that KM is encouraged to discuss issues with the NDEP when there is disagreement.
 - f. DQOs will be removed from the workplan.
 - g. KM noted that it is planned to collect background data from the various geologies on site.
 - h. KM noted that purge water will be put in pond GW-11 or processed through the GWTS and then put in pond GW-11.
 - i. Discussed low flow sampling versus bailing. NDEP does not recommend the use of bailing as a sampling mechanism. It was noted that it is the belief of the NDEP that the low-flow sampling technique will provide more representative results (likely will have lower metals concentrations because less sediment will be entrained). KM does not necessarily agree. NDEP noted that for the purposes of the background study, it is necessary to use one technique to complete the sampling.
 - j. Continued discussion on low-flow sampling. KM noted that it may not be possible to meet the 3% EC criteria as outlined by USEPA. NDEP believes that the USEPA guidance allows for deviation from the equilibration criteria and KM should review the language in the guidance.
 - k. KM noted that locations 117 and 188 will be relocated as part of the revised plan. It was also discussed that the storm drainage ditch on the southern boundary of the property may influence the concentrations in soil and/or groundwater. It was noted that the southern portion of the TIMET property had relatively elevated levels of perchlorate (hundreds of parts per billion in groundwater).
 - l. KM noted that it is likely that this will not be the only background study to be completed and that the data collected herein may be used as upgradient data, depending on the results.
 - m. NDEP expressed a concern that two sample locations (for soil data) may not be sufficient to complete a background study. NDEP also prefers that background data be collected from off-site locations.
 - n. KM noted that wells that will be installed deep will also have a shallow screen set at the first water interface in an adjacent well.
6. Other discussions:

- a. KM is still working on the fact sheet.
 - b. Km noted that a HASP is available in the background study work plan as Appendix B.
7. Next meeting: Monday, August 15, 2005 at 1:00 PM