

7000052

0037593

STAR

[16] From: Bryan Foley at DOE19 7/20/93 1:16PM (19584 bytes: 71 ln, 1 fl)  
To: Rich Hibbard at Ecology Lacey, Pamela S Innis at TPA1  
cc: Suzanne E Clarke at MTCI, Jay M Augustenborg at DOE15, Michael S Collins  
at DOE1, Vernon R Dronen at WHC85, Merl J Lauterbach at WHC249  
Subject: ERSDF Meeting Minutes Review 6/8/93

----- Message Contents -----

Text item 1:

Rich and Pam,

Suzanne Clarke has put together a historical record of action items and agreements (see attached file) according to her records as recorder for our meetings. This is substantially different from what you had listed Rich. I propose we maintain the historical record by including it in the minutes. It will serve as a record of things we have already done and will allow us to follow-up on old actions.

I would like both you and Pam to consider the need for formal minutes and perhaps we could address this subject at the next meeting on August 3, 1993. At present I think formal minutes are a necessity. However, the following should be noted with regard to the deciding on the use of formal minutes:

- 1) No action items are binding since the minutes were not signed.
- 2) If formal TPA Unit Manager minutes are to be taken from now on - the following should be clearly understood:
  - A) Agreements are binding if any party feels it is in their best interest to hold the other parties to the agreement.
  - B) Formal disputes and legal court cases have been decided on the basis of signed minutes.
- 3) We already have a PROCESS developed for taking formal minutes:
  - A) All agreements are read back to the group at the meeting and cannot be changed without the agreement of all three parties.
  - B) Agreement forms can be supplied and the text of the agreement written and signed during the meeting if any party so desires.
  - C) Action items can also be binding - but are usually less serious. In any case, all action items are read back and agreement reached on the content of the text.
  - D) At the request of any party, the full minutes - or the text of any item - will be read back to the group.

*file*

RECEIVED  
JUL 20 1993  
V. R. DRONEN

RECEIVED  
ERSDF  
SEP 15 1993

9432912150

JUL 1994  
RECEIVED  
EDMC

If you both want to proceed with formal minutes we need to reach some kind of closure concerning the actual content of the agreements and action items discussed to date since none are binding. I'd like to agree on the action items before the August 3, 1993 meeting.

Finally, in the event we do agree to adopt formal minutes, I will ask Suzanne to share with you some expectations she needs fulfilled in order for her to successfully execute her role as the recorder.

Please call me if you have any questions. WHC is currently in the process of drafting the two white papers on "issue resolution" and "CAMU vs. RCRA permit". I will forward those drafts to you as soon as I get them - hopefully by August 27, 1993.

Bryan  
509-376-7087

9/13/93 2:51

Action Item List(s)

NUMBER	ASSIGNMENT	DATE ASSIGNED	DATE CLOSED	ACTION
ERSDF-1	Pam Innis	3/23/93	?	Clarify the implication of "Risk Based Criteria" within the CAMU Rule.
ERSDF-2	Rich Hibbard	3/23/93	?	Evaluate the use of the W-5 trenches for ER generated mixed waste.
ERSDF-3	Moses Jarayski	3/23/93	5/25/93	Draft a list of suggested items to go into the letter from RL as a response to the CAMU letter coming from the regulators.
ERSDF-4	Merl Lauterbach	4/27/93	5/11/93	Prepare a detailed outline of the "package" that will be used for the CAMU application. The package should include a summary of the approach to satisfying the criteria specified in 40 CFR 264.552(c) and information on the proposed design options for the units.
ERSDF-5	Bryan Foley	4/27/93	5/11/93	DOE is to formally transmit the Site Evaluation Report for the ERSDF to the regulators.
ERSDF-6	Vernon Dronen	4/27/93	5/11/93	Westinghouse will outline the "barriers" to the use of the W-5 facility for disposal of past practice waste.
ERSDF-7	Merl Adams	4/27/93	5/11/93	At the May 11 meeting, Merl Adams will present a matrix of different waste form and containment technology options. The goal is to compare the effectiveness of treatment and disposal options within the framework of varying compliance criteria cases.
ERSDF-8	Pam Innis Rich Hibbard	5/11/93	Date?	Comments were requested of both EPA and Ecology on the annotated outline which covers application of CAMU to the ERSDF.
ERSDF-9	Pam Innis Rich Hibbard	5/11/93	5/25/93	Comments were requested of both EPA and Ecology with regard to the ERSDF Treatment Engineering Screening Exercise.
ERSDF-10	Moses Jarayski	5/25/93	6/8/93	Removal and treatment of contaminated soils and solid waste is a planned option for remediation of source operable units. It may be necessary/optimal to locate treatment facilities outside of source operable unit boundaries. Determine the permitting requirements for this situation.
ERSDF-11	Bryan Foley	5/25/93	6/29/93	Formally Transmit the Characterization Plan to the regulators for comment.
Rich Hibbard's version of ERSDF-12				
ERSDF-12	Merl Lauterbach	6/8/93	Open	Prepare and submit for discussion a listing of proposed documents to assist in guiding project work scope.

9413290.2152

Suzanne Clarke's version of ERSDF-12				
ERSDF -12	Pam Innis	6/8/9 3	Open	Define the parallel process to meet requirements for both a ROD and Site-wide permit.
Rich Hibbard's version of ERSDF-13				
ERSDF -13	Pam Innis	6/8/9 3	6/29/ 93	Be prepared to discuss the proposed EPA parallel document process at the 6/22/93 meeting. This should include an explanation of the need for a CERCLA ROD and what documentation if any will satisfy the RI/FS requirements.
Suzanne Clarke's version of ERSDF-13				
ERSDF -13	Merl Lauterbach	6/8/9 3	6/29/ 93	Establish a mechanism to reach consensus concerning the format and content of documentation required to reach both a ROD and fulfil requirements for the Site-wide Permit.
Rich Hibbard's version of ERSDF-14				
ERSDF -14	Merl Lauterbach	6/8/9 3	Open	Ecology requested a presentation from the 100 Area treatability test group. The presentation will address new tests needed. This should occur after the results of the modeling exercise are complete.
Suzanne Clarke's version of ERSDF-14				
ERSDF -14	Merl Lauterbach	6/8/9 3	Open	Give presentation concerning the planned treatability tests after the results of the modeling effort and negotiations are available.

#### ERSDF Agreement List

##### Agreements Recorded by Suzanne Clarke at the May 25 Meeting

- It was agreed that two additional disposal alternatives be included in the matrix of different containment and treatment technology options and that these be included in the modeling effort. The options to be added are:
  - Unlined disposal trench - grouted waste - dirt cover
  - Unlined disposal trench - grouted waste - hanford barrier
- It was agreed that the Site Characterization Plan would be classified as a Secondary Document under the TPA. Therefore there will be a 45 day Regulator review period.

Agreement Recorded by Rich Hibbard on June 8, 1993

- USDOE will proceed as if Ecology has already received HSWA authority and will complete a SEPA checklist for this project.

Agreement Recorded by Suzanne Clarke on June 8, 1993

- It was agreed that the NEPA process would be followed. This will meet the requirements of SEPA. Utilization of the SEPA checklist was discussed.

9413290.2154