

**START**

0036898 20

Meeting Minutes Transmittal

LIQUID EFFLUENT RETENTION FACILITY  
Unit Managers Meeting (Videoconference)  
Federal Building, Room 784B  
Richland, Washington

December 8, 1993  
8:00 a.m. - 8:30 a.m.

The undersigned indicate by their signatures that these meeting minutes reflect the actual occurrences of the above dated Unit Managers Meeting.

Not Present Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Clifford E. Clark, Unit Manager, RL

Daniel L. Duncan Date: 5/31/94  
Daniel L. Duncan, RCRA Program Manager, EPA Region 10

Moses N. Jaraysi Date: 5/31/94  
Moses N. Jaraysi, Unit Manager, Washington State Department of Ecology

LERF, WHC Concurrence

RC Bowman Date: 5/19/94  
Roger C. Bowman, Contractor Representative, WHC

Purpose: Discuss Permitting Process

Meeting Minutes are attached. The minutes are comprised of the following:

- Attachment 1 - Agenda
- Attachment 2 - Summary of Discussion and Commitments/Agreements
- Attachment 3 - Attendance List
- Attachment 4 - Action Items
- Attachment 5 - Letter from Ecology to RL dated November 19, 1993, regarding Liquid Effluent Retention Facility (LERF) Permit Application Review ✓
- Attachment 6 - LERF Notice of Deficiency Resolution Workshop Meeting
- Attachment 7 - LERF Notice of Deficiency Resolution Workshop Meeting Attendance List



9413227-2041

**Attachment 1**

**200 AREA EFFLUENT TREATMENT FACILITY (ETF)  
AND  
LIQUID EFFLUENT RETENTION FACILITY (LERF)  
Unit Managers Meeting (Videoconference)  
Federal Building, Room 784B  
Richland, Washington**

**December 8, 1993  
8:00 a.m. - 9:30 a.m.**

**Agenda**

**200 Area Effluent Treatment Facility**

1. Status of schedule/design/construction (WHC)
2. Status of disposal site contract
3. Unit Specific Topics
  - Status of Ecology's review of RCRA permit application
  - Discussion of effluent quality and efficacy of UV/OX
4. General Discussion
5. Action items
6. Next meeting date

**Liquid Effluent Retention Facility**

1. Status of permit application
2. Program status
  - Resolution of recycle capability between LERF and ETF
3. General topics
4. Action items
5. Next meeting date

9413227-2042

Attachment 2

LIQUID EFFLUENT RETENTION FACILITY  
Unit Managers Meeting (Videoconference)  
Federal Building, Room 784B  
Richland, Washington

December 8, 1993  
8:00 a.m. - 8:30 a.m.

Summary of Discussion and Commitments/Agreements

1. STATUS OF PERMIT APPLICATION

9413227.2043

Mr. M. Jaraysi (Ecology) stated that RL/WHC, Ecology and EPA will begin implementing his proposed Notice of Deficiency (NOD) review cycle for the Liquid Effluent Retention Facility (LERF). Ecology has sent a letter to RL which explains the review process and includes a schedule outlining the NOD comments to be discussed at each workshop meeting. According to Mr. Jaraysi's schedule, all of the NOD comments for LERF should be addressed within a three-month period. Mr. Jaraysi noted the schedule had been devised to ensure Ecology would have the technical support available at the workshop meetings to assist in resolving the issues. The first NOD workshop meeting is scheduled to follow the LERF Unit Managers Meeting today.

Mr. D. Duncan (EPA) requested that a record be kept of the NOD workshop meetings, and it was agreed to attach minutes of the NOD workshop meetings to the Unit Managers Meeting minutes.

2. PROGRAM STATUS

Mr. J. Coenenberg (WHC) recommended deferring the topic of resolution of recycle capability between LERF and 200 ETF to the NOD workshop meeting. Mr. Jaraysi suggested proceeding with resolution of the issue.

Mr. Coenenberg began by explaining that there is a Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) milestone for recycle capability between LERF and 200 ETF, and WHC is proposing to install a recycle line when the transfer line is installed.

Mr. Coenenberg referred to Mr. Jaraysi's concerns regarding operation of the recycle line in terms of coordinating scheduling with the 242-A Evaporator schedules. Mr. I. Papp (WHC) stated that a meeting was held with the 242-A group, and that Mr. D. Flyckt (WHC) had an action to make a list of issues and proposals for operating the two facilities in conjunction with each other.

Mr. Flyckt reported that it had been determined through discussions with the 242-A group that the LERF recycling could be coordinated with the 242-A Evaporator, and 242-A would use the

9413227.2044

first basin and 200 ETF would use the second basin. Mr. Flyckt noted that coordination between 242-A and LERF may impact the start-up of the 242-A Evaporator's third campaign, which would require RL/WHC approval if it were impacted. Mr. Jaraysi stated that the third campaign should take precedence over the issue of recycling. Mr. Flyckt said that a potential minor slippage in the start-up of 242-A would involve several months, and he questioned the rationale for impacting the start-up of 200 ETF rather than 242-A if double-shell tank space would not be needed for any activities at tank farms. Mr. Jaraysi pointed out the possibility that the parties may not be able to coordinate an agreement to allow 242-A to use the third basin for recycling while it is still functioning as a contingency basin.

Mr. B. Von Bargaen (WHC) stated that the operational readiness review (ORR) has been completed by WHC and is scheduled for an operational readiness evaluation (ORE) next week, which will indicate whether or not WHC can proceed with start-up of 242-A.

Mr. Jaraysi inquired about the status of repairs on the third basin. Mr. Von Bargaen responded that the administrative hold at tank farms delayed the original plans to repair the basin in the fall of 1993. Mr. Von Bargaen estimated repairs would begin in the March/April 1994 time frame, since the basin cannot be repaired in cold weather. Mr. Von Bargaen stated it will take a month to complete the repairs and another month to test the repairs. Mr. Jaraysi pointed out that the time frame for repair of the basin would extend into the second campaign. Mr. Von Bargaen stated that an option would be to run a smaller second campaign, and possibly coordinating the first and second campaign into one basin. Mr. Jaraysi then pointed out that the recycling capability would also be affected by the repair, since recycling would require the three basins to be functional. Mr. Coenenberg noted that Ecology's concern regarding recycling capability was the availability of contingency volume capacity for one basin and not necessarily an empty third basin, and Mr. Jaraysi concurred.

Mr. Jaraysi noted a concern he had expressed regarding treated effluent from C-018 sitting in the contingency basin, and in the event of an emergency situation untreated effluent would have to be pumped into the third basin. Mr. M. Cline (WHC) stated that the equivalent of one basin volume would be needed, and Mr. Jaraysi concurred. Mr. J. Berwick (WHC) asked if WHC would be allowed to pump the 200 ETF effluent waste if an emergency situation occurred, and Mr. Jaraysi responded that he would prefer pumping the effluent waste to the third basin instead of going into the soil.

Mr. Coenenberg stated that the LERF and the 200 ETF Part B permit applications need to be revised to include recycle capability. Mr. Jaraysi stated he had not reviewed the 200 ETF permit, but indicated recycling capability should be included in the 200 ETF permit since the recycle milestone is so closely related to the 200 ETF milestone.

9413227.2045

Mr. Duncan then inquired about revising the LERF Part A permit application. Mr. Jaraysi responded by asking what revisions would be needed if the effluent LERF received was still within the waste acceptance criteria. Mr. Duncan suggested ensuring that the issue of adequate capacity is addressed in the Part A. Mr. Duncan also noted that since the waste is the same, the waste codes would probably not have to be changed. Mr. Jaraysi stated he would review the waste code description in the Part A.

At this point, Mr. Coenberg asked if Mr. Jaraysi assumed that the recycle water would be process condensate, and Mr. Jaraysi stated that was his understanding from reading the milestone. Mr. Coenberg indicated his understanding was that the recycle water from 200 ETF would not be process condensate, and Mr. Jaraysi responded that the milestone (M-17-14 D) would need to be adjusted.

Mr. Berwick then read Milestone M-17-14 D as follows: Initiate operational test procedures for the 242-A Evaporator/PUREX Plant condensate treatment facility, Project C-018H, using simulants and/or actual LERF stored wastes, with recycle to the LERF basins.

Mr. Flyckt stated the solution that will be used during the operational test procedure (OTP) will be a cold solution, and that it will not consist of process condensate or a simulant. Mr. Flyckt added that the main purpose of the OTP is to ensure the equipment is working properly and to train the operators.

Mr. Flyckt stated that the only time the LERF facility plans to use the recycle line is during the OTPs. Mr. Jaraysi referred to a potential interest by WHC to retain the recycling capability if the 216 Permit is not issued by the start-up of 200 ETF, thereby running the 200 ETF by recycling the outgoing effluent to LERF. Mr. Papp stated that was a misunderstanding by Ecology, and proceeded to explain it had been estimated that the volume of water used during the OTPs would exceed the storage capacity at 200 ETF; therefore it would be recycled back to LERF. Mr. Jaraysi accepted Mr. Papp's explanation and stated that the milestone serves its purpose.

Mr. Jaraysi concluded that modification of the Part B permit application to include recycling capability should be handled through the NOD process. Mr. Flyckt stated that the LERF Part B permit, and possibly the Part A permit, will be modified to include the recycle line, and the parties concurred.

Mr. D. Bryson (RL) stated that WHC will have to define in the NOD the operational requirements and the operational restrictions for the recycle line. Mr. Flyckt asked if the simulant used for the OTPs would have to be defined in the NOD. Mr. Jaraysi indicated that the parties just need to be aware of what will be received in LERF. Mr. Papp added that the characteristics of the recycle water should be identified.

3. GENERAL TOPICS

There were no topics brought up for general discussion.

4. ACTION ITEMS

There were no past or present action items to status.

5. NEXT MEETING DATE

The next Unit Managers Meeting was scheduled for videoconference on January 10, 1994. It was agreed to hold the NOD workshop meeting later in the day of January 10, 1994, utilizing the teleconference with EPA in Seattle. Mr. Coenenberg suggested scheduling workshop meetings after WHC has revised the permit application. Mr. Jaraysi noted that according to his NOD workshop schedule, the parties could schedule additional workshop meetings to discuss the changes in the permit. Mr. Duncan suggested that WHC provide draft copies of changes to the permit to Ecology and EPA to facilitate agreement on the specific NOD comments.

9413227.2046

Attachment 3

LIQUID EFFLUENT RETENTION FACILITY  
Unit Managers Meeting  
Federal Building, Room 784B (Videoconference)  
Richland, Washington

December 8, 1993  
8:00 a.m. - 8:30 a.m.

Attendance List

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Phone #</u>
Joan K. Bartz	MACTEC	(509) 946-3693
Joel D. Berwick	RL	(509) 376-9869
Dana C. Bryson	RL	(509) 372-0738
Michael W. Cline	WHC	(509) 376-7957
Joe G. Coenenberg	WHC	(509) 376-1745
John R. Cook	MACTEC	(509) 946-3684
Dan L. Duncan	EPA	(206) 553-6693
Don L. Flyckt	WHC	(509) 372-3142
Tom M. Galioto	WHC	(509) 373-4894
Carolyn C. Haass	RL	(509) 372-2096
Paul G. Haigh	WHC	(509) 373-5831
Moses N. Jaraysi	Ecology	(509) 736-3016
Sharon Jones	WHC	(509) 373-0785
Kathy E. Knox	WHC	(509) 372-3596
Fred N. McDonald	WHC	(509) 372-2962
Ivan G. Papp	WHC	(509) 372-0940
Alex Stone	Ecology	(509) 736-3018
Jerry Turnbaugh	WHC	(509) 372-0863
Brian H. Von Bargaen	WHC	(509) 373-1829

9443227.2047

Attachment 4

LIQUID EFFLUENT RETENTION FACILITY  
Unit Managers Meeting (Videoconference)  
Federal Building, Room 784B  
Richland, Washington

December 8, 1993

Action Items  
8:00 a.m. - 8:30 a.m.

<u>Action Item</u>	<u>Description</u>
--------------------	--------------------

None	
------	--

9413227.2048

**Attachment 5**

**LIQUID EFFLUENT RETENTION FACILITY  
Unit Managers Meeting (Videoconference)  
Federal Building, Room 784B  
Richland, Washington**

**December 8, 1993  
8:00 a.m. - 8:30 a.m.**

**LETTER FROM ECOLOGY TO RL, DATED NOVEMBER 19, 1993,  
REGARDING LIQUID EFFLUENT RETENTION FACILITY (LERF) PERMIT APPLICATION REVIEW**

9413227-2049

#5  
LERF  
12-8-93

376-1745

November 19, 1993

Mr. James D. Bauer  
United States Department of Energy - Richland Field Office  
P. O. Box 550 - MSIN A5-15  
Richland, WA 99352

Dear Mr. Bauer,

**Re: Liquid Effluent Retention Facility (LERF) Permit Application Review**

Your Notice of Deficiency (NOD) response table has been reviewed by Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) and our table of concurrence is listed in the attached document.

It was agreed with your permitting staff that this application will be processed through the new review cycle which Ecology has proposed. The LERF Permit Application has now been brought to the stage where the Issue Resolution Workshop Meetings can be started. The first Workshop Meeting has been set with your staff to take place on December 8, 1993.

The unresolved NOD comments listed in the attached document are grouped according to the topics they address. A proposed schedule for the Workshop Meetings to resolve these comments is also shown in the referenced document.

I am looking forward to implementing this new review process, hoping that all concerned parties will cooperate to make it succeed.

9413227-2050

If you have any questions about any of the above please contact me at (509)736-3016.

Sincerely Yours

Moses Jaraysi  
LERF Unit Manager

MJ:sr

Enclosure

cc: Cliff Clark, DOE  
Dana Bryson, DOE  
Daniel Duncan, EPA  
Sue Price, WHC  
Joe Coenenberg, WHC

9413227-2051

**LERF NOD RESPONSE TABLE STATUS**

1. The list of comments with acceptable DOE/WHC responses:

2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 73, 75, 77, 78, 79, 81, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 111, 114, 115, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131.

2. The list of comments which need to be resolved:

WORKSHOP	TOPIC	UNRESOLVED COMMENT	COMMENTS TO FINALIZE
DECEMBER 1993	GENERAL WASTE MINIM'N REPORTING CLOSURE REQ'T PROCESS INFO.	1, 3, 8, 9,11,12,21 116 117 132 44	
JANUARY 1994	GROUND WATER MONITORING	72,74,76,80,83,84, 85	82
	WASTE CHARACTERISTICS	31	26,27,28
FEBRUARY 1994	PERSONNEL TRAINING	108,109,110,112, 113	

9443227.2052

## Attachment 6

LIQUID EFFLUENT RETENTION FACILITY  
 Notice of Deficiency Resolution Workshop Meeting  
 Federal Building, Room 784B  
 Richland, Washington

December 8, 1993  
 9:30 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.

No.	Comment/Response	Ecology Concurrence
1.	<p><u>FORWARD SECTION: Page iii, (lines 27 to 38):</u></p> <p><b>Comment:</b> United States Department of Energy, (USDOE), is referred to, in this text as the <u>Owner/Operator</u>. Westinghouse Hanford Company, (WHC), is referred to as the <u>Co-operator</u>.</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> WHC should be referred to as the Operator of the Hanford Facility.</p> <p><b>DOE-RL/WHC Response:</b> Westinghouse Hanford Company should not be referred to as "operator." In the Washington Dangerous Waste Regulations, "operator" is defined as the person responsible for the <u>overall</u> operation of a facility (WAC 173-303-040). Westinghouse Hanford Company is not responsible for the overall operation of either the Hanford Facility or any individual TSD unit within the Hanford Facility. The DOE-RL, Ecology, and EPA previously have agreed in the Tri-Party Agreement that the DOE-RL owns and operates the Hanford Facility. The contractors have more limited and specific roles under their contracts with the DOE-RL and may not be identified as responsible for all activities, such as corrective action, on the Hanford Facility. Therefore, Westinghouse Hanford Company will be referred to as the "Co-operator" of the Liquid Effluent Retention Facility.</p> <p><b>NOD Workshop Resolution:</b> WHC's response is accepted by Ecology.</p>	12/08/93
3.	<p><u>FORWARD SECTION: Page iv, (lines 8 and 9):</u></p> <p><b>Comment:</b> This test limits the sources of waste treated in the Evaporator 242-A Facility to the Double Shell Tanks.</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Revise this text to include all sources of waste which are to be treated by 242-A.</p>	03/31/93 (verbal)

No.	Comment/Response	Ecology Concurrence
3. (cont'd)	<p><b>DOE-RL/WHC Response:</b> The LERF will receive process condensate (PC) from the 242-A Evaporator. This PC will be produced by processing the contents of double-shell tanks. A characterization of PC that is expected from this processing is included in Chapter 3.0. The LERF will receive only PC from the 242-A Evaporator until the 200 Area Effluent Treatment Facility (provided by project C-018H) is operational. Discharge into the LERF from the 242-A Evaporator will be discontinued in accordance with TPA Milestone M-26-03. Present plans do not include other waste sources to be stored at the LERF.</p> <p><b>NOD Workshop Resolution:</b> WHC's response is accepted by Ecology. Mr. M. Jaraysi (Ecology) noted that the question is answered, but additional questions that have been generated regarding future milestones and the operation of 200 ETF will need to be addressed.</p>	12/08/93
8.	<p><b>CHAPTER 1.0, SECTION 1.1, Page 1-2, Line 5:</b> <i>"The length of service for this surface impoundment is estimated at <u>3 years to 5 years;...</u>"</i></p> <p><b>Comment:</b> This estimate was made at the time this permit application was first submitted.</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Now that the construction of C-018 treatment facility has already started, revise the estimate of the length of service of LERF accordingly.</p> <p><b>DOE-RL/WHC Response:</b> The text will be revised to indicate that the estimated design life of the LERF is 30 years. However, the service life of the LERF for storage of 242-A Evaporator waste is limited to June 1995 as identified in Tri-Party Agreement Milestone M-26-04.</p> <p><b>NOD Workshop Resolution:</b> The text will be modified to reflect the estimated design life of LERF, which is 30 years, and that LERF will function in accordance with the set milestones as amended in the TPA.</p>	03/31/93 (verbal)
9.	<p><b>CHAPTER 1.0, SECTION 1.4, Page 1-5, Lines 20 to 27:</b></p> <p><b>Comment:</b> This section defines the "Hanford Facility"</p> <p><b>Requirement:</b> Replace this definition of the "Hanford Facility" by the definition in the "Hanford Site Wide Permit" document.</p>	12/08/93

No.	Comment/Response	Ecology Concurrence
9. (cont'd)	<p>DOE-RL/WHC Response: The Hanford Facility is a single <i>Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976</i> (RCRA) facility, identified by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)/State Identification Number WA7890008967, that consists of over 60 treatment, storage, and/or disposal (TSD) units included in the <i>Hanford Site Dangerous Waste Part A Permit Application</i> (DOE-RL 1988). The Hanford Facility consists of the contiguous portion of the Hanford Site that contains these TSD units and, for the purposes of RCRA, is owned and operated by the U.S. Department of Energy (excluding lands north and east of the Columbia River, river islands, lands owned or used by the Bonneville Power Administration, lands leased to the Washington Public Power Supply System, and lands owned by or leased to the state of Washington).</p> <p>NOD Workshop Resolution: The definition of the Hanford Facility will be revised to be consistent with the current site-wide language.</p>	12/08/93
11.	<p><u>CHAPTER 2.0, SECTION 2.1, Page 2-1, Lines 41 &amp; 42:</u> <i>"Effluent from the 242-A Evaporator previously was disposed of to the soil column without treatment."</i></p> <p>Comment: What was the legal status of such an operation?</p> <p>DOE-RL/WHC Response: This comment is not within the scope of the LERF permit application. Therefore, a response will not be provided.</p> <p>NOD Workshop Resolution: WHC's response is accepted by Ecology.</p>	12/08/93
12.	<p><u>CHAPTER 2.0, SECTION 2.1.2, Page 2-3, Lines 3 to 10:</u></p> <p>Requirement: See comment #9.</p> <p>DOE-RL/WHC Response: Refer to response to Comment 9.</p> <p>NOD Workshop Resolution: The text will be revised to be consistent with the current site-wide language.</p>	12/08/93
21.	<p><u>CHAPTER 2.0, SECTION 2.5.2, Page 2-11, Lines 44 &amp; 45:</u> <i>"Provision is made for the natural expansion of gases between the liquid and the cover with activated carbon breather vents"</i>.</p> <p>Requirement: What are the gases expected to form between the liquid and the cover?</p>	

No.	Comment/Response	Ecology Concurrence
21. (cont'd)	<p>DOE-RL/WHC Response: Fluctuations in temperature of the water within the basins and the atmospheric air outside the basins could occur due to ambient weather conditions. These varying temperature differences, accompanied by resulting pressure differences, might allow vaporization and condensation of PC constituents, and the water itself, within an area of the water/cover boundary. Constituents that might be expected in the vapor phase can be identified by review of the PC constituents, identified in Chapter 3.0, Table 3-2 of the LERF permit application documentation. Therefore, "expected gases" are a combination of constituents identified in Table 3-2 and water vapor.</p> <p>NOD Workshop Resolution: Mr. B. Von Bargaen (WHC) has an action to provide an analysis for potential hazardous gases generated at LERF.</p>	
44.	<p><u>CHAPTER 4.0, SECTION 4.4.5.1.2, Page 4-20, Lines 4 to 7:</u> " ... <i>the waste acceptance criteria are set at levels that are less than those previously analyzed in Method 9090 tests, where such test data are available.</i>"</p> <p>Comment: How much less are the acceptance criteria levels set than the 9090 test levels? The last part of this text, "...where such test data are available.", is not clear.</p> <p>Requirements: Specify the reduction factor(s) used to set the acceptance criteria levels from the levels used for the 9090 chemical compatibility tests. Also, clarify the last part of this text: "where such test data are available".</p> <p>DOE-RL/WHC Response: The sentence, "For all constituents except acetone, the waste acceptance criteria are set at ..." will be deleted from the text. This wording was the result of a typographical error in editing previous drafts.</p> <p>NOD Workshop Resolution: Mr. B. Von Bargaen (WHC) has an action to review waste acceptance criteria limits and compare them to 9090 testing.</p>	

No.	Comment/Response	Ecology Concurrence
-----	------------------	------------------------

116. CHAPTER 10.0, GENERAL:

**Comment:** The Waste Minimization Program for the LERF should address the following areas:

- A "Top Management Support" ensuring that waste minimization is a company/project-wide effort.
- Characterization of Waste Generation.
- Periodic Waste Minimization Assessments.
- Encouragement of Technology Transfer.
- Program Evaluation: Conduct periodic reviews of program effectiveness.

The Waste Minimization Plan for LERF does not address all the areas as outlined in the above list.

**Requirement:** The EPA guidance document on Waste Minimization Plan Requirements, "Waste Minimization Opportunity Assessment Manual, EPA/625/7-88/003, should be referred to in establishing such a program for LERF. This waste minimization plan must address the minimization of hazardous waste from the thermal treatment unit.

**DOE-RL/WHC Response:** Requirements for waste minimization are contained in 40 CFR 264.73(a) and 264.73(b)(9). The requirements of 40 CFR.264.73(a) state that the "owner or operator must keep a written operating record at his facility." The requirements of 264.73(b)(9) mandate: "a certification by the permittee no less often than annually, that the permittee has a program in place to reduce the volume and toxicity of hazardous waste that he generates to the degree determined by the permittee to be economically practicable..." To fulfill the requirements of 40 CFR 264.73(b)(9), a certification that the Hanford Facility has a waste minimization program in place will be entered, annually, into the Hanford Facility operating record. The LERF Part B permit application will be revised to refer to this certification and its location.

**NOD Workshop Resolution:** Mr. B. Von Bargen (WHC) has an action to provide a waste minimization plan for LERF or tank farms and transmit it to Mr. D. Duncan (EPA). Mr. M. Cline (WHC) has an action to transmit to Mr. Duncan the DOE orders requiring waste minimization plans.



Attachment 7

LIQUID EFFLUENT RETENTION FACILITY  
Notice of Deficiency Workshop Meeting  
Federal Building, Room 784B (Videoconference)  
Richland, Washington

December 8, 1993  
9:30 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.

Attendance List

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Phone #</u>
Joe Coenenberg	WHC	(509) 376-1745
Dan L. Duncan	EPA	(206) 553-6693
Jan Fields	WHC	(509) 376-8556
Tom M. Galioto	WHC	(509) 373-4894
Paul G. Haigh	WHC	(509) 373-5831
Moses N. Jaraysi	Ecology	(509) 736-3016
Sharon Jones	WHC	(509) 373-0785
Kathy E. Knox	WHC	(509) 372-3596
Ivan G. Papp	WHC	(509) 372-0940
Brian H. Von Bargaen	WHC	(509) 373-1829

9443227-2059

Distribution:

B. A. Austin	WHC	B2-35
J. D. Berwick	WHC	R3-80
J. Blacklaw	DOH	
M. W. Bowman	WHC	R2-54
R. C. Bowman	WHC	H6-24
G. P. Burchell	WHC	A5-56
D. C. Bryson	WHC	A5-21
C. E. Clark	RL	A5-15
M. W. Cline	WHC	H6-24
J. G. Coenenberg	WHC	H6-24
J. Cook	GSSC	B1-42
A. J. Deliberto	WHC	R3-46
V. R. Dronen	WHC	A5-56
D. L. Duncan	EPA	HW-106
D. L. Flyckt	WHC	R3-45
L. D. Garner	WHC	R2-86
R. D. Gustavson	WHC	R1-51
M. N. Jaraysi	Ecology	B5-18
J. W. Kelly	WHC	L4-94
P. J. Mackey	WHC	B3-15
T. M. Michelena	Ecology	
S. L. Petersen	KEH	E6-25
S. M. Price	WHC	H6-23
L. R. Tollbom	WHC	R3-46
J. T. Thomas	KEH	E6-51
B. J. Von Bargaen	WHC	R1-43
RCRA Files/GHL	WHC	H6-23

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD: Liquid Effluent Retention Facility, TSD S-2-8  
[Care of EPIC, WHC (H6-08)]

Washington State Department of Ecology Nuclear and Mixed Waste Hanford Files,  
P.O. Box 47600, Olympia, Washington 98504-7600

Environmental Protection Agency Region 10, Seattle, Washington 98101, Mail  
Stop HW-106 (Records Center)

Please send comments on distribution list to K. E. Knox, WHC (H6-24),  
(509) 372-3596

9413227.2060