

**This document has been retyped from an original copy.
Original copies can be provided electronically by request.**

Determinations Errors

A notice of determination was issued which contained an incorrect Environmental Protection Agency number and the headquarters address of the feepayer rather than the facility address. The notice of determination is valid and need not be canceled and reissued. The basic legal requirement is that the feepayer receive sufficient notice as to the facility to which the determination applies. The feepayer operated only one hazardous waste facility and was well aware of the basis for issuing the determination. 9/7/90.

Mr. Robert M. Frank
Environmental Fees Unit

September 7, 1990

Janet Vining
Legal

Facility Fee Assessed Against (Redacted)

This is in response to your memorandum of July 5, 1990, in which you request an option concerning the validity of facility fee billings sent to (redacted) for fiscal years 1987-88, 1988-89, and 1989-90.

As I understand it, the facility address listed on the billings was the address of (redacted)'s headquarters office in (redacted). The facility subject to the fee is, in fact, located in (redacted). In addition, the EPA number given in the billings is incorrect. The number included in the billings is a one-time generator number issued for a location where the (redacted) tunnel opens into San Francisco. The (redacted) facility has a different EPA number.

The facility site and EPA number included in the billings were provided to the Board by the Department of Health Services. In its petition for redetermination, in which (redacted) argued that the facility in question was closed and therefore not subject to a facility fee, (redacted) made reference to the (redacted) facility, using the correct address and EPA number. DOHS's pre-hearing brief, which was served on (redacted) several months ago, included the correct address and EPA number. In addition, on August 8, 1990, DOHS attorney Colleen Murphy wrote to (redacted) and explained the discrepancy between the billings and the pre-hearing brief, in order to "eliminate any confusion".

I agree with your opinion that you do not need to cancel and reissue the determinations. No statutory provision was violated by the incorrect billings. The basic legal requirement is that (redacted) received sufficient notice of which facility is subject to the fee. Although the billing contained an incorrect address and EPA number, there appears to have been no problem with this notice, since the Hayward facility is the only one (redacted) operates, (redacted) referred to the Hayward facility and its EPA number in its petition for redetermination and has not complained about the error, and DOHS wrote to (redacted) to address any confusion that may have resulted from the incorrect billings.

I suggest that the Environmental Fees Unit also write to (redacted), acknowledging the error and making

reference to the correct address and EPA number. I recommend that the same action be taken concerning similar pending petition cases where information furnished by DOHS was incorrect.

Janet Vining

JV:wk

2430C

Cc: Mr. E. V. Anderson
Mr. Dave McKillip
Mr. Lou Feletto
Mr. Gary J. Jugum
Mr. Donald J. Hennessy
Mr. Gordon Adelman
Ms. Jo Nelson - DOHS