

Notes from the April 23rd, 2014 Inert Criteria Workgroup Meeting

Background and Scope of Work

- Transition from 304 to 350 – from Construction and Demolition Landfills to Inert Landfills
- Ecology – through the rule revision process – came up with both a list of six categories of inert waste, as well as criteria by which to judge non-listed, potentially inert wastes
- 2003 – WAC came into effect
- Statute: 70.95.060 commands Ecology to come up with inert criteria
- This group is addressing just WAC 173-350-990, not landfill standards, not piles standards, recycling, etc.

Primary points

- Under statute, even all recyclable materials are wastes – inert waste is a category of very low-risk waste
- Once a waste is designated as inert, its use is not restricted to inert waste landfills
- Up to 250 cy can be used as fill without a permit
- Can be stored at a facility in unlimited volumes without a permit, without a pad or other stormwater controls
- Can often be reused with little restriction
- Inert waste must therefore pose little or no environmental or human health risk, regardless of how it is used or stored

Questions for the workgroup to consider

Differentiate between inert waste and soil

- How much soil should be in the inert waste if any? How much non-soil in something regulated as a soil?
- Where do cementitious wastes fall into soils if at all?

Standards for metals, other contaminants

- Should inert criteria follow soils standards? What's de minimis contamination?
- What about de minimis organics like wood in inert waste? How much should be allowed?
- What about plastic, metals, etc. in, say, glass?

pH ranges

- Ground water standard is 6.5-8.5. Should this be the inert range?
- Listed wastes might still be higher – 9 or a little above. Should the inert criteria have a little wider range than groundwater standards?

Approval of waste meeting inert criteria, JHD vs. Ecology roles

- To improve consistency from county to county, should we change the way wastes get inert determinations?
- Should we reduce duplicating review efforts for the same waste?