

Notes from the April 29th, 2015 Inert Criteria Workgroup Meeting

Present: Dawn Marie Maurer, Bruce Chattin, Jenifer Hill, Chris Martin, Andy Comstock, John Bromley, Zakary Fiorito

Recap of work to date

Dawn Marie recapped the work to date

Applicability

- Proposed adding language clarifying use of crushed concrete as an aggregate replacement is not a solid waste handling activity. *This will be unnecessary as the Definitions group is clarifying when ALL materials, including crushed concrete, are no longer a waste.*

Definitions

- Concrete
- Cementitious Materials

Authority to make inert waste determinations

- Proposed to keep the authority with JHD's and create a database of county decision records available for other counties to review, perhaps using the Clearinghouse. – *Group decided at this meeting against concurrence with Ecology for inert determinations*

Listed wastes

- Did not propose any changes to the listed inert wastes other than clarifying the language regarding asphaltic shingles not being a listed waste

Recommendations to other groups

- Did not propose any changes to the Inert Waste Landfill group regarding the 250cy restriction on the use of inert waste as fill without a permit. *That group has already chosen to tackle that issue.*
- Potential recommendations for a BUD for certain waste types not captured under Inert Criteria – *Group supported future legislation to create a pathway for statewide BUDs by waste type*

Review of Containment Limits

Reviewed draft limits from Soils Group, including “unrestricted use” that would align with Inert Criteria

- Group raised concerns that the “unrestricted use” limits proposed for inert criteria were more restrictive than the “impacted soils” limits which would potentially be used to limit what could be used as fill in sand and gravel pits.
- This led to discussion of the crossover between inert waste landfills, limited purpose landfills, piles for storage and treatment, soils, and inert criteria.
- Considered the possibility of dissolving the Inert Criteria section and moving the inert wastes into the definitions section instead.
- Group voiced desire to have an integrated rule in which the various parts supported and aligned with each other and asked for direct interaction between groups and support from Ecology program management to make that happen.

Next steps

- Group recommended that we not meet again until we have more guidance from program management and the rule making committee about how the various sections will fit together so our rule language is compatible with other standards.