

## Notes from the June 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014 Inert Criteria Workgroup Meeting

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

### Points discussed for possible Inert Criteria Revisions

#### Standards for metals, other contaminants

- Chemical contaminants – The group decided to let the chemical contaminants criteria work continue in the earthen materials group and consider using the same standards if they seem to meet our needs.
- De minimis physical contamination – The group proposed adding language that would allow some de minimis physical contamination to be determined on a case-by-case basis during the review process. This would provide flexibility to allow some contamination based on risk of the material and contaminant in question.

#### pH issues

- Inter Criteria - The group would like to consider expanding the pH range of inert material beyond the 6.5-8.5 groundwater standards, and investigate the scientific data to determine how far those limits might be and still protect human health and the environment.
- Cured structural concrete – The group would like to propose exclusion in 173-350-020 for cured structural concrete crushed to an established specification and used for its engineering properties other than for fill. This would eliminate any confusion that crushed concrete has a pH that meets the inert standards and provides a clear pathway for use.

### Issues tabled for discussion at our next meeting

#### Listed wastes

- Clarification on what materials are cured structural concrete and which are not
- Clarification that asphaltic roofing shingles are not an inert waste, instead of just not *presumed* inert

#### 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?
  - Reduce duplicative review efforts
  - Consistent list of characteristic inert waste that have gone through review and approval
- Roles of each agency TBD

### Issues for other aspects of rule revision

#### BUDs

- Potential recommendations for beneficial use determinations for some non-inert wastes

#### 250 cy rule

- Should we propose changes to the Inert Waste Landfill group regarding the volume of inert waste that can be used as fill without restriction?