#	Comment	DOE Contractor
1	WAC 173-350-100 definition of "glass": The proposed definition of "glass" excludes "glass materials	WRPS
	containing significant concentrations of lead, mercury, or other toxic substances." In comments on the	
	second preliminary draft, Ecology was asked to clarify the meaning of "significant concentrations." In	
	response, Ecology stated that "[d]etermining what is significant in this context will be a judgment on the part	
	of the solid waste permitting authority." Deferring to the permitting authority to make this regulatory	
	interpretation will result in uncertainty within the regulated community and likely lead to inconsistent	
	application within the State. It is contingent upon Ecology to write rules clearly so that they can be	
	understood by those required to comply. Certainly Ecology must have some concept in mind, even if only in	
	a general sense, when referring to "significant concentrations" of toxic substances in glass. As requested	
	previously, please clarify the meaning of this term in regulation to facilitate a clear understanding and	
	consistent State-wide application. For example, a "significant concentration" could be "a level exceeding	
	that which is found in glass produced for public use; e.g., levels of lead which exceed those typically found in	
	leaded glass." Consideration should also be given to establishing an exception for glass which, when tested	
	using the Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure, does not leach hazardous constituents at levels which	
	are above unrestricted use values established under the Model Toxics Control Act regulations.	
2	WAC 173-350-410(1) list of inert wastes: The list of inert wastes in proposed WAC 173-350-410(1) is more	WRPS
	limited than inert waste under the existing regulation. Currently, WAC 173-350-990 (proposed for	
	elimination in the new regulation) allows for the listed inert wastes, <u>plus</u> other wastes which meet the	
	criteria in WAC 173-350-990(3). In response to comments on the second preliminary draft, Ecology stated	
	that the new rule "relies on the list of types of solid wastes that statute authorizes inert waste landfills to	
	receive (see RCW 70.95.065)." This misrepresents the statute: The list in RCW 70.95.065 isn't a list of all	
	waste authorized as inert, but instead is the minimum that <u>must</u> be included as inert. (See RCW	
	70.95.065(2).) The minimum inert waste list in the statute also includes "[o]ther materials as defined in	
	chapter 173-350 WAC." The criteria approach in the existing regulation at WAC 173-350-990(3) is entirely	
	consistent with the statutory provision, and Ecology has provided no justification for eliminating these	
	criteria in favor of a more limited approach. This being the case, the WAC 173-350-990(3) criteria should be	
	retained, as authorized by RCW 70.95.065.	
3	WAC 173-350-410(1): It does appear that Ecology is narrowing the universe of inert wastes which could	CHPRC
	impact costs at Hanford if formerly inert wastes become subject to costlier disposal. PRC would prefer that	
	the original definition of inert waste remain as currently written so as to not impede Hanford cleanup.	