



State of Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

Hazardous Waste Program Rulemaking Advisory Committee

Meeting Notes and Committee Recommendations
March 1, 2016

Overview and purpose

The Oregon Department of Environmental Quality convened an advisory committee to review the fiscal and economic impacts of DEQ's proposed revisions to Oregon's hazardous waste program rules. The committee is known as the Hazardous Waste Rulemaking Advisory Committee.

DEQ requested the committee provide comments and recommendations on DEQ's proposed rule recommendations including the fiscal and economic impact. DEQ also asked the committee fiscal impact questions about the proposed rules the Administrative Procedures Act (ORS 183.333) requires.

The questions DEQ asked the committee included:

- Will the rule have a fiscal impact?
- If so, what is the extent of the fiscal impact?
- Will the rule have a significant adverse impact on small businesses (<50 employees)?
- If so, how can DEQ reduce the economic impact of the rule on small business?

The second committee meeting took place on March 1, 2016, from 9 a.m. to 3 p.m. in DEQ's Portland Headquarters office. Before the meeting, DEQ provided the committee with draft fiscal and economic statements for proposed rules: *2015 Definition of Solid Waste*, *Conditional Exclusion for Solvent- Contaminated Wipes*, *Academic Laboratories Generator Standards and Technical Corrections*, *Disposal of Coal Combustion Residues from Electric Utilities*, *Post-Closure Permit Requirement*, *Amendments to Streamline the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Program*, *Conditional Exclusion for Carbon Dioxide Streams in Geologic Sequestration Activities*, *Vacatur of the Comparable Fuels Rule*, *Gasification Rule* and *Withdrawal of Emission-Comparable Fuel Exclusion under RCRA* along with links to the federal rules and questions derived from ORS 183.

While DEQ will seek recommendations from the committee on all fiscal impacts of the ten proposed rules, this meeting focused on the proposed 2015 Definition of Solid Waste rule, Post Closure and NPDES fiscal impacts. DEQ also presented follow-up discussion on some of the outstanding questions from the first committee February meeting.

This document includes a summary of the committee's recommendations and responses to the fiscal and economic impact statement questions. The public notice of this proposed rulemaking will also include those recommendations. A summary of the key decisions and recommendations is provided at the end of this document.

The proposed rule recommendations provided to the committee were drafts and subject to further development before DEQ opens for the public comment period later this year.

Committee members

All committee members attended the meeting in person except where noted:

Name	Affiliation
Michael Bernard	The Boeing Company
Myron Burr (<i>not attend</i>)	Siltronic Corp for Associated Oregon Industries
Heath Foott	Bend Research
Matt Hendrickson	University of Oregon
Jim Houser (<i>not attend</i>)	Hawthorne Auto Clinic, Inc
James Kincaid	Cable Huston LLP for Waste Management Oregon
Koreen Lail (<i>Alternate</i>)	Siltronic Corp for Associated Oregon Industries
Marjorie MartzEmerson	Pacific NW Pollution Prevention Resource Center
Audrey O'Brien	DEQ (Non-voting) for Materials Management Program
Geoff Tichenor	Stoel Rives LLP for Oregon businesses

Non-committee members at the meeting

DEQ staff:

Name	Title
Rich Duval	Facilitator, Senior Hazardous Waste Inspector
Jeannette Acomb	Project Coordinator, HW Policy Analyst
Laurey Cook	Rule Lead, Hazardous Waste Inspector
Dave LeBrun	Rule Lead, Senior HW Policy Analyst
David Livengood	Sponsor, Hazardous Waste Program Manager
Susan Shewczyk	Rule Lead, Hazardous Waste Inspector
Sarah Wheeler (<i>not attend</i>)	Advisor, Office of Compliance & Enforcement

Stakeholders and interested parties:

Name	Affiliation
Kiley Ross	Qorvo, Inc
Bret Bruhn	TTM/VIA Systems
Matt Raeburn	DEQ Materials Management Program
Aaron Shurtliff	Bonneville Power Administration
Dan Forbes	Portland Mercury

Background of the proposed rules

The Environmental Protection Agency delegates authority to the Department of Environmental Quality to operate the federal Resource and Conservation Recovery Act hazardous waste program in Oregon. Oregon must periodically review and adopt new or amended federal rules to retain this delegated federal authority. DEQ last updated its rules in April 2015. In that rulemaking, DEQ incorporated by reference most federal rules enacted through June 30, 2014.

In this rulemaking, DEQ proposes to align its hazardous waste rules with the federal rules. DEQ will do this by incorporating some previously adopted but subsequently amended federal rules, and incorporating some federal rules that have not been previously adopted into Oregon rules. These changes will enable Oregon to ask EPA to continue authorizing Oregon to operate the RCRA hazardous waste program in-lieu of EPA.

The Hazardous Waste Rulemaking Advisory Committee is being convened to inform this rulemaking. Committee meetings will be held through April 2016 to review the rules under consideration and provide input. Once advisory committee meetings are complete, DEQ will begin the formal rulemaking process.

DEQ will seek public comment on the list of rules being considered for incorporation when it opens a formal public comment period later this summer. DEQ will consider all comments before preparing a final rule proposal package the Environmental Quality Commission will consider in early 2017.

Discussion summary

At the beginning of the meeting, DEQ staff went over the follow-up questions from the first committee meeting of Feb. 3, 2016 (*See Follow-up items under each specific rule*).

The second part of this discussion summary includes newly presented material on the proposed Definition of Solid Waste rule under consideration by the hazardous waste program. That discussion is provided in four parts:

1. A focused discussion by committee members on the rule and its impacts,
2. The committees' answers to the four fiscal impact questions OAR 183.333 requires,
3. The committees' recommendation on the proposed rule, and
4. DEQ's responses to comments or questions not addressed at the meeting.

The following are the main highlights of the committee members' roundtable discussion.

Editor Note: Bracketed items [] have been added for further clarity.

Lab rule: [Academic laboratories generator standards](#) and [technical corrections rules](#)

Follow-up questions

Questions pending from the first advisory committee meeting of Feb. 3, 2016:

- Will there be a boiler plate lab plan? *EPA has a planning template for guidance.*
- If we knew more about why academic facilities are not opting in those states where this rule has been adopted and authorized, it might give us more feedback if a fiscal reason or due to the complexity of managing both generator statuses. *DEQ found eligible facilities were concerned with the dual regulations, and six month cleanouts.*
- Check with other states who adopted the rule to see lessons learned, if it worked out, etc. *DEQ found some states had no issue, other states like Washington have yet to receive notification of eligible labs opting-in.*

The committee had no additional questions for DEQ to address outside this meeting.

Wipes Rule: [Conditional exclusions from solid waste and hazardous waste for solvent-contaminated wipes rule](#)

Follow-up questions

Questions pending from the first advisory committee meeting of Feb. 3, 2016:

1. Can DEQ continue to regulate policy through a rulemaking (e.g., to all other solvents,

metals)? *DEQ: No, EPA does not allow authorized states to be less stringent than federal regulations. By expanding the rule's exclusion to include other solvents, EPA would consider the state less stringent.*

2. Can we label wipes with other words and still meet the federal regulations? *DEQ is checking with EPA on equivalent wording and equivalent stringency. Indiana adopted the rule (July 3, 2015) with the following modifications: Containers must be labeled Excluded Solvent- Contaminated Wipes as in the Federal Rule, "or with other words indicating the contents of the container."*

Part 1: Committee discussion

The following are the main highlights of the committee members' continued roundtable discussion on the Wipes rule and its fiscal impacts.

Rule interpretation

DEQ found most states believe this rule is limited to solvent-contaminated wipes only. Some rags formerly exempt by DEQ's 1996 policy will now be regulated through this rule. Wipes that do not meet the new exclusion (such as non-solvent contaminated wipes) could potentially meet another exclusion under the Definition of Solid Waste rule.

Conditionally exempt generators are currently allowed to commingle their rags with other wastes, this rule does not change that practice. This rule will affect or benefit small quantity or large quantity generators.

Safe management and unlined landfills

The committee had several questions and concerns about transporting and managing wipe wastes due to the potential fire hazard.

DEQ has concerns as well. Many of the unlined landfills in Oregon are located in the eastern part of the state and service small rural areas without large industries nearby. A potential solution could be DEQ (like other states) would require it go to a Subtitle C hazardous waste landfill or for incineration like we do now. The only difference is it would be managed as a non-hazardous solid waste going to hazardous waste subtitle C facility. Therefore the generator would not have to count this waste towards their generator status and would pay less for disposal.

Another solution could be requiring landfills to obtain a special waste permit issued by DEQ to include additional management requirements (specified thickness of bag, drums with liners, etc.), designation of specific landfill cells to receive the waste (with no compaction of cell), and specify waste hauler requirements.

Washington State (along with California and several other states) will not be adopting the disposable portion of the rule due to concerns with the spent wipe bags going into dumpsters, being transported and disposed of in landfills.

Alternate labelling

The committee suggested, if allowed by EPA, to include alternate and equivalent labelling language. *DEQ is checking with EPA.*

Interstate transportation and disposal

The committee discussed some landfills may not want to take these wastes and expressed concern that a company could collect and interstate transport these wastes.

DEQ has a two-way reciprocity agreement with its neighboring states. If a neighboring state's designated hazardous waste was transported to a neighboring state for disposal, the same restrictions will apply. Under this agreement, Oregon receives Washington waste that is not hazardous waste in Oregon, but requires disposal at a Subtitle C facility as 'out-of-state only' hazardous waste.

Committee comments

- My perspective is DEQ believes the solid waste permitting program can manage risk appropriately, then I would be happy to adopt the disposal component of the rule. *DEQ: Knowing that DEQ might say no to a particular landfill? Yes, DEQ may say no at any particular instance.*
- I feel comfortable with the reclamation side. On the disposal side, I like the special waste option provided it does address the state transportation along with the safety.
- I represent a fairly large facility and we have a separate special waste stream where we have a whole host of special waste permits listing everything that goes in that container and the receiving facility knows what to expect - items one through six.
- I would say at our local rural landfill, I don't think the haulers or the landfills do anything to stop these types of waste.
- I have never seen a truck driver get out and look through the trash before dumping it. *DEQ has seen a few instances where waste was checked before pick up.*
- Are we encouraging disposal over recycling? *DEQ: Yes, potentially all things being equal. If you can use reusable rags it is cheaper. Some industries cannot.*
- I just feel uncomfortable that we have for a long time required wipes go to Subtitle C facilities, and now we are leaning towards changing that [Subtitle D] without knowing what the appropriate requirements should be. *DEQ could ensure protective measures on a case-by-case determination of the solid waste permit.*
- In regards to policy, the department would encourage folks who have wipes that now will require management as hazardous waste to look for other available exclusions.

Part 2: Fiscal questions and Part 3: Committee recommendation:

For the committee's summarized responses, please see the February meeting notes.

Part 4: DEQ's responses to comments or questions not addressed at the meeting.

The committee had the following additional questions for DEQ to address outside the meeting.

- Can DEQ allow businesses to manage laundered wipes under the new DSW rule as exempt from Solid Waste? *DEQ is checking.*
- Does Waste Management have any concerns in handling the wipe materials? *Committee member is checking.*

Committee agreed to table for further discussion pending additional information at next meeting, Apr. 5, 2016.

Post closure rule: [Post-closure permit requirement and closure process rule](#)

Part 1: Committee Discussion

The following are the main highlights of the committee members' continued roundtable discussion on the rule and its fiscal impacts.

DEQ restated EPA is adamant the rule does not apply to any permitted sites and will not help with the current shell permit issue. EPA requires DEQ to maintain a permit for corrective action sites. DEQ

Management has determined to continue the current shell permit process since this rule will not help eliminate the dual regulations.

- Is there a committee recommendation? *DEQ: The rule does not apply to the current shell permits. Oregon's rules are currently written so there cannot be an interim site. The only portion of the rule that has any bearing is the section that reduces the post closure permit application requirements which DEQ would like to adopt by reference. The [partial] adoption would not change anything else.*
- Seems like if you feel comfortable with that portion of the rule then it makes sense to adopt by reference. I don't know that I would adopt the other parts of the rule if they are not going to be applicable in Oregon.
- So you are adopting something that you would never use? *DEQ: No, DEQ would adopt only the permit application requirement part of the rule and nothing else.*

Part 2: Fiscal questions on the post closure rule.

At the end of the rule presentation, the committee discussed DEQ's four questions derived from OAR 183.333. The committee's answers are summarized below:

- a. **Will the rule have a fiscal impact?**
No to both
- b. **If so, what is the extent of the fiscal impact?**
Not applicable
- c. **Will the rule have a significant adverse impact on small businesses (<50 employees)?**
No, to both
- d. **d. If so, how can DEQ reduce the economic impact of the rule on small businesses?**
Not applicable

Part 3: Committee recommendation for the post closure rule:

The committee supported the adoption by reference of the reduced post closure permit application requirements, and passed on the adoption of the rest of the rule at this time. The committee had the following comments:

- *If you are going to adopt that section that is fine.*
- *I have no problem with the adoption.*
- *I agree with the adoption.*

Part 4: Comments or questions not addressed in the meeting

The committee had no additional questions for DEQ to address outside the meeting, after reading the February meeting notes on wipes part 4 follow-up item responses.

Definition of Solid Waste Rule: [2015 Definition of solid waste rule](#)

Part 1:

The following are the main highlights of the committee members' roundtable discussion of the newly presented material on the Definition of Solid Waste rule and its fiscal impacts.

New contained definition

Committee members had much discussion on EPA's new definition of "contained" (meaning a unit or land based unit such as a pile), making it easier for regulators to identify sham recycling. The contained

definition is one of the major requirements for determining if a hazardous secondary material reclaimed under the generator-controlled exclusion is not discarded.

DEQ has concerns and commented on the 2011 draft proposed rule, along with other states, to recommend the definition include only containers, tanks, drip pads and containment buildings. EPA did change the proposed language based on comments in the final 2015 rule, but did not make this change. DEQ could modify the adoption of 'contained' to include additional criteria, making it possibly more stringent than the federal rule. Or DEQ can use an internal management directive to guide DEQ staff in determining what is contained. DEQ is recommending it be defined by Oregon rule of what is contained vs an internal management directive (DOJ concurs).

Oregon definition of solid waste

Oregon has an additional definition of solid waste by law that is separate from how RCRA defines solid waste. If a waste is excluded under the federal definition of solid waste and not regulated as a hazardous waste, it might still be an Oregon-only solid waste and subject to some requirements under *ORS 459.005(24)*.

Rule implementation

The committee had concerns about implementing the rule to ensure safeguards and exclusion requirements were being met. Under the new rule, some facilities could change from large quantity generators to conditionally exempt generators, making wastes formerly regulated as hazardous wastes be exempt from regulation. DEQ will also lose disposal and annual reporting fees.

DEQ currently focuses inspections on regulated facilities or facilities with hazardous waste activities: treatment, storage and disposal facilities (TSDs), Small and Large Quantity generators, or if a complaint is received. DEQ will need to reconsider the current approach to ensure conditions of the exclusion are being met and appropriately claimed. One option might be to work with the Materials Management program on a special solid waste permit.

Fees are important to maintain DEQ's compliance and oversight programs. The agency views the loss of fees as an internal issue for management to deal with separately and that it should not be a factor in adopting a rule like this.

Variance and RCRA permit

Under the DSW rule, a verified recycler can be verified in one of two ways: through a variance issued by EPA or the State; or through a RCRA permit. EPA requires a currently permitted facility to modify its permit to include the recycling activities and not switch to a variance. EPA has not defined how the permitting regulations of a RCRA permit would address the recycling and meet legitimacy demonstration in 40 CFR 264.

An Oregon variance is less structured in requirements and process than a RCRA permit. The biggest difference is the fees: a variance is \$30,000 (up to \$130K) and a RCRA permit is actual costs to process with permit renewals (up to \$150K). A RCRA permit is also subject to Division 120 siting requirements to address community risk, a variance is not. This rule requires community risk be addressed. DEQ asked the committee if the applicable siting parts of Division 120 should be included. DEQ is checking with EPA on guidance on how to address in a RCRA permit.

State adoption

Based on EPA's estimate, the states that adopted the 2008 DSW rule will adopt this rule in its entirety, with five currently in the process. Twenty states are likely to adopt the optional part (mostly South,

Midwest), and twenty states are on record to adopt only the mandatory parts (parts Northeast, Washington, California).

California and Washington will adopt only the mandatory parts of the rule. Washington already has stricter rules.

Committee comments

- It is important DEQ is supported programmatically so that it can administer and implement these exclusions, so the worst-case scenarios we are hoping to avoid in the promotion of recycling don't occur. We really want to promote recycling so we can avoid discarding items. At the same time we want DEQ to be there and support DEQ so there are no fly-by-night facility examples.
- Even though this is deregulation it is also increased regulation, and if you don't have the compliance aspect then you are not actually encouraging what you thought you were, and maybe in some instances someone can take advantage of.
- If you look at the dynamics of someone never regulated before, it's tough.
- If you really want to get creative with these small third-party recyclers you don't want to bump out with a \$30K [variance fee], you could have required training through DEQ, and a required inspection program where they get an initial inspection and one in six months.
- I actually see the financial piece a little bit more connected because we are making a choice to take material or entities out of a fairly heavily-regulated context where required inspections occur. I see the money going to administration, compliance, and outreach tied into this decision. *DEQ: If something is not regulated by RCRA, we won't necessarily visit. For example CEGs, DEQ only visits if there is a complaint because we don't have the resources to go visit them regularly. One of the drivers for DEQ resource allocations is EPA. What helps our management group is hearing from the committee [and public] on what you recommend.*
- I feel if we are removing something from RCRA we should be funding compliance to ensure that exemption is being met by the entities taking advantage of it.
- We are supporting the adoption of these exclusions provided DEQ does homework and comes up with the mechanisms it would propose in rule to effectively implement these exclusions both at the front door (notification) and also at the back end to ensure entities taking advantage of exclusions are meeting the requirements.
- We would like to support this [rule adoption] but don't want to see the provisions for oversight abandoned simply because it is in a different category than it was before.
- Speaking for myself, and speaking on behalf of the Associated Oregon Industries and energy environment representatives, we are ready to pursue a recommendation favoring adopting the entirety of this rule, including the optional components, today.
- I would love to know the recommendation that you are making, obviously there is basis behind that. Any high level that you can share with the group on why everyone is in favor and don't see issue to move forward? *Committee member response: The new exclusions are not really deregulation at all but rather just another matter in which the process of recycling can be accommodated with those requirements ensuring that process is based in protecting human health and the environment. Obviously the new element we heard today, and I think is really worth considering, is the program should only be proposing rules if they can support them. With that caveat, I think that is the high level analysis here. There really are materials that might be put to beneficial reuse when they were before wastes that could not be recycled under the RCRA matrix [40 CFR 261.2 Table] and now are able to.*
- Oregon isn't going to necessarily adopt by reference? We are going to address the 'contained' issue and a few of these other things? *DEQ is looking at those issues where we have identified a couple of areas where we have concerns. So adopting by reference might not be the entire*

solution. DEQ still wants to hear the recommendations from the committee.

- There are a few things in there that we would like to address and ‘contained’ might be one of them. So it makes sense in considering the adoption of this rule that we consider those tweaks we want before we move forward. *DEQ agrees.*
- For a recommendation to adopt a rule or not, I feel it is important that the committee feel like yes, we believe that it can be inspected and the exclusion will be properly applied. *DEQ: Management wants to ensure the exclusion is properly applied and will need to consider avenues and resource management.*
- I think if we are going to take something out of a hazardous waste program that we previously determined needed to go to a subtitle C facility and say that it is not regulated at all, I think there would need to be the question: Are we going to ensure that it stays non-regulated or that it is appropriately non-regulated. I want to be confident that there is going to be a DEQ program that actually reviews the facility on some time frame. *DEQ: Yes, committee recommendations around how DEQ adopts the rule is certainly what we are looking for.*

Committee’s next steps

DEQ will be looking for the committee’s recommendation for the rule’s required portions to adopt: legitimacy criteria, speculative accumulation, contained definition, and petition process, along with the adoption considerations of: further defining ‘contained’, variance, fees, siting, subpart H [financial assurance], etc.

DEQ will also be looking for the committee’s recommendation for the optional parts of the rule that include: the generator controlled exclusion (on-site), verified recycler variance (off-site), and the spent solvent remanufacturing exclusion.

Part 2: Fiscal questions - DSW Rule

The committee postponed answering these questions pending additional time to discuss.

- a. Will the rule have a fiscal impact?
- b. If so, what is the extent of the fiscal impact?
- c. Will the rule have a significant adverse impact on small businesses (<50 employees)?
- d. If so, how can DEQ reduce the economic impact of the rule on small businesses?

Part 3: Committee recommendation for the DSW Rule:

The committee postponed answering pending additional time to discuss.

Part 4: The following are new questions not addressed at the meeting:

1. Can DEQ regulate this reclaimed material under ORS 459?
2. Would it still be a solid waste under Oregon-only Rules?
3. Investigate variance structure, administration, general guidelines.
4. What recommended adoption changes does DEQ have for the DSW?
5. How should DEQ address recycling in a RCRA Permit under the DSW rule?
6. Does DEQ need to adopt the Subpart H of the DSW 2008 rule’s financial assurance requirements for the verified recycler?

NPDES Rule: [Amendments to streamline the national pollutant discharge Elimination system program regulations: round two](#)

Part 1: The following are the main highlights of the committee members’ continued roundtable

discussion on the NPDES rule and its fiscal impacts.

DEQ shared the rule is an EPA-only administrative rule and simply modifies an EPA procedure for terminating RCRA permits. EPA manages all permits under 40 CFR 124. This rule streamlines a former three-part procedure into a two-part procedure for terminating a RCRA permit. This rule is not applicable for state authority. EPA highly encourages states to be equivalent with the federal regulations for consistency.

Committee comments

- This is EPA only? *DEQ: Yes, EPA action only. Adopting this rule allows EPA to implement this rule in Oregon. Currently they have no intention in doing anything with permits in Oregon.*
- I thought they [EPA] had the authority to do it with or without state authority? *DEQ: EPA has the authority to do it without our permission [at the federal level], however they can't violate state law. So if we don't adopt it as part of our state program, they cannot use it. If we adopt it as part of our state program, and if EPA needs it they can use it.*
- So give us an example of when they would need to do this. *DEQ: The only way they would do this is if EPA had to over-file on one of our permits or if we ran into a permittee that we couldn't manage for whatever reason, EPA could step in and take oversight of the permit and this rule would apply to their action.*
- Doesn't EPA have the overarching ability that if you can't execute they can come and do it? *DEQ: No. EPA can oversee what we do, and they can tell us we are not doing this right. But they have to go through our program first before they step in. We can voluntarily give up the permit to EPA to manage, but in order for them to take it over it is a long formalized process.*
- The reason you want to adopt this is because? *DEQ: Based on our state authorization we are required to periodically adopt any new or amended federal rules. EPA highly encourages states to be consistent with the federal rules.*
- So if this happens, are you saying going from the three-step process to a two-step process is easier for the employer or easier for EPA? *DEQ: For EPA.*
- It is a procedural rule and not a substantive rule change. *DEQ: Correct, it does takes out one step in the required process to help streamline and reduce paperwork.*

Part 2: Fiscal questions on the NPDES rule

At the end of the rule presentation, the committee discusses DEQ's four fiscal impact questions that OAR 183.333 requires. The committee's answers are summarized below:

a. Will the rule have a fiscal impact?

No.

b. If so, what is the extent of the fiscal impact?

Not applicable

c. Will the rule have a significant adverse impact on small businesses (<50 employees)?

No.

d. If so, how can DEQ reduce the economic impact of the rule on small businesses?

Not applicable

Part 3: Committee recommendation for the NPDES rule:

The committee supported adopting this rule.

Part 4: Comments or questions not addressed in the meeting

The committee had no additional questions for DEQ to address outside the meeting. The February meeting had no follow-up questions.

DEQ asked the advisory committee if members would be interested in supporting DEQ when it presents these rules to the Environmental Quality Commission late 2016 or early 2017. *Committee deferred for next meeting.*

DEQ thanked the committee for participating, commenting on the proposed rules and fiscal impacts. Meeting was adjourned.

Summary of committee's recommendations

Lab:

Committee had no new questions. In the February meeting the committee recommended adopting the Lab rule. The committee had also recommended a possible amendment to require labs to submit their lab management plan when notifying DEQ of opting in. Fiscal impacts determined none, as labs have the option to choose to opt-in.

Wipes:

Committee agreed to table for additional discussion at next meeting, Apr. 5, 2016. In the February meeting the committee recommended adopting the reuse portion of the rule and postponed a recommendation for the disposal portion of the rule.

CO₂:

Committee had no new questions. In the February meeting the committee recommended to not adopt this rule. No fiscal impact.

Post-closure:

Committee recommended adopting the rule for the permit application requirements only. The committee recommended not adopting the rest of the rule. Fiscal impacts determined none.

Definition of solid waste:

Committee tabled for additional discussion at the April meeting. Fiscal questions postponed.

National pollutant discharge elimination system:

Committee recommended adopting the rule. Fiscal impacts determined none.