

**Removing Barriers Subtask Force
April 22, 2008
Department of Ecology
Meeting minutes
Attendees**

Members and Alternates

Kathleen Emmett – Ecology
Katharine Cupps – Ecology
Craig Riley – Department of Health
Dave Monthie – King County
Lars Hendron – City of Spokane
Clint Perry – Evergreen Valley Utilities
Walt Canter – WA Association of Water and Sewer Districts

Ecology Staff

Penny Mabie – EnviroIssues, Facilitator
Jennifer Busselle – Ecology
Jocelyn Winz – Ecology
Eugene Radcliff – Ecology
Jim McCauley – Ecology

Introductions

Kathleen introduced Jocelyn Winz, Public Outreach Coordinator for Ecology Water Quality Program. Jocelyn will provide the Removing Barriers Subtask Force (RBSF) with social marketing expertise as they look at potential barriers.

Review Agenda

Penny lead the committee through a review of previous Action Items.

Items reviewed:

- Draft proposal for staffing – Walt Canter and Kathleen Emmett, leads
- Clarification to RCW language – Kathy Cupps, lead
- Update on Executive Order Straw Dog – Kathleen Emmett, lead
- ELI Report on Incentives – carrots or clubs, Eugene Radcliff, lead

Agency Staffing Levels

The goal was to finalize RBSF staffing level recommendations to the Rule Advisory Committee.

To accomplish the basic goals of the Reclaimed Water Program, DOH and Ecology need to maintain—at a minimum—their current staffing levels. Additionally, redirecting current staff to permit work after rule adoption will provide stability to the program.

Discussion

Walt expressed concern that Reclaimed Water resources and staff remain dedicated to reclaimed water and not used by other water quality programs.

Lars Hendron, on behalf of Bill Peacock, supports the staffing recommendations.

Bill Peacock suggests that Ecology check with other states regarding their program size and staffing levels for reclaimed water issues.

Lars Hendron comments that a reclaimed water program needs assessment could discover what municipalities' plan for the future. The line graph supplied by Ecology does not show adequate growth.

Agencies agreed that it is important to include reclaimed water in needs assessments: Ecology could add it to the financial assistance program needs assessment and DOH could add to drinking water needs assessment.

RBSF force agreed with the long-term funding subtask force that future funding for reclaimed water projects should come from a different (new funding) source not from existing water and wastewater funding programs. Reclaimed water projects could have a disadvantage financially if the program has to compete with other projects.

Agencies will address cross-training for reclaimed water permit process internally. The RBSF decided to revisit the idea of operator certification or endorsement for reclaimed water in June.

Staffing Recommendations for the RAC

- Ensure the future needs assessment (Ecology WQP financial assistance and DOH Office of Drinking Water) include reclaimed water projects in the needs assessments.
- Ensure the funding source proposal reflects similar funding types as for other water quality permitted projects.
- Evaluate alternative ways to build capacity to address workload fluctuations i.e., contracting.
- DOH staffing needs include 2 FTE's in the Office of Shellfish and Water Protection. An EE3 position for project assistance is under review.

Reclaimed Water Treatment Use and Water (Sewer) Mining, Satellite Facilities

The Rule Advisory Committee asked the RBSF to address the issue of terminology and defining the state role regarding Reclaimed Water.

Topic

Local entities discharging wastewater to sewers for treatment at a regional facility want to recapture and reclaim (treat the water) locally – close to where it's used.

Terminology

Members agreed that “scalping” facilities might be insensitive to tribes and have other negative connotations.

Suggested names include:

- Satellite facilities
- Sewer mining
- Water mining
- Reclaimed water mining, or
- Variations on the names listed above

The Technical Advisory Panel suggested ‘water mining’. Suggested terms presented: wastewater mining, satellite (implies local small system), skimming, reclamation, reclaimed water mining.

Some members liked reclaimed water skimming. This needs more thought.

Defining the State Role

The State role includes:

- Review and approval role of project.
- Grant or loan funding.
- Permit issuance and enforcement.
- Technical assistance and guidance.

Recommendations to Rule Advisory Committee and Ecology

1. State should include guidance under feasibility studies addressing:
 - Cost effectiveness of a proposed project.
 - The impacts to the regional systems.
 - a) Physical – Examples: solids handling efficiencies and are there sufficient flows in the lines.
 - b) Financial – Examples: cost allocations and stranded costs.
 - c) Legal – Examples: existing contracts, codes, and agreements.
2. State should include permitting and enforcement within the rule.

Discussion

Members suggested adding permits to the legal information at the bottom of the discussion paper.

Recommendations to Rule Advisory Panel and Ecology

RBSF agrees to recommend the above recommendations to the RAC.

Coordinated Planning

The Removing Barriers Subtask Force (RBSF) agreed to the following recommendations to remove barriers to coordinated planning:

- Only revise language in RCW 90.46.120 and not revise other statutes.
- Delete the improper reference in RCW 90.46.120(2) to “utility elements” in the Growth Management Act (GMA).
- Ecology, DOH and CTED should develop a single, combined planning checklist for use by all agencies and programs:
- As applicable Ecology, DOH and CTED rules and guidance come up for review and updates, the appropriate agency should add the reclaimed water coordinated planning requirements to these documents. An executive order or an interagency agreement could help assure that the necessary updates occur in a timely manner.

Reclaimed Water Planning Checklist

Ecology presented a draft checklist for Reclaimed Water Planning. Input for this form was from Tim Gates (CTED), Mike Dexel (DOH) and Ecology WQ, WR and SEA programs. Agencies, consultants and planners could all benefit from the checklist.

Discussion

- The checklist should include a preamble that explains the intent of 90.46.120 RCW.
- The checklist needs directions on how to use it.
- Every agency has to agree to use the checklist specific to reclaimed water use planning (not as a replacement to their checklists but as an addendum).
- Is the purpose of the checklist to satisfy review needs of reclaimed water planning under all statutes?
 - Reviewers can use the checklist to ensure the statutory requirements are considered.
 - Using the checklist universally to streamline the process is one goal.
- Does the checklist inform the applicant for the reclaimed water use about the various planning requirements for reclaimed water projects?

- Agency personnel would use the checklist as guidance to determine, when they are looking at a plan, if they need to consider reclaimed water use in their planning review and how they should do that.
- Ecology should convene a workgroup from the various agencies to further develop the checklist for water use planning.

Ecology asked RBSF whether this type of integrated checklist would meet the intent of Governor Gregoire's directive to harmonize the various statutes to assure effective implementation. Dave Monthie suggested that in the 2008 legislative report we directly tell her – "we heard you Governor Gregoire and here are our recommendations for you to consider."

- Executive order
- Interagency agreement – continuation of existing interagency workgroups.
- Develop and use checklist
- Include reclaimed water in updates to rules and guidance documents.

ELI Report and 2003 Water Reuse Workshop Reports on Incentives

This agenda item was follow up on task from the March meeting when the RBSF wanted Ecology to expand on the incentives identified in the March Power Point presentation. Ecology provided a spreadsheet on the incentives that included:

- A brief description of the incentive.
- Examples of incentive implementation.
- A section to vote on whether the incentive was a carrot or a club.
- A section to record a recommend or not recommend option to pass the incentive onto the RAC.

The RBSF decided to use a three-phase approach when considering the incentives.

1. Phase I includes incentives identified as voluntary in nature and classified a "carrot."
2. Phase II included incentives mandated by the state or local regulatory entities and classified "clubs."
3. Phase III included incentives the RBSF determined have merit for future use and those sent back to Ecology for further work or definition.

The RBSF decided to provide the RAC with recommendations to consider in two phases.

1. In general, voluntary incentives would go into effect first, followed by the mandates, as conditions warranted. The incentives table summarizes the work to date. [Incentives Table](#)
2. The RBSF will consider the eight incentives left at the May meeting and consolidate the table in to recommendations to the RAC for consideration.

Social Marketing

Jocelyn Winz, the Water Quality Program Public Outreach coordinator, introduced herself and the social marketing process including:

- Outreach raises awareness to change behaviors. Social change equals either education or coercion. Somewhere in between is social marketing. Social marketing looks at a specific audience and finds out what they really need. One step to a successful social marketing plan is asking the actual consumers of the service or product what the barriers to the behavior change we need.
- A social marketing approach does not make decisions based on what the planners think should happen. This approach needs in-depth research of the focus consumer group. Social marketing uses peer-marketing and PR campaigns, to create an awareness or acceptance of a product such as reclaimed water. The State would become a resource for marketing and educational materials directed at public perception and education. Jocelyn will provide further details on this topic next month.

RBST Action Items

- Finish reviewing and classifying the Incentives Table.
- How can the state optimize organizational structure?
 - What are the options to best organize the reclaimed water program at the state level?
 - Should reclaimed water be a separate entity, such as a department, section, or unit?
 - Should reclaimed water program combine with other programs such as gray water use, conservation, and desalination plants?