

Reclaimed Water Rule Advisory Committee

January 10, 2007, 9:30 – 2:30

Dept. of Ecology, Lacey, Washington

Meeting Summary

Attendees: See attached list

Action Items: (for Ecology)

- Provide explanation/definition of “constructed treatment wetlands”.
- Include PowerPoint and handouts from the Permitting Process presentation with the meeting summary.
- Follow-up on process suggestions.

Action Items: (for Representatives)

- Karla to send policy list questions to Melissa to be included with meeting summary.
- All: review information from the permitting process presentation – including concept language – to the next meeting.

Opening:

- Melissa McEachron welcomed the group, and explained that Katharine Cupps was very ill and not able to attend the meeting. The agenda would be adjusted accordingly.
 - Mel Oleson from The Boeing Company was not able to attend due to snow. Melissa and Kathy will work with Mel to reschedule.
 - Kathy Cupps will present - Building the Picture using Examples - at the next meeting;

Follow-up on Action Items:

- Facilitator, Lori Isenberg, went through the list of action items from the last meeting and had Melissa provide reports.

√ Research and answer question from Ann Wick: <i>Does the distinction as to whether a particular wetland is or is not “a water of the state” apply only to reclaimed water?</i>	<i>Answer: The language only applies to reclaimed water use in constructed treatment wetlands.</i>
√ Clarify further the committee’s role and ability to address issues not specifically identified for the rule.	No new information. Melissa reiterated the role of the committee.
√ Clarify differences between statutes, rules and guidelines.	Tentatively scheduled for Feb. 14th meeting.
√ Clarify how to address water and waste water plans.	Come back to this when we come to the Reports puzzle piece.
√ Use case studies in presentations.	Three on agenda for today.
√ Add liability to Topic 2 on Topics of Interest List.	Done
√ Provide committee with information on regulations in	Everyone should have ordered a

other states. Briefly explain why each item was selected and highlight major points.	copy of the EPA guidelines.
√ Provide overview of committee budget.	Melissa provided a handout (attached) and answered questions
√ Provide a schedule of tasks and deadlines.	Melissa provided a handout (attached) and answered questions.

Karla Fowler – LOTT Water Reclamation Case Study

Karla presented information on how LOTT planned and implemented reclaimed water programs in Thurston County. There was quite a bit of discussion and interest on topics such as:

- Permitting processes
- Public involvement
- Timing
- Financing
- Lessons learned

A copy of the PowerPoint presentation will be made available on the website.

The Permitting Process

Melissa stepped in for Kathy and walked the group through the presentation Kathy had prepared. There were numerous questions; Melissa answered the ones she could and this list was developed for Kathy:

- Will there be joint permits?
- Are there examples from other WACs available?
- Sample DOH WAC – water supply? On-site sewage?
- What happens with a Scalping plant?
- Micro facilities: Definition? Permits?
- Conflict between #1 and #3?
- Will the permit process be shorter or longer than what is currently required in Chapter 90.48 WAC.
- Reclaimed water sources (statewide). What is included in legislative intent?

Wrap-up

- Lori reviewed the action items.
- The committee agreed on the February meeting would be full just with the carry-over items from this meeting:
 - Boeing case study (if it links to agenda topic)
 - Building the Picture Using Examples presentation
 - Clarify differences: statutes / rules / Guidelines
 - Kathy’s answers to the permitting process questions

- The group reflected on the meeting and brainstormed things that went well, general concerns, and suggestions for improvement.
 - Things that went well:
 - Melissa's handouts on the budget and schedule.
 - Case Study from Karla was very interesting.
 - Agenda for next meeting looks good.
 - General concerns:
 - We are trying to cover too much information in the time allotted.
 - Too much lecture; need more discussion (not consensus - some said they were comfortable with just listening).
 - Order of material is not comfortable for everyone (some people would like more background education before working on draft language).
 - Will we be provided with reasons why suggestions are or are not included?
 - Suggestions for Improvement:
 - Provide the presentations prior to the meeting so the presenter can spend more time in discussion with the group, rather than reading through PowerPoint slides.
 - Case study presentations should be linked to the agenda topics.
 - The transition process from general background information to draft language was discussed. The following processes were suggested by some members:
 1. The first meeting for a specific topic (such as permitting) should be used for general education and to identify common concerns and desires of the committee on that topic. The second meeting would be used to develop draft language for the WAC.
 2. Background information should be provided prior to the meeting to allow committee members to educate themselves. Questions could be answered at the meeting and draft language discussed.

Attendees

Department of Ecology

Melissa McEachron, Rule Coordinator

Lori Isenberg, Facilitator

Department of Health

Maryanne Guichard, Director, Office of Shellfish and Water Protection

In attendance

Members

Department of Ecology (WRP)
Department of Ecology (WQP)
Department of Health (phone)
City of Walla Walla (phone)
City of Olympia
King County
Spokane County
Kitsap County
LOTT Alliance
Sno-King Water Alliance
Evergreen Valley Utilities
Washington Water & Sewer Assoc.
WA PUDs Assoc. (phone)
Pacific Northwest Clean Water Assoc.
Association of Washington Businesses
Department of Agriculture
Puget Sound Action Team
Department of Corrections
Lakehaven Utility District
People for Puget Sound
Quileute Tribe

Lynn Coleman
Nancy Winters
Craig Riley
Hal Thomas
Tikva Breuer
Peggy Leonard
Bruce Rawls
Keith Folkerts
Karla Fowler
Ginger Desy
Clint Perry
Walt Canter
John Kounts
James Hagstrom
Chris McCabe
Ann Wick
Scott Redman
Garin Schrieve
Don Perry
Heather Trim
Katie Krueger

Alternates

State Parks
Evergreen Valley Util.
City of Lacey
WWSA

Erin Curl
Mark Nelson
Tim Wilson
Hal Schlomann

2. ACTION ITEM - SCHEDULE OF TASKS AND DEADLINES

Phase 1- “Building the Draft WAC and Guidance”

➤ Puzzle Pieces (Topics of Interest) and Reporting to the Legislature Schedule:

- Permitting Process: Jan’07-June’07
- Plans, Evaluations, and Reports: July’07-Sept’08
- 2008 Reporting to Legislature Oct ’07-Nov ’07
- Plans, Evaluations, and Reports (cont.) Jan’08-March’08
- Technical Standards March’08-March ’09
- 2009 Reporting to Legislature Oct’08-Nov’08
- General Information Jan’09- June’09

Phase 2 – “Draft WAC to Formal Rule Proposal” and “Draft Guidance to Formal Guidance”:

Both

- Public Involvement Opportunities Fall ‘09
 - “Draft WAC” and
 - Draft Guidance

Rule

- Economic Analyses Fall’09-Winter’2010
- Analyze suggestions from Public Involvement Late Winter ‘2010
- Determine location and number of Hearings Spring ‘2010
- Ecology prepares remaining documents and formally “proposes” the rule(CR-102) Late Summer ‘2010

Guidance

- Analyze suggestions from Public Involvement. Spring ‘2010
- Remaining Guidance items. Winter ‘2010
- Assess on-going Guidance needs. Spring ‘2011

Phase 3 – “Comment on Rule Proposal and Path to a Final Rule” and “Finalizing Guidance Documents”

Rule

- Ecology conducts hearings. Fall ‘ 2010
- Ecology responds to hearing comments and makes adjustments to all documents. Oct-Nov ‘2010
- Ecology makes final determination to adopt the rule Nov ‘ 2010

- Ecology prepares material to adopt the rule
- Ecology adopts and files the rule (CR-103)
- Ecology prepares “post-adoption” material

Nov ‘ 2010
Dec ‘2010
Jan-Mar ‘2011

Guidance

- Ecology finalizes Guidance Documents

Mar- June’ 2011