Reclaimed Water Rule Making Committee Meeting
March 25, 2009
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

- **Welcome and Introductions** 1
- **Updates** 2
- **Review Commentaries and changes for Parts I, II, III and IV** 3
- **Existing Framework Part B General Requirements** 8
- **Develop Agenda for April Meeting** 12
- **Wrap-Up and Action Items** 13
- **Meeting Attendees** 15

Welcome and Introductions

Tim Gaffney, Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology) welcomed the members of the Rule Advisory Committee (RAC) and introduced Bill Hashim as the facilitator for this meeting. Bill led the RAC in a round of introductions and reviewed the meeting agenda.

During this meeting, John Kounts, Susan Kaufman-Una, Paul Fabiniak, Tom Fox and Heather Trim joined via video conference from the Ecology-Northwest Region Office. Additionally, Kathy Cupps and Paul Schuler joined via teleconference.

Communication process
Tim Gaffney asked the RAC for their feedback on the communication process thus far and reviewed the comment process handout. In general the RAC thought the comment process was going well. Tim requested that the RAC submit their comments within five days; however he will take comments at any time.

Kathy requested that RAC members send "wordsmithing" comments to Ecology directly, rather than spend time doing so in the meeting. She also requested that RAC members identify in their comment whether it applies best to the existing framework or the new rule.

Comments and drafts of documents will continue to be placed on the RAC comment Web page. Final versions of documents for use at RAC meetings will be titled "meeting copy."

Questions/Comments:

- Walt Canter commented that a five-day turnaround works for most RAC members; however some members represent a committee or group that meets monthly, so it can be difficult to coordinate comments between the group in such a short timeframe. He said he would strive to work within the deadlines given by Ecology.

- *Are the comments posted on the Web site incorporated into the draft existing framework and is there a way to show that the change was made based on comments?* Kathy said it was difficult to show changes in this draft, so Ecology made the existing framework Outline Crosswalk handout.

Updates

Legislation

Kathleen Emmett explained that Melodie Selby has been following the bills in the legislature. SSB 5504 has passed out of the House Committee on Agriculture and Natural Resources and is doing well. There is an amendment that requires the RAC and the Water Rights Impairment Committee to submit recommendations to the legislature on the impairment requirements and standards for reclaimed water, and Ecology must submit a report to the legislature describing the opinions of stakeholders, including RAC and Water Rights Impairment Committee members, on the impairment requirements and standards for reclaimed water by November 30, 2009. The earlier language referencing the water code has been removed.

RAC members agreed to share their documents with the Water Rights Impairment Committee and the Technical Advisory Panel (TAP) in order to facilitate transparency between all of the committees. Ecology has developed a distribution method so that committee members do not receive multiple copies of the same e-mail.

Questions/Comments:

- *If the bill passes as it stands now, will Ecology be able to move forward with the rulemaking process?* Yes. The RAC will be able to continue writing the rule. Lynn Coleman said that Ecology will have to make sure the two committees' work overlaps as needed for the rule, and that the amendment does not inhibit this process.
- *Does the Water Rights Impairment Committee advise the RAC or were the two committees created independently?* The committees were created independently. The RAC is Ecology's rule advisory committee for the reclaimed water rule, while the Water Rights Impairment Committee works on water rights and water rights impairment issues across the department. Each committee can send recommendations for the other to consider. Lynn said that the permitting process has to come together and use recommendations from each committee.
- *Did the legislation creating the RAC acknowledge the Water Rights Impairment Committee?* The original legislation included establishing a committee to address water rights impairment issues; however that portion of the legislation was vetoed by the governor. The governor told Ecology to look at the water rights impairment issue and work with legislative leadership, so Ecology formed the committee to address the issue.

Kathy reminded the group that while the water rights impairment work is important, it is just one part of the RAC's task, and that the RAC needs to remain focused on rule development.

Other updates
Bill Hashim is reviewing applications from communities requesting stimulus money to build reclaimed water facilities. He will let Ecology and DOH reclaimed water staff know the project sizes as well as the areas the project proponents are located.

Tim announced that the reclaimed water report has been published and is available on the RAC Web site. The report is titled "Implementation of Reclaimed Water Use: 2008 Report to the Governor and State Legislature."

Review Commentaries and changes for Parts I, II, III and IV

Kathy Cupps led the RAC through a review of the revised Draft Existing Framework, which has RAC feedback incorporated within it.

WAC 173-219-020 Applicability
The RAC recommended having appendices outlining the regulations in guidance, rather than in the rule, because of numbering issues.

WAC 173-219-030 Definitions
Kathy added brackets as the end of the definition showing its origin. Kathy asked the RAC to think about how to edit definitions in the new rule. Placeholders were added for definitions RAC members requested.

RAC members thought the definition list was overly long and recommended shortening the definition list in the new rule.

WAC 173-219-040 Reclaimed water not considered a wastewater
The RAC recommended discussing meeting wastewater requirements (Ch. 90.48 RCW) versus product standards (Ch. 90.46 RCW) in the new rule. In addition, they recommended considering a global discharge permit.

- *If reclaimed water is no longer considered a wastewater, then why was the focus on reclaimed water shifted from discharge rather than product?* If reclaimed water is not adequately and reliably treated, then it would fall under Ch 90.48 RCW, the Water Pollution Control Act (WPCA). If reclaimed water is not used in accordance with authorized uses, then it is not meeting the intent of Ch 90.46 RCW, the Reclaimed Water Use Act (RWUA) and Ecology will need the authority of the WPCA to state that it is polluting the environment. The intent is to ensure reclaimed water is adequately and reliability treated and used in accordance with its permit, and if it is not, to remind everyone that Ecology has regulatory authority under the WPCA.
- *How would Ecology handle a situation where a stream augmentation project is being conducted and there is a main break of reclaimed water, where the water is going*

into the stream being augmented? Kathy said it would still be an authorized discharge under WPCA, which also grants Ecology enforcement authority. Even if it was potable water and had main break, then it could still be a problem.

- Tom said that given the hypothetical situation the facility still has a permit to discharge water into the river and a leaking water pipe would be covered by the discharge permit for stream augmentation.
- Don Perry recommended that the RAC and Ecology consider situations where there are leaking water pipes.
- Craig recommended having quality appropriate uses and control of reclaimed water in use agreements.

WAC 173-219-050 Division of responsibilities
No comments.

WAC 173-219-060 Types of permits issued under this chapter
No comments.

WAC 173-219-070 Enforcement
No comments.

WAC 173-219-080 Appeals
No comments.

WAC 173-219-090 Requirement for a person who generates reclaimed water
The RAC recommended that Ecology expand "reasonable and necessary" information for financial disclosures, described in 2(a) 3iii, either in the new rule and/or in guidance. Craig and Clint Perry will send Ecology some draft text of what the process might look like for a private entity to have a third-party guarantor. The language cannot conflict with Ch 90.46 RCW.

- *Do boatyards with boat-washing facilities using re-circulating systems have to hold a reclaimed water permit?* No, they are internally recycling industrial process water.
- *Are there existing practice and guidance documents for 2(a) 3iii?* No. The new rule would need to have a provision about it and guidance documents to cover a wide variety of situations.

WAC 173-219-100 Requirement for a person who distributes or transports reclaimed water
The RAC recommended that this section be cross-walked with the technical standards. They recommended the following actions for the new rule:

- Consider reclaimed water and wastewater cross connections.
- Have the attorney general look into the language differences between "enforceable contract" and "binding agreement."
- Clarify the "distribution" system, and ensure that the distribution center has control over the person distributing reclaimed water.
- Revisit whether Ecology has the authority to regulate distributors and end users in the new rule.

The RAC also recommended adding text to Subsection 3, which would state: "The person who distributes the reclaimed water shall ensure that the construction, operation, maintenance and monitoring system meets all applicable requirements of this chapter and the permit issued to generator of the reclaimed water *at the use area."*

- *In WAC 173-219-100 the language specifies an "enforceable contract" and in WAC 173-219-100 and 110 it states "binding agreement," do they mean something different?* No. That is simply how they are written in the existing standards.
- *Does this section adequately cover the minimum cross-contamination control issues?* It may not, which is part of the dilemma of writing the draft rule as we go along because some of the requirements for cross-contamination control are covered in Part B – Technical Standards. The RAC may need to refer to Part B or have all of the language in this section.
- *Is there is a cross connection between reclaimed water and wastewater?* The existing framework approach for cross-connection control is the responsibility of the public water system. The permittee is responsible for making sure cross connection is addressed, not the reclaimed water purveyor.
- Bill Peacock commented that some distributors or transporters may forget that reclaimed water is not potable water and may become lax in handling reclaimed water.
- Dave Monthie commented that he is not sure Ecology has the authority to regulate distributors and end users in WAC 173-219-100 and 110.

<u>WAC 173-219-110 Requirement for a person who uses reclaimed water</u>
The RAC recommended clarifying Subsection 3 and including the end user. They also recommended providing some clarity on "all parties." Tom will help Ecology wordsmith this language. The RAC recommended revisiting whether Ecology has the authority to regulate distributors and end users in the new rule.

The RAC also discussed whether a reclaimed water generator is responsible for ensuring the end user understands reclaimed water. In residential areas, the generator would not be able to enforce use because the water is going to private property. Some members felt that a reclaimed water purveyor could use a service agreement to outline use policy. Others felt that the agreement is no different than domestic potable water where plumbing codes cover cross connection and require backflow prevention. The RAC

decided that this topic needs further discussion in the new rule and should include guidance for the end user.

The RAC recommending adding language to Subsection 3, so it would read:
"The person using the reclaimed water shall ensure that the construction, operation, maintenance and monitoring system meets all applicable requirements of this chapter and the permit issued to generator of the reclaimed water *at the use area*."

The RAC recommending removing some language to Subsection 4, so it would read:
"Where the person using the reclaimed water is not the permittee, a binding agreement among all parties involved is required prior to the use of reclaimed water."

- *In Subsection 3, is it talking about the end user or a middle-man contractor?* Kathy said it should be the end-user.
- *Who are the parties in the sequence of operation, and does the end user have an agreement with all of the parties or just the organization within the sequence of the operation?* The permit is issued to the generator and the agreement has to be in place by the permittee.

<u>WAC 173-219-120 Requirements to submit documents for department review and approval</u>
The RAC recommended clarifying the professional engineer requirements in the new rule.

<u>WAC 173-219-130 Review standards</u>
No comments.

<u>WAC 173-219-140 Requirements for a reclaimed water plan</u>
Kathy explained that this section would require a reclaimed water "plan" rather than a "comprehensive plan" since there are other planning requirements that allow projects to consider opportunities to use reclaimed water. The reclaimed water plan will be required for a project seriously considering reclaimed water, and this plan will include planning and other details similar to a general sewerage plan.

The RAC discussed the reclaimed water service boundary requirement and the possible issues that could arise because of it, such as a reclaimed water purveyor claiming a large area of land and barriers to such purveyors. The RAC recommended that the new rule include the need for an interlocal agreement and require identification of other providers in the coordinated water system plans. In addition, the RAC recommended defining "service boundaries" in the new rule's definitions.

The RAC recommended changing Subsection 2 to state:

"Where opportunities for reclaimed water must be considered under other planning requirements, such documents may be submitted to the departments to meet some or all of the requirements of this section. The method by which such plans are approved shall remain unchanged. These include and *are not limited to*:"

- Hal recommended having a public hearing on whether the public wants the organization to be in the reclaimed water business or not. It is not clear whether this would be in the rule or not.
- *Is a plan required now?* Ecology does require such a plan under the sewerage plan. If the plan is not there, then Ecology can still require this information in the engineering report.
- *Who establishes the reclaimed water-sewer boundary?* The boundary would be explained in the plan.
- *Do we want to give Ecology the authority to disapprove a plan because it does not have an interlocal agreement?* Yes. Ecology would disapprove a plan if there is no interlocal agreement between the water purveyor and the reclaimed water purveyor.
- *Is there statutory authority for WAC 173-219-140 Subsection 1(g)?* The text came from guidance documents for review under the sewerage plan. Dave commented that the statutes currently only specify water rights downstream of the facility. The receiving water is not part of the statute.

<u>WAC 173-219-150 Requirements for a water rights impairment assessment</u>
Lynn explained that the language in this section is new and based on the 2006 guidance document on water rights impairment assessment.

The RAC discussed water rights impairment analysis and that is not being used the same way across the state. Ecology's policy is to require an assessment; however the attorney general says the authority is implicit, not explicit. Craig will send Kathy a draft of the existing water rights impairment assessment practices.

The RAC recommended that the rule include statutory language for the water rights impairment assessment, notice of appeal and deadline for completion, such as before the engineering report or before the permit is approved. In addition, they recommended having specific analysis submission requirements.

- Craig commented that most utilities are unaware of the water rights impairment assessment guidance, and that it is not currently being implemented to the level of detail described in this section.
- *Where should the impairment analysis go? Is it a part of the SEPA/NEPA requirements?* Lynn said there is interplay between impairment analysis, SEPA and the permit process; however these have not been thought through and there may be more efficient ways to do so.

<u>WAC 173-219-160 requirements for a reclaimed water facility engineering report</u>

No comments.

WAC 173-219-170 Requirements for plans and specifications
No comments.

WAC 173-219-180 Requirements for operations and maintenance manuals
No comments.

WAC 173-219-190 Requirements for construction quality assurance plan
The RAC recommended flagging this requirement for removal in the new rule.

- *If the reclaimed water facility does not have a quality assurance plan then how does it ensure quality/adequate quality control during construction?* It is done in accordance with other Ecology-approved plans and documents, and the owner/contactor certifies that it was built in accordance with the plans and specifications.
- Bill recommended having the quality assurance plan requirement based on the size of the facility.

WAC 173-219-200 Permit application
No comments.

Existing Framework Part B General Requirements

Jim McCauley led the RAC through a review of Part B Technical Standards of the Draft Existing Framework. There are two primary sections: general requirements and use-specific requirements.

B1 Minimum criteria
No comments.

B2 Source control
The RAC recommended having a better definition of "industry" and recommended modifying Subsection 5.

The RAC discussed notification requirements outlined in this section. Some RAC members thought it was odd that Ecology is requiring reclaimed water facilities be notified when sanitary collection systems add new clients. When a reclaimed water facility receives water from a commercial and/or industrial area, then prior to the connection of the flows to the facility it must verify that new flow will not affect the

output of the reclaimed water facility. The RAC recommended that if the purpose is to require reclaimed water facilities to conduct different notification to Ecology, then that should be in the rule. In addition, they recommended requiring a pretreatment permit.

- *Will the new rule include industrial users?* This could be incorporated into the new rule requirements.
- *Is "industry" defined?* The TAP discussed significant industries. A distinction may need to be made between commercial and industrial.
- *Is Ecology notified each time a new commercial facility opens?* Yes.
- *Is a water utility notified each time a commercial facility connects to the sanitary collection system?* No. Karla said that if a new industry is connecting, then the utility may be notified through the community development office; however this notice is generally based on this size of the facility.
- Craig said the City of Quincy notifies the local reclamation manager before adding new significant industrial users to determine whether the new users would affect its reclamation permit. Since the City of Quincy conducts groundwater recharge, as well as an industrial pretreatment program, they have to ensure the new user won't impact their ability to reclaim water.

B3 Prohibited uses

The RAC recommend using positive language, rather than the "shall not" negative language currently used, as the goal is to facility reclaimed water production.

- *If the use is not prohibited then can we assume that it is allowed?* Tom commented that saying all other uses are allowed does not take of reclaimed water standards, as a facility has different uses for Class D reclaimed water than it does for Class A.

B4 Class-based requirements

The RAC recommended reordering the classes to Class A to Class D, and ensuring that changes or modifications to the system be conducted and/or supervised by a qualified individual.

- *Is Class A the same as tertiary treatment?* Yes. Class A is tertiary treatment because it is advanced treatment beyond secondary treatment.
- Doug Raines commented that from the Department of Corrections' viewpoint some Class A (unrestricted non-potable human contact) reclaimed water could be used for flushing toilets and firefighting so why is there a restriction where residents have access? Jim said the Class A description is really about residential use where an individual has access to plumbing, so in the future the plumbing codes should control this use. Bill recommended having a requirement that changes to this type of system be conducted and/or supervised by a qualified individual.
- There was some discussion about removing Class D.

B5 Alternative treatment requirements

The RAC discussed whether pilot plant studies should be included in this section, as it is an alternative to the classes. The classes outline the water quality parameters, while other processes must meet the treatment. This section allows flexibility; however the pilot plant tests are new technologies not listed in the classes.

The RAC recommended that the pilot plant study framework be expanded to ensure the study is meeting the appropriate standards. Additionally, alternative treatment is included in the engineering study described in WAC 173-219-160 Subsection 4(d), so in the new rule Ecology should provide more details or reference to guidance.

B6 Disinfection

The RAC recommended resolving the conflict between the current standard and the Orange Book chapter on disinfection in the new rule.

- *Does chlorine have to be a part of the treatment process?* Yes. A 0.5 mg/L concentration of chlorine is necessary for the distribution part of the system for algae control, but it can be waived by DOH or Ecology.
- Craig commented that the residual and distribution systems are separate from disinfection. Bill said that there are testing requirements at both points.
- Allen de Steigner commented that there is a conflict between the current standard and the Orange Book chapter on disinfection because there was a 450 model chlorine requirement in the 2006 update.

B7 Treatment reliability

The RAC recommended changing Subsection 7(b) i to clarify whether there is a need for a separate source of power or two systems of power.

B8 Operations

The RAC asked for clarification on the discharge monitoring report requirements.

The RAC recommended changing the language in Subsection 5 to:
"A monthly summary of the operating records as specified under (3) of this section shall be filed monthly with *the lead agency*."

- Don suggested renaming the discharge monitoring report so as to not cause confusion with federal government requirements. Jim commented that there may be a combined permit with the NPDES discharge.

B9 Sampling and monitoring

The RAC recommended moving B8 and B9 to Part A of the Draft Existing Framework.

B10 Storage and distribution restrictions

The RAC recommended structuring this section the same way as the Water Supply WAC 146-290 in the new rule.

RAC members commented that the 10 feet separation includes separation from the main, potable water, storm drains and/or sanitary lines, and recommended keeping materials guidance information in this section.

- Kathy said that part of B10 belongs in Part A and the remainder belongs in Part B.
- There is an inconsistency in Subsection 5 when discussion potable and non-potable water versus potable water and reclaimed water.

B11 Distribution by tank trucks

The RAC discussed tank inspection and whether it is appropriate for a potable water purveyor to inspect a reclaimed water tank truck. The reason for tank inspection is to ensure quality control of the trucks hauling water, so a hauler does not haul water in a tank used for other liquids, such as pesticides. Some RAC members questioned whether county health departments should inspect the tanks. Other thought this section was redundant and already covered in B10 Subsection 1, where the reclaimed water purveyor is responsible for the inspection since the purveyor is distributing the water.

- Allen said the tanks inspection requirement defaults to the potable water standards and AWWA standards.
- Doug commented that the potable water purveyor should not inspect the tank truck; however if the water purveyor has cross-connection control, then it should be inspected.

B12 Cross-connection control

The RAC recommend discussing this section further and/or changing the language regarding inspections, as well as air gap separation requirements.

- Doug commented that there is no reason for a potable water purveyor to inspect reclaimed water systems. He recommended simply having a cross-connection control specialist.
- *Why does the potable water purveyor need to inspect the reclaimed water system?* Coordination with the water purveyor ensures they have adopted the program and have been approved with the Office of Drinking Water. Bill suggested coordination with the potable water purveyor might be needed more than inspection.
- *Why does there need to be air gap separation?* The air gap separation is an Office of Drinking Water requirement and comes from the cross-connection control regulations.

- Subsections 3 and 4 need wordsmithing because air gap separation may not be needed if a reclaimed water system has a backflow. In addition, plumbing codes may apply to these subsections.

B13 Setback distances
The RAC recommended for the new rule changing the setback distances to match the other WACs, as well as making the setback distance consistent with the Orange Book and the requirements for wastewater near potable water sources.

- Kathy commented that if Class D is removed then there would be one minimum setback distance.
- *If a facility has an onsite septic system with a 100 foot distance between the drain field and a water well, why does there have to be a 500 foot setback for reclaimed water?* Kathy said Ecology has the same question. Bill explained that existing wastewater from leach fields has sufficient nutrients to form a biomat to treat the wastewater. Reclaimed water does not have as many nutrients so it could transmit pollutants further.
- *Should the setback distance requirements for class change from 50 feet from a potable well to 100 feet? Can you change the piping material within the 100 foot zone?* The requirements should be consistent with wastewater near a potable water source and consistent with the Orange Book. Walt thought it should be on a case by case basis. Jim commented that when the TAP discussed this section they did not recommend significant changes because they wanted to be consistent with other rules and standards.

B14 General use area restrictions
No comments.

B15 Labeling of reclaimed water
The RAC recommended making the language in the new rule more positive, and to consider different identification labels, such as "Reclaimed water – do not drink non-potable water" and/or "We're using reclaimed water – do not drink from irrigation."

Develop Agenda for April Meeting

The agenda items for the next RAC meeting include:

- Discussion of the beneficial use standards in Part B of the Draft Existing Framework.
- Completion of the review of the Draft Existing Framework.
- pdate on reclaimed water legislation.

Questions/Comments:

- *Is it possible to have a side-by-side presentation of the existing framework and the RAC's recommendations for the new rule?* Jim said that Ecology is capturing the comments being made and has been applying those comments to the draft new rule.
- Dave commented that the new legislation might change the new rule.

Wrap-Up and Action Items

The next meeting is Wednesday, April 29. Video conferencing will be available at the Ecology-Northwest Region Office in Bellevue, but the RAC decided not to arrange to use it at the Eastern Region Office.

- Comment process works well as long as additional comments may be received after the deadline.
- Ecology will e-share information between the reclaimed water committees – Rule committee, water rights committee and technical advisory panel.
- RAC is ready to work on the new rule and quickly finish up the existing framework version.

Prior to the next meeting:

- Ecology will incorporate the comments from this meeting, as well as the comments they receive via e-mail.
- Ecology will move identified sections of Part B into Part A and create one final existing framework.
- Clint will send Ecology draft text of what the process might look like for a private entity to have a third-party guarantor.
- Craig will send Ecology a draft of the existing water rights impairment assessment practices.
- Bill will notify Ecology and DOH about the proposed reclaimed water applications he has reviewed.

3/25/2009 Recommendations for Existing Framework

- Use the same term if there is no difference between "enforceable contract" and "binding agreement."
- State that the responsibilities for the distributor are only for the distribution system and the responsibilities of the end user are only for the use area.
- Provide a reference crosswalk when additional requirements are in a different part of the rule.
- For water rights impairment (150), simply include the existing statutory language.
- For source control (310), include exemption from industrial pretreatment permits under WAC 173-216-050.

- Reorder the classes to Class A to Class D, and ensuring that changes or modifications to the system be conducted and/or supervised by a qualified individual.

3/25/2009 Recommendations for New Rule

- Incorporate SSB 5504 assuming it will become law.
- Consider authority and other ways to structure the rule.
- Place summary table of other laws and regulations as a reference appendix.
- Clarify relationships between the Water Pollution Control act and the Reclaimed Water Use act .
- Definitions. Shorten definitions section to those essential to the new rule.
- Lead Agency. Ecology and DOH should draft proposal for lead agency roles and responsibilities.
- Private Utilities. For permits issued to private utilities, provide more detail on requirements to demonstrate financial and other resources to ensure reliability, continuity and supervision of reclaimed water facility per RCW 90.46.030(7) and RCW 90.46.040(3) to be replace by SSB 5504 New Section.

- Distributor and 'end' user requirements.
    - Also consider requirements to protect reclaimed water from wastewater cross connections.
    - Clarify the "distribution" system, and ensure that the distribution center has control over the person distributing reclaimed water.
    - What authority does the lead agency have to regulate distributors and end users of reclaimed water (Agencies and AAG)?
    - What authority does the reclaimed water generator have for ensuring the end user understands reclaimed water? (Agencies and AAG)?

- Coordinated Planning
    - Include the need for an interlocal agreement and require identification of other providers in the coordinated water system plans.
    - Define the term "service boundaries" in the new rule's definitions.

- Professional Engineer Requirements. Address when a professional engineer is necessary to supervise and sign/seal a required submittal to the lead agency. It may not be necessary for all submittals and is an additional cost.

- Water Right Impairment.
    - Determine authority to require a water rights impairment assessment?
    - Include statutory language for the water rights impairment assessment, notice of appeal and deadline for completion.
    - Provide specific analysis submission requirements.

- Construction Quality Assurance Plan Requirement.
    - Consider deleting this requirement as an unnecessary step and additional cost. Plans and specifications should be sufficient.

    - Consider that this requirement may be needed for smaller facilities that do not have construction QA staff but may not be needed for municipalities that could have delegated review authorities.
- Source Control.
    - Require notification of new industrial users that may affect reclaimed water quality for the permitted use(s).
    - Determine Ecology's authority to make this more stringent than for industrial pretreatment requirements.
- Prohibited uses. The RAC recommend using positive language, rather than the "shall not" negative language currently used. Be careful not to imply that not prohibited means allowed as different uses have different water quality requirements.
- Residential Indoor Uses – Do not prohibit but require oversight by a qualified individual.
- Reducing number of classes from 4 to 2. Seeking comments on deleting Class B and D reclaimed water and only have Class A and Class C.
- Pilot Plants. Include details on pilot plant studies requirements and reference with cross-walks within the rule.
- Disinfection - Resolve the conflict between the current standard and the Orange Book chapter on disinfection in the new rule.
- Treatment reliability – Clarify whether there is a need for a separate source of power or two systems of power.
- Reporting Requirements.
    - Consider a different term than discharge monitoring report.
    - Require reporting only to the lead agency.
- Distribution by tank trucks - Requirement for potable water purveyor to inspect does not make sense if the reclaimed water utility owns the truck. It should be reclaimed water purveyor responsibility to assure applicable inspections.
- Cross connection control provisions need updating. Various opinions.
- Setback distances from potable wells – address consistency with other WACs and guidance. Justify any differences.
- Labelling. Use more positive identification labels, such as "Reclaimed water – do not drink non-potable water" and/or "We're using reclaimed water – do not drink from irrigation water."

Meeting Attendees

Committee Members and Alternates	**Ecology Staff**
Dan Pingel, City of Lacey	Katharine Cupps, Agency Lead
Frank Needham, City of Sequim	Tim Gaffney, Rule Writer
Bill Peacock, City of Spokane	Lynn Coleman
Tim Wilson, City of Tumwater	Kathleen Emmett
Gwenn Maxfield, Covington Water District	Jim McCauley
Ann Wick, WA Dept. of Agriculture	Bill Hashim, Facilitator
Doug Raines, WA Dept. of Corrections	Diann Strom, Note Taker, EnviroIssues
Don Perry, Lakehaven Utility District	
Clint Perry, Evergreen Valley Utilities	**Department of Health Staff**

Susan Kaufman-Una, King County	Craig Riley
Dave Monthie, King County	Stuart Glasoe
Karla Fowler, LOTT Alliance	
Paul Schuler, PNCWA	**Guests**
Heather Trim, People for Puget Sound	None
John Kounts, PUD Coalition	
Tom Fox, Seattle Public Utilities	
Hal Schlomann, WASWD	
Walt Canter, WASWD	
Allen de Steiguer, PNCWA	