

Reclaimed Water Rule Making Committee Meeting
June 25, 2008
9:30-2:30 p.m.

Welcome and Introductions 1
Task 1 - Proposed Ch. 90.46 RCW Legislative Changes 1
Task 2 - Water Rights Impairment..... 6
Task 3 - Removing Barriers..... 8
Task 4 - Technical Advisory Panel (TAP)..... 11
Wrap-Up and Action Items 13
Meeting Attendees 14

Welcome and Introductions

Angie Thomson, EnviroIssues, welcomed everyone, led the Rule Advisory Committee (RAC) in a round of introductions, and reviewed the meeting agenda.

Task 1 - Proposed Ch. 90.46 RCW Legislative Changes

A. Definitions.

RAC members previously advised Ecology that some of the definitions in the statute need to be revised. Kathy Cupps, Ecology, explained that the recommended approach is to determine which definitions should remain in statute and which could be moved or added to the rule. Revisions required to the statute would need to be done now. If definitions could be moved to the rule, then any needed revisions could be done in conjunction with the rule development. Kathy reviewed a worksheet of the definitions currently in the statute, RCW 90.46.010.

The RAC used the worksheet to decide which definitions are essential to the statute and which could be moved into the rule. The RAC also determined whether the definition needed to be revised. Definitions staying in the statute, but needing revision will be revised prior to the next RAC meeting.

Definition #1 - Agricultural industrial process water

Wording: OK

Location: Statute

- Ann Wick, Department of Agriculture, said their AG would like some clarification about “adequately and reliably treated” in the guidance rather than in the rule.

Definitions #2 and #3

Wording: OK

Location: Statute

Draft Meeting Summary

Definition #4 – Beneficial use

Wording: Revise the definition to include “agricultural uses.” It is also confusing between direct and indirect uses of reclaimed water. The definition is also circular in that it defines beneficial use and having a beneficial purpose. Beneficial is not defined and that seems to be the key word.

Location: Rule

- Heather Trim questioned whether “beneficial use” has already been defined in other statutes, such as the Clean Water Act (CWA). She recommended using the CWA definition and then having a second sentence discussing conveyance. There was also a discussion about agricultural process water and industrial process water which were added to the reclaimed water statute in 2001 and 2002, respectively. Those definitions included all types of reuse water and if the use did not fall under either of those categories then it is classified under industrial reuse water. Jim McCauley asked if agricultural wastewater used for cooling water is considered agricultural use. Kathy said no, but it would be considered industrial reuse water. The industrial reuse water definition is very broad-based. Perhaps the definition should just define “use”.

Definition #5 and #6 – Constructed beneficial use wetlands and constructed treatment wetlands.

Wording: OK, but clarify “values.”

Location: Statute

- Heather asked whether “wetlands” is defined in other statutes. Kathy said that she thinks the wetland definitions Ecology uses for constructed beneficial use wetlands is the same as is used for created wetlands, Heather thought that any wetland is considered a water of the state and the definition ‘wetland’ in the term treatment wetlands was used improperly. She recommended using ‘facility’ or ‘impoundment’ instead. John Kounts suggested that the RAC clarify when a wetland is a water of the state.. Karla Fowler said that the treatment wetlands do not function as a wetland; Kathy said that Washington law does not consider them to be waters of the state that must be maintained to meet wetland functions.

Definition #7 – Direct recharge

Wording: Revise

Location: Undecided

- Susan Kaufman-Una suggested using “controlled release” instead of “subsurface change,” and said the definition contradicts Definition #14 – Reclaimed Water. Bill Peacock said from an engineering standpoint the terms “indirect” and “direct” might be better; Craig Riley disagreed about the use of “indirect.” The term is confusing and a better term is needed to convey the concept of recharging into the aquifer’s saturated zone vs. percolating the water through the soil until it reaches the aquifer.

Draft Meeting Summary

Definition #8 - Greywater

Wording: DOH will revise

Location: Statute

- Jim was concerned about the use of “strength.” Dave Lenning noted that DOH uses grey water instead of greywater. DOH agreed to rewrite the definition.

Definition #9 – Groundwater recharge criteria

Wording: OK, but may become obsolete once rule is adopted.

Location: Statute

- Kathy thought that the RAC should remove the definition from the statute because it is a standard and the rule will establish the standard for ground water recharge. Craig disagreed because the intention is for groundwater recharge and home reuse; the Office of Drinking Water cares about this definition. Kathy stated that the term could remain in the statute but will be obsolete if the new rule provides a different standard. The statute allows Ecology to establish a different standard in the rule. Ecology wants it to be consistent with the state groundwater standards, not just the drinking water standards. Discuss modifying the definition with DOH.

Definition #10 – Industrial reuse water

Wording: OK

Location: Statute

- RAC members had some concern about how agricultural and beneficial uses will tie into industrial reuse water later on. It may be good to clarify it in the rule.

Definition #11 – Land application

Wording: OK

Location: Leave in statute and enhance in the rule to emphasize irrigation as the use.

- The term “landscape enhancement” was confusing to some and should be clarified in the rule. John asked whether there is a difference between land application and surface percolation, and would like the difference to be explained in the rule. Kathy said there is a difference in application because in land application the purpose is irrigating plants while surface percolation is meant to recharge ground water. Irrigation uses would maximize uptake of the water by the crops.

Definition #12 - Person

Wording: OK

Location: Statute

Draft Meeting Summary

Definition #13 – Planned groundwater recharge project

Wording: Slight revision

Location: Statute

- Kathy recommended striking “via direct recharge or surface percolation.”

Definition #14 – Reclaimed Water

Wording: Revise

Location: Statute

- Karla suggested avoiding negative wording such as “effluent,” and she was tasked with revising the definition.

Definition #15 – Reclamation criteria

- The RAC decided the definition is not needed and it will be removed from the statute.

Definition #16 – Sewage

Wording: May need revision, but RAC will wait to learn the revised definition of reclaimed water.

Location: Undecided

- The RAC discussed the definition of sewage as any waste from industrial, commercial and/or residential locations. There was some confusion about the difference between the wastewater and sewage definitions; Kathy said DOH uses the term “sewage” and Ecology uses “domestic wastewater.” The RAC discussed whether water from a dog kennel is considered sewage, and Kathy said it would only be considered sewage if it was mixed with human waste. Bill commented that once waste leaves a private site and goes to a publicly owned treatment facility, then it is considered sewage. Only when you are onsite can you distinguish between agricultural and industrial wastes.

Definition #17 – Streamflow augmentation

Wording: Revise and have the same intent, but make it parallel other language and that the use of reclaimed water is to supplement flows. Change “discharge” to use.

Location: Statute

- The RAC discussed how indirect streamflow augmentation fits in this definition and concern about discharging via wetland or surface percolation. Kathy said that indirect streamflow augmentation is covered under a different category and the purpose of percolation is to discharge to a river. These issues will be refined in the rule. Craig cautioned against making a definition that is too narrow.

Definition #18 – Surface percolation

Wording: DOH suggested revise to include “vadose zone.”

Location: Statute

Draft Meeting Summary

Definition #19 - User

Wording: OK

Location: Statute

Definition #20 - Wastewater

Wording: Revise

Location: Undecided. The RAC will revisit the definition once the definition for reclaimed water has been revised.

- Heather commented that the California water code has definitions for sewage and wastewater. Additionally, Seattle has stormwater that goes into the sewer system.

Definition #21 – Wetland or wetlands

Wording: OK

Location: Statute

Questions/Comments

- Craig said Definitions 1-3 are the result of six years of negotiations with the food industry.

B. Specific Regulatory Authority

Kathy reviewed the handout, *Proposed Changes to RCW 90.46* for consideration in 2009 Session, with the group. She said the goal of these changes is to have the statute include specific permitting and regulatory authority. Much of the language in the new sections was borrowed from Ch. 90.48 RCW and edited to fit into RCW 90.46 which allows continuity for administering permits and responsibilities. This is a work in progress and currently under review by the Office of the Attorney General.

The RAC must submit any suggested changes to Ecology by the end of July so they are included in the agency request legislation. Any comments about the draft legislation changes should be sent to Kathy via e-mail.

Questions/Comments

- Dave Lenning said DOH's AAG is still reviewing the proposed changes to the statute and has so far recommended that the statute include a definition for "lead agency" and "non-lead agency." The DOH and Ecology AAGs will meet next week to go over the proposed changes to ensure that the changes meets both agencies' needs. Dave said there may be changes to the draft distributed during the meeting.
- The authority to implement water rights impairment analyses will stay with Ecology.
- *Will Ecology and DOH share a common budget for administration of these permits? Will utilities be billed from both?* Kathy said one department will lead on each permit, so utilities will only receive a fee from one department. This information will be further defined in the rule. Don Perry was concerned about fee payment equity because in the past large water users paid and the smaller users did not. Kathy said

Draft Meeting Summary

the determination on whether larger users will subsidize the smaller users will be discussed in the fee rule.

- Heather said that People for Puget Sound would like a joint permit, not a single permit for reclaimed water due to the amount of permits there are to review. Additionally, Heather said she is against changing the word “shall” to “may” in Number 5 of the Permitting section because it circumvents the public process. She suggested having the permit renewal every five years, like the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit, with a public comment period during the permit renewal process. Kathy said that the renewal year information will be addressed in the rule, not the statute.
- *Are utilities going to fight a five-year permit renewal process?* Utilities may be concerned with a five-year permit renewal process because the providers will have no certainty in the commitments they have made already. Bill said that unlike wastewater, reclaimed water can be shut down without affecting users. Another concern is that public perception of reclaimed water could shift in such a way that the public will fight the renewal of reclaimed water permits. Kathy said that the rule will go into more detail about permitting and that this section of the statute may undergo more revisions.
- *If an industrial facility wants to use reclaimed water from its process and the water does not leave the site, does it have to undergo the permitting process?* No, the facility’s use of reclaimed water would be considered internal reuse and does not require a permit.
- *If a private investor wanted to invest in reclaimed water would they have to become a utility and obtain a permit?* Yes, unless they were a holder of a waste discharge permit.
- *Does the penalty section exclude elected officials?* No, they are defined as ‘persons.’

C. Coordinated planning

Kathy distributed a handout regarding revisions to RCW 90.46.120 and coordinated planning. Any comments about these revisions should be sent to Kathy via e-mail and the RAC should expect to see a revised draft soon.

Questions/Comments:

- The term “consideration” in the third bullet point on the handout needs to be clearly defined.

Task 2 - Water Rights Impairment

Lynn Coleman gave an update for the Water Rights Impairment Subcommittee. This committee is operating under the Governor’s directive to consider water rights impairment issues. Ecology put together a committee, consisting of tribes, environmental groups, irrigation districts, and Alliance for Water Rights to consider the issues in order

Draft Meeting Summary

to come to some sort of agreement about impairment. They will then inform and educate the legislature about this complex issue.

Three tribes and some environmental organizations are concerned about the potential for reclaimed water to impair in-stream flows. Kathy and Lynn believe that the utilities are not adequately represented on the subcommittee and would like input from the RAC, particularly utility representatives, regarding impairment issues.

Lynn said she has heard that utilities are unhappy with the Water Resources program, which is implementing the impairment standard, and others do not trust the program. There is a common feeling that there is a double standard between reclaimed water and wastewater facilities regarding water impairment rights. Lynn said that the Wenatchee watershed has an issue where in-stream flow has had decreased by a few percent to allow for growth and if Ecology comes in with reclaimed water it will further decrease in-stream flow and the tribes will have real problems with this.

Lynn would like utility representatives to join the subcommittee in order to have another opinion and determine whether there is any common ground regarding water rights impairment. If not, then the subcommittee will recommend that the legislature create the water right impairment policies. Lynn thought that the standard could be left the way it is and an allowance could be made for some additional exceptions to the standard, or the standard could be taken out or apply it to other wastewater treatment facilities.

Questions/Comments

- *Is there a stalemate in the subcommittee?* Lynn said she did not think there was a stalemate but no one at the meetings is strongly representing the “take the standard out” position.
- *Has there been a debate about the practicalities of determining impairment?* Lynn said that the subcommittee has spent time determining what impairment is and the best way for a utility to find out. Water Resources has a history of coming in late to the process, the impairment standard needs to be applied early in the process and agency staff need to have the training and guidance so they can adequately do their jobs.
- *Is the subcommittee looking for an approach on mitigating impairment?* The governor wants the committee to work with the legislature to determine what impairment is and address the standard. Kathy said that so far the subcommittee has found that there is no one particular method used by other states, instead there are many approaches being used. Washington State should have a standard that works best for our state and its unique features and issues, such as tribal water rights and in-stream flow rules to protect fish and wildlife. Kathy thought that the subcommittee should not single out reclaimed water but instead look holistically at the water needs of the state.
- Craig said that the subcommittee’s discussion thus far has been theoretical and needs to involve the utilities real-world practical limitations. Utilities will want to know

Draft Meeting Summary

how they can function without causing impairment and how Ecology will determine who is causing impairment.

- Bill commented that revisions to RCW 90.46.120 would supersede downstream rights; however, Kathy said another section of the law, RCW 90.46.130, must be met and that says you cannot reclaim the water if it impairs downstream water rights without compensation or mitigation. Bill agreed to attend the subcommittee meeting.
- Don said that he will attend the water rights meetings to give a perspective on a marine discharge, but he did not think there would be an easy solution.
- Lynn said during the process she has learned that there are many different combinations of facts. The Yakima Nation's representative said 1945 federal court decree dictates how the State will deal with water rights impairments, so we need to honor that. However, in other situations a city operates a wastewater facility and holds water rights so they can apply the capture/reuse concept. While some water rights holders feel that they should be able to do with their rights as they choose, and others are concerned about the possibility of water right transfers.
- Walt Canter said Liberty Lake near Spokane cannot use their reclaimed water and must discharge to Spokane River because of downstream impairment. Walt will ask someone from Liberty Lake to attend Lynn's group.
- Lynn cautioned that some people do not want to bring their impairment examples to the subcommittee because they are in active negotiations and worry that they will face future problems. Craig said that they may fear compromising new right transfers and public water systems have to keep every drop of water possible.
- Susan said that her counterpart gave recommendations to the subcommittee on how to improve the process, but it may have been too early in the subcommittee's discussions. Susan said that since she has worked with the Ecology northwest office on impairment and went through the impairment process in Carnation, she can talk about challenges. After King County found out about the water rights impairment issues, they did in-depth planning and treated the process like another permit. She also commented that she would not have presented to the committee while going through the process because of the project schedule and the sensitivity of the process. Although she is now trying to get a reuse permit, she does not think presenting in front of the subcommittee will affect the permit's status.
- Lynn will send the RAC utility representatives (Walt, Susan, Bill, Don, John, and Ginger) highlights and current status information from the subcommittees' meetings, to prepare them to present at the subcommittee meeting on Tuesday July 15. The meetings are generally held the second Tuesday of each month.

Task 3 - Removing Barriers

Bill updated the RAC about the Removing Barriers Sub-Task Force's (RBSF) work and reviewed the Recommendation to RAC for Organizational Structure.

Draft Meeting Summary

Bill said the RBSF is recommending changes in organizational structures for DOH and Ecology. The RBSF recognized that the goal is to provide clean water for the future and as such they are recommending management changes in both organizations. Below are the organizational priorities they have identified.

1. Ecology will retain the reclaimed water staff lead and elevate the reporting relationship by two levels, so that the reclaimed water manager has the “teeth” to implement the program goals.
2. DOH will maintain its reporting relationship, but improve the position’s authority and needed support.
3. Both agencies require adequate staffing and the RBSF recommends preserving the staff levels set in 2008. In addition, further steps are needed for long-term staffing strategies.
4. Create a department of water: This new department or entity will better manage water strategies across multiple program and agency boundaries. In addition to reclaimed water, this new department will include desalination, reclaimed stormwater, rainwater harvesting, injection wells and industrial reuse water.

Bill said that the RBSF recommends that the organizational and staffing changes should be implemented immediately.

In addition, both the Technical Advisory Panel and Water Rights Impairment committees continue to meet and work on their tasks. The RBSF has narrowed down the financial barriers to two fields:

1. Marketing: The state should have a state-wide marketing or educational (social marketing) campaign in order to introduce people to reclaimed water and reduce the “yuck factor.”
2. Economics: The RBSF is looking for ways to delay taxing reclaimed water, which is a revenue source. Users can be charged for water consumption or for discharging to a municipal facility (flush tax). The RBSF will recommend that this be implemented after the state-wide marketing campaign is complete, so that the public understands the importance of developing reclaimed water.

During the next RBSF meeting the group will consider economic and market barriers.

Questions/Comments

- *Is there legislative intent for marketing?* Kathy said it will take money to run a state-wide education campaign. The campaign will incorporate focus groups, surveys and development of a “tool box” of materials for local governments. Jocelyn Winz recommended that all governments implement education campaigns about reclaimed water and that funding should go through Ecology or DOH.
- Bill said the RBSF thought that the state-wide education campaign should encourage people to use reclaimed water, change their behavior and portray reclaimed water as an economic and/or environmental benefit or a status symbol. To do this the

Draft Meeting Summary

legislature will need to set aside \$1 to \$2 million for the campaign and development of tools. Jocelyn recommended that the state-wide education campaign be conducted simultaneously with the rule-making process.

- Heather commented that some citizens do not trust the state and recommended commissioning a neutral third party to study Washington's future water needs, including reclaimed water.
- Melodie Selby suggested that the reclaimed water staff lead have specific authority, rather than reporting to a particular position because Ecology's organizational structure is changing and the "reporting" position may no longer be there.

Funding Update

Melodie updated the RAC about Ecology's budgeting process for the next biennium. Ecology must submit its proposed 2009 budget to the governor's office on September 1.

Melodie has two placeholders in the budget: one for the reclaimed water RAC and another for the permit fee workgroup. As discussed last time, the Fee Workgroup is looking at short-term and long-term fixes to the permit fee program which Ecology feels is under-funded and has an inequitable fee structure. Ecology has some short-term solutions to help with the permit fee shortfall and will likely request to change the permit fee rule.

Melodie has requested the staffing levels and fees currently used by reclaimed water which were recommended in May. Additionally, there has been a request for the capital funding program.

Melodie said that if the RAC proposes a reclaimed water permit fee structure with the wastewater permit fees, then Ecology does not have the authority to charge fees for reclaimed water. Ecology's budget office has had meetings with the governor's office and legislative staffers and no one wants to talk about fees right now, so Ecology does not know whether submitting fee proposals is acceptable.

Ecology has two options for the reclaimed water fee:

1. Change the reclaimed water statute and include in those changes permitting and authority for charging fees.
2. Do not change the statute, and recommend that the reclaimed water and wastewater fees be proposed in one package.

Melodie recommended that the RAC decide on two or three types of fee structures to discuss at the next meeting and together decide on which fee structure the RAC should recommend.

Draft Meeting Summary

Questions/Comments

- Kathy said that the RAC is assuming the statute changes will go forward and that DOH and Ecology will continue to collect fees in the same manner.
- Craig commented that he is not sure how the fees will work because DOH has their own fees specified by the statute. If Ecology goes with a consultant-type model, then it will need to provide accurate overhead rates and cost accounting. He has found that the difficult part in doing so at DOH is ensuring that staff are efficient with their time.
- Kathy said those fees only cover review and writing of permits, but do not cover ongoing monitoring and inspections. Craig recommended that inspections be conducted on an hourly-fee basis. Melodie recommended that the RAC also consider the amount of time covered by tasks such as keeping the rules updated and other standards and deciding whether those would be covered by fees or overhead.
- *There are many different fee models, which model should the RAC use?* Kathy thought that Ecology should include reclaimed water fees in the wastewater discharge permit fee program to make sure no one is double-charged. DOH uses a different fee structure and has stated a goal of one combined fee structure. *However that may be difficult to achieve and DOH may need to continue their existing fee structure for now.*
- Don commented that utilities include fees as part of the project costs, and from the operations and maintenance side if Ecology wants to bill facilities, then they would not be upset. Don thought Ecology could also use the same fee structure it has now.
- Melodie said one advantage of having two separate fee systems is that the billing system is already in place while making a new fee system takes time.
- *Is the capital funding grant program state-wide rather than just Puget Sound?* Melodie said that it has not been one of the questions asked yet.
- *Is there a dollar amount at this time for the capital funding program?* Melodie said that she asked for the same amount the RAC asked for this biennium which about \$5.4 million. Kathy said that she thought there was a placeholder for \$10 million, and Melodie will send the funding information to Kathy.
- Lynn reminded the group that funding is needed for program development, which covers base funding for Jim, Craig, Kathy, and Lynn as well as the Water Resources program, Water Quality program, and DOH.

Task 4 - Technical Advisory Panel (TAP)

Angie said that at the last RAC meeting the group went over the TAP pathogen recommendations. The RAC's input on irrigation uses and pathogens will be used by TAP when they meet tomorrow.

Jim gave a presentation about the TAP's discussion on irrigation uses. He said that these are not recommendations at this point and he would like the RAC's feedback.

Questions/Comments

- Walt was concerned about equity between the rate payer and the end user since there may not be enough reclaimed water for an entire population's needs. He said he has read that it takes three to five residential units to supply enough reclaimed water for one residential unit. Kathy asked for Walt to let her know where he read this and that the information would be useful for urban uses, rather than irrigation uses. Walt said for a golf course with 1,500 homes surrounding it, it would take the reclaimed water of all of those homes to irrigate the golf course during the summer. He said that those 1,500 homes would be paying sewer rates for the reclaimed water used by the golf course. Jim said that some communities subsidize the rate for reclaimed water. The RAC thought this should be discussed by the TAP.
- Clint Perry said that he does not want to see a lot of detail in the permit about the issues identified by the TAP, such as specifying which crops are permitted to be planted in case a farmer decides to use another crop resulting in the reclaimed water facility having to change its permit. Craig said that the RAC has to recognize that reclaimed water is a water supply and that farmers should decide which crop they have in rotation.
- *Will the TAP make technical recommendations to the RAC? What can the RAC expect to see?* Jim said that the TAP will mostly make general recommendations and a few specific recommendations just as they did with the pathogen requirements. Ann suggested having general language in the permit with exclusions for specific requirements. Kathy said that the goal is to have the rule give authority and specify the technical issues in guidance documents, such as a purple book, which are easier to change. In addition, the rule would include an "escape clause" for the departments to examine some technical issues on a case-by-case basis.
- *Can animals drink reclaimed water?* The RAC discussed that irrigation is a seasonal need; however animals are raised year round so it could be used as stock water. Ann said that there is some concern about pharmaceuticals in the stock water.
- *What standards is the TAP considering for urban impoundments?* Impoundments already have requirements for algae and odor control, but the TAP will need to address the issue. Don thought that if you have reclaimed water in storage which has already been treated, then you do not need to treat it again.
- *Are there any technical barriers or problems to using reclaimed water in stormwater infiltration ponds during the summer?* This might be a type of groundwater recharge. Members of the RAC said there is a need for some guidance regarding this issue.
- *Can irrigators blend irrigation water with reclaimed water in order to get the quantity and quality of water they need?* Kathy said that this might involve some federal regulations, such as the Clean Water Act, but blending potable water and reclaimed water will happen and the TAP will need to address it. Jim said that blending irrigation water and reclaimed water is controversial in Idaho because of the liabilities associated with it.

Draft Meeting Summary

- Lynn said that the TAP can get information about evaporation, leeching of salts and equipment calculations from the NRCS which produces the *Washington Irrigation Guide* which estimates the amount of water needed for each.
- Kathy commented that the TAP will go into more detail about other irrigation topics not addressed such as soil characteristics (composition, depth to groundwater, etc.), previous land uses, salinity, ion toxicity, crop selection and rotation and plant tolerance.
- Don suggested that the TAP include a caveat about biological oxygen demand (BOD) levels for facilities with multiple permits. Those facilities must first meet their prior permit requirements if it is below the reclaimed water 30/30 requirement.
- Washington State University has some good soil conservation specialists.
- Some members thought that having a nitrogen standard is useful.
- The TAP needs to consider frost control.
- Ann suggested that the TAP not exclude hydraulic loading because irrigation water is used to apply pesticides and fertilizers and irrigation water can also be used to flush out salts.

Wrap-Up and Action Items

- Kathy and Karla will work on the definitions that need revision.
- Send comments about the proposed changes to RCW 90.46 and RCW 90.46.120 to Kathy via e-mail.
- Lynn will send Walt, Susan, Bill, Don, John and Ginger information regarding the Water Rights Impairment Subcommittee meeting.
- Jim will take the RAC's feedback regarding irrigation uses to the TAP for more discussion.
- The RAC will develop two or three fee structures to discuss with Melodie next month.
- Melodie will send Kathy information regarding the capital funding budget request.

Angie invited RAC members to attend the TAP meeting on Thursday, June 26. The next RAC meeting will be held on Wednesday, July 23 in Olympia, and the group will discuss definitions, regulatory authority, coordinated planning and fee proposals.

Draft Meeting Summary

Meeting Attendees

Department of Ecology

Katharine Cupps, Agency Lead

Department of Health

Dave Lenning, Environmental Health and Safety

Angie Thomson, Facilitator

Diann Strom, Note Taker

Committee Members and Alternates	Guests
Ann Wick, Department of Agriculture	
Tim Wilson, City of Lacey	
Craig Riley, Department of Health	
Bill Peacock, City of Spokane	
Doug Raines, DOC	
Clint Perry, Evergreen Valley Utilities	
Keith Folkerts, Kitsap County	
Walter Canter, WASWD	
Susan Kaufman-Una, King County	
John Kounts, WPUDA	
Karla Fowler, LOTT Alliance	
Ginger Desy, Sno-King Coalition	
Heather Trim, People for Puget Sound	
Don Perry, Lakehaven Utility District	
Ecology Staff	
Lynn Coleman	
Jim McCauley	
Melodie Selby	
Jocelyn Winz	
Jennifer Busselle	