

Meeting: Engineering and Planning Subcommittee

Date: October 1, 2008

Attendees: Walt Canter, Cedar River Water and Sewer District; Wes Jorgenson, City of Bellevue; Dennis Cheung, City of Issaquah; Scott Thomasson, City of Redmond; Margaret Wiggins, Northshore Utility District; Ron Little, Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District; Mark Buscher, King County; Debra Ross, King County; Steve Tolzman, King County; Laura Wharton, King County; Tamie Kellogg, Facilitator

Committee Business:

- The committee requested a list of stakeholders the Reclaimed Water Comprehensive Plan team will meet with. (The list was passed out at the meeting.)
- At the November 5th E&P meeting – allocation of Reclaimed Water to turf research project completed results will be presented.

Discussion of elements of MWPAAC's letter of July 11:

- Outcome of Plan
 - Identify problems and opportunities of Reclaimed Water (30 years out)
 - Prioritize uses of Reclaimed Water and requests received
 - Facility alternatives, infrastructure and cost
 - Recommendations for future analysis
 - Identify potential alternatives and make recommendations for additional analysis (i.e. stormwater management)
- What if...water suppliers don't need water... "we would recognize that in plan"
- KC will provide list of invitees to workshop (*done*)
- Develop a Financing Plan (include cost allocation)
- Review of Regional Wastewater Services Plan reclaimed water policies, additions and revisions recommended to amend reclaimed water policies
- Add to outcome:
 - A public outreach process – ongoing during this planning process – KC will give presentations @ existing groups meetings, etc.
- Nov 5 upcoming E&P meeting: application of RW to turf research project completed
- Cost/Benefit analysis – not compared to alternatives
 - Wes – you will only have cost of one alternative (Reclaimed Water); can't review and compare other alternatives
 - What are the valuation of the Reclaimed Water non-market benefits
- "potential" market identified
- Use of benefit/cost analysis (MWPAAC thinks it mean comparison – need to clarify what WTD means)
- What criteria will be used to determine the cost paid for RW users from existing backbone
- What is rate of investment for Pilot Projects (*note: existing reclaimed water projects*); Comp Plan's financing plan needs to include existing costs
- We have a reclaimed water system in place in at South Plant, Carnation, West Point and Brightwater. We are not intending to extend this system but that said, we are

working with people to use the Brightwater reclaimed water. The City of Bothell and UW Bothell have expressed interest in using the water.

Discussion on the purpose and use of guidance criteria:

- Provide consistency and balance throughout the process
- Provide opportunity for input
- Members viewpoints
 - Keep (seek uses that) money in the ratepayers' pocket
 - Look at an “a do nothing approach” alternative as a serious option
 - Look at alternatives that can pay for themselves
 - A no action alternative is acceptable
 - “Pay as you go” utility and uses consistent with that (if it doesn’t pay for itself then it doesn’t get done)
 - Explore satellite reclamation plants that are operated/managed/ owned by the local city/district
 - Reduce pollutant discharge to Puget Sound – look at alternatives to wastewater process changes, groundwater recharge areas (look at combined multiple uses)
 - Identify the primary purpose first and then look secondary problems can be identified
 - Seek reclaimed water uses that meet a non-potable demand (ex: seek reclaimed water uses that affect stream quality and flows down to a specific level; seek reclaimed water uses that provide aquifers and stream augmentation; it could be for mitigation or groundwater recharge)
 - Affordability and justification (ability to provide funding and justify expenditure)
 - Effectiveness of meeting primary purpose and multiple criteria
 - Ability to meet many of the guidance criteria/benefits (way plan to use criteria – package guidance criteria, take to RWQC/Council)

Sample way that criteria will be evaluated (detailed questions will be applied to each criterion)

Request	Criteria 1 enhance salmon bearing streams	Criteria 2 Ease of cost recovery	Criteria 3	Criteria 4
• Stream augmentation use	X		X	X
• Ease in cost recovery		X		

- Cost effectiveness, minimize use of wastewater rate as funding mechanism, start with financial criteria
- Environmental
 - Enhancing fish
 - Reclaimed water will not be used to corrupt the political process

- Those who benefit should pay
- Look at streams that do not have HCPs or mitigation plans
- Public Health
 - ability to meet all state and local regulatory requirements with this use
 - ability to achieve public acceptance from public health standpoint
 - potential for liability/insurance needs

Operational

- minimizes operational requirements of staff resources and costs
- seasonality – cost benefit should be considered in concert with cost/benefit analysis and regulatory requirements
- satellite plants – seasonality potential to reduce planned conveyance system improvements or other planned capital improvements (only if its year around)
- relationship to customer – who owns, who pays – minimize KC ownership and maintenance of facilities
- certification of operators – any special certification to operate RW facilities
- satisfy wastewater permit regulatory permit requirements
- ability to obtain financing/funding from benefitted constituents
- generate revenue
- ability to cover development and operating costs over the long-term horizon, during interim financing

From others:

- geographic equity
- enhance salmon streams
- benefit and sustain local agriculture

Discussion Questions:

- How would we extend the life and value of potable water, if water purveyors say they have a plan and an ample [water] supply? Water purveyors will be included in the [comp plan] discussions and the plan would be based on the input we've received and it will include information that's been gathered on climate change effects and population projections.
- Does the plan include a component of public outreach and awareness? How do we do that without scaring the public? It will be added to an expected outcome.
- The plan will include a cost/benefit analysis; will that include analysis on alternatives? The plan will identify other alternatives but won't include an evaluation. These other alternatives would be recommended with the understanding that they would need additional analysis.
- Will financial analysis include who should pay? Yes.
- Comment: At what point does the County go forward to fund a project? There is also the legal aspect of what you can be funded with wastewater revenue.