

Committee Business:

- A motion was made and seconded that the MWPAAC charter be adopted in a motion process by the King County Council. A roll-call vote was made with only Coal Creek Utility District abstaining (in favor of an ordinance).
- The Chair requested that MWPAAC become engaged in the Reclaimed Water Comprehensive Plan process. A specific written response from the County as to what MWPAAC's input will be on the Plan process has been requested.

WTD Director's Report (Lorraine Patterson):

- Suzanne Schweitzer was introduced as the new manager of the Resource Recovery Section of WTD.
- Tamie Kellogg of Kellogg Consulting was introduced as the MWPAAC facilitator.
- South Plant and West Point treatment plants received the National Association of Clean Water Agencies platinum awards.
- WTD is working toward an ISO certification for biosolids. Various ISO elements will be expanded throughout the division.
- The County Council is going in the direction of a two-year rate instead of the recommended one-year rate.
- We had 8MGD load into Ravenna creek, it was a sewage overflow that diverted to a storm water pipe. The as-builts were not updated, the operations crew diverted without knowing that it was a stormwater pipe. For 10 days we had this error, and it was our mistake.

WTD Director's Report Questions and Answers:

- Do you know the rationale? If the two-year rate is bad they can still come back the next year to adjust the rate is what I heard from a staff member.
- Has the council voted on that yet? They have to adopt the rate by June. Hopefully, we can persuade them to a one-year rate.
- Is there is a new organization chart that can be distributed to the members? Yes.

An update on pharmaceutical waste management:

- There is a wide range of biologically-active chemicals. They are organized into three classes based on sale/regulation: over the counter, prescription and controlled substances. Some of these pharmaceuticals are designated as hazardous waste. Controlled substances are regulated by the federal Drug Enforcement Administration due to the potential for abuse.
- Endocrine Disrupting Chemicals can be found in personal care products, metal, industrial chemicals, pharmaceutical drugs, pesticides, herbicides, fungicides and synthetic and naturally occurring hormones. Pharmaceuticals that are EDCs are showing up in the environment; nearly 80% of U.S. streams tested by the USGS have EDCs. They have also been found in drinking water supplies in many U.S.

cities. Antibiotics, hormones and SSRIs are receiving the most attention. In one study completed in Boulder Creek, Colorado found a 50/50% male/female ratio upstream of a treatment plant and 90/10% female/male ration downstream. Male fish have been found producing eggs.

- Poisonings and drug abuse deaths are on the rise for prescription drugs. Drugs sales have more than doubled in the last five years.
- Pharmaceuticals are present in the wastewater treatment system. In a Sequim study by Ecology they found 16 of the 24 compounds they were testing in effluent. There is no local data for King County but it is presumed that pharmaceuticals are in present. Conventional activated sludge and MBRs show good, mixed removals. Longer solids retention time also leads to greater removals.
- Current models and pilot programs are one-day collection events, household hazardous waste services, drop-off at police or sheriff offices, mail-back and drop-off/take-back at pharmacies.
- There are 24 Group Health locations, 11 in King County and 2 new Bartell Drugs participating in the Take-Back program. 9,000 pounds have been collected and all drugs are destroyed at the Spokane WTE facility.
- The MBR show mixed results, how does that compare to incineration? The MBR process provides polishing in addition to the secondary treatment process. The bugs will chew up and destroy some of these organic chemicals, and the filter part will further remove some of these chemicals. Wastewater can't be incinerated but pills can be incinerated.

WTD's Reclaimed Water Feasibility Study:

- A brief overview was given of the Reclaimed Water Feasibility study; the document is available on the website.
- The first element is new technologies and included research information on sand filter to reverse osmosis. The study concluded that the technologies the County has are perfectly acceptable to produce Class A reclaimed water.
- The second element is revenue sources. Reviewed were other studies and how these agencies were paying for reclaimed water through funding, financing and cost recovery. The study concluded that the options for grants and low cost loans may increase in the future.
- The third element is market analysis and it focused on WTD's customers, the local agencies. Information was also included on the public's perception and how water could be used to bolster environmental concerns. The study concluded that there is a market for reclaimed water.
- The fourth and fifth element of the study focused on the environmental and regional benefits. There were no individual projects to analyze; the study took a programmatic approach, what would happen if the discharge permit restrictions became lower. It was determine that reclaimed water is a solution. The final conclusion is that the subject needs much more study. WTD is proceeding with the Reclaimed Water Comprehensive Plan – that will take three years to finalize and it will explore other areas that the study was not able to.

May 28, 2008

Page 2

WTD's Reclaimed Water Feasibility Study Questions and Answers:

- How many of the local systems are of the size that Brightwater that are looking at reclaimed water? Brightwater is the largest that is using MBR technology.
- The feasibility study was done in-house? We hired a team of consultants.
- I found no credit to consultants? We hired Corollo Engineers and subcontracted.
- How much into the future? In the comprehensive plan we'll cover the future. This report is primarily a review of what we are doing now.
- Where is the identification for legislation changed? That's a major issue that we didn't see addressed, when that will be analyzed.
- The difference between classes reclaimed water and effluent, once it becomes Class A, when does it stop being effluent that we don't stop into the sound? It doesn't tell you what the quality of that water is, discharging water is effluent, one is the use and the other is the quality.
- What is the timing and pricing of the economic side of the plan? Our plan is to start working on the plan this summer. It should take a year to two years, and in fall of 09, we would have figured out how to quantify our cost and do a benefit cost analysis. We would have an agreed upon costs, a plan identifying how to quantify the benefits as well as the costs.
- Will the county provide us a definition between reuses and reclaim water? The state is struggling with that as well.
- Did you make a briefing to RWQC? Christie made a briefing but I think they want a second briefing via email.

E&P Subcommittee Report:

- Wes presented a short report to the committee.
- What do we need to focus on the reclaimed water comprehensive study? I don't think we need to comment on the feasibility study because it's already done.
- The committee agreed to write a letter of response to the feasibility study. Specific comments should be sent to Wes, who will be drafting the letter. The letter will be reviewed by E&P and the Executive Board followed by an email to the general committee.

Rate and Finance Committee Report:

- Trish presented a draft letter to be reviewed by the committee and requested comments. The finance committee will take the next draft and send it to the Chair for signature. Any additional comments from the committee would need to be sent into Trish. The finance committee will finalize and Tamie will make the revisions.
- The letter is to be sent to the County Council on the sewer rate proposal and it will include our recommendations. MWPAAC recommendations not included in the County Executive's proposal to the County Council were interest-only and the Culver policy.