

**MWPAAC RWSP Policy Review Task Force
Discussion/Proposed Amendments
Long-Term Wastewater Planning Policies
WORKING DRAFT**

Existing <u>Long-Term</u> Wastewater Planning Policies K.C.C 28.86.130	Task Force Proposed Amendments as of May 29, 2015	Task Force Comments/Discussion	Sub-committees and full MWPAAC comments
<p>A. Explanatory material. The wastewater planning policies are intended to guide the county in its long-term comprehensive planning for design and construction of facilities that meet the wastewater needs of customers within the service area.</p> <p>Recognizing that the RWSP is a complex and dynamic comprehensive development guide that will regularly need to be updated, the county will conduct annual reviews of plan implementation and its consistency with policies, and of scientific, economic and technical information as well as periodic comprehensive reviews of the assumptions on which the RWSP is based.</p> <p>These policies also express the intent of the council to request that the RWQC continue review of the conditions and assumptions that guide the implementation of the RWSP.</p>	<p><u>Explanatory Material. The regional wastewater services plan (RWSP) serves as a supplement to King County’s comprehensive water pollution abatement plan. The RWSP identifies capital project needs over a fifty-year planning horizon to ensure the county’s regional wastewater system keeps pace with growth, meets regulatory requirements, and is able to adapt to changing environmental conditions. RWSP program elements include, but are not limited to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>providing treatment at its existing plants and expanding treatment capacity to meet regulatory requirements and projected wastewater flows and wasteloads (see Treatment Plant Policies);</u> • <u>making improvements to the regional wastewater conveyance system to accommodate increased flows and to prevent improper discharges from the regional system (see Conveyance Policies);</u> • <u>controlling CSO discharges by the end of 2030 (see Combined Sewer Overflow Control Policies);</u> • <u>reducing inflow and infiltration (see Infiltration and Inflow Policies);</u> • <u>managing the county’s wastewater assets (see Asset Management Policies);</u> • <u>producing and recycling of wastewater-related resources, such as biosolids, reclaimed water, and energy (see Sustainability and Innovations Policies);</u> • <u>monitoring and resolving water quality issues (see Water Quality Protection Policies);</u> • <u>educating and engaging the public (see Public Involvement Policies); and</u> • <u>developing mitigation measures for environmental impacts from the construction and operation of wastewater facilities (see Environmental Mitigation Policies)</u> <p><u>The long-term wastewater planning policies provide guidance to the executive to conduct ongoing planning and updates of the RWSP and its corresponding policies.</u></p>	<p><i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> Task Force members asked WTD staff to make sure all policies are consistent regarding reference to RWSP as a supplement to the County’s comprehensive water pollution abatement plan. It was noted that at times local agencies amend their comprehensive plans, and other times adopt a new one; when is the timing for the County to adopt a new comprehensive plan versus supplements. This is a question to keep in mind for future updates</p> <p><i>May 15, 2015 discussion:</i> In regarding the question on how to refer to the RWSP, WTD staff checked with its legal experts, and the RWSP should be referred to as a supplement to the County’s comprehensive water pollution abatement plan.</p> <p>WTD staff had moved this section to other portions of the Code; the Task Force suggested keeping the information in the Wastewater Planning Policies section for now.</p> <p><i>April 23, 2015 discussion:</i> Task Force members wondered if now is the time to have the RWSP be the county’s comprehensive water pollution abatement plan.</p> <p>Task Force members also suggested that the RWSP be described, including the sub-elements in the explanatory material.</p> <p><i>March 17, 2015 discussion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Task Force members suggested the policies be the “long-term wastewater planning policies”. • There was discussion about the importance of when amending or updating a program element of the RWSP, like the Conveyance System Improvement program, that such efforts are done in a comprehensive manner, linking to other planning efforts as appropriate. When program elements are update, the RWSP and corresponding policies should be updated accordingly. • There was also mention of the continued desire to see a web-based comprehensive summary of 	<p><i>The policies the Task Force proposed were approved by full MWPAAC at its June 24, 2015 meeting.</i></p> <p><i>June 4, 2015 Engineering and Planning (E&P) Subcommittee discussion:</i> There was a comment to check on the 50-year planning horizon. <i>In 2013, WTD staff worked with the E&P subcommittee to review and update the planning assumptions for wastewater flow forecasting in 2013. As a part of this process, the decision was made to use a 50-year planning horizon. Fifty years was considered as a reasonable timeframe for modeling future wastewater flows.</i></p>

Existing <u>Long-Term</u> Wastewater Planning Policies K.C.C 28.86.130	Task Force Proposed Amendments as of May 29, 2015	Task Force Comments/Discussion	Sub-committees and full MWPAAC comments
		<p>information on WTD’s long-range capital program, and there was reference to the report that was completed in 2013 on various options to meet this need. This is a topic to keep in mind during discussion of the reporting policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was discussion on the timing of RWSP updates; there was general agreement that the RWSP should be updated at least every ten years to coincide with the information gathered from decennial flow monitoring and other planning update; this will help to bring all the planning/program elements together. • There was discussion that the most recent RWSP update discusses future solids capacity needs. It was noted that there isn’t anything in the treatment plant policies(TPPs) that discusses time frame for looking at treatment plant capacity needs, and the task force asked that WTD staff add information to the TPPs for the Task Force to review in the April meeting (see updated TPPs). 	
<p>WWPP-1: King County shall plan comprehensively to provide for the design and construction of facilities that meet the wastewater system needs of the service area and shall coordinate with other local jurisdictions to ensure that construction-related disruption to neighborhoods is minimized.</p>	<p><u>New WWPP-1: The executive shall continue to conduct ongoing planning and updates of the RWSP and its corresponding policies. At a minimum, the RWSP shall be reviewed and updated every ten years to correspond with updated federal census information and regional population and employment forecasts. When specific wastewater program elements are updated, such as the combined sewer overflow program or the conveyance system improvement program, the county shall incorporate applicable updated information into the RWSP and corresponding policies.</u></p>	<p><i>April 23, 2015 discussion:</i> There was discussion on what constitutes an update of the RWSP. Task Force members noted they wanted to be sure that as a sub-program element is updated, then the RWSP is also updated.</p> <p><i>WTD staff attempted to capture this discussion in new 28.86.040 above.</i> ***** <i>The updated language is WTD staff’s attempt to capture the Task Force March 17 discussion about timing and purpose of RWSP updates.</i></p>	<p><i>June 4, 2015 E&P subcommittee discussion:</i> There was a question on whether or not the policy should state “The executive shall...” or “WTD shall...” at the beginning of the policy.</p>
<p>WWPP-2: In planning future wastewater systems, King County shall make a long-term assessment of wastewater system needs.</p>	<p><u>New WWPP-2:</u> <u>To comprehensively assess and plan for wastewater system needs, the county shall at a minimum</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>take into account the need to accommodate build-out population when considering the size of facilities needed;</u> • <u>take into account the condition of existing assets when expansion or upgrade needs are identified;</u> • <u>consider the use of alternative or new technologies;</u> • <u>consider the potential for future regulatory requirements;</u> • <u>consider the potential for phasing facilities to meet identified needs;</u> 	<p><i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> Task Force members made a word change in the second bullet, which is now reflected in the new WWPP-2.</p> <p><i>May 12, 2015 discussion:</i> WTD staff had included new WWPP-2 in new WWPP-1. Task Force members felt this portion should be a separate policy, and they asked that WTD staff add additional parameters to the list.</p> <p><i>March 17, 2015 discussion:</i> The Task Force suggested deleting this policy; the intent of the policy is now covered in the proposed amended WWPP-1.</p>	<p><i>June 4, 2015 E&P subcommittee discussion:</i> There was a comment that these same factors should be considered when designing a facility.</p>

Existing <u>Long-Term</u> Wastewater Planning Policies K.C.C 28.86.130	Task Force Proposed Amendments as of May 29, 2015	Task Force Comments/Discussion	Sub-committees and full MWPAAC comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>work collaboratively with component agencies and local jurisdictions;</u> • <u>look for opportunities to achieve cost savings and operational and other efficiencies; and</u> • <u>carry out planning efforts in conformance with RWSP policies, and local, state, and federal rules and regulations.</u> 		
WWPP-3: In planning for facilities, King County shall work collaboratively with other jurisdictions and look for opportunities to achieve cost savings.	((WWPP-3: In planning for facilities, King County shall work collaboratively with other jurisdictions and look for opportunities to achieve cost savings.))	<p><i>May 12, 2015 discussion:</i> The intent of this policy is incorporated into New WWSP-2.</p> <p><i>March 17, 2015 discussion:</i> Task Force members suggested making the reference of “working collaboratively with ...” consistent with the language in the Public Involvement Policies. Members also suggested adding “and operational and other efficiencies” to the last sentence.</p>	
WWPP-4: Facility sizing shall take into account the need to accommodate build-out population.	((WWPP-4: Facility sizing shall take into account the need to accommodate build-out population.))	<p><i>May 12, 2015 discussion:</i> The intent of this policy is incorporated into New WWSP-2.</p> <p><i>April 23, 2015 discussion:</i> There was discussion on whether or not “build-out” needs to be defined. Some members noted that it is a term of art that is understood. (the policy is incorporated in 28.86.040 above)</p>	
WWPP-5: RWSP review processes. King County shall monitor the implementation of the RWSP and conduct reviews of the RWSP as outlined in K.C.C. 28.86.165.	WWPP- (5) <u>3</u> : RWSP review processes. King County shall monitor the implementation of the RWSP and conduct reviews of the RWSP as outlined in K.C.C. 28.86.165.	<p><i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> This policy should be looked at again after the review of the reporting policies is completed.</p> <p><i>April 23, 2015 discussion:</i> There was a comment to change “King County” to “The executive”. (The intent of this policy is incorporated in 28.86.040 above.)</p>	<p><i>June 4, 2015 E&P subcommittee discussion:</i> It was noted that this policy needed to be re-numbered to WWPP-3, this correction is now reflected in the policy.</p>