

MWPAAC RWSP Policy Review Task Force
Discussion/Proposed Amendments
Sustainability and Innovation Policies
WORKING DRAFT

	MWPAAC RWSP Policy Review Task Force Proposed Amendments as of July 10, 2015	Task Force Comments/Discussion	Subcommittee/Full MWPAAC Comments
	<p><u>Background and Overarching Policy Guidance. King County’s Strategic Plan includes goals and objectives to plan for long-term sustainability. WTD defines sustainability as the long-term viability, health, and robustness of environmental, social, and economic systems. Healthy natural environments; equity, social justice and vibrant communities; cost-effective capital investments, operations, and maintenance; and resilience to future disruptions and climate adaption are all components of long-term sustainability.</u></p> <p><u>The county places a high priority on reducing the environmental footprint of its operations, safeguarding and enhancing King County’s natural resources and environment, and integrating equity and social justice in all county actions and decisions.</u></p> <p><u>The following policy statements provide overarching guidance to the county’s wastewater treatment division in its efforts to meet these goals.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>The county’s wastewater treatment division shall continue to use sustainable practices, to the extent appropriate, in the design, construction, operations and maintenance of its facilities.</u>• <u>The county’s wastewater treatment division shall continue to incorporate equity and social justice considerations in its business practices and decision-making processes, and in the design, construction, and operations of its facilities.</u>• <u>The county’s wastewater treatment division shall continue to investigate and evaluate new technologies and ways of doing business, including potential projects, in order to increase the regional wastewater system’s resiliency and sustainability, and continue to protect the financial health of the regional wastewater system and ratepayer investments and provide due consideration of all impacts.</u>• <u>The county shall continue to recover, reuse, and distribute resources, such as biosolids, energy, and reclaimed water, from the wastewater treatment process, and shall evaluate the potential for additional resource recovery opportunities.</u>• <u>The county shall continue to work with its component agencies and other local, state, and national entities to develop and implement strategies for climate change adaption.</u>• <u>The county shall continue its long-standing</u>	<p><i>July 10, 2015 discussion:</i> WTD staff explained that the definition provided is WTD’s sustainability team’s definition. The Task Force suggested that the policy should note that this is WTD’s definition.</p> <p><i>June 19, 2015 discussion:</i> The Task Force asked WTD staff to provide further definition to the term “sustainability”, and to be more specific on why this section focuses on biosolids, energy, and reclaimed water policies. <i>The updated language provides further definition.</i></p> <p>The Task Force brought up the numbering of policies. WTD staff will obtain guidance from the Code Reviser on this topic. *****</p> <p><i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> In general, the Task Force members thought the background paragraph is okay. There was discussion on how this section should be numbered, and members felt that it would be best to leave that to King County to determine.</p> <p>Some members wanted the word “sustainability” to be more defined and noted it is a “buzz” word. Others felt it isn’t necessary to have a specific definition.</p> <p>There was discussion on whether or not this policy section should provide the policies, procedures, guidance on rainwater harvesting, composting toilets, etc. and other private development decisions that could result in impacts to revenue. Some felt these kinds of questions are financing issues. Others mentioned it might be helpful to encourage King County to establish a process to provide guidance on the growth of when these kinds of development practices become the norm. Others noted it is up to the local jurisdictions on how flow is reported.</p> <p>Members noted that these kinds of issues have been raised over the past few years and that it is something to discuss at the Engineering and Planning Subcommittee. Another topic to discuss is consistency in reporting flows; it was noted that this is an item being discussed in the contracts committee – there was general agreement that the contracts committee is a more appropriate arena for these topics.</p>	<p><i>Full MWPAAC approved the Task Force recommendations along with the subcommittees recommendations at its August 26, 2015 meeting. In addition, full MWPAAC changed the word “maximize” to “optimize” in</i></p> <p><i>E&P and Rates and Finance August 6, 2015 recommendations:</i> Make the following change to the third bullet in the explanatory material (delete “and” in front of “continue to protect”). They noted there are too many “ands” in this bullet.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>The county’s wastewater treatment division shall continue to investigate and evaluate new technologies and ways of doing business, including potential projects, in order to increase the regional wastewater system’s resiliency and sustainability, ((and)) continue to protect the financial health of the regional wastewater system and ratepayer investments, and provide due consideration of all impacts.</u>

	MWPAAC RWSP Policy Review Task Force Proposed Amendments as of July 10, 2015	Task Force Comments/Discussion	Subcommittee/Full MWPAAC Comments
	<p><u>commitment to research and development funding relating to water quality and technologies for the wastewater system.</u></p> <p><u>The county’s efforts to recover and reuse resources from the wastewater process, such as biosolids, energy, and reclaimed water, help meet the county’s sustainability goals and increase the regional wastewater system’s resiliency to potential future disruptions and climate change. Because of this, specific policies that guide the continuation of these efforts are ((listed below)) included as part of the sustainability and innovations policies section. As new technologies and sustainability efforts are developed, additional new policies may be added to this section.</u></p>		

Existing Biosolids Policies King County Code 28.86.090	MWPAAC RWSP Policy Review Task Force Proposed Amendments as of July 10, 2015	Task Force Comments/Discussion	Subcommittee/Full MWPAAC Comments
A. Explanatory material. The biosolids policies are intended to guide the county to continue to produce and market class B biosolids. The county will also continue to evaluate alternative technologies so as to produce the highest quality marketable biosolids. This would include technologies that produce class A biosolids.	<u>Sustainability and Innovations Biosolids Policies (SIBP) explanatory material. The county has been recycling biosolids for beneficial uses since the 1970s. Biosolids are the nutrient-rich organic products of the wastewater treatment process and return valuable nutrients and carbon to the land that enriches soils and keeps them productive. The county’s biosolids are produced and used in accordance with federal, state and local regulations. The use of the county’s biosolids helps offset the regional wastewater system’s greenhouse gas emissions and is an important component in meeting the county’s sustainability goals. The SIBP are intended to guide the county to continue recycling all of the regional wastewater treatment system’s biosolids for beneficial uses and seek ways to maximize the carbon sequestration benefits of biosolids recycling.</u>	<i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> Task Force members suggested some grammatical changes. Others mentioned that it might be better to move the language from Biosolids Policy-5 to the explanatory material. WTD staff added that language to the explanatory material. (BP-5: The county produces and uses biosolids in accordance with federal, state and local regulations.)	<i>E&P and Rates and Finance Aug. 6, 2015 recommended changes in black:</i> <u>Sustainability and Innovations Biosolids Policies (SIBP) explanatory material. The county has been recycling biosolids for beneficial uses since the 1970s. Biosolids are the nutrient-rich organic products of the wastewater treatment process. ((and)) They return valuable nutrients and carbon to the land, ((that enriches))enriching soils and increasing its productivity. ((keeps them productive)). The county’s biosolids are produced and used in accordance with federal, state and local regulations. The use of the county’s biosolids helps offset the regional wastewater system’s greenhouse gas emissions and is an important component in meeting the county’s sustainability goals. The SIBP are intended to guide the county as it continues to ((to continue)) recycling all ((of)) the regional wastewater treatment system’s biosolids for beneficial uses and seek ways to maximize the carbon sequestration benefits of biosolids recycling.</u>
BP-1: King County shall strive to achieve beneficial use of wastewater solids. A beneficial use can be any use that proves to be environmentally safe, economically sound and utilizes the advantageous qualities of the material.	<u>S</u> IBP-1: King County shall strive to achieve beneficial use of wastewater solids. A beneficial use can be any use that proves to be environmentally safe, economically sound and utilizes the advantageous qualities of the material.	<i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> The Task Force preferred the original policy language, so no changes are being suggested.	
BP-2: Biosolids-derived products should be used as a soil amendment in landscaping projects funded by King County.	((BP-2: Biosolids-derived products should be used as a soil amendment in landscaping projects funded by King County.)) <u>S</u> IBP- ((6)) 52: King County shall ((strive to)) produce the highest quality biosolids economically and practically achievable and shall continue efforts to reduce trace metals in biosolids consistent with 40 C.F.R. Part 503 pollutant concentration levels (exceptional quality) for individual metals. The county shall continue to provide class B biosolids and also to explore technologies that may enable the county to generate class A biosolids cost-effectively or because they have better marketability. ((Future)) ((d)) Decisions about technology, transportation and distribution shall be based on marketability of biosolids products.	<i>June 19, 2015 discussion:</i> The Task Force recommended moving amended BP-2 to be BP-5, and move BP-5 to be BP-2. ***** <i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> WTD Biosolids Program staff had suggested some language changes to the policy; the Task Force made some edits to the proposed policy changes, while keeping the intent of the policy.	<i>E&P and Rates and Finance Aug. 6, 2015 recommended changes (in dark blue):</i> <u>S</u> IBP- ((6)) 52: King County shall ((strive to)) produce the highest quality biosolids economically and practically achievable and shall continue efforts to reduce trace metals in biosolids consistent with 40 C.F.R. Part 503 pollutant concentration levels (exceptional quality) for individual metals. The county shall continue to provide class B biosolids. <u>The county shall</u> ((and)) also ((to)) explore technologies that may enable the county to generate class A biosolids cost-effectively, <u>which may have</u> ((or because they have)) better marketability. ((Future)) ((d)) Decisions about technology, transportation and distribution shall be based on marketability of biosolids products. ***** <i>Discussion from Aug. 6, 2015 meeting:</i> <i>There was also a comment about adding the avoidance of climate-impact related fines as an additional intent behind this policy.</i>
BP-3: King County shall consider new and innovative technologies for wastewater solids processing, energy recovery, and beneficial uses brought forward by public or private interests. King County shall seek to advance the beneficial use of wastewater solids, effluent, and methane gas through	<u>S</u> IBP-3: King County shall consider new and innovative technologies for wastewater solids processing, energy recovery, and beneficial uses brought forward by public or private interests. King County shall seek to advance the beneficial use of wastewater solids, effluent, and methane gas through	<i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> No changes were made to this policy.	

Existing Biosolids Policies King County Code 28.86.090	MWPAAC RWSP Policy Review Task Force Proposed Amendments as of July 10, 2015	Task Force Comments/Discussion	Subcommittee/Full MWPAAC Comments
research and demonstration projects.	research and demonstration projects.		
BP-4: King County shall seek to maximize program reliability and minimize risk by one or more of the following: 1. maintaining reserve capacity to manage approximately one hundred fifty percent of projected volume of biosolids; 2. considering diverse technologies, end products, and beneficial uses; or 3. pursuing contractual protections including interlocal agreements, where appropriate.	<u>SIBP-4:</u> King County shall seek to maximize program reliability and minimize risk by one or more of the following: 1. maintaining reserve capacity to manage approximately one hundred fifty percent of projected volume of biosolids; 2. considering diverse technologies, end products, and beneficial uses; or 3. pursuing contractual protections including interlocal agreements, where appropriate.	<i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> WTD Biosolids Program staff had suggested one change to this policy in #3. The Task Force noted the policy as written seemed to make more sense. In reviewing the change, WTD staff concur that the original policy should remain as is.	
BP-5: King County shall produce and use biosolids in accordance with federal, state and local regulations.	((BP-5: King County shall produce and use biosolids in accordance with federal, state and local regulations.))	<i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> There was discussion on whether or not this policy is really needed, as it states the obvious. Some members suggested moving this to the explanatory material. Others suggested that this should be part of a general statement to guide the RWSP that comes before all the policies. WTD staff moved the statement to the explanatory material.	
BP-6: King County shall strive to produce the highest quality biosolids economically and practically achievable and shall continue efforts to reduce trace metals in biosolids consistent with 40 C.F.R. Part 503 pollutant concentration levels (exceptional quality) for individual metals. The county shall continue to provide class B biosolids and also to explore technologies that may enable the county to generate class A biosolids cost-effectively or because they have better marketability. Future decisions about technology, transportation and distribution shall be based on marketability of biosolids products.	<u>SIBP-((6))5: Landscaping projects funded by King County shall use products derived from King County’s biosolids as a soil amendment, consistent with applicable rules and regulations.</u> ((King County shall strive to produce the highest quality biosolids economically and practically achievable and shall continue efforts to reduce trace metals in biosolids consistent with 40 C.F.R. Part 503 pollutant concentration levels (exceptional quality) for individual metals. The county shall continue to provide class B biosolids and also to explore technologies that may enable the county to generate class A biosolids cost-effectively or because they have better marketability. Future decisions about technology, transportation and distribution shall be based on marketability of biosolids products.))	<i>June 19, 2015 discussion:</i> Per Task Force recommendation, the new BP-2 language is moved to BP-5, and new BP-5 language is moved to be BP-2. ***** <i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> The changes shown reflect the May 29 discussion.	<i>E&P and Rates and Finance Aug. 6, 2015 recommended changes (to change the word “shall” to “should”):</i> <u>SIBP-((6))5: Landscaping projects funded by King County ((shall)) should use products derived from King County’s biosolids as a soil amendment, consistent with applicable rules and regulations.</u> ***** <i>Discussion from Aug. 6, 2015 meeting:</i> Committee members noted that there is support for landscaping only, and not for natural restoration soil amendment purposes.
BP-7: When biosolids derived products are distributed outside the wastewater service area, the county shall require that local sponsors using the products secure any permits required by the local government body.	((BP-7: When biosolids derived products are distributed outside the wastewater service area, the county shall require that local sponsors using the products secure any permits required by the local government body.))	<i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> WTD staff suggested deleting this policy as it is outdated and does not reflect current permit conditions. Task Force members asked for more information on the permits and when King County is no longer responsible for the products. <i>WTD staff will check with its Biosolids Program experts and should have this information at the June 19 meeting.</i>	
BP-8: King County shall work cooperatively with statewide organizations on biosolids issues.	<u>SIBP-(8)6:</u> King County shall work cooperatively with <u>national and</u> state(wide) organizations on biosolids issues.	<i>June 19, 2015 discussion:</i> Task Force members suggested adding national to state organizations. ***** <i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> No changes suggested.	<i>E&P and Rates and Finance Aug. 6, 2015 recommended changes (to change the word “shall” to “should”):</i> SIBP-(8)6: King County (shall) <u>should</u> work cooperatively with national and state(wide) organizations on biosolids issues.
BP-9: King County shall seek to minimize the noise and odor impact associated with processing, transporting and applying of biosolids, consistent with constraints of economic and environmental considerations and giving due regard to neighboring communities.	<u>SIBP-(9)7:</u> King County shall seek to minimize the noise and odor impact associated with processing, transporting and applying of biosolids, consistent with constraints of economic and environmental considerations and giving due regard to	<i>May 29, 2015 discussion</i> No changes suggested.	

Existing Biosolids Policies King County Code 28.86.090	MWPAAC RWSP Policy Review Task Force Proposed Amendments as of July 10, 2015	Task Force Comments/Discussion	Subcommittee/Full MWPAAC Comments
	neighboring communities.		
BP-10: Where cost-effective, King County shall beneficially use methane produced at the treatment plants for energy and other purposes.	((BP-10: Where cost-effective, King County shall beneficially use methane produced at the treatment plants for energy and other purposes.))	<i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> WTD staff suggested deleting this policy, as the intent of this policy will be covered in the new energy policies section.	
	Possible NEW policy: <u>SIBP-8: King County shall seek uses for its biosolids that maximize the carbon sequestration benefits of biosolids recycling, where financially and fiscally appropriate.</u>	<i>July 10, 2015 discussion:</i> The Task Force noted that it’s not necessary to have both “financially and fiscally” in the policy. Members preferred the word “fiscally”. <i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> WTD staff suggested adding this policy; carbon sequestration is an important benefit of biosolids recycling and helps meet the county’s sustainability goals. Some task force members asked about the implication of this policy; some felt it is too open? <i>WTD staff discussed this with its Biosolids Program experts. Staff suggested adding this policy because carbon sequestration is an important component of the County’s Strategic Climate Action and the King County Comprehensive Plan.</i>	

WTD Staff Thoughts on New Energy Policies	MWPAAC RWSP Policy Review Task Force Proposed Amendments as of July 10, 2015	Task Force Comments/Discussion	Subcommittee/Full MWPAAC Comments
	<p>Sustainability and Innovations Energy Policies (SIEP) Explanatory Material.</p> <p><u>Implementing energy efficiency measures are important tools in helping to achieve the county’s environmental sustainability goals, reduce or offset the county’s greenhouse gas emissions and reduce energy costs.</u></p> <p><u>The SIEP are intended to guide the county in continuing to produce, use, and sell energy generated from its wastewater treatment process; use other renewable energy sources in its wastewater facilities; and investigate and evaluate additional energy-related resource recovery opportunities.</u></p>	<p><i>June 19, 2015 discussion:</i> Task Force members recommended adding the words “and reduce energy costs”, to show that a benefit of energy recovery is also financial.</p> <p>*****</p> <p><i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> Task Force members suggested the changes shown in the second column.</p>	<p><i>E&P and Rates and Finance Aug. 6, 2015 recommended changes (in black):</i></p> <p><u>Sustainability and Innovations Energy Policies (SIEP) Explanatory Material. Implementing energy efficiency measures ((are)) is an important tool((s)) to ((in--))help ((ing to)) achieve the county’s environmental sustainability goals, and reduce or offset the county’s greenhouse gas emissions, and reduce energy costs.</u></p>
	<p><u>SIEP-1. To achieve the county’s environmental sustainability goals and reduce or offset the county’s greenhouse gas emissions, the county shall continue to use biogas as a renewable energy source.</u></p>	<p><i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> The Task Force suggested adding this statement as the first policy.</p>	
	<p><u>SIEP-2. The county’s wastewater treatment division shall continue to produce, use, and sell energy generated from its wastewater treatment process to the maximum extent possible.</u></p>	<p><i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> No changes suggested.</p>	
	<p><u>SIEP-3. The county shall evaluate sewage heat recovery technologies and partnership opportunities to optimize heat recovery from the county’s wastewater conveyance system.</u></p>	<p><i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> No changes suggested.</p>	
	<p><u>SIEP-4. The county shall continue to conduct energy audits of its wastewater facilities and evaluate ways to reduce energy use through continuous improvements in facility and equipment efficiency.</u></p>	<p><i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> No changes suggested.</p>	
	<p><u>SIEP-5. When considering investments in energy efficiency and renewable energy, the county shall consider the equipment’s energy efficiency, the potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and lifecycle cost effectiveness.</u></p>	<p><i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> No changes suggested.</p>	<p><i>E&P and Rates and Finance Recommended Changes (in black):</i></p> <p><u>SIEP-5. ((When considering investments in energy efficiency and renewable energy, t))The county shall consider the equipment’s energy efficiency, the potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and lifecycle cost effectiveness in an effort to promote energy efficiency and renewable energy.</u></p>

Existing Water Reuse Polices; K.C.C 28.86.100	MWPAAC RWSP Policy Review Task Force Proposed Amendments as of July 10, 2015	Comments/Discussion	Subcommittee/Full Committee Comments
<p>A. Explanatory material. The water reuse policies are intended to guide the county in continuing to develop its program to produce reclaimed water. The county will coordinate its program with regional water supply plans and work with state agencies and local jurisdictions on opportunities for water reuse. The county will implement pilot and demonstration projects. Additional projects shall be implemented subject to economic and financial feasibility assessments, including assessing environmental benefits and costs.</p> <p>The water reuse policies, as in the treatment plant policies, intend that the county continue producing reclaimed water at its treatment plants. The treatment plant policies also address the potential construction of one or more satellite plants. These small plants would provide reclaimed water, with the solids being transferred to the regional plants for processing.</p>	<p>((A. Explanatory material. The water reuse policies are intended to guide the county in continuing to develop its program to produce reclaimed water. The county will coordinate its program with regional water supply plans and work with state agencies and local jurisdictions on opportunities for water reuse. The county will implement pilot and demonstration projects. Additional projects shall be implemented subject to economic and financial feasibility assessments, including assessing environmental benefits and costs.</p> <p>———— The water reuse policies, as in the treatment plant policies, intend that the county continue producing reclaimed water at its treatment plants. The treatment plant policies also address the potential construction of one or more satellite plants. These small plants would provide reclaimed water, with the solids being transferred to the regional plants for processing.))</p> <p><u>Sustainability and Innovation Reclaimed Water Policies (SIRWP) Explanatory material. King County’s Wastewater Treatment Division (WTD) has been producing, using, and distributing reclaimed water for on-site and off-site uses since 1997. The production and use of reclaimed water addresses the County’s sustainability and environmental goals, and builds resiliency for future changing conditions. In addition, the production and use of reclaimed water helps meet Washington State’s goal to reduce reliance on the receiving waters of the state for effluent discharge and is part of the state’s strategy to extend potable water reserves and to restore the health of Puget Sound. The SIRWP reclaimed water policies are intended to provide guidance to WTD’s reclaimed water program to continue to meet these goals.</u></p>	<p><i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> No additional changes were suggested to WTD staff’s changes.</p> <p>8-26-15 MWPAAC discussion: Clarify that the state interest is DNR.</p>	
<p>WRP-1: King County shall actively pursue the use of reclaimed water while protecting the public health and safety and the environment. The county shall facilitate the development of a water reuse program to help meet the goals of the county to preserve water supplies within the region and to ensure that any reclaimed water reintroduced into the environment will protect the water quality of the receiving water body and the aquatic environment.</p>	<p>((WRP-1: King County shall <u>continue to</u> ((actively)) pursue the use of reclaimed water while protecting the public health and safety and the environment. ((The county shall facilitate the development of a water reuse program to help meet the goals of the county to preserve water supplies within the region and to ensure that any reclaimed water reintroduced into the environment will protect the water quality of the receiving water body and the aquatic environment.))</p>	<p><i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> WTD staff suggests these amendments to WRP-1. The portion deleted is due to the county has a developed reclaimed water program and the goals are now listed in the proposed new explanatory material. Because WA State Dept of Ecology uses the term “reclaimed water”, staff also suggests using “reclaimed water” in place of “water reuse”. The Task Force did not suggest any additional changes</p>	
<p>WRP-2: By December 2007, the King County executive shall prepare for review by council a reclaimed water feasibility study as part of a regional water supply plan which will include a comprehensive financial business plan including tasks and schedule for the development of a water reuse program and a process to coordinate with affected tribal and local governments, the state and area citizens. The reclaimed water feasibility study shall be reviewed by the RWQC. At a minimum the feasibility study shall comply with chapter 90.46 RCW and include:</p>	<p>((WRP-2: By December 2007, the King County executive shall prepare for review by council a reclaimed water feasibility study as part of a regional water supply plan which will include a comprehensive financial business plan including tasks and schedule for the development of a water reuse program and a process to coordinate with affected tribal and local governments, the state and area citizens. The reclaimed water feasibility study shall be reviewed by the RWQC. At a minimum the feasibility study shall comply with chapter 90.46 RCW and include:</p>	<p><i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> WTD staff suggests this policy be deleted as it has been fully implemented. The reclaimed water feasibility study was issued in March 2008 and reviewed by the Regional Water Quality Committee in April 2008. The Task Force members wondered if there should be a statement somewhere about updating programs like reclaimed water on a regular basis.</p>	

Existing Water Reuse Polices; K.C.C 28.86.100	MWPAAC RWSP Policy Review Task Force Proposed Amendments as of July 10, 2015	Comments/Discussion	Subcommittee/Full Committee Comments
1. Review of new technologies for feasibility and cost effectiveness, that may be applicable for future wastewater planning; 2. Review of revenue sources other than the wastewater rate for distribution of reused water; 3. Detailed review and an update of a regional market analysis for reused water; 4. Review of possible environmental benefits of reused water; and 5. Review of regional benefits of reused water.	1. Review of new technologies for feasibility and cost effectiveness, that may be applicable for future wastewater planning; 2. Review of revenue sources other than the wastewater rate for distribution of reused water; 3. Detailed review and an update of a regional market analysis for reused water; 4. Review of possible environmental benefits of reused water; and 5. Review of regional benefits of reused water.))		
WRP-3: Recycling and reusing reclaimed water shall be investigated as a possible future significant new source of water to enhance or maintain fish runs, supply additional water for the region’s nonpotable uses, preserve environmental and aesthetic values and defer the need to develop new potable water supply projects.	((WRP-3: Recycling and reusing reclaimed water shall be investigated as a possible future significant new source of water to enhance or maintain fish runs, supply additional water for the region’s nonpotable uses, preserve environmental and aesthetic values and defer the need to develop new potable water supply projects.)) <u>SIRWP-2: The County shall continue to investigate potential uses for its reclaimed water, such as wetland or stream flow enhancement, groundwater recharge, support for local sustainable agriculture, irrigation purposes, industrial uses, and commercial uses.</u>	<i>June 19, 2015 discussion:</i> Task Force members wondered what is meant by “local sustainable agriculture”, and if an agricultural entity was interested in purchasing reclaimed water, would it matter if it was “sustainable” or not. Task Force members suggested deleting that word. ***** <i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> The language reflects the May 29 discussion.	<i>E&P and Rates and Finance Recommended Changes (in black):</i> <u>SIRWP-2: The County shall continue to investigate potential uses for its reclaimed water, such as wetland or stream flow enhancement, groundwater recharge and support for local sustainable agriculture, irrigation ((purposes)), industrial ((uses)), and commercial uses.</u>
WRP-4: King County’s water reuse program and projects shall be coordinated with the regional water supply plans and regional basin plans, in accordance with state and federal standards. The coordination shall be done with the affected water supply purveyors. Water reuse must be coordinated with water supply/resource purveyors to ensure that resources are developed in a manner complementary with each other to allow the most effective management of resources in the county.	((WRP-4: King County’s water reuse program and projects shall be coordinated with the regional water supply plans and regional basin plans, in accordance with state and federal standards. The coordination shall be done with the affected water supply purveyors. Water reuse must be coordinated with water supply/resource purveyors to ensure that resources are developed in a manner complementary with each other to allow the most effective management of resources in the county.)) <u>SIRWP-3: King County’s reclaimed water program shall coordinate with regional planning efforts, in accordance with state and federal standards. The county shall coordinate with affected water purveyors regarding potential reclaimed water projects to ensure that projects are developed in a complementary and collaborative manner and allow for effective management of resources.</u>	<i>July 10, 2015 discussion:</i> Task Force members made a grammatical correction to the policy. <i>June 19, 2015 discussion:</i> Task Force members added the language “and allows for effective management of resources” to the end of the policy statement. <i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> WTD staff suggested tightening up the language in the original policy, while keeping the intent of the policy. No additional changes were suggested.	
WRP-5: King County shall implement nonpotable projects on a case-by-case basis. To evaluate nonpotable projects, King County shall develop criteria which will include, but are not limited to: capital, operation and maintenance costs; cost recovery; potential and proposed uses; rate and capacity charge impacts; environmental benefits; fisheries habitat maintenance and enhancement potential; community and social benefits and impacts; public education opportunities; risk and liability; demonstration of new technologies; and	((WRP-5: King County shall implement nonpotable projects on a case-by-case basis. To evaluate nonpotable projects, King County shall develop criteria which will include, but are not limited to: capital, operation and maintenance costs; cost recovery; potential and proposed uses; rate and capacity charge impacts; environmental benefits; fisheries habitat maintenance and enhancement potential; community and social benefits and impacts; public education opportunities; risk and liability; demonstration of new technologies; and	<i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> WTD staff suggested shortening the policy, while keeping the intent of the policy intact. Task Force members asked about if any controls should be in place for factors that are outside of what WTD should be doing.	<i>Full MWPAAC Aug. 2015 discussion and approved change:</i> Change the word “maximize” to “optimize”. <i>E&P and Rates and Finance Aug. 6, 2015 Recommended Change (to bullet the list of items in place of commas):</i> <u>SIRWP-4: King County shall implement its reclaimed water program to maximize use of the county’s existing reclaimed water systems and develop new projects as opportunities</u>

Existing Water Reuse Polices; K.C.C 28.86.100	MWPAAC RWSP Policy Review Task Force Proposed Amendments as of July 10, 2015	Comments/Discussion	Subcommittee/Full Committee Comments
enhancing economic development. A detailed financial analysis of the overall costs and benefits of a water reuse project shall include cost estimates for the capital and operations associated with a project, the anticipated or existing contracts for purchases of reused water, including agricultural and other potential uses, anticipated costs for potable water when the project becomes operational; and estimates regarding recovery of capital costs from new reused water customers versus costs to be assumed by existing ratepayers and new customers paying the capacity charge. Water reuse projects that require major capital funding shall be reviewed by RWQC and approved by the council.	enhancing economic development. A detailed financial analysis of the overall costs and benefits of a water reuse project shall include cost estimates for the capital and operations associated with a project, the anticipated or existing contracts for purchases of reused water, including agricultural and other potential uses, anticipated costs for potable water when the project becomes operational; and estimates regarding recovery of capital costs from new reused water customers versus costs to be assumed by existing ratepayers and new customers paying the capacity charge. Water reuse projects that require major capital funding shall be reviewed by RWQC and approved by the council.)) <u>SIRWP-4: King County shall implement its reclaimed water program to maximize use of the county’s existing reclaimed water systems and develop new projects as opportunities emerge. When evaluating projects King County shall consider factors such as capital costs, operation and maintenance costs, potential and proposed uses, rate and capacity charge impacts, environmental benefits, fisheries habitat maintenance and enhancement potential, community and social benefits and impacts, public education opportunities, reduction of future regulatory risk and discharge limitations, demonstration of new technologies, and enhanced economic development.</u>		<u>emerge. When evaluating projects King County shall consider factors such as</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>capital costs</u>• <u>operation and maintenance costs</u>• <u>potential and proposed uses</u>• <u>rate and capacity charge impacts</u>• <u>environmental benefits</u>• <u>fisheries habitat maintenance and enhancement</u>• <u>potential, community and social benefits and impacts</u>• <u>public education opportunities</u>• <u>reduction of future regulatory risk and discharge limitations</u>• <u>demonstration of new technologies</u>• <u>enhanced economic development.</u>
WRP-6: King County shall work with local water purveyors, including when the local purveyors update their water comprehensive plans, to evaluate the opportunities for water reuse within their local service area.	((WRP-6)) <u>SIRWP-5: King County shall work with local water purveyors, including when the local purveyors update their water comprehensive plans, to evaluate the opportunities for reclaimed water ((reuse)) within their local service area.</u>	<i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> No changes proposed (changes reflect re-numbering of policies and using the term “reclaimed water” in place of “water reuse”).	<i>E&P and Rates and Finance Aug. 6, 2015 recommended changes (to change “water comprehensive plans” to “water system plans”):</i> ((WRP-6)) <u>SIRWP-5: King County shall work with local water purveyors, including when the local purveyors update their water <u>system</u> ((comprehensive-))plans, to evaluate the opportunities for <u>reclaimed</u> water ((reuse)) within their local service area.</u> ***** <i>At the Aug. 6 meeting, there was also a comment that other plans related to sewer and water plans may be affected by this statement.</i>
WRP-7: King County shall develop an active water reuse public education and involvement program to correspond with the development of the water reuse program and be coordinated with other water conservation education programs.	((WRP-7: King County shall develop an active water reuse public education and involvement program to correspond with the development of the water reuse program and be coordinated with other water conservation education programs.))	<i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> WTD staff suggested deleting this policy; the intent is covered in the public involvement policies. No changes were discussed in May 29 meeting.	
WRP-8: King County shall utilize a forum or multiple forums to provide opportunities for coordination and communication with the Washington state Departments of Health and Ecology, which have the principal state regulatory roles in the planning, design and construction of reuse facilities. The county shall involve other parties on these forums, including but not	((WRP-8: King County shall utilize a forum or multiple forums to provide opportunities for coordination and communication with the Washington state Departments of Health and Ecology, which have the principal state regulatory roles in the planning, design and construction of reuse facilities. The county shall involve other parties on these forums, including	<i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> WTD staff suggested deleting this policy. No changes were discussed in May 29 meeting. The regulatory environment has changed to the point that these are no longer relevant.	

Existing Water Reuse Polices; K.C.C 28.86.100	MWPAAC RWSP Policy Review Task Force Proposed Amendments as of July 10, 2015	Comments/Discussion	Subcommittee/Full Committee Comments
limited to, the Corps of Engineers, Washington state Department of Fish and Wildlife, National Marine Fisheries Service, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, regional water suppliers, tribal governments, local water and wastewater districts, cities, local health departments, watershed forums and environmental and community groups.	but not limited to, the Corps of Engineers, Washington state Department of Fish and Wildlife, National Marine Fisheries Service, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, regional water suppliers, tribal governments, local water and wastewater districts, cities, local health departments, watershed forums and environmental and community groups.))		
WRP-9: King County shall work, on a case-by-case basis, with the Washington state Departments of Health and Ecology on water reuse projects including, but not limited to, those that are not specifically cited in the 1997 Department of Health and Ecology Water Reclamation and Reuse Standards.	((WRP-9: King County shall work, on a case-by-case basis, with the Washington state Departments of Health and Ecology on water reuse projects including, but not limited to, those that are not specifically cited in the 1997 Department of Health and Ecology Water Reclamation and Reuse Standards.))	<i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> WTD staff suggested deleting this policy. No changes were discussed at the May 29 meeting	
WRP-10: King County shall hold and maintain the exclusive right to any reclaimed water generated by the wastewater treatment plants of King County.	((WRP-10)) SIRWP-6: King County shall hold and maintain the exclusive right to any reclaimed water generated by the wastewater treatment plants of King County.	<i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> Task Force members discussed that the fact that agencies have to send all their wastewater to King County precludes the local agencies from doing reclaimed water. And if an agency were to produce reclaimed water, and sending less wastewater to the County system, what would happen, would they pay the same or less? It was noted that this is something being discussed in contracts subcommittee.	<i>E&P and Rates and Finance Aug. 6, 2015 discussion:</i> There was discussion regarding potential ownership of reclaimed water within local systems.
WRP-11: King County’s water reuse program projects shall not impair any existing water rights unless compensation or mitigation for such impairment is agreed to by the holder of the affected water rights.	((WRP-11)) SIRWP-7: King County’s reclaimed water ((reuse)) program projects shall not impair any existing water rights unless compensation or mitigation for such impairment is agreed to by the holder of the affected water rights.	<i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> No major changes suggested; updated numbering and use of “reclaimed water” in place of “water reuse”.	
WRP-12: King County shall retain the flexibility to produce and distribute reclaimed water at all treatment plants including retaining options to add additional levels of treatment.	((WRP-12)) SIRWP-8: King County shall retain the flexibility to produce and distribute reclaimed water at all treatment plants including retaining options to add additional levels of treatment.	<i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> There was discussion on whether or not the policy should state “for use” at all treatment plants. There were questions on what the intent of this policy was originally – was it just for the treatment plants or more broadly for the ability to produce and distribute reclaimed water elsewhere. WTD staff noted that this policy language is exactly the same as what was proposed in the Executive’s Preferred RWSP Plan dated April 1998.	
WRP-13: King County shall continue to evaluate potential funding of pilot-scale and water reuse projects, in whole or in part, from the wastewater utility rate base.	((WRP-13: King County shall continue to evaluate potential funding of pilot-scale and water reuse projects, in whole or in part, from the wastewater utility rate base.))	<i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> Most of the Task Force members felt this policy is not needed.	
WRP-14: King County shall complete an economic and financial feasibility assessment, including environmental benefits, of its water reuse program. The assessment shall include the analysis of marginal costs including stranded costs and benefits to estimate equitable cost splits between participating governmental agencies and utilities. The assessment shall also include a review of existing and planned water and wastewater facilities in an approved plan to ensure that water reuse facilities are justified when any resulting redundant capacity as well as other factors are taken into account.	((WRP-14: King County shall complete an economic and financial feasibility assessment, including environmental benefits, of its water reuse program. The assessment shall include the analysis of marginal costs including stranded costs and benefits to estimate equitable cost splits between participating governmental agencies and utilities. The assessment shall also include a review of existing and planned water and wastewater facilities in an approved plan to ensure that water reuse facilities are justified when any resulting redundant capacity as well as other factors are taken into account.))	<i>July 10, 2015 discussion:</i> The Task Force discussed the intent of this policy is to show that the program’s purpose and need will be examined on an ongoing basis. Some members noted that if there is no market for the program, it would be good to examine if the program is really necessary. The concept of zero-based budgeting was mentioned as an example. <i>June 19, 2015 discussion:</i> Task Force members noted that it would be helpful to have a policy that provides guidance for the county to continue to evaluate the economic and financial feasibility of the	<i>E&P and Rates and Finance Aug. 6, 2015 recommended change (to delete “see Reporting Policies”)</i> <u>SIRWP-9: Ongoing reviews and updates of the county’s reclaimed water program shall be included as part of the RWSP comprehensive reviews and updates. This review shall examine the purpose and need of this program and an assessment of the reclaimed water market to help determine the continued viability of the program. (see Reporting Policies)</u>

Existing Water Reuse Polices; K.C.C 28.86.100	MWPAAC RWSP Policy Review Task Force Proposed Amendments as of July 10, 2015	Comments/Discussion	Subcommittee/Full Committee Comments
	<u>SIRWP-9: Ongoing reviews and updates of the county's reclaimed water program shall be included as part of the RWSP comprehensive reviews and updates. This review shall examine the purpose and need of this program and an assessment of the reclaimed water market to help determine the continued viability of the program. (see Reporting Policies)</u>	reclaimed program on a periodic basis. There was discussion that there shouldn't be an assumption that the reclaimed water program will always exist – if there is no market for the water, it may not make financial or economic sense to have a program. <i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> WTD staff suggested deleting – this policy was similar to WRP-2, which has been fully implemented. There was discussion that perhaps this policy should be modified for periodic assessments to confirm the program is of value. There was also discussion that this concept could be added to the reporting policies. More discussion will occur at the June 19 meeting.	
WRP-15: King County should pursue development of a water reuse program to discharge reclaimed water to reduce freshwater consumption used in the operation of the Ballard Locks when environmental benefits and financial conditions merit this investment and new program.	((WRP-15: King County should pursue development of a water reuse program to discharge reclaimed water to reduce freshwater consumption used in the operation of the Ballard Locks when environmental benefits and financial conditions merit this investment and new program.))	<i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> WTD staff suggests deleting. The intent is incorporated in RWP-2.	
	<u>SIRWP-10: ((Decisions to determine cost share allocation of reclaimed water projects will be guided by the principle that the)). The full cost of constructing, maintaining and operating a reclaimed water project shall be allocated, to the extent possible, among groups in proportion to the benefits received.</u> <u>a. Wastewater ratepayers shall ((only)) financially contribute to reclaimed water projects to the extent the project benefits the wastewater system.</u> <u>b. Costs associated with a project that benefits only one or a subset of contract customers will be allocated to those customers specifically.</u>	<i>June 19, 2015 discussion:</i> Task Force members made some adjustments to the language in Guiding Principle #3 of the Reclaimed Water Guiding Principles to be more policy-type language. There were questions on what “a.” is really trying to say. <i>May 29, 2015 discussion:</i> Task Force members suggested adding this policy. It is the same language as Guiding Principle #3 of the Reclaimed Water Guiding Principles discussed in the regional negotiations team and tentatively finalized on Oct. 8, 2014.	<i>E&P and Rates and Finance Committee Aug. 6, 2015 discussion:</i> There was discussion regarding existing contracts and whether the full costs of generating reclaimed water is being recovered.
From Task Force Discussion on Treatment Plant policies TPP-5: King County shall undertake studies to determine whether it is economically and environmentally feasible to discharge reclaimed water to systems such as the Lake Washington and Lake Sammamish watersheds including the Ballard Locks.	((TPP-5: King County shall undertake studies to determine whether it is economically and environmentally feasible to discharge reclaimed water to systems such as the Lake Washington and Lake Sammamish watersheds including the Ballard Locks.))	<i>May 29, 2015 discussion</i> WTD staff suggested deleting this policy. The intent is incorporated in RWP-2. Task Force members concurred. WTD staff needs to update the Treatment Plant Policies to show this policy as deleted.	