

**MWPAAC RWSP Policy Review Task Force  
Discussion/Proposed Amendments  
Treatment Plant Policies  
WORKING DRAFT**

Existing Treatment Plant Policies K.C.C. 28.86.050	Task Force Proposed Amendments as of May 12, 2015	Comments/Discussion at MWPAAC RWSP Policy Review Task Force Meetings	Sub-Committee and Full MWPAAC Comments
<p>A. Explanatory material. The treatment plant policies are intended to guide the county in providing treatment at its existing plants and in expanding treatment capacity through the year 2030. The policies direct that secondary treatment will be provided to all base sanitary flows. The county will investigate possible tertiary treatment with a freshwater outfall to facilitate water reuse. The policies also direct how the county will provide the expanded treatment capacity necessary to handle the projected increases in wastewater flows resulting from population and employment growth. The policies provide for the construction of a new treatment plant (the Brightwater treatment plant) to handle flows in a new north service area, expansion of the south treatment plant to handle additional south and east King County flows and the reservation of capacity at the west treatment plant to handle Seattle flows and CSOs. The potential for expansion at the west and south treatment plants will be retained for unanticipated circumstances such as changes in regulations. The policies address goals for odor control at treatment plants and direct that water reuse is to continue and potentially expand at treatment plants.</p>	<p>A. Explanatory material. <u>King County’s treatment plants include three regional treatment plants (West Point Treatment Plant in Seattle, South Treatment Plant in Renton, and the Brightwater Treatment Plant in unincorporated Snohomish county), two local treatment plants (Vashon Treatment Plant in Vashon Island, and the Carnation Treatment Plant in Carnation). Each of these treatment plants has its own National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit, which outlines the conditions under which King County can discharge treated wastewater. In addition, the county has four combined sewer overflow (CSO) treatment plants in Seattle (Alki, Carkeek, Mercer/Elliott West, and Henderson/Norfolk). Two additional CSO treatment plants will be constructed in Seattle in accordance with the long-term CSO control plan. The West Point NPDES permit also establishes the conditions under which the CSO treatment plants can discharge treated wastewater. (see CSO control policies for more information on guidance for the CSO control program). The county is also responsible for the Beulah Cove large on-site septic system on Vashon Island.</u></p> <p>The treatment plant policies are intended to guide the county in providing treatment at its existing plants and in expanding treatment capacity <u>to meet regulatory requirements and projected wastewater flows and wasteloads resulting from population and employment growth.</u> The policies direct that <u>at a minimum</u> secondary treatment will be provided to all base sanitary flows <u>delivered to its regional or local treatment plants. The county will continue to evaluate additional opportunities for water reuse at its treatment plants and for offsite uses. (see Reclaimed Water Policies for more information on guidance for the reclaimed water program)</u></p> <p><del>((The county will investigate possible tertiary treatment with a freshwater outfall to facilitate water reuse. The policies also direct how the county will provide the expanded treatment capacity necessary to handle the projected increases in wastewater flows resulting from population and employment growth. The policies provide for the construction of a new treatment plant (the Brightwater treatment plant) to handle flows in a new north service area, expansion of the south treatment plant to handle additional south and east King County flows and the reservation of capacity at the west treatment plant to handle Seattle flows and CSOs. The potential for expansion at the west and south treatment plants will be retained for unanticipated circumstances such as changes in regulations. The policies address goals for odor control at</del></p>	<p><i>December 2, 2014 discussion:</i> There were no changes made to any of the policies as discussed at the Nov. 13 meeting. When the policies were distributed to the Task Force for a final review in December, a member made corrections to the numbering of the amended policies, which is reflected in this version.</p> <p><i>November 13, 2014 discussion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some task force members felt there is too much detail; others thought the detail is helpful.</li> <li>• Based on the discussion, reference to the ordinance that approved the long-term CSO plan was taken out; reference to the Beulah Cove system being regulated by WA Dept of Health was also deleted.</li> <li>• There was discussion on whether or not a date for when these policies cover is needed. Some noted their plans don’t include dates, others noted that a date may be stated once.</li> <li>• There was general agreement to leave out any reference to 2030 or 2060. It allows the policies to be more timeless, and be more like policies, versus timelines or schedules.</li> </ul> <p><i>WTD staff attempted to capture these comments in the updated policy.</i> *****</p> <p><i>October 30, 2014 discussion:</i> The discussion noted that the County has CSO treatment plants and local treatment plants as well, but they are not referred to in these policies; there was also a suggestion to make reference to other policies if there are overlaps – such as water quality policies, CSO control policies. The new language in the explanatory material attempts to capture this.</p> <p>The question was raised if 2030 is the right date? When should the date change? There was a proposal to put 2060 in, as that is the timeframe WTD is looking at flow forecasts. WTD staff will work with its managers to get guidance on this question. A Task Force member noted that the year 2030 was selected resulting from the work of Wastewater 2020, which re-analyzed every element of the wastewater program – should that kind of work be done prior to changing the long-term date; when is the right timing for re-analyzing everything comprehensively?</p> <p>Task Force members mentioned that these policies discuss odor control and water reuse, but there isn’t much about design or innovations/improvements at the treatment plants, such as</p>	<p><i>At the May 27, 2015 meeting, full MWPAAC approved the Task Force Proposed Amendments, with one word change to proposed Odor Prevention Policies Explanatory Material.</i></p>

**MWPAAC RWSP Policy Review Task Force  
Discussion/Proposed Amendments  
Treatment Plant Policies  
WORKING DRAFT**

Existing Treatment Plant Policies K.C.C. 28.86.050	Task Force Proposed Amendments as of May 12, 2015	Comments/Discussion at MWPAAC RWSP Policy Review Task Force Meetings	Sub-Committee and Full MWPAAC Comments
	<p><del>treatment plants and direct that water reuse is to continue and potentially expand at treatment plants.))</del></p>	<p>cogeneration. Should the policies discuss more efficient operations of the plants?</p> <p>Other general items raised include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider moving policies relating to reuse in the reclaimed water policies</li> <li>• Consider a separate section for odor policies</li> <li>• There were questions if there should be policies that would be beneficial in guiding operations and maintenance; it was also noted that policies should not be too prescriptive regarding day-to-day work.</li> </ul>	
<p>TPP-1: King County shall provide secondary treatment to all base sanitary flow delivered to its treatment plants. Treatment beyond the secondary level may be provided to meet water quality standards and achieve other goals such as furthering the water reuse program or benefiting species listed under the ESA.</p>	<p>TPP-1: King County shall provide <u>at a minimum</u> secondary treatment to all base sanitary flow delivered to its <u>regional or local</u> treatment plants. <del>((Treatment beyond the secondary level))</del> <u>Higher levels of treatment</u> may be <del>((provided))</del> <u>required</u> to meet <u>regulatory</u> water quality standards. <del>((and achieve other goals such as furthering the water reuse program or benefiting species listed under the ESA.))</del></p>	<p><i>November 13, 2014 discussion:</i> There was discussion that TPP-1 should focus on what <u>should</u> be done, and have a separate policy that discusses things that <u>could</u> be done. There should be a separate policy that discusses the things that <u>could</u> be done, and incorporate checks and balances for those items. (see new TPP-2).</p> <p>The majority of members felt the word “regulatory” is broader than “Washington State”, so the amended policy reflects this.</p> <p>There were questions on what, if anything should be said about ESA—the question was asked about what would be done at a treatment plant to benefit ESA? (New TPP-2 mentions ESA.) *****</p> <p><i>October 30, 2014 discussion:</i> There was a suggestion during the meeting to put the word “regulatory” in front of water quality standards. <i>In discussions with WTD staff experts, they suggested putting “Washington State” in place of “regulatory”, as we are required to adhere to the state’s standards. Both are in there for continued discussion.</i></p> <p>There was discussion on whether or not the reference to ESA or water reuse should be left in. There were varying opinions on this – some felt it allows flexibility, others felt the way it is written is to only benefit salmon. There was also discussion on whether these topics should be moved to the water quality protection policies, or if there should be mention of other kinds of issues that could cause future regulations, such as nutrient removal and human health criteria or other emerging water quality issues. The additional wording in last sentence is an attempt to capture these comments.</p> <p><i>WTD staff added the “at a minimum” and “regional or local” based on discussions with staff, as some of our plants, like Carnation and Brightwater, provide a higher level treatment to its flows, and to</i></p>	

**MWPAAC RWSP Policy Review Task Force  
Discussion/Proposed Amendments  
Treatment Plant Policies  
WORKING DRAFT**

Existing Treatment Plant Policies K.C.C. 28.86.050	Task Force Proposed Amendments as of May 12, 2015	Comments/Discussion at MWPAAC RWSP Policy Review Task Force Meetings	Sub-Committee and Full MWPAAC Comments
		<i>distinguish regional/local from CSO treatment, as stated in the explanatory material.</i>	
	<p><u>NEW TPP-2: The county will continue to work with regulatory agencies to examine water quality conditions and their potential to warrant additional levels of treatment. (See water quality policies for policy guidance on identifying and resolving regional water quality issues.)</u></p> <p><u>If levels of treatment exceeding regulatory requirements are considered, factors the county shall use in its decision-making process shall include, but are not limited to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Costs and sewer rate impacts</u></li> <li>• <u>Environmental and community benefits and impacts</u></li> <li>• <u>Potential for partnerships and cost-sharing opportunities</u></li> <li>• <u>Benefits and impacts to the operations of the regional wastewater system</u></li> <li>• <u>Consultation with MWPAAC and regulatory agencies</u></li> </ul>	<p><i>May 12, 2015 discussion:</i> Task Force members re-reviewed NEW TPP-2, and developed the proposed language in the second column.</p> <p><i>April 23, 2015 discussion:</i> Task Force members noted that this policy did not have process or criteria associated with it (some noted a similar comment for TPP-3 and TPP-7). Members suggested looking at the criteria in TPP-5 to see if any of the criteria make sense for this policy. The expectation is to justify expenditures. If it not something that has to be done for wastewater treatment, there should be opportunities for MWPAAC to weigh in on whether or not ratepayers should fund it. There were questions about at what point does MWPAAC membership have the ability to say “no, we’re not going to fund that”. Some noted that these types of questions are being discussed as part of the negotiations effort under way regarding the role of an operating board.</p> <p><i>December 2, 2014 discussion:</i> One task force member asked if the group felt the language was strong enough regarding “consulting” with MWPAAC in light of the contract negotiations under way. Task force members felt it was strong enough. There was a also a question about references to “MWPAAC” as things could change when the negotiations are completed – it was noted that name changes, if needed, can be done at a later time. *****</p> <p><i>November 13, 2014 discussion:</i> The language in this new policy is an attempt to capture the discussion about separating out regulatory requirements (TPP-1) and achieving other goals through higher levels of treatment, and providing for some checks and balances through consultation with MWPAAC.</p> <p><i>WTD staff mentioned there is a financial policy that may also meet the intent of the discussion, it is provided below:</i> FP-5: Significant new capital and operational initiatives proposed by the Executive that are not within the scope of the current RWSP nor included in the RWSP, or are required by new state or federal regulations will be reviewed by the RWQC and approved by the council to ensure due diligence review of potential impacts to major capital projects' schedules, including Brightwater, the bond rating or the sewer rate and capacity charge.</p>	<p><i>January 8, 2015, Engineering and Planning Subcommittee discussion:</i> There was a question regarding if King County increased treatment level for other goals, would that be in violation with the sewage disposal contract?</p>
<p>TPP-2: King County shall provide additional wastewater treatment capacity to serve growing wastewater needs by constructing the Brightwater treatment plant at the Route 9 site north of the city of Woodinville and then</p>	<p><u>NEW TPP-3: The executive shall conduct a comprehensive update of capacity-related needs at the county’s treatment plants at least every ten years to correspond with updated information from the Federal Census and regional population</u></p>	<p><i>May 12, 2015 discussion:</i> Task Force members completed their review of this policy.</p> <p><i>April 23, 2015 discussion:</i></p>	

**MWPAAC RWSP Policy Review Task Force  
Discussion/Proposed Amendments  
Treatment Plant Policies  
WORKING DRAFT**

Existing Treatment Plant Policies K.C.C. 28.86.050	Task Force Proposed Amendments as of May 12, 2015	Comments/Discussion at MWPAAC RWSP Policy Review Task Force Meetings	Sub-Committee and Full MWPAAC Comments
<p>expanding the treatment capacity at the south treatment plant. The west treatment plant shall be maintained at its rated capacity of one hundred thirty-three mgd. The south treatment plant capacity shall be limited to that needed to serve the eastside and south King County, except for flows from the North Creek Diversion project and the planned six-million-gallon storage tank, or minor rerating to facilitate south or east county growth. The potential for expansion at the west treatment plant and south treatment plant should be retained for unexpected circumstances which shall include, but not be limited to, higher than anticipated population growth, new facilities to implement the CSO reduction program or new regulatory requirements.</p>	<p><u>and employment forecasts.</u></p> <p><u>The treatment needs update shall incorporate this information along with other factors, such as findings from the decennial flow monitoring or any changes in water consumption or water conservation, to determine if improvements are needed. If additional wastewater flow or solids capacity needs are identified, considerations in determining how to meet identified needs shall include, but are not limited to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Ability to meet identified needs through adjustments to systemwide operations, including the conveyance system</u></li> <li>• <u>Evaluation of available technologies</u></li> <li>• <u>Evaluation of upgrades to existing equipment</u></li> <li>• <u>Costs and sewer rate impacts of potential alternatives to meet identified needs</u></li> <li>• <u>Environmental and community impacts or benefits</u></li> </ul> <p><u>Any changes in facilities of the west point treatment plant shall comply with the terms of the West Point settlement agreement of February 19, 1991.</u></p> <p><del>((King County shall provide additional wastewater treatment capacity to serve growing wastewater needs by constructing the Brightwater treatment plant at the Route 9 site north of the city of Woodinville and then expanding the treatment capacity at the south treatment plant. The west treatment plant shall be maintained at its rated capacity of one hundred thirty-three mgd. The south treatment plant capacity shall be limited to that needed to serve the eastside and south King County, except for flows from the North Creek Diversion project and the planned six million gallon storage tank, or minor rerating to facilitate south or east county growth. The potential for expansion at the west treatment plant and south treatment plant should be retained for unexpected circumstances which shall include, but not be limited to, higher than anticipated population growth, new facilities to implement the CSO reduction program or new regulatory requirements))</del></p>	<p>Task Force members suggested adding criteria or a description of a process to this policy that would be followed if additional treatment plant needs were identified. In addition, a Task Force member noted preference to keep the language in about the west point treatment plant rated capacity. (see highlighted language)</p> <p><i>March 17, 2015 discussion:</i> Task Force members discussed the need for incorporating the concept of a treatment plant update in the treatment plant policies. It was noted there are specified updates for the conveyance system improvement program and the CSO control program, and it would be good for the treatment policies to be more specific on updates to identify potential treatment plant capacity needs. The highlighted language is an attempt to meet the intent of the discussion.</p> <p><i>November 13, 2014 discussion:</i> There was discussion that this may be too long. There were comments to take out the portion highlighted in yellow, others thought to leave it in.</p> <p>There was also discussion on whether geographic needs should be mentioned. It seemed there was general agreement that geographic needs/growth patterns are inherent in an evaluation.</p> <p>There were comments that guidance for looking at how to meet needs in a holistic and systemwide manner is needed.</p> <p>There was also discussion on whether or not a policy is needed to provide direction to staff to conduct a study about future treatment plant loadings capacity needs. There seemed to be general agreement to add this to the implementation portion, which will be reviewed later in this process. Some members noted that sometimes it can be helpful for staff to have implementation direction.</p> <p><i>The language is an attempt to reflect this discussion. More discussion is merited to determine if the detail highlighted in yellow should remain or not.</i> *****</p> <p><i>October 30, 2014 discussion:</i> There were comments that the policies need to reflect that Brightwater is built.</p>	

**MWPAAC RWSP Policy Review Task Force  
Discussion/Proposed Amendments  
Treatment Plant Policies  
WORKING DRAFT**

Existing Treatment Plant Policies K.C.C. 28.86.050	Task Force Proposed Amendments as of May 12, 2015	Comments/Discussion at MWPAAC RWSP Policy Review Task Force Meetings	Sub-Committee and Full MWPAAC Comments
		<p>There were also comments that treatment capacity will be needed in the future, but that additional treatment could be provided via satellite plants. There was also a comment that if this is necessary, the policy should provide guidance on how that would be decided.</p> <p>The new language is an attempt to capture this discussion.</p>	
<p>TPP-3: Any changes in facilities of the west treatment plant shall comply with the terms of the West Point settlement agreement.</p>	<p><i>This policy language is now incorporated in New TPP-3 above.</i></p>	<p><i>April 23, 2015:</i> Based on discussion at April 23, 2015; WTD staff thought moving this policy to the new TPP-3 could address the intent of the discussion.</p> <p><i>November 13, 2014:</i> There were no additional recommendations made at this meeting. *****</p> <p><i>October 30, 2014 discussion:</i> There was discussion on whether or not this policy is still needed, as it is about complying with the law. The discussion also noted that there is no harm in keeping it in and it was important to various entities during the development of the RWSP. There was agreement among the task force that no changes would be proposed at this time.</p>	
<p>TPP-4: King County’s goal is to prevent and control nuisance odor occurrences at all treatment plants and associated conveyance facilities and will carry out an odor prevention program that goes beyond traditional odor control. To achieve these goals, the following policies shall be implemented:</p> <p>1. Existing treatment facilities shall be retrofit in a phased manner up to the High/Existing Plant Retrofit odor prevention level as defined in Table 1 of Attachment A to Ordinance 14712, the odor prevention policy recommendations dated March 18, 2003. This level reflects what is currently defined as the best in the country for retrofit treatment facilities of a similar size. Odor prevention systems will be employed as required to meet the goal of preventing and controlling nuisance odor occurrences;</p> <p>2. Existing conveyance facilities that pose nuisance odor problems shall be retrofitted with odor prevention systems as soon as such odors occur, subject to technical and financial feasibility. All other existing conveyance facilities shall be retrofitted with odor control systems during the next facility upgrade;</p> <p>3. The executive shall phase odor prevention systems implementing the tasks that generate the greatest improvements first, balancing benefit gained</p>	<p><b><i>There will be a new policies section, called Odor Prevention Policies as these policies apply to the regional wastewater system’s treatment and conveyance facilities.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Explanatory Material. <u>King County’s commitment to being a good neighbor includes preventing and controlling nuisance odors at its wastewater treatment plants and its conveyance facilities. The county established an odor prevention program for its wastewater facilities through Ordinance 14712 in 2003. The odor prevention policies provide guidance to the county in continuing to implement its odor prevention program.</u></i></b></p> <p><b><i>Odor Prevention Policy 1: King County’s goal is to prevent and control nuisance odor occurrences at all treatment plants and associated conveyance facilities. <del>((and))</del></i></b></p> <p><b><i>Odor Prevention Policy -2: <u>The county will continue to retrofit in a phased manner existing treatment and conveyance facilities that pose nuisance odor problems in accordance with the county’s odor prevention program and Ordinance 14712. <del>((carry out an odor prevention program that goes beyond traditional odor control. To achieve these goals, the following policies shall be implemented:</del></u></i></b></p> <p><b><i><del>_____</del></i></b></p> <p><b><i><del>1. Existing treatment facilities shall be retrofit in a phased manner up to the High/Existing Plant Retrofit odor</del></i></b></p>	<p><i>May 12, 2015 discussion:</i> Task Force members asked WTD staff to develop explanatory material for the odor prevention policies and to send out to members for review by email. The explanatory material in the second column includes feedback from Task Force members.</p> <p><i>November 13, 2014 discussion:</i> There was discussion about what the appropriate level of detail is for this policy. It’s possible that with an overarching statement, points 1 – 8 could be eliminated, or maybe keep some level of detail there.</p> <p>There was a question on whether or not the policy should acknowledge what has already been achieved.</p> <p>Task Force members asked WTD staff to contact Dave Christensen to incorporate his thoughts since he was unable to be at the meeting. The amended policy reflects comments provided by Dave.</p> <p><i>The amended language attempts to capture the discussion on Nov. 13 and discussion with Dave C.</i> *****</p> <p><i>October 30, 2014 discussion:</i> There was discussion that the odor policies should be separate</p>	<p><i>May 27, 2015 Full MWPAAC discussion:</i> It was noted that the word “and” is needed in the first sentence of the Explanatory Material.</p> <p><i>January 8, 2015, Engineering and Planning Subcommittee discussion:</i> There was a recommendation to change Odor Prevention Policy-1 to read as follows: “King <u>County</u> <del>((County’s goal is))</del> <b><u>shall take measures to reasonably</u></b> prevent and control nuisance odor occurrences at all treatment plants and associated conveyance facilities.”</p> <p>During the discussion, there was a question on whether the word “goal” should be included in a policy. Would it be better to state the policy (as above) and establish goals elsewhere to meet the policy?</p> <p>There was also a question regarding use of the words “prevent” and “control” in Odor Prevention Policy-1; what do they really mean? Another commented that including the word “nuisance” in Odor Prevention Policy-2 provides enough context relating to prevent and control. A question was also raised on whether or not “nuisance” needs to be defined.</p>

**MWPAAC RWSP Policy Review Task Force  
Discussion/Proposed Amendments  
Treatment Plant Policies  
WORKING DRAFT**

Existing Treatment Plant Policies K.C.C. 28.86.050	Task Force Proposed Amendments as of May 12, 2015	Comments/Discussion at MWPAAC RWSP Policy Review Task Force Meetings	Sub-Committee and Full MWPAAC Comments
<p>with cost, and report to the council on the status of the odor prevention program in the annual RWSP report as outlined in K.C.C. 28.86.165;</p> <p>4. New regional treatment facilities shall be constructed with odor control systems that are designed to meet the High/New Plant odor prevention level as defined in Table 1 of Attachment A to Ordinance 14712, the odor prevention policy recommendations dated March 18, 2003. This level reflects what is currently defined as the best in the country for new treatment facilities of a similar size;</p> <p>5. New conveyance facilities serving these new regional treatment facilities shall also be constructed with odor control systems as an integral part of their design;</p> <p>6. Design standards will be developed and maintained for odor control systems to meet the county's odor prevention and control goals;</p> <p>7. A comprehensive odor control and prevention monitoring program for the county's wastewater treatment and conveyance facilities will be developed. This program shall include the use of near facility neighbor surveys and tracking of odor complaints and responses to complaints and shall consider development of an odor prevention benchmarking and audit program with peer utilities; and</p> <p>8. New odor prevention and measurement technologies will be assessed and methods for pilot testing new technologies identified when determined by the executive to be necessary and appropriate for achieving the goals of this policy.</p>	<p><del>prevention level as defined in Table 1 of Attachment A to Ordinance 14712, the odor prevention policy recommendations dated March 18, 2003. This level reflects what is currently defined as the best in the country for retrofit treatment facilities of a similar size. Odor prevention systems will be employed as required to meet the goal of preventing and controlling nuisance odor occurrences</del></p> <p><del>2. Existing conveyance facilities that pose nuisance odor problems shall be retrofitted with odor prevention systems as soon as such odors occur, subject to technical and financial feasibility. All other existing conveyance facilities shall be retrofitted with odor control systems during the next facility upgrade;</del></p> <p><b>Odor Prevention Policy-3:</b> The executive shall phase odor prevention systems implementing the tasks that generate the greatest improvements first, balancing benefit gained with cost, and report to the council on the status of the odor prevention program in the annual RWSP report as outlined in K.C.C. 28.86.165.;</p> <p><b>Odor Prevention Policy-4:</b> New regional treatment <u>and conveyance</u> facilities shall be constructed with odor control systems <u>that are at a minimum in accordance with the criterion established by Ordinance 14712.</u> <del>((that are designed to meet the High/New Plant odor prevention level as defined in Table 1 of Attachment A to Ordinance 14712, the odor prevention policy recommendations dated March 18, 2003. This level reflects what is currently defined as the best in the country for new treatment facilities of a similar size;))</del></p> <p><del>5. New conveyance facilities serving these new regional treatment facilities shall also be constructed with odor control systems as an integral part of their design.))</del></p> <p><del>((6. Design standards will be developed and maintained for odor control systems to meet the county's odor prevention and control goals;))</del></p> <p><b>Odor Prevention Policy-5:</b> <u>The county shall continue to carry out its</u> <del>((A))</del> comprehensive odor control and prevention monitoring program <del>((for the county's wastewater treatment and conveyance facilities will be developed))</del>. This program shall <u>continue to</u> include the use of near facility neighbor surveys and tracking of odor complaints and responses to complaints. <del>((and shall consider development of an odor prevention benchmarking and audit program with peer utilities; and))</del></p>	<p>polices as they cover both treatment plants and conveyance facilities. It was also noted that the some of the policies have been fulfilled, so they could be deleted. There was a suggestion to state what the odor standard is instead of referring to the attachment of the ordinance.</p> <p>There was also a discussion that perhaps there should be a miscellaneous policy section where these policies should go, such as innovations and efficiencies; others noted that efficiencies are a subject matter of the contract subcommittee.</p> <p><i>WTD staff consulted its odor experts on the updated language to strive to capture the comments at the Oct. 30 discussion.</i></p>	

**MWPAAC RWSP Policy Review Task Force  
Discussion/Proposed Amendments  
Treatment Plant Policies  
WORKING DRAFT**

Existing Treatment Plant Policies K.C.C. 28.86.050	Task Force Proposed Amendments as of May 12, 2015	Comments/Discussion at MWPAAC RWSP Policy Review Task Force Meetings	Sub-Committee and Full MWPAAC Comments
	<p><b>Odor Prevention Policy-6:</b> New odor prevention and measurement technologies will be assessed and methods for pilot testing new technologies identified when determined by the executive to be necessary and appropriate for achieving the goals of this policy.</p>		
<p>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.</p>	<p>To be discussed during reclaimed water policies' discussion</p>	<p><i>November 13, 2014 discussion:</i> There was agreement among task force members that this policy does not deal with treatment, and it should be discussed during the discussions on the reclaimed water policies.</p> <p>*****</p> <p><i>October 30, 2014 discussion:</i> There were questions on what have we learned from earlier studies, and would that information impact this policy. It might be helpful to state a goal/purpose of this. It was noted that during the development of the RWSP, a goal was to keep higher flows in the Cedar River to aid fish migration.</p>	
<p>TPP-6: The county shall evaluate opportunities in collaboration with adjacent utilities regarding the transfer of flows between the county's treatment facilities and treatment facilities owned and operated by other wastewater utilities in the region. The evaluation shall include, but not be limited to, cost environmental and community impacts, liability, engineering feasibility, flexibility, impacts to contractual and regulatory obligations and consistency with the level of service provided at the county owned and operated facilities.</p>	<p>TPP-5: The county shall <u>continue to</u> evaluate opportunities in collaboration with adjacent utilities regarding the transfer of flows between the county's treatment facilities and treatment facilities owned and operated by other wastewater utilities in the region. The evaluation shall include, but not be limited to, cost, environmental and community impacts, liability, engineering feasibility, flexibility, impacts to contractual and regulatory obligations and consistency with the level of service provided at the county owned and operated facilities.</p>	<p><i>November 13, 2014 discussion:</i> There were no additional changes discussed or recommended.</p> <p>*****</p> <p><i>October 30, 2014 discussion:</i> There was a suggestion to add "continue to" to this policy, and there was a question if there is more to be done, or have we exhausted all opportunities.</p>	
<p>TPP-7: King County may explore the possibility of constructing one or more satellite treatment plants in order to produce reclaimed water. The county may build these plants in cooperation with a local community and provide the community with reclaimed water through a regional water supply agency. In order to ensure integrated water resource planning, in the interim period prior to the development of a regional water supply plan, King County shall consult and coordinate with regional water suppliers to ensure that water reuse decisions are consistent with regional water supply plans. To ensure costs and benefits are shared equally throughout the region, all reclaimed water used in the community shall be distributed through a municipal water supply or regional water supply agency consistent with a regional water supply plan.</p>	<p>TPP-6: King County may <u>continue to</u> explore the possibility of constructing <del>((one or more))</del> satellite treatment plants, <u>when appropriate.</u> <del>((in order to produce reclaimed water. The county may build these plants in cooperation with a local community and provide the community with reclaimed water through a regional water supply agency. In order to ensure integrated water resource planning, in the interim period prior to the development of a regional water supply plan, King County shall consult and coordinate with regional water suppliers to ensure that water reuse decisions are consistent with regional water supply plans. To ensure costs and benefits are shared equally throughout the region, all reclaimed water used in the community shall be distributed through a municipal water supply or regional water supply agency consistent with a regional water supply plan.))</del></p>	<p><i>November 13, 2014 discussion:</i> It was noted that the issue of decentralization is being discussed in the contracts committee, and there should be consistency in policy with what comes out of the contracts committee.</p> <p>*****</p> <p><i>October 30, 2014 discussion:</i> There was discussion that this policy be addressed in the contracts subcommittee. It was also suggested that this policy be moved to reclaimed water.</p> <p>There was discussion that some parts of the policy should be deleted, as there is no regional water supply plan. There were additional questions about striking out the portion highlighted in yellow, but more conversation seemed to be merited. – <i>This portion is now in strikeout form based on Nov. 13 discussion.</i></p>	
<p>TPP-8: King County shall continue water reuse and explore opportunities for expanded use at existing</p>	<p>TPP-7: King County shall continue <u>using treated effluent for treatment plant uses</u> <del>((reuse and explore opportunities for</del></p>	<p><i>November 13, 2014 discussion:</i> There was a question on whether or not this policy is even needed</p>	<p><i>February 5, 2015 Rates and Finance Subcommittee discussion:</i> Consider adding criteria related to pursuing cost-effective</p>

**MWPAAC RWSP Policy Review Task Force  
Discussion/Proposed Amendments  
Treatment Plant Policies  
WORKING DRAFT**

Existing Treatment Plant Policies K.C.C. 28.86.050	Task Force Proposed Amendments as of May 12, 2015	Comments/Discussion at MWPAAC RWSP Policy Review Task Force Meetings	Sub-Committee and Full MWPAAC Comments
plants, and shall explore water reuse opportunities at all new treatment facilities.	<del>expanded use at existing plants</del> ), and shall <u>continue to</u> explore water reuse opportunities at all (( <del>new</del> )) treatment facilities.	<p>since it is the norm. There was also a comment that it is useful to have as a policy to provide guidance for design of treatment facilities and gives a basis for continuing current practices.</p> <p>*****</p> <p><i>October 30, 2014 discussion:</i> There was discussion about what is the quality of water that is used for treatment plant process needs, and that we should use whatever water is appropriate. The language added attempts to capture this discussion.</p>	<p>measures to guide the use of effluent in the treatment process.</p> <p>Consider replacing SHALL with MAY. There was also a suggestion to make reference to the reclaimed water policies.</p>
	<p>POTENTIAL NEW POLICIES (maybe for water quality protection policies?):</p> <p><i>Based on November 13 discussion:</i> <u>TPP- NEW (8): King County will continue to evaluate new information regarding contaminants of emerging concern and the potential for treatment processes to address such contaminants.</u></p>	<p><i>November 13, 2014:</i> The language under “Based on November 13 discussion” strives to capture the discussion from that meeting.</p> <p>There was general agreement that the intent of the last sentence in the Oct. 30 version should be looked at during the discussion on water quality protection policies.</p> <p>*****</p> <p><i>October 30, 2014 discussion:</i> Miscellaneous comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There were comments about the potential for a policy to handle emerging chemicals of concern. <i>The language added is an attempt to capture the intent of the discussion.</i></li> <li>• There was a comment about supporting efforts on the disposal of pharmaceuticals and take back programs</li> <li>• There was a question on where should policies about cogeneration go? Cogeneration should address power reduction, perhaps a policy that calls for energy audits and looking for opportunities to extract heat. Continue energy innovations to generate and reuse energy; consider in-line micro turbines in conveyance.</li> <li>• There was a suggestion for a policy to support continuous improvement and employees taking time to develop innovations; others mentioned that this belongs as part of core values and not in the policy statements</li> </ul>	