

Administration:

- Members Present: Frank Metheny, Ron Rochon, Tom Grant, Eric Anderson, Laura Markley, Rachel Cardone, Valerie Cholvin Alice Lanczos
- SPU Staff Present: Judy Gladstone, Al Dietemann, Liz Fikejs, Julie Burman, Sue Morrison

AGENDA TOPICS:**Reclaimed Water – Background Briefing****Judi Gladstone,
SPU Water Policy**

Reclaimed water was described by Judi as water treated to a standard generally higher than what is required for discharge to a receiving body of water. It can be used for non-potable purposes such as irrigation, toilet flushing, or ground water recharging. The Brightwater project was overviewed as well as SPU's analysis. The analysis concluded that the proposed North Seattle Reclaimed Water Project would not be a sound investment for the region due to high costs, low level of benefits, and availability of much lower cost alternatives for achieving comparable benefits. An asset management approach was used to perform the analysis which included analyzing the project like any other business case. The bottom line of the analysis showed 50 potential customers with 1.7 mgd of potential use. The project would require 27 miles of pipe plus pumping facilities. There would be \$87 million dollars in initial capital improvements, and \$109 million total life cycle costs. The customers benefiting from the project would mostly be irrigators such as golf courses and cemeteries. The environmental benefits to be recognized were .69 mgd which would not add to supply, improve reliability or increase stream flows. Our current supply is good through 2060. Most of the potential users of the reclaimed water are currently self-supplied (i.e. have their own supply wells). The increase of summer flows in nearby streams is possible, but the effect would be small. Environmental benefit would include keeping over 3 tons of nitrogen out of Puget Sound each year. However, this is only equivalent to .04% of the total amount of nitrogen currently discharged from King County's treatment plants. Alternatives with same benefits include switching self-supplied irrigators to water from SPU, ramping up SPU's conservation program to offset new demand, and installing 1 mgd MBR plant in Renton. Costs of this alternative would be \$27M and provides 11 times the benefit. A perspective analysis examined who benefits and who should pay. The greatest benefit was shown to be to the region, not local or to the user. SPU ratepayers could pay a larger proportion of project costs than the share of benefits they receive.

Regional and Seattle-Only Water Conservation Program**Julie Burman**

Julie reviewed the regional water conservation program goals and why they were set as well as progress that has been made and the costs. Given the 6 Year DOH goal set in the 2007 Water System Plan and the 2011-30 savings target, a question of the level of conservation to be set/funded for 2011-2013 was posed to the committee. The policy question is "Where do we want to go in the next couple of years?" Six possible conservation program options for 2011-2013 were presented and members were asked to provide Julie with feedback regarding their preferred option. Rachel asked if there was a preference among members to work individually or to convene a sub-committee. It was agreed that individual feedback to Julie or Sue would be the best method. Sue will consolidate comments into a spreadsheet.

Committee Business**Alice Lanczos**

Sue reported that the field trip on the Cedar River will take place on October 16th. At this time, 6 members are able to attend. It will be an all day event, with the group meeting on Mercer Island at approximately 8:30AM, and returning in the mid to late afternoon. More details to follow.

Wrap-up**Alice Lanczos**

Next meeting will be held Wednesday, September 15th.

Meeting adjourned at 5:55PM.