

**Small Water Systems Technical Committee**  
9:30-12:30, February 12, 2007  
Seattle KC Public Health Eastgate  
*Facilitator: Tamie Kellogg, Kellogg Consulting Inc.*

**Meeting Summary Notes**

**1. Introductions – Housekeeping**

- The Committee approved the draft summary notes for the January 8 meeting.
- The Committee requested that the presentation on building lot regulations be moved to earlier in the meeting after introductions and housekeeping.
- KCDNRP reported that the Executive Committee is meeting today and that the Small Water Systems Committee is not on the agenda.
- Sarah Ogier introduced Larry Stockton as KCDRNP’s new Groundwater Program manager.

**2. Presentation on Building Lot Regulations in Relation to Water Delivery**

- Steve Graddon of Graddon Consulting and Research, Inc., said that he is a real estate land broker, land use consultant, and instructor in old land use law (pre 1969). He conducts research on land parcels to determine whether they are vested historical legal lots. He usually recommends that these lots hook up to local water systems when owners are ready to build. In regard to easements, Steve reported that they are a benefit, not a legal right.

He thinks that it is not unreasonable for a property owner to pay for installation of a water line, depending on the length of the line, that extends through a lot that fronts their property. Owners of lots that were legally created before August 12, 1969, are entitled to obtain permits for building a primary residence, including a permit to drill a private well, except if there is a risk to health, welfare, or safety (for example, no available groundwater).

**3. Discussion on Committee’s Definition of “Recommendation”**

- Tamie asked the committee to start thinking about how they would like to present recommendations in the final report—as findings or options or recommendations.
- One member suggested that the report should be useful to others. It should tell the story of what the committee did (in terms of key issues) and should also document the process.

*Agenda Item for March 12 meeting: Continue the discussion on how to define “recommendation.”*

**4. Update: Subcommittee on Issues 4.1 (Quality) and 4.2 (Enforcement)**

- PHSKC and DOH discussed the report from the subcommittee on Issues 4.1 and 4.2 (water quality and enforcement for small water systems). The report was sent to the committee on Friday, February 9. Members’ overall impression of the report is that it needs more work—that it should be

reorganized, made more concise, and focus on the evaluation of the efficacy of enforcement strategies. The report should also make clear the type of systems being discussed (number of connections).

- PHSKC showed a PowerPoint presentation of recommendations and findings regarding Group B systems and asked members for feedback on the recommendations. Members asked questions regarding the recommendations. One member would like more information on how PHSKC will improve its database. The committee requested that the recommendations be rewritten to provide the factual basis for each recommendation, why the recommendation is being made, how it could be implemented, and potential barriers to implementation (including political barriers).
- DOH began a summary of their portion of the report concerning systems with 15-100 connections. The discussion will continue at the March 12 meeting after DOH's representative on the committee returns.

***Action Items for the March 12 meeting: (1) PHSKC will send members the electronic version of the PowerPoint Presentation; (2) PHSKC will revise the Group B system recommendations; (3) committee members will send DOH their responses to questions listed on page 24 of the report; and (4) PHSKC and DOH will revise and complete the report. Revisions will be sent at least seven days before the meeting.***

***Agenda Item for the March 12 meeting: Continue the discussion of the 4.1 and 4.2 report and recommendations.***

## **5. Discussion of “Timely and Reasonable”**

- The Committee continued its discussion of the “King County Proposed Elements for Inclusion in Utility Service Policies for Timely and Reasonable Service.”
- One member asked about the purpose of the “proposed elements” document. Tamie suggested that it could serve as a discussion tool from which we draft principles for the committee’s final report. Another member suggested that it could be included as an appendix to the report. The committee did not reach agreement on this matter.
- Members also discussed whether the title of the proposed elements document is appropriate—whether “King County” should be removed from the title because the document is being revised to reflect committee proposals too. No decision was made.
- Two items under “Basic Principles” (Items 1e and 1h) were moved to a parking lot list for further discussion and for possible inclusion in another format such as an introductory paragraph.
- Some members felt that a higher expectation for direct connection within a UGA (Item 1e) may be true for King County but not for utilities. Others thought that water utilities do treat areas inside a UGA differently than those outside. DOH said that it did not have different expectations for inside as opposed to outside a UGA.

- DOH asked whether there would be the will to tell potential customers that they are unlikely to win an appeal if the utility is following its policies.
- Another item was added to the parking lot list: How to disseminate information to the public on utility policies and plans. A public meeting is held and the updated (or new) plan is published on the Web during the review process. Is this enough?
- The wording in Item 2b under “Specific Requirements” was changed because utilities said that they can’t include a schedule for how and when they will deliver water throughout each portion of their service areas.

***Action Items for March 12 meeting: (1) PHSKC will revise the proposed elements document to reflect the committee’s discussion and send it to the committee; (2) committee members will make further revisions in Track Changes and send them to Larry Fay.***

***Agenda Item for March 12 meeting: The Committee will continue to discuss and revise the proposed elements.***

## **6. Update: Committee Final Report**

- The committee discussed the draft outline and draft Chapter 1 of the final report, which had been sent via email a week before the meeting.
- The committee expressed a desire to keep the report short. To that end, members suggested that the section on regional water supply planning in Chapter 1 either be removed, condensed, or placed in an appendix.
- Members agreed that an executive summary should be added to the outline and that the executive summary should be kept to five or fewer pages.
- It was also agreed that Chapters 2 and 4 should be combined and that the section for each key issue discussed in this chapter should include an introduction, summary of the discussions, issues that emerged, and findings.

***Action and Agenda Item for March 12 meeting: Cathie will revise the outline (including fleshing out the chapter on key issues) and send to committee members in time to review before the March 12 meeting.***

## **7. Next Meetings**

- Meetings scheduled:
  - March 12
  - April 23

***Other Agenda Items for March 12 meeting: (1) KCDNRP will report on whether it is willing to support the committee beyond the April 23 meeting if more time is needed to complete the key issue discussions; (2) KCDNRP and DOH will discuss whether they can meet outside the meetings to formulate and document thoughts regarding the receivership issue.***

**Abbreviations:** DOH—Washington State Department of Health, DNRP—King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks, Ecology—Washington State Department of Ecology, PHSKC—Public Health—Seattle and King County, CWSP—Coordinated Water System Plan, MWL—Municipal Water Law, SPU—Seattle Public Utilities, WLRD—Water and Land Resources Division within King County DNRP.