CONVENE: 5:31 p.m.

PRESENT: Mayor Debbie Sullivan and Councilmembers Michael Althauser, Joan Cathey, Leatta Dahlhoff, Angela Jefferson, Charlie Schneider, and Eileen Swarthout.

Excused: Councilmember Peter Agabi.

Staff: City Administrator John Doan, Water Resources and Sustainability Director Dan Smith, and Communications Manager Ann Cook.

LOTT CLEAN WATER ALLIANCE RECLAIMED WATER STUDY UPDATE:

Manager Smith introduced Lisa Dennis-Perez, LOTT Environmental Planning & Communications Director and Wendy Steffensen, LOTT Reclaimed Water Infiltration Study Project Manager. Ms. Dennis-Perez and Ms. Steffensen updated the Council on the status of the LOTT Clean Water Alliance Reclaimed Water Infiltration Study, a study to answer community questions and concerns about residual chemicals that may remain in reclaimed water, and what happens when residual chemicals are infiltrated into the ground.

In the early 1990s, LOTT embarked on a long-range planning process to explore other alternatives for managing wastewater in the future based on discharge limitations to Budd Inlet imposed by the Department of Ecology. Through a planning and public involvement process, LOTT identified reclaimed water as a preferred strategy for managing wastewater in the future.

Following the adoption of the long-range plan, LOTT implemented the plan by building two facilities to produce Class A reclaimed water at the Budd Inlet Reclaimed Water Plant at the main treatment facility in Olympia and at the Martin Way Reclaimed Water Plant in Lacey, a satellite treatment facility producing Class A reclaimed water.

Ms. Steffensen described the composition and roles of the Reclaimed Water Infiltration Study participants:

- Steering Committee (LOTT Technical Sub-Committee)
- Community Advisory Group
- Science Task Force
- Peer Review Panel
- Study Team

The study's framework was to answer the question of what are the risks

from infiltrating reclaimed water into groundwater because of chemicals that may remain in the water from products people use every day, and what can be done to reduce those risks. The study's four main tasks were designed to answer specific questions:

- Task 1: Water Quality Characterization
  What is the current quality of our local waters: groundwater, surface water, drinking water, wastewater, and reclaimed water?
- Task 2: Treatment Effectiveness Evaluation
  What happens to reclaimed water that is infiltrated to groundwater: where does it travel and how quickly, and how does the quality of the water change over time?
- Task 3: Risk Assessment
- What are the relative risks of replenishing groundwater with reclaimed water?
- Task 4: Cost/Benefit Analysis
  What are the costs and benefits of various approaches for treating and using reclaimed water Study Team reported the reclaimed water study focused on two main questions of whether residual chemicals from household and personal care products are in local groundwater, surface water, wastewater, and reclaimed water and the effectiveness of LOTT's treatment processes for removing residual chemicals from wastewater.

The 10-year scientific study is nearing conclusion with the following key findings:

- Residual chemicals were found at very low levels (parts per billion and parts per trillion) in all types of water tested.
- LOTT's treatment processes were found to be effective at removing many residual chemicals in wastewater and reclaimed water, but some chemicals remain after treatment.
- Residual chemicals were found in the environment – in areas where reclaimed water is infiltrated to replenish groundwater – and in areas where it is not.
- Findings are consistent with similar studies conducted in other places in the country and the world preliminary results
- Potential risks are low and the current use of reclaimed water is safe.

Next steps include changes in regulations for some chemicals and that the chemical landscape will change as chemicals are phased out and new chemicals enter the wastewater treatment system. Based on study findings, the proposed approach is to continue using reclaimed water,

conduct targeted monitoring for trends of chemicals and potential sources of chemicals, and reevaluate the study and the need for advanced treatment in the future based on new information.

Ms. Dennis-Perez said one of the very first steps is to share the study results with the community and receive public input. The input will be integrated into a broader master planning effort currently in progress to revisit the long-term strategy and refine it for the future. Public engagement in the summer and fall includes a series of community forums. The first forum focuses on the Reclaimed Water Infiltration Study and sharing findings and obtaining feedback on the proposed next steps. Feedback from the forum will be used to prepare a second community forum focused on the broader master planning effort and obtain feedback on long-term management options for the future. Feedback will be used to draft the final draft of the Master Plan for review and to receive feedback by the community at a third forum. The feedback will inform a revised Master Plan at the end of 2022 or early 2023. The first forum is a virtual meeting on August 15, 2022 at 5:30 p.m. followed by an online open house from mid-August to mid-September. The open house enables visitors to review details of the study and provide feedback. To participate in either event, the public is asked to send an email to reclaimedwaterstudy@lottcleanwater.org for information on how to participate in the meeting and the open house.

Councilmember Swarthout asked whether legislation addressing products containing flame retardant chemicals has been effective in eliminating or reducing retardant chemicals in water. Ms. Steffensen advised that testing revealed that the presence of flame retardant chemicals did not reach any risk threshold.

Councilmember Swarthout commented that she receives daily emails from the public about microplastics in water. Ms. Dennis-Perez said microplastics in water is an area of great interest but unfortunately it was not considered as part of the study.

Councilmember Dahlhoff said data from the study provides future opportunities to track trending of by-products as they are banned to ascertain if exposure to humans has been lessened. She expressed appreciation for the work completed by LOTT, which is a nationwide leader in spearheading and modeling the way of using science to inform.

REGIONAL FIRE AUTHORITY REMNANT

City Administrator Doan reported the Regional Fire Authority Planning Committee is developing a proposal for the potential formation of a Regional Fire Authority (RFA) to provide fire and emergency medical

FUNDING:

services in Tumwater and Olympia. The current proposal is to fund the RFA with three primary revenue sources: a $1.00/$1,000 property tax, a Fire Benefit Charge, and the Medic One services contract. The operating assumption is that the City would lower its property tax by the corresponding $1.00/$1,000. With this change, the City's property tax rate for General Government would be approximately $1.26/$1,000 in 2022. Although $1.00 would be reduced, the City currently spends approximately $1.13 in general property tax revenue on the Fire Department excluding revenue received from Medic One. The result is an approximate $0.13/$1,000 "savings" to the City from the transfer of fire and emergency medical responsibilities to the RFA. The decision on the investment of the remnant funds (13 cents) is the responsibility of the City Council and not the RFA. He outlined the options for consideration:

1. Reduce the property tax by the 13 cents. This enhances the fiscal appearance of the RFA to the public, but puts a burden on the City's General Fund to provide services, including some remnant fire-related services.
2. Bank some or all of the property tax. This would require the City to take an action to bank the 13 cents of taxing capacity and the City could go back and pursue it at a future time. The City could do this in part or in total.
3. Immediately utilize the 13 cents for any General Fund purpose.
4. Immediately utilize the 13 cents but limit use to public safety purposes.

Staff recommends Option 4 as it provides for the remnant fire costs that the City is obligated to pay (LEOFF, Emergency Management, and the Fire Engine). It also invests additional funding in improvements to public safety through the Police Department, funds a shared Emergency Management staff position with Olympia, funds the Police Radio Replacement Program, and adds a Police Officer and equipment.

By 2031, with the payoff of the Fire Engine and reduced LEOFF obligations, the proposal calls for additional police personnel to be determined at that time.

Should the RFA receive voter approval, the Council would adopt action in a future budget. However, prior to the election, the Council is requested to adopt a resolution to retain the 13 cents per $1,000 valuation and dedicate the funds for public safety purposes.

Councilmember Schneider commented that the proposal of expenditures

is more than the projected amount of revenue from remnant property tax. He asked for additional clarity on the proposed expenditures and projected revenues.

Councilmember Dahlhoff noted that the Public Health and Safety Committee met earlier in the day and agreed the remnant property tax should be allocated to public health and safety purposes.

MAYOR/CITY ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT: There were no reports.

RECESS TO EXECUTIVE SESSION: **Mayor Sullivan recessed the meeting at 6:07 p.m. for approximately 30 minutes to discuss collective bargaining pursuant to RCW 42.30.140(4)(b). No action is planned following the executive session.**

RECONVENE AND ADJOURNMENT: **Mayor Sullivan reconvened and adjourned the meeting at 6:35 p.m.**

Prepared by Valerie L. Gow, Recording Secretary/President
Puget Sound Meeting Services, psmsoly@earthlink.net