WATER: A BASIC NEED BUT AN INCREASINGLY COMPLICATED ISSUE

By Jan O'Connor, Reclaimed Water Committee

W
ater has played an essential role in the development of historic settlements. Water was essential for consumption, agriculture and early transportation.

English settlers who came to North America brought English common law to the colonies. The English system of water rights was known as the riparian system. It gives each owner of land bordering a stream the right to use water from a stream as long as that use does not unreasonably affect water quality and quantity downstream. Early on, settlers in Washington Territory followed the riparian doctrine. Currently, older riparian rights are recognized, but no new water rights can be established under riparian doctrine. In the western United States, the doctrine of prior appropriation was also used. The first user of water had a priority right to continue the use of water regardless of the location of the land. Water was necessary for carrying out mining operations even if they did not adjoin the stream. In times of shortage, under these systems, the burden falls on those with the most recent claims.

Since these claims are still recognized, it is important that they be adjudicated (officially recognized and recorded). Because of the large number of unadjudicated claims and their uncertain status, the state legislature has limited the recording of water rights. The number and status of these rights is really difficult to assess with limited resources.

When Washington became a state in 1889, it assumed jurisdiction over waters within its borders. However, over half of the surface water (this includes streams) in the state originates in Canada or other states. And thirty-five percent of the state is federal property, either as national forest or as reservations for Native Americans for whom the federal government is the trustee. Furthermore, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution states that congress has the power to regulate commerce among the states. The Supreme Court has determined that this authority includes all navigable rivers and tributaries as well as their headwaters. This authority has been assumed by the federal government.

In looking back, it is clear that the rules of western water law by which water was allocated in the state in earlier times are inadequate. To use water from a stream without impacting downstream users:
- assumes there is an adequate supply of water.
- ignores the fact that the water in a stream is part of a system.
- discounts the role of the stream in the ecosystem.
- ignores the contaminants that may enter the stream as used water returns to it.
- pays attention to short term climatic conditions but tends to ignore long term projected changes.

The state took no action on water rights until 1917, when the legislature passed the Surface Water Code, establishing a permit system requiring state approval before water could be diverted from a
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## Contact Information

### League of Women Voters of Seattle

- **Address:** 1620 18th Avenue, Suite 101, Seattle, WA 98122
- **Phone:** (206) 329-4848
- **Fax:** (206) 329-1273
- **Email:** info@seattlelwv.org
- **Website:** [www.seattlelwv.org](http://www.seattlelwv.org)

**Office Hours:**
- Weekdays, 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.

### League of Women Voters of Washington

- **Address:** 4730 University Way NE # 720, Seattle, WA 98105
- **Phone:** (206) 622-8961
- **Email:** lwvwa@lwvwa.org
- **Website:** [www.lwvwa.org](http://www.lwvwa.org)

### League of Women Voters of the United States

- **Phone:** (202) 429-1965
- **Email:** lwv@lwv.org
- **Website:** [www.lwv.org](http://www.lwv.org)

**Postal Regulations**

*The Seattle Voter* is published monthly except June and August.

**Published periodicals postage paid at** Seattle, WA.

**Postmaster:**
- Send address changes to *Seattle Voter*.

- **Address:** 1620 18th Ave, Suite 101, Seattle, WA 98122
- **Website:** [www.seattlelwv.org](http://www.seattlelwv.org)
President’s Message

In February we celebrate our 91st Birthday, and while we don’t have any members who joined in 1920, we do have several who are as old as or older than the League. I’ve been sworn to secrecy, but many of you know who they are. Let’s celebrate a longevity that I hope is contagious for all our members!

What keeps an organization like ours going strong through good times and bad? In part, I’d say it is a shared belief that giving up is not an option; that the goal is worth fighting for no matter how long it takes. Certainly, the original suffragists didn’t expect that it would take 72 years to win the right to vote, yet they and their successors persevered. (I do wonder how the struggle would have gone if they’d had email, Facebook and Twitter!)

In these challenging times, when we are confronted with the tragedy in Arizona and an increasingly toxic climate for political discourse, when the economy and lack of revenue push our representatives to cut essential human services, when we ourselves are struggling to make ends meet, it is easy to feel overwhelmed. People start saying “it’s hopeless, it’ll never change, there’s nothing we can do.”

Wrong. History has shown us—from the American revolution to emancipation to suffrage, through the Great Depression and countless other struggles large and small—nothing is hopeless, things can change and there is a lot we can accomplish if we are willing to work.

So what can you do? Well, neither you nor I nor the League can fix everything at once overnight. So pick something that you want to be your focus. We’ll be using your responses to last month’s meetings to look for priorities for the local league. You can join us by working on a committee, responding to action alerts, or helping to organize an event. You could also choose to follow your own issue—research it, sign up for email alerts, watch council or committee meetings online or attend them in person. In addition, don’t be afraid to get into a political discussion with friends. Let them know what you and the League are doing; ask them how they feel about the issues; tell them how they can get involved and encourage them to do so.

We need to model the behavior we want to see in our communities; if we don’t do it, how can we expect others to do so? And never forget the immortal words of Margaret Mead: “Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world; indeed, it’s the only thing that ever has.”

Sincerely,

Learn CPR this month!

February is Heart Health Awareness month and in honor of this you can learn CPR from the President!

Our own Allison Feher is an instructor with the American Red Cross and has volunteered to teach up to 12 League members and friends how to perform Adult CPR. Cost for the class is $50 ($55 if you need a formal certificate). Since Allison is donating her time, most of the fee is a donation to the League, less only the cost of supplies and equipment rental.

Date: Saturday, February 12 at 9:00am
Location: The Seattle League office
RSVP required. Contact the office at 329-4848 or info@seattlelwv.org
# February/March

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Forum: Reclaimed Water 7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Board Meeting 9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Voter Deadline/International Relations Comm. 12:45 p.m./Teacher Study Comm. 3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Special Election Justice At Work Open House 12:30 p.m.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nominating Committee 10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>League’s 91st Birthday</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Transportation Committee 10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Civics Education Committee 4:30 p.m.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Teacher Study Committee 3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>March 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Forum: Women and the Media 7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## FEBRUARY
- **Forum: Reclaimed Water**
  - Thursday, February 3 7:30 p.m.
  - Seattle First Baptist Church
- **Board Meeting**
  - Saturday, February 5 9:00 a.m.
  - League Office
- **Voter Deadline**
  - Monday, February 7
- **International Relations Committee**
  - Monday, February 7 12:45-2:45 p.m.
  - League Office
- **Teacher Study Committee**
  - Monday, February 7 3:30 p.m.
  - League Office
- **Special Election**
  - Tuesday, February 8

## MARCH
- **Forum: Women and the Media**
  - Thursday, March 3 7:30 p.m.
  - Eastside Location TBD
- **Board Meeting**
  - Saturday, March 5 9:00 a.m.
  - League Office
- **Voter Deadline**
  - Monday, March 7
The League of Women Voters of Seattle (LWVS) presents a public forum each month between August and May, generally on the first Thursday of the month at 7:30 p.m. Many forums are preceded by discussion leader briefings at 6:30 to assist with preparation for monthly unit meetings. Most forums are held at the Seattle First Baptist Church, but occasionally they are scheduled in other locations, including at least one on the eastside. The tentative schedule of upcoming forums for 2010-2011 appears above; check your Voter or the LWVS website, seattlelwv.org, each month for up-to-date information.

**Board Briefs By Joanna Cullen, Secretary**

*The Board of the League of Women Voters of Seattle (LWVS) met on Saturday morning, January 8.*

**TRY**

A continued effort for fundraising for the new TRY is necessary and all Board members were urged to help with this.

**League Office**

President Allison Feher reported on the purchase of new office equipment.

**Committees**

Committee work as reported in the January Voter is continuing. The reading committee for upcoming Reclaimed Water forum in February has been meeting and is working on finalizing the work. Reading committees for upcoming forums on Women and the Media, Taxation and Budget, and Transportation were formed.

The Technology Committee reported on its effort to improve the LWVS website and its work with Outreach, Public Relations and Membership to explore more efficient and meaningful strategies for effective uses of electronic and social networking communications.

The committee that is reviewing the ballot issues endorsement process presented a report for Board discussion and further review.

**Calendar**

A Board retreat is planned for January and the Annual Meeting will be on Thursday, May, 19, 2011.

**National Priorities**

The League of Women Voters of the United States (LWVUS) requested suggestions for action priorities for the coming year. The Board reviewed the current list of action priorities and endorsed them, with a few additions and changes. National’s top three priorities are Global Climate Change, Health Care Reform, and Campaign Finance Reform. The second tier includes Ethics and Lobbying, Elections Reform, DC Voting Rights, Committee to Eliminate Discrimination against Women, and Arms Control.

The LWVS Board passed motions to add the Death Penalty and Immigration Reform to its recommended list and to suggest moving Ethics and Lobbying to the top tier of priorities.
Committees

**INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE**
**DATE:** MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7  
**TIME:** 12:45–2:45 P.M.  
**PLACE:** LEAGUE OFFICE

We will continue to discuss American foreign policy, with an emphasis on competing views of how the country should project itself in the world. Readings are available from Ellen Berg at ellenzberg@msn.com. We will also have a report from Ellen on a meeting with Peace Action on the next steps for the nuclear disarmament movement in the region.

**TEACHER STUDY COMMITTEE**
**DATES:** MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7  
**DRAFT:** MONDAY, FEBRUARY 28  
**TIME:** 3:30 – 5:00 P.M.  
**PLACE:** LEAGUE OFFICE

For more information, contact Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis at terrylucy2u@comcast.net.

**NOMINATING COMMITTEE**
**DATE:** WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 9  
**TIME:** 10:00 A.M.  
**PLACE:** 909 E NEWTON ST., D-9

The Nominating Committee is in the process of compiling a list of potential nominees for Board positions. If you have names to suggest, please contact committee chair Nancy Eitreim at nanecye@speakeasy.net or (206) 722-2820.

**SOCIAL JUSTICE COMMITTEE**
**DATE:** THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10  
**TIME:** 7:00 – 8:30 P.M.  
**PLACE:** LEAGUE OFFICE

**TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**
**DATE:** TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15  
**TIME:** 10:00 – 12:00 A.M.  
**PLACE:** LEAGUE OFFICE  
**SPAKER:** TRANSPORTATION CHOICES COALITION SPOKESPERSON

The Transportation Committee will be presenting the May Seattle League Forum. Each of our meetings for the next few months will be focused on preparing for that forum. Our subject will be “Smart Transportation Choices and How to Fund Them.”

**CIVICS EDUCATION COMMITTEE**
**DATE:** WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16  
**TIME:** 4:30 P.M.  
**PLACE:** VIOS CAFÉ, UPSTAIRS AT THIRD PLACE BOOKS, RAVENNA (NE 65TH AND 20TH AVE NE IN SEATTLE)

The meeting will cover other people’s new ideas and the March Forum. Please email Dana Twight at dctwight@mac.com for more information or with questions.

**ECONOMICS AND TAXATION COMMITTEE**
**DATE:** SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 26  
**TIME:** 9:00 A.M.  
**PLACE:** 909 E. NEWTON ST., D-9

For more information, call Nora Leech at (206) 328-0445.

**IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE**

The Immigration Committee continues to write responses to myths about immigration. To date, four of these myths have been published in the *Voter*, one each month. Three more are nearing completion. We are working with Jean Carlson on ideas for wider audiences. The Seattle University Law School newsletter has published one, and has agreed to publish the others. Although Comprehensive Immigration Reform may not come up before Congress any time soon, a positive outcome for reform requires much education of the public. These articles are the committee’s contribution toward that end. Co-chairs, Barbara Reid and Barbara Yasui.
Announcements

HELP WANTED

NOMINATING COMMITTEE
The terms of several League of Women Voters of Seattle (LWVS) Board members will be expiring in June. The Nominating Committee is seeking candidates for a new slate of officers and directors, to be elected at Annual Meeting in May. If you have suggestions, or are interested in serving yourself, please let the committee know. Send the names of candidates, a brief introduction, and contact information to committee chair Nancy Eitreim at nancye@speakeasy.net, or call her at (206) 329-4848.

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE
LWVS has recently established a group to look at how we use technology, particularly our website. We would appreciate any feedback on the site, seattlelwv.org. Please send any comments or suggestions to technology.seattlelwv@gmail.com.

We would like to expand this committee. We are also in need of someone to provide us with guidance in web design, Access data base and other technical areas. If you or someone you know would be willing to share such expertise with us, please contact us at the email address above.

MEMBERSHIP
See this month’s membership report (page 13) for a list of many ways that you can make a difference. A number of the tasks require only a few hours per month, and you can choose the one that suits you best.

LWVS would like to acknowledge the recent appointment of member Nora Leech to the national League’s Privatization Study Committee! Nora chaired the local League’s Privatization Study Committee in 2010, and proposed a national privatization study at last year’s LWVUS Convention. Congratulations, Nora!
LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF WASHINGTON LOBBY DAY

DATE: THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 24
TIME: 8:30 A.M. REGISTRATION
       9:00 A.M. PROGRAM
COST: $25 PER PERSON — LUNCH PROVIDED
PLACE: COLUMBIA ROOM, STATE CAPITOL, OLYMPIA

League of Women Voters of Washington (LWVWA) Lobby Day at the State Legislature is an opportunity to discuss legislative issues with the LWVWA Lobby team and other Leaguers, learn how to help the team act on the LWVWA legislative priorities, hear speakers and meet state legislators and their staff. Members who attend the morning program are encouraged to make appointments to meet with individual legislators in the afternoon.

If you are interested in carpooling to Olympia for Lobby Day, please call the League office at (206) 329-4848.

GREAT DECISIONS 2011

There is still time to sign up for a Great Decisions 2011 discussion group. The three groups sponsored by the League of Women Voters of Seattle will begin meeting in February. Please call the contact person listed below for more information or to arrange to join a group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Meeting Times</th>
<th>Contact Person</th>
<th>Phone #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3426 74th S.E., Mercer Island</td>
<td>Thursday Afternoons</td>
<td>Susie Anschell</td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>909 E. Newton, Seattle</td>
<td>Alternate Tuesday Evenings</td>
<td>Carol Goldenberg</td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issaquah—call for location</td>
<td>Alternate Sunday Evenings</td>
<td>Denise Smith</td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To order the $20.00 2011 Great Decisions briefing book, call (800) 477-5836 or visit www.greatdecisions.org.

2011 Topics:
- REBUILDING HAITI
- U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY
- HORN OF AFRICA
- RESPONDING TO THE FINANCIAL CRISIS
- GERMANY ASCENDANT
- SANCTIONS AND NONPROLIFERATION
- THE CAUCASUS
- GLOBAL GOVERNANCE
**THE CENTRAL WATERFRONT PROJECT INFORMATION SESSION**

**DATE:** Thursday, February 17  
**PLACE:** Seattle Aquarium  
**TIME:** 6:30-8:30 p.m.

The second major information session on the Central Waterfront Project will include a 30 minute presentation by James Corner, who has been selected as the lead designer for the project.

---

**THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST HISTORIANS GUILD CONFERENCE**

**DATE:** Saturday, March 5  
**TIME:** 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.  
**PLACE:** Museum of History and Industry

The topic of this year’s conference is Pacific Waterways. The topic is relevant to many League interests, and past conferences have always been excellent sources of information. Visit www.pnwhistorians.org for more information.

---

**JUSTICE AT WORK OPEN COURT**

**DATE:** Tuesday, February 8  
**TIME:** 12:30 – 4:00 p.m.  
**PLACE:** King County Superior Court Presiding Courtroom  
516 3rd Ave., Seattle, 9th Floor

The King County Courts will be holding an open house, cosponsored by the Justice in Jeopardy Initiative. Visitors will have the opportunity to hear from presiding judges, see court in session, and learn about court programs, records and services.

**Schedule:**  
12:30 – 1:00 p.m. Registration  
1:00 – 1:45 p.m. Opening remarks  
1:45 – 3:00 p.m. Open Court  
3:00 – 4:00 p.m. informal Q&A session

RSVPs are not required but are appreciated, to Nell McNamara at nell@ejc.org or (206) 447-8168.

---

**FEBRUARY 8 IS ELECTION DAY**

For some of us at least. Voters in Bothell, Fall City, Kirkland, North Bend, Redmond, Sammamish, Snoqualmie and Woodinville will be deciding on capital investments in their schools. North Bend area voters will also be deciding on a new fire station. School district boundaries do not necessarily follow municipal boundaries, so voters in parts of some cities may not be participating. If you didn’t get a ballot and you think you should have, call King County Elections at (206) 296-8683.
League News

THANK YOU TO TRY DONORS

The Seattle League Education Board would like to thank our generous donors and volunteers for their support of this year’s They Represent You (TRY) directory. Our 2011 fundraising campaign has helped us meet the costs of publishing and distributing the TRY. The 2011 directory will be available in mid-February. We are very grateful to our donors listed below! If you’d like to join this august group, please consider a tax-deductible donation to this signature League production. Thanks again!

Major Sponsors - $4000 and above
Microsoft Corporation, Anonymous

Sponsors - $2500-$3999
Lorna Stern

Major Contributor - $1000 and above
Charles and Nancy Bagley, Vicky Downs
Friend of the League, Judy Pigott
Charlene McKenzie, SPEEA Society of Professional Engineering Employees in Aerospace

Contributor - $500-$999
Congressman Jim McDermott and Therese Hansen, Anonymous, International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers Local 17, Bruce and Denise Smith, Betty and Jay Sullivan, Vanguard Charitable Endowment Program

Supporters - $250-$499
46th District Democrats, AFT Seattle Community Colleges Local 1789, Renton Carpenters Union Local 1797, Carpenters Union Local 131, Connections Group, LADS (Lathing, Acoustical, Drywall Systems Local 1144, League of Women Voters of King County South, SEIU Healthcare 775NW, Herb Bridge and Edie Hilliard, Kris and Alan Bushley, Jean Carlson, Lucy and Michael Copass, Theline Cramer, Diana Henderson, Thom Langley, Monica Leigh, Mary McColl Neilson, Sue Mecklenburg, Judith Ostrow, Kathy Sakahara, Dorothy Young Sale, Ruth Schroeder, Ms. Lee Van Divort, Cyndi Woods

Donors
Friend of the League, Issaquah Day Unit, Seattle King County Coalition on the Homeless, Ann Aagaard, Ellen Aagaard, William Anderson, Margaret Austin, Nadine Baker, Sandy Barney, Mae Benne, Kris Bushley, Jean Carlson, Maureen Carroll, Pat Cleary, John Coleman, Betty Culbert, Hilda Darling, Nancy Debaste, Idalice Dickinson, Gloria Epstein, Rick Erickson, Nancy Ericsson, Hilke Faber, Marcy Golde, Betsy Greene, Dorothy Guth, Verda Hansberry, Constance Hellyer, Diana Henderson, Elizabeth Kerr, Marguerite Kuhns, Thom Langley, Kathy Leiendoeker, Patricia Lein, Virginia Leland, Anne Lester, Louise Luce, Jocelyn Marchiosis, Dorris Martin, Roberta Martin, Ronald Mattson, Rosalie McCreary, Sarah McElroy, Jean McMurrrey, Gabriella Metzger, Sue Mozer, Lois North, Jan O’Connor, Mary Pneuman, Mary Margaret Pruitt, Karen Reed, Ruthe Ridder, Nancy Rust, Shelley Schermer, M.J. Schiffrin, Ruth Schroeder, Kathryn Shields, Gail Shurgot, Elsie Simon, Nancy Smith, Olive Spannaus, Jane Stevens, Akilah Stewart, Maureen Stone, Elizabeth Terrey, Tjitske van der Meulen, Janet Ward, Laura Weese, Ruth Wernitz, Peter Wheeler, Ethel Williams, Marian Wolfe, Elizabeth Yates
Action & Advocacy

THE LEAGUE AND NONPARTISANSHIP

BY SUSAN GILBERT, NEWSLETTER EDITOR AND 40-YEAR LEAGUE MEMBER

It is not uncommon for outsiders, and even some members, to question how the League can be nonpartisan yet advocate on positions that, in the slice of time that is now, appear to be partisan. In the highly partisan climate that has developed in recent years, the League is one of the very few political organizations that is not in either the liberal/Democratic camp or the conservative/Republican camp. And we have members of all political persuasions and encourage them to get involved in politics. So members may be partisan but the organization is not. All this is hard for many to wrap their minds around.

The League is nonpartisan in that we do not endorse or support any political party or candidate for office. We don’t rate legislators, we don’t track their votes and we don’t threaten them if they don’t vote our way. Voter service is one of our main missions and we publish nonpartisan voter guides and hold candidate forums to help voters educate themselves beyond TV ads.

Education is an important League function, and we try in our meetings and in this newsletter to inform our attendees/readers and stimulate them to think about issues in our world.

However, the League is also an advocacy group, and we have positions on issues that have been developed over the years since our founding in 1920 and are the result of study and consensus of the local Leagues nationwide. These positions are updated from time to time, but are basically consistent. The positions and platforms of the political parties, on the other hand, do change and at times they resemble our League position, or not. But the League doesn’t change or drop its positions because they are currently those of one party or the other. And we do speak out.

An example is health care. The League has a position on comprehensive health care for all Americans. President Truman liked that idea too and President Eisenhower delivered a special message to Congress on January 31, 1955 recommending a comprehensive health program for Americans. Lyndon Johnson got Medicare passed and that took the pressure off for awhile. But President Nixon encouraged HMOs as a way to rein in costs and provide health care for more people. Then President Reagan came along and decided the free market was the best way to manage health care and the Republicans have basically supported this idea since. But clearly both parties have been on both sides of the issue.

The key is not to confuse politics with position advocacy.

Mission Statement
The League of Women Voters of Seattle, a nonpartisan political organization, encourages informed and active participation in government, works to increase understanding of major public policy issues and influences public policy through education and advocacy.

The League of Women Voters of Seattle serves the greater Seattle area, including the cities of north King County as well as east King County from Bothell to Bellevue.
The 2011 legislative session began on January 10 and is scheduled to end its 105-day session on April 24. The League of Women Voters of Washington (LWVWA) Lobby Team consists of League members who have an interest in one or more issue areas—housing, taxes, health care, K-12 education, early learning, climate change, the environment, budget, and reproductive choice, to name a few. Team members follow legislation on their issue, speak to legislators, and write a weekly report for distribution in the Legislative Newsletter. The team can always use a few more members to cover emerging issues—corrections and lending practices are two important areas that at present do not have coverage.

The LWVWA Lobby Team, under the leadership of Kim Abel, has been meeting since the first week of session and will meet every Thursday until the final cutoff. Meetings are held every Thursday at 11:30 a.m. in the Cherberg Building, Room 236 on the Capitol campus, and all League members are invited to attend the meetings. Many members of the Team participate in the meetings using the skype connection on their computers, so they don’t have to go to Olympia every week.

Leg.wa.gov is the website that connects everyone to the action in Olympia. Another resource is TVW, Channel 23. Its website is tvw.org. There are several programs that will give you more information about events in Olympia during the session. “Inside Olympia” features weekly interviews and in-depth discussions with state leaders. “The Impact” is also an interview show that looks at how decisions are made in Olympia and how those decisions affect citizens. “Legislative Review” airs every weekday evening and features highlights from the day’s legislative action. On Friday evenings and throughout the weekend a summary of the week’s activities is aired. All of these programs can be seen several times on different days of the week. See tvw.org for specific days and times.

Don’t forget Lobby Day on February 24! There will be speakers, including lobby team members, our professional lobbyist Lonnie Johns-Brown and legislative members. You will also get a quick course in how to lobby your legislators. To sign up for Lobby Day, download the form at www.lwvwa.org or call the state league office at (206) 622-8961. The cost is $25 and includes lunch. See you there!

Mark Your Calendar for TRY 2011!

The 2011 edition of They Represent You: Directory of Elected Officials will be arriving in our office on February 7th. Please plan to come by and pick up copies to hand out to your unit members, friends, neighbors, and any other organizations you work with. It’s an amazing tool that no King County resident should be without!
Membership Report by Kelly Powers, Membership Chair

Eastside Get to Know League Event — Thursday, March 3

There will be a Get to Know League event before the March Forum — exact time to be determined. This is our annual membership event that we hold on the eastside. All are welcome and we hope to get many potential new eastside members to attend. This is a great way for new members and prospective members to get an overview of the League and then to see one of our terrific forums right afterwards.

Who could you invite? If you’d like us to send out an invitation to someone, please send the name and address to us at membership.seattlelwv@gmail.com, or call (206) 329-4848. We will be mailing out invitations around Valentine’s Day.

If you’re planning to attend, please RSVP to the League office by February 25 so we can be sure to have enough hors d’oeuvres.

Renew with Local League

To save money, the League of Women Voters of the United States has decided that it will no longer handle League memberships. All memberships will now be handled by the local leagues. This can be confusing because it’s possible that you may receive a solicitation that refers to “membership,” but is actually a request for a donation.

The easiest way to avoid potential confusion is to be sure to renew at the local level using the Seattle League renewal form — that way you are a member at the local, state and national levels. Of course you’re welcome to donate at all levels.

Thanks for keeping an eye out for the Seattle membership renewal form. It looks like this:

We want to make sure you don’t lose your membership. If you receive a mailing and are not sure, call the office at (206) 329-4848 and we can help keep you connected to the League.

Online Payment Update

More Membership housekeeping! We have changed the attributes for Paypal payments so it’s just a one-time payment rather than an annual, recurring payment. We apologize for the inconvenience.

It’s been a rough ride moving from Click and Pledge to Paypal and then researching the new bank’s online payment offerings. Many thanks to Allison Feher and Judy Bevington for many hours of research. We think we have it now!

We’ve also added the ability to pay for gift memberships online.
**Call for Volunteers!**

Did you know that volunteers carry out most of the administration work of the League?

If you’d like to….

- ease into learning more about the League
- share your experience and expertise or build your resume
- honor your New Year’s resolution to get more involved...we need you!

**Mailings**

If you like the satisfaction of getting things done, crave a regular schedule and like socializing while your work, this is the volunteer position for you! We mail between 50 and 100 renewals each month — a small mailing easily doable in 1 1/2 hours, usually at the end of the month. We like to have a couple of people to make it fun and for vacation coverage.

**Office Support**

Help us stay on top of our game! Come in once or twice a month to shred, prepare for mailings, set up files, do small organizational projects or small data entry projects in the office. It’s a great way to begin to get to know what’s going on at the League. Once or twice a month for 2 hours.

**Membership Contact for Units**

If hospitality is your joy, help fire up the League’s welcome wagon. Help connect new members to the League. 2 hours a month.

**Graphics and Layout**

Add zip to our publications and invitations! We use Adobe In Design and Word. This is an occasional need. Most projects can be done at home and by email, and take 2–4 hours. Add your name to the list of graphics folks to call for small projects.

**New Member Biography Writer**

For the ultimate people person who enjoys connecting people to the League.

You will follow up with new members to learn more about their experiences, interests and talents and write up a few lines about them for the *Voter*.

Time required varies — under 4 hours towards the end of the month, except June and July.

**Membership Committee**

Passionate about building League membership? Help us recruit and retain members. A sample of topics we’ll act on include: how to engage volunteers, how to give our members the best possible League experience, and how to integrate new members. Whether you’re a visionary individual or a nuts and bolts person, your input is welcome. 4 hours a month.

To learn more, or to volunteer, please email membership.seattlelwv@gmail.com or call the office (206) 329-4848.
MEMBERSHIP NOTES

Please join us in wishing Olive Spannaus a happy 95th Birthday. Olive was awarded the Carrie Chapman Catt award in 1995. As many of you recall, Olive was devoted to new members — interviewing new members, writing new member bios, arranging new member dinners and composing League songs. Olive joined the League when she lived in Illinois. Her League interests ran the gamut from sewers to housing integration to the recognition of Communist China. When she retired to Seattle, Olive joined the Seattle League. Olive shares the love of League with her daughter, Boots Winterstein, who is recovering from knee replacement surgery.

In Memoriam — Jane Brown
By Pat Cleary; picture supplied by Olive Spannaus

Jane Brown, a Leaguer to her bones, died last fall in Plano, Texas. Jane had been a longtime and active member of the Seattle League, and for some years while living in Louisiana, had been active in the New Orleans League. She moved to Texas a number of years ago to be closer to her family.

I had the privilege of working with Jane beginning in the late seventies. She was a great mentor and supporter of my work and the work of others in the League.

Jane was a dedicated member of the Education committee and an observer at virtually every school board meeting. She had a deep commitment to quality integrated education for all students, a commitment that she worked for both in her years in New Orleans and when she returned to Seattle.

For years, she was an almost constant presence in the League office, serving as office administrator. She was there for the mailings, the Voter collating and the CIS desk. She wasn’t above a bit of elbow grease either.

We worked together on the Women’s Rights committee. One of the first tasks that the president, Astrid Berg, bestowed upon me was the pledge drive for the Equal Rights Amendment. I had no idea of how to go about this, but Jane made sure I had the lists, wrote up a script and had a training session for the volunteers. And of course she provided the house and the brunch. Just about any task could be fun with Jane. When we worked on the Women and Local Government study, with Jane’s encouragement, we went as a committee to the movie Nine to Five, and included it on our bibliography. She also was a firm supporter of League’s taking a position on gay rights in the late seventies.

She knew what the League preamble stood for.
BOOK REVIEW by Vicky Downs

The Blue Death: Disease, Disaster and the Water We Drink

by Robert Morris

A retired nurse recommended this book published in 2007, saying it “reads like a detective novel.” I found it full of colorful stories of epidemics, from waterborne diseases in mid-19th century England to late 20th century outbreaks in Africa, India and the United States. What these accounts have in common is the natural human fear of the unknown together with human complacency about scientific knowhow and its ability to keep us safe.

Describing the 1993 epidemic of cryptosporidiosis in Milwaukee, Morris urges us to make no assumptions about the safety of our water. In Wisconsin, 400,000 became sick and over 100 died, while men in charge of the water system assured everyone that the water standards were normal. Until that time, few knew anything about cryptosporidium, which literally means “unseen seed.” Fortunately, someone in the US was studying that particular microbe, and in time helped to stop the epidemic. Morris says that though “we are unlikely to see another major outbreak of [that disease]… improvements have almost always looked backward. The risk we must fear most is the one we have never seen.”

We learn that filtering is necessary, but it cannot make water completely safe. Beds of sand are “at the heart” of a filtering system’s obstacle course in its efforts to keep out anything that can hurt us. However, imagine a tiny, unseen microbe enlarged to the size of a human adult. “When we enlarge the filter to match, the smallest grain of sand would grow to the size of a four story building. The largest would become taller than the Sears Tower.” At this scale, the microbes could tumble through the building-sized grains of sand, and a minuscule virus “would be like a child’s marble tumbling through a chaotic stack of boulders the size of apartment buildings.”

Morris has taught at Harvard, Tufts and other universities, and now lives in Seattle. He tells us that older cities are of special concern because leaks “can be an open door to microbes.” In response to a review he reports that Seattle has “terrific source water compared to any other city,” in addition to a good reputation for its program of prioritizing water pipe replacement.

Nonetheless, because we need to worry about new and unknown diseases, he strongly advises us to install and maintain “point-of-use” filters in homes and businesses. Though they aren’t cheap, they are far more sensible than bottled water, which is a thousand times more expensive than tap water with no guarantee of being safer. We also should be concerned about “growing populations and the increasing competition for finite resources of all kinds [which] pose the greatest threat to the future of humanity.”

I learned a great deal about waterborne diseases and about Seattle’s water, and am grateful to Dr. Morris for the ease with which I could learn about a complicated subject.

The opinions in this review are personal and do not represent those of the LWV.
DENISE SMITH, former President of the League of Women Voters of Seattle and current head of the Reclaimed Water Study Committee, kindly loaned me her copy of *The Big Necessity*. It is a humor-filled yet serious book on an important topic that is difficult to discuss in polite company.

The book is filled with fascinating stories and helpful statistics. 2.6 billion people — four out of every 10 human beings — live without any kind of toilet. “In the United States…1.7 million people have no sanitation.” In 1993, “Milwaukee’s drinking water made 400,000 people sick and killed over 100.” Milwaukee, it turns out, “discharges treated sewage effluence,” and sometimes raw sewage as well, into Lake Michigan, the source of its drinking water. The overflow from sewers after a deluge is one main way in which raw sewage enters the lake.

George uses the metaphor of astronauts in a space capsule to explain why it is important to treat our human waste safely. I had not realized that it is too expensive to send drinking water into space. This means that astronauts traveling in their space capsules have to drink their recycled “urine, sweat and tears.” In microcosm, this is what we have to do with water on Earth. “Most of it is salty and none of it is infinite.” We are constantly recycling water, and too often do a poor job of it.

The author shows us how culture affects the use of toilets. In China, rural people use toilet facilities with no doors in a place called the ni hao, meaning “the hello.” In India most people use bushes outside their villages, or alleys in the cities. In Japan it is now common to find toilets with heated seats for winter, built-in bidets and air dryers.

Engineers with special degrees are not needed to develop facilities to deal safely with human excrement. Local inventors have often found ways to make composting toilets, toilets needing very little water, “wilderness” toilets light enough to carry in a backpack, and “Jiffy bags of crystals for drivers caught in traffic to pee in.” Sometimes an idea works well in one place, but marketing the product for wider distribution can be difficult. Few Americans care to buy the fancy Japanese commodes with their built-in water sprays and dryers, and many Indians don’t want to use the government-built latrines made of cement, which seem too fancy and dark.

This is an intimate topic, and people generally are more comfortable with familiar facilities and ways of doing things, and are not eager to try something new. The author reports how one scientist, Kar, figured out how to get poor farming villagers in Bangladesh to build their own latrines. He started by visiting a village and getting the residents to show him around. After a while, he asked where they went to defecate. Once there, he spent a great deal of time, smelling the foul air and insisting on staying right there so everyone could experience the disgust with their visitor.

He then asked the villagers to help him calculate how much excrement was left in the open. After adding up the number of people and the number of times each defecated, they imagined cartloads of excrement and were “horrified by the sheer quantity of [it].” They realized that it went — “into their bathing ponds, onto their feet, their hands and into their mouths.” Kar then talked about flies, and pointed out how their tiny feet pick up minute pieces of excrement outside. Some then alight on food that will soon be in people’s mouths, leading to diarrhea. Filled with disgust at the thought, villagers almost immediately began to dig latrines. Two months later everyone was using a latrine and insisting that others do so as well.

This is an important topic. We learn in *The Big Necessity* that bad hygiene and unsafe water cause one in ten of the world’s illnesses, and that airplanes carry diseases around the globe. We are all in this together, and “we need to talk frankly” about this most human topic. Rose George helps us to do so.

*The opinions in this review are personal and do not represent those of the LWV.*
Many people believe that undocumented immigrants are not entitled to the protections given by the Constitution. This belief is widespread, as shown in a recent op-ed article in an Oklahoma newspaper, “Illegal aliens lack constitutional rights.” However, the Supreme Court has held for more than a century that aliens within the United States are persons entitled to constitutional protection. That includes aliens who are unlawfully present. While undocumented immigrants do not benefit from all of the rights granted to citizens, in particular the right to vote, they are entitled to most other fundamental rights that citizens enjoy.

Our nation’s history is full of legal precedent confirming that those present in the United States, even those with no defined immigration status, can rely on the Constitution for protection. For example, undocumented immigrants are entitled to due process: the idea that laws and legal proceedings must be fair. In 1886, the Supreme Court ruled on one such important case involving the rights of Chinese immigrants. The Court held that undocumented immigrants shall not be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law, as laid out in the 14th Amendment.  

Undocumented immigrants are also entitled to equal treatment under the law and protection against unreasonable searches and seizures. In 1982, the Supreme Court pronounced that undocumented immigrants were covered by the Equal Protection Clause of the Constitution when it struck down a Texas law that denied public education to the children of undocumented aliens. In 2008, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals held that in a case in which immigration agents entered a home and arrested aliens without obtaining a warrant, and could not demonstrate special circumstances or proof of consent, the officers’ entry constituted an unlawful search and seizure. 

Additionally, the Supreme Court has held that undocumented immigrants are entitled to competent legal representation at the government’s expense in criminal cases, as laid out in the 6th Amendment. Immigrants also have rights in immigration hearings, a type of civil proceeding, such as the right to a deportation hearing with an immigration judge. They also have the right to an interpreter, if necessary, and the right to examine the evidence being presented against them. 

While it is true that undocumented immigrants do not share in all the rights enumerated under the Constitution, it is also true that citizens are not always entitled to all of those rights. Convicted felons, for example, cannot own firearms or vote. Citizens not born in the United States may not run for president. However, the law makes clear that undocumented immigrants are entitled to protection under the Constitution while they are within the boundaries of the United States.

Justice is one of the most basic values of the United States. To have true meaning, justice needs to be applied to all persons within the jurisdiction of the U.S., not only to U.S. citizens. Through the broad definition of “all” we acknowledge as a country the humanity of all people, and apply to all equal treatment under the law. Precedent established through the cases cited above reminds us that justice is, and should continue to be, applied to undocumented immigrants.
1http://newsok.com/illegal-aliens-lack-constitutional-rights/article/3530334

2Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356 (1886). The Court held specifically that the statement, “nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws,” applied to all persons “without regard to any differences of race, of color, or of nationality,” and to “an alien, who has entered the country, and has become subject in all respects to its jurisdiction, and a part of its population, although alleged to be illegally here.”

3Plyler v. Doe, 457 U.S. 202 (1982). In its decision, the Court held, “The illegal aliens who are plaintiffs in these cases challenging the statute may claim the benefit of the Equal Protection Clause, which provides that no State shall ‘deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.’ Whatever his status under the immigration laws, an alien is a ‘person’ in any ordinary sense of that term… The undocumented status of these children vel non does not establish a sufficient rational basis for denying them benefits that the State affords other residents.”

4Lopez-Rodriguez v. Mukasey, 536 F.3d 1012 (2008). The plain language of the Fourth Amendment states “the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated; and no Warrants shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.”

5130 S. Ct. 1473 (2010). The ruling requires defense counsel to provide affirmative, competent advice to a noncitizen defendant regarding the immigration consequences of a guilty plea. In the absence of such advice, a noncitizen may raise a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel.


Diversity Policy

The League of Women Voters of Seattle (LWVS), in both its values and practices, affirms its beliefs and commitment to diversity and pluralism, which means there shall be no barriers to participation in any activity of the League on the basis of gender, race, creed, age, sexual orientation, national origin or disability.

LWVS recognizes that diverse perspectives are important and necessary for responsible and representative decision-making. LWVS subscribes to the belief that diversity and pluralism are fundamental to the values it upholds and that this inclusiveness enhances the organization’s ability to respond more effectively to changing conditions and needs.

LWVS affirms its commitment to reflecting the diversity of Americans in its membership, board, staff and programs.
February Program: Reclaimed Water

Reclaimed Water Update Questions

For Discussion:

1. What is reclaimed water? What treatment processes are used?
   How is it delivered?

2. How is reclaimed water classified? For what uses is it approved? What limits its use?

3. What are the advantages of a centralized system vs. a decentralized system?

4. What are the benefits of developing a mainstream reclaimed water system? Is it cost effective?

5. What obstacles are there to the development of a reclaimed water system?

Consensus Question:

Does the League support the development of mainstream reclaimed water programs at this time?
What factors should be considered for adopting reclaimed water programs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Less Important</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cost effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental safeguards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effects on Puget Sound and other water bodies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how much water is reused/saved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human health and safety protections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulation, oversight and enforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>privatization &amp; water rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction
Waters issues in Washington State and King County in particular are a long standing interest of the League of Women Voters of Seattle (LWVS). The challenges to water quality and quantity predicted with global climate change, the threat to aquatic species from pollution of Puget Sound and fresh water resources, and the increased demand for water with our burgeoning population are topics currently being addressed by local and regional policy makers in King County.

One solution that addresses all of these issues is the reuse of treated wastewater for non-drinking water purposes. Since October 2008, King County has been in the process of developing their Reclaimed Water Comprehensive Plan, intended to provide “guidance for King County’s reclaimed water program for the next 30 years.” Over the last six months, the LWVS Reclaimed Water Committee has conducted interviews with representatives from King County, the city of Seattle and People for Puget Sound and reviewed this program. This report is an overview of the evolution of wastewater treatment in King County from the creation of the Municipality of Metropolitan Seattle (Metro) to the King County Regional Treatment System and Reclaimed Water Program.

Typically, population growth results in increased demand for water. In fact, the King County region has seen a paradoxical decrease in demand for several reasons, including conservation and update of plumbing codes. Nevertheless, some communities in Washington have already reached the limits of easily available water. The use of groundwater from wells exempt from water right permits under Washington state statute RCW 90.44.050 for irrigation and other non-drinking water purposes has lowered water tables. Long time water advocate, water and sewer commissioner and county councilwoman Louise Miller remarked to our committee that: “We should not be using good drinking water to put out fires, wash trucks or water golf courses.”

Critical to our response to water demand is the understanding that along with increased demand for water comes an increased production of wastewater. Viewing wastewater as a resource through water reclamation and reuse, rather than as sewage to be discharged, offers the opportunity to simultaneously provide a new source of water and make productive use of wastewater. Many communities have implemented nonpotable (water not suitable for drinking) reclaimed water programs to provide water for landscape, agricultural and industrial uses. Reusing wastewater also provides communities with an opportunity to divert effluent, the liquid product of wastewater treatment plants, away from sensitive surface waters.

The regional population growth in the late 1980s and early 1990s put significant pressure on local water supplies in the central Puget Sound area. Several water shortages at that time highlighted the potential limitations of existing supplies. Pressure from growth and over-appropriated water basins in some local areas caused some suburban King County water districts to impose temporary moratoriums on new water connections between 1989 and 1998. This unsatisfied demand intensified the search for new sources to supplement traditional water supplies. Reclaimed water — that is, effluent derived in any part from sewage from a wastewater treatment system that has been adequately and reliably treated — was seen as one new resource to supply nonpotable water.

At about this same time, several salmon species in the Puget Sound watershed were listed or being considered for listing as threatened under the Endangered Species Act. King County Metro was
involved in this issue for its role in affecting Puget Sound water quality through discharge of effluent. Once again reclaiming water offered a potential solution. Increasing the level of wastewater treatment would improve the quality of discharged water while decreasing its quantity by diverting treated water for reuse. King County initiated a water reclamation program and has been using reclaimed water since 1997 for on-site industrial processes and landscape irrigation at its regional treatment plants in Seattle and Renton.

The Regional Wastewater Services Plan adopted by the King County Council in 1999 included the decision to build a third wastewater treatment plant to meet the increased demand in King and south Snohomish Counties. The new plant, Brightwater, includes reclaimed water processing as an integral part of its treatment system. Brightwater, as an advanced secondary treatment facility, will under normal flows treat all wastewater through membranes that can with some further disinfectant produce Class A reclaimed water. During high flow situations it becomes a blended system, with most flow going through the membranes and excess through secondary treatment.

Most recently, in 2005, the Puget Sound Partnership, a high level advisory commission of regional leaders, was established. This commission studied the scientific, geographical, political and funding issues influencing the sound’s environmental problems. In their report to the governor, the partnership identified use of reclaimed water as one of the possible solutions to the long term health of Puget Sound.

The History of Wastewater Treatment in the Region
To understand the King County reclaimed water program, it is helpful to understand some history of wastewater treatment in the region. King County’s wastewater treatment website and League members’ institutional memories provide the following background.

Wastewater treatment in King County and parts of Snohomish and Pierce Counties entered a new era when the Municipality of Metropolitan Seattle (Metro) was created by King County voters in 1958 to address the problems arising from rapid urban growth and inadequate wastewater treatment in the area. At that time, less than half the sewage in King County received any treatment, and many small and individual wastewater treatment systems were failing or close to failure. The city of Seattle’s main sewage outflow pipe discharged into Puget Sound just a short distance offshore, at a depth of only 25 feet. Throughout the area, raw sewage and storm water from multiple sources were contaminating Lake Washington, Puget Sound, other smaller lakes and rivers.

Prior to 1958, regional leaders including Jim Ellis and concerned citizens including Madeline Lemere, a member of the League of Women Voters, had joined together to address the contamination of Lake Washington. The group conducted a study of the water pollution problems facing the region and used their findings to gather public support. They also petitioned the state legislature to allow local governments in Washington to form metropolitan municipal corporations. A legislative measure passed in 1957 allowed regions to establish governmental bodies such as Metro to solve problems that crossed jurisdictional boundaries of special districts, cities and counties.

The approach taken by the newly formed Metro was thought to be very progressive at the time. The plan developed a regional system based upon watershed boundaries rather than individual systems
within jurisdictions. Metro’s first comprehensive sewage plan was adopted at the first meeting of the newly formed Metro council, establishing the framework for a regional system. The system included five wastewater treatment plants, including Seattle’s Alki Beach sewer plant, and large interceptor sewer lines around Lake Washington, the Duwamish Waterway and the Elliot Bay commercial waterfront.

Over the next 10 years Metro completed the Carkeek Park Treatment Plant, the Richmond Beach Treatment Plant, the Renton Treatment Plant and the West Point Treatment Plant. Metro also built wastewater pump stations and more than 100 miles of large trunk lines and interceptor sewers to connect the system. Most significant to the public, Metro closed the Lake City Treatment Plant in 1967, ending the flow of sewer effluent into Lake Washington.

The Metro Council began with elected officials from Seattle, King County, and small cities in the area, including south Snohomish County. The council was expanded by state legislative action in 1970s and 1980s to include representatives from Bellevue and sewer districts in the metropolitan service area and unincorporated areas.

Citizens concerned about the representation structure of Metro Council, as a body of elected officials from many jurisdictions with no direct constituents, brought a lawsuit against Metro. Judge William Dwyer ruled in 1991 that the Metro Council was unconstitutional. The King County Council and regional cities convened a summit to discuss reorganization. In 1992 voters approved an initiative to merge the Municipality of Metropolitan Seattle (Metro) with King County. The merger was completed in January 1994, and Metro wastewater treatment became King County Department of Natural Resources Wastewater Treatment Division.

Projected population growth determined by the Puget Sound Regional Council in the mid 1990s and wastewater flow estimates based on use patterns at that time predicted that King County’s regional wastewater treatment system would run out of capacity by 2010. In order to meet the planning requirements of the Growth Management Act and ensure effective wastewater treatment services in the future, the county carried out an intensive planning effort with elected officials and other stakeholders across the service area. The group developed a regional wastewater service plan, including a few policy options to be decided by then County Executive Ron Sims and approved by the King County Council.

The County Executive’s preferred Regional Wastewater Services Plan (RWSP) cited the region’s commitment to preserving water quality and recycling resources in a cost-effective manner while meeting or exceeding state and federal standards for water quality. The Regional Wastewater Services Plan was delivered to the King County Council in April 1998 and adopted after considerable study and review on November 29, 1999.

The adopted plan included building a new North treatment plant, Brightwater, with a new outfall into Puget Sound, and expanding the East treatment plant (in Renton). The plan also provided for reusing highly-treated water from the plants, conducting pilot and demonstration projects in order to study ways to economically provide reclaimed water, investigating stream-flow augmentation and groundwater recharge opportunities, and exploring the idea of building satellite plants to provide reclaimed water to local communities.
Construction on the new Brightwater Treatment Plant began in 2006. Geological and technical issues and problems with drilling the conveyance tunnel have delayed the planned 2011 beginning of operations. Most problems have been resolved and construction continues at this time. Production of reclaimed water remains a key component of the new Brightwater Wastewater Treatment Plant. As mentioned, the RWSP supports treating wastewater for irrigation purposes, and contemplates public and regulatory acceptance of reclaimed water as an adjunct to existing water supplies.

Stormwater runoff— rainwater that is contaminated by pollutants from roads, agricultural, industrial and other land sites— is recognized as the major cause of pollution in Puget Sound; it is a diffuse, difficult to control, non-point pollution. Such pollution, however, is outside the scope of King County wastewater management and of this study.

**A Brief History of Reclaimed Water**

Using reclaimed water is not a new idea. The United Nations Economic and Social Council established a policy in 1958 that states “No higher quality water, unless there is a surplus of it, should be used for a purpose that can tolerate a lower grade.” The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) first developed guidelines for water reuse in 1980. EPA policy was that for human consumption, “priority should be given to selection of the purest source. In cases where there is limited availability of water of the purest source lower quality water can be substituted to serve nonpotable purposes such as urban residential, commercial, and industrial uses.” (EPA 1976) Treated wastewater can provide a suitable source for irrigation, air conditioning and industrial cooling towers, industrial processing, toilet flushing, dust control and construction, cleaning and maintenance, including vehicle washing, manmade scenic water features and fountains, and environmental and recreational purposes.

Water reuse is an established practice in the United States, where in 2003 it was estimated that “1.7 billion gallons per day of wastewater is reused, and reclaimed water use on a volume basis is growing at an estimated 15% per year.” (EPA 2003) Since 2004, twenty-five states including Washington have had regulations in place regarding water reuse.

In Washington State, the city of Walla Walla has operated a water reclamation plant since 1927. Reclaimed water from this plant has irrigated agricultural land, particularly in areas where surface and groundwater is restricted. A 2005 Department of Ecology case study of reclaimed water facilities reported that in 2004 there were 17 facilities operating in Washington State providing water for purposes including crop and landscape irrigation, toilet flushing, dust control, construction water, industrial cooling, created wetlands, ground water recharge and stream flow. There are now 24 reclaimed water permits in Washington, ranging in size from 5000 gallons per day to 9.6 million gallons per day (mgd) at the Walla Walla irrigation project. A reclaimed water project at Snoqualmie Ridge was developed through a partnership between the city of Snoqualmie and the Weyerhaeuser Development Corporation. Snoqualmie’s Class A water reclamation facility has supplied reclaimed water to the Snoqualmie Ridge development for direct use or storage in Eagle Lake since 1998, allowing the Snoqualmie Ridge PGA Golf Course to meet its 1.0 mgd landscape maintenance requirement with reclaimed water.
Reclaimed Water in King County

The evolution of reclaimed water in the King County region has been driven as much by the desire to improve the quality and quantity of effluent leaving the treatment plant and entering Puget Sound as by the opportunity to augment water supply. Reclaimed water also provides a consistent and reliable source for nonpotable water uses, offering an alternative to the proliferation and continued use of exempt wells for nonpotable purposes that are stressing watersheds throughout the county. Regional Wastewater Services Plan outreach to residents in the King County wastewater service area identified a strong community desire to protect water quality and public health and a willingness to pay more to prevent water quality problems if costs were distributed equally. Keeping water bodies such as Puget Sound, Lake Washington, and regional rivers and streams clean was a high priority for those interviewed.

Reclaimed water was introduced into the King County wastewater system treatment system for on-site industrial processes and landscape irrigation at the Renton and Seattle treatment plants in 1997. King County’s current reclaimed water program produces 284 million gallons of Class A reclaimed water per year at these two regional wastewater plants. The Renton Plant has the potential to produce 1.3 mgd Class A reclaimed water from an average capacity of 115 million gallons per day. The West Point Plant has the potential to produce up to 0.70 mgd Class A reclaimed water from an average capacity of 133 million gallons per day, and the Brightwater Plant is expected to produce 5.0 mgd Class A reclaimed water from an average of 36 million gallons per day when it becomes operational.

There is a reclaimed water hydrant at the Renton Plant that provides nonpotable water for county and other jurisdiction staff to use for street sweeping, cleaning drains and catch basins, and controlling dust. Reclaimed water is also used by county staff to irrigate a demonstration garden and greenhouse and newly planted vegetation used for stream restoration and flood control projects.

Reclaimed water from Brightwater will be used for irrigation at the treatment plant, tank wash down, and other processing requiring nonpotable water. King County plans to make the reclaimed water available to customers along the outflow line and via a “purple” distribution pipeline to the Sammamish Valley area and has the ability to expand Brightwater reclaimed water production capacity as customer demand grows. See Figure 1. The cost of reclaimed water to be provided by King County has not yet been determined; however, it is expected to be sufficiently less than Seattle Public Utility’s wholesale drinking water rate to encourage use for nonpotable purposes.

What is Reclaimed Water?

All water on earth is essentially reused water, since water is constantly moving as a solid, liquid or gas through the atmosphere, lithosphere or biosphere. Whether it is taken from a snow-melt surface water source such as Seattle’s Cedar River or Tolt River systems or a groundwater source such as the Highline well field or the Issaquah Aquifer, the water we drink and use has been used before. The natural hydrologic system of evaporation, condensation, precipitation and infiltration and the natural treatment of groundwater percolating through sand and gravel have supplied our past water needs. The engineered process of reclaiming water, sometimes called water recycling or water reuse, involves a multi-step treatment process that speeds up nature’s restoration of water quality.
King County’s regional treatment plants use an activated sludge process, a biological treatment using aeration, bacteria, screening and more technical measures, to treat all of the wastewater to meet state and federal secondary treatment standards before discharge into Puget Sound. The wastewater must receive a series of treatment steps that among other things removes suspended solids, organic material and pathogens. The reclaimed water process involves additional treatment beyond the secondary treatment, including additional filtration and disinfection, in order to meet the standards of reclaimed water. All reclaimed water is highly treated and must meet a specific set of treatment and reliability standards to assure that it is appropriate for the intended use. The process provides a high level of purity and reliability to assure that only water meeting stringent requirements leaves the treatment facility.

Reclaimed water has several definitions. The definition used in the Departments of Ecology and Health 1997 Water Reclamation Standards is:

“Reclaimed water means effluent derived in any part from sewage from a municipal or domestic wastewater treatment system that has been adequately and reliably treated, so that as a result of that treatment, it is suitable for a beneficial use or a controlled use that would not otherwise occur, and is no longer considered wastewater.”

Another less formal definition used in King County’s outreach is this:

“Reclaimed water is wastewater that’s treated to such a high level it can be used safely and effectively for nondrinking purposes such as landscape and agricultural irrigation, heating and cooling, and industrial processing...Reclaimed water is available year-round, even during dry summer months or when a drought strains other water resources. Reclaimed water is distributed through a separate set of purple pipes, which makes sure reclaimed water and drinking water supplies are never
mixed. Purple is the nationally designated color marking reclaimed water pipes, hoses, pumps, and other equipment.”

Reclaimed Water Standards
Washington State specifies four classes of reclaimed water, labeled Class A, B, C and D. Classification is determined in part by the level of disinfection, based on bacteriological analysis of total coliform organisms. Class D, the lowest class of reclaimed water, requires a minimum of secondary treatment plus additional disinfection. Class D reclaimed water may be used only in restricted areas on non-food crops. Increasingly stringent levels of disinfection differentiate Class D from the higher levels of Class C and B reclaimed water. Class A reclaimed water receives advanced treatment steps beyond secondary treatment. Chemicals such as aluminum sulfate (alum) are added to form larger particles from the smaller remaining particles in the water. Filters remove the larger particles, and the water is then disinfected with processes including ultraviolet light, chlorine, or ozone to destroy surviving bacteria, viruses, or other pathogens.

When it becomes operational, Brightwater will produce about 5 million gallons of Class A reclaimed water each day, and eventually up to 36 mgd as demand requires. The Brightwater Plant will use an advanced treatment technology called a membrane bioreactor (MBR) system instead of the conventional large round settling tanks. Microfiltration membranes are becoming increasingly popular to achieve Class A treatment. These membranes are immersed in the wastewater. The MBR system draws wastewater through hollow fibers with microscopic pores small enough to filter out particulate matter and even individual bacteria. A membrane bioreactor converts screened sewage to “clean” effluent in a single process, but additional disinfection is still required to meet Class A standards.

Washington state standards do not include the use of microfiltration membranes for Class A reclaimed water production. Until the new reclaimed water rule (chapter 173-219 WAC) is complete, Ecology and Health will use the California standards for membrane treatment to show equivalency to the filtration steps for Class A reclaimed water.

The current Washington state reclaimed water classifications are all considered nonpotable water. Higher levels of treatment, better than Class A, that would meet potable or drinking water standards are not within the realm of the King County reclaimed water program at this time but may be in the future. Such higher levels could allow use of reclaimed water for artificial recharge of aquifers, wetland supply, and surface water augmentation of open water bodies and stream and river flow.

The Washington State Department of Ecology has produced a guide for the level of reclaimed water needed for each reclaimed water use. (See Table 1)
### Table 1: Uses of Reclaimed Water

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses of Reclaimed Water</th>
<th>Class of Reclaimed Water Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irrigation of nonfood Crops</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation of nonfood Crops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees and fodder, fiber, and seed crops</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sod, ornamental plants for commercial use, and pasture to which milking cows or goats have access</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irrigation of Food Crops</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation of Food Crops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spray irrigation – all food crops</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spray irrigation – food crops which undergo physical or chemical processing sufficient to destroy all pathogenic agents</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface irrigation – food crops where there is no reclaimed water contact with edible portion of crop</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface irrigation – root crops</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface irrigation – orchards and vineyards</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface irrigation – food crops which undergo physical or chemical processing sufficient to destroy all pathogenic agents</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape Irrigation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Irrigation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted access areas (e.g., cemeteries &amp; freeway landscapes)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open access areas (e.g., golf courses, parks, playgrounds, schoolyards, and residential landscapes)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impoundments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impoundments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape impoundments</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted recreational impoundments</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonrestricted recreational impoundments</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish hatchery basins</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorative fountains</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flushing of sanitary sewers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street sweeping, brush dampening</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street washing, spray</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washing of corporation yards, lots, and sidewalks</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dust control (dampening unpaved roads and other surfaces)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dampening of soil for compaction (at construction sites, landfills, etc.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water jetting for consolidation of backfill around pipelines</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire fighting and protection – dumping from aircraft</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Rules for Wastewater Treatment

The state of Washington began a formal pollution control program in 1945 with the creation of the Pollution Control Commission and enactment of RCW 90.48, the Water Pollution Control Act. Three years later the federal government enacted the Water Pollution Control Act, which provided funds for design of municipal wastewater treatment plants and for study of water pollution problems. The 1956 Federal Water Pollution Control Act and amendments in 1961 established grants for construction of municipal wastewater treatment plants.

The federal Water Pollution Control Act required the Surgeon General to cooperate with states to develop water pollution control programs for interstate waters, confirming the role of state and local health jurisdictions in wastewater treatment and pollution control. The Water Quality Act of 1965 directed the states to adopt water pollution programs for interstate waters. The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration was created by the 1965 Water Quality Act to administer federal water quality improvement and pollution control programs, but was abolished five years later, to be succeeded in a federal reorganization by the Environmental Protection Agency.

The state of Washington established a wastewater discharge permit system in 1955, encoded in RCW 90.48. In 1971, the Pollution Disclosure Act established a new approach to pollution control. Under this act, all dischargers are required to provide a high level of wastewater treatment regardless of the quality of the receiving body. The act also requires a technology–based standard for effluent releases that is applicable to all dischargers.

The federal government enacted the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972, which also requires technology–based pollution control. Although passed as amendments, this was effectively a new law and in 1977, along with its revisions, became known as the Clean Water Act. The Clean Water Act objectives are “to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Nation’s waters.” Together with our state Water Pollution Control Act (RCW 90.48) and Pollution Disclosure Act (RCW 90.52), it forms the framework of the Washington State water quality regulatory program.
Directed by these federal and state requirements, the Washington State Department of Ecology (DOE) regulates discharges to state waters. These requirements include the National Pollutant Discharge and Elimination System (NPDES) administered by the Water Permits Division (WPD) within the EPA’s Office of Wastewater Management, and both general and site-specific state regulations. Specific permits for wastewater discharge in Washington are regulated under RCW 90.48, the Water Pollution Control Act. According to DOE guidance, wastewater discharges must be treated to protect existing beneficial uses of ground or surface water, but the wastewater is not planned for a specific beneficial use.

**Legislative Directives for Reclaimed Water**

The Washington State Legislature passed the Reclaimed Water Act (RCW 90.46) in 1992. At that time Washington was experiencing significant water shortages throughout the state. Headlines pronounced Water Crisis and Severe Drought and water users on both sides of the state were searching for new sources of water.

```

**Introduction to Reclaimed Water Code**

“It is hereby declared that the people of the state of Washington have primary interest in the development of facilities to provide reclaimed water to replace potable water in nonpotable applications, to supplement existing surface and ground water supplies, and to assist in meeting the future water requirements of the state.”
```

RCW 90.46, the Washington Reclaimed Water Act, clearly articulates both concerns and potential uses of reclaimed water:

“To the extent reclaimed water is appropriate for beneficial uses, it should be so used to preserve potable water for drinking purposes, contribute to the restoration and protection of instream flows that are crucial to preservation of the state’s salmonid fishery resources, contribute to the restoration of Puget Sound by reducing wastewater discharge, provide a drought resistant source of water supply for nonpotable needs, or be a source of supply integrated into state, regional, and local strategies to respond to population growth and global warming.”

The Reclaimed Water Act directed the Washington State Departments of Ecology and Health to develop standards for reclaimed water use and to jointly administer a reclaimed water program. The goals of this joint program are to encourage use of reclaimed water, provide new water supplies to meet future needs, protect public health and safety, protect and enhance the environment, gain public confidence and support for reclaimed water, and find cost-effective solutions. The Department of Health (DOH) specifically is directed to focus on the reliability of the treatment process, assess the distribution, storage and use of reclaimed water and coordinate with local public health supply managers. The Department of Ecology (DOE) approves applications for reclaimed
water use through the Water Reclamation and Reuse program of the Water Quality division. The Department of Health, through the division of Environmental Health’s Office of Shellfish and Water Protection, administers the Water Reclamation and Reuse program.

Under The Reclaimed Water Act, anyone who generates reclaimed water must obtain a state reclaimed water permit before putting the water to use. The law requires reclaimed water permits to be issued only to public entities or to entities permitted under the state Water Pollution Control Act (RCW 90.48). A reclaimed water permit establishes the required water quality and authorizes the distribution, storage, and use of the reclaimed water. The permit specifies monitoring, recording, and reporting to verify that the treatment process is functioning correctly, that ground or surface water criteria are not violated, and that reclaimed water limitations are being achieved. The permit includes approved locations, uses, and related conditions needed to assure human health and environmental protection.

Legislation in 1997 added a clause to RCW 90.46 stating that “the owner of a wastewater treatment facility that is reclaiming water with a permit issued under this chapter has the exclusive right to any reclaimed water generated by the wastewater treatment facility.” This exclusive right clause encouraged the municipalities to invest in reclaimed water projects. However, a concern remains that the use of reclaimed water may reduce the amount of water left in the natural system of rivers, streams and lakes and thereby potentially impair other users.

Another concern about the exclusive right clause is the potential encouragement of privatization of reclaimed water production facilities. This is an issue of concern nationally and internationally. The League has addressed the privatization of wastewater treatment and reclaimed water in the LWVS 2009 Privatization Study. In Washington State, one of the 24 permitted reclaimed water facilities, the Cardinal Glass facility, is a private reclaimed water project which has provided water for industrial use since 2006.

In 2006 the Legislature passed ESHB 2884 amending the Reclaimed Water Act and directed the Departments of Ecology and Health to adopt rules by December, 2010 addressing all aspects of reclaimed water, thereby establishing a clear permitting process. This legislation enabled the rulemaking process for reclaimed water. The intent of the rulemaking process is to remove some barriers to reclaimed water use by promoting consistent, credible and predictable regulatory processes.

The water reclamation rule is intended to provide sufficient flexibility to accommodate the diversity of proposed projects while assuring that reclaimed water is considered within the context of other state and federal requirements. Having this rule will move reclaimed water forward from a pilot phase to a mainstream program. The DOE considers public interest in accordance with state policy established in RCW 90.54. The rule was scheduled for adoption in December 2010. In response to a severe budget shortfall, Governor Gregoire recently froze implementation of non-essential rules, including this rule, which will impact the finalization of the reclaimed water rule.

Engrossed Second Substitute Senate Bill 6117 (E2SSB 6117) passed the legislature in 2007; it reaffirmed the state’s commitment to reclaimed water and recognized the importance of the
following reclaimed water use:

- Consistent, reliable water supply as Washington faces climate change challenges.
- Reduced discharge of treated wastewater into Puget Sound and other sensitive areas.
- More water in our rivers, lakes and streams for salmon recovery and other benefits.
- Comprehensive water planning integrating water and wastewater management.

Governor Gregoire, however, vetoed a section of this bill. She reasoned that there were issues of concern in areas of both water rights and water quality.

Water right permits regulated under RCW. 90.03 Water Code and RCW. 90.44 Ground Water Code govern the quantity, location and purpose of water use in relation to other water users. Reclaimed water permits are regulated under a different law, RCW 90.46, the Reclaimed Water Act. Reclaimed water is considered a new water supply planned for beneficial use but does not require a water right per se. The law requires issuance of a single comprehensive permit governing the water quality, the rate, location, and purpose of use. The owner of the permitted facility receives an exclusive right to the water treated but may not impair the water rights of another user.

Impairment is an important concept in Washington water law. It is based on prior appropriation, the rule of "first in time, first in right." New water uses such as reclaimed water shall not impact existing water right users. For example, water processed for reclaimed water use could be redirected away from a traditional receiving body where someone else had made use of it. This potential for impairment must be addressed. There may also be net environmental benefits from reclaimed water programs, such as treating wastewater to a higher reclaimed standard before discharge to large water bodies such as Puget Sound, or using reclaimed water to augment stream flow in summer.

In August 2007, the Department of Ecology convened an advisory committee to consider water right issues related to impairment from water reuse projects. In 2009 SSB 5504 directed DOE and DOH to submit recommendations regarding impairment requirements and standards to the Legislature. The Governor further recommended DOE to propose amendments to the impairment standard to ensure the state is protecting water resources and complying with state agreements. The state process remains at this point as we enter the 2011 legislative session.

**Water Quality Concerns**

Reclaimed water permits are intended to meet all statutory requirements for authorizing the beneficial use of reclaimed water, including those limitations and conditions believed necessary to control toxics, and to protect human health and the beneficial uses of waters of the state of Washington. The DOE issues permits that are typically valid for five years.

The Departments of Ecology and Health use a multi-barrier approach to assure these requirements are met at all times. A multi-barrier approach is a required sequence of prevention, control, and treatment steps to prevent water from leaving a reclamation facility until it meets the required quality. This assures that only water meeting the standards is distributed.

The first step in the multi-barrier approach, source control, is intended to prevent contaminants from entering the wastewater though best management practices and pre-treatment. Next, the wastewater
is treated through a series of processes to meet the federal secondary treatment standards. Class A reclaimed water receives additional treatment as detailed in the Reclaimed Water Standards section above. All reclaimed water receives a very high level of disinfection. In addition to the treatment steps, reclaimed water facilities use continuous monitoring, alarms, extra standby treatment units, and emergency areas to re-treat or divert improperly treated water to assure a high quality product.

As analytical methods improve for constituents considered as emerging pollutants, the ability to detect these constituents at trace levels has also improved. Many of these contaminants of concern are found in all water sources and are ubiquitous in the environment. As the scientific community becomes more adept at discovering and quantifying their presence or absence in the parts-per-billion or -trillion range, it should not be a surprise that the presence or absence of most emerging pollutants is largely a function of how hard one looks and to what degree detection methods have advanced.

The presence or absence of an unregulated substance does not necessarily present concern or a need for alarm. To put this in perspective, nearly ninety percent of adult Americans consume caffeine daily. A person would need to drink approximately one million cups of reclaimed water at concentrations seen in some studies to ingest a dose of caffeine equivalent to that provided by one cup of coffee.

The presence of constituents of concern, such as nutrients, pharmaceuticals, hormones and steroids, organic and synthesized chemicals, and microbiologicals, is not necessarily a reason to dismiss the use of reclaimed water. There are specific standards and treatments for microbiologicals in the reclaimed-water processes. Reclaimed water facility operators ensure that disinfection of the final reclaimed water significantly reduces the microorganism levels, but this process often elevates levels of disinfection byproducts such as trihalomethane and haloacetic acids. Class A reclaimed water does not have to meet the drinking water standards for these byproducts.

Additional concerns regarding reclaimed water quality include emerging pollutants which are defined as “those synthetic or naturally occurring chemicals or microorganisms that are not commonly monitored in the environment but have the potential to enter the environment and cause known or suspected adverse ecological and(or) human health effects.” King County closely monitors the scientific work of national and international researchers on these emerging pollutants, including endocrine disrupting chemicals in the environment. “A Survey of Endocrine Disruptors in King County Surface Water” was published in 2007.

King County continues to monitor the presence of these emerging chemicals, and works with organizations such as People for Puget Sound to limit the amount of chemicals discharged in wastewater through education about proper disposal of chemicals.

In 2008, the Washington State Department of Ecology (DOE) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) conducted a study to characterize pharmaceuticals and personal care products (PPCP) at five municipal wastewater treatment plants that discharge to Washington State waters. The study routinely found pharmaceuticals and personal care products in all samples. Secondary treatment reduced 21 percent of the 172 organic compounds to below detection levels. Advanced nutrient removal and filtration technologies reduced the number of compounds detected
None of the wastewater treatment technologies were able to remove three of the PPCP chemicals. These were the pharmaceuticals carbamazepine (anticonvulsant), fluoxetine (antidepressant), and thiabendazole (a fungicide). Overall, the DOE/EPA study suggests that a higher level of wastewater treatment, designed to remove nutrients, reduces concentrations of certain PPCP chemicals.

These findings, however, emphasize the importance of the first step in the multi-barrier approach, source control. As a start, the DOE in partnership with Group Health and Bartell Drugs has mounted a drug collection program to safely dispose of surplus home medications in order to remove them from the wastewater stream.

**Centralized vs. Decentralized Debate**

The King County wastewater treatment system, with two active regional treatment facilities and a third major treatment facility in development, is a successful centralized system. Centralized systems require major public investment to build and operate and are often energy intensive to operate. The King County wastewater treatment system has made attempts to address energy costs with the energy recovery project at the South Treatment Plant, but the distribution infrastructure (pipes, pumps, maintenance) is expensive to install, particularly in a developed urban environment.

Some argue it would be a better investment for the health of Puget Sound to invest in other, more cost-effective alternatives such as installing natural drainage systems in North Seattle or improving options for small local treatment facilities. Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) conducted an economic analysis of the full life-cycle costs of building and operating a distribution system to deliver reclaimed water from the Ballinger portal (the end of the Brightwater reclaimed water main line) to potential customers in North Seattle and Shoreline. SPU called this contemplated distribution system the North Seattle Project. In this analysis, SPU determined that the estimated $109 million for building and operating a distribution system was not cost-effective when weighed against the availability of lower cost alternatives such as installing natural drainage systems in North Seattle, switching self supplied irrigators from their own sources to Seattle municipal water, and intensifying existing water conservation programs. They concluded that the North Seattle Project was not an effective means of attaining the modest water supply increase and the environmental benefits predicted, and that the cost to provide reclaimed water to North Seattle from the Brightwater portal at Ballinger would be four times the cost of alternative projects that provide the same benefits. Costs and benefits are still being debated, and will likely be refined prior to proceeding with planning a specific distribution system.

A major hurdle to maximizing opportunities to use reclaimed water is finding the means for ‘delivering’ reclaimed or recycled water from water treatment facilities to various users for irrigation, landscape and domestic purposes, even for possible in-home use. One alternative offered is to design decentralized water treatment facilities that keep water from leaving the subbasin. The argument is that the design and operation of decentralized plants will offer an efficient and economic strategy for delivering reclaimed water to users.

A decentralized reclaimed water system could provide on-site or localized distribution of treated wastewater to an on-site irrigation facility or industrial customer(s) or a reclaimed water district on
a neighborhood-sized scale. A decentralized system would employ smaller-scale treatments on site, thus reducing the number of distribution pipes and pumps and other necessary infrastructure.

Indeed, the Regional Wastewater Services Plan identifies “explore the idea of building satellite plants to provide reclaimed water to local communities” as one of the elements of the plan. The King County Reclaimed Water Comprehensive Plan describes a reclaimed water “skimming or polishing strategy” which focuses on “providing reclaimed water for nonpotable consumptive uses, irrigation and industrial/commercial uses using small preassembled reclaimed water treatment facilities from various points along influent or effluent pipelines of the County’s regional wastewater conveyance system.”

Options that incorporate more biology-based systems that mimic the natural environment and promote more diversity in environment are gaining support as the sustainability movement gains popularity. Investments in low impact development (LID) and support of research into more sustainable alternatives to wastewater treatment are important roles for our state, local and national government as well as private industry.

The debate between centralized and decentralized wastewater treatment or a combination of the two is ongoing.

Climate Change
Climate change modeling of the western Cascade region by the Climate Impact Group predict that snow pack — that is, the snow stored in the mountains — will continue to decrease in years to come. Winter precipitation will fall as rain rather than snow under warmer winter temperatures. Without physical and operational changes to drinking water systems, such as water releases and improvement of distribution, less snow available to melt in spring will mean less water will be available during critical summer months for both stream-flow needs and human water demands. This is particularly significant since we as a region rely heavily on rain and snowmelt to replenish our aquifers and supply our lakes, streams and rivers with water. Reclaimed water could provide a source of nonpotable water independent of climate variations, thus reducing the demand on scarce supplies of potable water. In the future, reclaimed water treated to higher standards and called “Class A+” may also supplement water in streams and aquifers.

Conclusion
Investments in water and wastewater infrastructure have been central components of successful communities throughout history. Seattle is a prime example of this, with the public investment in securing the Cedar River Water supply in the 1890s and in the establishment of Metro for wastewater treatment in 1958. King County’s new Brightwater regional Wastewater Treatment Plant and the reclaimed water program are further examples of major investments for our future.

Seattle’s economy and quality of life are intimately tied to our water. Ensuring availability of water and sewer capacity during the building boom of the 1990s was a primary driver for the construction of a new regional wastewater plant. Puget Sound water quality issues in the region have also gained importance. Research by the EPA, DOE and People for Puget Sound identified pollutants including pharmaceuticals and personal care products in Puget Sound. Recent reports of algae blooms, lower
dissolved oxygen levels and fish kills, all related to increased nutrient plumes in the South Sound, have added a level of urgency to the process.

One of the primary benefits cited for the use of reclaimed water is its positive impact on water quality. The quality of wastewater discharged from King County’s two regional treatment plants has a significant effect on the water quality of Puget Sound. As an end-of-pipe or point source, King County’s two regional plants discharge more than 40% of the wastewater that flows into Puget Sound. Treatment of wastewater to reclaimed standards alone would be beneficial to the health of Puget Sound even without actually reusing that water. By also diverting that reclaimed water to secondary use, the water reclamation process further reduces the flow of pollutants to Puget Sound.

Planning for reclaimed water should take the long-range perspective. It should address issues such as drinking water supply, quality of effluent discharged to bodies of water such as Puget Sound, and impacts of organic and inorganic constituents including emergent pollutants. Problems of seasonal shortages and low stream flows that will be exacerbated by climate change should be addressed. Effective and adequately funded regulatory systems, including oversight and enforcement, are needed to protect the public interest.

Successfully implementing a new program, particularly one that will need significant investment in infrastructure and change in public perception, is difficult. When evaluating King County’s reclaimed water plan, League members should keep in mind the problems the program is meant to solve. There is significant contention between policy makers and jurisdictions about how much of the original King County Reclaimed Water proposal should be implemented. Treatment of wastewater to reclaimed water standards before discharge to Puget Sound is generally well received. Where, how and how much Class A reclaimed water should be distributed throughout the county is another matter.

Concerns about the cost of building a new purple pipe distribution infrastructure when weighed against the environmental benefits expected or when compared with alternative, less costly projects have been voiced by Seattle Public Utilities. Additionally, reports from Puget Sound Partnership have focused on the significant impacts to Puget Sound from stormwater runoff.

League members, too, should consider cost-effectiveness and long-term benefits to the region when evaluating King County’s complete reclaimed water plans. We should not lose sight of the long term goals of making the best use of our valuable water resource. The League’s continued participation in the reclaimed water comprehensive planning will bring us closer to wise use of this valuable resource.
Definitions excerpted from:
Washington Department of Ecology Reclamation and Reuse Standards September 1997

“Beneficial Use” means the use of reclaimed water, which has been transported from the point of production to the point of use without an intervening discharge to waters of the State, for a beneficial purpose.

“Class A Reclaimed Water” means reclaimed water that, at a minimum, is at all times an oxidized, coagulated, filtered, disinfected wastewater. The wastewater shall be considered adequately disinfected if the median number of total coliform organisms in the wastewater after disinfection does not exceed 2.2 per 100 milliliters, as determined from the bacteriological results of the last 7 days for which analyses have been completed, and the number of total coliform organisms does not exceed 23 per 100 milliliters in any sample.

“Class B Reclaimed Water” means reclaimed water that, at a minimum, is at all times an oxidized, disinfected wastewater. The wastewater shall be considered adequately disinfected if the median number of total coliform organisms in the wastewater after disinfection does not exceed 2.2 per 100 milliliters, as determined from the bacteriological results of the last 7 days for which analyses have been completed, and the number of total coliform organisms does not exceed 23 per 100 milliliters in any sample.

“Class C Reclaimed Water” means reclaimed water that, at a minimum, is at all times an oxidized, disinfected wastewater. The wastewater shall be considered adequately disinfected if the median number of total coliform organisms in the wastewater after disinfection does not exceed 23 per 100 milliliters, as determined from the bacteriological results of the last 7 days for which analyses have been completed, and the number of total coliform organisms does not exceed 240 per 100 milliliters in any sample.

“Class D Reclaimed Water” means reclaimed water that, at a minimum, is at all times an oxidized, disinfected wastewater. The wastewater shall be considered adequately disinfected if the median number of total coliform organisms in the wastewater after disinfection does not exceed 240 per 100 milliliters, as determined from the bacteriological results of the last 7 days for which analyses have been completed.

“Effluent” means the liquid product (esp. of wastewater treatment plants) derived in any part from sewage from a wastewater treatment system.

Exempt Wells are groundwater withdrawals exempt from water right permits under Washington State statute RCW 90.44.050.

“Food Crops” mean any crops intended for human consumption.
“Ground Water” means water in a saturated zone or stratum beneath the surface of land or below a surface water body.

“Impoundment”
“Landscape Impoundment” means a body of reclaimed water which is used for aesthetic enjoyment or which otherwise serves a function not intended to include public contact. Examples may include but are not limited to: golf course water ponds/hazards, landscape ponds and vegetative landscape ponds, e.g. “lily ponds.”

“Nonrestricted Recreational Impoundment” means a body of reclaimed water in which no limitations are imposed on body-contact water sport activities. Examples may include but are not limited to: recreational lakes, public water features (ponds) and fish ponds.

“Restricted Recreational Impoundment” means a body of reclaimed water in which recreation is limited to fishing, boating, and other non-body-contact water recreation activities.

“Instream flow” means a specific stream flow at a specific location for a defined time and typically following seasonal variations—the flow needed to protect and preserve instream resources and values, such as fish wildlife and recreation.

“Nonpotable water” means water that is not used or intended to be used as, or is unsuitable for, a source of water supply for domestic purposes and has not been classified as an source of drinking water by the department.

“Pathogens” are microorganisms that can cause disease in other organisms or humans, animals, and plants. Pathogens include bacteria, viruses, fungi, or parasites found in sewage, in runoff from farms or city streets, and in water used for swimming. Pathogens can be present in municipal, industrial, and nonpoint source discharges.

“Potable water” means water that is used or intended to be used as, or is suitable for, a source of water supply for domestic purposes and has been classified as a source of drinking water by the department.

“Reclaimed Water” means effluent derived in any part from sewage from a wastewater treatment system that has been adequately and reliably treated, so that as a result of that treatment, it is suitable for a beneficial use or a controlled use that would not otherwise occur and is no longer considered wastewater.

“Reuse” means the use of reclaimed water, in compliance with Washington Departments of Health and Ecology regulations and these standards, for a direct beneficial use.

“Sewage” means water-carried human wastes from residences, buildings, industrial and commercial establishments, or other places, together with such ground water infiltration, surface waters, or industrial wastewater as may be present.
“Streamflow Augmentation” means the discharge of reclaimed water to rivers and streams of the state or other surface water bodies, but not wetlands.

“Total coliform organisms” Total coliform, fecal coliform, and E. coli are all indicators of drinking water quality. The total coliform group is a large collection of different kinds of bacteria.

“Wastewater Treatment Facility” means a facility that receives water and waste discharges from homes, businesses and industry through a sewer system. A wastewater treatment facility is not considered a reclamation plant.

“Wetland or Wetlands, (RCW 90.46 definition)” means areas that are inundated or saturated by surface water or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation and typically adapted to life in saturated soil conditions. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar areas. Wetlands regulated under RCW 90.46 shall be delineated in accordance with the manual adopted by the Department of Ecology pursuant to RCW 90.58.380. (Ed. note: reclaimed water discharges to certain natural and constructed wetlands are currently permitted, subject to conditions, limitations and restrictions.)
Web Resources for Reclaimed Water Review
Fall 2010

History of Metro King County
http://www.kingcounty.gov/environment/wtd/About/History.aspx
Waste Water Treatment History
http://www.kingcounty.gov/environment/wtd/About/History/BuildingRegionalFacilities.aspx
Waste Water Treatment Building Regional Facilities

King County Wastewater Treatment
http://www.kingcounty.gov/environment/wtd.aspx
KC Wastewater Treatment Division
KC Wastewater Treatment Division Regional Wastewater Services Plan
KC Wastewater Treatment Brightwater Project
KC Wastewater Treatment: Treatment Process
http://www.kingcounty.gov/environment/wtd/About/SewerAgencies.aspx
KC Wastewater Local Sewer Agencies

Reclaimed Water In Washington State
KC Reclaimed Water
Water Reclamation and Reuse Guidelines September 1997
http://www.doh.wa.gov/ehp/ts/WW/wrr/default.htm
Division of Environmental Health Water Reclamation and reuse program
WA Department of Ecology: Water Quality, Reclaimed Water
WA Department of Ecology/ WA Department of Health
Water Reclamation and Reuse Standards September 1997
http://apps.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=90.46
Title 90 Chapter 90.46 RCW Reclaimed Water Use
http://water.washington.edu/Research/Projects/reclaimed%20water/reclaimed%20water%20news.html
UW Reclaimed Water Seminar, April 23, 2009. The seminar was cosponsored by the League of Women Voters, the UW Student Chapter of American Water Resources Association (AWRA), and the King County Wastewater Treatment Division.
Reclaimed Water Washington State Legislative History
WA Department of Ecology: Reclaimed Water Legislation

Reclaimed Water and Impairment
WA Department of Ecology Water Rights Impairment Standards for Reclaimed Water
2009 Report to the Legislature

http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/permits/permit_pdfs/king_co_s_water%20reclam/
SouthWaterReclamationPlant_Factsheet.pdf
FACT SHEET FOR RECLAIMED WATER PERMIT ST-7445 King County South
Wastewater Treatment Plant - Water Reclamation Facility September 30, 2009

http://ag.arizona.edu/AZWATER/
University of Arizona Water Resources Research Center

Reclaimed Water Use
Case Studies in Reclaimed Water Use  DOE 2005

Seattle Public Utilities
Reclaimed Water Economic Analysis, Seattle Public Utilities, August 2010

http://ag.arizona.edu/azwater/aawt/24613ae3-7f00-0101-014c-28db49ed9286.html
University of Arizona Water Resource Research Center

http://watereuse.org/foundation
“A Reconnaissance-Level Quantitative Comparison of Reclaimed Water, Surface Water, and
Groundwater”, WateReuse Foundation Product 02-008-01 (April 2009)

Reclaimed Water Toxics
USGS Toxics  Toxic Substances Hydrology Program
Emerging Contaminants In the Environment

WA Department of Ecology
Focus on Toxic Chemicals in Puget Sound Control of Toxic Chemicals in Puget Sound

WA Department of Ecology Focus on Pharmaceuticals
and Personal Care Products

King County report: Endocrine disrupting chemicals in the environment

http://green.kingcounty.gov/wlr/waterres/streamdata/reports/Endocrine-disrupting-compounds.aspx
Survey of Endocrine Disruptors in King County Surface Waters
http://pugetsound.org/pressroom/issues/urban-bay-restoration/stormwater-policy/
people-for-puget-sound-stormwater-policy
People for Puget Sound Stormwater Policy

Reclaimed Water and Climate Change
Climate Impact Group Hydrology and Water Resources

Climate Impacts Group Climate Impact on Northwest Water Resources

22CC1EA43FA8F1725533D242A75

Water Privatization
The Business of Water: Privatizing an Essential Resource
League of Women Voters of Seattle Water Positions

DRAINAGE AND WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT
- Support the development of governmental policies, legislation, and processes for storm water management that protects and maintain habitats as part of a sustainable ecosystem.
- Support emerging scientifically based practices that encourage best management practices, low impact development and natural drainage systems.

Joint Positions of the King County Leagues

REGIONAL WATER SUPPLY
- Support water conservation efforts by all users including education programs, voluntary and mandatory conservation requirements that take into account previous conservation efforts and alternative types of water reuse. 1996, 1999
- Support a regional approach to water resources, watersheds, basins, aquifers and to the accountability of any decision-making bodies to citizens. 1999
- Support a legal framework to create a regional water entity to manage regional water development. 1996

WASHINGTON STATE WATER RIGHTS AND GROUNDWATER PROTECTION
- Support the principle of maximum net benefits including human health and safety, riparian habitat, concurrency of supply with permitted demand, Indian treaty rights, protection of in-stream flow, and hydraulic continuity. 1996, 1999
- “Allocation of waters among potential uses and users shall be based on the securing of the maximum net benefits for the people of the state. Maximum net benefits shall constitute total benefits less costs including opportunities lost.” (Water Resources Act, 1971)
- Support federal and state standards and guidelines on a watershed basis. Other governments should meet or exceed federal and state regulations. County government should be the most restrictive. 1996
- All wells (Class A, B, and single family residential wells) should be measures and the data regarding water withdrawal, use and claims be reported to King County and the Department of Ecology.
stream. This was followed by the Groundwater Act of 1945, limiting the water which could be obtained by drilling into the aquifer. All groundwater withdrawals must have a water right permit. However, there are four exceptions: watering stock, watering a lawn or non-commercial garden, using water for industrial purposes, or using the water for small group domestic supplies. There are limits on these uses, but they provide inexpensive alternatives to using reclaimed water. Groundwater statutes are administered at the state level by the Department of Ecology and Department of Health.

In addition to water rights, another major issue is water quality. The quality of the water available for drinking became a major concern as cities grew. Pollution made headlines.

Publications by the League of Women Voters about water resources probably outnumber studies on any other subject. They range from a 1957 study titled *On the Water Front: Introduction to Administrative, Legislative, and Economic Problems Involved in Water Resource Development* to the Seattle League’s 2008 *Regional Approach to Municipal Water Management* and the 2009 study, *Follow the Water: A Study of Drainage*. The national studies have tended to focus on clean water and the state studies on water rights, although the national League has maintained in its positions that water quality and quantity are related.

The national Clean Water Act was passed in 1948, with subsequent amendments. In 1970, the Environmental Protection Act was passed and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) was established; more environmental legislation followed. The acts led to wastewater and pollution standards, now administered by the state Department of Ecology and Department of Health.

At the state level, the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) was passed in 1971, the Shoreline Management Act in 1972, and the Growth Management Act in 1990. These acts have been strengthened and amended, and similar measures have been passed at the county and city levels. The federal Endangered Species Act was passed in 1969, and in 1999 the Puget Sound Chinook were listed as an endangered species, requiring a recovery plan.

There are many stakeholders with strong interests in access to water. Water management authority is dispersed among the federal government, the tribes, the EPA and local water systems.

The Washington legislature divided the state into sixty-two Water Resource Inventory Areas (WIRA), which were to be carefully studied so that good decisions could be made in evaluating water rights within the areas and managing the supply. These studies were carried out in WIRA 8 and 9, which include the Sammamish/Cedar system and the Green/Duwamish system, where they are basic to planning for the urban areas. They were not completed for the entire state because of costs. Cooperative efforts among stakeholders have been a help in developing policy. One of the earliest such efforts was a study in 1959 of The Great River of the West by the Leagues of the Columbia Basin. Shortly thereafter, the League lobbied for the passage of the Columbia River Interstate Compact. Other cooperative efforts include the Chelan Agreement, which brought concerned groups together to work out an agreement, and the Puget Sound Partnership, focused on saving the Sound and the salmon.

The national and state Leagues have many positions related to water. These positions advocate planning which includes all interests involved, and emphasize the importance of considering quantity, quality and environmental impact in making decisions.
# Unit Meetings

## FEBRUARY UNIT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday, February 7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTHEND</strong> — Marian Wolfe/Susan Jones</td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td>7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Lila Bulen, 3716 Cascadia Ave. S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hedgewolfe@aol.com">hedgewolfe@aol.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:susan@monckjones.com">susan@monckjones.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuesday, February 8</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BELLEVUE</strong> – Bonnie Rimawi</td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td>10:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Bellevue Public Library, Rm. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bonnierim@aol.com">bonnierim@aol.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEST SEATTLE</strong> – Ethel Williams/Hazel Schiffer</td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
<td>The Kenney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Hazelms@drizzle.com">Hazelms@drizzle.com</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td></td>
<td>7125 Fauntleroy Way SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday, February 9</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NORTH END AFTERNOON</strong> — Helen St. John</td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Gloria Butts, 12009 1st Ave NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hbstjohn@gmail.com">hbstjohn@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIEW RIDGE</strong> – Gail Winberg</td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td>12:45 p.m.</td>
<td>Gail Winberg, 6004 NE 60th St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:winbergeng@q.com">winbergeng@q.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QUEEN ANNE/MAGNOLIA/BALLARD EVE.</strong> – Karen Adair</td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td>7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Bettina Hosler, 9516 2nd NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:adairk@seanet.com">adairk@seanet.com</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday, February 10</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ISSAQUAH DAY</strong> — Connie Reed/Dorris Martin</td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Issaquah City Hall &amp; Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:reedhtop@earthlink.net">reedhtop@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:dorrismrtn@aol.com">dorrismrtn@aol.com</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td></td>
<td>580 E. Sunset Way, Coho Room (upstairs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KIRKLAND/REDMOND</strong> — Sheila Hoff</td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Liv Grohn, 338 10th Ave., Kirkland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MERCER ISLAND</strong> — Lucy Copass/Cynthia Howe</td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td>9:15 a.m.</td>
<td>Mercer Island Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:lucyco@speakeasy.org">lucyco@speakeasy.org</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td></td>
<td>3605 84th Ave. SE, Mercer Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:howe.john@comcast.net">howe.john@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NORTH CENTRAL</strong> – Jan Orlando</td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td>7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Edith Miller, 6902 32nd Ave. NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:orlanre@aol.com">orlanre@aol.com</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848 <a href="mailto:edynrog@iname.com">edynrog@iname.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHORELINE</strong> — Juliet Beard</td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td>4:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Richmond Beach Congregational Church, NW 195th St &amp; 15th Ave NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIVERSITY HOUSE</strong> — Charles and Nancy Perkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>________________________________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:perkwz@msn.com">perkwz@msn.com</a> (206) 329-4848 10:00 a.m. University House, 4400 Stone Way North, Auditorium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Email</strong></th>
<th><strong>Phone</strong></th>
<th><strong>Time</strong></th>
<th><strong>Location</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:perkwz@msn.com">perkwz@msn.com</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>University House, 4400 Stone Way North, Auditorium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Friday, February 11**

**BAYVIEW** — Peg Williams

| pwilliams@brc-res.com (206) 329-4848 1:30 p.m. | Bayview Retirement Community 4th Floor Solarium |

**Monday, February 14**

**FIRST HILL** — Jeannette Kahlenberg

| kahlenb@gmail.com (206) 329-4848 10:00 a.m. | Horizon House, 900 University St., Sky Lounge, Mary Margaret Pruitt, hostess |

**CAPITOL HILL/MONTLAKE** — Jan O’Connor/Zita Cook

| oconnor.js@gmail.com (206) 329-4848 7:15 p.m. | Linnea Hirst, 1602 E. McGraw (206) 329-4848 |

**Wednesday, February 16**

**N. KING COUNTY** — Marjorie Hawkes/Raelene Gold

| mshawkesis@gmail.com (206) 329-4848 9:30 a.m | Third Place Commons |
| raelene@seanet.com (206) 329-4848 | Meeting Room |

**Saturday, February 19**

**BALLARD/MAGNOLIA/QUEEN ANNE DAY** — Kerry Peterson

| (206) 329-4848 10:00 a.m. | Judy Ostrow, 3604 NW 60th St. |
### Board & Committee Contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Executive Committee</th>
<th>Email/Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009–2011</td>
<td>President Allison Feher (206) 329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:president@seattlelwv.org">president@seattlelwv.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2012</td>
<td>1st V.P. Action Nan Moore (206) 329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nanaction@comcast.net">nanaction@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009–2011</td>
<td>2nd V.P. Membership Kelly Powers (206) 329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:membership.seattlelwv@gmail.com">membership.seattlelwv@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009–2011</td>
<td>3rd V.P. Public Relations Jean Carlson (206) 329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jean.carlson@art.net">jean.carlson@art.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009–2011</td>
<td>4th V.P. Voter Editor Beatrice Crane (206) 329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:votereditor@seattlelwv.org">votereditor@seattlelwv.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009–2011</td>
<td>Treasurer Judy Bevington (206) 329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gbeving@eskimo.com">gbeving@eskimo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2012</td>
<td>Secretary Joanna Cullen (206) 329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jfoxcullen@gmail.com">jfoxcullen@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Directors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2012</td>
<td>Outreach Brigitte Ashley (206) 329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brigitteashley@hotmail.com">brigitteashley@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2012</td>
<td>Unit Coordinator Diana Henderson (206) 329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:whender912@aol.com">whender912@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2012</td>
<td>Voter Service Julie Anne Kempf (206) 329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:julie@kempf.com">julie@kempf.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2012</td>
<td>Communications Kathy Sakahara (206) 329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kathysakahara@gmail.com">kathysakahara@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2012</td>
<td>Voter Service Cyndi Woods (206) 329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cyndiwoods@comcast.net">cyndiwoods@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Education Fund Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009–2011</td>
<td>Co-President/Treasurer Denise Smith (206) 329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:issaquahsmith@msn.com">issaquahsmith@msn.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009–2011</td>
<td>Co-President Laura Weese (206) 329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:laura899@earthlink.net">laura899@earthlink.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009–2011</td>
<td>Secretary Kris Bushley (206) 329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:abushley@earthlink.net">abushley@earthlink.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2012</td>
<td>Director Ruth Schroeder (206) 329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:schrdrcrl@comcast.net">schrdrcrl@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Board Positions</td>
<td>Cynthia Howe (206) 329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:howe.john@comcast.net">howe.john@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committees</td>
<td>Dana Twight (206) 329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dctwight@mac.com">dctwight@mac.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civics Education</td>
<td>Nora Leech (206) 329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nleech2002@yahoo.com">nleech2002@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics &amp; Taxation</td>
<td>Lucy Gaskell-Gaddis (206) 329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:terrylucy2u@comcast.net">terrylucy2u@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Kathleen Randall (206) 329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kathleenr8@gmail.com">kathleenr8@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice Committee</td>
<td>Barbara Reid (206) 329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:barbereid@yahoo.com">barbereid@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>Barbara Yasui (206) 329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:daruma52@msn.com">daruma52@msn.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Relations</td>
<td>Ellen Berg (206) 329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ellenzberg@msn.com">ellenzberg@msn.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Karen Kane (206) 329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kanek@opener.net">kanek@opener.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclaimed Water Study Committee</td>
<td>Denise Smith (206) 329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:issaquahsmith@msn.com">issaquahsmith@msn.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Janet Winans (206) 329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:janetwinans@earthlink.net">janetwinans@earthlink.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominating Committee</td>
<td>Nancy Eitreim (206) 329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nancye@speakeasy.net">nancye@speakeasy.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Vicky Downs (206) 329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:downsdowns@aol.com">downsdowns@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peggy Saari (206) 329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:peggy@comcast.net">peggy@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liv Grohn Goodman (206) 329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:livgrohn@verizon.net">livgrohn@verizon.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reclaimed Water

Speakers include:
- **Judi Gladstone**, City of Seattle Public Utilities
- **Mark Buscher**, King County Wastewater Treatment Division
- **Heather Trim**, People for Puget Sound

The League of Women Voters of Seattle
1620 18th Ave, Suite 101
Seattle WA 98122

Moving? Let us know!
Call the League office at (206) 329-4848 or email info@seattlelwv.org

LWV SEATTLE: FEBRUARY FORUM

Thursday, February 3
6:30 p.m. - Discussion Leader Briefing
7:30 p.m. - Forum
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