

National Water Research Institute

AN NWRI WHITE PAPER

Views on the Status of **“Water Recycling 2030: Recommendations of California’s Recycled Water Task Force”**

Prepared by:

MARGARET H. NELLOR, P.E.
Nellor Environmental Associates, Inc.
Austin, Texas

Co-Sponsored by:

WATEREUSE CALIFORNIA



NWRI White Paper

**Views on the Status of
“Water Recycling 2030:
Recommendations of California’s
Recycled Water Task Force”**

Prepared by:

Margaret H. Nellor, P.E.
Nellor Environmental Associates, Inc.
Austin, Texas

Prepared for:

National Water Research Institute

Co-Sponsored by

WateReuse California

May 2009

About NWRI

A 501c3 nonprofit organization, the National Water Research Institute (NWRI) was founded in 1991 by a group of California water agencies in partnership with the Joan Irvine Smith and Athalie R. Clarke Foundation to promote the protection, maintenance, and restoration of water supplies and to protect public health and improve the environment. NWRI's member agencies include Inland Empire Utilities Agency, Irvine Ranch Water District, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, Orange County Sanitation District, Orange County Water District, and West Basin Municipal Water District.

For more information, please contact:

National Water Research Institute
18700 Ward Street
P.O. Box 8096
Fountain Valley, California 92728-8096 USA
Phone: (714) 378-3278
Fax: (714) 378-3375
www.nwri-usa.org

Publication Number NWRI-2009-01

This NWRI Final Project Report is a product of NWRI Project Number 07-KM-005.

Acknowledgments

This White Paper was prepared by Margaret H. Nellor, P.E. of Nellor Environmental Associates, Inc., for the National Water Research Institute of Fountain Valley, California. WateReuse California was a co-sponsor of this White Paper. Special thanks are extended to Mary Grace Pawson of Winzler & Kelly, Kirsten McLaughlin of the Irvine Ranch Water District, and Bill Jacoby, Water Resources Consulting, for their valuable suggestions and insight in the preparation of this White Paper and for organizing the Town Hall Session held at the 2008 WateReuse California Conference. Gratitude is also extended to the water recycling professionals, state regulators, and other individuals who volunteered to be interviewed and also provided information for the White Paper.

Acronyms

CDPH	California Department of Public Health
DWR	Department of Water Resources
IRWMP	Integrated Regional Water Management Plan
NGO	Non-governmental organization
NWRI	National Water Research Institute
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board

Contents

1. Executive Summary.....	1
2. Introduction.....	5
2.1 Purpose of White Paper.....	5
2.2 Background on the Task Force Recommendations.....	5
3. Overview of the Task Force Recommendations.....	6
4. Process Used to Develop White Paper.....	10
4.1 Stakeholder Interviews.....	10
4.2 Town Hall Session.....	11
4.3 Comments on the Draft White Paper.....	13
5. The Recycled Water Policy Development Process: A Case Study in Implementing Task Force Recommendations.....	14
5.1 Background on the Decision to Adopt the Recycled Water Policy.....	14
5.2 SWRCB Draft Policy Effort.....	15
5.3 Collaborative Stakeholder Effort.....	15
5.4 Stakeholder Outcome.....	16
5.5 Collaborative Efforts for Improving SWRCB Performance.....	18
6. Views and Perceptions.....	19
6.1 Status of the Recommendations.....	19
6.2 Importance of Task Force Issues and New Issues.....	25
6.3 Lessons Learned and Obstacles.....	26
6.4 Importance of Recycled Water.....	28
7. Next Steps.....	29
Attachment 1: Summary of Views Regarding the Status of the Recommendations.....	31
Attachment 2: Discussion of Issues (Importance of Task Force Issues/New Issues).....	43
Attachment 3: Lessons Learned/Obstacles.....	45
Attachment 4: Why Is Recycled Water a Critical Resource for California?.....	49
Attachment 5: SWRCB Strategic Plan – Recommendations for Future Actions.....	51

Tables

Table ES-1: Views on the Status of Task Force Recommendations.....	2
Table 1: Task Force Recommendations.....	6
Table 2: General Perception of the Status of Recommendations.....	20

1. Executive Summary

In June 2003, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) issued the report, *Water Recycling 2030: Recommendations of California's Recycled Water Task Force* (Task Force),¹ which identified 26 issues related to the financial/economic, regulatory, and social concerns that typically arise in water recycling projects, and presented recommendations for each issue. Fourteen of these concerns were described as “key issues.”

The purpose of this White Paper is to review the status and provide information on implementing the Task Force recommendations. This White Paper summarizes:

- Stakeholder views and opinions regarding implementation.
- Lessons learned and obstacles to implementation.
- The importance of the Task Force issues.
- Any new issues that have developed since 2003.
- The importance of recycled water as a resource for California.
- Recommended next steps for moving forward.

The development of this White Paper was based on:

- Interviews with stakeholders.
- Presentations and discussions from a “Town Hall Session” held at the 2008 Annual Conference for WaterReuse California.²
- Subsequent comments provided after the Town Hall Session and strategic plans adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB).
- Work by stakeholders to shape the SWRCB update to its 2005 Recycled Water Policy.³
- Recent actions by the DWR to adopt a plumbing code for dual-plumbed buildings that use recycled water.
- Ongoing legislative work to provide local agencies with better control over residential self-regenerating water softeners.

The process to update the Recycled Water Policy (Section 5) serves as a case study for implementing the recommendations of the Recycled Water Task Force.

A summary of the stakeholder’s views on the Task Force recommendations is presented in Table ES-1, which is the result of interviews of a range of stakeholders conducted prior to the adoption of the updated Recycled Water Policy.

¹ California Department of Water Resources Recycled Water Task Force (2003). *Water Recycling 2030: Recommendations of California's Recycled Water Task Force*, California Department of Water Resources, Sacramento, CA. www.owue.water.ca.gov/recycle/docs/TaskForceReport.htm.

² Formerly, the California Section of the WaterReuse Association.

³ The SWRCB draft Guidance for “Implementing State Statutes, Regulations and Policies for Recycled Water Projects,” November 2005.

Overall:

- Of the 14 key issues, the general view was that none of the recommendations had been fully implemented, and recommendations related to only five issues had been partly implemented.
- Of the full list of 26 issues, recommendations from only two issues had been fully implemented (none of which were key issues), and recommendations for nine issues were partly implemented.
- Of the remaining 15 issues with no recommendations implemented, some work was underway on the recommendations for 11 of the issues, including seven key issues.

Table ES-1: Views on the Status of Task Force Recommendations

Issue Category	All Issues		Issues Implemented		Issues Partly Implemented		Issues Not Done		Issues Not Done But Some Activity	
	Total	Key	Total	Key	Total	Key	Total	Key	Total	Key
Bonds	5	3					1	1	4	2
Leadership	1	1							1	1
Cross-connections	3	1					1		2	1
Other Regulatory Matters	5	3			3	2			2	1
Plumbing Code Changes	2	1	1						1	1
Community Involvement/ Outreach	2	2			1	1	1	1		
Economics/Funding Process	5	1	1		2		1		1	1
Education	1	1			1	1				
Source Control	1				1					
Water Softeners	1	1			1	1				
Total	26	14	2	0	9	5	4	2	11	7

With regard to the importance of the original Task Force issues, the general view was that these issues were still important, but some categories of issues were more important than others. The top five priorities included:

- Communication with the public.
- State leadership and advocacy.
- Regulatory consistency.
- Funding.
- Public support.

There were mixed views on the importance of incidental runoff and water softeners, indicating that these issues may be more important in some parts of the state than others. There were five new issues viewed to be important that were not addressed by the Task Force:

- Constituents of emerging concern.
- Anti-degradation.
- Salinity management.
- Indirect potable reuse.
- Need for better information on water recycling in the state.

The SWRCB's 2009 Recycled Water Policy directly addresses constituents of emerging concern, compliance with the SWRCB's Anti-Degradation Policy, and salinity management.

With regard to lessons learned and obstacles encountered in moving the recommendations forward, the key mechanisms for advancing the recommendations appeared to be:

- Having an organization take the lead in championing an issue.
- Maintaining a sustained effort with the parties responsible for implementing the recommendations.
- Ensuring that legislative mandates include staffing for program implementation.

In some cases, external factors, such as drought and strains on water resources, were believed to potentially have more impact in moving recommendations forward.

A number of obstacles were identified that have prevented the recommendations from moving forward, including:

- Challenges in the state's economy.
- Lack of funding.
- Adverse economics.
- Lack of money/resources for state agencies.
- Lack of state leadership.
- Lack of consistent support from non-governmental organizations (NGOs).
- State regulatory infrastructure.
- Makeup of the Task Force members and structure of recommendations.
- Recycled water community.
- Public perception.

The general view was that recycled water is a critical resource for the state based on a number of factors, including providing a local sustainable supply; a means to reduce energy and carbon footprints; a means of dealing with climate change; the increased pressure due to population growth and drought; and the cost of developing new potable water supplies.

Although one of the goals of the White Paper was to identify specific next steps to move forward with the Task Force recommendations that had yet to be implemented, it was evident that this

would not be an easy endeavor and will require additional discussion and deliberation. This situation results in part from the need for a strategic approach (which was not part of the original Task Force recommendations), the number and complexity of issues, and how the recommendations were framed. To be successful, this discussion will need to focus on a strategic approach and the use of a shared vision dialog.

Future efforts should also emphasize collaboration with stakeholders and problem-solving to address these issues, consistent with the January 2009 recommendations of the Little Hoover Commission.⁴ The stakeholder process for the updated SWRCB Recycled Water Policy was initiated by WateReuse California because there was a belief that the outcome would result in a better policy rather than the typical process of individual stakeholders “battling it out” with the SWRCB to achieve specific provisions and language in policies. While there was a risk that the effort would fail (and significant resources were required to make the effort work), it was clear that the outcome was of more benefit to the stakeholders than the version of the Policy that was originally intended to be adopted by the SWRCB.

⁴ Little Hoover Commission (2009). *Clearer Structure, Cleaner Water: Improving Performance and Outcomes at the State Water Boards*. Sacramento, California, January 2009. www.lhc.ca.gov/lhcdir/report195.html.

2. Introduction

2.1 Purpose of White Paper

In June 2003, DWR issued the report *Water Recycling 2030: Recommendations of California's Recycled Water Task Force*,⁵ which addressed the mission established in Assembly Bill 331, Chapter 590, Statutes of 2001, to evaluate the current framework of state and local rules, regulations, ordinances, and permits to identify opportunities for and obstacles or disincentives to water recycling.⁶

It has been 5 years since the release of the Task Force Report. The purpose of this White Paper is to review the following:

- Stakeholder views and opinions regarding implementation.
- Lessons learned/obstacles to implementation.
- The importance of the Task Force issues.
- Any new issues that have developed since 2003.
- The importance of recycled water as a resource for California.
- Recommended next steps for moving forward.

The desired outcome is for the White Paper to serve as a communication piece that can be used by water and wastewater agencies, industry associations, and stakeholder groups to discuss future efforts to advance water recycling in California.

2.2 Background on the Task Force and Recommendations

The Task Force consisted of 40 people representing federal, state, and local government; public health professionals; private sector entities; environmental organizations; academics; internationally recognized researchers; and public interest groups. It was a cooperative effort between three California agencies: DWR, SWRCB, and the California Department of Public Health (CDPH).⁷ All three agencies play a role in advancing recycled water use. Their work together on the Task Force established an important precedent for the level of state leadership required to advance the use of recycled water.

Although water recycling encompasses a broad range of wastewater sources, the Task Force decided to focus on the planned reuse of treated municipal wastewater; specifically, the financial/economic, regulatory, and social issues that typically arise in water recycling projects. The 2003 report was the culmination of over 12 months of intensive study and consultation by Task Force members and agency staff. The Task Force identified and adopted 26 issues with recommendations to address obstacles, impediments, and opportunities for California to increase its recycled water usage.

⁵ California Department of Water Resources Recycled Water Task Force (2003). *Water Recycling 2030: Recommendations of California's Recycled Water Task Force*, California Department of Water Resources, Sacramento, CA.
www.owue.water.ca.gov/recycle/docs/TaskForceReport.htm.

⁶ www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/01-02/bill/asm/ab_0301-0350/ab_331_bill_20011009_chaptered.pdf.

⁷ Formerly, the California Department of Health Services (DHS).

3. Overview of the Task Force Recommendations

The issues in the Task Force report were subdivided into “key issues” and “additional important issues,” with recommendations for each issue. A summary of recommendations from the Task Force Report is presented in Table 1. In the White Paper, the issues have been numbered 1 to 26; the original numbering of “Issues Areas and Key Recommendations” from the Task Force Report are included in brackets with the title of the issue. Issues 1 through 14 were the key issues in the report; Issues 15 through 26 were designated as additional important issues. More detailed information on the background and context of the issues and recommendations is included in the Task Force Report.

Table 1: Task Force Recommendations	
Issue	Recommendations
1. Funding for Water Recycling Projects [1.1]	State funding for water reuse/recycling facilities and infrastructure should be increased beyond Proposition 50 ⁸ and other current sources. A bond issue should be passed by the Legislature to obtain funding, and state agencies should request Federal funding from Congress.
2. Community Value-Based Decision-Making Model for Project Planning [2.1]	Local agencies should engage the public in an active dialogue and participation using a community value-based decision-making model in planning water recycling projects that addresses all alternatives to the use of recycled water. For controversial issues, local agencies should convene independent advisory committees selected with the public. Public participation activities should go beyond the minimum requirements of State and Federal environmental laws, perhaps being reinforced by State funding agencies requiring a comprehensive public participation process as a condition for receiving State funds, or for future bond laws to include this as a requirement. State guidelines for public participation should be developed by someone such as the California Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee or its successor.
3. Leadership Support for Water Recycling [2.2]	State government should take a leadership role in encouraging recycled water use and improve the consistency of policy within branches of State government. To accomplish this, CDPH should convene a panel to develop common terms for recycling and standard signage for projects. DWR should take the lead in re-activating the coalition that developed the 1994 “Statement of Support for Water Reclamation” to undertake a review and update that document and carry out other activities to promote water recycling. State agencies, such as DWR, SWRCB, and CDPH, should assist local agencies with information and education on current and cost-effective technologies for recycled water projects, as well as guidance on legislated recycled water regulations. The State should convene an independent statewide review panel on indirect potable reuse to ensure adequate health and safety assurance for California residents. This effort could be taken on by the California Bay-Delta Science Program. Bond laws should include funding for public outreach. Local agencies should create well-defined recycled water ordinances. Local regulatory agencies should effectively enforce these ordinances.
4. Educational Curriculum [2.3]	The State Department of Education should appoint a panel to develop comprehensive education curricula for public schools, and institutions of higher education should

⁸ Proposition 50 provided funding for competitive grants for a variety of projects, including water reclamation, and funding for competitive grants for developing Integrated Regional Water Management Plans (IRWMPs) for projects such as water supply reliability programs.

Table 1: Task Force Recommendations

Issue	Recommendations
	incorporate recycled water education into their curricula. DWR should approach California universities about the need for more recycled water experts and request the incorporation of recycled water into their curricula, as well as help enhance existing educational materials or programs on recycled water. Other government agencies and NGOs should enhance their existing public education programs.
5. State-Sponsored Media Campaign [2.4]	The State should develop a water issues information program, including water recycling, for radio, television, print, and other media.
6. Uniform Plumbing Code Appendix J [3.1]	DWR should take the lead in revising Appendix J of the Uniform Plumbing Code, which addresses plumbing within buildings with both potable and recycled water systems, and adopt a California version that will be enforceable in the State.
7. CDPH Guidance on Cross-Connection Control [3.2]	CDPH should prepare guidance that would clarify the intent and applicability of Title 22, Article 5 of the California Code of Regulations pertaining to dual plumbed systems and amend this article to be consistent with requirements included in a California version of Appendix J that the Task Force is recommending to be adopted.
8. Health and Safety Regulation [4.1]	CDPH should involve stakeholders in a review of various factors that could affect the health and safety associated with the use of recycled water to identify any needs for enhancing existing local and State health regulation associated with the use of recycled water.
9. Incidental Runoff [4.2]	SWRCB should convene a committee to investigate, within the current legal framework, alternative approaches to achieve more consistent and less burdensome regulatory mechanisms affecting incidental runoff of recycled water from use sites.
10. Uniform Interpretation of State Standards [4.3]	The State should create a uniform interpretation of State standards in State and local regulatory programs by taking specific steps recommended by the Task Force. For example, SWRCB should appoint an ombudsman to oversee uniformity within the SWRCB and the Regional Water Quality Control Boards; CDPH should take steps to ensure the uniform interpretation and application of water recycling regulations; and SWRCB and CDPH should hold a workshop evaluating Florida regulations. The Opinion Unit of the California Department of Justice (Attorney General’s Office) should be requested to conduct a legal analysis to determine the latitude that is permitted to impose more restrictive local requirements.
11. Water Softeners [4.4]	The Legislature should amend the Health and Safety Code Sections 116775 through 116795 to reduce restrictions on local ability to impose bans on, or more stringent standards for, residential water softeners. Within the current legal provisions on water softeners, local agencies should consider publicity campaigns to educate consumers regarding the impact of self-regenerative water softeners. The WasteReuse Foundation should continue to evaluate the impacts of water softeners on contributions to salinity problems in recycled water.
12. Uniform Analytical Method for Economic Analyses [5.1]	SWRCB, DWR, and CDPH should convene an expert panel to develop a uniform and economically valid procedural framework to determine the economic benefits and costs of water recycling projects for use by local, State, and Federal agencies. Guidance should be developed to conduct economic feasibility analyses, incorporating nonmarket values when possible. Appropriate benchmarks should be established for comparing the incremental costs of developing recycled water with the cost of developing an equivalent

Table 1: Task Force Recommendations

Issue	Recommendations
	amount through alternative measures. An advisory team should be created by DWR, SWRCB, and CDPH to assist in these tasks.
13. Research Funding [6.1]	The Legislature should pass a bond allocating sustainable funding for research on recycled water issues.
14. University Academic Program for Water Recycling [6.2]	The funding from the bond as described in No. 13 (Issue 6.2) should be set aside to encourage an integrated academic program on one or more campuses for water recycling research and education.
Additional Issues	
15. Funding Coordination [1.2]	A revised funding procedure should be developed to provide local agencies with assistance in potential State and Federal funding opportunities. A Water Recycling Coordination Committee should be established by SWRCB to work with funding agencies, streamlining project selection within individual agencies while ensuring an open process, peer review, and public review.
16. Regional Planning Criterion [1.3]	State funding agencies should make better use of existing regional planning studies to determine the funding priority of projects. This process would not exclude projects from funding where regional plans do not exist.
17. Funding Information Outreach [1.4]	Funding agencies should publicize funding availability through workshops, conferences, and the Internet. The SWRCB should take the lead in setting up a water recycling website and holding workshops.
18. Department of Water Resources (DWR) Technical Assistance [1.5]	The Legislature should pass a bond to provide sustainable State funding for DWR's technical assistance and research, including flexibility to work on local and regional planning, emerging issues, and new technology.
19. Project Performance Analysis [1.6]	The Legislature should pass a bond to provide funding to SWRCB to perform a comprehensive analysis of the performance of existing recycled water projects in terms of costs and benefits and recycled water deliveries. An estimate should be performed of future benefits potentially resulting from future investments.
20. Recycled Water Symbol Code Change [3.3]	DWR and CDPH should ask the Department of Housing and Community Development to submit a code change to remove the requirement for the skull and crossbones symbol in Sections 601.2.2 and 601.2.3 of the California Plumbing Code.
21. Stakeholder Review of Proposed Cross-Connection Control Regulations [3.4]	CDPH should take the lead in ensuring that stakeholders are encouraged to review CDPH draft changes to Title 17 of the Code of Regulations pertaining to cross-connections between potable and non-potable water systems.
22. Cross-Connection Risk Assessment [3.5]	CDPH should collaborate with other agencies in conducting a thorough assessment of the risk associated with cross-connections between disinfected tertiary recycled water and potable water.
23. Permitting Procedures [4.5]	Various measures should be conducted to improve administration and compliance with local and State permits, including CDPH updates of water recycling laws and recommendations on its website and clarification of Engineering Report requirements; dissemination of information by the Association of California Water Agencies and the

Table 1: Task Force Recommendations

Issue	Recommendations
	California Association of Sanitation Agencies regarding different permitting requirements; and State legislative and local tax incentives to offset costs of compliance with regulations.
24. Source Control [4.6]	Local agencies should maintain strong source control programs and increase public awareness of the importance of reducing pollution and ensuring a safe recycled water supply.
25. Economic Analyses [5.2]	Local agencies are encouraged to perform economic analyses in addition to financial analyses for water recycling projects to provide transparency regarding the true costs and benefits of projects. State and Federal agencies should require economic and financial feasibility as two funding criteria in their funding programs.
26. Statewide Science-Based Panel on Indirect Potable Reuse [6.3]	As required by AB 331, the Task Force reviewed the 1996 report of the California Indirect Potable Reuse Committee and other related advisory panel reports and concluded that reconvening this committee would not be worthwhile at this time. Details concerning the recommendations are contained in the report. The Task Force intends for this report to be used as a working tool to guide the Legislature, State government, public agencies, the public, and all water recycling stakeholders towards the safe and successful expansion of recycled water use to help meet the State's future water supply needs (also see recommendation for Issue #3 [2.2 in the Task Force Report] about a new panel).

4. Process Used to Develop the White Paper

The White Paper was developed based on:

- Interviews with stakeholders that were compiled into a Draft White Paper.
- Presentations and discussions from a “Town Hall Session” held at the 2008 Annual Conference for WaterReuse California, held in Newport Beach, California.
- Subsequent comments provided after the Town Hall Session including strategic plans adopted by the SWRCB.
- Efforts by stakeholder to shape the SWRCB’s actions with respect to its updated Recycled Water Policy, adopted in February 2009.
- Recent actions undertaken by the DWR to adopt design standards for dual plumbed buildings.
- Ongoing legislative work to provide local agencies with better control over residential self-regenerating water softeners.

4.1 Stakeholder Interviews

In January and February 2008, the National Water Research Institute (NWRI) sent invitations to water recycling stakeholders to participate in telephone interviews. Thirty-four individuals received the invitations, representing water and wastewater agencies, water and water recycling organizations, environmental groups, regulators, and State and Federal officials involved in water recycling in California.

Twelve individuals agreed to be interviewed. This group consisted of representatives from water recycling agencies/associations and one environmental group. Some of these individuals or representatives from their organizations served on the Task Force. No representatives from water agencies or State/Federal agencies were interviewed. However, all individuals invited to participate in the interviews were also invited to attend the Town Hall Session to provide input.

The goal of the interviews was to assess perceptions about the status of the issues and recommendations. Participants were given the opportunity to discuss any or all of the issues and recommendations. All participants were provided anonymity as part of this effort to garner candid information about their viewpoints.

Please note that the definition of “success” or “completion” of implementing an issue and its recommendations was not defined for the participants, but was left to their judgment. In some instances, participants defined success if some recommendations within an issue were implemented; in other instances, participants only defined success/completion if the recommendations were fully implemented. If participants were not aware of the status of an issue, they were asked to indicate as much.

The questions asked during the interviews included:

- Opinions on the status of the recommendations.

- For recommendations that have been implemented, have they moved reuse forward in the state (if so, are there specific examples)?
- If the recommendations have not been implemented, why not – what were the factors preventing implementation, if any?
- If the recommendations have not been implemented, is the issue still a priority and, if so, how do we move forward to implement the recommendation?
- Is the issue still important?
- Are there new issues?
- For the issues implemented, what were the key factors that helped get the recommendation implemented and what were the lessons learned?
- For those that were implemented, what did it take to make it happen, was it a good thing, and what lessons were learned during the process?
- Is recycled water is a critical resource for the state?

In some cases, the respondents also provided suggestions on ways to move forward with the Task Force recommendations.

The results of the interviews were compiled into a Draft White Paper that was presented at the Town Hall Session on March 25, 2008.

4.2 Town Hall Session

On March 25, 2008, NWRI and WateReuse California sponsored a 2-hour “Town Hall Session” at WateReuse California’s 2008 Annual Conference to review the status of implementing the Task Force recommendations and to discuss the next steps in moving water recycling forward in the state. Over 350 people attended the session, and copies of the Draft White Paper were provided to participants.

The general format for the Session included an overview of the results of the Draft White Paper, a Panel discussion, and an open forum for the participants to provide input and comments on the Draft White Paper, Panel member presentations, or other issues related to water recycling.

Panel members included:

- *Moderator:* Tim Quinn, Executive Director, Association of California Water Agencies
- Jonas Minton, Water Policy Advisor, Planning and Conservation League
- Tam Doduc, Chair, State Water Resources Control Board
- Ane Deister, Vice President, Water Resources, Brown and Caldwell

The panel members presented on a number of priorities, including the need for:

- Developing a strategic approach for issues (new and old).
- Using a shared vision dialog approach for public policy.
- Having leadership at the state level.

- Creating public support.
- Elevating funding priorities by state, regional, and local entities.
- Completing the SWRCB Recycled Water Policy.
- Completing the SWRCB General Irrigation Permit.
- Developing the SWRCB Economic Analysis Key Framework and Methodology.
- Sponsoring research.
- Addressing chemicals of emerging concern.
- Ensuring that new development should be linked with conservation and water recycling.

Input from the audience generated the following list of issues and topics:

- Message and mindset – we need to listen to the public, bring them into the process, and open up the process to questions.
- Peer-reviewed science combined with outreach – must combine with public concerns/comments and use for public outreach.
- Chemicals of emerging concern – media focus, public focus, safety focus.
 - Challenge - balancing realities with uncertainties.
 - Make this topic more visible.
 - Put risk in context - relative risk and public awareness (e.g., California Proposition 65 warning labels).⁹
- Power of transparency – need to first establish trust, not just sell a product.
- The water industry is held to a high standard.
- Leadership – need a champion(s) at the state level; visionary; perhaps the Governor.
 - Recycled water needs to be supported in the Governor’s water plan.
 - Water-Energy Sub-Team, Climate Action Team for 2009 California Water Plan – needs to address recycled water and climate change.
- Focus on action items/goals/strategies.
 - Creating momentum, enthusiasm, action.
- Understandable research.
- Recycled water is not high on public and political radar statewide.
 - Need strategic action plan to get recycled water on the Governor’s radar.
- Florida example – creation of a state agency to both promote and regulate recycled water; should these functions be combined?

⁹ In 1986, California voters approved an initiative to address growing concerns about exposure to toxic chemicals. That initiative became the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, better known by its original name of Proposition 65. Proposition 65 requires businesses to notify Californians about significant amounts of chemicals in the products they purchase, in their homes or workplaces, or released into the environment. Businesses are required to provide a "clear and reasonable" warning before knowingly and intentionally exposing anyone to a listed chemical. This warning can be given by a variety of means, such as by labeling a consumer product, posting signs at the workplace, distributing notices at a rental housing complex, or publishing notices in a newspaper.

- Create a recycled water ombudsman as exempt position with the state.

The top five priority goals and issues identified as part of the Town Hall Session included:

1. Communication with the public.
 - Commitment to public health and safety.
 - Need for water supply.
2. Leadership/advocacy.
3. Regulatory consistency.
4. Funding.
5. Public support.

4.3 Comments on the Draft White Paper

Individuals who were interviewed and participants at the Town Hall Session were given the opportunity to provide comments after the Session, including their views on the status of the recommendations. Several of the individuals who were interviewed, as well as representatives from DWR and SWRCB, provided feedback.

SWRCB provided copies of its Water Recycling Funding Program performance plan (titled Strategic Plan) dated January 18, 2007; the Water Recycling Funding Program Performance Plan Annual Report covering year 2007 activities; and an updated table from the Strategic Plan that reflected activity through April 2008 and current plans underway with regard to the recommendations. These comments were incorporated into the final White Paper.

In September 2008, SWRCB updated the Strategic Plan and relevant actions related to recycled water, and the Task Force issues were incorporated into the final White Paper. The final White Paper reflects recent actions undertaken by DWR.

In April 2009, DWR issued a public notice for workshops to be held in May 2009 to introduce draft language for dual plumbed buildings design standards.¹⁰

Finally, during the 2008 legislative session, WaterReuse California and the Inland Empire Utilities Agency co-sponsored Assembly Bill 2270 (Laird/Feuer/Strickland), which would have provided local agencies throughout the state with more authority to regulate residential self-regenerating water softeners within their services areas. This bill passed both houses with bipartisan support before it was vetoed by the Governor on the basis that it limited consumer choices with little impact on salt contributions. Shortly after the veto, the Governor's office contacted the bill sponsors and requested that similar legislation be introduced in 2009, with a specific focus on the hydrologic regions where salinity management is an acute issue. WaterReuse California, Inland Empire Utilities Agency, and Irvine Ranch Water District are collectively cosponsoring Assembly Bill 1366, authored by Feuer, Caballero, and Strickland, which responds to the Governor's request.

¹⁰ See www.owue.water.ca.gov/recycle/plumb/2Plumb.doc.

5. The Recycled Water Policy Development Process: A Case Study in Implementing Task Force Recommendations

5.1 Background on the Decision to Adopt the Recycled Water Policy

Beginning in 2004, water recycling projects were impacted by the actions of some of the nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards (Regional Boards) specifically around the application of the SWRCB's Anti-degradation Policy, as set forth in Resolution 68-16 "Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality Waters in California." The Regional Board interpretations of the policy generally sought to prevent any change in groundwater quality, regardless of considerations around the provision to meet the "maximum benefit to the people of the State," as stated in the policy. In some cases, the Regional Board determined that any change in salinity, even though the change still allowed the groundwater to meet State water quality and health standards, was unacceptable. In other cases, the Regional Board mandated that no chemicals could be detected in a groundwater or could only be allowed at levels where there is no risk created by the presence of the chemical as a result of an indirect potable reuse project, even if the risk was deemed acceptable by CDPH. Because of this trend and in response to the Task Force recommendations, SWRCB worked with the Regional Boards, recycled water producers and suppliers, and NGOs to develop guidance¹¹ related to permitting recycled water projects in accordance with State Water Board Resolution 68-16.

This guidance document was not complete when the Alamitos Barrier groundwater recharge project came before the SWRCB. For the Alamitos Barrier groundwater recharge project, the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board used CDPH Notification Levels, which are not drinking water standards but rather health-based advisory levels, to establish enforceable limits in a recycled water permit.¹² Importantly, not only did CDPH not recommend that its Notification Levels be used to establish enforceable limits, it was on record explaining that Notification Levels were not meant to be used to set limits. The inclusion of Notification-Level limits in permits was temporarily resolved by the issuance of SWRCB Order 2006-0001 for the Alamitos Barrier Project. This order concluded, based on the policies favoring reclamation and reuse of water, that it was inappropriate for the Regional Boards to include CDPH Notification Levels as effluent limitations in the permits for indirect potable reuse projects. Importantly, the order recognized that part of the State's charge is to provide for both water quantity and quality; therefore, subjecting recycled water to higher standards than those applied to potable water (which limits the State's water supply and creates circumstances that are contrary to the SWRCB's charge to prevent waste and unreasonable use of water). The Alamitos Barrier Order also emphasizes the primacy of CDPH on issues of human health. Specifically, it states:

Most significantly, DHS [now CDPH], which is the state agency responsible for drinking water quality, issued its own approval and conditions for this Project and recommended against the use of its notification levels as effluent limitations.

¹¹ The SWRCB draft Guidance for "Implementing State Statutes, Regulations and Policies for Recycled Water Projects," November 2005.

¹² Notification Levels (Health & Safety Code Section 116455) are health-based advisory levels established by CDPH for chemicals in drinking water that lack maximum contaminant levels. When chemicals are found at concentrations greater than their notification levels, certain requirements and recommendations apply.

Within the Alamitos Barrier Order, the SWRCB offered its own insights into how the Anti-Degradation Policy should be interpreted:

We find that the Los Angeles Water Board did not accord ample weight to the public benefits of reclamation and reuse in water-short areas of the state. The replacement of imported potable water with highly treated reclaimed water is strongly encouraged. The public health is clearly being protected, especially where DHS has fully approved the project and has, itself, discouraged the use of notification levels as effluent limitations.

The process surrounding the Alamitos Barrier Project, its permit, and the appeal of its permit caused SWRCB to pursue an update to its Recycled Water Policy.

5.2 SWRCB Draft Policy Effort

After the adoption of the Alamitos Barrier Order, SWRCB held a workshop in March 2007 on whether the agency should develop a water recycling policy and, if so, what issues the policy should address. Following the workshop, SWRCB decided to proceed with developing a proposed Recycled Water Policy and, in October 2007, held a hearing on a proposed draft. The proposal was criticized by environmental organizations and the recycled water community. Principal complaints about the proposal from environmental interests were that the proposal would not ensure compliance with water quality objectives, that the anti-degradation provisions would weaken water quality protections, and that the proposal failed to consider constituents of emerging concern. The water recycling community objected to the proposal because it would not achieve the objective of promoting water reuse, and failed to deal with critical issues such as incidental runoff. SWRCB revised the draft Policy in part and scheduled a hearing for February 19, 2008, to adopt it. The water recycling and NGO community still strongly objected to the draft Policy, found it to lack clarity and purpose in furthering water recycling, and asked that the hearing be continued to March 2008, with the intent that stakeholders would propose a collaborative effort to revise the Policy on behalf on SWRCB.

5.3 Collaborative Stakeholder Effort

SWRCB deferred the hearing on the Policy to March 18, 2008. At that meeting, the following agencies jointly testified before SWRCB:

- Association of California Water Agencies.
- California Association of Sanitation Agencies.
- California Coastkeeper Alliance.
- Heal the Bay.
- National Resources Defense Council.
- Planning and Conservation League.
- WateReuse California.

The stakeholders acknowledged that the Draft Recycled Water Policy did not adequately support the use of recycled water and that a revised approach was needed. The stakeholder group requested that SWRCB consider a facilitated process with the different organizations to work through the necessary revisions. The stakeholders recognized that their organizations had

differences of opinion about how the State and local agencies should increase the use of recycled water. However, they believed that an expedited, open dialogue was the best approach to identify solutions to support a sustainable water supply for the benefit of the people of California and the environment.

SWRCB consented, and the collaborative effort began shortly thereafter, with members of each organization participating in the discussions, along with a facilitator and support from CDPH and members of SWRCB and their staff. At the beginning of the negotiations, the stakeholders agreed that they wanted policy that would:

- Create a call for action that would result in the greater use of recycled water.
- Integrate recycled water into water management planning for the State.
- Produce a carefully crafted and balanced set of recommendations to address conflicting concerns.
- Maximize consistency in permitting projects while preserving the Regional Board's authority and flexibility to address local conditions.
- Address the majority of recycled water project permits.
- Be a policy, not a permit.

The stakeholders worked through the spring and summer of 2008 and, on September 2, 2008, provided SWRCB with joint recommendations regarding the Policy and its provisions.

5.4 Stakeholder Outcome

Despite significant differences among water industry and environmental stakeholders about what the Recycled Water Policy should say, the group was able to provide consensus language on specific provisions, with the exception of incidental runoff. The recommendations were presented in the form of a revised draft Policy that included the following key provisions:

- ***Preamble.*** This provision acknowledged the current water crisis in the state and the need for a sustainable water policy that addresses water recycling, water conservation, storm water, and maintenance of supply infrastructure, consistent with state and federal water quality laws. It included specific water goals for conservation and the use of recycled water and storm water (to be consistent with the SWRCB Strategic Plan).
- ***Purpose of Recycled Water Policy.*** This provision provided direction to Regional Boards on issuing recycled water permits with streamlining criteria for the vast majority of recycled water projects and to maximize consistency among permitting while reserving sufficient Regional Board authority and flexibility to address site-specific conditions.
- ***Benefits of Recycled Water.*** This provision acknowledged that the use of recycled water in accordance with the Policy is presumed to have a beneficial impact and encourages public agencies to use this presumption in evaluating the impacts of recycled water projects on the environment.

- ***Mandates for the Use of Recycled Water.*** This provision set statewide mandates for the use of recycled water and implementation through cooperation and collaboration.
- ***Agency Roles.*** This provision recognized shared regulatory jurisdiction over recycled water use among various state agencies, and that the Regional Boards should rely on CDPH for the establishment of permit conditions to protect human health.
- ***Salt/Nutrient Management Plans.*** This provision require plans to be developed for every groundwater basin/sub-basin within 5 years of policy adoption (7 years with extensions), with commitments from the California Association of Sanitation Agencies, WaterReuse California, and Association of California Water Agencies to fund the plans (along with other stakeholders), and criteria for what should be included in the plans.
- ***Landscape Irrigation Projects.*** This provision creates streamlining criteria for permit approvals and do not require groundwater monitoring for streamlined permits, except as called for in an approved salt/nutrient management plan.
- ***Monitoring.*** This provision requires the monitoring of recycled water for priority pollutants twice per year and for constituents of emerging concern annually (consistent with expert panel recommendations).
- ***Groundwater Recharge Projects.*** This provision requires site-specific, project-by-project review, set criteria for Regional Board approval, and an expedited “1 year” permit process for projects that use reverse osmosis for surface spreading.
- ***Anti-degradation.*** This provision sets Groundwater Recharge Project criteria and Landscape Irrigation Project criteria for the types of analyses that must be conducted.
- ***Constituents of Emerging Concern.*** This provision acknowledges more scientific information and significant work is needed on test methods and more specific determinations as to how constituents of emerging concern may impact public health or the environment, and calls for the SWRCB, in consultation with CDPH, to convene within 90 days of the adoption of the Policy a “blue-ribbon” expert advisory panel to make recommendations for the monitoring of constituents of emerging concern in recycled water
- ***Incentives.*** This provision identifies incentives, including funding, for the use of recycled water and storm water.

SWRCB staff reviewed the stakeholder draft, made clarifications, and added provisions for incidental runoff. On February 3, 2009, SWRCB adopted the Recycled Water Policy with support from stakeholders. This policy is seen as a critical step in implementing some of the key Task Force recommendations. The Policy will be finalized after approval by the Office of Administrative Law. One key to its success will be how it is implemented by the individual Regional Boards.

5.5 Collaborative Efforts for Improving SWRCB Performance

The case study of the Recycled Water Policy collaborative effort is an excellent example of one of the key recommendations from the Little Hoover Commission's recent report on *Clearer Structure, Cleaner Water: Improving Performance and Outcomes at the State Water Boards*.¹³ The Commission took up the study of the SWRCB and Regional Boards to determine whether their structures and duties with regard to water quality regulation, and their relationship to each other, were adequate and appropriate for the challenges they face today. The Commission recommended that significant revamping was necessary and should include a number of characteristics, including having these agencies focus on solving water quality problems in creative and collaborative ways.

Generally, the Commission noted:

In 2008, the SWRCB's effort to develop a statewide water recycling policy may have helped create a new model for policy development. With near unanimous dissent among stakeholders regarding a recycling policy proposal created by state water board staff, stakeholders agreed to work together and develop a policy that they would then propose to the board. After several months, the stakeholder group created a 13-page proposal that all sides agreed on. The proposal suggested new goals for the use of recycled water in the state, called for state- and stakeholder-funded basin plan updates for managing salt and nutrient issues, a streamlined permitting process to encourage recycled water projects, and the creation of an expert panel to advise the state on how to handle constituents of emerging concern based on current science. The Commission recommended that the SWRCB and regional boards should use this model to develop future policies.

Specifically, the following recommendation from the Commission report may serve as an incentive for SWRCB and the Regional Boards to engage in additional stakeholder efforts:

Recommendation 3: The State must increase focus on clean water outcomes and emphasize collaboration, creativity, and problem-solving to address current water quality problems. Specifically, the State should:

Use stakeholder task forces. As the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board has done, other regional boards should increase the use of stakeholder task forces to work through difficult regulatory issues.

Efforts should also emphasize collaboration with stakeholders and problem-solving to address these issues.

¹³ Little Hoover Commission (2009). *Clearer Structure, Cleaner Water: Improving Performance and Outcomes at the State Water Boards*. Sacramento, California, January 2009, page xiv.

6. Views and Perceptions

6.1 Status of the Recommendations

To provide a concise approach to reviewing general views and perceptions regarding the Task Force recommendations, the 26 issues were grouped into 10 categories:

- Bonds.
- Leadership.
- Cross-connections.
- Other regulatory matters.
- Plumbing code changes.
- Outreach and communications.
- Economics and funding administration.
- Education.
- Source control.
- Water softeners.

The general perception of the status of the recommendations associated with each issue by category was assigned to one of four groupings and is presented in Table 2:

- Implemented – The recommendations have been implemented [☑].
- Partly implemented – Some of the recommendations have been implemented [✓].
- Not done – None of the recommendations have been implemented [☒].
- Not done, but some activity – None of the recommendations have been implemented, but there is some activity ongoing related to the recommendations [✗].

The Task Force Report’s 14 key issues are denoted in *bold italics*; comments on some issues are also provided.

Table 2: General Perception of the Status of Recommendations

Category	Description	Done	Partly Done	Not Done	Not Done But Some Activity	2008 Comments/Follow-Up Actions
Bonds	<i>1. Funding for Water Recycling Projects</i>				✗	No bonds passed to address specific recommendations, but funding is available for IRWMPs, ¹⁴ which may or may not further reuse; also made significant progress in putting a minimum of \$250 million into every bond proposal
	<i>13. Research Funding</i>				✗	No bonds passed to address specific recommendations, but SWRCB using Prop 13 funding for water reuse projects. Funding of projects by the WateReuse Foundation and NWRI

¹⁴ Integrated Regional Water Management Plans. Grant programs funded by Propositions 50 and 84 for projects to protect communities from drought, protect and improve water quality, and improve local water security by reducing dependence on imported water. Funding is jointly administered by SWRCB and DWR. www.swrcb.ca.gov/funding/irwmpg/index.html.

Category	Description	Done	Partly Done	Not Done	Not Done But Some Activity	2008 Comments/Follow-Up Actions
	14. University Academic Program for Water Recycling			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	18. DWR Technical Assistance				✗	No bond passed to address specific recommendations, but DWR provides technical assistance
	19. Project Performance Analysis				✗	No bond passed to address specific recommendations, but SWRCB is funding relevant research
Leadership	3. Leadership Support for Water Recycling				✗	SWRCB strategic plans, ¹⁵ and SWRCB and stakeholder action related to the Recycled Water Policy ¹⁶
Cross-Connections	7. CDPH Guidance on Cross-Connection Control				✗	CDPH is working on regulations ¹⁷
	21. Stakeholder Review of Proposed Cross-Connection Control Regulations				✗	CDPH is working on regulations (see Issue #7)
	22. Cross-Connection Risk Assessment			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Other Regulatory Matters	8. Health and Safety Regulation				✗	CDPH is working on the draft groundwater recharge regulations using a stakeholder group and is providing oversight for relevant research projects
	9. Incidental Runoff		✓			SWRCB - Executive Director memo, ¹⁸ the Recycled Water Policy ¹⁹ and General Irrigation Permit ²⁰
	10. Uniform Interpretation of State Standards		✓			SWRCB - Recycled Water Policy ²¹ and General Irrigation Permit
	23. Permitting Procedures		✓			SWRCB - draft Recycled Water Policy ²² and General Irrigation Permit

¹⁵ Strategic Plan January 2007–December 2008 (SWRCB, January 18, 2007); and Strategic Plan Update 2008-2012 (SWRCB, September 2, 2008).

¹⁶ www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/water_recycling_policy/; the Policy was adopted by the SWRCB on February 3, 2009.

¹⁷ CDPH is working on revisions to the regulations; www.cdph.ca.gov/certlic/drinkingwater/Documents/Draftregulations/Crossconnectiondraftreg-12-08-05.pdf.

¹⁸ February 2004, Memo from Celeste Cantu, *Incidental Runoff of Recycled Water*.

¹⁹ Incidental runoff is addressed in the adopted Recycled Water Policy; however, it will be important to observe how the provisions are implemented by Regional Board before determining if the issue has been fully resolved.

²⁰ Assembly Bill 1481 (De La Torre) added Section 13552.5 to the Water Code; requires the SWRCB to adopt a General Permit for Landscape Irrigation on or before July 31, 2009.

²¹ The Recycled Water Policy only addresses irrigation and groundwater recharge.

²² *Ibid.*

Category	Description	Done	Partly Done	Not Done	Not Done But Some Activity	2008 Comments/Follow-Up Actions
	26. Statewide Science-Based Panel on Indirect Potable Reuse				×	CDPH is using the specified reports; this was the most difficult recommendation to understand its intent
Plumbing Code Changes	6. <i>Uniform Plumbing Code Appendix J</i>				×	Plumbing code package is ready for submittal; in May 2009, DWR will start the process to adopt dual plumbing design standards for potable and recycled water systems
	20. Recycled Water Symbol Code Change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
Community Involvement/ Outreach	2. <i>Community Value-Based Decision-Making Model for Project Planning</i>		✓			Local agencies are engaging in community dialog; limited state activity; A number of applicable projects have been initiated. ²³
	5. <i>State-Sponsored Media Campaign</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Economics/ Funding Process	12. <i>Uniform Analytical Method for Economic Analyses</i>				×	SWRCB has funded research and plans to convene the economic panel fall 2008; DWR may be using a framework for grants
	15. Funding Coordination			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	16. Regional Planning Criterion		✓			Recycling is a factor used in funding decisions for DWR; also activity via IRWMPs, but these plans may or may not further reuse, and activity via the 2009 California Water Plan
	17. Funding Information Outreach	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
	25. Economic Analyses		✓			Being done by local agencies; for state, some activity via evaluations of economic analyses for Prop 50 proposals and via IRWMPs, but are not yet used as funding criteria
Education	4. <i>Educational Curriculum</i>		✓			5th grade curriculum sponsored by WateReuse California, Water Education Foundation, and NWRI, and used by some local agencies; DWR has provided assistance to some universities

²³ The NWRI-sponsored 2008 manual, *Building the Wastewater Utility Brand*; WateReuse Foundation projects: WRF-01-004-01, *Best Practices for Developing Indirect Potable Reuse Projects: Phase 1 Report* (2004); and WRF-01-004-02, Water Supply Replenishment Website.

Category	Description	Done	Partly Done	Not Done	Not Done But Some Activity	2008 Comments/Follow-Up Actions
Source Control	24. Source Control		✓			Routine source control done by all agencies; not all programs are focusing on chemicals of emerging concern
Water Softeners	11. <i>Water Softeners</i>		✓			Some legislative changes, but still obstacles to local control or banning existing softeners; NWRI and the Southern California Salinity Coalition ²⁴ have sponsored projects on the removal of water softeners
Total	26	2	9	4	11	

Of the 14 key issues, the general perception is that recommendations for 11 issues have not been implemented and recommendations for five issues have been partly implemented. For a full list of the 26 issues, the general perception was that recommendations for two issues had been fully implemented, recommendations for nine issues had been partly implemented, and recommendations for 15 issues had not been implemented. For these 15 issues, some work is underway for recommendations related to 11 of the issues, but the outcome is uncertain with regard to successful implementation. One interesting observation was that, as part of the stakeholder interviews, for 23 of the issues, at least one respondent was not aware of the status because it was not an issue that the individual was tracking, including the two issues that were deemed to have been fully implemented.²⁵

For the two issues shown to be completed in Table 2, there was general agreement that the recommendations for Issue #20 (Plumbing Code Change – Recycled Water Symbol) and Issue #17 (Funding Information Outreach) had been implemented.

For two of the six issues with partly completed recommendations, the general perception was that only the recommendations assigned to local agencies had been implemented, but state recommendations had not, although some state activity was taking place (Issue #2 Community Value-Based Decision-Making Model for Project Planning and Issue #25 Economic Analysis).

For Issue #24 (Source Control), the decision to place this issue in the “partly completed” grouping was based on two factors. While there was general agreement that public agencies were administering source control programs, not all programs were dealing with chemicals of emerging concern, which is a current critical issue for water recycling (but was not identified as a Task Force issue at the time).

For Issue #11, despite the legislative changes made to date, there was general agreement that local agencies still face significant challenges regarding prospective bans on automatic water

²⁴ The Southern California Salinity Coalition is a non-profit coalition of water and wastewater agencies in Southern California dedicated to managing salinity in our water supplies. www.socalsalinity.org.

²⁵ The three issues that the individuals interviewed were all aware of included: 1) Issue 5 - State Sponsored Media Campaign, 2) Issue 9 - Incidental Runoff, and 3) Issue 24 – Source Control.

softeners and have no ability to ban existing softeners. There were also concerns that regulators fail to fully comprehend these limitations when developing policies or permits for public agencies with regard to controlling salts.

For the 15 issues with recommendations that have not been implemented, some type of work is underway for 11 issues in four groupings: bonds, leadership, cross-connections, and other regulatory matters. For the five issues related to the passage of bonds by the Legislature, the general view was that while funding for projects and research is critical for furthering water recycling, they were also aware of difficulties in passing bonds due to state water politics and the state economy. However, it was believed that significant progress has been made as shown by the inclusion of a minimum of \$250 million into legislative proposals for recycling projects. Efforts included the Democratic and Republican versions of all bonds that have been proposed as initiatives for possible circulation or as legislatively adopted bonds. Consequently, there was optimism that future bond efforts will be passed given the visibility of recycled water and efforts by a number of groups/associations. SWRCB has also utilized funds from Proposition 13 to sponsor research.

For two of the 14 issues that had no recommendations implemented, but with work underway, the general perception was that some activity had occurred via Integrated Regional Water Resource Management Plans (IRWMPs), but there were differences in points of view regarding the relative value of IRWMPs in advancing water recycling, ranging from assistance for recycling to skepticism about any assistance. In the latter case, this sentiment was based on the belief that the funding is only for regional planning, of which recycled water is one piece (and often not a strongly supported piece) or is overshadowed by other projects in the watershed that have more public appeal and, thus, are more likely to be funded under the IRWMPs.

For 10 of the 15 issues with recommendations that had not been implemented, work is under way at the state level:

- DWR technical assistance.
- SWRCB's work on the General Irrigation Permit and sponsored research, and the adoption of the Recycled Water Policy.
- CDPH work on various regulations.

Many were hopeful SWRCB's efforts related to the implementation of the Recycled Water Policy and development of the General Irrigation Permit would advance water recycling; however, others were skeptical of the likely outcomes. At the time of the interviews, some of the perceptions regarding the draft Recycled Water Policy were that it was not a carefully considered, stakeholder-based effort to come up with a cogent policy. There was also the view that the goal of this work on the draft Recycled Water Policy should not be to make water recycling requirements less burdensome (as emphasized in one of the Task Force recommendations), but to comply with Federal and State laws. Many of these concerns were resolved in the final Recycled Water Policy adopted in February 2009.

In its comments on the Draft White Paper, SWRCB provided information on recommended next steps from its January 18, 2007, Strategic Plan for 2007–2008 that are directly related to the Task

Force recommendations and actions that SWRCB is undertaking for 12 of the 26 issues. The Plan has six strategic projects for calendar years 2007 and 2008, four of which are directly related to the Task Force recommendations:

- ***Project #1 - Develop Economic/Financial Analyses Guidance*** that addresses Issue #12 (Uniform Analytical Method for Economic Analyses) and Issue #25 (Permitting Procedures).
- ***Project #2 - Develop Beneficiary Pays Framework Guidance*** that addresses Issue #12 (Uniform Analytical Method for Economic Analyses).
- ***Project #3 - Perform Project Performance Analyses*** that addresses Issue #19 (Project Performance Analysis).
- ***Project #4 - Promote, Coordinate, and Finance Water Recycling Statewide Efforts*** that addresses Issues #13 (Research Funding), Issue #14 (University Academic Program for Water Recycling), and Issue #17 (Funding Information Outreach).

In September 2008, SWRCB adopted an updated Strategic Plan for 2008-2012. One of the key priorities is to promote sustainable local water supplies, including recycled. This priority item includes two specific actions related to recycled water:

- **Action 3.2.1** - Use existing regulatory authorities to require the development and implementation of water recycling plans by wastewater management agencies working with water supply agencies, where the recycling of treated effluent is not maximized at wastewater treatment plants located in areas of imported water supply. Prioritize implementation of the plans for those plants that discharge to water bodies from which the water is not easily recovered (addresses Issue #3).
- **Action 3.2.3** - Revise funding criteria, where allowable, to ensure that grant and loan projects funded by the Water Boards support activities that enhance water reuse, water recycling, and groundwater recharge (addresses Issue #12).

Finally, one of the 14 issues with recommendations that had not been implemented, but with some work done, generated the most negative responses during the interviews (Issue #6 [Uniform Plumbing Code Appendix J]). A long list of activities had been undertaken by the water recycling community to prepare the regulatory package and obtain enabling legislation needed to change the Plumbing Code. There was frustration that, despite this work, DWR has not yet acted to submit the package so that the change could be implemented. After the Town Hall Session, DWR provided input that it lacked the necessary staff resources to complete the California Building Standards Commission regulatory process based on current staffing and other program demands. However, in April 2009, DWR issued a public notice regarding workshops to be held in May regarding the adoption of the plumbing code standards, and released a draft of the standards for public review and comment.

Additional information on the status of the recommendations is presented in Attachment 1.

6.2 Importance of Task Force Issues and New Issues

Based on the interviews, Town Hall Session presentations/discussions, and comments on the Draft White Paper, the common view was that all of the issues were generally still important, but some categories of issues were more important than others. The top five priorities included:

- 1) Communication with the public.
- 2) State leadership and advocacy.
- 3) Regulatory consistency.
- 4) Funding.
- 5) Public support.

With regard to the uniform interpretation of state standards, it was noted that one of the significant issues raised during Task Force discussions may no longer be critical due to staffing changes. This issue was that some local health agencies set more stringent standards than state standards.

There were mixed views related to the general importance of incidental runoff and water softeners. These issues appeared to be more critical in specific regions of the state. Additional information is presented in Attachment 2.

There were also five issues of current interest that were not addressed by the Task Force:

- **Constituents of Emerging Concern.** This issue was considered to be critical for public perception and for dealing with obstacles raised by the public, regulators, and NGOs regarding water recycling projects. An important step will be to collect information on the issue and have an “authority” with public credibility, such as CDPH, provide information to the public. It should be noted that a provision in the Recycled Water Policy establishes a program to evaluate the risks of constituents of emerging concern to the public and the environment.
- **Anti-Degradation.** While this issue may have been previously been limited to certain areas of state based on Regional Board permitting decisions, it has now has a broader audience as a result of the work being done on the SWRCB draft Recycled Water Policy, including the ongoing Recycled Water Stakeholder Group meetings (the outcome of which may impact the approach and scope of the policy). Prior to the formation of this group, there was optimism that the policy will address key issues related to applying the State Anti-Degradation Policy to water recycling projects and their impacts on groundwater, but there was also skepticism regarding a positive or productive outcome. There are perceptions that a few Regional Boards have taken very extreme positions when applying the Anti-Degradation Policy or have improperly challenged the authority of CDPH with regard to the protection of public health. It should be noted that a provision in the Recycled Water Policy provides mechanisms addressing anti-degradation for irrigation and groundwater recharge projects.

- **Salinity Management.** This issue is critical as more agencies move to the treatment of recycled water with membranes and, consequently, generate brine, requiring disposal. It should be noted that the Recycled Water Policy includes provisions for establishing regional salt/nutrient management plans.
- **Indirect Potable Reuse.** Even though the Task Force Report included a few recommendations related to indirect potable reuse, this issue was not specifically addressed and deserves attention.
- **Better Information on Water Recycling in the State.** The general perception was that it will be difficult to move water recycling forward unless we have better information on how much recycled water is being used statewide. Future efforts should analyze different IRWMPs to look at the water recycling component and determine if these plans have helped water recycling. Better information is also needed to highlight the nexus between water recycling and energy/climate change benefits and/or environmental impacts for advanced treatment.

Additional information is presented in Attachment 2.

6.3 Lessons Learned and Obstacles

With regard to lessons learned through efforts to move the recommendations forward, the general perception was that the key mechanisms for moving forward included:

- Have a party take the lead in championing an issue.
- Maintain a sustained effort with the parties responsible for implementing the recommendations.
- For legislative mandates, make sure there is funding for state resources to implement the mandate.

For recommendations implemented to date, many believed this role has fallen to local agencies and WaterReuse California. Recycled water issues are complicated and interwoven, which impacts implementation. In some cases, it is necessary to have a combination of will and outside forces to be successful. For example, external factors (such as drought and strains on water resources) may have more impact in moving recommendations forward. Some believe that legislative solutions are easier to implement than administrative solutions that have to be undertaken by state agencies. For legislative solutions, success is more likely with a strong supportive legislator and staff. Additional information is presented in Attachment 3.

With regard to obstacles encountered in implementing the recommendations, a number of barriers were identified, as summarized below.

- Current state of the economy.
- Lack of funding for recycled water projects.
- Economics:

- The cost of recycled water projects may be higher than other alternatives – this may be driven by regulations.
- The pricing policy for potable water (where potable water is subsidized) can make recycled water projects non-competitive.
- Lack of money/resources for state agencies.
 - Given the uncertainties with the state budget and staffing reductions, agencies are not willing to use resources for working on issues.
 - Staffing limitations at state agencies restricts the ability to work on implementing recommendations.
- Lack of state leadership.
 - No state agency champion for recycled water.
 - No lower staff level buy-in or willingness to move forward.
- Lack of consistent support from the NGO community.
- Regulatory agency infrastructure.
 - Turf battles among agencies (SWRCB/CDPH/DWR; SWRCB/ Regional Boards; and Regional Boards/CDPH).
 - The organization of agencies dealing with water quality and health is too fractured.
 - Entrenchment on issues.
- The Task Force structure and recommendations.
 - Too many issues and recommendations.
 - Some recommendations are too specific, with no mechanism to make them happen.
 - Some recommendations are too general or vague.
 - No mechanism for reporting on success or lack of success.
 - Lack of strategic approach.
 - No one on the Task Force had a clear understanding of the Clean Water Act issues and that regulation of recycled water should not be less burdensome, but in compliance with the law.
- Recycled water community.
 - Disagreements in the recycled water community on importance of issues, willingness to move forward, or how to move forward.
 - Positions of local agencies are too entrenched or adversarial when faced with opposition.
- Public perception.
 - People still do not accept recycled water.
 - Lack of information on the occurrence and effects of chemicals of emerging concern.

Additional information is included in Attachment 3.

6.4 Importance of Recycled Water

The general view is that recycled water is a critical resource for the state based on a number of common themes, including:

- All water sources are critical.
- Recycled water is a localized supply.
- Recycled water is a sustainable supply.
- Reduced energy and carbon footprints.
- Climate change.
- Increased pressure due to population growth and drought.
- Protection of endangered and threatened species.
- Cost of developing new potable water sources.

Additional information is presented in Attachment 4.

With regard to the theme of sustainability, some believe that it is important to increase the use of existing available recycled water. For the future, however, more consideration should be given to decentralized water recycling systems and to ensuring that new developments maximize conservation and recycling.

7. Next Steps

Although one of the goals of this effort was to identify specific next steps to move forward with the Task Force recommendations that had yet to be implemented, it was evident (based on input from the interviews and Town Hall Session, and from comments on the Draft White Paper) that this would not be an easy endeavor and will need additional discussion and deliberation. This situation results in part from the need for a strategic approach (which was not part of the original Task Force recommendation), the number and complexity of issues, and how the recommendations were framed.

Some recommendations were provided, including:

- Re-prioritize (and, possibly, restructure) the old and new issues/recommendations, develop a short-list, and create a report card mechanism so they can be tracked.
- Use a “Shared Vision” dialog approach when working on the issues.
- Maintain the visibility of recycled water to have success with future water bonds.
- On chemicals of emerging concern:
 - Work with NGOs regarding chemicals of emerging concern and the safety of recycled water, with CDPH serving as the lead spokesperson.
 - Provide public education and outreach on the proper disposal of prescription and over-the-counter drugs.
- Reconvene the 1994 “Summit” that developed the 1994 “Statement of Support for Water Reclamation.”
- Consider ways to help with state staffing resources, such as assisting DWR with the regulatory process for changing the plumbing code.
- Bring in the Plumbing Code changes through the Water Plan, thereby satisfying the Administrative Procedures Act requirements.
- Coordinate and track both the actions and recommended future actions being undertaken by SWRCB with regard to the Task Force recommendations based on information in the SWRCB Strategic Plan (see Attachment 5).
- Integrate recommendations from the Recycled Water Policy.

Attachment 1: Summary of Views Regarding the Status of the Recommendations

Issue	Status
<p>1. Funding for Water Recycling Projects [1.1]²⁶</p> <p><i>Recommendations:</i> State funding for water reuse/recycling facilities and infrastructure should be increased beyond Proposition 50²⁷ and other current sources. A bond issue should be passed by the Legislature to obtain funding, and state agencies should request Federal funding from Congress.</p>	<p><i>Overall Impressions:</i> Not done, but progress; also some money via the regional plans in Prop 50 and Prop 84 that include recycled water, but are not dedicated to recycled water.</p> <p>Summary of Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Not done – due to political climate, but made significant progress in putting a minimum of \$250 million into every bond proposal in the public domain. ● Possibility for \$250 million to be included in upcoming bonds. ● Future bond efforts – hopeful – the WateReuse California is working the issue; the Association of California Water Agencies is making recycled water a top priority. ● Done in concert with Prop 50 funding for Integrated Regional Water Resource Management Plans (IRWMPs)²⁸ – so only for regional planning of which recycled water is a piece and often not a strongly supported piece. ● Not done - IRWMPs do not have dedicated funding for recycling projects. ● Money in Prop 50 and 84,²⁹ and funding for IRWMPs, which shows marginal success. ● There will be no new water bonds this year due to the California economy, but maybe in future since recycled water has more visibility. ● There are \$75,000 planning grants available as part of the State Revolving Fund Program. ● Local efforts, such as those by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD), are helpful and important. ● WateReuse California has used data provided by SWRCB to support new state bond initiatives. ● Not aware of issue status.
<p>2. Community Value-Based Decision-Making Model for Project Planning [2.1]³⁰</p> <p><i>Recommendations:</i> Local agencies should engage the public in an active dialogue and participation using a community value-based decision-making model in planning water recycling projects that</p>	<p><i>Overall Impressions:</i> Being done at the local level; limited at state level. Mixed responses regarding state activity ranging from limited state activity via the IRWMPs and Water Recycling Facilities Planning to no activity.</p> <p>Summary of Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Not done at state level/public participation being done at local level. ● Some local efforts very successful like the Orange County Water

²⁶ www.owue.water.ca.gov/recycle/docs/Pages19-34Chapter4.pdf; pg 20.

²⁷ Proposition 50 included funding for competitive grants for a variety of projects, including water reclamation, and funding for competitive grants for development of Integrated Regional Water Management Plans (IRWMPs) for projects including water supply reliability programs.

²⁸ Grant Program funded by Proposition 50, Chapter 8, for projects to protect communities from drought, protect and improve water quality, and improve local water security by reducing dependence on imported water. Funding is jointly administered by the SWRCB and DWR. www.swrcb.ca.gov/funding/irwmgp/index.html.

²⁹ Proposition 84 included funding for IRWMPs, and the implementation program is under development.

³⁰ www.owue.water.ca.gov/recycle/docs/Pages19-34Chapter4.pdf; pg 22.

Issue	Status
<p>addresses all alternatives to the use of recycled water. For controversial issues, local agencies should convene independent advisory committees selected with the public. Public participation activities should go beyond the minimum requirements of State and Federal environmental laws, perhaps being reinforced by State funding agencies requiring a comprehensive public participation process as a condition for receiving State funds, or for future bond laws to include this as a requirement. State guidelines for public participation should be developed by someone such as the California Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee or its successor.</p>	<p>District’s Groundwater Replenishment System and Redwood City (one respondent said this shows marginal success).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Not being done well at state level (e.g., the SWRCB is not doing a good job with regard to outreach and discussion for the draft Recycled Water Policy). ● Some local efforts are too adversarial. ● Only being done at state level as part of IRWMPs/Public participation being done at local level. ● Not done at state level. Research foundations have sponsored projects that address public participation.³¹ ● Recommendation not yet implemented; current Water Recycling Facilities Planning Guidelines require one public meeting for construction funding. ● Not aware of issue status.
<p>3. Leadership Support for Water Recycling [2.2]³²</p> <p>Recommendations: State government should take a leadership role in encouraging recycled water use and improve the consistency of policy within the branches of State government. To accomplish this, CDPH should convene a panel to develop common terms for recycling and standard signage for projects. DWR should take the lead in re-activating the coalition that developed the 1994 “Statement of Support for Water Reclamation” to undertake a review and update that document and carry out other activities to promote recycling. State agencies, such as DWR, SWRCB, and CDPH, should assist local agencies with information and education on current and cost-effective technologies for recycled water projects, as well as guidance on legislated recycled water regulations. The State should convene an independent statewide review panel on indirect potable reuse to ensure adequate health and safety assurance for California residents. This effort could be taken on by the California Bay-Delta Science Program. Bond laws</p>	<p>Overall Impressions: For the specific recommendations – not done. Not done for general state leadership, with mixed responses regarding activity by the state ranging from the SWRCB is taking a leadership role to state agencies not taking actions to move reuse forward.</p> <p>Summary of Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● No leadership at state level. ● Only the SWRCB is taking a leadership role as part of the draft Recycled Water Policy.³³ ● Promising developments with SWRCB members that are interested in supporting and increasing recycling as evidenced by the discussions about the draft Recycled Water Policy, but that the outcome remains to be seen, as well as the development of the General Irrigation Permit;³⁴ CDPH is working with stakeholders on the draft groundwater recharge regulations. ● SWRCB funded research on understanding public concerns and on marketing strategies for non-potable water reuse, the results of which should help public education and outreach. ● SWRCB responds to requests for information and guidance on CDPH and Regional Board permitting requirements; funding information materials are produced by SWRCB. ● For the separate recommendations, not aware the specifics have been done; but for general state leadership, it seems the agencies support reuse, but actions have not shown this to be the case (talk is cheap). ● California Water Plan (Bulletin 160) is often touted by state agencies, but they take no actions to meet the recycling goal. ● CDPH needs to provide more support for indirect potable reuse

³¹ WRF-01-004-01, *Best Practices for Developing Indirect Potable Reuse Projects: Phase 1 Report* (2004); WRF-01-004-02, Water Supply Replenishment Website.

³² www.owue.water.ca.gov/recycle/docs/Pages19-34Chapter4.pdf; pg. 28.

³³ www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/water_recycling_policy/.

³⁴ Assembly Bill 1481 (De La Torre) added Section 13552.5 to the Water Code; requires the SWRCB to adopt a General Permit for Landscape Irrigation on or before July 31, 2009; www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/water_recycling_policy/.

Issue	Status
<p>should include funding for public outreach. Local agencies should create well-defined recycled water ordinances. Local regulatory agencies should effectively enforce these ordinances.</p>	<p>projects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Leadership is lacking, and we need another summit like the one that generated the 1994 Statement of Support. ● If we had a 2008 Statement of Support, it would just gather dust. ● WateReuse California has developed a model ordinance, but it is not clear if local agencies are using it or not.³⁵ ● Not aware of issue status.
<p>4. Educational Curriculum [2.3]³⁶</p> <p>Recommendations: The State Department of Education should appoint a panel to develop comprehensive education curricula for public schools, and institutions of higher education should incorporate recycled water education into their curricula. DWR should approach California universities about the need for more recycled water experts and request the incorporation of recycled water into their curricula, as well as help enhance existing educational materials or programs on recycled water. Other government agencies and NGOs should enhance their existing public education programs.</p>	<p>Overall Impressions: Partly done. For comprehensive curricula – not done at state level with mixed responses regarding activity, ranging from no action or not aware of action by the state to specific activities by DWR. Being done at local level, with activities undertaken by WateReuse California (with DWR participation) and local agencies. For university programs, being done at a few universities by DWR.</p> <p>Summary of Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Not done at state level/WateReuse Education Committee (includes DWR) developed 5th grade curriculum³⁷, the Water Education Foundation helped print it, and local agencies are working with their schools to use it. ● WateReuse Education Committee is considering a recycled water video contest for upper grades. ● Legislative mandate to develop new environmental curriculum, but don't know the extent it includes recycled water. ● There is one state college/university that made this a focus.³⁸ ● DWR is providing funding for the University of California, Santa Cruz Center for integrated Water Research, and has participated in a group to assist Sacramento State University with its curriculum. ● Not aware.
<p>5. State-Sponsored Media Campaign [2.4]³⁹</p> <p>Recommendation: The State should develop a water issues information program, including water recycling, for radio, television, print, and other media.</p>	<p>Overall Impressions: Not done.</p> <p>Summary of Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Not done at state level. ● Being done at local level like the Orange County Water District's Groundwater Replenishment System project and local/regional media campaigns focusing on drought and conservation, Bay Delta issues, etc. ● Conservation messages could have included information on recycling/water cycle.

³⁵ www.watereuse.org/ca/modelwrord.htm.

³⁶ www.owue.water.ca.gov/recycle/docs/Pages35-40Chapter4.pdf, pg 35.

³⁷ The booklet can be found at www.watereuse.org/ca/index.html.

³⁸ The University of California at Santa Cruz has the Center for Integrated Water research using Proposition 50 money, and research grants from the California Public Utilities Commission and the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency; <http://ciwr.ucsc.edu/desalplanning/index.html>.

Issue	Status
<p>6. Uniform Plumbing Code Appendix J [3.1]⁴⁰</p> <p><i>Recommendations:</i> DWR should take the lead in revising Appendix J of the Uniform Plumbing Code, which addresses plumbing within buildings with both potable and recycled water systems, and adopt a California version that will be enforceable in the State.</p>	<p><i>Overall Impressions:</i> Not done (it was the one issue with the most negative responses related to lack of completion), but activity.</p> <p>Summary of Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Not done – should have been a slam dunk since all of the pieces are in place. ● Just waiting for DWR to send it in; do not know why this has not happened. ● Lack of action makes planned projects illegal. ● Funding and staffing is needed to go through the regulatory process; DWR currently lacks the resources to do this work in-house and manage all other program responsibilities. ● Not aware of issue status.
<p>7. CDPH Guidance on Cross-Connection Control [3.2]⁴¹</p> <p><i>Recommendations:</i> CDPH should prepare guidance that would clarify the intent and applicability of Title 22, Article 5 of the California Code of Regulations pertaining to dual plumbed systems and amend this article to be consistent with requirements included in a California version of Appendix J that the Task Force is recommending to be adopted.</p>	<p><i>Overall Impressions:</i> Not done but with some CDPH activity underway.</p> <p>Summary of Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CDPH is working on this.⁴² ● Not aware of issue status. ● Local agencies are doing training.
<p>8. Health and Safety Regulation [4.1]⁴³</p> <p><i>Recommendation:</i> CDPH should involve stakeholders in a review of various factors that could affect the health and safety associated with the use of recycled water to identify any needs for enhancing existing local and State health regulation associated with the use of recycled water.</p>	<p><i>Overall Impressions:</i> Not done, but with some CDPH activity underway.</p> <p>Summary of Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CDPH is doing this with the draft groundwater recharge regulations⁴⁴ and through participation in specific research projects, like the WaterReuse Foundation filter loading rate study. ● Not aware of issue status.
<p>9. Incidental Runoff [4.2]⁴⁵</p> <p><i>Recommendation:</i> The SWRCB should convene a committee to investigate, within the current legal framework, alternative</p>	<p><i>Overall Impressions:</i> Not done, but with some SWRCB activity.</p> <p>Summary of Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Not done, although an attempt to do this by a SWRCB memo⁴⁶ was made and triggered litigation.

³⁹ www.owue.water.ca.gov/recycle/docs/Pages35-40Chapter4.pdf, pg 37.

⁴⁰ Ibid, pg 38.

⁴¹ Ibid, pg 39.

⁴² CDPH is working on revisions to the regulations;

www.cdph.ca.gov/certlic/drinkingwater/Documents/Draftregulations/Crossconnectiondraftreg-12-08-05.pdf.

⁴³ www.owue.water.ca.gov/recycle/docs/Pages41-45Chapter4.pdf, pg 41.

⁴⁴ CDPH is working on the draft regulations using a stakeholder group.

⁴⁵ www.owue.water.ca.gov/recycle/docs/Pages41-45Chapter4.pdf, pg 42.

⁴⁶ On February 24, 2004, the State Water Resources Control Board issued a memorandum to the various Regional Board Executive Officers regarding Incidental Runoff of Recycled Water.

Issue	Status
<p>approaches to achieve more consistent and less burdensome regulatory mechanisms affecting incidental runoff of recycled water from use sites.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SWRCB conducted legal analysis, conducted stakeholder meeting, issued memo. ● Uniform interpretation at the state – not done, but the draft Recycled Water Policy and/or General Irrigation Permit may advance this, if they are successful. ● Not done (huge failure) and is still a huge issue for some regions. ● Not done, and may have created a monster in the process because it is rallying cry for NGOs for compliance with the Clean Water Act and may be for naught since only impacts some regions. ● Not done, but hope General Irrigation Permit will address this. ● Not done, but General Irrigation Permit may create a more burdensome regulatory mechanism. ● Work is being done by state as part of the draft Recycled Water Policy.⁴⁷ ● Not aware of issue status.
<p>10. Uniform Interpretation of State Standards [4.3]⁴⁸</p> <p><i>Recommendations:</i> The State should create uniform interpretation of State standards in State and local regulatory programs by taking specific steps recommended by the Task Force. For example, SWRCB should appoint an ombudsman to oversee uniformity within the SWRCB and the Regional Water Quality Control Boards; CDPH should take steps to ensure the uniform interpretation and application of water recycling regulations; and SWRCB and CDPH should hold a workshop evaluating Florida regulations. The Opinion Unit of the California Department of Justice (Attorney General’s Office) should be requested to conduct a legal analysis to determine the latitude that is permitted to impose more restrictive local requirements.</p>	<p><i>Overall Impressions:</i> Not done, with some activity by the state.</p> <p>Summary of Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Uniform interpretation at the state has not been done. ● The draft Recycled Water Policy and/or General Irrigation Permit may advance uniform interpretation, if they move forward. ● The relationship between CDPH and the regional boards is splintered. ● Local health department interpretation issues may have disappeared with key staff retirements. ● Ombudsman position created legislatively via Assembly Bill 1481, but awaiting fees from the General Irrigation Permit to put it in place. ● The position is included in the SWRCB fiscal year 08-09 budget. ● Concerned that the position will not be devoted to recycled water full-time, and may filled by staff at the SWRCB who, in addition to other responsibilities, may have a bias regarding uniform interpretation of standards. ● Not aware of issue status.
<p>11. Water Softeners [4.4]⁴⁹</p> <p><i>Recommendations:</i> The Legislature should amend the Health and Safety Code Sections 116775 through 116795 to reduce restrictions on local ability to impose bans on (or more stringent standards for) residential water softeners. Within the</p>	<p><i>Overall Impressions:</i> Partly done, but the overall level of success has mixed views.</p> <p>Summary of Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 2003 legislation removed a few barriers and 2006 legislation helped one agency with process to ban existing softeners in Southern California. ● Success.

⁴⁷ Incidental runoff is not being addressed in the Policy, but was discussed as part of the workshops and comments on the Policy.

⁴⁸ www.owue.water.ca.gov/recycle/docs/Pages46-52Chapter4.pdf, pg 46.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

Issue	Status
<p>current legal provisions on water softeners, local agencies should consider publicity campaigns to educate consumers regarding the impact of self-regenerative water softeners. WRF should continue to evaluate the impacts of water softeners on contributions to salinity problems in recycled water.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Too piecemeal, and the changes don't solve the problem with existing softeners or the state regulators understanding of what can be done to regulate softeners. ● Evaluate ways to reduce salts from water conditioners. ● Still working on this with the Southern California Salinity Coalition.⁵⁰ ● Hope that a new bill to be introduced in 2008 by Laird will help. ● Aware of some legislative changes, but not their impact. ● Not aware of issue status.
<p>12. Uniform Analytical Method for Economic Analyses [5.1]⁵¹</p> <p>Recommendations: SWRCB, DWR, and CDPH should convene an expert panel to develop a uniform and economically valid procedural framework to determine the economic benefits and costs of water recycling projects for use by local, State, and Federal agencies. Guidance should be developed to conduct economic feasibility analyses, incorporating nonmarket values to the extent possible. Appropriate benchmarks for comparing the incremental costs of developing recycled water with the cost of developing an equivalent amount through alternative measures. An advisory team should be created by DWR, SWRCB, and CDPH to assist these tasks.</p>	<p>Overall Impressions: Not done, but some state activity.</p> <p>Summary of Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The SWRCB may be convening the panel – otherwise, not done. ● SWRCB partially funded research to develop an economic framework for evaluating the benefits and costs of water reuse (WRF 2006);⁵² the SWRCB will convene a state/federal/university Economic Analysis Task Force in fall 2008 with recommendations and draft guidelines by end 2009; equitable cost allocation will also be addressed. ● DWR is doing this through planning grants. ● Not done. ● Not aware of issue status.
<p>13. Research Funding [6.1]⁵³</p> <p>Recommendation: The Legislature should pass a bond allocating sustainable funding for research on recycled water issues.</p>	<p>Overall Impressions: Not done with some activity.</p> <p>Summary of Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Not done. ● Not done – some money coming from Federal sources. ● Not done – but SWRCB has an on-going research funding program using Proposition 13 bond funds; in Dec. 2007, SWRCB approved an amendment to increase funding by \$650,000. ● Some money is coming from the State Energy Commission. ● Not aware of issue status.
<p>14. University Academic Program for Water Recycling [6.2]⁵⁴</p> <p>Recommendation: Funding from the bond</p>	<p>Overall Impressions: Not done.</p> <p>Summary of Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Not done.

⁵⁰ www.socalsalinity.org.

⁵¹ Ibid, pg 47.

⁵² WRF 03-006-02: An Economic Framework for Evaluating the Benefits and Costs of Water Reuse; www.watereuse.org/Foundation/documents/wrf_03-006-02_Proj_Prof.pdf.

⁵³ Ibid, pg 51.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

Issue	Status
<p>as described in No. 13 (Issue 6.2) should be set aside to encourage an integrated academic program on one or more campuses for water recycling research and education.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Not aware of issue status. ● DWR participated in a group to assist Sacramento State University with its curriculum as a separate effort (see Issue 4).
Additional Issues	
<p>15. Funding Coordination [1.2]⁵⁵</p> <p><i>Recommendations:</i> A revised funding procedure should be developed to provide local agencies with assistance in potential State and Federal funding opportunities. A Water Recycling Coordination Committee should be established by SWRCB to work with funding agencies, streamlining project selection within individual agencies while ensuring an open process, peer review, and public review.</p>	<p><i>Overall Impressions:</i> Not done.</p> <p>Summary of Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Not done. ● Not aware of issue status. ● Some help coming from local funding mechanisms, but not at the state level. ● Can go out into the market and get a better interest rate than the State Revolving Fund program, with fewer strings attached.
<p>16. Regional Planning Criterion [1.3]⁵⁶</p> <p><i>Recommendations:</i> State funding agencies should make better use of existing regional planning studies to determine the funding priority of projects. This process would not exclude projects from funding where regional plans do not exist.</p>	<p><i>Overall Impressions:</i> Partly done, but mixed views on activity and implementation.</p> <p>Summary of Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The existence of an Urban Water Management Plant⁵⁷ was a criterion for Prop 50 funding; one ranking criterion was to have maximum recycling and conservation. ● Not done. ● Recycled water is included in IRWMPs, but not in determining priority or funding for recycled water projects. ● IRWMPs are a doing this; therefore, some success. ● IRWMPs in some regions are too superficial. ● IRWMPs will not help. ● Will happen to some extent with the next California Water Plan (2009) as it will include information on regional efforts, including Urban Water Management Plans, thanks to input from the Advisory Committee. ● SWRCB water recycling funding staff has not used existing regional plans to guide decisions or advice to local agencies. ● Not aware of issue status.
<p>17. Funding Information Outreach [1.4]⁵⁸</p> <p><i>Recommendation:</i> Funding agencies should publicize funding availability through workshops, conferences, and the</p>	<p><i>Overall Impressions:</i> Done.</p> <p>Summary of Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Not done. ● Not aware of issue status.

⁵⁵ www.owue.water.ca.gov/recycle/docs/Chapter5.pdf, pg 53.

⁵⁶ Ibid, pg 54.

⁵⁷ www.owue.water.ca.gov/urbanplan/index.cfm.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

Issue	Status
<p>Internet. SWRCB should take the lead in setting up a recycling website and holding workshops.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Success – SWRCB and DWR websites, workshops, etc. ● Some level of effort, but not coordinated or proactive; they just want to get the money out the door. ● Concern about future outreach given budget issues.
<p>18. DWR Technical Assistance [1.5]⁵⁹</p> <p>Recommendation: The Legislature should pass a bond to provide sustainable State funding for DWR’s technical assistance and research, including flexibility to work on local and regional planning, emerging issues, and new technology.</p>	<p>Overall Impressions: Not done with some activity.</p> <p>Summary of Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Not done. ● Not aware of issue status. ● Lack of funding should not prevent DWR from providing assistance. ● DWR provides technical assistance.
<p>19. Project Performance Analysis [1.6]⁶⁰</p> <p>Recommendations: The Legislature should pass a bond to provide funding to SWRCB to perform a comprehensive analysis of the performance of existing recycled water projects in terms of costs and benefits and recycled water deliveries. An estimate should be performed of future benefits potentially resulting from future investments.</p>	<p>Overall Impressions: Not done, but SWRCB funded research is looking at project performance.</p> <p>Summary of Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Not done. ● Not aware of issue status. ● Some information via IRWMPs, but not done via bond. ● SWRCB has sponsored an inventory of projects that use recycled water; the information is available or will soon be available.⁶¹ ● SWRCB is sponsoring a project to conduct a comprehensive analysis of project performance for selected projects previously funded.
<p>20. Recycled Water Symbol Code Change [3.3]⁶²</p> <p>Recommendation: DWR and CDPH should ask the Department of Housing and Community Development to submit a code change to remove the requirement for the skull and crossbones symbol in Sections 601.2.2 and 601.2.3 of the California Plumbing Code.</p>	<p>Overall Impressions: Done.</p> <p>Summary of Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Done – success. ● DWR was responsible for requesting the Skull and Cross Bones removal. ● Not aware of issue status.

⁵⁹ Ibid, pg 55.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ WRF-03-006-01, *Water Reuse Economic Framework Workshop Report* (2004); WRF-03-006-02, *An Economic Framework for Evaluating the Benefits and Costs of Water Reuse* (2006); WRF-06-001, *Conduct Survey Research to Obtain Information/Data from all Water Recycling Facilities in California*; WRF-06-02, *Exploring the Value of Reliability Benefits for Reuse (and Desalination) Projects*.

⁶² Ibid, pg 56.

Issue	Status
<p>21. Stakeholder Review of Proposed Cross-Connection Control Regulations [3.4]⁶³</p> <p><i>Recommendations:</i> CDPH should take the lead in ensuring that stakeholders are encouraged to review CDPH draft changes to Title 17 of the Code of Regulations pertaining to cross-connections between potable and non-potable water systems.</p>	<p><i>Overall Impressions:</i> Not done but with some CDPH activity underway.</p> <p>Summary of Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Being done – success.⁶⁴ ● Being done, but need to follow through to complete it. ● Aware something is going on, but not status. ● Not done. ● Not aware of issue status.
<p>22. Cross-Connection Risk Assessment [3.5]⁶⁵</p> <p><i>Recommendation:</i> CDPH collaborate with other agencies in conducting a thorough assessment of the risk associated with cross-connections between disinfected tertiary recycled water and potable water.</p>	<p><i>Overall Impressions:</i> Not done.</p> <p>Summary of Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Not done. ● Not aware of issue status.
<p>23. Permitting Procedures [4.5]⁶⁶</p> <p><i>Recommendations:</i> Various measures should be conducted to improve administration and compliance with local and State permits, including CDPH updates of recycling laws and recommendations on its website and clarification of Engineering Report requirements; dissemination of information by the Association of California Water Agencies and the California Association of Sanitation Agencies regarding different permitting requirements; and State legislative and local tax incentives to offset costs of compliance with regulations.</p>	<p><i>Overall Impressions:</i> Not done with some activity by state.</p> <p>Summary of Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Information on CDPH website – otherwise not done. ● Solve one problem (Alamitos Barrier permit)⁶⁷ and you get another (City of Los Angeles permits)⁶⁸ – the SWRCB draft Recycled Water Policy and General Irrigation Permit are intended to help - so there is some activity in the last 2 years. ● Half-hearted attempts, but not done. ● Tax incentives not done. ● SWRCB draft Recycled Water Policy and General Irrigation Permit may/will help with this depending on outcomes. ● Not done. ● Not aware of issue status.

⁶³ Ibid, pg 57.

⁶⁴ CDPH is working on revisions to the regulations;
www.cdph.ca.gov/certlic/drinkingwater/Documents/Draftregulations/Crossconnectiondraftreg-12-08-05.pdf.

⁶⁵ www.owue.water.ca.gov/recycle/docs/Chapter5.pdf, pg 57.

⁶⁶ Ibid, pg 58.

⁶⁷ State Board Order 2006-0001 for the Alamitos Barrier Recycled Water Project. State Board Order 2006-0001 concluded that it is not appropriate for Regional Boards to include non-MCL, Notification Level-based limits in the groundwater recharge permit for that project, and additionally found that Regional Boards should follow CDPH recommendations with regard to protection of human health.

⁶⁸ Waste Discharge and Water Recycling Requirements and Monitoring and Reporting Programs for Title 22 Recycled Water Issued to the City of Los Angeles for the Donald C. Tillman Water Reclamation Plant and the Los Angeles-Glendale Water Reclamation Plant.

Issue	Status
<p>24. Source Control [4.6]⁶⁹</p> <p>Recommendation: Local agencies should maintain strong source control programs and increase public awareness of their importance in reducing pollution and ensuring a safe recycled water supply.</p>	<p>Overall Impressions: Partly done – agencies administering programs, but focus on chemicals of emerging concern only being done on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>Summary of Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Being done – success. ● It is being done, but may be a function that programs are already a requirement in discharge permits for most agencies. ● Many agencies are focusing on chemicals of emerging concern, which is the key pollutant group of concern. ● Being done on case-by-case for specific recharge projects for chemicals of emerging concern. ● Not being done or not being done enough for chemicals of emerging concern, just routine industrial source control.
<p>25. Economic Analyses [5.2]⁷⁰</p> <p>Recommendations: Local agencies are encouraged to perform economic analyses in addition to financial analyses for water recycling projects to provide transparency regarding the true costs and benefits of projects. State and Federal agencies should require economic and financial feasibility as two funding criteria in their funding programs.</p>	<p>Overall Impressions: Partly done – implemented by local agencies – some activity at the state level, but not funding criteria.</p> <p>Summary of Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Not done at state level/being done at local level. ● Only being done at state level through IRWMPs/Being done at local level. ● Being done when state looks at new projects for funding. ● After the conclusion of the SWRCB’s Economic Analysis Task Force and completion of draft economic analysis guidelines in 2009, inclusion of these into funding criteria will be evaluated. ● Interest by local agencies in energy/climate change/recycled water nexus has lead to studies looking at this type of economics. ● Prop 50 proposal review includes an economic analysis; the SWRCB is currently working on this issue. ● Not aware of issue status.
<p>26. Statewide Science-based Panel on Indirect Potable Reuse [6.3]⁷¹</p> <p>Recommendation: As required by AB 331, the Task Force reviewed the 1996 report of the California Indirect Potable Reuse Committee and other related advisory panel reports and concluded that reconvening this committee would not be worthwhile at this time. Details concerning the recommendations are contained in the report. The Task Force intends for this report to be used as a working tool to guide the Legislature, State government, public agencies, the</p>	<p>Overall Impressions: Not done, but with activity at the state level.</p> <p>Summary of Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Being done in limited way (believe some of the documents being used, but not sure). ● Not done. ● Not done, and it is very important that we have an expert panel for indirect potable reuse projects for public communication needs. ● Not aware of issue status.

⁶⁹ www.owue.water.ca.gov/recycle/docs/Chapter5.pdf, pg 60.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ Ibid, pg 61.

Issue	Status
public, and all water recycling stakeholders towards the safe and successful expansion of recycled water use to help meet the State's future water supply needs [also see recommendation for Issue #3 [2.2 in the Task Force Report] about a new panel).	

Attachment 2: Discussion of Issues (Importance of Task Force Issues/New Issues)

Are the Task Force Issues Still Important?

- Yes.
- Yes, in terms of general categories, such as funding, public perception, and regulatory hurdles.
- Yes, in terms of funding, public perception/buy-in, regulatory consistency, incidental runoff, and education.
- Yes, in terms of incidental runoff, water softeners, and indirect potable reuse projects.
- The water softener reform issue may not an important issue as not very many agencies have implemented ordinances.
- Salt from automatic softeners is still an important issue, but the legislative fixes haven't solved the problem and/or because the changes do not deal with existing softeners, the problem continues, or the changes simply haven't removed enough obstacles.
- Yes, but there are too many of them. For the future, we need a set of streamlined high-priority issues and "tangible" recommendations to move the program forward with report card on progress made (or not made) and establish clearinghouses for information to document what's happening (e.g., information on model ordinances, if recycled water projects are receiving priority via the IRWMPs, etc.).
- Some more than others (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, and 23), but if we dealt with the high-priority issues, many of the others would go away.
- Most of them are important, particularly funding, state leadership, state media campaign, and incidental runoff (the last is critical for public acceptance because it makes people think recycled water is even too unsafe to go in the gutter).
- The issues related to economic framework, funding coordination, economic analysis, regulatory updates, and the cross-connection risk assessment are no longer important.
- As the recommendations were so "white washed," it's doubtful how important they really are.

Other Issues?

- Constituents of emerging concern:
 - Need to either gather existing information or generate new information on their significance.
 - Need to provide information on these chemical to the public, who will otherwise be suspicious – you won't be able to change their minds without information.
 - Need someone with credibility to the NGOs and public to explain this information so we can get past the complaint that until we know for sure we shouldn't be

doing it – and the credible source can't be the recycling community - we need someone like CDPH to do this.

- Groundwater and anti-degradation
 - The SWRCB has guidance for surface water, but the question is still open for recycled water and groundwater; we hope the Recycled Water Policy will address this, but it will be an interim approach and will need to be dealt with long-term.
 - Some Regional Boards are taking too extreme a position with regard to the impacts on groundwater due to irrigation using recycled water.
 - Conflicts between the delegation of authority between regional boards and CDPH with regard to human health.
- Brine management is going to be an ongoing challenge for projects with advanced treatment, and more projects are going in that direction – so inland areas with no brine lines will have an increasing need to develop a solution.
- Salinity management issues identified by SWRB in their draft Recycled Water Policy – this is really important in most of the regions of the state with difficult solutions for inland areas – we need state leadership to work with local agencies; we need to understand the environmental benefits/impacts if agencies must apply membrane treatment.
- Better information on recycling in the state – for example, in the future, someone should analyze different IRWMPs to look at the water recycling component and if these plans have helped recycling.
- Making IRWMPs a better mechanism for recycled water funding.
- Highlighting the nexus between recycling and energy/climate change benefits.
- Indirect potable reuse (was not addressed by the Task Force).

Attachment 3: Lessons Learned/Obstacles

Lessons Learned from Recommendations that Have Moved Forward:

- Legislative solutions:
 - Easier to implement than administrative solutions undertaken by state agencies.
 - Strong supportive legislator and staff can make things happen.
- Local projects are successful because of local efforts, not state efforts.
- Recycled water issues are complicated and interwoven.
- Need a state champion (state person or water reuse person or someone who makes it happen).
- Need support from the Governor's office and state agencies (DWR and SWRCB), both from political appointees and staff.
- Certain staff members at CDPH have been very helpful, but SWRCB and DWR need to be less passive and more active in helping projects move forward.
- Need a good balance between protecting public health and increasing water resources – CDPH champions have been trained to use this approach.
- Need a combination of will and outside forces - in some cases, movement happened in spite of the Task Force recommendation due to other circumstances, like source control being done under a separate program and water softener legislation pushed by local agencies.
- External factors, such as drought, population pressures, and limited water resources, may have more impact in getting recycled water moving forward than working on the specific Task Force recommendations.
- Need constant nipping at the heels of responsible parties, cannot assume will be done otherwise; utilities have taken the lead in making things happen.
- It takes a sustained effort and leadership from associations at the highest level to keep recycled water a high priority statewide.
- Need to ensure the NGOs see the value of recycled water to get money into water bonds for recycled water projects and to garner support for projects (more outreach needed).
- Need to have successful public outreach and education in schools.
- There's been so little progress – except for issue #20 (removing the skull and cross bones), which was the only real success, and it was handled simply.
- Need resources in the state agencies.

- Need to ensure that legislative mandates for programs include staffing resources for state agencies to implement the mandates.

Obstacles to Moving Forward:

- Bad state economy.
- Lack of funding:
 - No money or not enough money for recycled water projects.
 - Have to have funding to make serious inroads to meet state goals (some localities have projects that would cost \$500 million to \$1 billion alone).
- Recycled water economics:
 - Cost of projects may be higher than other alternatives.
 - Costs driven up by regulations.
- Pricing policy for water:
 - Because potable water is subsidized and underpriced, we subsidize wasteful water use and discourage recycled water through pricing policies; we need to decide what water is worth and not wait until global warming forces action – by then it will be too late to make thoughtful decisions.
 - The public and elected officials do not properly value water in the United States – it is too cheap.
- IRWMPs:
 - Do not have dedicated funding for recycled water projects.
 - Are problematic for recycled water funding inasmuch as they have become the “darling” of the Legislature, but recycled water projects have to compete with “sexier” types of projects with stronger constituency support, and thus it is harder to get money for projects.
- No money/resources for state agencies:
 - Given the uncertainties with the state budget and staffing reductions, agencies are not willing to use resources for working on the issues (even if most of the work has been done, such as the plumbing code change).
 - DWR is significantly understaffed (currently only 2 staff managing 50 desalination grants and other pertinent assignments). Requests for additional staffing have been denied by the Department of Finance based on lack of authorizing language for staffing in bills that have created programs.
- Leadership:
 - No state agency champion.
 - No state ownership of recycled water, even though some agencies like DWR claim recycled water is critical for California’s overall water program.
 - The top state agency members have buy-in, but not the lower level state staff due to ingrained beliefs or lack of staff continuity.
 - Bureaucratic reluctance to advance the ball.

- State agencies take the approach that they do not want an individual party to be upset (be it the public or NGOs), and this keeps them from not taking stands other than paying lip service to recycling (for example, the incidental runoff issue).
- Not willing to take on challenging issues.
- Turf battles among state agencies and between state agencies and local agencies, who are unwilling to listen to each other; each agency has its own lens it looks through (SWRCB – beneficial uses; CDPH – drinking water standards; DWR – getting water out the door); the draft Recycled Water Policy was a non-proactive reaction by the SWRCB to a turf battle with Region 4, rather than a comprehensive and thoughtful approach.
- Regulatory agency obstacles:
 - The agency promoting recycled water is also the regulatory agency that is creating obstacles for projects at the local level – so it is tough to move projects forward, and they often become too expensive.
 - Even if state policies are adopted, the regional boards may not follow them.
 - Lack of consistency among regional boards.
 - The organization of the SWRCB and regional boards creates problems with consistency – we need to blow up the boxes and have one agency responsible for recycled water.
 - The state agencies dealing with water quantity, quality, and health need to be reorganized so they can effectively work on issues.
 - Regional Boards and CDPH do too much finger pointing or not accepting responsibility for their actions – the Regional Board will say CDPH is making them do it, while CDPH will say it is not their jurisdiction, and only a recommendation to the Regional Board.
 - Entrenchment on issues, particularly SWRCB lawyers; they are unwilling to move forward.
- Working against the Clean Water Act hurts recycled water – arguments that recycled water is cleaner than Colorado River water or storm water and, thus, requirements for recycled water should be weakened is not legal – we need to tighten requirements for those sources of water not weaken recycled water requirements.
- Recycled water community:
 - Disagreements in the recycled water community can cause things to bog down (like the General Irrigation Permit) – if we cannot agree, how can we get things fixed?
 - Different localities have different issues that impact them, and it may lead to lack of willingness to work on and resolve issues (for example, if an issue does not impact an agency or that agency thinks that any effort will raise an issue to a statewide level and then impact them – there is often a lack of cooperation).
 - Positions of local agencies are too entrenched when faced with opposition; efforts by local agencies are typically adversarial and not discussion-based; many agencies tend to have strongly held positions about recycled water and have knee-jerk reactions when faced with public opposition.

- Need better information on how much is being recycled in the state – do not really know, once we know what the baseline is, we can push for more.
- The Task Force recommendations:
 - The recommendations suffer from not being tangible – state agency actions and legislative actions, and the Task Force do not have the wherewithal to make them happen.
 - In some cases, the recommendations are too specific (e.g., DWR should do “X”) and there is no one to make them do it (even with special legislation like the Plumbing Code issue), or they may claim based on wording in legislation that they cannot move forward without money; or the recommendation is too general, like “look into” something with no one agency willing to take the lead.
 - Lack of strategic approach – it this . . . then that.
 - Too many water issues – hard to focus.
 - Too many task force recommendations.
 - The recommendations are perceived as being biased.
 - The recommendations were “white-washed” without a good faith effort by DWR and SWRCB to move forward.
 - No one has taken the responsibility to report on success, activity, or lack of activity with regard to the recommendations.
 - The recommendations suffered from not having someone on the Task Force with an understanding of the Clean Water Act issues, and that mechanisms for recycled water should not be less burdensome, but in compliance with the law.
- Public perception:
 - People still do not like recycled water or are afraid of it.
 - Lack of information on the occurrence and effects of chemicals of emerging concern.
- Recycled water is still considered by regulators and NGOs as a waste to be feared and controlled – we have a long way to go.
- Competing with other state priorities.
- Education:
 - Teacher’s unions are preventing the development of a statewide curriculum.
 - No money for or time set aside in school programs to include even WateReuse California curriculum.
- Plumbing union for developing the Appendix J for the Plumbing Code.
- Conflict in support from NGOs depending on the project. They attack water projects and say we need to do more conservation and recycling, but then turn around and attack recycling projects; we need to resolve the disconnect.

Attachment 4: Why Is Recycled Water a Critical Resource for California?

- All water resources are critical. The concern about energy and carbon footprints makes recycled water even more important; in many cases, recycled water is a more localized supply that can be used with less energy and, thus, is part of our sustainability ethic – we shouldn't use anything once and throw it away. We won't be building surface storage or more desalination projects in next 2 years – so there are not many other options other than underground storage, which is compatible with reuse and recycling. As permits become more stringent and agencies treat to higher levels and as alternative supplies get more expensive, recycled water looks better and better.
- Recycled water will become even more important as energy/climate change become important factors when looking at project viability.
- It is generally accepted that we must use water recycling to meet state needs as part of the overall water portfolio – it is an integral part of our future water supply.
- Because of increased pressure on water resources, recycled water still has potential – it can be further developed because it is available, and there are not many untapped supplies as pressures on water resources and population increase.
- It is an important element of wastewater management that can reduce expenditures for treatment and disposal and reduce the risk of water supply reliability due to droughts/climate change to have a robust water environment.
- In the 2005 California Water Plan, recycled water was the third largest source of new water. Recycled water builds local supply reliability and reduces the need/impacts of imported water, as well as improves water quality by reducing wastewater discharges and reducing power and carbon footprints.
- Lots of reasons: pressures on water supply due to the protection of Winter Run Salmon and Delta Smelt; population growth; climate change; economics of new water; recycled water is locally available.
- Recycled water is essential in light of global warming and having a reliable/sustainable water supply because it is a reliable source; but to have sustainability, we need to plan now for future developments to shift to decentralized recycled water systems and not large regional systems. We need to ramp up the current use of existing recycled water supplies, but start thinking about decentralized systems for the next 100 years.

Attachment 5: SWRCB Strategic Plan – Recommendations for Future Actions⁷²

In its comments on the Draft White Paper, the SWRCB provided information on recommended next steps from its Strategic Plan that are directly related to the Task Force recommendations and actions that the SWRCB is undertaking for 13 of the 26 issues. A summary of those recommended actions is presented below.

Issue #1 - Funding for Water Recycling Projects [1.1]

- Continue to encourage additional state bond funds for water recycling.
- SWRCB should encourage federal funding in a program with uniform criteria.

Issue #2 - Community Value-Based Decision-Making Model for Project Planning [2.1]

- Determine existing statutory authority with respect to state loans and grants to require public information and outreach during planning in order to receive state loans and grants. Conduct legal review with DWR. If legal review reveals no additional statutory authority needed, then revise guidelines to require public participation during planning.

Issue #3 - Leadership Support for Water Recycling [2.2]

- Recommend that any new bonds for recycled water projects include public information and outreach as eligible expenditures.
- Continue information transfer and provide guidance to local agencies.

Issue # 5 - State-Sponsored Media Campaign [2.4]

- SWRCB will coordinate with DWR and track the progress of this recommendation.

Issue #10 - Uniform Interpretation of State Standards [4.3]

- SWRCB will track progress and coordinate with DHS, if appropriate.
- Appoint staff within the Division of Financial Assistance's Water Recycling Funding Program to review Florida's water recycling program. Alternatively, if SWRCB ombudsman position in FY 2008-2009 budget is approved, this task could be completed by the new ombudsman.
- Survey Regional Boards to document how they are meeting the objectives of Task Force recommendation (e.g., Regional Boards should be more proactive during the planning of recycled water projects, and each Regional Board should have a resident expert on water recycling to provide consistency).

Issue #12 - Uniform Analytical Method for Economic Analyses [5.1]

- Implement Key Strategic Project #1 (Develop Economic/Financial Analyses Guidance) outlined in the Water Recycling Funding Program Strategic Plan.

Issue #13 - Research Funding [6.1]

- Implement Key Strategic Project #6 (Promote, Coordinate, and Finance Water

⁷² Update of the table in "Strategic Plan, January 2007-December 2008, Water Recycling Funding Program, Division of Financial Assistance," dated January 18, 2007.

Recycling Statewide Efforts) outlined in the Water Recycling Funding Program Strategic Plan. Continue using bond funds to sponsor research, including objectives identified in this Task Force recommendation.

Issue #14 - University Academic Program for Water Recycling [6.2]

- Implement Key Strategic Project #6 (Promote, Coordinate, and Finance Water Recycling Statewide Efforts) outlined in the Water Recycling Funding Program Strategic Plan. Work with one or more University of California campuses to identify and fund a potential water recycling research program.

Issue #15 - Funding Coordination [1.2]

- Implement Key Strategic Project #6 (Promote, Coordinate, and Finance Water Recycling Statewide Efforts) outlined in the Water Recycling Funding Program Strategic Plan. SWRCB should take the lead to work with other funding agencies and convene a funding agency coordination group.

Issue #16 - Regional Planning Criterion [1.3]

- SWRCB Division of Financial Assistance staff should become familiar with existing regional studies, as well as the issues, analyses, and recommendations included in these studies.

Issue #17 - Funding Information Outreach [1.4]

- Appoint a key person within the Division of Financial Assistance to maintain state funding information on the SWRCB website. Implement Key Strategic Project #6 (Promote, Coordinate, and Finance Water Recycling Statewide Efforts) outlined in the Water Recycling Funding Program Strategic Plan.

Issue #19 - Project Performance Analysis [1.6]

- Encourage funding for this recommendation in new water bond proposals. If funds become available, the SWRCB should lead a state and federal funding agencies committee to define the scope of analysis and coordinate a joint effort.
- In the meantime, SWRCB will implement Key Strategic Project #3 (Perform Project Performance Analysis) outlined the Water Recycling Funding Program Strategic Plan. The Water Recycling Funding Program will perform a comprehensive performance analysis of a select group of previously funded completed projects to compare the planned benefits, costs, and recycled water deliveries with actual performance.

Issue # 25 - Economic Analyses [5.2]

- Implement Key Strategic Project #1 (Develop Economic/Financial Analysis Guidelines) outlined in the Water Recycling Funding Program Strategic Plan. Include financial and economic analysis as funding criteria in the Water Recycling Funding Program once guidelines are revised and adopted.



National Water Research Institute

**18700 Ward Street • P.O. Box 8096 • Fountain Valley, California 92728-8096
(714) 378-3278 • Fax: (714) 378-3375 • www.NWRI-USA.org**