

# SENATE BILL REPORT

## SSB 5925

---

---

As Passed Senate, March 13, 2001

**Title:** An act relating to agricultural industrial process water.

**Brief Description:** Reusing waste water derived from food processing.

**Sponsors:** Senate Committee on Environment, Energy & Water (originally sponsored by Senators Jacobsen, Honeyford, Fraser, Rasmussen and Morton).

**Brief History:**

**Committee Activity:** Environment, Energy & Water: 2/20/01, 2/27/01 [DPS].  
Passed Senate: 3/13/01, 47-2.

---

### SENATE COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT, ENERGY & WATER

**Majority Report:** That Substitute Senate Bill No. 5925 be substituted therefor, and the substitute bill do pass.

Signed by Senators Fraser, Chair; Regala, Vice Chair; Hale, Honeyford, Jacobsen, McDonald, Morton and Patterson.

**Staff:** Genevieve Pisarski (786-7488)

**Background:** Existing law establishes standards, procedures, and guidelines for use of reclaimed water that is derived from sewage from a wastewater treatment system.

**Summary of Bill:** Agricultural industrial process water— is treated food product processing water and can be used for irrigation and other agriculture-related uses, including construction and maintenance. The water is used under a wastewater discharge permit. If there is significant health risk associated with the use, the Department of Health is consulted. The generator retains the exclusive right to the water and is not subject to additional water right permitting requirements. The use shall not impair existing water rights within the generator's source of supply. Water rights that substitute use of reclaimed water are not relinquished.

**Appropriation:** None.

**Fiscal Note:** Available.

**Effective Date:** Ninety days after adjournment of session in which bill is passed.

**Testimony For:** Food processors will have the same opportunity to reuse water that municipalities do. The wastewater discharge permits that currently control the quality of the water will continue to apply. There will be fewer undesirable discharges to surface water and less need for new water rights. These benefits offset the effect of less water going instream. Protection of existing water rights should be included. Breweries could be added.

**Testimony Against:** None.

**Testified:** PRO: T. K. Bentler, Rick Wickman, Washington Food Processors Council; Tom McDonald, Perkins Coie; Megan White, Department of Ecology; Steve Gano, Miller Brewing.