

4<sup>th</sup> DRAFT White Paper Analysis Outline  
Blue Ribbon Panel  
August 26, 2010

The need for consistency in the use of common and positive terminology to convey effective messages about water sustainability.

1. Describe the existing situation or issue

A. Water issues are inherently complex and reclaimed water is no exception.

B. Definitions for reclaimed water and associated terminology vary between entities statewide.

C. The professional water community uses technical terms.

D. The bulk of communication regarding reclaimed water comes from the professional water community.

E. Conflicting definitions, complex terminology and negative campaigns (inherited from other states,) encourage mistrust, misinformation, and confusion for the public, the media, as well as political leaders and industry professionals.

F. Conflicting messages create confusion and undue concern about associated issues such as water quality and public safety.

G. Conflicting messages create uncertainty about adopting reclaimed water.

H. Examples of projects from other parts of the U.S., both successes and failures are available as models and cautionary tales.

2. Describe associated impediments to increased reuse

A. Conflicting definitions make it difficult to compare apples to apples when sharing information, developing policy, and for regulatory reporting.

B. Terminology issues can contribute to difficulty in permitting, funding, regulation, and public acceptance of projects, thereby limiting implementation of new projects.

3. Describe the possible solutions (e.g. policy/rule/legislation or guidance) that could be applied to remove impediments

A. Create a lexicon of terminology that conveys a positive message and can be utilized as industry standard on a statewide basis.

B. Implement phased educational programs and outreach campaigns appropriate to specific audiences.

4. Provide the recommendations

A. Create a Coalition to engage industry experts and a public relations firm to translate industry terminology into an acceptable lexicon for statewide use and to procure funding from federal, state, local and private institutions.

B. Commission the Coalition to formulate a strong, positive message that can be utilized on the state, county, and local level and that is appropriate to a variety of audience segments (agriculture, commercial, municipal, and consumer for example.)

C. Educate water professionals on the use of the new terminology and the benefit to their industry for employing the terminology.

D. Conduct an outreach campaign to potential users of reclaimed water.

E. Engage with academics, local celebrities, and business partners as official spokespeople for reclaimed water.

F. Ask that the Governor proclaim an auspicious date as Water Reuse day for Arizona.

G. Water providers fund the Coalition, the public relations firm, and the awareness campaign.

H. Procure written support from political leaders.

5. Describe how the policy/rule/legislation or guidance could be administered (state, county, local, etc.)

A. A statewide Coalition administers the effort to determine common terminology, craft a strong, positive message, and create a plan for the awareness campaign and education program.

B. The statewide Coalition administers federal, state, and private grants and funding.

C. The statewide Coalition acts to employ and supervise a Public Relations firm.

C. Local entities and providers fund an awareness campaign appropriate for local use.

D. Providers and private partners administer professional education programs.

6. Describe the benefits of the recommendation

A. Clear messaging will encourage public acceptance of the development of reuse projects, water uses and overall water pricing.

B. The audience for reclaimed water projects will increase.

C. Public trust of government will increase.

D. Positive media coverage will increase.

E. National awareness of Arizona as a leader in reuse will increase.

F. Perception of other BRP issues will benefit as part of the education and awareness process.

G. Reporting requirements and data collection will be standardized.

H. Acceptance of future water issues and solutions will enjoy early adoption.

- I. Confidence in water supply, water quality, and public safety will increase.
- J. The need for additional water supplies, and expense is lessened.

7. Describe possible unintended consequences of recommendation

- A. Demand overtakes supply.
- B. Rules decrease flexibility for providers.
- C. A disconnect occurs between Arizona and Federal standards.
- D. Public opines that money should be better spent elsewhere.

8. Describe the associated cost / benefit of implementation, possible funding sources, and estimated cost to the end user using the matrix below for each recommendation (recognizing that some issues may not be able to utilize this approach – e.g., public perception):

Implementation Costs:

Con: Any statewide effort will be expensive.

Pro: Individual providers and institutions determine their funding contribution for the coalition as well as staff effort based on their own objectives.

Pro: Reporting cost to provider is reduced due to standardized terms.

Possible Funding Sources:

Con: Public/Private partnerships require effort and supervision.

Pro: Public/Private partnerships will assist in balancing expense.

Con: Federal Grant requires administration time.

Cost to Agency (Hi/Med/Low)	Cost to Utility (Hi/Med/Low)	Cost to End User (Hi/Med/Low)	Potential for Cost Pass-Through	Benefits/Removal of Impediments	Additional Comments
--------------------------------	---------------------------------	----------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------