



MURRAY  
CITY COUNCIL

## MURRAY CITY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

---

The Murray City Municipal Council met as a Committee of the Whole on Tuesday, June 18th, 2014, in the Murray City Center, Conference Room #107, 5025 South State Street, Murray Utah.

### Members in Attendance:

Dave Nicponski	Council Member
D. Blair Camp	Council Member
Diane Turner	Council Member
Brett Hales	Council Member
Jim Brass	Excused

### Others in Attendance:

Doug Hill	Public Services Director	Janet Towers	Exec. Asst. to the Mayor
Janet M. Lopez	Council Administrator	Kate Sturgeon	Resident
Jennifer Kennedy	Recorder	Steve Roberson	Resident/Fire
Jan Wells	Chief Administrative Officer	Kellie Challburg	Council Office
Danny Astill	Public Services-Water Sup.		

Mr. Nicponski called the Budget and Finance Committee meeting to order and welcomed those in attendance. He excused Jim Brass who was absent.

### Approval of Minutes

Mr. Nicponski asked for approval on the minutes from the Budget & Finance Committee Meetings on April 29, 2014, and May 8, 2014. Ms. Turner moved approval. Chairman Hales seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Mr. Nicponski adjourned the Budget and Finance Committee meeting and Chairman Hales called the Committee of the Whole meeting to order. He also excused Mr. Brass.

### Approval of Minutes

Chairman Hales asked for approval on the minutes from the Committee of the Whole on May 6, 2014. Mr. Nicponski moved approval. Ms. Turner seconded the motion. All were in favor.

**Business Item #1**

**Central Valley Water Reclamation Facility**  
**Update- Danny Astill**

Chairman Hales welcomed Mr. Astill. Mr. Astill stated that the State has introduced new regulations regarding nutrients for treatment plants throughout the State. He would discuss nutrient pollution problem statewide and the solutions proposed, and the approach from Central Valley.

The nutrient pollution in Utah is basically excess nitrogen and phosphorous that comes into the water from different means.

The good news is that if the State continues to work with the Utah communities, Utah has the talent and expertise to deal with the issues without a lot of State legislation.

Nutrients in the water mostly originate from urban and rural sources. The largest percentage, possibly 75% to 90% of all nutrients in the water come from storm water and/or agricultural operations. Those are termed non-point sources. Everything contributes a little bit to the waterways. Nutrients in the water grow as the state grows, with increasing development. He showed a map of the large number of impacted areas within the State.

Excessive nutrients in the rivers make it hard to fish, and also hard for the fish to live. Eutrophication is sediment that blocks sunlight and brings nutrients into the water. This causes phytoplankton to grow and allows the algae to grow and bloom. Once the algae begins to bloom, it takes over everything and eats up all the oxygen, and the phytoplankton eats up the food that the fish would normally eat. The algae will eventually fall off but requires oxygen to decay it.

Environmental stewardship certification for agriculture is one of the non-point source ideas that have originated. Work has started with the agricultural community to discover better ways to protect water from crossing the land and ending up in the rivers. There are technology based standards being proposed. Depending on where that technology ends up, the numbers range from 50 cents to \$15 per connection. That will be a big hit depending on where the regulation comes in. Mr. Camp asked if he was referring to technology upgrades in the existing plants or additional treatment facilities. Mr. Astill replied that he was referring to bringing water to a certain location, determining the level which you could treat the water and discharging it into the state waterways. The required level set would determine what Central Valley is required to do to treat the water. It could be a minimal cost or a large cost. If the maximum level was chosen, similar to the requirement that Chesapeake Bay had to meet, then it could be as much as a \$20 to \$50 million expansion. Obviously, hopes are that it comes in much less than that.

The watershed basin approach is being looked at to focus on the pristine water headwaters first and start looking downwards from the headwaters to the valleys and determine what could be done along the pathway.

Adaptive management is management in steps, for example, the watershed basin approach, and work down and eventually come to treatment plants and agricultural users. Different solutions are being researched.

Currently, the EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) is encouraging the State to refine values and set specific data. Fortunately, Utah has become somewhat resistant to it but succumbing to the pressure. The entire Country is dealing with this and law suits are being filed. The State is trying to be pro-active and yet set a standard that everyone can meet. The State will look at each location and determine how badly the water is impaired, or if it is impaired, and if it is a problem. There are yes and no's in all of the questions in the different areas.

Non-point source pollution is the leading cause of water quality impairment in the lakes and streams. It also applies to Murray City in the storm water discharges. He noted that Mr., Russ Kakala and the Murray Storm Water Department will be faced with that in the future.

Mr. Astill said a great benefit to the City has been the wetlands that take some of the water before it enters into the Jordan River. Those wetlands may have to be enhanced, but that would require a lot less money than treatment.

The State is looking for sustainable funding methods for programs. The agricultural groups don't have the funding to fix their problems and are looking for a way to do that. Last year, the Division of Water Quality proposed the toilet tax. The proposal was to add \$1 to every resident per month to start funding some of these projects. The State was pretty resistant to it, but it may come back in the future.

Mayor Eyre asked about the non-single point source pollution and if it comes from irrigation water off agricultural areas. Mr. Astill confirmed that was correct. Mayor Eyre said that it was mentioned that there were sediment problems and asked about the fertilizer sprays and if they were suspended in the water or do they settle to the bottom. Mr. Astill commented that it doesn't always come out, but it comes in with sediment and as the sediment comes, it pulls a lot of the nutrients out with it. He added that silt carries a lot of nutrients.

Central Valley is a great facility and is proposed to receive a large investment of approximately \$150 million. It has a small golf course around it in attempts to use water from the plant, so that it doesn't go to the river. Central Valley's approach is that they realize that the nutrient issue is not going away, and has chosen to be proactive. They are working with DEQ (Department of Environmental Quality) and the EPA and participating in the Jordan River/Farmington Bay coalition. Central Valley has the Chief Scientist from the University of Utah advocating for nutrient control and producing the study. He uses graduate students to do the work and communicates that to the State. The State has said that they had all the data, but Central Valley has data also that can demonstrate that the nutrient problem is not coming from the treatment plants. Even though the State knows that from the data, they are still going to use the technology based standard.

Central Valley will have to meet the technology based standard in 2020. The current permit is up for renewal next July or August. They are currently going through the process of what the new regulations and limitations will be. Mr. Nicponski asked if the \$20-\$40 million facility needs to be in place before 2020. Mr. Astill said that was correct that that regulation would have to be met. Mr. Nicponski asked if Central Valley Water had its own line on the property tax revenue. Mr. Astill replied that it does not. Mr.

Nicponski asked if Central Valley would look into a property tax. Mr. Astill said that they could not because they are not a taxing entity or a special district. They simply exist to treat the seven entities that own them. It is a bit of a hybrid that you don't see often throughout the County added Mr. Astill. The seven entities got together, made an agreement and built the plant. The seven entities include two cities, Murray and South Salt Lake, and five other communities such as, Mount Olympus, Cottonwood Sanitary Sewer District, Taylorsville-Bennion, Granger-Hunter and Kearns. Murray City has the largest share, but the burden will fall on all of the seven entities.

The approach is to find out where the impairment is, and if there really is an impairment. Based on the proposed rule, the cost could be anywhere from a \$1.5 million to \$3 million investment to meet those limitations. The State is giving an off-ramp if it can be proven that there isn't an impairment. The limitations are a reality and will need to be addressed in the future. Costs will go up slightly whether it be through plant optimization to meet the nutrient levels or other processes. The energy recovery study is very promising and offers a couple of alternative options. Either way, costs will go up to treat the nutrients and for the physical investment in the brick and mortar. The energy recovery option could stabilize the cost for the treatment plant, and give future money to offset maintenance and operational costs through the sale of green gas or green power. Mr. Nicponski asked what the additional costs would be. Mr. Astill said the operational cost, if done today without any plant modifications would be about \$700,000. He added that the cost would be divided among the seven entities, depending on the percentage of shares. Murray currently has about 10% ownership, with about a 13% usage share. Mr. Astill said the next level of the facility investment would vary between \$1.5 million and \$3 million. The estimate of \$700,000 in operational costs would go down depending on the condition of the physical facility.

The largest focus for the future is the non-point source issues, including storm water discharges, noted Mr. Astill. He stated that he would keep the Council up to date on issues.

Mayor Eyre stated that he had just attended meetings in Denver and learned about security on City owned facilities, such as power and water treatment plants. He said there has been an increase in domestic terrorism and disgruntled people attempting to hurt public facilities, and the government. He asked if there was additional security measures being taken. Mr. Astill replied that security increased about ten years ago and there are security requirements. The water facilities throughout the community have all increased security with cameras and monitoring. Mr. Astill said he receives bulletins about attacks on facilities and that helps to heighten security. He said they have a good relationship with Cottonwood Heights who will often do extra security patrols. Mr. Nicponski asked if the location was approximately 3300 South and 900 West. Mr. Astill replied that was correct and it was mostly an all commercial neighborhood.

Mr. Hales thanked Mr. Astill for his presentation and adjourned the meeting.

Council Office Administrator II  
Kellie Challburg