



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, August 23, 2016 in the Murray City Center, Conference Room #107, 5025 South State Street, Murray Utah.

Council Members in Attendance:

Blair Camp, Chair	District #2
Diane Turner, Vice-Chair	District #4
Dave Nicponski	District #1
Jim Brass	District #3
Brett Hales	District #5

Others in Attendance:

Ted Eyre	Mayor	Jan Wells	Chief Admin. Officer
Jan Lopez	Council Administrator	Janet Towers	Exec. Asst. to the Mayor
Pattie Johnson	Council Office	Jennifer Kennedy	City Recorder
Justin Zollinger	Finance Director	Frank Nakamura	City Attorney
Doug Hill	Public Services Director	Dana Dmitrich	Parks Advisory / Citizen
Glen Perry	Bikes For Kids	Wayne Riggs	Murray Chamber
Shane Evertsen	Murray High School/Coach	John Bond	Citizen
Tyler Warren	Murray Journal	Ethel DeFosse	Citizen
Carlton DeFosse	Citizen	Phil Heck	Central Valley
Tom Holstrom	Central Valley Water		

Chairman Camp called the Committee of the Whole meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. and welcomed those in attendance.

1. Approval of Minutes

Mr. Camp asked for corrections and approval on the minutes from June 7, 2016. Mr. Brass moved for approval. Ms. Turner seconded the motion. All were in favor.

2. Business Items

2.1 Bicycle Park Conceptual Design Report – Doug Hill, Glen Perry, Shane Evertsen presenting.

Mr. Hill introduced Glen Perry, with the Bikes for Kids organization and Shane Evertsen, a Murray City resident and volunteer coach for the Murray High School mountain biking team. Mr. Perry and Mr. Evertsen have been working on and off with the Murray City Parks and Recreation Department and the Park Board for the last year regarding the construction of a mountain biking facility and trail park.

Mr. Hill explained a similar idea had come before the city in the past by someone who wanted to volunteer his time to construct it; on a much smaller scale, the result was a very informal type of facility, where small bike paths were designed and still exist, however, trails are not well maintained at this time. After considering other areas, Mr. Hill felt Germania Park was a great location for a new bike park since the small trails from the original idea were already cut into the area. A map was shown of Germania Park and the area north of it near the Jordan River Parkway where new construction would take place.

Mr. Hill felt it was important to explain what the new facility would consist of before any decisions are made and reported Mr. Perry and Mr. Evertsen hired a professional design firm to assist. A plan was designed after the firm provided their expertise and made suggestions as to what would work well for Murray City. The Parks and Recreation Advisory Board reviewed the plan and gave unanimous approval. The hope is to see the council approve the park so that fund raising can begin. There is no funding available to construct the park at this time.

The main concern the Park Board had was adequate parking, because they believed the bike park would be very popular. Mr. Hill agreed, should the city move forward with the decision to construct the park, parking should be addressed. He reported there was land available for that, by way of the Rocky Mountain Power right-of-way.

Mr. Perry explained the reason and concept behind the idea and its history with Murray City, and stated Bikes for Kids was formed 10 years ago in 2006. An annual bike ride and bike give away took place at the Intermountain Health Center (IHC) parking lot, where Murray Power Department displayed their power trucks as the start and finish lines for the ride they hosted. Each year 1,000 new bikes were given away to underprivileged school aged kids in Utah. After 7 years, 7,000 of the bright yellow, private label, BMX style bikes were given out, but due to the demographics of the giveaway, there was no way of measuring the actual impact the organization had on the community. Three years ago it was decided by the board to discontinue the charity and begin a new outreach. Working with other established organizations the focus changed to get kids on bikes, who wanted to become more involved with the mountain bike sport itself, but could not otherwise. The Utah High School Mountain Bike League and the Youth Sports Alliance of Park City, Utah are organizations working with young triathletes groups. Bikes for Kids funded a new effort and purchased 150 mountain bikes for the Utah High School Mountain Bike League and a few dozen for other opportunities. Bikes for Kids continues to look for other opportunities to aid in the outreach and helping the biking community in Utah. The biggest need identified recently, was the lack of adequate places in the valley for kids to ride and practice. The Utah High School Mountain Biking League literally exploded in its fifth season with registered athletes going from practically nothing, to 2,500 this year. In Utah, it is the fastest growing sport with the largest

league in the country, actually having to split the league into north and south divisions at the high school level. Mr. Perry explained mountain trails are inundated with kids on bikes and most kids do not have the skills to be out in those areas. In order to help kids attain better ability, before hitting mountain trails, developing a park in the valley for skill improvement became the group's greatest desire.

Bikes for Kids started working with Mr. Evertsen to promote the park location because Murray made sense due to the central location. The park will allow for skill progression, utilizing what already exists in Germania Park. A closed circle loop was pointed out on the map benefitting kids of all ages and abilities with another area, which would be a true piece of single track one might see in mountains. The park would assist in training and developing skills, as well as, provide a mile and a half of ride in the loop.

Mr. Perry reported he was not looking for funding from Murray City, as the project would be completely funded privately. Once approved by council, fund raising efforts would begin; estimated costs were between \$500,000 and \$750,000 for the entire facility. Once completed, the facility would be turned over to the city for operation and maintenance. One mandate given by the city was that the facility must be completely composed of natural materials, without concrete or asphalt, since it would be located in a natural preserve area. Existing materials, rock, timber and trees would be utilized to make the entire facility, which mimic mountain trails. A sprinkler system throughout the park would be necessary to best maintain trails, as well as, keep them from getting dusty, watering only every few days.

Mr. Evertsen said he met with Mr. Perry as he became more involved with the high school program to discuss the bike park proposal. Since there was no other place to practice, Mr. Evertsen takes students to ride at the existing location. Trails are not clear and kids are constructing jumps with their own shovels and removing overgrowth so they can use it. It is a great facility, however, it could be much safer and more effective, not just for students, but for anyone who is interested in cycling. Excelling in the sport can be long term and he considers cycling a life sport, which is why he was excited to join in the effort as a volunteer. He endorses the project and believes the new trail system in the proposed area would provide a very safe place to ride as opposed to riding on busy roads even when it comes to just keeping in shape. Draper and Park City are the only other options for mountain biking practice.

Mr. Nicponski inquired if residents in the area were contacted about the proposal. Mr. Hill stated there had been no public involvement yet. The early stages and design phase are just unfolding but he felt having the council aware and comfortable with it was a priority. He inquired, if Mr. Perry came to council reporting \$750,000 had been raised, would the city approve.

Mr. Hill has communicated with city's attorneys, as far as liability, and discussions about the legality of ownership. The city would own the facility, and be responsible for associated costs, such as, utilities, occasionally rebuilding dirt mounds and adjusting timber and rocks, however, it would not be a heavy maintenance project. The idea was shared with the mayor and Kim Sorensen. Announcing it to the public would occur if approved. He believed it was a worthy project for the city.

Mr. Perry agreed and said aggressive fund raising had not yet started. Several people have shown interest in getting involved, however, he wanted to be sure it has an opportunity to be constructed, before money was raised for something that would not happen.

Mr. Hales inquired whether the park would be available to all residents in Murray. Mr. Perry confirmed it would be like Murray Park.

Ms. Turner asked about the cost of maintenance. Mr. Hill stated it was not clear yet, however, estimates were between \$30,000 and \$40,000 per year, which would be typical for this type of project. More detailed analysis was expected for the exact cost of maintenance.

Ms. Turner inquired about parking and the possibility of expansion. Mr. Hill stated existing parking near the pavilion could be utilized and pointed out approximately 35 accommodating parking stalls. Kids might ride bikes to the park, however, residents coming from further away would need parking access. Mr. Hill believed there were possibilities for parking expansion, although, it had not been discussed yet. He pointed out the Rocky Mountain Power property that could be available. Allowed uses in their right-of-way had been discussed in the past, but not for this particular project. Parking lots and venues that don't have structures above ground, are typically acceptable uses for RMP.

Mr. Camp stated parking was an important detail due to the small lot and if it became as popular as it could be, which he hoped, parking might impact the neighborhoods and guest parking in the cul-de-sac nearby would be concerning. He felt it was an awesome idea and whatever could be done to improve the parking would be wise, and pointed out the existing parking lot right on 5300 South that could be utilized as well.

Mr. Brass rides and liked the idea and pointed out most bikers in the area would ride to the facility. Access would be easy coming from existing trails from 4800 South.

Mr. Hales inquired how many kids participated in the high school program. Mr. Evertsen said the team consists of boys and girls; they had gone from 4 to 12 students in three years and would continue to grow.

Mayor Eyre asked Mr. Hill if any portion of the land was protected wetlands and would that bring concern. Mr. Hill said there were no wetlands in the suggested area but there were some to the north.

Ms. Turner felt it was a great idea and a wonderful use of space. Mr. Hales agreed. Mr. Brass said it would be great for the kids. Mr. Nicponski said it would be interesting to see how the community would respond.

Mr. Camp asked once built, other than low maintenance, would it generally be unsupervised use and could it be used year round, as long as there was not too much snow or water. Mr. Hill confirmed that was the vision, as a public facility, it would be open with typical park hours and operate as other city parks do. However, without having a facility like this one in the city before, the guess was it would not need hired staff or a fee to enter the park, it would be similar to various skate parks throughout the valley.

Mr. Perry stated proper instructions for park use would be provided. Most avid mountain bikers already know standard biking etiquette for trails out in nature and these are the types of guests expected. Mr. Evertsen agreed and recommended park rules be posted at the entrance to the park and believed most would follow them, however, there would always be those who might not.

Ms. Turner asked Mr. Hill about legal issues. Mr. Hill replied there would be legal issues related to accepting the money, the agreement of ownership and construction. All details would be spelled out as the project moves forward.

Mr. Nicponski reiterated community response was important. Mr. Brass noted the popular use of the Jordan Parkway and he recalled the resistance when the Nature Center was constructed; once the public realized there was no visual interruption it was well accepted. He believed the park would be a similar situation, with not much to see except minor improvements but certainly not obstructions to view. The question remains how many people will it attract.

Mr. Hill stated the goal was to create a low impact area, unlike the old BMX park near Riverview Jr. High School, which received neighborhood opposition due to large events every weekend. The bike park would be low use, no noise associated with it, mountain bikers respect the environment and there would not be large crowds of people. He expects some resistance to it and public meetings will be held.

Mr. Camp said it was good use of land that is currently underutilized. Mr. Brass said Google Earth depicts the existing trails, which proves the use is already there. Any avid mountain bike rider has a great investment in a bike and are very unlikely to be destructive guests.

Mr. Evertsen agreed and stressed the culture of the National Interscholastic Cycling Association (NICA), which has over 2,000 kids this year. Ages 12-17 who were previously not being instructed, are now learning respect and proper ways to ride mountains and trails and care for trails.

Mr. Nicponski asked if access could be controlled should the park need to be closed. Mr. Perry stated fencing was not included in the design.

2.2 Central Valley Water Reclamation – Jim Brass, Tom Holstrom, Phil Heck presenting.

Mr. Brass reminded the council about changes the facility needed and the impact modifications would have on sewer bills, and in some cases, a rather dramatic impact. General Manager, Mr. Holstrom, and Assistant General Manager, and Process Engineer, Mr. Heck, from Central Valley Water Reclamation, (CVWR) were invited to give a brief background on the strategic initiatives the organization is facing.

Background

There are three major costly initiatives that affect permit renewal. 1) Nutrient removal, which has not been done adequately. 2) Asset management, the facility is deteriorating as CVWR approaches 30 years old. 3) Evaluation and design of the effluent pipe to the Jordan River.

Central Valley Water services five special service districts and two municipalities, one of which is Murray City, a member since 1978. There are seven miles of interceptor, up to 84 inch diameter and two siphon structures, one of which failed two years ago. The 75 million gallon per day (MGD) waste water treatment plant facility is located on approximately 60 acres of a 140 acre site.

The initial construction was completed with EPA grant money and local funds in the 1980's. Service is now provided to approximately half a million people within 115 square miles. With the rate flow of 75

MGD, it currently treats about 50 – 55 MGD and discharges to Millcreek at a point about 2,300 feet above its confluence with the Jordan River. Unfortunately the key point of discharge has become a major topic.

Nutrients Removal History

Nutrients, primarily phosphorus and nitrogen have been hot topics in the waste water industry since the 1970's, when it was removed from detergents and various cleaners. In the 1980's and 1990's along to the east coast all waste water treatment facilities became nutrient removal facilities. Mississippi Basin and western states have come under focus by the EPA in recent years, with intermountain areas the last to get on board with nutrient controls. In anticipation of limits, the CVWR joined the Jordan River and Farmington Bay Water Quality Council in 2008 to conduct research on nutrients.

The state of Utah adopted what is termed an Adaptive Management approach toward nutrient control, which began with two initiatives. 1) High mountain pristine areas with a phosphorus limit of .15 mg/L P (milligram per liter phosphorus). 2) A technology based effluent limit for all mechanical treatment facilities in the state to achieve a 1.0 mg/L P level. The plant discharges approximately 3 to 3.5 mg/L P. While it seems like a small amount, Mr. Holstrom explained getting the last 2 to 2.5 mg/L P is a very costly endeavor. The phosphorus rule was approved in December 2004 and CVWR is currently on a five-year compliance schedule with the state. The state has recognized that CVWR and Salt Lake City are both very large facilities and will require additional time to come into compliance. An extension is expected.

Nutrient control is such a concern in the Jordan River because treated effluent is increasing. By 2060, the state estimates that waste water treatment discharges will be over half of the Jordan River.

Recommendations to the Board

After years of study and trying to work with the Division of Water Quality, CVWRF's goal is to approve construction of a biological nutrient removal process. The plant currently has a trickling filter solids contact process, but the process does not remove phosphorus. Trickling filters will need to be removed and replaced to achieve the lower phosphorus limit of 1.0 mg/L P and would also provide residual benefits on ammonium nitrogen and other nutrients. Extending the compliance date to January 1, 2025 is expected. Cost estimates are \$80-\$90 million and includes the design, construction, ongoing maintenance and rehabilitation of the rest of the treatment facility.

Mr. Heck reported the discharge permit expired in 2015 and the plant has been operating under an expired permit. A new permit has not yet been issued by the state, even though the renewal application was submitted 180 days prior to expiration. Central Valley Water is discharging to Millcreek, the dilution of the waste water for calculation of discharge parameters, is based on the flow to the Jordan River, creating changes to the permit by the state, which explains the delay.

Mr. Heck explained the difference between discharges to the both rivers. The point of discharge at low flow in the Jordan River is at 50%, which provides good dilution, with limits for ammonia, copper and other various parameters permitting higher levels, because they become diluted into the flow. The Millcreek flow is at 95%, with only 5% dilution, which causes a decrease in a number of parameters to levels that are hard to meet, such as, ammonia and the whole effluent toxicity. A biological test is

difficult at the 95% effluent rate of Millcreek; the test is much more successful at the 50% dilution of the Jordan.

Toxicity is an issue the plant cannot meet consistently, unless the dilution of the Jordan River is considered. If toxicity tests are not met for a certain number of repetitions, mandatory toxicity evaluations would be required, consisting of many chemical tests and the estimated cost for the various testing is approximately \$75,000 per month. Tests would be conducted indefinitely, until toxicity sources are discovered or the state terminates required tests.

Recommendations are to pursue the construction of a 2,300 foot pipeline to the Jordan River, reestablishing the dilution factor with a good correction to the river. The cost of the project is approximately \$10 million to construct the pipeline. The State Division of Water Quality has agreed to a peer review panel to assess whether the project provides a net environmental benefit to the Millcreek River. Afterwards, if the review panel finds that the discharge water is a benefit to the creek and taking it out would actually degrade the creek, there may be a way out of the challenge and the project would come to a stop.

Mr. Nicponski inquired what other plants were currently discharging into the Jordan River and if a precedent could be set. Mr. Heck reported the Jordan Basin, Riverton Plant and South Valley Sewer District all discharge into the Jordan. He added CVWR had discussions with the state regarding modifying the permit, which is a possibility.

Mr. Holstrom reported he and Mr. Heck discovered a backhoe had been operating for Salt Lake County Flood Control and was literally dredging vegetation out at Millcreek from CVWR's point of discharge. This was further evidence for the peer review process.

Mr. Heck added moving forward is imperative so that CVWR could be in a position to begin construction of the pipeline and their hope was the board would approve that opportunity.

Mr. Brass stated at some point the plant needs a permit top rate and agreed that a parallel approach would be essential, whether a pipeline is constructed or not, preparations should be in order to meet deadlines. The sad part was, building a pipeline was less expensive than taking the risk of having to begin very costly testing.

Mr. Heck mentioned, a toxicant has been discovered that is not treatable and CVWR would be obligated to treat it, once the cycle of required testing began. At least the cost of the pipeline is known and CVWR believes construction is the less risky outcome.

Asset Management

The design life of the 30 year old plant was 50 years and equipment is now 20-25 years old. The reason for the asset management study was due to accumulating maintenance costs of equipment. Every asset was reviewed with risk of failure considerations and associated costs for replacement were shared. Mr. Heck presented photos to show the assets of concern where worn out and damaged equipment had occurred and described several issues including a major 30 inch siphon pipe collapse, a worn out pump, a corroded 60 inch interceptor pipe, a failed clarifier drive, two heat loop pumps, and obsolete generator and co-generator systems.

Asset Management Steps

Mr. Heck reported CVWR reviewed all assets and conducted condition assessments, failure evaluations and prioritized them for either repair or replacement, based on risk of failure and consequences of failure and devised a Capital Improvement Plan. All recommendations to the board are to move forward over the next 20 years at a \$150 million cost. Addressing the most urgent in the next five years would require a cost of \$50 million. The hope is to take care of all problems and repairs and the get the plant running again at a level where it will function relatively risk free and not have the constant failures they are seeing.

Benchmarking

Mr. Holstrom stated the National Associates of Clean Water Agencies (NACWA), was hired to perform cost analysis and cost of service analysis, to determine where CVWR lies on a national basis. Sewer charges have been escalating at 4.8% per year from 1999 to 2014, actually exceeding inflation rates. The cost of service for CVWR was pointed out on a graph in comparison with the escalating NACWA index, including the treatment facility and the collection costs. The cost per customer in 2016 was \$100.

Mr. Brass stated CVWR is very inexpensive and efficient and reported the staff does a good job in keeping the plant spotless and up and running. He added the plant dodged a bullet when the siphon collapsed. It did not create a raw sewage spill, and it was repaired, however, an expensive cost.

Mr. Holstrom explained a graph of Operation Maintenance Costs compared to other agencies. The national average in 2013 was \$2400 per million gallons treated. The cost for CVWR in 2016 came in at \$780 per million gallons. Comparisons were made against other facilities around the country, which are already removing nutrients that reflected CVWR was below the 5th percentile.

A handout was given to the council summarizing the three costly strategic initiatives explaining the recommendations that would be provided to the board their next scheduled meeting. He welcomed any phone calls, questions or concerns the council might have and invited the council to tour the facility.

Mr. Hill confirmed the project would cost \$150 million. The next step was to determine who would be paying what portions of the cost. At the end of the day, it would be Murray City residents who would see increases to sewage bills.

The interlocal agreement Mr. Holstrom referred to would be provided to the council and would be a modification of the existing agreement that Murray currently had with CVWR. The documents on ownership, maintenance and rebuild would be available to the council after a rate study was completed and a cost to Murray City was determined.

Ms. Turner asked when the last rate increase in Murray City was. Mr. Hill stated 2012 for a five year rate increase.

Mr. Brass reported there was a question on the interlocal agreement regarding board review language and stated the board wanted it included. Mr. Holstrom replied it was no problem.

Mr. Camp thanked Mr. Holstrom and Mr. Heck for the clarifications. Mr. Brass invited the council to attend the open board meeting for CVWR which would be held August 24, 2016.

3. Announcements

Ms. Lopez had several announcements, however, due to lack of time she would send them to the council via email.

4. Adjournment - 6:25pm

**Pattie Johnson
Council Office Administrator II**

DRAFT