



MURRAY CITY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Murray City Municipal Council met as a Committee of the Whole on Tuesday, July 17, 2018 in the Murray City Center, Conference Room #107, 5025 South State Street, Murray Utah.

Council Members in Attendance:

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

Others in Attendance:

Doug Hill	Mayor Pro Tem	Jan Lopez	Council Director
G.L. Critchfield	City Attorney	Jennifer Kennedy	City Recorder
Jennifer Heaps	Comm. & Public Relations Director	Pattie Johnson	Council Office
Tim Tingey	ADS Director	Danyce Steck	Finance Director
Jim McNulty	Development Services Mgr.	Blaine Haacke	Power - General Manager
Danny Astill	Public Works Director	Bruce Tuner	Power – Operations Manager
Russ Kakala	Streets Superintendent	Mark Hooyer	Trans-Jordan Cities
Greg Bellon	Power – Assistant General Manager	Cory Kowalski	Resident
Lesha Earl	Trans-Jordan Cities	Michael Shea	Heal Utah
Scott Williams	Heal Utah	Deann Shepherd	Humane Society
Janice Strobell	Resident	Jennifer Brass	Resident
Brent Barnett	Resident	Jan Cox	Resident
Meredith Muller	Resident	C L Mayne	Resident

Ms. Turner called the Committee of the Whole meeting to order at 4:46 p.m. and welcomed everyone.

1. Approval of Minutes

Ms. Turner asked for comments or a motion on the minutes from Committee of the Whole meetings May 1, May 15, and June 5, 2018. Mr. Hales moved approval. Mr. Brass seconded the motion. All were in favor.

2. Discussion Items

2.1 Trans-Jordan Landfill (TJL) Recycling Discussion – Danny Astill, Mark Hooyer, and Lesha Earl

The discussion was a continuation from a previous Committee of the Whole meeting, in order to provide more information related to current recycling challenges. The presentation included a handout and photos depicting common trash mixed together with items considered recyclable material.

Mr. Hooyer said contamination is the leading problem creating the increased volume in garbage at TJL. Contaminated waste means liquid, grease/oils, or food are present on recyclable items thrown into recycling cans, which ultimately spreads to and ruins entire truckloads of material that cannot be recycled. Unrecyclable material, such as glass, thrown into recycling cans is another challenge, therefore, educating the public is vital, due to vast contamination problems.

He said understanding current events in the recycling world is important, because although TJL is involved with solid waste, TJ's general landfill operations have seen a major impact because of China's new import regulations. Since solid waste fees are the number one driver of recycling, the more costly it is to throw out garbage, the better recycling programs become.

Ms. Earl explained recycling processes do not take place in the United States but has been shipped to China where the process occurs - until now. She explained the Chinese government decided, due to constant contamination, to no longer accept recycled waste from the United States. China's new regulations include, banning 23 items deemed no longer acceptable, strict standards that recycled waste be 0.5% or less contaminated, and the implementation of extreme procedures at their ports, where all waste is stopped for thorough inspection before entering the country. China's dramatic stance and firm procedures are filmed and broadcast to demonstrate people can be arrested on spot for not complying.

Mr. Hooyer explained Green Fence and National Sword programs were created and enforced in the past by China, which were effective over time, however, they failed, due to non-compliance of strict contaminate regulations. This resulted in China refusing to accept recycling and foreign garbage into any port from anyone, without further notice.

Ms. Earl said consequently, United States cities are feeling the impact on many levels, particularly, when citizens find out cities have not been forth right in educating them about the current recycling crisis. Therefore, a sense of distrust has developed, which is why becoming proactive with informing the public is more important than ever, in order for citizens to help work through the situation.

Mr. Hooyer noted two recycling facilities along the Wasatch Front; Rocky Mountain Recycling, and Recycle America. He said it was hard to calculate the amount of contaminated recyclable material landfills receive every year from recycling facilities. However, one of those facilities is located in a TJL garbage district, so he was able to determine specifically the amount of contaminated waste

being brought to the landfill by measuring their monthly garbage volume at the tipping gate. (He noted the other recycling facility contributes contaminated waste to another landfill.)

A graph was shared to reflect how garbage volume increased from the recycling facility in May 2016 through 2018, as follows:

- 2016 – Monitoring began over a five-month period when approximately 365 tons was received in January, and varied from month to month through May.
- 2017 – Nearly 500 tons was received in January alone, which continued to increase each month for the rest of the year.
- 2018 – A significant increase occurred when 1,242 tons was recorded just in January. The trend to increase did not slow down - as of May 31, 2018, 6,437 tons came from the recycling center.

Mr. Hooyer concluded what the recycling center was throwing away, more than doubled each year and by the end of May 2018 contributions were nearly equivalent to the entire year of 2017. Whether the recycling center picked up new districts or not was unclear, the impact on the landfill was substantial. He said the amount of waste received is a clear indication that material is not getting recycled. The increase was so much that the recycling facility purchased new trucks, and hired additional drivers to keep up with increased loads going to TJL.

Ms. Earl stressed educating the public correctly about recycling habits included three rules of thumb: First Reduce – Then Reuse - Then Recycle. She is actively involved in helping cities organize events and teaches proper recycling, promoting the new “Be Bright, Recycle Right” campaign, adopted by many cities. (See attachment #1) She visits elementary schools, attends Earth Day celebrations, and various civic organizations, as well as, business and religious organizations, in order to equip everyone with the best recycling habits.

Mr. Nicponski wondered about plans for constructing and opening a second landfill.

Mr. Hooyer said the Bayview Landfill, located in Alberta, Utah, was purchased three years ago for future use.

Mr. Hooyer shared concerns with citizens who diligently clean personal recycling materials, only to see items end up in landfills because of another person’s carelessness. He thought it would be helpful to reassure citizens that the industry is retooling, reinvesting and regrouping – knowing China once took care of everything for the United States. As a result, major recycling organizations nationwide are scrambling to open new centers, develop better methods, and upgrade technology to catch up with the back load and this new challenge. He said the process to achieve what China was doing could take up to 18 months, if not years, before the market makes its way back again.

Markets are gone for recycling #3 through #7 plastics, and mixed paper that includes magazines and junk mail, which means these materials are no longer recycled. So the question is often asked if separating, sorting and putting recycling cans out should discontinue entirely, until a resolution is found. Mr. Hooyer’s answer was that years of public education would be lost and have to start all over again if the practice just stopped, which would damage the industry all because of a changing market for what seems to be temporary down fall. He thought before such actions were taken,

waiting it out would be more valuable until it is determined what the market will do. In addition, Waste Management, the largest recycling company in the nation, is currently investing hundreds of millions of dollars in new recycling centers and new technology, because they realized too late China was accepting contaminated recycling material for quite some time.

Mr. Brass stressed the importance of rinsing items prior to placing them in recycling cans. However, he thought the public handout was confusing because some items reflected lids on, and some items had lids off, which might be misleading about pouring out, cleaning and rinsing.

Mr. Hooyer said containing a clear message was important and challenges started when residents assumed items could be recycled whether washed or not because overall recycling was all that mattered. That popular assumption is what harmed the industry initially. He attended meetings with recycling centers, organizations, and institutions, in order to formulate a unified message for recycling instructions as to what is and is not accepted, and how to clean items. However, over time companies strayed from the agreed list of requirements and the unified message was not maintained. For example, toilets have been pulled from recycling bins.

Mr. Hill recalled a discussion during budget time about the impact of recycling on the Solid Waste Enterprise Fund budget, and noted the cost for disposing general waste to the landfill was \$16 per ton, and the cost was \$50 per ton for disposing recycled material. When the last fee study was conducted for the Solid Waste Fund, high recycling costs were not anticipated. As a result, the increase would not be sustainable, which would have a greater impact on the Solid Waste Fund, and therefore, he thought immediate action would be required regarding an increase to solid waste fees.

Ms. Turner thought most citizens want to continue with recycling, so it would be important to do whatever was necessary to support residents and the industry.

2.2 Animal Mill Ordinance Discussion – Dale Cox, G.L. Critchfield, and DeAnn Shepherd, Marketing Director of the Humane Society (HS)

Mr. Cox favored the ordinance for the following reasons: 1.) Because he cares about humane treatment of animals; 2.) To show support for Murray citizens that have been mistreated and misguided, resulting in emotional and financial stress and adding more animals to shelters; 3.) To reduce the cost of sheltered pets in Murray.

Ms. Shepherd wanted to spread awareness about the ordinance, in order to address inhumane conditions at puppy mills used for breeding rabbits, puppies, and kittens sold for commercial purposes and profit. Animals coming from these conditions have behavioral and health issues and commonly end up in shelters and are difficult rehome.

Salt Lake County and Sandy City passed the ordinance, and Midvale City would consider the ordinance this evening during their council meeting. Ms. Shepherd said the ordinance does not put pet stores out of business and does not affect responsible breeders.

She explained the HS encourages healthy in-home breeding and thinks it is important for buyers to see environments, meet dog breeders and monitor veterinary care, because good breeders never hand animals over to pet stores and healthy breeders encourage the return of pets should the adoption not work out, however, animals purchased in pet stores cannot be returned. In addition, accident litters listed on-line and sold for quick money are often interbreed, have medical and behavioral issues because these types of animals are often raised in poor conditions and taken from the mother too soon.

The ordinance would provide a humane model for buying and selling, like Petco and PetSmart, where animals for sale come from sources like the HS, shelters, or non-profit rescue facilities - instead of puppy mills. If passed, the ordinance would allow animal control officers to attain animal histories from sellers, to prove animals did not come from mills.

The ordinance differs slightly from city to city. For example, Midvale City's ordinance also includes a required customer service guarantee so that new pet owners are provided not only medical history, but congenital defect information upfront and some kind of exchange/return policy with reimbursement of the adoption fees.

The ordinance originated in Sandy City, when push back from the community was recognized against a new puppy store coming to their city. The store wanted to sell puppies that derived from out of state, which is why Sandy passed the ordinance for precautionary reasons. Ms. Shepherd explained once a pet store opens, stores are difficult to close. With the ordinance a lot of undue stress on animal control could be avoided because animal control officers are consistently responding to complaint calls from consumers to check on pets in questionable stores and follow up on problems consumers have after purchasing animals.

Ms. Turner asked about consumer complaints in Murray.

Ms. Shepherd reported none, because Murray's pet stores only sell fish, small reptiles and pet supplies - not puppies or kittens. Only a handful of pet stores in Utah sell puppies and kittens, therefore, the burden for finding homeless pets a home falls on the HS shelter. She said there was no need to bring more pets, especially animals from puppy mills with medical problems, into the state from other countries, such as, the Ukraine.

Murray's pet shelter takes in stray, lost and found animals, however, the HS also receives complete surrendered pets, either due to impulse buying, behavioral or medical concerns, death of an owner, or just change of mind, so the HS acts as the guardian for those pets by covering all expenses until issues are resolved and animals are rehomed properly.

Mr. Critchfield shared a concern related to animal mill ordinances, by explaining other cities passed the ordinances right after horrific puppy mills were discovered in Chicago and the Midwest. Animals found in such inhumane conditions, were forced to reproduce repeatedly, to ship animals around the United States. He said this practice was not found in Utah.

Another concern he had was the regulatory position the city council represents when considering an ordinance like this. He thought the council might be going beyond what was already legislated and allowed in Utah. For example, if a commercial pet store moved into the city, the question might be asked on what basis the ordinance was passed by the city council.

The second part of the regulatory position was the message the Murray City Council would be sending to the state legislature - should the council pass a law that is not authorized by state law. He said there was no telling what the reaction might be from state legislators. The council would be telling a business what inventory was or wasn't appropriate. To his knowledge the city had never adopted such regulations in the past and it was hard to say what direction would be taken at the state level.

Mr. Hill expressed Mayor Camp's concerns about Murray passing the ordinance for the same reasons Attorney Critchfield stated. The mayor's preference would be to wait and see if any action was taken during the upcoming legislature session.

Mr. Nicponski said unless the HS goes directly to the legislature nothing would happen legislatively because most legislators are anti-humane society, anti-animal advocates and thought action would be slow on their part. Therefore, he thought the council should consider their role as a city, and utilize the regulatory authority they have by passing the ordinance.

Mr. Cox thought by giving future Murray pet store owners notice about the ordinance, a firm guideline would be respected, and mentioned the idling ordinance. He wondered if it was like the animal mill ordinance at the state level.

Mr. Critchfield explained the idle free ordinance was different because the state passed a law allowing cities the choice to adopt the idle free ordinance if they wanted to.

Ms. Turner discussed her desire to see plastic bags eliminated and explained what stopped her from pursuing a city ordinance was knowing the state could supersede the city ordinance. So, she was supporting a state senator to pass an ordinance banning plastic bags at the state level. Even though she thought banning plastic bags was the right thing to do, she did not want to put the city in jeopardy, by going above them - she considered the animal mill ordinance in the same manner.

Mr. Critchfield preferred the animal mill ordinance be passed at state or federal levels. He explained the federal government currently regulates licensed breeders, but organizations like the HS say federal regulations were not effective, due to a lack of federal enforcement. He identified with the HS because officers were not policing pet stores as often as they should. Overall, he thought the council should carefully consider adopting the ordinance and reiterated the ordinance was not explicated in state law.

2.3 Small Nuclear Reactor (SNR) Discussion – Diane Turner, Blaine Haacke, Michael Shea

In addition to cost related concerns, Ms. Turner wanted to provide further information the council had not heard in previous Committee of the Whole meeting during May 2018 and continue the discussion regarding SNR project.

Mr. Haacke explained financial details of the membership agreement, the cost of each phase, important deadlines and off-ramp options. He noted Murray had spent \$4,744 so far, which is the middle of the first phase and over the next 7-8 months the city will expend \$10,000 to continue exploring the resource further.

The first off-ramp opportunity, or chance to exit the project, is March 2019. He said the Utah Associated Municipal Power System (UAMPS) Committee, which is called the Carbon Free Power Project (CFPP) would decide as a group of 20-25 members, whether to continue with the project or not. Murray also has that opportunity to decide whether to go forward.

If UAMPS decides participation is not in the best interests of the entities, in March 2019, they can back out of the project and get 100% reimbursement from NuScale, the DOE, and all other awarded grant funding. As a result, Murray would get its money back, as well.

However, if UAMPS decides to continue forward and Murray does not, the city would not get reimbursed \$4,744 paid so far, and would be obligated to pay an additional \$10,000 as agreed. Therefore, the city must stay with the group to get 100% reimbursement.

When the council considers the resolution to approve the project contract in August, it authorizes the city to continue on until March of 2019, which is the next off ramp. Following that, the next off-ramp opportunity is in 2020, which requires a \$109,000 commitment. In summary, should Murray back out in May of 2020, the city would be obligated to pay a total of \$120,000.

Should Murray proceed with the group, those costs, including costs in June 2023 of \$827,172, would not come from Murray. Funding would be attained by short term notes through UAMPS and would eventually be part of the bonding for the project.

After the off-ramp date in 2023, bonding for the project would occur and the city would no longer be eligible for a 100% reimbursement. He stressed that at any point, if Murray takes the off-ramp and UAMPS continues with the project, Murray would not get a reimbursement.

He commented to research and examine a resource of this nature \$100,000 was not significant. He explained the city's power department is always exploring optional resources, such as, large scale solar, which costs several thousand dollars to research.

Mr. Haacke thought by 2023, when the cost for research would be at its greatest, he would know whether the price range of \$65 per megawatt would be attained. UAMPS determined the cost could be somewhere between \$45 and \$65 per megawatt for the nuclear power resource.

He noted the Intermountain Power Plant (IPP) project refueling from coal into natural gas is estimated to be between \$65 and \$70 per megawatt, which was comparable. He said it would be completed in the same time frame of 2027.

Ms. Turner noted SNR technology was brand new. Mr. Haacke agreed, the resource was new, however, the technology had been used in the past by nuclear submarines.

Mr. Shea, Senior Policy Associate, and Scott Williams, Executive Director of Heal Utah said their organization was 20 years old, which began in Tooele specializing in the destruction of biological chemical weapon and energy solutions. Current focus is to promote clean air climate, renewable energy and protects Utah from nuclear, toxic and dirty energy threats.

Mr. Shea shared a power point presentation and stated that Heal Utah's primary opposition to the SNR project is the waste issue. He said the product produces one of the most poisonous substances on the planet and has no long-term storage plan, meaning 1,000s to 10,000 years. He said this raises much concern, however, their hope was to present their stance from an energy and market perspective, as to why they do not think the SNR project Murray should invest in.

He explained the term 'Least Cost Least Risk' (LCLR) used by utility companies to describe the decision making process related to large scale investments. By balancing least cost options with projects that have the least risk, LCLR includes new generation, replacement generation, transmission, and load and demand side management.

He said UAMPS promotes positive attributes about SNRs, such as, they provide: reliable base load power, they are a carbon free power source, and they are their own generation source, meaning they isolate municipality from energy market fluctuations, and others.

A breakdown of 2017 energy pricing was shared to point out alternative cost effective energy resources. The following was noted regarding historical projects, which gave a general sense of pricing around the nation:

- Wind and solar are the cheapest.
- Wind \$30 - \$50 per megawatt hour (Mwh)
- Solar \$43 - \$48 Mwh
- Nuclear \$112 - \$183 Mwh (These prices represent large scale conventional projects.)

Mr. Shae noted current pricing in 2018 for wind and solar was in the low \$20 Mwh range. He said the above prices for wind and solar were unsubsidized and do not take into account production tax credits or investment tax credits, which are large subsidies that renewables get. He noted SNR's receive government loans, and there is a wide variety in the above pricing ranges based on location and specific projects.

He explained the Levelized Cost of Energy (LCOE), which is the averaging of electricity pricing over the lifetime of a project that can hide high up front capital costs in the first years of the project. This can happen because calculations are made without the interest rate, which would account for

the rise in costs over time. He said nuclear projects can put rate payers at risk because of high capital costs.

He said another potential hidden cost could be transmission costs, because large scale transmission lines from substations would be required.

The proposed site for the SNR is located about 3.5 miles from the nearest substation, so in order to get power to communities, scale down of power occurs. He explained converted energy first goes to the substation, then transfers to other transmission line, then connects to smaller transmission lines, which connect to distribution lines that eventually make their way to Murray.

Mr. Shae said according to UAMPS, to bring 500 to 700 MW of SNR energy on line, new transmission lines would need to be constructed that could cost approximately \$1 million to \$3 million dollars per mile. Pacific Corporation oversees the Antelope substation, which would need significant upgrades, and new construction to handle that much new generation.

Other hidden costs he noted were:

- Delays due to design innovation
- Infrastructure requirements
- Impact of innovative design
- Waste Issues
- Economic competitiveness
- Reduced emergency planning zone
- New generation of technology
- Limited market opportunities.

Mr. Hales asked if UAMPS was deliberately hiding costs.

Mr. Shae replied UAMPS was not intentionally deceiving members. However, when new technology comes to market it is almost impossible to see potential costs that could happen. He said other large utility companies in the Western United States are not looking at SNRs because they do not view the resource as a viable form of technology for providing low cost electricity.

In summary, Heal Utah's opinion is SNR projects do not meet LCLR criteria and there are other low cost generation options, so they are eager to work with Murray in choosing another alternative.

Mr. Brass drives an electric car and has solar panels but noted SNRs provide zero emissions and is a base resource 24 hours per day, seven days a week; he believed there was no other dependable resource available like SNR. For example, he said cloud cover often inhibits his solar panels, and therefore, the resource is not always reliable. And, when the wind stops blowing, relays trip on wind turbines causing entire areas to lose power for great lengths of time - as happened in West Texas. He stressed there must be a resource generating power at all time. He said Murray citizens need a reliable cost effective resource and if a clean environment is also a priority- zero emissions is the best option and currently there is no other alternative to SNR.

Mr. Shae affirmed the city was looking to replace only five megawatts of electricity, and from an engineering perspective, he thought the city should utilize wind or solar for such a small amount. He noted the city's wide variety of reliable resources already available in its portfolio.

Mr. Brass was not aware of any recycling program for solar panels, and expressed concern about solar panels that last only 15 years. Due to heavy metals inside solar panels, and hazardous waste they produce there is no way to recycle them. In addition, solar panels are one of the largest polluters in Massachusetts where they are manufactured.

Mr. Brass noted concerns regarding car batteries and the negative impact they have on the environment also, not only during manufacturing but also by disposing them as hazardous waste. He thought hidden costs could be found in every resource and it was important to find answers to address all these concerns.

Mr. Shea said there was no perfect way to generate energy and all resources come with a cost regarding production and waste harmful to the environment. However, he said the potential for harm from nuclear waste, vastly outweighs disposing of solar panels, because enriched uranium in SNR contaminates everything it comes in contact with.

Mr. Haacke stressed the SNR would not be located in Utah – it would be located in Idaho and trucks with uranium waste would never be traveling through Utah.

2.4 Metro Narcotics Task Force Budget – Danyce Steck

One year ago Murray City notified Chief Mike Brown with the Metro Narcotics Task Force, in Salt Lake City that as of June 30, 2017, Murray would no longer serve as the host funding agency for the Task Force - after doing so for 20 years.

Upon receipt of the resignation letter, the Task Force requested Murray provide more time for the transition of these duties - up to December 2017. In December 2017, the Task Force requested a second extension and named Salt Lake City as the agency that would accept the assignment as host funding agency. However, by June 14, 2018 Salt Lake City contacted Murray to report they were still not prepared to take over until November 2018, and therefore no budget was prepared.

Ms. Steck said state auditors begged Murray to prepare a budget because the Task Force would be operating without one. Because Murray supports the mission of the Task Force, the city agreed to act as temporary fiduciary agents until Salt Lake City can make the transition. Ms. Steck noted funding the Task Force was provided by grant money, so there would be no financial cost to the city to act as the host funding agency, other than staff preparing the budget.

The council would consider the budget amendment in a future council meeting, in order for the Task Force to continue in their activities in FY 2019.

2.5 Murray City Center District (MCCD) Ordinance Modifications to Density, Lighting, and Parking – Tim Tingey

The council previously requested more detailed parameters because currently there are no maximum height limits or density limits in the MCCD area. The discussion was a follow-up to review modifications related to density, lighting and parking in the MCCD.

Mr. Tingey reported the ordinance had gone through the process with the MCCD Design Review Committee and the Planning Commission for recommendations, and the proposed changes coincide with the Wasatch Front Regional Council planning effort to establish urban centers in the MCCD.

The MCCD has strict design standards related to width, area, and side yard regulations, as well as, building design, scaling and landscaping. Therefore, Mr. Tingey reviewed the proposed changes to amend the ordinance related to the following standards in developing the MCCD:

- Location - Structures must be within one half mile from bus rapid transit and light rail.
- Parking - Can be located along street edge, configured in different areas, and adjacent to buildings to provide parking for multiple uses. Four-story municipal and public buildings require some parking within perimeters of the facility or provide a parking structure 750 feet from the main building.
- Residential Density - Maximum shall not exceed 80 units per acre.
- Height Regulations - Buildings not to exceed 10 stories or 135 feet, whichever is less.
- Podiums - Required at third-floor on buildings six stories or greater.
- Podium Step-Back Components - Maximum 20 feet, minimum 15 feet.
- Landscaping, Setbacks and Plaza Components - Must be 15% of all developed projects.
- Lighting – Poles should not be taller than 16 feet in the MCCD. Arterial roads allow light poles 23 feet in height, positioned in a downward shielded manner.

The council would consider the ordinance during a council meeting.

2.6 Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Ordinance Modifications to Lighting – Tim Tingey

Mr. Tingey said proposed lighting standards for the TOD are the same as noted above in the MCCD Ordinance, however, lighting fixtures may look different.

2.7 Mixed-Use Ordinance Modifications to Lighting - Tim Tingey

Mr. Tingey said proposed lighting standards for Mixed-Use areas are the same as noted above in MCCD and the TOD Ordinance.

Mr. Brass addressed street lights that are 23 feet tall, which would be positioned downward to shield light on arterial roads and wondered if this was enough to keep light from reflecting into apartment windows during night time hours.

Mr. Tingey said there was nothing else beyond what had already been considered during the design process that included another type of lighting, and there was no specific standard guideline at this point.

Mr. Brass suggested further research be considered to find a better way of spreading light, in order to keep street pole lights from shining into residents' windows.

3. **Announcements:** Ms. Lopez made several announcements related to coming events for the council members.
4. **Adjournment:** 6:13 p.m.

Pattie Johnson
Council Office Administrator II

ATTACHMENT #1



MURRAY
PUBLIC
SERVICES

Be Bright, Recycle Right!

Paper & Cardboard ♻️ Aluminum & Steel ♻️ Plastic Bottles & Containers



Paper & Cardboard

Office Paper Junk Mail Magazines Newspaper Paper Bags Paperboard Boxes
Cardboard Egg Cartons Cardboard Clean Pizza Box Lids



Aluminum & Steel

Empty Aerosol Cans
Aluminum Cans Steel Cans



Plastic Bottles & Containers

Containers & Lids
Food Bottles & Containers
Drink Bottles
Plastic Jugs



NO plastic bags,
foam, or glass!

KEEP IT CLEAN! All items
must be free of food & liquids.

Recycling Questions? Visit TransJordan.org/recycle



Draper • Midvale • Murray • Riverton • Sandy • South Jordan • West Jordan
Collectively dedicated to conserving resources for a sustainable future.

