MOUNTAIN GREEN SEWER IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
5455 West Old Highway Road, Mountain Green, Utah
Agenda for Thursday, June 5, 2014
Board of Trustees Meeting at 7:00 PM

I. Welcome, Introductions, Invocation
II. Public Comment Period
III. Business Items

1) Discussion/Decision: Repairs to sunken asphalt above sewer main

- Lois Woody, at 6400 Highland Drive, asked the District if it can repair the asphalt over the sewer main that runs up her driveway and continues on to her neighbor's property, 6466 Highland Drive for Joseph & Simone Rousseau.
- The excavated area and the asphalt over where the main was installed has sunken and deteriorated forming a depressed channel for rain water, snow and ice that makes her driveway difficult to navigate and somewhat dangerous in the winter. Because the area in question is depressed, ice removal is difficult to impossible.
- This sewer main was installed as part of the original system in the Highlands around 24 years ago. An 8" pipe was run up the center of her driveway to a manhole at the top, and the line then continues down the center of the upper driveway where it terminates at a manhole covered cleanout. The trenched area over the main sewer line has subsided and the asphalt covering it has deteriorated to the point that it is evident the trench for the sewer main below is the reason for the damage.
- Post Asphalt has provided four different quote options for possible repairs which break the sections into the LOWER *(from Highland Drive up Mrs. Woody's driveway to the first manhole)* and the UPPER *(the Rousseau's driveway from the first manhole to the end)*.
  - **Option 1: $6,088** The entire length of the driveway - both the lower and upper sections – Sweep the sunken trench clean of debris, spray a tack coat then finish with a 3" average coat of asphalt to bring the trench above level and feathered at the edges. Approximately 453' long x 8' wide (feathering).
  - **Option 2: $3,674** Treatment in Option 1 to the lower driveway only.
  - **Option 3: $2,777** Treatment in Option 1 to the upper driveway only.
  - **Option 4: $6,378** (Must be added to Option 1) Overlay the entire driveway with 1.5" of new asphalt after Option A trench has been fixed. Total cost for Option 4 would be $6,088 + $6,378 = $12,466.
- First, does the Board believe that it is the District's responsibility to repair the depressed and damaged driveway?
- Second, which portion of the driveway does the Board think should be repaired: the lower, the upper or both?
- Third, does the Board think that only the center portion directly over the sewer main trench be repaired, or the entire width of the driveway?

- Does the Board approve having the repairs made and if so, which level of repairs *(which quote)* does the Board want to have done?

2) Discussion/Decision: Will Serve for two ERUs for Meadow Ridge

- Skyler Gardner with Gardner Cottonwood Creek LLC has requested Will Serves for two ERUs for the lot across from the school in Cottonwoods III. This area was originally planned as a six unit condominium development for which the District issued Will Serves in May 2007 but has since expired. The plan now is to develop the two individual lots for homes to be built. Impact Fees of $5,271 per lot will be included in the new Facilities Completion and Reimbursement agreement below and the purchasers of the lots will pay the inspection fees.
- Does the Board approve issuing the Will Serve for the two Meadow Ridge lots?

3) Discussion: Trunk Line Status

- The Trunk Line from the Bank on Old Highway to our headworks is on track and will probably break ground in mid-July then commence operation by November.
- On May 29 we held a pre-construction meeting at the District office with Skyler Gardner, EK Bailey Excavation, Dwayne and Wayne Johnson and Robert Volk.
- After plan reviews and discussion, all participants walked and inspected the entire route across the Johnson property in order to spot any concerns.
- There are only two administrative items outstanding:
  - A renewal of the state water/stream crossing permit – Sent in May 23.
  - Finalization of the new Facilities Completion and Reimbursement Agreement

4) Discussion/Decision: The new FACILITIES COMPLETION and REIMBURSEMENT AGREEMENT for the Trunk Line Installation

- MGSID Board Members should review the attached FACILITIES COMPLETION and REIMBURSEMENT AGREEMENT prior to attending the meeting.
- The District Manager, the Gardners and the attorneys for both parties have finalized a direct exchange/reimbursement agreement that will trade Impact Fees for the installation of the Trunk Line. The Board needs to review and approve this agreement so we can move forward with and complete this installation before the end of this summer.
- Does the Board approve the new FACILITIES COMPLETION and REIMBURSEMENT AGREEMENT for the Trunk Line installation?

5) Discussion/Decision: Should MGSID provide a written comment on the proposed rule for technology based Limits for Controlling Nutrient Pollution?

- On April 30, 2014, The Utah Water Quality Board gave its approval to the Division of Water Quality to solicit Public comment on a proposed rule that will restrict discharges of phosphorus into surface waters by wastewater treatment plants. *Web link: http://www.nutrients.utah.gov/rule.htm*
- The proposed rule will be published by the Division of Administration Rules on June 1. The 60-day public comment period will run from June 1 to August 1.
- A series of public meetings will be held across the state to explain the proposed rule, answer questions, and solicit public input *(visit web link above to see dates and other information)*. The Division of Water Quality encourages members of

the public to attend one of these meetings, submit written comments, and provide their input on Utah's Nutrient Strategy. Residents attending these meetings can also learn more about the ways they can help protect Utah's water resources.

- *Proposed Rule:* Under the proposed rule, all wastewater treatment plants in the state will play a role in reducing phosphorus discharges into state waters.
- *Non-lagoon Plants:* Treatment plants that do not use a lagoon or pond-based treatment technology, referred to as "non-lagoon" plants in the rule, will be required to produce treated wastewater that contains 1.0 mg/L of phosphorus or less before that water may be discharged. This new requirement becomes effective no later than January 1, 2020.
- *Lagoon and Pond-based Plants:* Generally, lagoon or pond-based treatment plants that discharge into receiving waters cannot reliably meet this 1.0 mg/L phosphorus limit, and the costs to upgrade are considered to be unaffordable at this time. Under the proposed rule, each discharging lagoon will be evaluated to determine the current amount of phosphorus discharged each year—the annual "load" in pounds per year that each plant discharges. The proposed rule would restrict the amount of phosphorus that a [Lagoon] plant could discharge to 125 percent times the current average annual total phosphorus loading to the receiving stream. Once the lagoon's phosphorus cap has been reached, the owner of the facility would have five years to construct treatment processes or implement treatment alternatives (such as land application) to prevent the lagoon from exceeding its total phosphorus loading cap.
- *Exceptions:* The rule contains four exceptions to the phosphorus limits for discharging facilities with the following special circumstances:
  - *they are currently controlled for phosphorus due to site-specific water quality protection conditions;*
  - *they can demonstrate that the discharge from the treatment works will not increase the total phosphorus concentration in the receiving water beyond 10 percent;*
  - *they can demonstrate that the proposed limitation is not necessary to protect the receiving water quality or its beneficial uses; and,*
  - *they meet specific conditions of economic hardship.*
- To meet these exceptions and be exempted from the proposed phosphorus limits, the applicable conditions must be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the director of the Division of Water Quality by January 1, 2018. Otherwise, under the proposed rule the treatment plants would need to implement the technology-based limit or loading cap (as applicable) by January 1, 2020.
  - *Based on current growth projections MGSID will probably begin the final design process in 2018 with construction starting around 2020 and in operation around 2022. Verbal statements from DWQ personnel and the written exception for Lagoon plants support the belief that the DWQ would most likely grant MGSID an exception and/or extension while the District is taking the necessary actions to meet the new requirements.*
- *Monitoring:* In addition to the limits on phosphorus discharges, the proposed rule would also require all discharging treatment plants to monitor their influent and effluent wastewater for phosphorus and nitrogen in their various chemical forms. For many facilities, this will be the first time they have gathered information about the amounts of nutrients they are releasing to the environment. The data

collected through this monitoring will be critical to DWQ, scientists, and the interested public for determining the ways in which nutrient pollution from towns and cities may be impacting water quality. These data will also support the good science necessary to permanently protect the waters of the state of Utah.

- *Further Information:* The proposed rule will be available on the Division of Administrative Rules web site beginning June 1, 2014. For more information about nutrients and nutrient pollution, visit DWQ's nutrients Web page.
- *Does the Board want the District Manager to prepare and submit a written comment to the Utah Water Quality Board in regards to the proposed rule for technology based Limits for Controlling Nutrient Pollution before August 1, 2014?*

6) Discussion: District Operations ~ May 2014

- Per the 2014 Budget, Janet transferred $25,000 from the Main Checking Account into the PTIF0248 Excess Funds Account on May 27, 2014. We will transfer another $8,000 into the PTIF4667 Emergency Fund in July.
- Effluent water continues to measure well within state requirements and removed over 83% of BOD and 73% TSS in May. E-Coli bacteria registered at 4 organisms per 100 milliliters which is less than 3% of maximum permit levels.

7) Discussion: District Statistics as of May 31, 2014

- Comparison of the number of Impact Fees received to date.
  - **2014 = 21** Impact Fees
  - **2013** = **38** Impact Fees
  - **2012** = **20** Impact Fees
  - **2011** = **2** Impact Fees

ERU STATUS

ERUs Billing	ERUs Under Construction	ERUs Connected	ERUs Committed But Not Activated	WILL SERVES Committed
869	**66**	**+ 900**	**+ 333.5**	**= 1,299.5**

TOTAL ERUs CONNECTED LAST SIX MONTHS RUNNING

	DEC 2013	*JAN 2014*	*FEB 2014*	*MAR 2014*	*APR 2014*	*MAY 2014*
CONNECTED	**862**	**870**	**873**	**880**	**889**	**900**
% OF CAPACITY	47.9%	48.3%	48.5%	48.9%	49.4%	50.0%

District requirements on Upgrade: Option Study @ 70% (1,260); Design @ 80% (1,440); Build @ 90% (1,620)

MGSID BANK STATEMENTS

STATEMENTS ENDING	MAIN OPERATIONS CHECKING	$3,456 EXPANSION ACCOUNT	$5,271 EXPANSION ACCOUNT	***BANK TOTALS***
April 30, 2014	$121,922	$81,563	$5,189	***$208,674***
PTIF 248 OPERATIONS FUNDS	PTIF 4598 EXPANSION FUNDS	PTIF 4667 EMERGENCY FUNDS	PTIF 4668 REPLACEMENT FUNDS	**FUND TOTALS**
$133,302	$122,901	$125,857	$207,474	***$589,534***

TOTAL CASH $798,208

OPERATIONS INCOME & EXPENSE STATEMENT

YTD ~ January 1, 2014 through May 31, 2014

INCOME	
Monthly Service Fees	$116,878
Late Fees	$ 290
New Lateral Inspections	$ 1,500
Other Income	$ 4,501
Taxes Income	$ 17,948
Interest Income	$ 772
TOTAL INCOME	**$141,889**
EXPENSE	
Administration	$ 60,019
Operations	$ 39,888
TOTAL EXPENSE	**$ 99,907**
NET ORDINARY INCOME	**$ 41,982**

IMPACT FEE/EXPANSION INCOME	$ 71,173
EXPANSION EXPENSES	$ 462
DEVELOPER REIMBURSE	$ 48,384
NET EXPANSION INCOME	**$ 22,327**

8) Discussion/Decision: Review and approval of May 1, 2014 and May 8, 2014 Minutes.

9) Discussion: The next meeting is scheduled for the first Thursday, July 3, 2014 at 7:00 PM

- How many Board Members believe that they will be able to attend this meeting as it is the day before the Fourth of July Holiday? Should we cancel the July meeting or move it to the third Thursday in July?

Motion to Adjourn