

1 **MINUTES OF THE SPRINGVILLE CITY WATER BOARD**

2
3 Tuesday, May 8, 2018
4 6:30 a.m.
5 110 South Main Street
6 Springville, Utah 84663
7



8
9 **ATTENDANCE**

10
11 Councilmember Secretary
12 Craig Jensen Marcie Clark
13
14 Board Members City Staff
15 Alton Beck Brad Stapley
16 Nile Hatch Shawn Barker
17 Calvin Crandall
18 Rollin Hotchkiss
19 Rod Andrew
20 Bryan Boshell - excused
21 John Clemons
22

23 Mr. Hotchkiss welcomed everyone. Cl. Jensen introduced himself. He grew up in Springville and works for Sunroc,
24 on the building materials side. Each board member gave an update on themselves.
25

26 Mr. Hatch moved to approve the January 2018 minutes. Mr. Andrew seconded. All were in favor.
27

28 Mr. Stapley gave an update on our water system. The numbers on Bartholomew Spring last month were almost
29 4,000 gpm less than April 2017. We still have good wells and we're doing fine. Some of the other springs are
30 higher. Mr. Barker mentioned that Bartholomew Spring usually peaks in May or June and tapers off in July. He's
31 concerned that by August, the spring flows may be really low. Mr. Stapley said we had some good spring rains, so
32 we're not doing too bad. Mr. Crandall mentioned that the weather station at the Spanish Fork Power Plant measured
33 2.99 inches of rain in April.
34

35 Mr. Stapley talked about old galvanized water services on Center Street, east of Main Street. Center Street is
36 scheduled to be resurfaced, but we need to decide if we should replace old water services before that. Many of these
37 services are from 1935. We would have to do it in sections because of the amount of traffic on Center Street. The
38 sections are based on detour routes.
39

40 **New Business**

41 Mr. Barker gave an update on the 400 South Well #2. We found water at 500 feet and continued to about 563 feet,
42 where we got out of that water and the well stopped. They're done drilling. The screen and casing are in. They are
43 in the process of pulling the drill casing out and gravel packing as they come up. The casing is only up about 20 feet.
44 It's a slow process, but it's progressing. We're hoping to have similar flow as the first 400 S Well. We think we're
45 in the same aquifer, but the strata is just little bit different. We won't know what the water is like until we test pump.
46

47 Mr. Beck asked if the Evergreen Well is still being used to water the cemetery. Mr. Barker explained that it is not.
48 When it is on, the water goes right into the system. The water is high in iron. We inject a polyphosphate to help with
49 the color of the water. We usually only run that well when we're in a pinch.
50

51 Mr. Stapley explained what a drive shoe is. He showed a picture of the 36" casing at the well site and the camera that
52 was sent down, which showed perforation of the pipe. The pipe had metal fatigue and broke. Behind it you can see
53 gravel, which is a great sign. We sent down a fire hose with about 200 gpm water and it flushed right out into the
54 formation. Mr. Stapley is hoping to get 4,000 gpm out of this well. There's a concrete plug at the bottom of the pipe
55 now.
56

July 10, 2018
Approved

1 Nutrient Removal Variance Letter Update - Mr. Stapley updated the board on the wastewater effluent. The State has
2 put out a “science-based” regulation that goes into effect January 1, 2020. And all treatment plants that go into Utah
3 Lake have to meet a minimum of no more than 1 mg/liter phosphorous into the lake. We run about 2-3 mg/liter
4 currently. It will cost us about \$2.5 million dollars to get to that level, by chemical removal. Besides that \$2.5
5 million, it will cost us about half a million dollars per year more in chemical costs and haul away costs, because now
6 we’ll have to pull out both chemicals that have been put in, haul it away, and the phosphorous we’ll be removing.
7

8 Right now we’re doing benchmark testing on the plant itself, trying to find out how much and where the best
9 injection points for these chemicals are to get the phosphorous level down to 1. At the same time, we and other
10 communities, including Provo, have sent a variance letter to the State to have more time to decide what to do. We’re
11 not sure that the timeline will give us enough time to do what is needed, and it may not be the right technology to do
12 it. The timelines for state requirements don’t match the timelines that the new technology needs to prove itself. And,
13 the Utah Lake Study is a 3-year study. Mr. Stapley sits on the Utah Lake committee and the study might come back
14 and show that the lake won’t change, even if all the treatment plants are turned off. It could say that agriculture is the
15 problem. Erica Gaddis, from the State, just received Springville’s variance letter. Mr. Stapley needs to call her today
16 and answer any of her questions.
17

18 Mr. Stapley has asked Mr. Garrido to study the condition of the plant and give an update. The real problem is the
19 underground infrastructure under the plant, which is really old - old pipes, old concrete, old digesters. Do we rehab
20 our plant and leave it where it is? Do we join with Provo in their new plant? Do we build a new plant in Springville?
21

22 Cl. Jensen asked if there has been any movement toward the South Utah Valley Wastewater Plant. Mr. Stapley said
23 that it is actually going away, and they’re trying to sell the property. Springville should get about \$800,000 back if
24 they sell it. The timing was wrong for that one to work.
25

26 Mr. Stapley mentioned that we’re still in debt from the latest upgrade in 2010 – a 20-year \$8 million dollar bond.
27 The EPA has a timeline too, and they don’t care about the funding. The EPA is pushing a lot of this on the State. In
28 order for the State to keep getting federal funding, they need to keep the EPA happy.
29

30 Mr. Hotchkiss has a colleague that has been measuring phosphorous loading to Utah Lake. They are taking dry
31 deposition measurements from the atmosphere – what blows in and precipitation. It rains dirty here in Utah. Mr.
32 Stapley mentioned that Wood Miller and LaVere Merit are saying that the phosphorous deposition in the rainstorms
33 would keep the algae blooms going, even if they stalled the plants. The nation-wide science panel that is studying the
34 lake will have to determine the same thing. Mr. Stapley also mentioned that the algae bloom could get worse if the
35 lake were to be cleaned up. The turbidity keeps the bloom from going down further. It’s a high desert lake.
36

37 Mr. Stapley stated that we are having less snowpack, warmer temperatures, more wind, and more spring rains – all of
38 which affect the lake. And Utah Lake isn’t the only lake having problems in the west.
39

40 Highline Ditch Policy –

41 Mr. Stapley explained that we have a situation where a new property owner wants to use Highline ditch water on a
42 large parcel that has not been irrigated historically. Mr. Stapley showed on the map where the ditch runs down along
43 Canyon Road. There are approximately 63 users on the Highline ditch. The Highline ditch was put in when
44 Springville City decided they wanted the water in Spring Creek for culinary purposes. They traded water with the
45 users in the area that used to get water from the springs. The people that were using it never had a right; just shares.
46 Or, they may have had rights, but traded it out. The legal history is not clear. Mr. Stapley believes the water rights
47 were associated with Spring Creek. The City bought those out and then agreed to provide another way to get water to
48 the users. The way to get them more water was to get it from Hobble Creek, with a City water right. The people
49 using Highline ditch have no water right; they’re buying a commodity. Over time, with development, some people
50 have stopped using that commodity because they sold the property. But there were never any water transfers. The
51 use and need for Highline ditch has gone down over the years. But we have an issue with some very large land users.
52 Some are over 4 acres. We’re still selling water to these people, but the Highline water is way more valuable to the
53 City (known as “upper water” or “canyon water”) because of where it’s being taken out. Through the State, the City
54 can move that water to Bartholomew Spring and put it in the culinary system. Year round, we have to spill water out
55 of Bartholomew Spring because we don’t have the right to take that much.
56

1 We have someone that has bought a piece of property off Canyon Road and he wants to put in an orchard and use
2 highline ditch water to irrigate. This is a precedence issue. Mr. Stapley wants to get people off of Highline ditch.
3 He can use culinary water. Mr. Stapley gave this example as just an example. The principal is “what are we going to
4 do with Highline ditch water?” We have water attorneys looking into this to figure out the issue between rights and
5 shares. This property owner sent Mr. Stapley a warranty deed for the Fackrells that shows a certain amount of water.
6 But it looked like water shares, not rights.
7

8 Mr. Stapley stated that the City agreed to provide water, but it didn’t say at what cost or from where. He heard the
9 Highline users had a meeting with an attorney, and the attorney didn’t think they had any recourse.
10

11 Mr. Hatch asked what our cost is of the Highline water and the user’s price. Mr. Stapley said we estimate that it will
12 cost \$1.8 million to fix the ditch in order for it to continue to work (this does not include the annual share costs).
13 There’s a part of the ditch that the City needs. The rest of it is only for those 63 Highline users.
14

15 Mr. Beck stated that he is against giving water to this person. He thinks he will be wasting his time trying to grow an
16 orchard. Mr. Hatch explained if we give precedent to deliver water without actually knowing rights and legal issues,
17 then those rights seem to get muddied a little bit, just by the action. Mr. Andrew stated that the property owner’s
18 motives are irrelevant. We all know people get emotional about water. Mr. Stapley mentioned that we will have to
19 wait until the adjudication, but for now, the answer will be no.
20

21 Our next scheduled meeting is in July. In past years, we didn’t meet in July, but now our schedule is every other
22 month. Mr. Hotchkiss asked if we should still meet in July. Mr. Stapley suggested we wait and see what happens in
23 the next month to determine if there is a need to meet.
24

25 Mr. Clemons moved to adjourn. Mr. Hatch seconded. All were in favor.
26

27 *Adjourn* – This meeting adjourned at 7:38 a.m.
28
29