

August 16, 1991

To: City Council
City Services Committee

From: Greg Trainor Utility Manager

Re: MINUTES
City Services Committee
August 13, 1991
2:30 PM to 5:10 PM
Conference Room A

Present: Shepherd, Nelson, Baughman, Bennett Achen, Shanks, Wilson, Lappi, Trainor, Cheney,
Kole, Hazelhurst, Bennett B, Starr

Bud Bradbury, Purdy Mesa Livestock Water Company (PMLWC)

1. The first issue discussed was the request of the PMLWC for five acres of City property for their treatment plant. The City Council met with representatives of the Company on August 5, 1991 at the Council's workshop. Staff prepared a draft letter to the Company outlining information that the Company would need to submit before the City could finalize an agreement on a site. At issue is the location, size, future use of the City's property, and compensation to the City for a lease. Shepherd indicated that there were two missions: One, the delivery of raw water to the Company and, two, that the City's interests were not diminished by this transaction. Staff emphasized that no real answer could be given until they select an engineer who can discuss the technical options. Staff indicated that the draft letter will be delivered to the Company, that we would work with their engineer in resolving the issues, and return to the entire Council with a recommendation. Compensation was discussed. The Committee told Mr. Bradbury that they would be willing to donate, for \$1, land sufficient for their needs. They directed Mr. Bradbury to have the Company's engineer meet with the City utility department to determine an appropriate site.

2. With the pending retirement of water counsel Jim Dufford, the Committee discussed the process which the City should undertake to evaluate future water counsel. There have been many attorneys that have indicated a desire to undertake the City's representation in this special area, including Linda White of Jim Dufford's staff. Dan Wilson suggested the following process:

1. Staff develop, with Council input, an RFP and a citizen participation plan for this effort.

2. Interested legal counsel will respond to the RFP and meet with a panel of individuals that will interview each candidate. This panel could be made up of an outside, western slope water attorney; a community leader such as a past council member, and a third person.

3. This panel would recommend 2 names to the City manager, City attorney, and City utility manager who, as a group, would make a recommendation of one person to the City Council for their ratification.

The Committee agreed to proceed with this recommendation. They asked to review the RFP.

3. Utility staff discussed recent meetings with the Panorama Sewer District (Redlands) and the Valley Vista Subdivision (32 Road on Orchard Mesa)-both of which are on independent sewer systems and lagoons. The Panorama system indicated that they would like to come onto the 201 system and asked if the City would reduce the \$750.00 per household plant investment fee. Utility department response was that the PIF is charged to all individuals coming onto the system. Panorama indicated that it would make a request to the City

Council/County Commission. Their system is adjacent to the Tiara Rado Interceptor and within the 201 sewer service boundary.

Valley Vista is under a compliance schedule with the State Health Department to come up with a solution to its leaking lagoons. It is not close to any collection system nor is it within the 201 sewer service system. Discussion commenced concerning their efforts to do engineering studies, complete annexation to the OM Sanitation District, and financing a major sewer extension to the subdivision.

There are many problems associated with this situation:

1. Approval by the County of a major subdivision miles from sewer services.
2. The expense of a major sewer interceptor which will have to be borne by the residents.
3. After the construction of the Appleton sewer, the County revised their procedures for the creation of improvement districts for financing improvements. This process is cumbersome, time consuming, and very expensive. No improvement districts have ever made it through revised process.
4. The subdivision is outside of the 201 sewer service area and, as such, can not come into the sewer system without a change in the 201 boundary. Such a change would have to be a joint effort of the City and the County.
5. Orchard Mesa Sanitation District will not allow Valley Vista sewage to flow through any of their lines without Valley Vista becoming part of the OM District. This would result in an enlargement of the OM District, which the City should not support since it is contrary to the goal of reducing duplicative levels of government in the Valley.
6. Construction of a major interceptor will result in urban development along the interceptor. This type of development is contrary to Mesa County's land use plans for Orchard Mesa which does not envision development on the agricultural lands on OM.
7. Mesa County's zoning has not changed within the 201 boundary service area. Inclusion of Valley Vista into the 201 and subsequent dense urban development which will occur along the interceptor will have to result in the reduction of density in other areas within the existing 201 boundary.

During discussion there were several policy alternatives that the Committee centered on:

1. There should be no change in the 201 boundary until Mesa County changes its position on approval of dense development in the rural fringe far from urban services.
2. There should be no actions that result in the enlargement of the OM Sanitation District.
3. There should be no action taken that will result in development on Orchard Mesa contrary to Mesa County's plan for OM.
4. There should be "balance sheet" developed for the 201 service area that would trigger a downzoning for portions of the 201 if Mesa County approves zoning of a higher density than that which was in place at the time of the creation of the 201 service area boundary.

(GT's note: This is where the Committee ended its discussion on this topic. significant effort will have to be taken to define the problem and to develop agreement on a course of action.)

4. Public Works Director Jim Shanks reviewed for the Committee his memorandum of July 31, 1991 concerning Sewer System Capital expenditures for the period 1985 to 1991. A copy of this report is attached. Its significance is that "Collection System Capital" expenses have equaled "Collection System Capital"

revenues paid for by those users contracting for collection system work. "Backbone System Capital" revenues, which are paid for by all users of the sewer system, have exceeded "Backbone System Capital" expenses for the period 1985-1991. Capital reserve accounts have now been created to account for collection system capital revenues and expenses as well as for backbone capital revenues and expenses.

5. Finally, Sanitation Superintendent Darren Starr discussed issues of the landfill, the County's development of "tipping fees" for landfill environmental compliance, and the City's interdependence with the County on how fees are developed-in short, the City is affected by the County's development of fees and by the liability at the landfill yet the City has no current role in the management of the landfill. Staff is preparing a "discussion paper" on this issue.