



BOARD OF  
**Mesa County**  
**Commissioners**

P. O. Box 897  
Grand Junction, Colorado 81502

George R. White  
District No. 1  
244-1605

Dick Pond  
District No. 2  
244-1604

Maxine Albers  
District No. 3  
244-1606

Gordon Tiffany  
County Administrator  
244-1603

MEMORANDUM

TO : JIM PATTERSON, GRAND JUNCTION PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR  
FROM: MARK ECKERT, ASSISTANT COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR  
DATE: JANUARY 30, 1984  
SUBJ: COMMENTS ON PERSIGO 201 PLAN UPDATE, THE SEWER RATE  
AND GRAND JUNCTION INFILTRATION STUDIES

During December of 1983, the Board of County Commissioners directed County staff to become involved in the review of the 201 Update and Sewer Rate Studies. This direction was based upon the Board's involvement in producing an update of the county land use code and the findings of the Public Works Group which investigated county sewer problems. I was directed to coordinate county staff input. The following is a synopsis of staff comments on each of the studies.

A. 201 Plan Update

- 1) the reports should include a methodology for amending the 201 boundary either through expansion or contraction;
- 2) various growth scenarios should be utilized -e.g.- high, low, medium - population and industrial compositions;
- 3) investigation of the inclusion of the Clifton area sanitation districts into the 201 area needs to be evaluated;
- 4) investigation of the feasibility of preserving the existing City of Grand Junction Sewer Plant for future use instead expanding the intake/treatment capabilities of the Persigo Plant;
- 5) investigation of any pending Colorado state legislation which might impact land use or sewer service delivery in the County is suggested.

B. Sewer and Water Rate Study

- 1) the report should include various population/ industrial/commercial growth scenarios with special emphasis on the high and low cases and methodology should be consistent with that used in the 201 Update;
- 2) the impacts of "annexing" portions of the Ute Water system and the varying rate of growth between City and Ute systems should be investigated for possible affect on usage patterns within the sewer system;
- 3) cost estimates and projections should take into account Persigo Plant expansion costs (versus refurbish-

ment of the existing City sewer plant), plant and line maintenance costs and existing bonded indebtedness;

4) revenue estimates and projections should include sewer tap fees, property tax fees, sales tax and other types of special assessments.

C. Nichol's Infiltration and Inflow Study

1) determination of whether all users of the Persigo facility or those within specific areas - e.g. - Central Grand Valley Sanitation District - should be charged for separation of sewer and storm flow drainage.

2) utility level of this "I and I" study for County use as a guide for implementing a number of LID's within the 201 area.

This abbreviated list of suggestions/questions are County staff's main concerns on these critical studies. Of particular and immediate concern is the role of the Nichol's study. In order to clarify our concerns or any questions or comments you may have on these concerns, I would suggest that County staff and City representatives meet during the week of January 30th. County staff will include Bennett Boeschstein, Ken Glover, Steve Johnson and myself. Future meetings will probably need to involve City and County finance personnel. Your assistance and cooperation in this matter is appreciated.

xc: Bennett Boeschstein, Planning  
Bob Carman, Engineering  
Ken Glover, PRO  
Steve Johnson, Legal  
Jack Morgan, Finance  
Gordon Tiffany, Administrator