

MINUTES

VALLEY WIDE SEWER COMMITTEE MEETING

May 11, 1977

8:00 P.M.

County Commissioners Meeting Room

Chairman Howard Roland called the meeting to order and introduced new Committee Member, Bill O'Dwyer, newly elected City Councilman replacing Bob Van Houten.

The Chairman then introduced representatives from H.D.R. Engineers who were present to make a presentation to the Committee on the new sewage treatment plant and related interceptors. Bill Bredar stated that he was there to present some refined preliminary estimates which had been presented to the City Staff and to the E.P.A. at prior meetings. He then passed out copies of the revised cost estimates to the members present. He pointed out that the time factor affects the cost estimates and that the estimates that he passed out represented cost at time of construction. H.D.R. had taken the January, 1977, cost estimates and escalated them at 8% per year to January, 1978, plus they added a 15% contingency factor to get the estimated cost at the time of the bid.

Karl Henrickson then presented the different alternatives that have been studied. He said that the State Health Department and E.P.A. both feel that nitrification and dechlorination would be necessary in this project. Duane Jensen read a letter from the State Health Department confirming those feelings. It is the opinion of H.D.R. that alternate No. 6 is the most feasible at this time. Bob Jennings pointed out that the present grant for modifications to the existing sewage treatment plant does not include provision for nitrification.

Suzie Younge asked if land was the major problem with going to land application. It was answered that land is a major factor. She then asked why we could not go to year around irrigation in the land application process.

Bob Jennings asked that if we went to alternate No. 6, would we still modify the existing treatment plant. Jensen stated that we would not. John Ballaugh of the Planning Department asked if there was a salvage value to the existing plant. Karl answered that this

facility would have a reuse value. It was pointed out that the estimated unit costs were based on the plant operating at full capacity.

The estimated cost of the related interceptor sewer lines was also presented.

It was asked what type of odor control would be installed at the new plant. Karl pointed out that the treatment process was different and produced less odor. Also there would be other odor control devices such as gas collectors, chemical treatment, and possible covers on certain units. It was pointed out that the annual operation and maintenance cost, which are local costs, made the big difference in the recommendation of alternate No. 6.

Bob Jennings asked if nitrification was really necessary for normal fish life other than the endangered species and questioned if nitrification was necessary at all. Bill Bredar responded that he thought that it was necessary.

Mr. O'Dwyer asked if there would be any pumps necessary on the River Road Interceptor. It was pointed out that this was a gravity line with no pumps needed.

Mr. Ed Carpenter, representing Plateau Engineering in association with Western Engineering, asked if he could make additional comments regarding land application. Mr. Carpenter said that he thought land application was a viable alternative and presented information to support that. He presented a plan that gave an alternative of having one treatment facility or two. The first alternate would pick up the sewage flow at the existing plant and divert it north on 25 Road; the second alternative would pick up sewage at 22 Road and divert it north to a treatment facility site. Carpenter pointed out that he felt that the land could be acquired at about \$50 per acre and the sewage could be pumped up to aerated holding ponds above the Highline Canal from which point it could be gravity fed to land application.

H.D.R. was asked if they would comment on the presentation by Ed Carpenter. Karl Henrickson said that he would make a few comments, but these were without the benefit of having studied Carpenter's proposal in detail. Karl pointed out that Carpenter's plan appeared to have a reservoir capacity of 3,000 acre feet and perhaps it should be 75,000 acre feet. He pointed out that the pump station would probably

need to be sized to meet the flow capacity demand and that there would need to be an alternate power source. The transmission lines perhaps should be designed a little larger to meet future demands. Power costs were not included and would probably be a significant cost. It is possible that an additional pump station would be needed both to pump sewage in and out of the lagoons. There would also be monitoring equipment needed. Karl pointed out that a user of the effluent would have to be found before E.P.A. would allow the land use system to be built. He pointed out that the cost estimate of the pressure lines seemed to be a little low. He asked if salinity would be a problem and asked if E.P.A. would permit the land application in that area. He also asked if water rights would be affected.

Suzie Younge asked if E.P.A. preferred land application. Bredar answered that they required that land application be considered, but that they did not prefer any one type of treatment over another.

Carpenter responded to Karl's comments. He stated that he had checked into the water rights; that additional reservoirs were planned; and that his estimates were based on a 7 month irrigating season.

General discussion followed concerning Carpenter's presentation. Bob Jennings said that he would not like to make any quick judgment on the matter. Jim Patterson pointed out that he did not feel that it was feasible to pursue Carpenter's presentation any further. Suzie Younge stated that she thought that we should try to find any way possible to use land application. She said that the confirmed customer was a good point, but that she would like to pursue the land application process further. Duane Jensen pointed out that H.D.R. had investigated land application, and that they did not feel it was feasible. Conni McDonough pointed out that there would be additional community cost involved in generating a new development site as proposed under Carpenter's plan. These community costs include schools, busing, roads, etc. Ballaugh pointed out that Carpenter's projections were at today's costs, and that they would have to be increased to give the true cost at time of construction. Ed carpenter said that he would like to see the Committee devote an additional 30 days to the land application study which would give him an opportunity to respond to the questions raised at this meeting. Howard Roland pointed out that maybe there

was a possibility that a canal could be constructed to take sewage downstream towards Mack.

Jim Patterson pointed out that the Valley Wide Sewer Committee had hired H.D.R. to do this study and questioned why the Committee would now endorse another engineering firm that was considered at the time H.D.R. was hired to do additional studies. It was suggested that perhaps H.D.R. could look at Carpenter's proposal and respond to it as well as the additional work that Carpenter would do.

Bob Jennings moved that we proceed with alternate No. 6 with the provision that the Committee meet again in 30 days to hear an additional report from Ed Carpenter. Ted Ford seconded the motion. Jim Patterson asked exactly what did Jennings mean by moving ahead- did this mean that we could proceed to present alternate No. 6 to the Water Quality Control Commission? It was pointed out that we could not do that at this time. The motion was approved with 6 members voting yes and 3 voting no.

The next meeting has been scheduled for June 16.

JAMES R. BIBER

Real Estate Appraiser - Consultant

SUITE 714
VALLEY FEDERAL PLAZA
GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO 81501
303 - 245-0697



May 11, 1977

Mr. Jim Patterson
City Engineering Dept.
City of Grand Junction
250 North 5th Street
Grand Junction, CO 81501

RE: Elton Crow Property

Dear Mr. Patterson:

Pursuant to your request, I have made a preliminary study of land values in the vicinity of the Elton Crow property west of Grand Junction. The property is currently listed for sale for \$112,000.00, and the property contains approximately 51.85 acres, more or less. Along with the land is a set of improvements of questionable value, if any, and 77 shares of Grand Valley Water which is of value.

It is my opinion the asking price for the property is within reason, and that a formal appraisal of the property would support a value at or near the asking price of \$112,000.00 based on 51.85 acres.

If you have any questions or are in need of more information, please call me.

Respectfully submitted,

James R. Biber, C.R.A.

JRB:dk

TO: City Council
FROM: James E. Wysocki, City Manager
DATE: May 11, 1977

J. E. W.

In reviewing our alternates in discussion of location of the sewer plant with the engineers, two locations were chosen. The most desirable of the alternatives it was noted just in the past week became available for purchase. Attached please find a copy of a preliminary study from Mr. James R. Biber, appraiser. I instructed Mr. Patterson to contact the realty company to find out the particulars on this piece of ground. The owner has agreed to take an option until August of this year for \$5,000 which would give us the time necessary to determine finally how the entire valley-wide program will be formed.

I would strongly recommend, as does Mr. Patterson, that we exercise an option on this particular parcel as it is more desirable from an esthetic standpoint and the price as indicated by the appraiser is within reason. We will discuss this before too long, perhaps after tonight's discussion.

JW:jc