

**TRANSMITTAL
LETTER**



HENNINGSON, DURHAM & RICHARDSON

ENGINEERING • ARCHITECTURE • PLANNING • SYSTEMS • ECONOMICS

310 CAPITOL LIFE BLDG. DENVER, COLO. 80203 (303) 861-1300

PROJECT: GRAND JUNCTION / MESA COUNTY
(name, address)

PROJECT NO: 73-42-10

DATE: 1/31/78

TO:

If enclosures are not as noted, please inform us immediately.

ATTN: DUANE JENSEN, CITY ENGINEER

If checked below, please:

- Acknowledge receipt of enclosures.
- Return enclosures to us.

WE TRANSMIT:

- herewith under separate cover via _____
- in accordance with your request _____

FOR YOUR:

- approval distribution to parties information
- review & comment record
- use _____

THE FOLLOWING:

- Drawings Shop Drawing Prints Samples
- Specifications Shop Drawing Reproducibles Product Literature
- Change Order REPORTS

COPIES	DATE	REV. NO.	DESCRIPTION	ACTION CODE
5	12/21 & 22/77		SUPPLEMENT NO. 2 TO PREDESIGN REPORT RELATING TO SEASONAL AMMONIA NITROGEN REQUIREMENTS SUMMARY OF COST EVALUATIONS	
5			COMPARISON OF MAJOR CONSIDERATIONS	

ACTION CODE A. Action indicated on item transmitted B. No action required C. For signature and return to this office D. For signature and forwarding as noted below under REMARKS E. See REMARKS below

REMARKS _____

COPIES TO:

H.D.R.
John P. Horst
BY:

COMPARISON OF MAJOR CONSIDERATIONS

	<u>Me chanical Plant - Alternative V</u>	<u>Land Treatment Plans</u>
Cost-Effective	<u>Yes</u> - more cost effective than land treatment	<u>No</u> - less cost effective than mechanical treatment
Desired by City/County	<u>Yes</u> - approved by: Valley-Wide Sewer Com. Mesa Cty. Plan. Com. Mesa Cty. Comm'rs. Grant Junct. City Council	<u>No</u> - not approved by City/ County officials
Promotes Salinity Control	<u>Yes</u> - no adverse impacts	<u>No</u> - contributes saline return flows to Colorado River
Eliminates Water Rights Problems	<u>Yes</u> - discharge to Colorado River	<u>No</u> - diversion to irrigated lands served by irrigation canal companies
Easiest to Implement	<u>Yes</u> - no adverse impacts	<u>No</u> - private land acquisition for long term farming operation
Lower Manpower Requirements	<u>Yes</u> - minimum plant staff required	<u>No</u> - additional laborers during irrigation season
Avoids Further Environmental Studies	<u>Yes</u> - no studies required	<u>No</u> - EPA requires additional studies that would delay program
Land Under Option	<u>Yes</u> - City acquired plant site	<u>No</u> - land is not acquired
Flexibility for Future Reuse	<u>Yes</u> - effluent \geq 30/30 capable for future reuse	<u>No</u> - reuse of aerated lagoon effluent $<$ 30/30 not permitted by law
Easiest for Sludge Treatment	<u>No</u> - sludge treatment required	<u>Yes</u> - sludge disposed of with effluent
Requires Small Land Areas	<u>Yes</u> - 50 acres	<u>No</u> - 500 to 3,300 acres
Easiest for Expansion	<u>Yes</u> - on original plant site	<u>No</u> - large land acquisitions required in the future
Increases Productivity of Grand Valley	<u>No</u> - not initially; possible with re-use	<u>Yes</u> - high management level system can increase production
Meets Scheduled Treatment Needs	<u>Yes</u> - new plant start-up by 1981	<u>No</u> - implementation could take several years