Colorado Pepartment of Health

Frank A Graver, July MD Executive Director

August 22, 1979

Mr. Pete Heye, P.E. HDR Engineers 310 Capital Life Center Denver, Colorado 80203

RE: Grand Junction, Mesa County WWTP, C080337

Dear Mr. Heye:

In response to your letter of August 9, 1979, we have the following clarifying comments.

- 1. We have not evaluated the proposed capacity of the River Road Interceptor. The 40 MGD capacity will have to be substantiated based on ultimate domestic flows only, not wet weather flow. At this time designing facilities for wet weather flow has not been justified in this situation. Our design review will document the adequacy of capacity and determine grant eligibility. The use of the River Road Interceptor to carry storm flows is for short terms only. The extent of flows to the combined sewer system will have to be quantified and a plan to deal with the situation developed. We see no basis to size the River Road Interceptor or the Persigo Wash plant for storm flows.
- 2. It is our position that bypasses of storm flows should occur at the existing plant site prior to the River Road Interceptor just after the combined severs. Some form of regulator could be employed initially to bypass over a fixed amount. Compromising the capacity of the Interceptor with wet weather flow should be short term only.
- 3. At the regional plant site the facility, if it is to have flow equalization, will have to be designed based on equalized peak of domestic dry weather flow. We have no substantiations for a bypass at this point, nor increasing plant capacity above anticipated dry weather flows.

Flow equalization has several benefits, as an interim treatment facility, it enhances operability and reliability and could minimize bypass until

AUG 2 7 1979

OFFICE OF GRANTS

Mr. Pete Heye Page 2 August 22, 1979

a permenant solution is presented. However, the design of this River Road Interceptor and the Persigo Wash plant with bypasses to handle 40 mgd is questionable for several reasons. Is it cost effective? Is it necessary? Is it totally grant eligible? We at this time do not have these answers. In further meetings with yourselves, Bob Shankland and others at EPA we expect to answer the planning questions relating to bypasses, and ammonia to enable Grand Junction to proceed expeditiously.

Very truly yours,

Jonathan W. Love, P.E. Domestic Waste Consultant Construction Grants Section Water Quality Control Division

JWL:ts

cc: Dick Bowman City of Grand Junction ,Bob Shankland, EPA √William Hormberg, EPA

PANORAMA IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO 81501 P.O. Box 10

August 22, 1979

poly

Mr. Jim Patterson Secretary Valley Wide Sewer Committee City Hall 5th & Rood Avenue Grand Junction, CO 81501

Dear Mr. Patterson,

Some time ago the Panorama Improvement District designated one of our directors to represent the district at all Valley Wide Sewer meetings. Your office was apprised of this at that time. In the future would you please direct correspondence regarding the Valley Wide Sewer to Mr. Rodney Preator, 611 Glacier Drive, Grand Junction, Colorado, 81503.

It would perhaps be appropriate at this time to remind you of our earlier correspondence stating that in no way does the Panorama Improvement District intend to be a part of the Valley Wide Sewer system. With considerable foresight, planning, and expense we have secured for our district a most effective and economical method of processing our sewage.

In your August 7 minutes you refer to Mt. Garfield, Fruita, and 201 areas. Your failure to mention Panorama and the absence of our representative causes me some concern.

Kindest regards,

Donn Conn Chairman

cc: Maxine Albers, Chairwoman of County Commissioners Jane Quimby, Mayor Rodney Preator, P.I.D. Director Greg Hoskin, P.I.D. Attorney