



City of Grand Junction, Colorado 81501
265 South Main St.

August 24, 1982

Mr. George R. White
Mesa County Board of Commissioners
P. O. Box 897
Grand Junction, CO 81502

Dear Mr. White:

If the "201" service area boundary for the Persigo Wastewater Treatment Plant is to be changed, there are certain steps or procedures that I recommend be followed.

The first thing that I would recommend is to identify the area or areas that should be considered for possible inclusion in the service area. These new areas should be identified after very careful consideration because if the "201" service area boundary is changed we will still have those properties just outside the area which would then like to be included. This could be a never ending process.

Once the possible new areas are identified, a study should be made of the areas to determine existing sewage facilities, existing land uses, and probable future land uses, zoning, and development densities. Future probable sewage flows from the area can then be calculated.

After the total needed additional capacity is determined, a design engineer should determine how this additional capacity can be added to the designed capacity of 25 MGD of the new plant. Major interceptors such as the River Road Interceptor should be evaluated to determine if they can handle the additional capacity or if new interceptors will have to be constructed. An estimated cost of all the required improvements should be made.

The cost of constructing the needed improvements described above should be compared to other alternate methods of sewage treatment such as septic tanks, package plants, or any possible combination of all alternatives.

A policy should also be proposed which would determine who would pay for the needed facilities and how it would be paid. For example, if it is determined that the Persigo plant should be enlarged, will the cost of the design and construction be passed on to all users of the system or to just those users in the areas that are making the enlargement necessary?

Mr. George R. White

August 24, 1982

Page 2

Once all of these decisions have been made, the "201" service area boundary should be amended with clear definition of how sewage from any part of the service area will be treated.

Potential developers can then evaluate the feasibility of their development under the requirements of the "201" facilities plan and proceed to construct their developments according to the plan.

The procedure described above is the same procedure that was used to determine the size and type of facilities that are now being built to serve the existing "201" service area. By using this process we are, to the best of our ability, building a facility that is not too small to handle projected sewage flows and yet is not built to excess capacity. We were careful to consider such factors as non-developable areas such as rivers and flood plains. These type areas were considered in the overall analysis to determine plant capacity. The present plan also identified certain areas (Clifton Sanitation Districts I and II) in which the sewage would be treated at separate facilities other than the Persigo plant.

We have received about \$20 million in EPA grants to construct the facilities identified in the "201" plan. Our agreement with EPA is to treat sewage from all developments (except the Clifton Districts) within the existing 201 boundary. If we negate our ability to treat all sewage generated within the "201" boundary because we used that capacity to treat sewage generated outside of the "201" boundary, it is my opinion that we will have violated our grant agreement with EPA.

The City recently was given notice of intent to ask the City to refund a \$50,000 grant to EPA because in the opinion of the auditors the City did not construct according to the EPA funded design. I hope we can avoid a situation in which we would be asked to refund our more recent much larger grants to construct facilities in accordance with the approved "201" plan because we deliberately chose to serve an area different from the approved plan.

Sincerely,



James E. Patterson, Jr.
Utilities Director

cc - Jim Wysocki
Gerald Ashby