



City of Grand Junction, Colorado 81501

250 North Fifth St.,  
244-1557

March 14, 1983

Mr. William H. Hormberg, P.E.  
Director, Office of Grants  
Water Division  
U.S. EPA Region VIII  
1860 Lincoln Street  
Denver, CO 80203

Dear Mr. Hormberg:

In response to your recent telephone request to provide documentation as to the relative dates of 1) the design work for modifications to the City of Grand Junction's existing (~~now interim~~) Wastewater Treatment Plant, and 2) the decision not to construct the modifications and to change the Section 201 facilities plan, I enclose the following exhibits:

1. ~~Step III Grant Application for Modification to Existing WPCP~~ - cover letter from NHPQ, consulting engineers, enclosing completed plans and specifications for modifications, dated April 1, 1977. Design work necessarily preceded application date.
2. Minutes of Valley-Wide Sewer Committee Meeting, dated May 11, 1977. Due to new or additional treatment requirements, Committee recommends that alternative to modification of existing plant be pursued.
3. Predesign Report Supplement, dated Nov. 18, 1978, evaluating alternative treatment methods, utilizing costs for previously designed modifications to existing plant.
4. Request to Proceed with Design of New Treatment Plant, dated Dec. 1, 1977, to WQCC, assuming Phase 1 land treatment analysis is approved.

5. CDH letter to Grand Junction requiring further treatment analysis, dated Dec. 9, 1977, which refers to City's "desire to abandon the existing plant and go with one regional facility".
6. Valley Wide Sewer Committee Meeting Minutes of Jan. 24, 1978, outlining final steps in approval of revised 201 facilities plan.
7. Letter from EPA to Grand Junction of Dec. 27, 1978 regarding payment request for plans and specifications of existing plant modifications.
8. Letter from CDH to EPA of Jan. 5, 1979 submitting plans and specifications for above payment request.
9. Letter to EPA Inspector General from City dated March 23, 1982 regarding draft audit report.
10. Chronology of Events.

These documents indicate that modification design work for the existing plant was completed prior to the 201 facilities plan revision resulting in the decision not to implement the modifications as designed. While the documents submitted do not depict the actual decision dates, except by reference, the relationship of these time frames is sufficient to rule out the possibility that the modification design work post-dated the decision to abandon the existing plant.

Please let me know if there is any further information that you require in this regard.

Very truly yours,

James E. Patterson, Jr.  
Utility Director

JEP/rs