

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

MEMORANDUM

Reply Requested

Yes  No

Date

March 17, 1983

To: ~~(XXXX)~~ Jim Wysocki and  
Curt Wiedeman

From: ~~(XX)~~ Jim Patterson



I attended a public hearing on March 15 before the State Water Quality Control Commission regarding the Construction Grant Project Priority List for Federal Funds FY-83. The list as prepared and proposed by the Water Quality Division staff listed Grand Junction as first priority for continued EPA funding of the new sewer plant with an additional \$1.5 million, which will bring the eligible portion of our project to full 75% funding. Seven of the nine commission members were present; however, one member (Tad Foster - Colorado Springs) abstained from discussion and voting.

Representatives from Colorado Springs gave support to the list as presented (they are priority #2) and ask that there be no delay in approval of the list.

Brighton representatives supported the list (priority #5) but asked for five additional priority points for innovative treatment process (vacuum assisted drying beds). The five additional points would not change their priority position but would make them eligible for additional funding.

Pueblo submitted a statement that they should be in the project hold over category (first four priorities).

Broomfield also pleaded (for two hours) that they should be in the hold over category as a continuation of the Upper Big Dry Creek plan of which Westminster has built their portion of the plan. I think this would be similar to Clifton claiming that upgrading their lagoons is a continuation of our project. Might be! This would make Broomfield priority #4.

The Colorado Homebuilders Association had asked to be a party to the hearing but did not present any testimony.

Representatives from Longmont asked to be given enough points to make them priority #6 on the basis that they too were a hold over project. They are seeking \$12 million to build a project which they project will be needed in 1995 and which is not yet designed.

At no time did it appear that Grand Junction's #1 priority was being challenged or put in jeopardy.

After hearing all the evidence (six hours) the commission voted to adopt the list as presented plus awarding Brighton five additional priority points. With that action Grand Junction is authorized to receive the additional \$1.5 million. We had submitted our application several weeks ago. We should receive a grant ammendment in May.