

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

MEMORANDUM

Reply Requested  
Yes  No

Date  
June 21, 1983

To: (From:) Jim Patterson From: (To:) Steve Johnson *ST*  
Jim Wysocki  
Ralph Sterry

RE: CITY WATER RIGHTS ACTIVITY

At a meeting yesterday between Ralph, Cliff Jex, Jim Dufford, and myself, several matters were considered and proposed affecting City water rights.

I. Persigo Sewer Plant Effluent

The City has a conditional decree on Persigo effluent up to 40 c.f.s. which will come up for a diligence hearing on August 8, 1983, (docket #W-3681). This right involves augmentation use of the effluent in return for withdrawal at the 22 Road pump site which could then be used in an exchange with The Ranchman's Ditch. Current estimated maximum effluent flow (after plant expansion) will be 14-16 c.f.s., not including storm water bypass.

Since Jim Wysocki had asked me in April to check into this water right, and to file for an exchange if necessary, I thought it important to communicate the group's ideas on this plan.

I had raised the question of whether to now seek an exchange of effluent for ditch water at an earlier meeting of the same group. Jim Dufford stated then that the idea had been tried and failed, due to health concerns and economic infeasibility of lowering lateral headgates. It turns out, however, that in reviewing the history of the City's sewer discharge permit, the earlier exchange idea concerned EPA's "land treatment" of fairly raw sewage, in contrast to fully treated effluent. Also, the earlier efforts had just consisted of a discussion with the superintendent of the Grand Valley Ditch.

At yesterday's meeting, I therefore drew a distinction between the two proposals based on different types of water to be replaced into the ditches. I also alluded to the experience of several east slope cities with water exchanges, which might be researched to demonstrate how health and economic questions have been successfully addressed.

We all agreed at the meeting that a new effort be made to explore reuse of effluent. Prior to any direct contact with the ditch company, it was agreed to carefully chart out the proposal, study its economic feasibility, research the health aspects, and study the east slope experience.

Several different exchange possibilities will be explored, including

- (1) Withdrawal at the Clifton Treatment Plant of Grand Valley Water, with effluent exchange at Persigo into the Ranchman's Ditch;
- (2) Withdrawal at Clifton, with exchange of river water from the 22 Road pump site into Ranchman's, augmented by Persigo effluent;

CITY WATER RIGHTS ACTIVITY

June 21, 1983

Page 2

- (3) Direct exchange of G.V. water by transfer of place of use of G.V. shares to the Clifton Plant, with a trade for the shares by offering Persigo effluent directly to farmers in the Persigo area via direct pipeline and avoiding involvement of the Ranchman's Ditch.

While these possibilities are being explored, the consensus position is to adopt Cliff Jex's suggestion: merely maintain diligence on the 22 Road Pump Site, and not to attempt to decree an exchange/augmentation program until 1984, when preliminary studies/negotiations have been completed.

II. Westside Sewer Plant Effluent

ok  
A diligence hearing on Grand Junction Pump and Diversion Station No. 1 is scheduled for August 1983 in order to maintain this right. The question is whether to abandon it, as Jex and Dufford suggest. The right is for 9 c.f.s., and would have to be transferred to Persigo when Westside is abandoned next spring. There may be no point in such a proceeding, since the right referred to above (40 c.f.s.) is in excess of potential effluent flows, and is sufficient to fill the Ranchmans to capacity. In other words, a transfer won't result in a 49 c.f.s. consolidated right, since we'll end up with less than 40 c.f.s. at Persigo in all probability.

III. Redlands Tailrace Pump Station

?  
This conditional right also comes up for diligence hearings in August '83. Both Jex and Dufford suggest letting it be abandoned, because (1) it lacked initial justification; and (2) there is no solid "proof" of development, which should show expenditures of \$4-6,000. (We can show near \$1500 now.) I would like to look at this more closely with Ralph.

IV. Water Committee Proposal

WMS-CKL  
Jim Dufford suggested that several Council members be appointed to a Water Committee so that these proposals/ decisions could be refined and understood prior to formal hearing. This idea is close to Mr. Phipps' suggestion to Jim Patterson that Advisory Committees on Water, Streets and Sewer be formed. They would consist, however, of City residents, and take some time pressures off Council members.

The need for more and better communication and guidance is clear; an appropriate mechanism should be selected.

V. Next Meeting

We will meet at Cliff Jex's office on July 5, 9:00 A.M. to discuss final strategy on the diligence hearings. We will also hear a presentation by Jex on the history of our relationship with Ute, and on a plan to acquire more shares of Grand Mesa Reservoir.