

G.R.S. 30-2-901 et. seq.

No vote

Revenue Bonds

To: Lyle

From: Mark

Re: Countywide Sewer District

Lyle,
This rambles a bit
and is not my definitive
thought on the subject.
Will be glad to discuss
at any time.
Mark

Comments:

1) No matter which method is used there are some difficult questions that focus on geography, previous contract commitments and system operation.

a) geography - Mesa is an "east/west" county demographically whose terrain would require multiple treatment plants and investments in conveyance (pump stations, lines) that could be prohibitive politically and staggering economically. Clifton San and Orchard Mesa San provide service to the east of Grand Junction, but there are questions concerning capacity, long-range treatment plans (only ponds are presently used) and their desire to expand. These two districts are providing the "choice" - i.e. - higher density areas - presently and the presence of a county-wide system that did not (could not?) serve less densely populated areas, ^{on the pumping of these systems} would raise questions of equity in the public mind.

b) previous contracts - to the West of Grand Junction we have several package plants, a burgeoning demand for special districts and the soon to be completed Persigo Wash Plant. This is the high growth portion of the Valley presently. The new plant's fiscal success and operational efficiency is based upon absorbing as much of existing and planned development as possible. [It should be noted that the new plant is one whose processes are geared to residential wastes with little capability for dealing with heavy industrialization should this be attracted to the Valley.] As you know, the County is legally involved here.

A "countywide district" could provide a valuable service in financing additional interceptors. (Several are planned but I'd need to check if they're part of the present financing)

The presence of such interceptors could make accessible larger areas and limit, if not deny, future special use district development. This generates a couple of questions. First, the new Persigo Plant's max capacity may be reached "sooner". Would (should) the new district undertake expansion of the Persigo Plant or build a new one? Either action could raise political problems of the type mentioned in a) above. Second, is the operation of the system. (1) operation of system - the County has no administrative or operational personnel for such a sewer, the fact, which necessitated the current City/County Sewer Agreement. The present system is only nominally responsive to the MCC. The idea of using the MPC as an oversight board for a mayor, technical function like this is dangerous under a minimum a professional engineer/public works function is established in a lead role. Given the present financial situation concerning personnel, we might be better off examining the possibility of establishing the front-end financing mechanism and establishing stipulations for our soon to be districts that would turn them over to the County within a given amount of time - eg - time of completion. This would leave the engineering in the private sector although I'm sure we can use City forces for this under an addendum to the existing agreement so that the system's continuity is maintained.

Note - the Commissioners have never denied a special district to my knowledge nor placed any stipulations on our