

*Pete Blank*

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

MEMORANDUM

Reply Requested  
Yes  No

Date  
Dec. 20, 1983

To: ~~(XXXX)~~ Jim Wysocki, City Manager From: ~~(XX)~~ Steve Johnson, Admin. Assistant  
Gerald Ashby, Acting City Manager  
Jim Patterson, Director of Public Works

RE: INDUSTRIAL PRETREATMENT ORDINANCE

The following information may be of some benefit during discussion and passage of the Industrial Pretreatment Ordinance that was distributed to Council members on this date.

I. Pretreatment in General

Pretreatment is basically the removal or reduction of contributions of hazardous or incompatible pollutants from industrial wastewater prior to discharge into the public sewer system.

The Industrial Pretreatment Program as described in a draft May 1983 report previously distributed to Council members sets up a permit system within the 201 service area for the regional wastewater treatment works. This method of control essentially parallels the state system that regulates the discharge of effluent from the Persigo plant into the Colorado River.

Specific discharge limitations will be created by subsequent resolution and permit activities for significant industrial users in order to protect the most vulnerable part of the treatment process.

The program will thereby avoid (1) "upset" of the biological sewage treatment process; (2) "interference" with water recycling and sludge utilization, and (3) "pass-through" of impermissible pollutants into the Colorado River, the atmosphere, or land receiving sludge applications.

In addition, pretreatment at the industrial source is frequently the most cost-effective treatment method, and encourages recycling of industrial materials and waste-products.

II. Program Development and Scope

Creation of the industrial pretreatment (IP) program has been a continuing requirement of previous state NPDES discharge permits, and EPA grants for the design and construction of the Persigo plant and associated interceptors.

The federal government is currently putting more budgetary and enforcement emphasis upon the creation of IP programs by grantees.

With the assistance of consulting engineers, the City conducted a second industrial user survey in August of 1982. Industries of potential concern were identified and sent questionnaires in December of 1982. Site visits were concurrently conducted. The goal was to identify industries that might be determined

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

MEMORANDUM

Reply Requested  
Yes  No

Date  
Dec. 20, 1983

To: (~~XXXX~~) Jim Wysocki  
Gerald Ashby  
Jim Patterson

From: (~~XX~~) Steve Johnson

Industrial Pretreatment Ordinance  
Page 2

to be "significant" in terms of impact on the treatment plant. Five have currently been identified: Clymer's, Colorado West Dairies, Corn Construction, Grand-Valley By Products, and The Daily Sentinel. The survey will be a continuing effort, however, and other industries "categorically" identified by the EPA may become subject to the permit program. These industries include automatic laundries, car washes, and electro-platers.

III. Legal Authority

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1977 and implementing federal regulations prescribe a detailed and complex system of control of industrial wastes. The approvable pretreatment program elements consist of (1) direct physical and legal control over industrial wastes by the Manager/Operator of the treatment plant; (2) procedures to monitor and limit those wastes; and (3) an administrative structure that is adequately financed and reports to the state annually.

Pretreatment as a concept is not new, and various pretreatment strategies currently exist in Chapter 25 of the City Code. In a June 9, 1983 submittal statement by Gerald Ashby and myself, the argument was made that we currently have "adequate authority" to require pretreatment. EPA refused to buy off, however, until we passed a detailed ordinance which was then in draft form. That ordinance was based in part on a model EPA ordinance, ordinances passed by Denver, Westminster, and Rapid City, South Dakota, and upon unique local conditions and requirements. The EPA did approve in concept the rest of the draft IP program.

The multi-jurisdictional aspect of the IP program is important because of the limited territorial reach of police powers of the City. We cannot entirely rely upon potential industrial waste permits as contracts to give us the necessary leverage over users, because they may not even apply for permits, and because health concerns require emergency-type powers.

The City must therefore operate outside the City as the agent for, and by authority of, each connector special district and the County. In order to accomplish this, the districts and County must first adopt or pass an IP program parallel to that set up in our new ordinance. They they must delegate some of the power to enforce that program to the City. In the past, this has been done with varying degrees of specificity, but it is apparent that program adoption and revisions (or addendums) to existing sewer service contracts are required to create a legally enforceable IP program over the entire Persigo Service Area.

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO  
MEMORANDUM

Reply Requested  
Yes  No

Date  
Dec. 20, 1983

To: ~~(XXXX)~~ Jim Wysocki  
Gerald Ashby  
Jim Patterson

From: ~~(XX)~~ Steve Johnson

Industrial Pretreatment Ordinance  
Page 3

The sewer special sanitation districts referred to include Central Grand Valley, Fruitvale, Valley West, Grand Junction West, Ridges, Railhead, and Orchard Mesa. Mesa County's cooperation will also be critical to this effort.

IV. Public Participation

The May 1983 report was disseminated to the Chamber of Commerce, Industrial Development, Inc., the seven districts, County planners and administrators, attorneys for the districts and the County, and the five potential significant industrial users (SIU's) identified above.

A public meeting was held on November 1, 1983 to explain the program. Notice was published in the Sentinel by display ad, and notice letters were sent to all media and the potential SIU's. Telephone calls were also made to the SIU's.

Attendance at the meeting was sparse. No significant comments on the program have been received.

V. Program Costs

The IP program is required to be funded by the industrial users/permittees. Initial estimates are that a five year permit application fee will cost a user \$100. Sampling by the City of the five users was initially identified at a cost of near \$5,200, but this will be doubled in order to adequately monitor and verify the existence of certain pollutants over time prior to permit activities. This cost will be divided among SIU's, who will also have to pay for private testing of equivalent effluent samples. Administrative costs of the program will amount to several thousand per year and will be applied to all industrial users, perhaps through higher service charges after a rate study is completed.

VI Deadline for Action

The current deadline for submittal to the EPA of a finalized ordinance is March 1, 1984. Connector agreement revisions/addendums with districts encompassing the five potential SIU's should be in progress, but need not be completed prior to the request for final program approval.