- COUNTY PLANNING

grand junction-mesa county 559 white ave. rm. 60 grand jct.,colo. 81501 (303) 244-1628

December 21, 1983

0

opment

Mesa County Commissioners Mesa County Grand Junction, Colorado RECEIVED Mosa County Actorney

At our December 15 workshop, the Planning staff presented the Planning Commission with the results of a County Sewer Policy Study. Departments associated with Public Works in the County participated in this project, and we would like to endorse their efforts in general to you. Based on the discussion at the workshop there are also particular suggestions and an organizational structure we think are important to enact in Mesa County. While they have been outlined in the Sewer Policy Study draft, it is evident that some actions should be accomplished sooner than others.

 A "Catchment Area" Engineering study is imperative for determining potential line capacity problems and areas to be served in the future. Such a study would assist in ensuring adequate service to current County residents and implementing the concept of "pay your own way".

Grand Junction is now contracting for engineering services which would in part produce such a study for infiltration of ground water. To ensure that the study is usable, we recommend the County be represented in this study by the City.

- 2. We understand that the County is under pressure to sanction Local Improvement Districts for sewer lines. There are obvious advantages associated with this financing "instrument". For the County to be responsible to its citizens, a method for administering these districts is necessary. Such a method would take care of problems with maintenance in the future, proper sizing, and monitoring of the line's capacity. We recommend that no L.I.D.'s be approved until the study mentioned in #1 above is completed.
- 3. While the idea of a County Sewer Board sounds good, we recommend that it not be formed until the study is completed.

Letter to Mesa County Commissioners December 21, 1983 Page 2

> We envision a Sewer Board to consist of laymen appointed by the Commisioners and delegated enough authority to deal with local improvement districts and other sewer related matters such as sanitation districts. An appeals process to the Commissioners with predetermined criteria is further recommended.

- 4. Crucial to the success of any policy for sewer is the acquisition of utilities staff (a professional engineer who would be responsible for sewer review, L.I.D. assessments, and related matters). This became very clear in the course of discussion. While the County's budget is severely constrained, the importance of such a staff person merits efforts to fund the position. We recommend that the sewer fund be used for the position this year. This could be in part reimbursed through Local Improvement District costs and by cost sharing fees if possible.
- 5.We see a need in the County to revise the existing City/County service agreement. There is apparently very little control on the part of the County for sewer services which are County owned and used by County residents. We can appreciate the City's role as a capable manager thus far in the Persigo system. However, issues have emerged in terms of financing future expansions to Persigo Plant and possible interceptor lines which would be best handled by the County in a more straight forward manner. We strongly recommend some directive from you for review on the part of the attorney and other relevant staff.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on these efforts. We hope these recommendations are considered favorably and as expeditiously as possible.

Sincerely, a farmer Tum Jim Young, Chairman

Mesa County Planning Commission

JY/sw

۰,