

MESA COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

P. O. Box 3626

Grand Junction, CO 81502

(303) 244-1612

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mark Eckert, Assistant Administrator
FROM: Stephen B. Johnson, Assistant County Attorney
SUBJECT: Sewer Issues Paper Meeting
DATE: January 27, 1984

SMACKZ

At the Thursday, January 26, 1984 Sewer Issues Paper Meeting attended by yourself, the County Commissioners and other interested parties, you asked me to summarize in writing the request that I made with regard to the on-going studies of the City/County Sewer System. The City is about to release its request for proposals for the 201 Facilities Update for the Persigo Service Area. George White wondered what would happen to the Old City Sewer Plant now that it is being bypassed and essentially abandoned for sewer use by the City. Jim Patterson indicated that it may become part of the City Services Facility. Mr. White wondered whether it would not be wise to mothball the facility for future use. Mr. Patterson indicated that it was probably not cost effective to do that. I suggested to Mr. Patterson that as part of the 201 Update, the City require its consultant to undertake an economic analysis of the cost benefits of preservation and future use of the City Sewer Plant as part of the City/County joint sewer system, as opposed to further expansion beyond the design capacity of the Persigo Plant. While in all likelihood Mr. Patterson is correct about the feasibility of such future use of the City Sewer Plant, he agreed it would be worthwhile and he would undertake to have the consultant examine this issue.

Mr. Patterson also discussed the Nichol's Sewer System Evaluation. This evaluation was undertaken as part of an effort to reduce Infiltration and Inflow (I&I) as both a grant and discharge permanent requirement. Successful reduction of I&I would essentially equate with increased capacity in the collections system and at the treatment level of the wastewater works. Practically, that goal will be most easily accomplished by separation of the storm and sanitary sewers where they are combined, primarily in sections of the original areas of Grand Junction, as well as in areas within Fruitvale and Central Grand Valley Sanitation Districts. At that time I indicated that there are system wide benefits to such an analysis, and indeed the plant manager-operator is required to study and evaluate and propose ways to

Mark Eckert
January 27, 1984
Page 2

separate the storm and sanitary sewers. However, where the costs are more discrete, where the benefits may accrue to a single District or entity more than to other members of the area encompassed by the Persigo Service area, it may be desirable to analyze whether the sewer separation cost should be borne by all users or some users. I requested Mr. Patterson to require the consultant in the upcoming water and sewer charge rate study to attempt to project the costs that may be involved in the storm sewer separation program, incorporate those costs in any future rate making considerations, and to identify as an issue whether all or portions of the users of the joint sewer system should pay for that separation. Mr. Patterson also agreed that this would be done.

Finally, the issue arose as to whether the County should wait to commence hiring of additional staff and appointment of utility board members until the Nichol's Sewer System Analysis is completed. Mr. Patterson indicated that this study would "to some extent" provide useful information for future creation of local improvement districts for sewer systems. Since one of the primary proposals the Commissioners were considering was to wait until such study was completed before undertaking further action on LIDs, I suggested that Mr. Patterson attempt to help define exactly in what manner the information to be generated could assist the County. In short, I asked for his recommendation and summary of the information that is required to create Sewer Improvement Districts and to correlate that information with that to be generated by the Nichol's Study. Mr. Patterson's basic recommendation was that if the County intends to create these LIDs the Nichol's Sewer System Analysis will provide some useful information in defining sub-basins, and in giving elevations and capacities of lines, but it would not assist in determining choices of location of sublaterals, defining their size or length, and applying the sub-basin or topographical features of the study to existing subdivisions that would best be served by the LIDs. Mr. Patterson agreed to supply this information in writing.

sj/jb

cc: Maurice Lyle Dechant, Mesa County Attorney
Bennett Boeschstein, Planning Department

MESA COUNTY WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITIES (City-County Data Book)

	Total Taps Sold Thru 12/82	Average Daily Flow	Peak Daily Flow	Average Per Capita Flow	Peak Per Capita Flow	System Capacity	Monthly Service Charge			Tap Fees		
							Single Family	Multi-Family	Commercial	Single Family	Multi-Family	Commercial
Central Grand Valley Sanitation District	3,461	519,000 gpd	950,000 gpd	54 gpd	98 gpd	2.5mgd ¹	\$10.10	Based on single family equivalency ratio (SFER)	\$ 750 PIF (GJ) 1,000 CGV PIF 1,750 -500 rebate when developer hooks on line. 1,200 Total	Based on SFER		
Clifton Sanitation #1 ²	493	150,000	210,000	110 gpd ³	155 gpd	165,000 gpd	\$ 5.00	Based on SFER	\$1,500	Based on SFER		
Clifton Sanitation #2	4,150	690,000 gpd	1.15 mgd est.	60 gpd	100 gpd	420,000 gpd East 1.5 mgd West ⁴	\$ 6.00	Based on SFER	\$1,500	\$1,500/unit	Based on SFER	
Fruitvale Sanitation Dist. ⁵	3,200	520,000 gpd	1.1 mgd	80 gpd	100 gpd	1.25 mgd or approximately 700 additional taps	\$ 6.75	Based on SFER	\$ 800	\$800/unit to 4 units Over 4 \$800 x # of units x 72%	Based on SFER	
City of Grand Junction ⁶	10,075 ⁷	5.9 mgd	14.2 mgd	120 gpd	142 gpd	Main Plant 5.4 mgd Interim Plant 1.0 mgd Persigo will be 12.5 mgd	\$ 6.75	Based on SFER	\$ 750 PIF min. 1,050 CIP min.	Based on SFER		

Note: All wastewater facility figures are as of 12/31/82.
 PIF = Plant Investment Fee
 SFER = Single Family Equivalency Ratio
 GPD = Gallons Per Day
 MGD = Million Gallons Per Day

Footnotes on Mesa County Wastewater Treatment Facilities

- Central Grand Valley Sanitation District is a collection system only with approximately 75 miles of pipeline. All wastewater is treated by the Grand Junction system. The areas of the District that utilizes 15" or 18" pipeline has a daily capacity between 1.7 mgd and 2.7 mgd. Source: Larry Cockroft of Paragon Engineers; John Krissman, CGV Board of Directors.
- Source: Jimmy Ranie, Clifton Sanitation District #1 Board of Directors; Larry Schidler, System Operator.
- Estimates are by Grand Junction/Mesa County Planning Department.
- Clifton Sanitation District #2 has an East (33 Road) Lagoon and a West (32 Road) Lagoon. Currently there is a moratorium for permits on the 32 Road system until either an 8" companion collection line is added or the current line is replaced by a 12" or 15" line. Source: Gale Enger, Manager.
- Fruitvale Sanitation District is a collection system which contracts with Grand Junction for sewage treatment. Peak flows and system capacity is based on a study by Gingery Associates, Inc. Source: Art Crawford, Manager, Fruitvale Sanitation District.
- Source: Ron Rusky, Asst. City Manager; Jarley Seybond, Utility Accounts; Jerry O'Brien, Sewer Plant Operator.
- This is an estimate by the Grand Junction/Mesa County Planning Dept.