

M E M O R A N D U M

TO : Jim Patterson, Grand Junction Public Works  
Director

FROM: Mark Eckert,<sup>ME</sup> Assistant County Administrator

DATE: February 6, 1984

SUBJ: Review of City/County Staff Discussions on the  
Persigo 201 Plan Update, Sewer Rate and Grand  
Junction Infiltration/Inflow Studies

The following corresponds to your written comments and are a result of the discussions February 2 and 3, 1984 concerning the upcoming studies. No comment designates that County staff was in accord with your comments. The remainder are our responses.

A. 201 Plan Update

- 1) Criteria and procedures for changing the 201 boundary will be recommended in the report.
- 2) No comment.
- 3) County staff will contact the Clifton sanitation districts to determine whether or not the respective entities would have any interest in participating in the 201 update effort at their own expense.
- 4) It is our understanding from the discussions that the old Grand Junction Sewer Plant cannot be used for treatment, but the plant's future utility will be briefly dealt with in terms of potential for use as a stormwater or industrial pretreatment facility.
- 5) No comment.

B. Sewer and Water Rate Study

- 1) As discussed, the Commissioners would like to have the Rate Study as intended, but also require that the analysis demonstrate the term consequences of more immediate rate policies. For example, elected officials need information immediately to understand what financial options are available to them should rates be kept artificially low, while a need to expand the Persigo treatment facility develops quickly due to a high growth scenario.
- 2) County staff does not entirely agree with your comment here, but agrees that it can remain a topic for future debate and does not have to be dealt with in the upcoming studies.
- 3) and 4) Same comment as B.1) above. County staff sees comments B.1), 3), and 4), of the

M E M O R A N D U M

TO : Jim Patterson, Grand Junction Public Works  
Director

FROM: Mark Eckert,<sup>ME</sup> Assistant County Administrator

DATE: February 6, 1984

SUBJ: Review of City/County Staff Discussions on the  
Persigo 201 Plan Update, Sewer Rate and Grand  
Junction Infiltration/Inflow Studies

The following corresponds to your written comments and are a result of the discussions February 2 and 3, 1984 concerning the upcoming studies. No comment designates that County staff was in accord with your comments. The remainder are our responses.

A. 201 Plan Update

- 1) Criteria and procedures for changing the 201 boundary will be recommended in the report.
- 2) No comment.
- 3) County staff will contact the Clifton sanitation districts to determine whether or not the respective entities would have any interest in participating in the 201 update effort at their own expense.
- 4) It is our understanding from the discussions that the old Grand Junction Sewer Plant cannot be used for treatment, but the plant's future utility will be briefly dealt with in terms of potential for use as a stormwater or industrial pretreatment facility.
- 5) No comment.

B. Sewer and Water Rate Study

- 1) As discussed, the Commissioners would like to have the Rate Study as intended, but also require that the analysis demonstrate the term consequences of more immediate rate policies. For example, elected officials need information immediately to understand what financial options are available to them should rates be kept artificially low, while a need to expand the Persigo treatment facility develops quickly due to a high growth scenario.
- 2) County staff does not entirely agree with your comment here, but agrees that it can remain a topic for future debate and does not have to be dealt with in the upcoming studies.
- 3) and 4) Same comment as B.1) above. County staff sees comments B.1), 3), and 4), of the

original memo as being highly interrelated, and due to Commissioner comments, a necessity to fulfill in the upcoming study.

C. Nichol's Infiltration and Inflow Study

- 1) No comment.
- 2) After the description provided by Ken Reedy, County staff is comfortable with the utility of this study in aiding the County in its implementation of pending LID's. The County reserves the right to utilize the Sewer Fund for further study should the Commissioners determine that it is warranted.

The cooperation you and Ken demonstrated is appreciated and was informative. I do not feel that there was any great divergence of opinion except on the role of the Rate Study. If you feel comfortable that the studies can accomplish what is summarized above, please let me know. Similarly, if there are any problems with amending the RFP's to reflect these needs, please let me know. The intent here is not to slow progress on these important efforts, but to assure that the elected decisionmakers are cognizant of their import as decisionmaking tools.

cc: Bennett Boeschenstein, Planning  
Bob Carman, Engineering  
Ken Glover, PRO  
Steve Johnson, Legal  
Jack Morgan, Finance  
Gordon Tiffany, Administration