



Mesa County
Health
Department

515 Patterson Road
Grand Junction, Colorado
81501 - 1996

Administration
(303) 244-1743

Environmental Health
(303) 244-1750

Nursing
(303) 244-1760

W PERSIGO FLE
DESIC

"WELLNESS IN A SAFE ENVIRONMENT"

April 17, 1985

To: Mark Eckert

From: ^D Tom Douville

Re: City/County Agreements Related to the Persigo Treatment Plant

I think the best course of action for us to follow currently is to let Steve Johnson complete his effort to categorize and identify the agreements that exist and hopefully identify the significant points of each one. When he has completed this, at that point I believe that I can identify where the gaps are in terms of what has been done as compared to what is required under the E.P.A. and state grant requirements. From that we should be able to develop a position paper for presentation to the commissioners.

This position paper would start out with an identification of the problem and from that the options that we have in terms of correcting it. Also, we would be able to identify what the potential liabilities are to the county if the deficiencies are not corrected.

We will need to collectively review the mechanisms by which the plant investment fee is to be recaptured, how rates and other fees are established and how these have been charged. The city at this point is the only source of information as to the status of the sewer fund and any other funds derived from these monies. I am not at this point in possession of any data from the city on this. Gordon's questions posed to Mark Achen in regards to the city's annexation posture when lines, etc. are expanded was not really answered. These funding questions are relevant in terms of how we view annexation. From my preliminary review of Jim Patterson's report, the city gains if they are annexing the properties in question. We also gain in that we would no longer be responsible for the maintenance of the lines or for providing the service itself.

I do think we should strongly review the possibilities of charging at least some of our administrative effort against the sewer fund. From an examination of Jim Patterson's material and that material supplied to Gordon by Mark Achen, it is apparent that the city charges against the sewer fund a substantial amount of administrative effort. We currently are charging nothing and since we anticipate spending more time on this effort we should attempt to recover some of the cost from the program. This philosophy is in line with the county's position on cost center budgeting. The costs are a result of having and administering this program and therefore should be charged against it.

TD/jg