



Mesa County
Health
Department

515 Patterson Road
P.O. Box 20,000-5033
Grand Junction, Colorado
81502-5033

Administration
(303) 244-1743

Environmental Health
(303) 244-1750

Nursing
(303) 244-1759

Animal Control Center
362 28 Road
P.O. Box 20,000-5002
Grand Junction, Colorado
81502-5002

(303) 244-1892

June 12, 1987

TO: The Members of the Wastewater Facility Review Board

FROM: Dr. George Cianko

Re: Duties and Responsibilities; County vs City

Problem Statement:

The need for a clear definition of the duties and responsibilities of the County Commissioners and the City's Utilities Management staff related to the Persigo Treatment Facility and the integrated units.

Problem Areas:

1. The awkwardness of carrying out the regulatory agency's responsibilities and serving as a responsible member of the County staff, in the management of the Wastewater Treatment Program.
 - What role will the County play in this program?
2. The complete disregard and refusal to heed the warnings concerning public health over sandtrap waste disposal problems. The policy of not accepting Public Health requirements will place the County in an vulnerable position with State mandated Regulations.
 - Will the County continue to be placed in this position because it does not suit the City's Management?
3. A major concern is the status of the inflow/infiltration problem. This E.P.A. requirement and funding for it has never been completed yet. If the E.P.A. demands its money back, because of incompleted work, the County will be held responsible for it.
 - Does the County have the payback money to give the E.P.A. and how has the money for the inflow/infiltration work been spent?
4. The requirement of a Financial Revenue Program to have the County City collect its fair share from industrial and commercial dischargers.
 - Where is the Financial Revenue Program and what does it contain in the way of payback collected for the maintenance of the plant as needed in the future?
5. The need for a viable and self-sustaining pretreatment plan which has supposedly been in operation for 3 years.

- Why isn't the Pretreatment Plant Program accountable for the unusually low payback from industry and commercial establishments?.
 - Is it possible that the residential section is subsidizing industry with higher rates? If so, how long has this been going on and how long does the City expect the residential community to subsidize industry?
6. The Utilities Department raised Waste Hauler fees in April.
 - Were the Commissioners involved in the decision making process?
 7. The Persigo plant management, by design, has given the County the program plans developed by their consultant, but have never given us the data developed for the program presented. We have asked for it but never have received it.
 - Why has our request for the data been ignored. Is it because we feel that some of the suggestions in the consultant's program may be excessive and somewhat costly?
 8. The County staff has never been actively recruited to discuss some of the problem areas in the operational management of the plant.
 - Is this because the City does not think we are capable of a knowledgeable input, or is because of reasons which should be confined in the Department?
 9. The City staff has constantly ignored Gordon Tiffany's request for the reference of all communications on the Persigo Plant operation through me for review and dissemination to the appropriate County staff people.
 - Why do they persist on sending the material to Gordon?
 10. The County lacks much of the information concerning the past relationship between the County and the City on the management chores of the Persigo plant.
 - It is absolutely necessary to retrieve the material spelling this relationship so that definite lines of authority and responsibility can be clearly established.

GMC:tlm

(CYVSCITY.LTR) 6/12/87 gmc