

DOCUMENTS INDEX - 1975:

Rev. 5/97

-
- 1975 City established the 201 sewer boundaries to determine the size of a future City plant. Boom trend existed in the valley and new homes built in Tiara Rado, the Bluffs, Paradise Hills and Valle Vista. An advisory committee was formed to find ways to provide sewer service Valleywide. Representatives ranged from Mack to DeBeque. This committee worked to the 1980 City-County Sewer Agreement and construction of the Persigo Wash treatment plant. (City Newsletter, August, 1994).
- 1975 Suggested organization for joint administration of sewer construction, operation and maintenance (proposed Valley Sewer Board - Area Advisory Committee, responsible for all sewer construction; establish special sewer fund and County treasurer office and construction and engineering to be paid for by issuing revenue bonds). [**Valley Wide Sewer Committee documents**]
- 1975 "Analysis of alternate entities for implementing the facilities plan for a regional sanitary sewer system for the Grand Junction Area." (Rough draft presented to the Valley Wide Sewer Committee. [**Valley Wide Sewer Committee documents**]
- ?/75 Valley Wide Sewer Committee meeting minutes: (last page of what appears to be the initial minutes assigning members to sub-committees and assigning tasks to various sub-committees). [**Documents by Category - Volume V**]
- ?/14/75 Analysis of Redlands Population Projections, by T. V. Garel, Plateau Engineering; ?/14/75 handwritten notes address new treatment facility and need for an organizational agreement between City and County officials. [**007**]
- 01/14/75 County Commissioners adopt a resolution establishing a "Master Sewer Plan for Mesa County". County sends a letter to the Colorado Water Quality Control Commissioner to get on the priority list for Federal funding before the January 15, 1975 deadline.
- County Commissioners 1/14/75 resolution resolves that the Commissioners desire to undertake a program to provide sewerage facilities in all areas of Mesa County "not including areas within the boundaries of any incorporated city or town" pursuant to the authority granted to the Commissioners under Colorado law (C.R.S. § 30-20-101, and especially 30-20-402). (Resolution approved by Commissioners Roland, Albers and Aubert). [**Commissioners Minutes**]
- 02/03/75 Memo from Jim Patterson to Harvey Rose, City Manager, "A Recommendation Concerning Modifications to the Water Pollution Control Plant" [**017**]
- 02/05/75 City Council Minutes: Jim Patterson summarized a memorandum [see 2/3/75 memo from Patterson to Rose] recommending that the City "back off" from any fast action plans with regard to wastewater treatment improvements - NHPQ representative Bruckner presented a second of three reports regarding improvements to the Water Pollution Control Plant. [**Dan Wilson Files**]
- 02/28/75 Letter from Kenneth Webb, CDOH/WQCD to Richard Brown, Colorado Division of Planning re: need for more definitive information concerning proposed collection systems and treatment facilities for Mack and Loma - need to determine if consistent with Basin Water Quality Management Plan and 201 Facilities Plan. [**CDOH Documents**]
- 03/24/75 County Commissioners participate in a lunch meeting with the Grand Junction City Council to discuss the Valleywide Sewer Plan. [**Commissioners Minutes**]

- 04/01/75 Letter from Earl Balkum, Chief Technical Services and Grant Section, WQCD/CDOH to Jim Patterson re: EPA funds schedule for Grand Junction. CDOH seeks clarification on City's requests for funding for FY-76 and FY-77. "Only those interceptors which eliminate an existing treatment plant or that portion of the main interceptor starting at a new plant site and up to the manhole where the sewer will carry 90% of the flow are eligible for full 100% points. [CDOH Documents]
- 04/02/75 City Council Minutes: Discussion of sewage treatment contract for Paradise Hills. [022] [Documents by Category - Volume V]
- 04/16/75 City Council Minutes: Hearing - Proposed Ordinance - Zoning Howard Johnson Annexation HO; Kanaly Annexation ordinance passed for publication; Phase 1 Orchard Mesa Sanitary Sewer District completed; consideration of agreement between City and Crossroads Colorado West for sewer service approved; proposal for contract between city and Doremus/Fleisher/Mason Company for sewer service tabled. [022] [Documents by Category - Volume V]
- 04/17/75 Letter from Evan Dildine, FDA, to James Patterson, advising City ordinance meets requirements. [012]
- 05/75 "Municipal Wastewater Treatment Works Construction Grants Program - References: Regulations, Guidance and Procedures." EPA document. This is the EPA/CWA "bible" according to Dick Bowman. The document is divided into three sections: regulations, program guidance and guidelines all of which were updated/revised and/or superseded over time. The most recent update in the manual is dated 12/78. [CDOH Documents]
- 05/07/75 City Council Minutes: City Attorney presented and reviewed proposed agreements between the City and Paradise Hills (the City to take over the operation of the two Paradise Hills' treatment plants subject to resolution of the \$150.00 per tap plant investment fee issue) and between the City and Ridges (an agreement providing for sewer service to the proposed Ridges development - the City does not agree to subsidize the system). The Ridges not yet annexed to the City. [022]
- 05/21/75 City Council Minutes: City Manager authorized to execute the Paradise Hills Sewer Service Agreement, as amended. City Manager explained a change in the State requirements forcing the City to improve its treatment plant - council authorized a contract with NHPQ to study the proposition. Also discussed were: available grants, the need for a north - northeast interceptor and the route of such a line into the existing collection system. [Dan Wilson Files]
- 05/21/75 Memorandum of Agreement between Paradise Hills Service Company and the City of Grand Junction pursuant to which the City will provide sewer services and allow connection to the City Sewerage System; includes terms relating to: system management and maintenance by the City, billing, sewer rates, ownership, POA/annexation, etc.
- 05/23/75 Letter from J. E. Patterson to Bob Bray, advising of approval of agreement allowing City to operate and maintain sewage treatment plant that serves Paradise Hills Subdivision. Council also voted to accept an EPA Grant which would allow the City to construct an interceptor sewer line which eliminate the need for the Paradise Hills package treatment plant and bring the sewage from Paradise Hills subdivision to the existing system. [046 - attached to 10/11/78 Water Consumption memo]

- 06/10/75 Memo from Jim Patterson to Harvey Rose, City Manager re meeting with EPA discussing grant application and water and sewer use ordinance and sewer rate. Patterson warns that returning to the old sewer rate of \$2.05 per month will not satisfy the EPA requirement that the City charge a sufficient rate to cover the operation, maintenance and normal replacement cost of sewage treatment facilities (a requirement to be eligible for EPA grant money). **[046 - attached to 10/11/78 Water Consumption memo]**
- 06/16/75 County Commissioners approve Mr. Ed Carpenter of Plateau Engineering to represent the County at the Colorado Water Quality Control Commission meeting in Denver on 7/15/75. **[Commissioners Minutes]**
- 06/30/75 County Commissioners receive the report of Ed Carpenter concerning his attendance at the State Water Quality Control Board Meeting. Carpenter reports that the Colorado State Health Department will probably be approving the Valleywide Sewer System Plan prepared by Nelson, Haley, Patterson and Quirk, engineering consultants (the City's consulting engineers - the 1975 201 Facilities Plan) rather than the Western Engineers County funded plan. If that occurs the County will not need to apply to the EPA for funding. Approval of the NHPQ plan is anticipated within 30 to 45 days. The County has been saved money by Mr. Carpenter's trip to Denver. Carpenter stated "the Valleywide Sewer System costs would be too much for a County project and should be a cooperative project of cities and county." **[Commissioners Minutes]**
- 07/07/75 Ed Carpenter reports to the County Commissioners concerning the progress on the Valley Wide Sewer System stating that it will not be necessary for the County to apply for EPA funding because the Colorado Health Department has approved the NHPQ plan. Further, "as this is a City/County effort, they are to hold conferences with the City Engineering staff, the City/County Planning staff, the consulting engineers and others concerned with the sewers, boundaries, treatment plants, funding, rates, division of responsibilities, and the many other phases of the project." Carpenter and another engineer from Plateau Engineering, Tink Garel, "felt sure that a uniform and fair plan would be forthcoming". **[Commissioners Minutes]**
- 07/14/75 Ed Carpenter and T.V. Garel report to the County Commissioners concerning their meeting with the City staff to discuss the Valleywide Sewer System. The meeting went well. "A joint City/County agreement was now needed on a split of services and financing." "A request could now be made to the EPA for funds for Step 2 and 3 for construction and engineering; but funds and grants could not be requested until a full agreement is reached by the City and County." An engineering feasibility study is necessary. **[Commissioners Minutes]**
- 07/16/75 City Council Minutes: City Manager Harvey Hornberg reports "as a result of several meetings with the County Commissioners, the City has been asked to join with the County in a committee to negotiate an agreement between the City and the County for the provision of valley wide sewer service." City Manager recommends cooperation with the County, further discussion concerning a City/County department or an operation to provide for construction and maintenance of collection and treatment facilities throughout the urbanized area; a single inside and outside the City service rate and tap fee and "strong consideration to the removal of annexation as a requirement for tapping onto the system." **[Dan Wilson Files]**
- 07/21/75 County Commissioners receive requests for formation of Mt. Garfield Sanitation District. **[Commissioners Minutes]**
- 07/23/75 Statement of Albin Anderson given at public hearing concerning the proposed adoption of the 201 Facilities Plan. **[EPA Documents - Grant Section]**

07/23/75

Public hearing, Grand Junction 201 facilities plan - City Hall. Verbatim transcript indicates discussion between Attorney Anderson, Gordon Bruckner (NHPQ), Ed Carpenter (Plateau Engineering-representing County Commissioners), Jim Patterson (Director, Utilities Department, City of Grand Junction), Mr. Harvey Rose (City Manager), Lawrence Aubert (Mesa County Commissioner), Charles Downing (Board of Directors, Central Grand Valley Sanitation District), Bob Gerlofs (Engineer), Harold Boyles (Citizen), Jack Sparks (Engineer for COG, ex officio Water Quality Control Commission), Larry Kozisek (Mayor, City of Grand Junction), Greg Hoskin (Attorney), Suzanne Young (Chairman, Citizens Advisory Committee on Sanitation), C. A. Hofwolt (Palisade, Colorado), Bob Strain (President, Clifton Sanitation District), Bob Van Houten (City Council member ?).

The gist of the public comments concerned inclusion of areas outside of the City of Grand Junction within the plan with the effect that the City would have control over the sanitation system and have the ability to charge customers for services when those customers have no representative within the City since they are not City residents. This was the concern of the Special Districts and persons appearing primarily from the Clifton and Palisade areas. They were proponents of either separate treatment plants with separate metropolitan districts to construct, manage and operate those plants providing representation on the board of those new entities for each of the participating municipalities or sanitation districts. Further proposed that the County, government of the all encompassing geographic unit, control the sanitation system under the statute allowing counties to do so.

Lawrence Aubert, County Commissioner, stated that the Commissioners had discussed the proposed 201 plan informally and were generally in agreement with it. The County is convinced that complete cooperation and coordination between the City and the County is absolutely necessary and essential. The County's concerns as expressed were: Dovetailing of the proposed plan with new districts which might be formed in the future outside the City of Grand Junction.

Mr. Rose indicated that the City Council and the County Commissioners had met the week before and agreed to form a committee to work towards developing an agreement between the City and County towards implementation of the 201 facilities plan. The temporary committee was to arrive at an agreement between the City and County as to the development of sewer in the valley and operation of the sewer once it is developed. The committee had just been formed but had not yet met as of July 23, 1975, the public hearing on the facilities plan proposal. The committee was to include: Bob Van Houten, City Council, Jim Patterson, City Utilities Director, and Mr. Rose. County Commissioners representatives were to include Howard Roland, County Commissioner, Mr. Carpenter, Engineer for the County, Gene Allen and Ted Ford.

Mayor Kozisek stated the City feels that the implementation of the plan requires complete cooperation between the City and County.

The City is not in a position to undertake this ambitious program by itself.

The City is not "looking at this program as a tool for annexation."

The plan includes "benefits to everyone within the area (including future development outside of the City."

NOTE: It appears that this hearing was in front of the City Council so all members of the City Council at that time were present and were encouraged by the Mayor to speak up at that time.

Bob Van Houten, City Councilman, doesn't believe that either the City or the County could by itself implement the plan in its entirety.

The City and the County together can by implementing this plan benefit all of the people in the valley.

The benefit is not directed solely to the citizens of Grand Junction.

Believes that the City Council and County Commissioners can reach an understanding and agreement as to a method of implementation that will solve the problems and concerns.

Spoke in favor of the plan; noted that Clifton (Sanitation District?) is fairly well down on the EPA priority list for funding.

Harold Boyles (County Health Dept. chair) commented and noted: The City is high on the priority list for receiving grant money and the County is low on that list. A year prior, Ken Webb (?) said that the City's priority could be utilized to obtain the grant money for this project.

The State Health Department is going to insist that certified operators, according to the size of the plant, be required to operate the facilities that are now in operation. Whoever operates the new system will have to be able to meet the requirements of the State Health Department. Some of the present smaller systems are being operated properly and some are not. (Attendance List, Agenda, Verbatim Questions and Comments, and Written Comments-Appendix E, 1975 Facilities Plan).

07/28/75 Ed Carpenter, Plateau Engineering, employed by the County to work on Valleywide Sewer System planning presented a "declaration of policies" written for the commissioners' reference. Commissioners appoint Howard Roland as their representative to the Valleywide Sewer Planning Committee. [Commissioners Minutes]

07/28/75 Letter, Margaret M. Crowley to Jim Patterson, City Utilities Director. States opposition to the 201 facilities plan and treatment of Clifton Sanitation District's number one sewage by either the City alone or jointly with the County. Proposes any joint operated treatment plant to be operated and controlled by the Special Districts and the County Commissioners. (Attendance List, Agenda, Verbatim Questions and Comments, and Written Comments-Appendix E, 1975 Facilities Plan).

07/29/75 Letter, Robert Strain, President, Clifton Sanitation District, to Jim Patterson, City Utilities Director. The Clifton Sanitation District protests inclusion of the Clifton Sanitation District in any plan for the City of Grand Junction's treatment plant. They object to taxation without representation and the City setting rates for the District in any fashion. (Attendance List, Agenda, Verbatim Questions and Comments, and Written Comments-Appendix E, 1975 Facilities Plan).

08/01/75 Letter, Suzanne Young (Chairperson, Citizens Advisory Planning Group, Subcommittee on Sanitation), to Jim Patterson, Director of Utilities. Writes to support the plan "because it encourages City/County cooperation. It is a constructive step in the organization of an economical regional sanitation system." Suggestions are: There should be equal representation of all parties involved in the planning, construction and operation of all joint facilities. Implementation of the plan should require proper land use zoning in order to protect the integrity of the project. (Attendance List, Agenda, Verbatim Questions and Comments, and Written Comments-Appendix E, 1975 Facilities Plan).

08/05/75

Letter, J. N. Burkhalter, P.E. - L.S., General Manager Western Engineers, Inc., to Jim Patterson, Department of Public Works, Director, City of Grand Junction. Writing to express concerns regarding the NHPQ sewer plan. Expresses concerns regarding prior HDR study financed and rejected by the City, construction by Central Grand Valley of an undersized outfall line to serve the District abandonment by the City of a plan for treatment of Central Grand Valley sewage locally and allowance of sewage from CGV to the City plant and necessitating rehabilitation and remodeling of the existing City plant. Adoption of the NHPQ plan would result in duplication of sewer outfalls. The City's rejection of the HDR plan forced the County to engage Western Engineers to prepare a new "County plan". The NHPQ plan is a duplication of effort. Further, specifically: It appears to me that the NHPQ plan would try to make the best of the HDR and Western Engineers, Inc. plan, gain control of the most lucrative environs around the City of Grand Junction and thereby gain unequivocal control of development in the main part of the Grand Valley. The residents outside the City do not wish to be under the complete and total control of the City Council for any reason, including sewage treatment. The outlying areas should be allowed to solve and manage their own problems. Responsibility for developing sewage treatment facilities for the Grand Valley should lay with the County Commissioners who represent the voters and taxpayers outside of the City. The City should only be concerned with those folks and areas inside the City. The City is part of the County. The County is not part of the City. (Attendance List, Agenda, Verbatim Questions and Comments, and Written Comments-Appendix E, 1975 Facilities Plan).

Letter, Melvin Diffendaffer, to Jim Patterson, City of Grand Junction. "Violently objects" to the Clifton area being included in the City plan and especially with the prospect of being charged twice the City rate for sewage since he lives outside of the City. (Attendance List, Agenda, Verbatim Questions and Comments, and Written Comments-Appendix E, 1975 Facilities Plan).

Letter, Fred Selan, President, Central Grand Valley Sanitation District, to Jim Patterson. States opposition to the City Council being the sole rate setting authority for a joint sewage system. Complains that the CGV board was not invited to provide input to the NHPQ study. Prefers a regional waste treatment district for all of the areas east of Grand Junction and representation by the appropriate Special Districts on that board. (Attendance List, Agenda, Verbatim Questions and Comments, and Written Comments-Appendix E, 1975 Facilities Plan).

08/06/75

City Council accepts and approves the Grand Jct. Area Facilities Plan (by Resolution)

08/07/75

Letter Maxine Albers, Mesa County Commissioners, to City of Grand Junction, Mayor Kozisek. Commissioners are generally in agreement with the NHPQ study. To implement the plan will take the cooperation and coordination of both the City and the County "and eventually other governmental agencies in the valley, to expand the sewer to areas of the valley that are badly in need of sewer service at the present time. This cooperation and coordination will also be vital to obtain necessary state and federal financing." County encourages the City to proceed with steps II and III of the plan, the engineering and construction of facilities. County's concerns regarding the 201 study are: Areas of the valley not covered by the 201 study must be easily dovetailed into the study and receive sewer later when and if they require it. (As the valley grows these areas need to be provided with sewer service as soon as possible.) "The Commissioners sincerely hope that equitable costs for sewer service can be worked out, particularly for those people who live outside the Grand Junction City limits." "It is imperative that all areas of the valley be properly represented in any cooperative arrangement between the City and County." (Attendance List, Agenda, Verbatim Questions and Comments, and Written Comments-Appendix E, 1975 Facilities Plan).

- 08/18/75 County Commissioners adopt a resolution concerning sewerage facilities in the Mt. Garfield Sanitation District. The resolution notes the commissioners prior determination that the County should, pursuant to statutory authority and C.R.S. § 30-20-401, et seq., proceed toward the establishment of a sewerage system or systems in those areas of the County where such are needed and are economically feasible. Further the board notes that although it has not been determined yet what route will be followed in the development of the County sewerage system, it is believed that the creation of the Mt. Garfield District "would be inimical to development of the County plan." As such the commissioners approved creation of the district. **[Commissioners Minutes]**
- 08/19/75 Letter to Albin Anderson from Bryce L/ Harlow, Congressional and Intergovernmental relations, U.S. EPA Region VIII discussing, in response to Mr. Anderson's concerns, the objective of the 201 Planning Area boundaries. **[EPA Documents - Grant Section]**
- 08/25/75 Letter from Ed Carpenter, Plateau Engineering to Commissioners re: the concept of a regional or valley wide sewer plan and how it could be organized and financed - reporting on trips to Denver, "after considerable effort was spent to gather data, it was learned that the City's 201 Facilities Plan was nearly complete and the Commission Staff in Denver would not support a separate effort by the County to implement the system", and stating that the state water quality staff "would welcome a joint City-County regional approach to sewer funding" with the City's 201 Plan serving as the basis for funding. *NOTE: The detailed chronology of the May thru July, 1975 events.* **[County file - Reso/Valley Wide Sewer - Box 3]**
- 09/02/75 "Facilities Plan, City of Grand Junction" prepared by NHPQ. **[Section 1 - City Rules and Regulations - "201 Facilities Plan"]**
- 09/12/75 "Proposed Agreement"- form of proposed agreement between the City and the County "to establish a regional sewer and wastewater treatment program". **[Valley Wide Sewer Committee Documents]**
- 09/17/75 City Council Minutes: Proposal for refinancing water-sewer revenue bonds; sewer agreement with Tiara Rado Subdivision tabled. **[022] [Documents by Category - Volume V]**
- 09/17/75 City Council Meetings re proposal for refinancing water-sewer revenue bonds (remaining outstanding debt on the existing bonds \$4,180,000.00 Kirchner, Moore & Co., Denver, represented by Joe Barrows and James Kreidle.
- 09/23/75 City Council Minutes: Sewer Agreement with Tiara Rado Subdivision approved; proposal for refinancing 1968 - 1969 water-sewer revenue bonds discussed. **[022] [Documents by Category - Volume V]**
- 10/01/75 City Council Minutes. City attorney Ashby presents two proposals for "earmarked revenues" one of which would include funding for capital improvements and amortization of bonds of the City, 1/4 of which would be used in the Utilities Department of the City for operation, maintenance and expansion of the systems and present or future debt service. The two ordinances' intent is to reduce water, sewer and trash rates to the December, 1974 levels. **[Documents by Category - Volume V]**
- 10/14/75 County Commissioners adopt a resolution approving the Mack Sanitation District using language substantially similar to that used in approving the Mt. Garfield Sanitation District. **[Commissioners Minutes]**
- 10/15/75 City Council Minutes - Council discusses an ordinance rolling back sewer rates to the rates that became effective by an ordinance in 1971. **[Documents by Category - Volume V]**

- 11/05/75 City Ordinance 1590. An ordinance reducing the fees for use of utilities within the City. Sewer service charge per single family dwellings reduced to \$2.05 per month. Charges for service outside the City doubled the equivalent City rate except where otherwise provided by contract. A connection permit required. Ordinance effective 1/1/76. **[Documents by Category - Volume V]**
- 11/05/75 City Council Minutes. Council struggling with budget issues, adopts an ordinance imposing an additional sales and use tax of 1% adopted in place of raising utility rates. **[Documents by category - Volume V]**
- 11/19/75 Agreement between City of Grand Junction and Orchard Mesa Sanitation District regarding connection by the District to the City System and treatment of District Sewer by the City.
- 11/19/75 City Clerk Minutes, book 35, page 551. Council approves proposed agreement with OMSD and adopts a formula for charging OMSD for treatment services only.
- 12/01/75 Letter from J. E. Patterson to Richard Rush, Colorado Kendal Ranch Corp., re: historical statement as to the Clean Water Act, the EPA grants, the 1975 Facilities Plan and the City and County's decision to join forces to provide sewage facilities to areas of the County that area densely populated and in need of a sewage system: relative powers of the City and County issues, land use control issues, and contractual issues. **[046 - attached to 10/11/78 Water Consumption memo]**