Phosphorus levels high; testing and supporting infrastructure are being shared this way: MSD–19.79 percent, PLSD–33.33 percent, and WWSD–46.88 percent. These percentages are the subject of a pending lawsuit that WWSD has filed against MSD and PLSD over how the cost of construction will be shared.

Wicklund said that these costs should be divided by thirds. PLSD had originally agreed to pay a third of the costs.

MSD’s position is that each district should pay the same percentage of the cost of this expansion according to the amount of currently owned treatment capacity for phosphorus. Wicklund said that MSD has been working with TLWWTF’s Joint Use of Facilities Agreement (JUA) rules for treatment constituent expansions: WWSD–64.28 percent, MSD–34.0 mg/l, 58.7 percent, and PLSD–15.93 percent.

MSD’s position is also that each district should own those same percentages of the new chemical total phosphorus treatment capacity that is being created with the new total phosphorus tertiary chemical treatment clarifier. The lawsuit would be solved by the lawsuit, which is addressed in the Joint Use Agreement, he said.

Burks suggested that once the phosphorus removal process actually begins next May, sampling of actual amounts will automatically occur three times a week. He said that the committee voted unanimously to continue testing phosphorus levels once a month for now, but once the clarifier starts operating, the testing will be done more frequently.

Construction going smoothly Tetra Tech engineer Steve Tamburini presented a report on progress by Aslan Corp. on the new total phosphorus tertiary chemical treatment clarifier. The total budget for the project is $3.642 million, and construction was progressing on or ahead of schedule for the first five months of work, Tamburini said.

Tetra Tech’s existing TLWWTF has no designated capability for removing total phosphorus, because there was not a requirement for treating this constituent until the state’s approval of Health Department Control Regulation 85 in June 2012. The facility already meets the Control Regulation 85 total inorganic nitrogen (TIN) November 2019 limit of 15 mg/l. TLWWTF must comply with the new 1 mg/l running annual median total phosphorus limit listed in Control Regulation 85 starting on November 1, 2019 under the facility’s new five-year discharge permit that took effect on May 1. The new phosphorus treatment clarifier is designed to comply with this TIN limit and will start compliance testing in mid-2016, Tamburini said.

Construction so far has proceeded with a temporary building permit, which will expire soon. The final building permit will not be issued by the Pikes Peak Regional Building Department until the plans include a backup electrical generator for the ventilation and temperature control in the chemical treatment area, which is classified H4 since it stores large amounts of non-flammable chemicals commonly used in both water and sanitation treatment. Wicklund said that future operating costs or split-outs for the district’s influent wastewater for the whole month, he said. He anticipated that cost sharing for chemicals and electricity used in new total phosphorus tertiary chemical treatment clarifier next year would be far larger than the small costs of sampling and testing, he said. “Does Palmer Lake want to pay a third of the chemical costs for this when it’s only contributing 14 percent? We have to do something to make the billing fair for each district,” Wicklund said. “We are not just going to be splitting the costs of operating that phosphorus treatment by thirds.” Wicklund said.

Shaffer disagreed with Wicklund, saying that a single data point should not result in spending so much extra money on testing immediately. He also said that the current phosphorus monitoring was supposed to just be an indicator, not a way to assess future operating costs or split-outs on capacity.

Burks said that the issue of billing for chemicals and electricity for phosphorus removal had not yet been discussed or decided by the JUC. Wicklund said it was premature to talk about billing now, and that it would be decided when differences between the member districts were settled in January or February, after the lawsuit was over.

Wicklund disagreed that the billing question would be solved by the lawsuit, since those results would determine ownership percentage in paying for construction of the new total phosphorus tertiary chemical treatment clarifier. The lawsuit did not have anything to do with operating costs, such as treatment issues, which are addressed in the Joint Use Agreement, he said.

Wicklund said that cost sharing for chemicals and electricity used in new total phosphorus tertiary chemical treatment for this constituent was about to be split by thirds. He said that he shared this way: MSD–19.79 percent, PLSD–33.33 percent, and WWSD–46.88 percent. These percentages are the subject of a pending lawsuit that WWSD has filed against MSD and PLSD over how the cost of construction will be shared.

Wicklund said that these costs should be divided by thirds. PLSD had originally agreed to pay a third of the costs.

Wicklund said MSD’s board had discussed the fact that more frequent phosphorus testing would reduce the possibility of an outlier reading incorrectly representing the whole month’s levels for any one of the three districts. One composite sample in one day might not be representative of the district’s influent wastewater for the whole month, he said. He anticipated that cost sharing for chemicals and electricity used in new total phosphorus tertiary chemical treatment clarifier next year would be far larger than the small costs of sampling and testing, he said. “Does Palmer Lake want to pay a third of the chemical costs for this when it’s only contributing 14 percent? We have to do something to make the billing fair for each district,”...