



LISTED IN THE NATIONAL REGISTER
OF HISTORIC PLACES

Board of Managers

MEMBER QUESTIONS & COMMENTS

Saturday, February 13, 2021 ▪ 10:00 a.m.

Recorded ZOOM™ Session

MEMBER QUESTION/COMMENT	RESPONSE (If Applicable)
<p><i>Deborah Griffith, MGCA Member</i> 209 5th Street</p> <p>In the event that an up-front payment is possible, you mentioned that it would lower the interest for the loan. In this case, would the Members who choose the yearly payment option get a reduced fee, or would the savings be put into capital fund?</p>	<p>MGCA Board Member, Kevin Burd stated that the overall cost would be broken out by Member. Members would have the option to pay that lump sum up front or to pay an annual amount for the life of the loan including the interest. That monthly amount would not change.</p>
<p><i>Margaret Hopkins, MGCA Member</i> 505 Glossbrenner Avenue</p> <p>How many employees does the Mt. Gretna Authority have, and are they shared by the water, sewer, and Borough?</p>	<p>MGCA Board Member, Kevin Burd has heard in conversation the number of employees referred to as seven. This number can be confirmed. We believe these are employees of the Borough, and then the Borough bills out overhead costs to the Authority and to the Chautauqua.</p>
<p><i>Margaret Hopkins, MGCA Member</i> 505 Glossbrenner Avenue</p> <p>Is the Authority now willing to take on our infrastructure?</p>	<p>MGCA Board Member, Kevin Burd the Authority has let us know that if we answer a series of questions, they are willing to consider the option.</p>
<p><i>Margaret Hopkins, MGCA Member</i> 505 Glossbrenner Avenue</p> <p>Q Do we have any sense of how that breaks down for water supply vs distribution for the current Authority customers? Is it separate from their sewer that they pay?</p>	<p>MGCA Board Member, Barb Myers replied that we do not know the cost breakdown of water supply vs water distribution for Chautauqua customers of the Authority. The majority of the costs in the water bill are for overhead costs of employees, equipment, buildings, etc. The cost is separate from the sewer cost. We are assuming that the Authority would bill us the same way they do their current customers, but have had no fixed answer from the Authority.</p> <p>MGCA Board Member, Kevin Burd stated that two letters have been sent to the Authority requesting specific information, and Board representatives attended the February Authority meeting. Having started this conversation one year ago, no fixed answers have yet been received, though a formal written response was sent to the Board after the February meeting. At Ms. Hopkins' request, all three letters will be made available to the MGCA on the website before the 2/16/21 meeting of the Board of Managers.</p>



MEMBER QUESTIONS & COMMENTS

Saturday, February 13, 2021 ▪ 10:00 a.m.
Recorded ZOOM™ Session

MEMBER QUESTION/COMMENT	RESPONSE (If Applicable)
<p><i>Margaret Hopkins, MGCA Member</i> 505 Glossbrenner Avenue Q Is it possible to provide details for each of the estimates so overall cost is broken down?</p>	<p>MGCA Board Member, Barb Myers replied that would be possible. Some data will be attached to this report as a final page.</p>
<p><i>Margaret Hopkins, MGCA Member</i> 505 Glossbrenner Avenue Q Is it possible to look at what we've paid in the past decade for our water distribution projects?</p>	<p>MGCA Board Member, Barb Myers responded that we are gathering information about the distribution system currently. That is an ongoing project that will take some time. Our focus right now is on the supply segment, and we are not yet ready to discuss the distribution system. We hope to do that soon. We hope the presentation does impress upon Members that the distribution system is a separate issue and one that needs to be dealt with.</p>
<p><i>Margaret Hopkins, MGCA Member</i> 505 Glossbrenner Avenue Comment – If in joining the Authority it is a possibility that they would assume management of our distribution system, it may be prudent to delay the February Board vote on the options until this answer is known.</p>	
<p><i>Christine Slotznick, MGCA Member</i> 507 3rd Street Comment – She did not send in a formal response to the January meeting, but verbally wanted to give her support for Option #3 and the lump sum payment. Q – Do the first options include the cost of purchasing water from the Authority during the project.</p>	<p>MGCA Board Member, Kevin Burd stated that the cost of purchased water is included in the estimates.</p>
<p><i>Christine Slotznick, MGCA Member</i> 507 3rd Street Q – When ballots are sent to the Membership for a vote on the capital project loan, will background information be included to educate Members who have not been able to attend or listen to the webinars?</p>	<p>MGCA Board Member, Kevin Burd thanked Christine for pointing out that educational material will need to be included with the ballot information.</p>
<p><i>Bill Linton, MGCA Member</i> 211 7th Street Q – Do Options #1 and #2 include financial provisions for the eventual purchase of a new tank?</p>	<p>MGCA Board Member, Barb Myers responded that Option #1 does not include the cost of a tank replacement. This was intentional to demonstrate that even doing the absolute minimum to the tank as is feasible, the costs associated with that project are still higher than simply purchasing a new tank. Option #2 does include the cost of a new tank after 25 years.</p>



LISTED IN THE NATIONAL REGISTER
OF HISTORIC PLACES

Board of Managers

MEMBER QUESTIONS & COMMENTS

Saturday, February 13, 2021 ▪ 10:00 a.m.

Recorded ZOOM™ Session

MEMBER QUESTION/COMMENT	RESPONSE (If Applicable)
<p><i>Lou LaRicci, MGCA Member</i> 409 7th Street Q – Has the board considered moving to metered water in the future?</p>	<p>MGCA Board Member, Kevin Burd responded that in the effort to keep an equivalent comparison, the Board did not look at metering the water since the MGCA does not currently meter water and neither does the MG Authority.</p> <p>MGCA Board Member, Barb Myers responded that the bulk of the cost is in installing the meters and the prohibitive cost has prevented us from moving that direction.</p>
<p><i>Robert Travitz, MGCA Member</i> 502 Second Street Comment – As a member of the B&G Committee, he has seen a lot of discussion about metering water over the past few years. Some of the major problems are that we can't even identify shut-off valves, so we would need to dig extensively around cottages to find the pipes to install the meters. Disturbing old pipes also introduces other potential repair problems. In addition, we would need the infrastructure to read the meters and then turn around and bill for them. Every time we looked at it, the cost was not worth any benefit we might gain.</p>	

BREAKDOWNS FOR WORK ESTIMATES

Option 1 Limited Refurbishment

Tank Painting	128,600
Use of MGA Water	10,290
Pump House Automation	28,000
	166,890

Option 2 Extensive Refurbishment

Tank Painting	276,000
Specifications, Permitting	9,000
Inspections/Painting	15,000
Use of MGA Water	13,230
Pump House Automation	28,000
	341,230

Option 3 New Tank/Foundation

Tank/Foundation Construction*	510,000
Geotech Investigation**	7,000
Specs/Permitting	17,000
Construction Inspection	20,000
Use of MGA Water	44,100
Pump House Automation	28,000
	626,100

*Site work incl in construction dependent on geotechnical findings

**Included Geotech Investigation if no MGCA geology report available

NOTE: Archives Committee has recently located original geology report