



# MEMBER QUESTIONS & COMMENTS

Submitted during public comment period: 1/9/21 – 1/31/21

Saturday, January 9, 2021 ▪ 10:00 a.m.

Recorded ZOOM™ Session

TIM MARKOVITZ, 501 Otterbein

**Q: [Question posed during presentation, answered after the meeting.] How deep is the well and what is the recovery of the well?**

A: Well #3, the well we currently use, has a depth of 470 feet. Further information about pumping capacity and types of pumping capacity are available from the in-depth reports from the DEP which we would be happy to share.

MARGARET HOPKINS, 505 Glossbrenner

**Q: What size tank and how does the size of a new tank compare to the size of the existing tank? Would the new tank be steel or...? Advantages of the material?**

A: The current tank is a welded-steel, elevated, standpipe storage tank. Historical records indicate that it is a 60,000-gallon tank, but Suez Utility Service Company indicated that it is a 50,000-gallon tank, and the firm we hired to perform the cost/benefit analysis (Becker Engineering) estimates that based on tank dimensions provided by Suez, it is closer to 70,000 gallons.

A calculation will be made to determine the required capacity of the replacement tank, taking into consideration average daily community demand, fire flow requirements, etc. It may be possible to get a smaller replacement tank, but the reduction in overall project cost would not be proportional to the reduction in tank size. Any change from our current tank capacity must be approved by DEP.

The proposed replacement tank would be of the same design and construction (welded steel, elevated, standpipe). Our engineer's tank consultant, All America Services, considered all options and recommended this type/construction as the best choice for longevity, etc.

**Q: How would the tank be mounted and how does this compare to the existing foundation – height, materials, size etc.?**

A: Becker Engineering determined that the current foundation would not meet code requirements for a new tank and would need to be replaced. We do not have exact specifications, but the tank should be of similar dimensions and would need to be mounted on a similar elevated concrete foundation to provide satisfactory system water pressure.

**Q: Does the estimated cost of \$680,000 include the cost for purchasing water for the 6-8 months for construction of the new tank and foundation? What is the cost of water from Mount Gretna Water Authority?**

A: Yes, the estimated cost to purchase water during the construction period was included in the overall project cost. The MGA does not have a standard rate for metered water usage. In the past (2016) they charged \$200/day to supply water to the Campmeeting over a two-week period. The estimate is based on the historical rate with a 10% adjustment for inflation, which would equal a project water supply cost of approximately \$44,100.



# MEMBER QUESTIONS & COMMENTS

Submitted during public comment period: 1/9/21 – 1/31/21

Saturday, January 9, 2021 ▪ 10:00 a.m.

Recorded ZOOM™ Session

***Q: Does the estimated cost of \$680,000 include site preparation? What is involved in site preparation? If the \$680,000 cost does not include site preparation, what is the estimated cost of site preparation?***

A: Yes, the estimate includes site preparation. Included in this estimate is approximately \$7,000 for a geologic survey of the site. A survey was done prior to the original installation (in 1947). If records from this survey can be located a new survey may not be required.

***Q: Who would provide maintenance of the tank and foundation? Would there be a contract for maintenance of the tank and a separate contract for maintenance of the foundation? What is the cost of the contract or contracts? What would the contract(s) cover in terms of maintenance?***

A: At this point in the process we do not have that level of detailed information. In developing a cost estimate for ongoing operation of the system, Becker Engineering included a cost estimate for all required tank/foundation maintenance.

***Q: Mentioned in the presentation was an annual expenditure of \$18,000 for monitoring of the automated system and/or testing water. Please provide more details about what this involves. Would the Campmeeting continue to contract with Martin Water? If not, with another company? What entity will ensure compliance with DEP regulations?***

A: The \$18,000 estimate was for the hiring of a Certified Water Operator, who would be responsible for all aspects of water supply system operation, including sampling, treatment, monitoring, and ensuring DEP compliance. With a new automated system, daily, in-person visits by the Operator would not be required. We do not know at this time who the vendor would be.

***Q: Is there a cost overrun built into the \$680,000? If so, what is that amount?***

A: As stated in the presentation, the cost estimates are just that – estimates – and are best used to get a sense of the scale of the projects. Construction contracts normally include a contingency clause to address potential cost overruns, and we would expect that to be the case with this project as well.

***Q: Has there been any additional information about financial details from the Authority? Please provide when information was last requested by MGCA and when the Authority last responded.***

A: To date, the Authority has not indicated what it would charge Campmeeting residents for water. We last sent a request for that information on January 4, 2021, but have not received a response. The estimated cost quoted in the water supply presentation is what Authority customers are currently being charged. Representatives from the MGCA will be attending the Authority Board meeting on February 1, and hope to get more information.



# MEMBER QUESTIONS & COMMENTS

Submitted during public comment period: 1/9/21 – 1/31/21

Saturday, January 9, 2021 ▪ 10:00 a.m.

Recorded ZOOM™ Session

***Q: Has there been any communication with Mt. Gretna Borough about possibly joining the Authority? Please provide details.***

A: The MGCA broached the subject of having a representative on the Authority Board. There is no final decision, but the MGA does not seem to be inclined to allow such representation. The Campmeeting would simply be a customer of the Authority.

***Q: At the presentation, the question was asked as to whether basically doubling the Authority's customer base would reduce costs. Has the Authority or the Borough addressed or answered this question? Perhaps borough officials would be interested in knowing how MGCA joining the Authority might impact the costs for borough residents.***

A: The first question was also asked of the Authority in the MGCA's January 4<sup>th</sup> correspondence with them, but was not answered. The last issue above was raised at the Authority's January meeting, but the Authority declined to answer the question.

***Q: Mentioned in the presentation was an annual expenditure of \$18,000 for monitoring the automated system. Would MGCA still have this annual expenditure if we joined the Authority?***

A: No.

***Q: Do any of the options include an annual assessment dedicated to the water system— production and distribution—so as to build a fund for future improvements or meeting future state-mandated requirements? If so, what is the amount? If not, why not?***

A: Options 1, 2, and 3 included costs for all required maintenance of the water supply system. As explained in the presentation, costs to maintain/improve the water distribution system were not included. The Board of Managers believes it would be prudent to include an amount for this in the annual assessment going forward.

LINDA CAMPBELL, 402 Glossbrenner

***Q: On slide 26 (which shows a breakdown of estimated cost of all four options), Option 2 shows an annual per/unit cost of \$135 for tank replacement, while Option 3 shows an annual per/unit cost of \$26 for tank recoating. Is that slide correct?***

A: Yes, it is. The main heading of Option 2 is "Extensive Tank Refurbishment." With this option, the life of the current tank could be extended as much 20-30 years, but at the end of this period a new tank would likely be required. The \$135 is the annual per/unit cost build sufficient funds to pay for a new tank in 25 years. The main heading of Option 3 is "Tank/Foundation Replacement." With this option, the new tank would probably need to be recoated in 20-30 years. The \$26 is the annual per/unit cost to build sufficient funds to pay for tank recoating in 25 years.



# MEMBER QUESTIONS & COMMENTS

Submitted during public comment period: 1/9/21 – 1/31/21

Saturday, January 9, 2021 ▪ 10:00 a.m.

Recorded ZOOM™ Session

JAY NOBLE, MOUNT GRETNA SCHOOL OF ART

**Q: *Is there a debt payment rolled into [the Chautauqua water] fee currently that hasn't expired yet, similar to what Campmeeting would be paying through option 3? Could the payment of actual water use be lower to Chautauqua if their debt payment component was removed?:***

A: To the best of our knowledge, there is no debt payment being included into the cost of water for Chautauqua residents.

ROBIN WELTE, 505 3rd

**Q: *Is waste water treated by the Authority currently cycled back into the drinking water? Might this happen in the future?***

A: The Authority obtains all of its water from ground wells and does not recycle treated waste water into their drinking water system.

JUDY BOJKO, 712 5<sup>th</sup>

**Q: *Do we know the condition of the existing water tank foundation?***

A: There is no indication that the existing foundation is at risk of imminent failure. However, it would not meet building code requirements for installation of a new storage tank. So, installation of a new tank would require installation of new foundation as well. The cost to install a new foundation was included in the total project cost for Option 3.

TOM AND KAY HEBERLING, 210 3rd

**Q: *Can the new tank be established near the old tank so that our current supply of water would not be interrupted until the new system is completed?***

A: If an option is chosen for a new tank, the tank will be placed in the same location. Regardless of which option is chosen, we would work to make any interruptions with water distribution to be as minimal as possible so as to control costs.