



Water tower

Faye Maulfair

Sat, Jan 30, 2021 at 10:02 PM

To: Mt Gretna Campmeeting Office <Office@mtgretnacampmeeting.org>

First of all I would like to thank all who have been working on dealing with the water issue on behalf of all of us who have a cottage in Campmeeting. It's obvious that a lot of time was spent to research and come up with possible solutions.

If I understand correctly of the four options presented options 1 & 2 would not be permanent solutions so I do not support those 2 options. Option 4 would give control to the Gretna Authority and would be very costly to us cottage owners. Plus prices could be raised without input from Campmeeting. So I definitely would not be in favor of option 4.

I would support option 3 as the best solution. It does not kick the can down the road to be dealt with at a future time as does options 1 and 2 and we do not relinquish control of the wells as option 4 does. And option 3 increases our HOA fee less than options 1,2 and especially 4.

For those who live year round in Gretna and pay property taxes for only one house as well as utilities & upkeep for one property an ever increasing HOA fee may not be that big of an issue. But I'm sure there are many who only use their Gretna cottage as a second residence as we do and are concerned about the ever increasing costs of owning a Gretna cottage. So with that in mind I am supportive of option 3 because it gives us hopefully an ongoing solution & cost the least.

Respectfully,
Faye A. Maulfair



presentation

2 messages

LOUISE ADAMS <>

Sat, Jan 9, 2021 at 2:43 PM

To: "office@mtgretnacampmeeting.org" <office@mtgretnacampmeeting.org>

That was an excellent presentation this morning. Thank you for making it so easy to understand.

I could heartily endorse Option 3. That seems the most sensible. 1 and 2 are just kicking the can down the road and 4 seems too expensive. So, if you're looking for opinions, that is mine.

Thank you.

Louise Adams
304 6th St.



Question re water supply options

Robin <>

Sat, Jan 9, 2021 at 6:17 PM

Reply-To:

To: Mt Gretna Campmeeting Office <Office@mtgretnacampmeeting.org>

Thank you to all the board members for the zoom presentation today on options for maintaining our Campmeeting water supply. I was very impressed by the amount of research and analysis involved and by the clear and concise way the information was presented. Based on what I learned today, it appears to me that option 3 is the most viable. This is a long-term solution that allows us to maintain control of our wells and is also comparable in cost to options 1 and 2.

Aside from the loss of control and the additional expense involved with becoming a customer of the Mt Gretna Authority, I wonder if the water quality would be as good as our Mt Gretna Campmeeting well provides. What happens to the wastewater that is treated by the Authority? Is it eventually cycled back into drinking water? If not, might that happen in the future? The answer to that question might be relevant to the ongoing discussion.

Thank you again,

Robin Welte

505 3rd St



Quick question: Slide # 26

Linda Campbell

Sun, Jan 10, 2021 at 6:42 PM

To: "Office@MtGretnaCampmeeting.org" <Office@mtgretnacampmeeting.org>

Reviewing my screen shot of slide 26, I noticed that option 2 lists Tank Replacement (heading "Extensive Tank Refurbishment") while option 3 ("Tank/Foundation Replacement") lists Tank Recoating. I was under the impression that option 3 was replacement. Is the slide correct?

Linda Campbell



Water Presentation

2 messages

Pdeppen@windstream.net <>To: Office@mtgretnacamp
meeting.org

Mon, Jan 11, 2021 at 8:17 AM

Hello Board Members,

As many community members already mentioned, the water presentation was thorough and much appreciated.

Based on my interpretation of the communication between Campmeeting and the Mount Gretna Water Authority, I don't think the Authority is too interested in serving Campmeeting. The fact that we are still waiting for answers to questions and Campmeeting would not have a representative on their board, leads me to believe they view our request as a favor rather than a business collaboration. For these reasons, I would be hesitant to move forward with the Water Authority.

I believe the best choice is option #3, replacement of tank and foundation at a cost of \$680,000.

I have a rather cumbersome request. Could we give each cottage owner the option of a one time assessment of roughly \$2800, ($680,000 \div 242$) or to pay \$215.00 on a yearly basis? Obviously, it is easier for some of us to write a \$2800 check than it is for others. However, the more owners who pay the \$2800 the less we have to finance, thus an overall savings. Of course, the \$215 may decrease depending on the amount we need to finance or same the same and beef up our capital fund for our next project. I think this is a very community minded approach. Unfortunately, it would complicate our yearly assessment invoices, no longer would everyone be paying the same amount. There would be two separate amounts based on if you paid an upfront lump sum or you divided that sum into yearly payments. I would be pleased to pay the one time assessment knowing I am helping out community members who are unable to do so. I have a feeling, many other residents would do the same. Only the Campmeeting office would know the decision each cottage owner chooses. Once again, the less we have to finance, the less interest we as a community needs to pay.

I have a feeling we will be having similar discussions in the near future pertaining to our sewer lines and drainage challenges. So this may be the first of many future assessment increases. Please continue to research grant availability and alternative financing. I think that is the key to keeping Campmeeting more diverse from a socioeconomic stand point.

Thank you for tackling this challenging project. I look forward to your decision.

Paula Deppen



Re: MGCA Water Supply Comment Period Closing Soon

Paulette Aye <>To: office@mtgretnacamp
meeting.org

Mon, Jan 18, 2021 at 10:47 AM

Can you please provide a breakdown of what our assessment pays for today?

The bill does not show it.

That may help folks make a better decision.

Thank you!

Regards,

Paulette



Water

John Barton

Mon, Jan 18, 2021 at 2:44 PM

To: Mt Gretna Campmeeting Office <Office@mtgretnacampmeeting.org>

Hi Debbie,

Since you are requesting comment on water I'll throw in my two cents. I am in favor of option 3, with the provision that option 4 could be viable if MGA was willing to provide all required data/information and Campmeeting had equal representation on the MGA board.

John Barton
511 2nd Street



water tank

jvbojko35

Mon, Jan 18, 2021 at 4:18 PM

To: Office@mtgretnacampmeeting.org

Do we know the condition of the water tank concrete foundation?

At this time I feel Replacement option one (to replace the tank) is advantageous if the foundation is sound enough to last long enough to support the new tank.

Thanks,

Judy Bojko

Sent from my Galaxy



Option 3 please

Deb

Mon, Jan 18, 2021 at 10:45 AM

To: "Office@MtGretnaCampmeeting.org" <Office@mtgretnacampmeeting.org>

Good Morning,

Please put me down for Option 3 of the options presented in the Water Supply Slideshow.

My only question, and this is one that can be answered later. Will I have a paid in full option so I don't have to pay my portion plus interest over the long term? I'd rather pay the \$2810 (680,000/242) and have it done in one go than pay \$5375 (215 * 25) over 25 years.

Again, I think that's an administrative issue that should be addressed after the decision is made.

I think Option 4 is the least fiscally responsible.

It appears to give away our water (the easement for the well), a valuable resource, while drastically increasing the annual cost of our water with no guarantee of price stability and no investment to our infrastructure. Option 4 would make us cripplingly, permanently dependent on an outside authority which we have surrendered our resource, without compensation, while gaining no long term benefit or even a voice within the entity.

I support the increase in HOA annual assessment as long as there are very clear guidelines on exactly what the fund is to be used for. I wouldn't want to see the fund drained to support a pet project and then disaster strikes some part of the infrastructure and there is no cushion.

Thank you,

Deborah Griffith

209 5th Street,

Campmeeting.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10



water supply

Ann Bering

Tue, Jan 19, 2021 at 8:22 PM

To: "Office@MtGretnaCampmeeting.org" <Office@mtgretnacampmeeting.org>

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the water supply meeting. I can see there is a lot of information involved in making an educated decision and it is tricky to decide what to do.

As a child growing up in Campmeeting I enjoyed playing around the water tank as well as many other still existing landmarks. I now appreciate it in a very different way.

The options given are impressive. Imagine a community our size with multiple options!

Option 1 is enticing because it is the least costly, but upon further review, "you get the least bang for your buck." It could become a money pit, more like a band aid than a repair.

Option 2 is a bit safer with more extensive refurbishing, and could be acceptable, but we could do better and insure a longer life to the water system.

Option 3 is the one I would choose. It is long lasting and solves problems instead of temporarily repairing them and leaving them fragile. We all like the quality of our water and having a little control of the water, the system, and the water delivery operation.

Option 4 also appears to be a good solution. However, the benefit of having two water sources and therefore backup for each source of water is invaluable. Choosing option 3 is like having backup - an insurance policy for both the Campmeeting water system and the Water Authority.

Thank you again for your time and effort.

Ann and Joe Bering
305 Eighth St.

January 19, 2021

Mt. Gretna Campmeeting Association
Board of Managers

Subject: Water Supply Presentation

I would like to thank the Board for providing all of the information currently available to the members on this extremely important issue for our consideration and comments. I, along with other members, already asked some questions during the on-line presentation on January 9th and expect that the answers provided will be made available to all members before a final decision is made by the Board. However, I also wanted to provide the following comments/suggestions for your consideration.

1. Given that any option will substantially increase each member's contribution to the annual cost of the water supply system, it may be more prudent to allow members the choice to pay this cost on either an annual, quarterly or monthly basis.
2. Given that any option will substantially increase each member's contribution to the annual cost of the water supply system, it may be more equitable to remove or increase the current cap on rentals in order to allow those part-time residents to recover these increased costs.
3. It is expected that full-time residents use a greater proportion of the water supply system than part-time residents. Accordingly, it may be more equitable to install a water meter in each resident and have these costs assigned on a per use basis.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments/suggestions for your consideration. For what it's worth, I personally favor Option #3. In any case, I know that the Board will seek the best path for the members' future water needs and will explore all possible sources of revenue, including grants and low cost loans.

Sincerely,

Lou LaRicci
409 7th Street



MGCA Water Project Comments

Dennis Shaak

Sat, Jan 23, 2021 at 4:13 PM

To: "Mt. Gretna Campmeeting" <office@mtgretnacampmeeting.org>

Thank you to the board/committee members who are tackling this important project. The webinar video was great, very informative. For background, my wife Martha and I own the cottage on 309 1st St. We plan on having our cottage for many years to come, eventually passing it on to our daughter and her husband when they relocate to PA. in a few years.

We think option 3 is the best option. Our community has good wells, we should use them. We will need water forever, we should make the investment now to do the job correctly for the long term. It does not seem logical to pipe water up the hill to the reservoir and then pipe it back down the hill again, and then having to pay a premium price for our own water. We realize this will require the involvement of our board to manage the system, but they have been managing an old problem prone system for many years, a new system should be less work.

One question that I have involves the increased yearly assessment numbers. It is not apparent to me why the option 2 annual cost (\$280) is so much higher than the option 3 annual cost (\$215). The installation cost of option 3 (\$680K) is twice as expensive as option 2 (\$372K), but the annual cost is \$75 less expensive? I assume that is because option three does not require a tank replacement x number of years down the road.

The apparent high cost of the MGA and their lack of response to your inquiries indicates they are not interested in expanding their operations. Makes you question what type of response we would get to water system problems if we were their customer.

We understand a loan is necessary. Would you consider having a method that would allow individual units to pay off their portion of the loan early, so they do not have to pay on a loan over 25 years. I know that paperwork and accounting wise this would be more complicated, but it would allow individuals to eliminate paying the interest all those years.

We also think it wise to create a water distribution maintenance fund to have in place for future distribution maintenance expenses.

Thank you,
Martha and Dennis Shaak
309 1st St.



Water proposals

2 messages

Linda Campbell

Mon, Jan 25, 2021 at 11:55 AM

To: "Office@MtGretnaCampmeeting.org" <Office@mtgretnacampmeeting.org>

Hello. Jim and I are in favor of Option 3 for the following reasons:

1. It allows us to maintain some degree of control over the water distribution process as well as over the resource that we own.
2. It is the most economical of the plans presented.

Let me expand on our reasoning. We are currently paying high sewer rates to the Mount Gretna Borough, those charges rising annually which a review of prior years clearly affirms. At our primary residence in Mount Joy, sewer charges, which are tied to metered water use, run approximately \$95/quarter. certainly considerably lower than the current and projected Mount Gretna Borough sewer rates. Moreover, reports indicate that our wells are providing an ample supply of potable water, suggesting that we would, in fact, be providing water to the borough. We have concerns about the easement. It does seem rather inefficient to pump water to their tanks and back to our delivery lines. Again comparing costs at our Mount Joy residence, the water charge for the current quarter is \$82, with an approximate annual cost of \$330, much lower than the price for water service quoted by the Mount Gretna Borough. Adding to these cost considerations is the observation that paying \$546 to the borough, a charge likely to rise if the history of sewer charges is any indication, would yield no long-term investment; Option 3 would give us a new system with subsequent control. We are also interested in knowing whether it would be possible to pay the total charge up front, thus saving on the interest on the loan. Could this option be considered for interested property owners?

As a matter of curiosity and information, we are interested in clarifying our understanding about the church: according to the information provided at the meeting, the church is included in the count of 242 units. Are the church **and** manse included in this count and billed separately?

On a different topic, we noticed that the figures on the assessment sheet do not add up to the total of \$2150 but rather \$2000. Does that mean our assessment is instead this second figure? Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Returning to the water question, we appreciate the opportunity for the community to provide feedback to the board.

Linda and Jim Campbell



Owner comments on Water Tank Options

Emily green

Mon, Jan 25, 2021 at 3:56 PM

To: office@mtgretnacampmeeting.org

To: MCGA Trustees

From: Joan Nagle and Emily & Jack Green, owners, 709 Third St.

Subject: Water Tank comments

Thank you very much for the overview of the work that's been done to date to understand the state of our water system and the options that might be available and advisable for improving it. We'd like to comment.

First, our compliments on the good work that's been done so far. We appreciate the thoughtful testing, the creation and research of multiple options, and the clear and concise way in which they were presented. Well done, and it definitely builds our confidence in whatever path we do pursue as an Association.

Second, it seems clear to us from the overview that the right path is option 3. Options 1 & 2 don't cost much less and don't give us much in the way of runway; they seem like kicking the can down the road but at a considerable expense. We'd only favor not facing the music, so to speak, if it was a lot less expensive to do so. Option 4—which in advance of your study we might have predicted would be the best path, just getting out of the water business—is surprisingly expensive.

And because we are residents and water consumers for only about 8 weeks/year, Option 4 would be of added concern if the fee they would charge would be the same for all cottages, vs based on usage (which we understand there is no current capability to do). The suggested annual costs for water for options 1-3 are low enough that we don't mind subsidizing the year-round water consumption of our neighbors, as we already do, but once it gets that pricey, we would be less comfortable with the inherent unfairness of that approach.

Thus, facing the work that needs to be done, so we can continue to use our own delicious Campmeeting water, is the best course. We appreciate the thoughtfulness around financing this, so that the expense doesn't go entirely onto the backs of current residents but is supported by later beneficiaries as well.

Thanks for the chance to express our views and again, thanks for the good work so far.

Respectfully

Emily & Jack Green

Joan Nagle

709 Third St.

Campmeeting

Emily Green

Mount Gretna Campmeeting Association

January 26, 2021

Kay and Tom Heberling

210 3rd Street

Mount Gretna, PA

Re: Water

1. We support option 3, a total replacement of tank and equipment. This option includes maintaining control of our wells and water system. This should provide decades of safe and adequate supply of water.
2. We recommend offering each user the opportunity to pay their share as a lump sum or have their payment via a Campmeeting loan. This option would allow those able and preferring to pay immediately to avoid the cost of interest. Those who wished to take out their own loan at less interest or over a shorter period of time could do so.
3. We support establishing an infrastructure fund to cover water distribution, sewer lines, culverts, and roads.
4. We feel the greatest health liability from our water system is via a leak in our distribution system. An automated system to monitor and adjust the water would have us in compliance with water standards as it exits the tank system.

Question: 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?

Thank you,

Kay and Tom Heberling

To the Board of Managers
Jan. 23, 2021

Thank you again for the presentation on the options for the Association's drinking water.

I have several questions about Option 3: New Tank and Foundation:

1. What size tank and how does the size of a new tank compare to the size of the existing tank?
 - a. Would the new tank be steel or...? Advantages of the material?
2. How would the tank be mounted and how does this compare to the existing foundation – height, materials, size etc.?
3. 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?
 - a. What is the cost of water from Mount Gretna Water Authority?
4. Does the estimated cost of \$680,000 include site preparation?
 - a. What is involved in site preparation?
 - b. If the \$680,000 cost does not include site preparation, what is the estimated cost of site preparation?
5. Who would provide maintenance of the tank and foundation?
 - a. Would there be a contract for maintenance of the tank and a separate contract for maintenance of the foundation?
 - b. What is the cost of the contract or contracts?
 - c. What would the contract(s) cover in terms of maintenance?
6. Mentioned in the presentation was an annual expenditure of \$18,000 for monitoring of the automated system and/or testing water.
 - a. Please provide more details about what this involves. Would the Campmeeting continue to contract with Martin Water? If not, with another company?
 - b. What entity will ensure compliance with DEP regulations?
7. Is there a cost overrun built into the \$680,000? If so, what is that amount?

I also have some questions about Option 4: Mt. Gretna Authority

1. Has there been any additional information about financial details from the Authority?
 - a. Please provide when information was last requested by MGCA and when the Authority last responded.
2. Has there been any communication with Mt. Gretna Borough about possibly joining the Authority?
 - a. Please provide details.
3. 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?
 - a. Again perhaps borough officials would be interested in knowing how MGCA joining the Authority might impact the costs for borough residents.

4. 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 general question

1. 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?
 - a. If so, what is the amount?
 - b. If not, why not?

Thank you for all your efforts in understanding our water system, presenting the information, and answering members' questions.

Margaret Hopkins
505 Glossbrenner Ave.



Re: MGCA Water Supply Comment Period Closing Soon1 message

Jay Noble

Wed, Jan 27, 2021 at 12:58 PM

To: Mt Gretna Campmeeting Office <office@mtgretnacampmeeting.org>

Dear Mt Gretna Campmeeting,

Option 3 seems best. Fully replace the tank and foundation, keeping independent control of water in Campmeeting's hands. Personally, I'm young enough to very possibly be involved with camp meeting for another 30 years or more and favor long term fixed expense solutions.

The worst idea seems option 4, ceding control of water to Mt Gretna Water Authority.

- My initial reaction is the cost seems excessive and the proposal overly complicated/uncertain compared to the other options.
- I expect a quagmire of potential conflict between borough boards negotiating a deal or trying to correct problems with the deal as they emerge years later.
 - One thing that struck me is Chautauqua could potentially pass costs along to camp meeting members, lowering or even eliminating their own Chautauqua member costs.
 - Long term the water rate may rise or vary more dramatically through the deal, while the water fee for option 3 would essentially remain fixed or probably go down over time as inflation increases long term against an essentially fixed expense of the water option #3.
- Circling back to the first bullet point, my thought is that the water fee paid by Chautauqua seemed disproportionately high. Is there a debt payment rolled into their 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? Even if the actual water use fee is lower without the debt component, I still feel independent control of water option #3 is a better option, retaining the emergency use connection with Mt Gretna Borough as a backup.

Thanks for the comment period and presentation,

Jay Noble
Executive (Artistic) Director
Mount Gretna School of Art & Four Pillars artist residency
PO Box 182
Mount Gretna, PA 17064
717-823-8367
jnoble@mgsoa.org
www.mgsoa.org
www.fourpillars.org



Campmeeting Water Supply - Member Comment

Hazel, Jeffrey

Fri, Jan 29, 2021 at 11:07 AM

To: "office@mtgretnacampmeeting.org" <office@mtgretnacampmeeting.org>

Hello, MGCA Board of Managers:

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh-in on the ongoing water project. I appreciate the efforts of this board, as well as the committee members devoting time to this project and your open communication with MGCA members regarding studied options. In a follow-up communication, members were asked to provide information related to thoughts on water options discussed as well as system charges and maintenance fees in their communities.

Of note, Our primary residence is in Maryland. Our quarterly public water cost ranges from \$200 - \$250 (reminder that we enjoy Mt. Gretna every weekend – so we're not using water in Maryland during this time), and in Montgomery county we have an additional yearly infrastructure cost of \$650 depending on frontage. I hope you find this helpful as you continue to gather information related to overall cost/maintenance of water systems.

We support the ongoing efforts of the board and am in favor of Option #3 (tank replacement). A new tank will sustain us for generations to come.

We clearly have the best most pristine water source in the area for multiple reasons and it is prudent that we protect our water source. When family members visit us in Mt. Gretna from the west coast or southern states, they consistently mention how wonderful our water is (not only to shower but to *drink*) – they think we have such a luxury! I'm not kidding – you should hear my mother! I think many take this for granted.

Again, I do want to thank you all for your work and time commitment as board members – it doesn't go unnoticed by members.

Thank you,

Jeffrey Hazel / Russell Vereb— [602 Kephart Avenue](#).

jeffrey.hazel@marriott.com

Douglas Lorenzen and Pamela Bishop
503 First St.
Mt. Gretna, PA 17064

January 30, 2021

Via email: Office@MtGretnaCampmeeting.org

Mr. Kevin Burd, President
Mt. Gretna Campmeeting Association Board of Managers
P.O. Box 428
Mt. Gretna, PA 17064

RE: Water Supply Issue

Dear Kevin,

We would like to compliment you and the whole Board of Managers (BOM) for a well-organized and factual presentation on the water supply issue facing the Mt Gretna Campmeeting Association (MGCA). We know it took an extraordinary amount of time and work as volunteers in preparing the presentation. This is, without a doubt, the single most important issue facing the MGCA at this time.

We offer the following comments for your and the BOM's consideration.

1. Option #4, the option to have the Mt. Gretna Authority (MGA) supply us with all of our future water needs could be the most appealing as it would potentially get us out of the water business and the associated responsibilities. However, there are several questions that need to be answered to make this option attractive. First, we need to know what effect on water rates and connection fees (connection of our well and our distribution system), the doubling of their customer base would have and also the fact that we would be nearly doubling their water supply capability. It is reasonable to assume that their rates would go down significantly. Second, it is also reasonable to assume we would be given full membership and seats on the Mt. Gretna Authority. Without positive responses to these questions, this option is unacceptable. We need full membership on the MGA not just to become a bulk water customer, for this option to be viable.

2. Of the remaining options, in the near term, it would be reasonable for MGCA to choose the cheaper option (Option #1) to allow us time to negotiate with the Mt. Gretna Authority. We believe the refurbishment of the tank would give us easily 5 more years of use. It would also

allow MGCA time to institute and build a reserve fund to help finance the change over to the MGA or in lieu of joining the MGA, the erecting of a new tank. We need ample time to negotiate properly with the MGA and to build a reserve fund. We need an annual water assessment to build a reserve fund, no matter which option we choose. If we do not join MGA, we will need to employ professional management for our water system.

3. Regarding our water distribution system, it may be reasonable to assume that the MGA would not agree to “take over” the distribution lines, but would they accept responsibility for running the system and obtaining the necessary permits. Also, we need to know what expenses are associated with the distribution system management (such as monitoring and sampling), maintenance and replacement and plan for those future costs. Therefore, we need more information regarding the distribution system.

4. We commend you and the BOM for the excellent job on fact-finding, but we now need a panel of experienced professionals to negotiate on our behalf with the MGA to ensure we have a sound and fair agreement. Such negotiations could take a good deal of time.

Thank you for consideration of our comments. We look forward to the February 13 water supply member meeting.

Sincerely,

/s/Doug Lorenzen and Pam Bishop

Doug Lorenzen and Pam Bishop