

1. Given the current state of affairs regarding the pandemic of Covid 19 whereby citizens are highly encouraged to remain at home, we feel it fair, and necessary to maintain our democratic way of life to hold off any public comment period until such time as public gatherings are reinstated. *In the spirit of public involvement, a list of acronyms and abbreviations at the end of this document.
2. The Planning Commission respectfully requests a written response from HRG concerning (each of) our comments and questions.
3. The word “SHALL” in the second item of the Executive Summary needs to be eliminated, as it is inconsistent with the body of the document in which Milford Borough is not implementing the OLDS ordinance, rather is instead conducting a five-year long study. The word “SHALL” makes the implementation mandatory, and Milford Borough clearly is not planning to implement such an ordinance.
4. If this plan is approved, a new inter-municipal agreement will be signed, and the contents of this agreement are not stated. There are 4 municipalities and 2 municipal authorities. Who would run this Board? How will people be appointed? Will each municipality and authority have a seat at the table? Who will have control?
5. The engineer admitted that reviewing 1,200 pages, which constitutes ordinances and comprehensive plans of Municipalities of this 1,600 page document, is not needed. Why are these 1,200 pages included in the document? What portions or provisions of those documents will be used to support the 537 Plan? Comprehensive plans and ordinances are living documents that are in review and constant change. It is not clear why those documents at this time would be useful after they are changed. Can they be removed and why shouldn't they be removed?
6. Comments on the task activity report (TAR) have not been received from DEP or Delaware River Basin Commission (DRBC). Furthermore, both agencies should have been consulted prior to any formal planning or studies being conducted. Where is the supporting documentation of those meetings and comments from both?
7. Isn't the first step to this process supposed to be a substantiation for this study ie. ground failure, known as an “anti-degradation letter.” Was such a letter submitted to DEP and if so, please provide a copy. If this step was omitted, please explain.
8. Has the power company been notified of any proposed or emergency impact on their infrastructure?

9. #1 Recommendation (Alternatives) – By going with the grinder pump system the burden of maintenance and repairs falls on the property owner. Added pressure to the property owner mounts when the electric goes out and there is no generator on site. The extra expense of installing a generator would be the burden of the property owner. With grinder pumps, depending on the length to the main line, odor can be an issue. This has not been discussed, please explain in detail. It is also proposed that these two horsepower grinder pumps will be placed in 50 gallon tanks, which will result in frequent start up and shut off which will diminish the life of the pump. The constant start up and running will also increase the electricity use, which is not addressed in the document. Multi-tenant properties will have to have the grinder pumps on the ‘house’ electricity account.
10. If the plan called for gravity feed, and only several pump stations throughout the system, all of the previously stated grinder pump alternative concerns should be eliminated, correct?
11. It is indicated in the Plan that each EDU is based on 200 gallons per day. A study was done in Milford Borough a few years ago and the average gallons per day was 230 – 250. The national average is 265 gallons. So where did the #200 gallons derive from? Why should this number be used rather than the standard national average? How would using the national average impact the proposed project? Given the smaller number is being used, if it is short of actual usage, how does that impact the capacity, pump station and pipe planning and peak flow planning in this document?
12. \$72 per EDU. Please clarify this fee schedule. We don’t know what the wholesale price is for Westfall Municipal Authority or the Milford Municipal Authority. Will this be the same fee for everyone? OR, will there be different fee structures? There is a maximum reasonable charge based on average household incomes; how does that get calculated in this multi-municipal project and how does that compare to this proposal? How would it compare if the price is adjusted due to the EDU gallonage being national average?
13. There is no Impact Statement on development. The impact on the development, preexisting lots, and density needs to be included in the document. What impact on development will the sewage have on preexisting land? When will the system be at capacity? Milford Borough has suggested expanding lot coverage from 35 to 50% due to the availability of sewer infrastructure, which would allow increased size of houses and more bedrooms. Currently, sewage capacity drives the maximum size of the house and number of bedrooms. If the Borough makes this change, this will increase the sewage output from these properties. How will that impact the system capacity and the planning for pump stations, etc.? What recommendations would be made to the Borough and the Township in that regard?

14. A massive expansion would allow restaurants to be able to provide more meals in a day and residential housing to expand. How much capacity does the facility have right now? Is there availability for expansion of the volume of effluent to be treated? Do the municipalities need to prioritize or control the growth to keep the system within its capacity? How far ahead would the municipal authority need to begin planning the expansion of the plant's capacity to ensure it was prepared before capacity is reached and how would the costs of that expansion and planning be shared / allocated? Should each municipality be given an apportionment of the growth capacity or is it first come first serve?
15. A widespread confirmation of on-lot disposal system failures was not confirmed, and according to DEP, we do not have ground failures here; we only have system failures. Why is \$6-12 million expansion of sewage happening? USDA and PennVEST loans (or a combination of the two loans) can be used to solve the issue of a small number of on-lot sewage failures. Fixing the on-lot sewage works when frequent pump outs become necessary. We have good soil for drainage.
16. What other clear alternatives, other than some type of central sewage were considered? How has Westfall Township benefitted from the 20 years hooked up to central sewage? Have they provided high quality and family supporting jobs?
17. The location of the lines in streets and alleys needs to be clearly defined. How do we pick a definite route for pipes, etc. 10 years in advance?
18. The Borough says there will be no tapping fee. However, the tapping fee cannot be waived by the Borough since this fee goes to the Municipal Authority to be used for capital improvements. The Borough might get grants, but that does not mean that the tapping fee can be avoided? How can it be implied that there will be no tapping fee when the fee is unavoidable?
19. Table 3.3 Summary of Tier 2 Survey Malfunction Categories - there is no cross referencing of the recommended sewer expansion area with the numbers referenced here. Accordingly, it is not possible to ascertain whether or how many of these properties have the potential to be served or would be mandated to be served by the expansion of sewer service as it is being recommended.
20. 3.3.2 Well Water Survey – indicates there are “no properties within the planning area that are serviced by private wells...” – there is no cross referencing of the OLDS surveyed against their specific water usage to ensure they are indeed served by public water. This is a particular challenge in Milford Township wherein the majority of the properties are not served by the public water system and the portion of Westfall Township that this expansion includes, an area which is currently in its majority not

served by the Milford Water Authority or the Matamoras Water Authority. Further, one Milford Township development near the path of the planned expansion area has a well that is immediately adjacent to the planning area, is not currently served by municipal water because the MWA and the development did not reach an agreement for service adequate to both sides, and reportedly has a Court Order that will require their septic sewage land area to be deeded back to the developer should central sewer become available.

21. Page 4-3 Land Use Plan – “Capacity at the MATW WWTP has been reserved [for the Katz Uses] but the land has not been developed”. Do the capacity projections in the plan include the Katz reserved capacity or exclude that capacity as the development has not happened yet? Would the Katz reserve capacity, in tandem with the recommended expansion area, cause the WWTP to exceed its DRBC & DEP approved capacity?
22. Page 4-7 4.1.2 Land Use Conservation – “existing subdivisions in Milford Township are full.” This is a misstatement of fact. Perhaps it would be more accurate if the statement were limited to the developments along the recommended path and immediately adjacent to the sewer expansion area as proposed.
23. 4.4 Page 4-23 Table 4.11 Population History and Projections – does not note that the County’s projections were not realized for 2010 and the County does not even seem likely to have reached the 2010 projections by 2020, rather experienced a significant change in the pattern. It is important to note that, so as not to misrepresent the growth of the area and the resultant demand for infrastructure.
24. 4.5 Wastewater projection Page 4-23 – DVHS is based on an annual average. Does this present an issue considering the annual average is utilizing significantly lower activity and could distort calculations for peak flow planning?
25. 4.6 Summary of Wastewater Planning Needs – Page 4-24 States that Milford Township is served “entirely by OLDS,” would it not be more accurate to say OLD/COLDS?
26. 5.2 States there are 10 potential connections from where the line currently ends at McDonald’s to the Milford Township line. This is not an accurate statement. 1. DV Complex 2. Village Diner 3. Milford Senior Care 4. Have a Hoot 5. Crossfit 6. Kitattinny Campground 7. Westfall Professional Building 8. Tschopp’s 9. Pierce House 10. Office Bldg 11. Mobile Home Park and industrial building 12. Music Center 13. Sequoia Tree 14. Residence next to tree service 15. Pike County Light & Power 16. Sunshine Station 17. Tractor Supply 18. Scottish Inn/Fairbanks Inn – it should be noted this does not include any in fill of vacant properties of which there are several. If there are 10 potential connections because of some response from the property owners or another particular reason, that should be noted. If Westfall Township implements a mandatory hook up ordinance as is being recommended, how would these additional

properties, not currently served by public water, impact the capacity and flow recommendations and pump station capacity?

27. Alternative 4A says 33,500 gallons per day but Alternative 4C says the same connections but shows 22,600 gallons per day. Why is that?
28. The Broad Street option shows 49 connections but the 4D option of using the alleys shows 68. Are these additional connections commercial as well?
29. 5-4 How is it that Alternative 6F originally (in the June version of the plan) says 48 residential connections and though nothing else has changed in its description it now says only 19 residential connections?
30. How is it that Alternative 7 originally showed 123 commercial connections in the June version but now it shows 134?
31. Figure 5.2 “Projected Organic Loads” shows a spike at October 2019. Why did it spike in October of 2019? Is that 1000 gallons per day?
32. 5.2 Pg. 5-6 Typo – Price Chopper, not Shopper
33. 5.2.1 Conventional Gravity Sewers states the feasibility of conventional gravity is dependent on high groundwater tables... Was there a review of a groundwater study to cross reference with the planned areas to the system? Where did they identify that as an issue?
34. 5.2.1 Low Pressure Systems – What is meant by “sewage may be septic?” “Odor problems” typically arise at what length? This has a huge potential for quality of life deterioration and negative impact on tourism!
35. 5.2.1. LPS When discussing grinder pump systems – Is 50 gallons sufficient for the fiberglass basin? How fast would 50 gallons fill in a power outage in an average home? Would the basin size be regulated and by whom or what? Who determines the type of pump (there are two listed)? Benefits and drawbacks of each type?
36. How many of the “suspected failures” shown on the chart are in the proposed sewer area?
37. The proposed system includes manholes every 400 feet and at every change in direction. What are the maintenance requirements for these manholes and what types of problems can arise from them? Sinkholes? Stormwater management issues? Are these maintenance requirements born by the Authorities or the municipalities and are the

maintenance costs factored into the costs outlined in this plan? What would be the description and/or the design of these manholes being it's a 6 inch line.

38. Where exactly on E Harford Street does the system end?
39. 5.5 Pg 5-9 COLDS are not recommended – Why should Milford Township restrict the ability of a developer to choose whether to hook up or use a COLDS system? What happens if this plan is enacted but the extension is not done for an extended period of time; are new projects blocked unless they extend the line themselves? Could this language be used to force areas of the Townships not in this plan to become sewerred i.e. if COLDS are not recommended anywhere in the Township but the sewer lines are in a limited area? If Milford Township is merely a conveyance line why should the properties there be restricted against COLDS systems?
40. “Too expensive” to do a COLDS Alternative as compared to the full line extension project; that seems improbable, doesn't it? What about the interim basis - shouldn't a COLDS system be permissible if the line is not ready or will not be ready by the time the project would be operational?
41. 5.5 on Page 5-9 2nd paragraph, second line form the bottom trails off “connect once the sewer’ then a new sentence begins. What’s missing?
42. 5.1.4 ‘Provide for only minimal growth in the planning area’ – Define minimal? How so?
43. 5.11.5 No cost estimate is given for repair and replacement. For such a small number of properties what would it cost to get that? How can we NOT have that?
44. 5.11.6 The extensions proposed area... subject to change. By whose authority?
45. 5.11.6 How will all the manholes affect stormwater and be affected by stormwater? Does this create concern for sinkholes? Snow plowing issues? Long term road maintenance issues?
46. 5.11.6 #12 – Are the municipal paving depths accurate to us?
47. 5.11.6 #22 – Is that entire area outside the 100-year floodplain?
48. 5.14 There is a \$1600 tapping fee built into the estimates. [Borough Council members are saying no tapping fee. On follow up the Borough Council President is saying the tapping fee will be paid using grant money for the businesses. What grant funding source will pay that? *[Scenic Rural Character Preservation money paid by the taxpayers*

of the entire County to subsidize those tapping fees as clean water initiative like the study itself?]

49. Table 5-26 on Pg. 5-40 indicates the tapping fees are not to contribute to the project cost for Milford or Matamoras planned alternatives. Why is that? Does that mean no tapping fees will be charged? Who will ultimately determine the tapping fees? Has the Milford Water Authority contributed speculative tapping fee or per EDU fees to this study or acknowledged the legitimacy of the rates herein?
50. Pg. 5-8 5.4.2 Water Conservation – “The use of laundry facilities may be limited to one load per day or discontinued altogether.” This statement writes into our plan the ability of the local government enforcement officer to micro-manage the essential life activities happening inside a residence in a way that seriously jeopardizes the functionality of a home and frankly is unlikely to be enforceable. Furthermore, it begs the question, should properties on the extension, including new development, reach or nearly reach the system capacity, would such intrusive overreaching be used (or attempt to be used) on the participating properties? Considering their ability to remedy the situations would be nil, such would be extremely dangerous to the local economy.
51. Pg. 5-10 5.7 Holding Tanks – Does Milford Townships want a holding tank ordinance? Why should we adopt one? Why would this be driven by this plan without direction coming from the Township Supervisors or Planning Commission as ordinances are, normally and typically? Again, if Milford Township is just a conveyance line, why would we need to do this?
52. Pg. 5-10 5.8 Sewage Management Programs – “Will evaluate the implementation... will draft [OLDS Management Ordinance] by year 2... and complete by year 4.” Why would Milford Township, as a ‘conveyance/transmission’ municipality be held to a higher standard than Milford Borough, whose overdevelopment and density are driving the purported need for this sewer extension and plan update? This is frankly and absolutely unacceptable.
53. Pg. 5-11 – Suggesting that “systems may be inspected by an authorized agent at any reasonable time including the introduction of ... substances into interior plumbing...” is another government overreach of private property rights. Even in landlord/tenant situations occupants must be given notice before entry into their home. No thanks! This is not appropriate for our community!
54. Public Education – what sort of resources does this require the municipality to provide residents? What expenses does this cause the municipality to incur? Is this within the control of each municipality? Can this program be used against the municipality if a system fails and the residents are abiding by the requirements and maintaining their

systems? Can DEP mandate what must be provided/spent by the municipality in this regard?

55. Pg. 5-13 5.11.3 Alternative for Milford Borough – “The alleys behind E and W Harford St are proposed... lower cost for owners to connect... located in the back of the property... lower restorations costs as these alleys are not PENNDOT roads.” There is no alleyway behind one side of Harford Street. How will the costs be equitably divided, given this benefits owners on one side of the street at the added expense of those on the other and what is the plan to provide service to the far side of Harford Street?
56. Several of the buildings with major issues and needs are on the far side of Harford Street, including the Dimmick Inn, located at the main intersection of town. How will service to these properties be achieved without crossing the PENNDOT road, a road which is the lifeblood of this entire region and the disruption of which will cause massive temporary traffic problems and have dire economic consequences for the local businesses? If lines are going to cross Harford Street in multiple locations, this would be disastrous for the duration of the construction period. Is that ‘alternative’ cheaper than running the line down the street itself where construction zones could be set up to permit one lane traffic as both sides of the road are not being crossed at the same place?
57. 5.11.5 No Action Alternative – “however it does not address the issues raised... and business economic viability in the Plan Areas.” Where in this study has the economic viability of area business been analyzed? [It has not]. While it may be true that a very small number of specific properties with problematic systems and high volume uses may have site locations that limit the traditional solutions they can deploy to correct them, this study has not analyzed alternatives that could be done to serve those systems economically, nor has the study undertaken assessments of alternative locations those businesses could relocate to, nor alternative business types that would be better suited to those property limitations and more economically profitable and viable for those sites. Further, it is not within the scope or purview of this study to assess the economic viability of individual properties nor has this study undertaken analysis of whether some businesses and properties will have their economic viability diminished as a result of this proposed project, which several business and property owners have also purported. As such, this unqualified statement needs to be removed.
58. Frankly, that this study would suggest that homeowners could or should be forced to limit their property use by so far as limiting their ability to do household laundry whilst business property owners facing system issues should instead be the catalyst for the entire planning area to spend millions of dollars for the benefit of those few business(es)’ economic viability rather than even determining the cost of alternatives they may be able to provide themselves or alternative business plans that could mitigate their issues is uneven, unfair and bias, contrary to what the municipality(ies) should undertake to be in our approach to govern properly for the people and by the people.

59. Pg. 4-24 4.5 The 200 GPD = 1 EDU originates with the Westfall Twp. “Chapter 94 Report.” What is this and given its significance why is it NOT included in this document as an appendix item? Please supply a copy of this document ASAP.
60. Pg. 4-8 Build Out Analysis – The composite zoning map is used to show “buildable/non-buildable land.” This does not identify what is previously classified as non-buildable by virtue of inability to “perk” for OLSS (On Lot Septic Systems) and would become buildable by virtue of this project.
61. Pg. 4-12 Build Out Analysis Chart – How is it that the water consumption is listed as 175 gpd per household while the sewage generated is listed as 200 gpd per household? If the sewage can be so much more than the water consumption, how is it that this analysis equates the two figures and wouldn’t that potentially underestimate the sewage flows in this plan?
62. Pg. 5-41 5.11 Conclusions – “along Pennsylvania is” should be along Pennsylvania Avenue.
63. Pg. 5-41 5.11 Conclusions – “Because Westfall Township will not institute a mandatory connection ordinance...” – How does Westfall Township Ordinance. No 109 enacted 5/7/2002 as denoted on Pg. 1-3 #12 differ from such a mandatory connection ordinance?
64. Didn’t the DEP require the new intermunicipal agreement, which covers the governance, costs and authorizes the breakdown of roles, responsibilities and authority across the municipal authorities and municipalities prior to finalization of the TAR and this Plan? Who is to take the onus on drafting that Agreement (and paying for the drafting)? Why should Milford Township finalize this Plan for approval by DEP and be held to it when we do not know how we will be treated by the other entities in the proposed Agreement and whether we will have representation with whatever entity(ies) are given authority over the proposed system? We currently have none on the MWA though the Borough has allowed a township resident/property owner appointee of their choosing, from time to time. 5.11 Pg. 5-41 Conclusions indicates “Once the sewage rates are set and agreed upon, it is not anticipated that there will be any other complications regarding the intermunicipal agreement.” Representation on a Board(s) that will have autonomous future authority over fees these township property owners will have no choice once hooked up to pay, and the handling of capacity, prioritization of new development in available capacity etc. are all important “complications” to that Agreement.
65. Pg. 5-37 Table 5-23 includes the cost for 67 test pits @ \$550 each. Does that cost include the restoration cost for those test pits and average out over the cost of the whole 67 (as it seems test pits would be dug in streets, alleys, curbs).

66. Pg. 5-37 Table 5-23 includes 191 curb stops and check valves but there are 284 EDUs being connected. Some users are more than one EDU but how was that number derived? Is it 191 properties?
67. It is unclear if this plan will replace the existing Milford Township Act 537 Plan and become, once approved, the sole Act 537 Plan for Milford Township, which is a concern as it focuses almost entirely on the "Planning Area" and this document requires an OLDS ordinance, a Holding Tank ordinance and it says there will be no community systems. We currently have an informal proposal that includes a COLDS system, in the planning area. Could Milford Township be forced to pay for the line extension to that property should we adopt this plan which prohibits a COLDS system, whilst the infrastructure to replace it has not yet been provided. Doesn't DEP and DRBC prefer to have COLDS systems than discharging into the Delaware?
68. Please supply a list of the professionals that have had responsibility to review this document and their association with each/any government entity including the County, who is the primary funding agency for this Plan.

Due to the limited time constraints on this project, we have done the best we can to present you with the above findings. Having more time would have enabled us to review more thoroughly the graphs and charts accompanying this Plan as well as scrutinizing the printed word with more care.

Acronyms and abbreviations:

DEP – Department of Environmental Protection
DRBC – Delaware River Basin Commission
OLDS – On Lot Distribution System
COLDS – Community On Lot Distribution System
Perk – Percolation test for the rate of permeability into the soil
TAR – Task Activity Report
HRG – Herbert Rowland and Grubic Engineering firm
EDU – Equivalent Dwelling Unit (in gallons)
GPD – Gallons per day
LPS – Low Pressure System
USDA – United States Department of Agriculture
PENNVEST – Pennsylvania Infrastructure Investment Authority
MATW – Municipal Authority of Westfall
MWA – Milford Water Authority
WWTP – Wastewater Treatment Plant
DVHS – Delaware Valley High School
OLSS – On Lot Septic System
Tapping Fee – the price for tying into the main line

PENNDOT – Pennsylvania Department of Transportation