Facility Identification No. 0118771 Facility Name Timeless Towns of the Americas

V. DESCRIPTION OF STORAGE TANKS (Complete for each regulated storage tank at this location)

A. ABOVEGROUND TANKS

TANK REGISTRATION NUMBER	STATUS	DATE OF INSTALLATION MO YR	CAPACITY (GALLONS)	SUBSTANCE (CURRENTLY OR LAST STORED)	CERCLA NAME AND CAS NUMBER	OTHER SUBSTANCE NAME	FIRE SAFETY PERMIT	REGISTRATION FEE	STATE USE ONLY
A									
A									
A									
A									
A									
A									
A									
A									
A									
A									
								-0-	

TOTAL ABOVEGROUND TANK FEE (A)

B. UNDERGROUND TANKS

TANK REGISTRATION NUMBER	STATUS	DATE OF INSTALLATION MO YR	CAPACITY (GALLONS)	SUBSTANCE (CURRENTLY OR LAST STORED)	CERCLA NAME AND CAS NUMBER	OTHER SUBSTANCE NAME	FIRE SAFETY PERMIT	REGISTRATION FEE	STATE USE ONLY
001	C	0072	10000	E			Y	50	50
002	C	0072	500	A	86290-81-5		N	50	50
003	T	0076	500	A	86290-81-5		N	50	50

TOTAL UNDERGROUND TANK FEE (B) 150. 150

TOTAL ABOVEGROUND & UNDERGROUND TANK FEE (A+B) 150. 150

KEY FOR COMPLETION OF SECTION V.

Status

- C Currently in Use
- T Temporarily Out of Use
- P Permanently Out of Use

Substance Currently or Last Stored

- A Gasoline
- B Diesel
- C Gasohol
- D Kerosene
- E Heating Oil
- F New Motor Oil
- G Used Motor Oil
- H Aviation
- I Hazardous Substance
- J Other
- K Unknown
- L Mixture

Fire Safety Permit

- Y Yes
- N No

VI. CERTIFICATION (Read and Sign after completing all sections)

I certify under penalty of law that I have personally examined and am familiar with the information submitted in this and all attached documents, and that based on my inquiry of those individuals immediately responsible for obtaining the information, I believe that the submitted information is true, accurate, and complete. This registration is conditioned upon compliance with provisions of the Storage Tank and Spill Prevention Act, with any regulations and orders issued pursuant to this Act, and with the requirements for obtaining a permit required under this Act.

Name and Official Title of Owner	Signature	Date Signed
Paul B. Fox, Vice President	Paul B. Fox	2/28/90

Internet Mapping Framework

Map center: 39° 45' 45" N, 77° 16' 6" W

Legend

Ohio_wet_scan
- 0
- 1
- Out of range

Interstate

Major Roads
- Other Road
- Interstate
- State highway
- US highway

Roads

Cities

USGS Quad Index 24K

Lower 48 Wetland Polygons
- Estuarine and Marine Deepwater
- Estuarine and Marine Wetland
- Freshwater Emergent Wetland
- Freshwater Forested/Shrub Wetland
- Freshwater Pond
- Lake
- Other
- Riverine

Lower 48 Available Wetland Data
- Non-Digital
- Digital
- No Data
- Scan

NHD Streams

Counties 100K

States 100K

South America

North America

N

Scale: 1:9,995

This map is a user generated static output from an Internet mapping site and is for general reference only. Data layers that appear on this map may or may not be accurate, current, or otherwise reliable. THIS MAP IS NOT TO BE USED FOR NAVIGATION.

rtex Internet Mapping Framework (IMF) - Mozilla Firefox

://wetlandsfws.er.usgs.gov/imf/imf.jsp?site=NWI_CONUS

.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

etlands Online Mapper

Home | Layers | Legend | Key Map | Locate | Contact Us | Print PDF | Help | Exit

Advanced tools

Jump To: Lower 48 States

Map Layers

- Interactive Layers
  - Wetlands Data
    - Wetlands Data Availability
      - Scale > 1:100,000
        - Digital (vector data)
        - Scan (raster data)
        - Non-Digital (hardcopy only)
        - Unmapped Area
      - Scale < 1:100,000
        - Digital (data will display)
        - Scan (data will display)
        - Non-Digital
        - Unmapped Area
    - Digital Wetland Polygons (Ve
    - OH Wetland Raster Scan Dat
    - Wetland Raster Scan Data (1
    - Wetland Project Area Metad.
    - Historic Wetlands Map Info
    - AZ/NM 100k Scans (use i for
  - Base Data
- WMS Display Layers (not printab
  - Shaded Relief (USGS)
  - Digital Raster Graphic (TerraSer
  - Digital Ortho Quad (TerraServer
  - Land Cover (USGS)

Automatically Refresh Map
Show Legends

Notes:
Please refer to the following for descript of the functions of the controls in the lay list above.

Click folder to show or hide contents

Click to turn on all layers in the associated folder.

8,730 go Map Tool: **Zoom In** Active Layer: **Digital Wetland Polygons (Vector)**

Powered by

ational Flood Insurance Program at 1-800-638-6620.

MAP SCALE 1" = 500'

250 0 500 1000 FEET

METERS

NFIP

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM

PANEL 0244D

FIRM

FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP

ADAMS COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

(ALL JURISDICTIONS)

PANEL 244 OF 430

(SEE MAP INDEX FOR FIRM PANEL LAYOUT)

CONTAINS:

COMMUNITY	NUMBER	PANEL	SUFFIX
CUMBERLAND, TOWNSHIP OF	421249	0244	D
FREEDOM, TOWNSHIP OF	421051	0244	D

Notice to User: The **Map Number** shown below should be used when placing map orders; the **Community Number** shown above should be used on insurance applications for the subject community.

MAP NUMBER
42001C0244D

EFFECTIVE DATE
FEBRUARY 18, 2009

Federal Emergency Management Agency

This is an official copy of a portion of the above referenced flood map. It was extracted using F-MIT On-Line. This map does not reflect changes or amendments which may have been made subsequent to the date on the title block. For the latest product information about National Flood Insurance Program flood maps check the FEMA Flood Map Store at www.msc.fema.gov

Map Scale: 1:6,580 if printed on A size (8.5" x 11") sheet.

Meters: 0 50 100 200 300

Feet: 0 250 500 1,000 1,500

N

MAP LEGEND

Area of Interest (AOI)

- Area of Interest (AOI)

Soils

- Soil Map Units

Special Point Features

- Blowout
- Borrow Pit
- Clay Spot
- Closed Depression
- Gravel Pit
- Gravelly Spot
- Landfill
- Lava Flow
- Marsh or swamp
- Mine or Quarry
- Miscellaneous Water
- Perennial Water
- Rock Outcrop
- Saline Spot
- Sandy Spot
- Severely Eroded Spot
- Sinkhole
- Slide or Slip
- Sodic Spot
- Spoil Area
- Stony Spot
- Very Stony Spot
- Wet Spot
- Other

Special Line Features

- Gully
- Short Steep Slope
- Other

Political Features

- Cities

Water Features

- Oceans
- Streams and Canals

Transportation

- Rails
- Interstate Highways
- US Routes
- Major Roads
- Local Roads

MAP INFORMATION

Map Scale: 1:6,580 if printed on A size (8.5" × 11") sheet.

The soil surveys that comprise your AOI were mapped at 1:24,000.

Please rely on the bar scale on each map sheet for accurate map measurements.

Source of Map: Natural Resources Conservation Service
Web Soil Survey URL: http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov
Coordinate System: UTM Zone 18N NAD83

This product is generated from the USDA-NRCS certified data as of the version date(s) listed below.

Soil Survey Area: Adams County, Pennsylvania
Survey Area Data: Version 5, Jan 30, 2008

Date(s) aerial images were photographed: 4/15/1994

The orthophoto or other base map on which the soil lines were compiled and digitized probably differs from the background imagery displayed on these maps. As a result, some minor shifting of map unit boundaries may be evident.

Map Unit Legend

Adams County, Pennsylvania (PA001)			
Map Unit Symbol	**Map Unit Name**	**Acres in AOI**	**Percent of AOI**
Hc	Hatboro silt loam	14.6	11.5%
LgB	Legore channery silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	17.1	13.4%
LgC	Legore channery silt loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes	3.3	2.6%
MdA	Mount Lucas silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes	2.8	2.2%
MdB	Mount Lucas silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	39.3	30.8%
NaB	Neshaminy channery silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	3.4	2.7%
NdB	Neshaminy channery silt loam, 0 to 8 percent slopes, extremely bouldery	3.5	2.8%
NdD	Neshaminy channery silt loam, 8 to 25 percent slopes, extremely bouldery	0.1	0.1%
Uc	Urban land	14.8	11.6%
W	Water	8.4	6.6%
WaA	Watchung silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes	16.2	12.7%
WaB	Watchung silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	0.0	0.0%
WbB	Watchung silt loam, 0 to 8 percent slopes, extremely bouldery	4.1	3.2%
Totals for Area of Interest		**127.6**	**100.0%**

Adams County, Pennsylvania

WaA—Watchung silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes

Map Unit Setting

Elevation: 200 to 2,000 feet
Mean annual precipitation: 35 to 50 inches
Mean annual air temperature: 45 to 57 degrees F
Frost-free period: 120 to 220 days

Map Unit Composition

Watchung, silt loam, and similar soils: 80 percent
Minor components: 9 percent

Description of Watchung, Silt Loam

Setting

Landform: Depressions
Landform position (two-dimensional): Summit
Landform position (three-dimensional): Interfluve
Down-slope shape: Concave
Across-slope shape: Linear
Parent material: Residuum weathered from diabase

Properties and qualities

Slope: 0 to 3 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: 60 to 99 inches to lithic bedrock
Drainage class: Poorly drained
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Very low to moderately high (0.00 to 0.20 in/hr)
Depth to water table: About 0 to 12 inches
Frequency of flooding: None
Frequency of ponding: None
Available water capacity: High (about 10.5 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability (nonirrigated): 4w

Typical profile

0 to 9 inches: Silt loam
9 to 18 inches: Silty clay
18 to 25 inches: Clay
25 to 30 inches: Clay
30 to 40 inches: Clay
40 to 60 inches: Loam

Minor Components

Dunning

Percent of map unit: 4 percent
Landform: Flood plains
Landform position (two-dimensional): Toeslope
Landform position (three-dimensional): Tread
Down-slope shape: Concave

Across-slope shape: Concave

Hatboro

Percent of map unit: 3 percent
Landform: Flood plains
Landform position (two-dimensional): Toeslope
Landform position (three-dimensional): Tread
Down-slope shape: Concave, linear
Across-slope shape: Concave, linear

Croton

Percent of map unit: 2 percent
Landform: Depressions
Landform position (two-dimensional): Toeslope
Landform position (three-dimensional): Base slope
Down-slope shape: Concave, linear
Across-slope shape: Linear, concave

Data Source Information

Soil Survey Area: Adams County, Pennsylvania
Survey Area Data: Version 5, Jan 30, 2008

Adams County, Pennsylvania

WbB—Watchung silt loam, 0 to 8 percent slopes, extremely bouldery

Map Unit Setting

Elevation: 200 to 2,000 feet
Mean annual precipitation: 35 to 50 inches
Mean annual air temperature: 45 to 55 degrees F
Frost-free period: 120 to 220 days

Map Unit Composition

Watchung, extremely bouldery, and similar soils: 80 percent
Minor components: 5 percent

Description of Watchung, Extremely Bouldery

Setting

Landform: Depressions
Landform position (two-dimensional): Summit
Landform position (three-dimensional): Interfluve
Down-slope shape: Concave
Across-slope shape: Linear
Parent material: Residuum weathered from diabase

Properties and qualities

Slope: 0 to 8 percent
Surface area covered with cobbles, stones or boulders: 9.0 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Drainage class: Poorly drained
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Very low to moderately high (0.00 to 0.20 in/hr)
Depth to water table: About 0 to 12 inches
Frequency of flooding: None
Frequency of ponding: None
Available water capacity: High (about 10.7 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability (nonirrigated): 7s

Typical profile

0 to 9 inches: Silt loam
9 to 18 inches: Clay
18 to 25 inches: Clay
25 to 30 inches: Clay
30 to 40 inches: Clay
40 to 60 inches: Silty clay loam

Minor Components

Croton

Percent of map unit: 3 percent
Landform: Depressions
Landform position (two-dimensional): Toeslope

Landform position (three-dimensional): Base slope
Down-slope shape: Linear, concave
Across-slope shape: Linear, concave

Dunning

Percent of map unit: 2 percent
Landform: Flood plains
Landform position (two-dimensional): Toeslope
Landform position (three-dimensional): Tread
Down-slope shape: Concave
Across-slope shape: Concave

Data Source Information

Soil Survey Area: Adams County, Pennsylvania
Survey Area Data: Version 5, Jan 30, 2008

Adams County, Pennsylvania

Uc—Urban land

Map Unit Setting

Mean annual precipitation: 40 to 46 inches
Mean annual air temperature: 48 to 57 degrees F
Frost-free period: 161 to 215 days

Map Unit Composition

Urban land: 85 percent

Description of Urban Land

Setting

Down-slope shape: Linear
Across-slope shape: Linear
Parent material: Pavement, buildings and other artifically covered areas

Properties and qualities

Slope: 0 to 8 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: 10 inches to dense material

Interpretive groups

Land capability (nonirrigated): 8s

Data Source Information

Soil Survey Area: Adams County, Pennsylvania
Survey Area Data: Version 5, Jan 30, 2008

Adams County, Pennsylvania

NaB—Neshaminy channery silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes

Map Unit Setting

Elevation: 300 to 2,000 feet
Mean annual precipitation: 35 to 50 inches
Mean annual air temperature: 45 to 57 degrees F
Frost-free period: 150 to 220 days

Map Unit Composition

Neshaminy, channery silt loam, and similar soils: 80 percent
Minor components: 4 percent

Description of Neshaminy, Channery Silt Loam

Setting

Landform: Hillsides
Landform position (two-dimensional): Summit, shoulder, backslope
Landform position (three-dimensional): Side slope
Down-slope shape: Convex
Across-slope shape: Convex
Parent material: Residuum weathered from diabase

Properties and qualities

Slope: 3 to 8 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Drainage class: Well drained
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately high (0.20 to 0.60 in/hr)
Depth to water table: More than 80 inches
Frequency of flooding: None
Frequency of ponding: None
Available water capacity: Moderate (about 7.5 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability (nonirrigated): 2e

Typical profile

0 to 8 inches: Channery silt loam
8 to 15 inches: Gravelly silty clay loam
15 to 70 inches: Channery clay loam

Minor Components

Watchung, silt loam

Percent of map unit: 4 percent
Landform: Depressions
Landform position (two-dimensional): Summit
Landform position (three-dimensional): Interfluve
Down-slope shape: Concave

Across-slope shape: Linear

Data Source Information

Soil Survey Area: Adams County, Pennsylvania
Survey Area Data: Version 5, Jan 30, 2008

Adams County, Pennsylvania

NdD—Neshaminy channery silt loam, 8 to 25 percent slopes, extremely bouldery

Map Unit Setting

Elevation: 400 to 1,600 feet
Mean annual precipitation: 36 to 50 inches
Mean annual air temperature: 46 to 57 degrees F
Frost-free period: 155 to 210 days

Map Unit Composition

Neshaminy, extremely bouldery, and similar soils: 80 percent

Description of Neshaminy, Extremely Bouldery

Setting

Landform: Hillsides
Landform position (two-dimensional): Backslope, shoulder
Landform position (three-dimensional): Side slope
Down-slope shape: Convex
Across-slope shape: Convex
Parent material: Residuum weathered from diabase

Properties and qualities

Slope: 8 to 25 percent
Surface area covered with cobbles, stones or boulders: 9.0 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Drainage class: Well drained
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately high (0.20 to 0.60 in/hr)
Depth to water table: More than 80 inches
Frequency of flooding: None
Frequency of ponding: None
Available water capacity: Moderate (about 7.5 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability (nonirrigated): 7s

Typical profile

0 to 8 inches: Channery silt loam
8 to 15 inches: Gravelly silty clay loam
15 to 70 inches: Channery clay loam

Data Source Information

Soil Survey Area: Adams County, Pennsylvania
Survey Area Data: Version 5, Jan 30, 2008

Adams County, Pennsylvania

NdB—Neshaminy channery silt loam, 0 to 8 percent slopes, extremely bouldery

Map Unit Setting

Elevation: 400 to 1,600 feet
Mean annual precipitation: 36 to 50 inches
Mean annual air temperature: 46 to 57 degrees F
Frost-free period: 155 to 210 days

Map Unit Composition

Neshaminy, extremely bouldery, and similar soils: 85 percent

Description of Neshaminy, Extremely Bouldery

Setting

Landform: Hillsides
Landform position (two-dimensional): Summit, shoulder, backslope
Landform position (three-dimensional): Side slope
Down-slope shape: Convex
Across-slope shape: Convex
Parent material: Residuum weathered from diabase

Properties and qualities

Slope: 0 to 8 percent
Surface area covered with cobbles, stones or boulders: 9.0 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Drainage class: Well drained
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately high (0.20 to 0.60 in/hr)
Depth to water table: More than 80 inches
Frequency of flooding: None
Frequency of ponding: None
Available water capacity: Moderate (about 7.5 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability (nonirrigated): 7s

Typical profile

0 to 8 inches: Channery silt loam
8 to 15 inches: Gravelly silty clay loam
15 to 70 inches: Channery clay loam

Data Source Information

Soil Survey Area: Adams County, Pennsylvania
Survey Area Data: Version 5, Jan 30, 2008

Adams County, Pennsylvania

MdA—Mount Lucas silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes

Map Unit Setting

Elevation: 200 to 2,000 feet
Mean annual precipitation: 34 to 50 inches
Mean annual air temperature: 45 to 57 degrees F
Frost-free period: 130 to 220 days

Map Unit Composition

Mount lucas, silt loam, and similar soils: 80 percent
Minor components: 7 percent

Description of Mount Lucas, Silt Loam

Setting

Landform: Hillsides, hillslopes
Landform position (two-dimensional): Summit, footslope, backslope
Landform position (three-dimensional): Side slope
Down-slope shape: Convex, linear, concave
Across-slope shape: Convex, linear, concave
Parent material: Residuum weathered from diabase

Properties and qualities

Slope: 0 to 3 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: 48 to 99 inches to lithic bedrock
Drainage class: Somewhat poorly drained
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately low to moderately high (0.06 to 0.60 in/hr)
Depth to water table: About 4 to 16 inches
Frequency of flooding: None
Frequency of ponding: None
Available water capacity: Moderate (about 7.5 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability (nonirrigated): 2w

Typical profile

0 to 8 inches: Silt loam
8 to 16 inches: Silt loam
16 to 37 inches: Channery loam
37 to 44 inches: Very channery loam
44 to 60 inches: Very channery sandy loam

Minor Components

Watchung, silt loam

Percent of map unit: 5 percent
Landform: Depressions
Landform position (two-dimensional): Summit
Landform position (three-dimensional): Interfluve
Down-slope shape: Concave
Across-slope shape: Linear

Hatboro

Percent of map unit: 2 percent
Landform: Flood plains
Landform position (two-dimensional): Toeslope
Landform position (three-dimensional): Tread
Down-slope shape: Concave, linear
Across-slope shape: Concave, linear

Data Source Information

Soil Survey Area: Adams County, Pennsylvania
Survey Area Data: Version 5, Jan 30, 2008

Adams County, Pennsylvania

MdB—Mount Lucas silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes

Map Unit Setting

Elevation: 200 to 2,000 feet
Mean annual precipitation: 34 to 50 inches
Mean annual air temperature: 45 to 57 degrees F
Frost-free period: 130 to 220 days

Map Unit Composition

Mount lucas, silt loam, and similar soils: 80 percent
Minor components: 8 percent

Description of Mount Lucas, Silt Loam

Setting

Landform: Hillsides, hillslopes
Landform position (two-dimensional): Summit, footslope, backslope
Landform position (three-dimensional): Side slope
Down-slope shape: Convex, linear, concave
Across-slope shape: Convex, concave, linear
Parent material: Residuum weathered from diabase

Properties and qualities

Slope: 3 to 8 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: 48 to 99 inches to lithic bedrock
Drainage class: Somewhat poorly drained
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately low to moderately high (0.06 to 0.60 in/hr)
Depth to water table: About 4 to 16 inches
Frequency of flooding: None
Frequency of ponding: None
Available water capacity: Moderate (about 7.5 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability (nonirrigated): 2e

Typical profile

0 to 8 inches: Silt loam
8 to 16 inches: Silt loam
16 to 37 inches: Channery loam
37 to 44 inches: Very channery loam
44 to 60 inches: Very channery sandy loam

Minor Components

Watchung, silt loam

Percent of map unit: 5 percent
Landform: Depressions
Landform position (two-dimensional): Summit
Landform position (three-dimensional): Interfluve
Down-slope shape: Concave
Across-slope shape: Linear

Hatboro

Percent of map unit: 3 percent
Landform: Flood plains
Landform position (two-dimensional): Toeslope
Landform position (three-dimensional): Tread
Down-slope shape: Concave, linear
Across-slope shape: Concave, linear

Data Source Information

Soil Survey Area: Adams County, Pennsylvania
Survey Area Data: Version 5, Jan 30, 2008

Adams County, Pennsylvania

LgB—Legore channery silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes

Map Unit Setting

Elevation: 80 to 2,000 feet
Mean annual precipitation: 35 to 50 inches
Mean annual air temperature: 45 to 55 degrees F
Frost-free period: 150 to 220 days

Map Unit Composition

Legore and similar soils: 90 percent

Description of Legore

Setting

Landform: Hillsides
Landform position (two-dimensional): Summit, shoulder, backslope
Landform position (three-dimensional): Side slope
Down-slope shape: Convex
Across-slope shape: Convex
Parent material: Residuum weathered from anorthosite and/or residuum weathered from diabase

Properties and qualities

Slope: 3 to 8 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Drainage class: Well drained
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately high to high (0.60 to 2.00 in/hr)
Depth to water table: More than 80 inches
Frequency of flooding: None
Frequency of ponding: None
Available water capacity: Moderate (about 8.4 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability (nonirrigated): 2e

Typical profile

0 to 10 inches: Channery silt loam
10 to 30 inches: Silty clay loam
30 to 60 inches: Sandy loam

Data Source Information

Soil Survey Area: Adams County, Pennsylvania
Survey Area Data: Version 5, Jan 30, 2008

Adams County, Pennsylvania

LgC—Legore channery silt loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes

Map Unit Setting

Elevation: 80 to 2,000 feet
Mean annual precipitation: 35 to 50 inches
Mean annual air temperature: 45 to 55 degrees F
Frost-free period: 150 to 220 days

Map Unit Composition

Legore and similar soils: 90 percent

Description of Legore

Setting

Landform: Hillsides
Landform position (two-dimensional): Backslope, shoulder
Landform position (three-dimensional): Side slope
Down-slope shape: Convex
Across-slope shape: Convex
Parent material: Residuum weathered from anorthosite and/or residuum weathered from diabase

Properties and qualities

Slope: 8 to 15 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Drainage class: Well drained
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately high to high (0.60 to 2.00 in/hr)
Depth to water table: More than 80 inches
Frequency of flooding: None
Frequency of ponding: None
Available water capacity: Moderate (about 8.3 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability (nonirrigated): 3e

Typical profile

0 to 10 inches: Channery silt loam
10 to 30 inches: Silty clay loam
30 to 60 inches: Sandy loam

Data Source Information

Soil Survey Area: Adams County, Pennsylvania
Survey Area Data: Version 5, Jan 30, 2008

Adams County, Pennsylvania

Hc—Hatboro silt loam

Map Unit Setting

Elevation: 0 to 1,000 feet
Mean annual precipitation: 36 to 48 inches
Mean annual air temperature: 50 to 57 degrees F
Frost-free period: 140 to 210 days

Map Unit Composition

Hatboro and similar soils: 80 percent
Minor components: 5 percent

Description of Hatboro

Setting

Landform: Flood plains
Landform position (two-dimensional): Toeslope
Landform position (three-dimensional): Tread
Down-slope shape: Concave, linear
Across-slope shape: Concave, linear
Parent material: Alluvium derived from metamorphic and sedimentary rock

Properties and qualities

Slope: 0 to 3 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: 60 to 99 inches to lithic bedrock
Drainage class: Poorly drained
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately high to high (0.60 to 2.00 in/hr)
Depth to water table: About 0 to 6 inches
Frequency of flooding: Frequent
Frequency of ponding: None
Available water capacity: High (about 9.7 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability (nonirrigated): 4w

Typical profile

0 to 9 inches: Silt loam
9 to 44 inches: Silt loam
44 to 56 inches: Sandy clay loam
56 to 70 inches: Stratified gravelly sand to clay

Minor Components

Othello

Percent of map unit: 3 percent
Landform: Terraces
Landform position (two-dimensional): Toeslope
Landform position (three-dimensional): Tread
Down-slope shape: Linear
Across-slope shape: Linear

Nanticoke

Percent of map unit: 1 percent
Landform: Tidal flats
Landform position (two-dimensional): Footslope
Landform position (three-dimensional): Talf
Down-slope shape: Linear
Across-slope shape: Linear

Towhee

Percent of map unit: 1 percent
Landform: Mountain valleys, depressions
Landform position (two-dimensional): Footslope, toeslope
Landform position (three-dimensional): Side slope, head slope
Down-slope shape: Concave, linear
Across-slope shape: Concave

Data Source Information

Soil Survey Area: Adams County, Pennsylvania
Survey Area Data: Version 5, Jan 30, 2008

Adams County, Pennsylvania

W—Water

Map Unit Setting

Mean annual precipitation: 36 to 50 inches
Mean annual air temperature: 46 to 59 degrees F
Frost-free period: 120 to 214 days

Map Unit Composition

Water: 99 percent

Description of Water

Setting

Parent material: Rivers streams ponds

Properties and qualities

Frequency of ponding: Frequent

Data Source Information

Soil Survey Area: Adams County, Pennsylvania
Survey Area Data: Version 5, Jan 30, 2008

Perry Petroleum

Perry Petroleum Equipment, Ltd.
P.O. Box 208
10231 Raccoon Valley Road
Ickesburg, PA 17037
(717) 438-3776
Fax (717) 438-3930

March 23, 2010

Eisenhower Hotel
Attn: Bob Zullinger
2636 Emmitsburg Road
Gettysburg, PA 17325

Re: Tank Removal

Dear Bob:

This letter is being sent to confirm that Perry Petroleum Equipment (DEP Certification# 0014) removed an underground storage tank at the above location. We found no suspected contamination upon removal of the tank, nor did we encounter any problems with the removal of this tank. We also pressure tested the lines from the old tank to the new tank and found no leaks.

If you have any questions in regard to this information, please do not hesitate to contact me at (717) 438-3776.

Sincerely,

Brian D. Sheaffer,
President

BDS/alk

9J09047-01

CHAIN OF CUSTODY/ REQUEST FOR ANALYSIS

Please print. See back of COC for instructions/terms and conditions.

FAIRWAY LABORATORIES
Environmental Laboratory

2019 9th Ave.
P.O. Box 1925
Altoona, PA 16602

Phone: (814) 946-4306
Fax: (814) 946-8791

Page 1 of 1

Client Name: Perry Petroleum
Address: P.O. Box 208
Tekesburg PA
Contact: Amy Krone
Phone #:
Fax #:
Project Name: Eisenhower Hotel
Quote/PO #:

Receiving Info	Y	N
Custody seals		
Seals Intact?		
Received on ice?		
COC/Labels agree?		
Correct containers?		
Correct preservation?		
VOA head space?		

Sample Temp:

Please Circle Program: ACT II, CERCLA, RCRA, NPDES, SDWA, CWA

TAT: Normal ☐ Rush ☐
Rush TAT subject to pre-approval and surcharge.
Date Required: / /

Reportable to PADEP? Yes ☐
PWSID #

Analyses Requested: Fuel #2

FLI use only	Sample Description/Location	Sample Date	Sample Time	Grab or Composite	Matrix: Soil	Matrix: Water	Matrix: Other	# of Containers	Fuel #2	Bottle Type/Comments
	#1	10/8	3:00		X			2	X	1 4oz 2 vets

By relinquishing my sample to Fairway Laboratories, Inc., I hereby agree to the terms and conditions printed on the reverse.*

	Signature	Date	Time	Remarks
Sampled by:	Brent Pence	10/8	3:00	Samples taken beneath
Received by:	Amy Krone	10/8	4:00	tank at fill/pump
Relinquished by:	Amy Krone	10/8	4:00	location
Received by:	UPS	10/8	4:00	
Relinquished by:				
Received by:	Tracy Comstock	10/9/09	9:47	UPS.

White Original FLI Use

PAGE 01 FAIRWAY LABS 814-946-8791 10/08/2009 15:57

FAIRWAY LABORATORIES
2019 Ninth Avenue
PO Box 1925
Altoona, Pennsylvania 16603
(814) 946-4306 (814) 946-8791 - Fax

FAIRWAY LABORATORIES

Perry Petroleum Equipment	Project:	EISENHOWER HOTEL	
10231 Raccoon Valley Rd (Shipping)	Project Number:	[none]	**Reported:**
Ickesburg PA, 17037	Collector:	bp	10/30/09 09:03
Project Manager: Amy Krone	Number of Containers:	3	

Client Sample ID: #1 **Date/Time Sampled:** 10/08/09 15:00

Laboratory Sample ID: **9J09047-01 (Soil)**

Analyte	Result	Laboratory Reporting Limit	Units	Date / Time Analyzed	Method	Analyst	Note
Volatile Organic Compounds by EPA Method 8260B							
1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene	<0.576	0.576	mg/kg dry	10/12/09 15:51	EPA 8260B	wm	
1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	<0.576	0.576	mg/kg dry	10/12/09 15:51	EPA 8260B	wm	
Benzene	<0.230	0.230	mg/kg dry	10/12/09 15:51	EPA 8260B	wm	
Toluene	<0.576	0.576	mg/kg dry	10/12/09 15:51	EPA 8260B	wm	
Ethylbenzene	<0.576	0.576	mg/kg dry	10/12/09 15:51	EPA 8260B	wm	
Isopropylbenzene	<0.576	0.576	mg/kg dry	10/12/09 15:51	EPA 8260B	wm	
Methyl tert-butyl ether	<0.576	0.576	mg/kg dry	10/12/09 15:51	EPA 8260B	wm	
Naphthalene	<0.576	0.576	mg/kg dry	10/12/09 15:51	EPA 8260B	wm	
Semivolatile Organic Compounds by EPA Method 8270C							
Fluorene	<0.378	0.378	mg/kg dry wt.	10/27/09 12:15	EPA 8270C	bg	
Phenanthrene	<0.378	0.378	mg/kg dry wt.	10/27/09 12:15	EPA 8270C	bg	
Conventional Chemistry Parameters by SM/EPA Methods							
% Solids	86.8	0.0100	%	10/13/09 17:20	SM 2540G	cr	

The results in this report apply to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

DATA CHART
For Use With
petro tite

STATION NUMBER _____ DATE 9/3/69

1 LOCATION BUS RT 15 (Street No. and/or Corner) [illegible] (City) PA (State) _____ (Telephone No)

2 OWNER EISENHOWER HOTEL (Name) _____ (Address) _____ (Representative) _____ (Position) _____ (Telephone No)

3 OPERATOR _____ (Name) _____ (Dealer, Mgr. or Other) _____ (Address (if different than Location)) _____ (Telephone No)

4 REASON FOR TEST [illegible]

5 TEST REQUESTED BY [illegible] (Name) _____ (Position) _____ (Telephone No)

6 SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS _____

7 CONTRACTOR OR COMPANY MAKING TEST
MECHANIC(S) NAME _____

8 IS A TANK TEST TO BE MADE WITH THIS LINE TEST? ☐ YES ☐ NO

9 MAKE AND TYPE OF PUMP OR DISPENSERS (SUCTION OR SUBMERSIBLE) _____

10 WEATHER _____ TEMPERATURE IN TANKS _____ °F _____ °C COVER OVER LINES _____ (Concrete, Black Top, etc.) APPROXIMATE BURIAL DEPTH _____

11 IDENTIFY EACH LINE AS TESTED	12 TIME (MILITARY)	13 LOG OF TEST PROCEDURES, AMBIENT TEMPERATURE, WEATHER, ETC	14 PRESSURE psi OR kPa		15 VOLUME READING			16 REMARKS
			BEFORE	AFTER	BEFORE	AFTER	NET CHANGE	SIZE, LENGTH & TYPE OF LINE, # FLEX CONNECTORS CONCLUSIONS, REPAIRS AND COMMENTS

ADVANTAGE ENGINEERS

March 26th, 2010

Mr. Bernard A. Yannetti, Jr., Esq.
HARTMAN & YANNETTI
126 Baltimore Street
Gettysburg, PA 17325

RE: Summary of Findings
Timeless Towns Water System Evaluation
Cumberland Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania
Advantage Project No.: 1002004

Dear Mr. Yannetti:

This letter describes the evaluation performed by Advantage Engineers, LLC (Advantage) of the existing groundwater-sourced potable water system that services the Timeless Towns of America (TTA) site. The evaluation relied on available background information, a site visit to inspect the water system, an interview of the current water system operator, and review of files maintained at the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PADEP) Southcentral Office.

Site Description

The TTA site is located between Emmittsburg Road (Old Route 15) and US Route 15, in Cumberland Township, Adams County (Figure 1). The property consists of two (2) parcels registered in Adams County that total approximately 111 acres and described as follows:

1. Timeless Towns of the Americas (98.92 acres) – occupied by the Eisenhower Inn and Conference Center, and the All Star Amusement Complex. The Inn includes approximately 313 rooms in two (2) buildings, with convention facilities, restaurant, lounge, deli, and swimming pool. The Amusement complex includes an indoor facility with playing surfaces and tennis courts, and arcade center.
2. Michael Investments Inc. (12.06 acres) – occupied by the 76-unit Devonshire Village condominiums.

The property was originally developed for commercial use in 1972, and has been expanded with additional facilities since that time. A groundwater-sourced Community Water System (CWS) provides potable water to the site. Wastewater is collected and conveyed to an on-site wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) that is located at the south end of the site; treated water discharges to a tributary stream that drains into Marsh Creek located to the south.

Hydrogeologic Setting

Based on Pennsylvania Topographic and Geologic Survey (PTGS) mapping, and well construction logs, the property is underlain by Diabase, which is a dense, igneous rock. The bedrock abruptly changes to shale and siltstone to the west, across Emmittsburg Road, where the Gettysburg Formation occurs (Figure 2). With respect to groundwater production, Diabase is a poor aquifer with characteristic low yields (5 gpm median) and shallow water bearing zones that are subject to strong

seasonal water level influence[1] (Geyer and Wilshusen, 1982). The Gettysburg Formation is a more productive aquifer, with a median yield of 66 gpm, and usually provides more numerous and deeper water bearing zones that are less susceptible to seasonal variation.

Groundwater occurs at shallow depths across the site, generally within 5 to 15 feet of the ground surface. Groundwater is anticipated to flow southward, based on the presence of Marsh Creek which is the principal groundwater receptor in the area.

Existing Water System

The site was visited on March 18, 2010 in order to observe the current facilities and interview the water system operator. Photographs of the wells and system facilities are attached.

Supply Sources

The current system is supplied by the eight (8) wells listed in Table 1. The yields are those recognized by PADEP as the dependable pumping rate in the Public Water Supply (PWS) Permit No. 0195504, issued August 1996. Each well is pumped using a submersible pump, and reportedly with an individual totalizing meter and flow control valve at each wellhead. One well is in a subgrade pit, but the remainder are completed above grade with a pitless adaptor. The background literature mentioned low level controls in each well, which would shut off the well pump if the water level declined to a pre-set depth. The approximate locations of the wells are shown on the attached Figure 2.

Table 1 – Summary of Supply Wells

ID	Date Drilled	Depth feet	Yield gpm	Advantage Comments on Prior Testing
102	1972	90	7	Recovered in 15 hours, pumped at up to 10 gpm
103	1977	287	5	Poor recovery, partial dewatered condition
104	1972	280	5	Poor recovery, partial dewatered condition
105	1972	280	4	Poor recovery, partial dewatered condition
106	1987	400	7	Recovered in 20 hours
107	1973	105	5	Recovered in 3 hours
108	1973	105	5	Poor recovery, partial dewatered condition
310	1993	250	2.5	Low yield, probably 1 gpm
		Combined Yield	**30.5**	**Equates to 44,000 gpd**

gpm – gallons per minutegpd – gallons per day

The well construction details are mostly unknown with respect to water bearing zones, depth of casing, the presence of a casing seal, and whether the wells meet current PADEP PWS supply well construction standards. Based on available information, the well yields are based on short duration tests of up to 10 hours that were completed in 1993, except Well 310 which was pumped for 48 hours. All of the testing was performed during wet weather conditions, and thus represented a "best-case" scenario. Anecdotal information indicated that the well yields were "grandfathered" into the PWS permit. In addition, the wells were permitted prior to the requirement for the owner to "own or control" the Zone 1 wellhead protection area, which if permitted today would be a minimum 100-feet

[1] Geyer, A. and Wilshusen, J., Engineering Characteristics of the Rocks of Pennsylvania, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Topographic and Geologic Survey, 1982.

radial area surrounding the well, within which no public roads or parking areas, sewer lines, stormwater facilities, and other potential sources of groundwater contamination.

Overall, based on our review of the 1993 well testing, it appears the listed well yields are higher than what is actually sustainable. Wells 102 and 107 may have sustained yields in the 4 to 5 gpm range, but the remaining wells probably have sustainable yields of less than 3 gpm. As noted, at some of the well locations the aquifer has been partially dewatered, which will result in an even lower sustainable yield. There does not appear to be any correlation between the well locations across the site and the well yield.

Capacity

The combined rated capacity of the wells is listed at approximately 44,000 gpd based on sustainable yields that range from 2.5 gpm to 7 gpm. Experience at the site has shown that the reliable yield of these wells is in the range of 50% to 75% of this value, depending on the severity of dry weather conditions. It appears that the rated yields are higher than what is sustainable on a long term basis, and that system operation during peak demand periods does not provide for a daily recovery period (it is desirable to have a 12 hour daily recovery period, if feasible). Any supply well production estimate should be based on drought conditions to ensure that the supply is reliable on a long-term basis that is independent of weather conditions. The sustainable well yields are more likely in the 1 gpm to 4 gpm range. Thus, a more realistic projection of the combined production during prolonged dry conditions is in the 20,000 to 25,000 gpd range. Daily water demand above this value can only be sustained by storage volume.

Water Quality

The raw water quality meets applicable Primary and Secondary Drinking Water Standards (DWS). A 1996 PADEP report indicated that the raw water from Well 106 contained 19.3 milligrams per liter (mg/L) nitrate, which exceeds the 10 mg/L Primary DWS; and, Well 108 contained excessive Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) at 1,050 mg/L, which exceeds the Secondary DWS of 500 mg/L. When the raw water from these wells is blended with the remaining wells, the overall raw water quality meets the nitrate and TDS standards.

PADEP evaluated the wells for surface water influence in 1994. At that time they found no reason to change the designation of the wells from "groundwater" to "groundwater under the direct influence of surface water".

Buried waste materials at the Gettysburg Foundry site resulted in contamination of soil and groundwater in the area. Nitrates, metals (aluminum, iron, manganese, selenium, vanadium), and salt constituents (chlorides, sulfates, sodium, potassium) have been detected in groundwater samples at the foundry property. The foundry is principally hydraulically cross-gradient to the TTA property, so the adverse effects from the foundry site were partially mitigated, but groundwater from the foundry site has migrated to the TTA site and affected the water quality of some wells. Ms. Ruth Bishop of PADEP informed Advantage that impact to the TTA wells has included elevated nitrate, chlorides, and salts (sodium and potassium), and caused elevated TDS. In addition, the permitting of potential TTA supply wells located at the south of the property near the WWTP was denied due to water quality issues (Nitrate and TDS) that are related to the foundry issue.

Water System Infrastructure

The facilities were originally constructed in 1972 and 1973, with subsequent expansions. The system currently uses the eight (8) supply wells which discharge to a common 4-inch PVC header that conveys the water to the 2-story, cylindrical concrete treatment building. The raw water passes through a totalizing meter, is chlorinated, and then discharged to a +/- 150,000 gallon concrete, in-ground storage tank. The tank is maintained in the full position, and a float switch operates the wells. The float is activated within a small (approximately 6-inch) vertical interval. The chlorinated water from the storage tank is fed to the distribution system by a set of three (3) variable speed, 40 hp pumps in the lower level of the treatment building, each with a capacity of 400 gpm at 210 feet of head pressure. The pumps are used individually, and switched automatically every 18 hours, with one pump always in operation. The transmission piping is a combination of 2-inch and 4-inch PVC piping.

Current Water Use

The off-season daily average water demand is approximately 20,000 gpd. TTA's records for 2009 were reviewed to estimate the demand during the highest water use period, which is typically June, July, and August. The 2009 records are weekly totals. Based on these records, the average daily water demand during June, July, and August 2009 was as follows:

Hotel and conference center	20,700 gpd
Devonshire Village condominiums	11,700 gpd
All Star Sports Complex	300 gpd
Approximate Total	**32,700 gpd**

During this 3-month period the peak weekly use was 270,000 gallons, which corresponds to a daily average use of 38,700 gpd for 7 consecutive days. Unfortunately, the peak demand period corresponds with the driest weather periods, and the combined well field output may be insufficient. The off-season water demand can be reasonably satisfied with the current sources. During the peak demand months, and especially during any prolonged period of dry weather, the existing sources require almost continuous pumping but are unable to satisfy demand without the use of storage.

Anticipated Future Demand

The addition of a slots facility will require an additional 15,000 gpd, and any further site expansion will require additional water. The addition of only the slots facility will result in a net peak season daily demand in the 48,000 gpd range. Therefore, the water system will require a minimum increase in the range of 25,000 gpd in order to meet demand during dry periods (when the current sources can produce 20,000 to 25,000 gpd). This deficit equates to an additional source with at least a 17 gpm sustainable yield.

Findings

Water Sources

The water system has a source supply deficit of approximately 25,000 gpd if the slots facility water demand is added to the current demand. Typically a PWS would not utilize a supply well with yields

in the 1 gpm to 4 gpm range, but due to the geologic setting the TTA system is forced to rely on the current set of very low yielding wells.

There does not appear to be consistent records that document the daily production from each well, along with the static water level (SWL) and pumping water level (PWL). Such records might permit a more accurate assessment of well yields, and possibly enable the design of a well field management plan that could maximize the total production. However, any such fine tuning of the operations would be very unlikely to increase production by more than about 5% to 10% of the current volumes.

Construction of more supply wells at the site would require an additional 17 gpm capacity. Based on the current yields of wells which average less than 5 gpm, this would require the addition of at least 3 to 4 more production wells, each with the requirement for the wellhead protection area.

Water System Facilities

Portions of the current facilities are dated and should be upgraded. The following are recommended tasks, which are based only on a brief site visit. A more in-depth list of recommendations can be provided along with the estimated costs.

1. Some of the wellhead areas include exposed wiring, poor-fitting covers and access to metering and valves, and lack bollards or other protection where there is vehicle traffic.

2. The outside meter pit sump and Well 102 sump were flooded and should be modified so that they are continuously dry.

3. The current 3-pump system that maintains distribution pressure appears to be very inefficient, as it requires the continuous operation of a 40 hp pump to supply the site. Fire flow pumps need to be separated from the service pumps with a separate storage tank, which would be activated by low pressure.

4. Add service pumps on variable speed drives complete with a bladder tank to satisfy domestic usage.

5. Bring the existing storage tank up to code as much as possible including mixing, and coating the lid which has visible cracking that should be sealed. The access hatch should be raised and brought up to standards, and the tank needs a vent. If it has not been performed, the tank should be thoroughly cleaned by draining and any accumulated muck removed.

6. Add/modify the ventilation to the treatment building first floor to eliminate/reduce the chlorine atmosphere, as the existing atmosphere will corrode the control panels and wiring.

7. Provide secondary containment for the hypochlorite totes.

Recommendations

The following options are provided as a solution to the issue of obtaining an additional and reliable water supply. While there are costs and benefits associated with each of the alternatives, it is the opinion of Advantage that Alternative 1 provides the best, long-term solution for providing water to the proposed facility expansion.

Alternative 1:
The most favorable, long-term solution would be development of two (2) supply wells at an off-site location in the Gettysburg Formation, and abandoning the current well field. Ideally, each new well should have a reliable yield of 60 to 70 gpm, which would enable pumping only one (1) well for about 12 hours each day to supply the peak season daily supply of water. The wells would be required to have the wellhead protection area surrounding each well, obtaining easements for access and piping, and constructing a transmission line across Emmittsburg Road and private property. The preferable well locations should not be located further south than Cunningham Road (approximately) to avoid potential water quality issues associated with the Gettysburg Foundry. Figure 3 shows the area and available tax parcel mapping, and the mapped Gettysburg Formation contact. Prior to selecting a parcel for well development, some hydrogeologic structural study should be performed to identify the most favorable locations with respect to potential well yields.

With respect to a project timeline, it may be feasible to permit two (2) new wells and the associated engineering improvements within 12 months. This is an aggressive schedule, and would require well construction and testing, and the engineering design, within the next 3 to 4 months. A pre-application meeting should be held with PADEP in order to address any potential issues prior to submitting the application for the wells and system improvements.

Alternative 2:
The second option is to continue to use the existing well field, and supplement the supply with one (1) off-site well. Nearly the same time, efforts and expense as listed for Alternative 1 would be necessary, but the continued reliance on the existing well field would be necessary. If the TTA well field remains in use, the wells should be re-tested and a well field management plan developed from the testing results. The wellheads and associated controls should also be upgraded.

Alternative 3:
Continue to rely on the TTA well field, and develop additional on-site supply wells. This option should include re-testing of the existing wells and development of a well field management plan.

Depending on the project and time constraints, the developer may need to initially pursue Alternative 2, with the long-term goal of Alternative 1. Also, depending on the project timeline, there may be no option but to rely on the current water system for some period of time prior to completing any of the alternatives listed above. During this period there should be preparations to obtain bulk water to supplement the well field.