



DAM SITE OF WARRINGTON STORAGE RESERVOIR OF DELAWARE RIVER PLAN FOR NEW PHILADELPHIA WATER SOURCE
 An integral part of the alternate plans advanced by the consulting engineers of the Philadelphia Water Commission for a new water supply is creation of a 20-billion-gallon reservoir near Warrington. The above illustration shows the area where the northern end of the reservoir dam will be located at Neshaminy. The dam will be west of the Doylestown-Easton highway, Route 611, shown to the left of the picture. The road will be within the area proposed to be taken over by the city but will not be flooded. The town of Neshaminy located north of the area shown above will be in the path of the spillway to Little Neshaminy Creek.

City's Water Puzzle Warrington District To Fight Reservoir

Third of a Series
 By Richard J. O'Keefe

The alternate plans endorsed by the Water Commission consulting engineers for bringing Upper Delaware River water to Philadelphia provide for a 20 billion gallon storage reservoir near Warrington, 15 miles north of Philadelphia.

This phase of the program has aroused the bitter opposition of hundreds of residents and landowners whose properties would be flooded, or unified in their opposition. They, too, have expressed themselves prepared to carry to the highest courts their fight against any effort by Philadelphia to take their holdings.

In order to create the reservoir it would be necessary for the city to acquire 2550 acres of land of which 5200 would be in Montgomery county and 2290 in Bucks county. Opponents to the plan in the area declare that more than 1000 properties would be inundated by the reservoir or taken to provide a bordering protective strip.

AGRICULTURAL SECTION

The land that would be acquired is now generally devoted to farming, pasturage and woodland usage. Located in it are a number of moderate residences and several farms, as well as a portion of the borough of Neshaminy. Many of the families have lived in the section for generations.

As in the case in the area of the Wallpack Bend Reservoir, relocation of portions of well-travelled highways would be necessary by construction of the Warrington Storage Reservoir.

DAM NEAR EASTON PIKE

The dam creating the reservoir would be constructed just west of Route 611 leading through Doylestown to Easton. It would extend from the northern edge of the U. S. Naval Air Station to Neshaminy, where a spillway into the Neshaminy Creek would be constructed.

George T. Tettemer, real estate assessor of Warrington township, said the reservoir land represents about one-third of the total assessments of the township.

WOULD DOOM NESHAMINY

Location of the site within the township in addition to dispossessioning residents would mean wiping out two public schools, a parochial school, three churches and the village of Neshaminy.

Charles L. Murray, tax collector of Bucks County, declared the reservoir would mean a loss of approximately \$300,000 in taxes and compel upping the taxes for sections not physically affected by the reservoir.

DATE BACK TO REVOLUTION

Edward T. Hancock, a member of the County Board of Commissioners, pointed out that many of the buildings that would be destroyed go back to the Revolutionary period and have been the homes for generations of the same families. He further opposed the site because its selection would force relocation of a number of county roads.

The primary roads that would have to be relocated, in addition to a half-dozen well-kept secondary roads, are Route 152 leading to Chalfont, Route 483 connecting Foxcroft and Montgomerystown and Route 63 leading to Lansdale. While the Easton road passes over the eastern area of the reservoir land, it would not be necessary to relocate it, since the dam would be to the west.

UNIFIED IN OPPOSITION

Residents in the area of the Warrington Reservoir, unlike those in the area of the 30-mile Wallpack Bend Reservoir in the Upper Delaware, are unified in their opposition. North of Bushkill, opposite which the Wallpack Bend dam would be built on both sides of the river, there is no unanimity of thought about the proposal.

J. Russel Eshbek, prothonary of Pike's county, heads the opposition on the Pennsylvania side and Frank J. McBride, of Wallpack Center, north of the dam site, is leader of the New Jersey opposition.

SOME LITTLE CONCERNED

On both sides of the river, there were found property owners who seemed little concerned although their holdings would be completely inundated.

William J. Schomver, owner of the Bushkill Restaurant located in the center of the town which would be almost entirely flooded, was agreeable to the construction of the reservoir if it would be open for recreational purposes. The construction engineers guarantee continuance of recreational activities on the reservoir if it is built.

NO DIFFERENCE TO HIM

Jeremiah Rosencrans, who for years conducted the only ferry between Bushkill and Easton, said that although the Army cut his ferry cable, it made no difference to him, although his farm property, located just north of the proposed dam site, would be entirely flooded.

Benjamin L. Bauman, of Irvington, N. J., director of the Tri-State Bible Conference, located southeast of Fort Jervis, favored the proposal on condition that recreational use of the reservoir be permitted.

(Continued Tomorrow)

LEGAL TANGLE BARS REPAIR OF WATER METERS

City Gets Jammed Up in Bids for Replacement Parts

By EDWARD STONE
 Gathering dust in the city's repair shop at 29th and Cambria stis is a huge collection of broken water meters.

They come mostly from homes. A few are big ones come from industrial and commercial establishments. All were brought in for repairs. One official says there are 5000, another 7000, a third 9000.

Whatever their number, they have been lying around for many months, in some cases as long as two years. The reason? Inability to get repair parts.

Legal Knot
 No, it's not the war's aftermath. It's just a little legal knot which the city managed to get itself tied.

Philadelphia's houses and other buildings use a score of different makes of water meters. When they go bad, the Water Bureau takes them out for repairs. The repair and replacement parts are bought by the Department of Supplies and Purchases.

In most cases those parts can be made by various manufacturers. Years ago, the department used to advertise for bids and buy the parts from the lowest responsible bidder, in line with the city's custom.

Romped Away With Contracts

But the enterprising Phoenix Meter Corp., New York, began to romp away with many of the department's contracts. Too many, its rivals complained to Martin J. McLaughlin, chief clerk of the Water Bureau.

So McLaughlin recommended to Director of Supplies and Purchases Charles H. Grakeloff that parts be bought only from the firms manufacturing the particular meters for which the parts were intended.

Grakeloff agreed, beginning around the end of 1943. Invitations for bids gave notice that only the manufacturer of the specific meter would be considered.

Nevertheless, Phoenix still put in bids. They were rejected. Phoenix went to court through its local representative, John B. McHugh, Jr.

Company Is Winner

The city fought, but McHugh won out. In May, 1944, Judge Gerald F. Flood, of Common Pleas Court No. 1, forbade "any condition restricting bids to the manufacturers of water meters for the replacement of parts of their respective meters."

The Supplies Department refused to admit it was licked. It tried a different tactic. It circulated invitations for bids reading like this: "Repair parts of XYZ meters, which parts shall be manufactured for said meters by the XYZ Meter Company."

That, the City Solicitor's office told Grakeloff, would spike Judge Flood's decision. Nothing to stop anybody under the sun from buying XYZ parts from the XYZ company and selling them to the city, was there? It wasn't that the "free and untrammeled bidding" required by law?

Questions Raised

But Robert C. W. Hite, then City

...who made the city's check, was satisfied. "Can't the XYZ company underbid its own buyers?" he asked in effect, "is that free competitive bidding?"

He refused to countersign several checks for meter parts supplied under the bids which he questioned. And the sellers of those parts went unpaid.

White, in Republican eyes, may have been just a Democratic troublemaker. But Frank J. The man, Republican, who succeeded White as controller, is following White's example and refusing to pay the questioned bills, too.

Says McLaughlin, now Director of Public Works, which department includes the Water Bureau: "Because those bills are unpaid, the manufacturers won't give us any more parts. Without parts we can't repair meters."

Wants Court Ruling
 Says Tiemann: "I don't doubt the failure to pay past bills is causing trouble in repairing meters. But I won't take a chance of violating Judge Flood's decree. I'm not willing to accept the opinion of the City Solicitor's office. The City Solicitor is not the Court. I want Court ruling."

No one would give details of the unpaid bills, or the quantities of parts required, or much else.

"See Grakeloff," was the consensus.

But Grakeloff, known far and wide as a fluent and eloquent speaker, won't talk this time.

"Tell the people I am saving them money on city purchases," was his sole answer to all questions.

Incidentally, the property owner has to pay the city for meter repairs—if they are made.

Philadelphia Water Department
 Historical Collection
 2004.019.0019B

2004.019.0019B