May 19, 2010
Curtis Hall

The regular meeting of the **BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS** was held this evening, President Morton J. Simon, Jr. presiding. Members present were Commissioners Hampton, Haywood, McKeown, Sharkey, and Swavola. Staff present were Joseph L. Galdo, Jr., Director of Fiscal Affairs; Bryan T. Havir, Assistant Township Manager; John O. Hoover, Jr., Director of Parks and Recreation; Rudy Kastenhuber, Public Works Coordinator; David Lynch, Director of Engineering, Zoning & Inspections; Mark McDonnell, Public Works Superintendent; John J. Norris, Chief of Police; Joseph O'Neill, Fire Marshal; Ruth Littner Shaw, Main Street Manager; Joseph M. Bagley, Esq., Wisler, Pearlstine, LLP; and David G. Kraynik, Township Manager. A Public Attendance List is attached.

1. President Simon opened the meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance being led by Commissioner McKeown.

2. Each member having received a copy of the Commissioners' Regular Meeting Minutes dated April 17, 2010, upon motion of Mr. McKeown, the Minutes were unanimously approved by the Board of Commissioners.

3. Each member having received a copy of the Executive Summary Financial Report of the Manager/Secretary for the month of April, 2010, upon motion of Mr. Swavola, the Report was unanimously approved by the Board of Commissioners and ordered spread in full upon the Minute Book.

4. Each member having received a copy of the Accounts Paid Report for the month of April, 2010, upon motion of Mr. Swavola, the Report was unanimously approved by the Board of Commissioners and ordered spread in full upon the Minute Book.

5. Mr. McKeown presented Military Deployment Awards to the following current police officers who served in the Armed Forces in a combat zone:

Lt. John Farley	Vietnam War
Sgt. James Slavin	Operation Enduring Freedom
Sgt. David Feinstein	Operation Desert Shield / Desert Storm
Ofc. Robert Dougherty	Operation Iraqi Freedom 2005
Ofc. Robert Dougherty	Operation Iraqi Freedom 2009
Ofc. Edward Farrell	Operation Iraqi Freedom
Ofc. Jacalyn Hinchee	Operation Desert Shield / Desert Storm
Ofc. Jacalyn Hinchee	Operation Iraqi Freedom/Enduring Freedom
Ofc. Chad Smith	Operation Iraqi Freedom

6. Mr. Simon presented **Resolution No. 18-10** to the father of Joshua Fattal, currently detained in Iran.

A Resolution No. 18-10
of the Board of Commissioners of Cheltenham Township

Whereas, THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF CHELTENHAM TOWNSHIP, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, with hope for a compassionate and positive outcome, expresses deep concern about the welfare of three U.S. citizens detained in Iran since July 31, 2009; and

Whereas, Josh Fattal, who grew up in Cheltenham Township, along with fellow hikers Shane Bauer and Sarah Shourd, allegedly crossed an unmarked section of the Iraq-Iran border while on a recreational trip in the Kurdish region of Iraq. The three were arrested by the Iranian government and are now held in Evin Prison in Tehran with no clear signs about their legal status; and

Whereas, The family and friends of the hikers, along with countless other organizations, agencies and luminaries like Archbishop Desmond Tutu, Noam Chomsky, and Cornel West, have unanimously urged the Iranian government to release the hikers from detention as soon as possible. The families are grateful that Iranian authorities have authorized their visas and hope this indication of goodwill and compassion will translate into an opportunity to bring their loved ones home.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF CHELTENHAM TOWNSHIP, duly convened in regular session this Nineteenth Day of May, A.D., 2010, does hereby officially express hope that the three hikers will soon be released and returned to the embrace of their families and loved ones. It is further directed that this Resolution be spread in full upon the minutes of this meeting and that a copy thereof be presented to the Fattal family.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I, MORTON J. SIMON, JR., President of the BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF CHELTENHAM TOWNSHIP, have hereunto set my hands and caused the Seal of the Township of Cheltenham to be made a part thereof. DONE AT ELKINS PARK, PENNSYLVANIA, in the year of the Township of Cheltenham, the one hundred and eleventh.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
OF CHELTENHAM TOWNSHIP

By: _____
President

Attest: _____
Township Manager and Secretary

7. Mr. Simon noted that Patricia Swirsding was unable to attend this evening's meeting due to illness to receive **Resolution No. 19-10** in recognition of her retirement from the Police Department.

Resolution No. 19-10
of the Board of Commissioners of Cheltenham Township

Whereas, THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF CHELTENHAM TOWNSHIP, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, with deep appreciation and admiration, salutes **PATRICIA SWIRSDING,** of 95 Henry Avenue in Warminster, on the occasion of her retirement after nearly 16 years of service with the Township; and

Whereas, **PATRICIA SWIRSDING** joined the Township family as the full-time secretary to the Chief of Police on July 5, 1994, and served with three different Police Chiefs during her tenure. Her responsibilities included preparing agendas, handling correspondence, maintaining essential records and helping to assemble documents for numerous grant applications. Efficient and reliable, she performed all her duties with diligence and a careful attention to detail; and

Whereas, **PATRICIA SWIRSDING** was well-liked by fellow employees and community members alike for her kindness and willingness to help others. Her warmth and good humor is greatly missed by all of her co-workers since her retirement on March 12, 2010.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF CHELTENHAM TOWNSHIP, duly convened in regular session this Nineteenth Day of May, A.D., 2010, does hereby officially honor **PATRICIA SWIRSDING** for her dedicated service to the Cheltenham community and wishes her the best of luck in all her future endeavors. It is further directed that this Resolution be spread in full upon the minutes of this meeting and that a copy thereof be presented to Ms. Swirsding.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I, MORTON J. SIMON, JR., President of the BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF CHELTENHAM TOWNSHIP, have hereunto set my hands and caused the Seal of the Township of Cheltenham to be made a part thereof. DONE AT ELKINS PARK, PENNSYLVANIA, in the year of the Township of Cheltenham, the one hundred and eleventh.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
OF CHELTENHAM TOWNSHIP

By: _____
President

Attest: _____
Township Manager and Secretary

8. Mr. Sharkey presented a Community Service Award to Joseph Kluchinski, II, for his Eagle Scout project at Curtis Dog Park.

9. Richard and Marguerite Kass, representatives of the Greater Glenside Patriotic Association, presented a plaque of appreciation to the Township.

10. Mr. Simon noted that as a result of an error in a Times Chronicle Legal Notice, two Ordinances due to be considered for adoption this evening regarding an amendment to the Traffic Code and an amendment to the Firearms Ordinance will be re-advertised for adoption at the June 16, 2010 meeting of the Board of Commissioners.

11. PUBLIC HEARING: To receive any and all comments and suggestions from the public regarding the proposed amendment to repeal Chapter 290 of the Cheltenham Code entitled "Stormwater Management" and replacing said Chapter with a new Chapter 290 entitled "Tookany/Tacony-Frankford Watershed Stormwater Management" (see attached). Said Ordinance was duly advertised.

Mr. Simon opened the Hearing and reviewed the proposed Ordinance to amend the Code, and he asked for comments from the Board and the public. There were no comments from the Board or the public.

Upon motion of Mr. McKeown, and unanimously approved by the Board, the hearing was closed.

12. Upon motion of Mr. McKeown, the Board of Commissioners unanimously adopted **Ordinance No. 2202-10** repealing Chapter 290 of the Cheltenham Code entitled "Stormwater Management" and replacing said Chapter with a new Chapter 290 entitled "Tookany/Tacony-Frankford Watershed Stormwater Management" (see attached).

13. Upon motion of Mr. Haywood, the Board of Commissioners unanimously awarded a contract for Furnishing Rates for Concrete Curb and Sidewalk Replacement to Ditri Construction Inc., Philadelphia, PA for:

CURB 0 TO 50 LF X 50 51 TO 100 LF X 100 101 TO 200 LF X 600	SIDEWALK 0 TO 80 SF @ 300 SF 4" SW @ 300 SF 6" DW	SIDEWALK 81 TO 400 SF @ 400 SF 4" SW @ 100 SF 6" SW	SIDEWALK OVER 400 SF @ 2000 SF 4" SW	DETECTABLE WARNING SURFACE 35 +/-	TOTAL
$ 40.00 = $ 2,000.00 $ 35.00 = $ 3,500.00 $ 30.00 = $18,000.00	$ 7.50 = $ 2,250.00 $ 8.50 = 2,550.00	$ 7.50 = $ 3,000.00 $ 8.50 = 850.00	$ 7.00 = 14,000.00	$200.00 = $7,000.00	$53,150.00

being the lowest responsible bidder meeting Township specifications and being within budgetary limitations.

14. Upon motion of Mr. Haywood, the Board of Commissioners unanimously awarded a Consortium Contract for Furnishing Biodegradable Paper Leaf & Grass Collection Bags to Dano Enterprises, Inc., 76 Progress Drive, Stamford, CT 06907 for:

Approximately 415,000 thirty (30) gal. bags	@	$0.309/ea.
Additional price for thirty (30) gal. bags	@	NC
Approximately 145,400 forty (40) gal. bags	@	0.435/ea
Additional price for forty (40) gal. bags	@	NC
*Print lettering on thirty/forty (30/40) gal. bags – One time charge $300 (This charge is only applicable to Townships and/or Boroughs who do not have their "Art Work" currently on file with Dano Enterprises, Inc.)	@	NC*
Peel and Seal Adhesive Strips, 2 per bag	@	0.002/Bag
Excludes all federal excise and PA sales taxes.		

being the lowest responsible bidder meeting Township specifications and being within budgetary limitations.

Mr. Simon noted that there would be no increase in the charge of the bags to residents.

15. Upon motion of Mr. Haywood, the Board of Commissioners unanimously approved a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application No. L867 to Everton Brown, owner of 1721 Chelsea Road, LaMott, relating to replacing the existing wood deck with a new deck with a railing as recommended by the LaMott Board of Historical and Architectural Review.

16. Upon motion of Mr. Haywood, the Board of Commissioners unanimously approved a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application No. L868 to Kevin and Parthenia Bunch, owners of 8 ½ Latham Parkway, LaMott, relating to the repair and/or replacement of the existing room and storm-damaged siding as recommended by the LaMott Board of Historical and Architectural Review.

17. Upon motion of Mr. Haywood, the Board of Commissioners unanimously approved a Certificate of Appropriateness relating to Pedestrian Streetscape Lighting for the LaMott Historic District as recommended by the LaMott Board of Historical and Architectural Review.

18. Upon motion of Mr. Haywood, the Board of Commissioners unanimously approved a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application No. W811 to Craig and Wendy Comisar, owners of 102 Cliff Terrace, Wyncote, relating to the construction of a pair of six foot wooden trellises and replacement of one storm window as recommended by the Wyncote Board of Historical and Architectural Review.

19. Upon motion of Mr. Haywood, the Board of Commissioners unanimously approved` a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application No. W812 to Nick Fisher, tenant of 113 Greenwood Avenue, Wyncote, relating to the repair and/or replacement of the existing concrete patio, the installation of a railing and the placement of tables with umbrellas and chairs on said patio as recommended by the Wyncote Board of Historical and Architectural Review.

20. Upon motion of Mr. Haywood, the Board of Commissioners unnimously approved a request by Michael Yanoff, Attorney for the Applicant, for a waiver of the time period in which Cheltenham Township Development Application No. 00-05 Record Plan Wordsworth Academy Site Improvements – 7827 Old York Road is to be acted upon by the Township. This waiver will expire sixty (60) days from the date Mr. Yanoff notifies the Township, in writing, that the waiver is withdrawn.

21. Upon motion of Mr. Haywood, the Board of Commissioners unanimously awarded a contract for exterior renovations to the Cheltenham Art Center to Twining Construction Co., Inc., Newtown, PA 18940 in the amount of $160,168 for the base bid and also for Alternates 1, 2 and 3 being the lowest responsible bidder meeting Township specifications and being within budgetary limitations.

22. Upon motion of Mr. Haywood, the Board of Commissioners unanimously awarded a contract to Godwin Pumps of Bridgeport, NJ, in the amount of $1,292,040.08 for the purchase and installation of an Interceptor A Bypass Pumping System contingent upon a) Godwin providing proof of insurance of $2,500,000 for commercial general liability and naming the Township as an additional insured and b) the Township signing a new Wastewater Service Agreement with the City of Philadelphia.

23. Upon motion of Mr. Haywood, the Board of Commissioners unanimously approved the following Capital Budget transfer:

$1,250,000 from Capital Account No. 92-009 (2008 Bond Issue proceeds)

to Capital Account No. 92-773 (Sanitary Sewer Rehabilitation).

24. Mr. Simon asked that the Public Works Committee Meeting Minutes be amended as follows: page 19, item 27, should read "In view...", not "In lieu...".

25. Upon motion of Mr. Haywood, and unanimously approved by the Board, the Public Works Committee Regular Meeting Minutes dated May 12, 2010, were accepted as amended.

26. Upon motion of Mr. Sharkey, the Board of Commissioners unanimously adopted a posthumous **Resolution No. 26-10** for Tanicha Workman a student at Cheltenham High School. Said Resolution will be presented at a future meeting of the Board of Commissioners.

27. Upon motion Mr. Sharkey, the Board of Commissioners unanimously adopted **Resolution No. 27-10** honoring Marian Dondero upon her retirement as Director of Ancillae Assumpta Academy. Said Resolution will be presented at a future meeting of the Board of Commissioners.

28. Upon motion of Mr. Sharkey, and unanimously approved by the Board, the Public Affairs Committee Regular Meeting Minutes dated May 5, 2010, were accepted.

29. There were comments from the public regarding the Public Affairs Committee meeting of May 5, 2010:

a. Theresa Camerota, 1112 Church Road, Wyncote, asked why LaMott was still being spelled incorrectly.

Mr. Sharkey asked Mr. Kraynik if he had any information. Mr. Kraynik answered that he was asked by the Public Affairs Committee at its meeting on May 5, 2010, to respond to allegations by Diane Williams, 1812 Beech Avenue, LaMott, that the Township spells LaMott incorrectly, that LaMott should be spelled "La Mott", and that the LaMott community is marginalized. Mr. Kraynik stated that he has every intention to submit a report to the Public Affairs Committee at its June 2, 2010 meeting. He has started research, which has not yet been completed, and at this time, there is uncertainty about how LaMott should be spelled. To date, his research has found an inconsistent spelling of LaMott. So far, inconsistencies have been found in various documents, publications and websites, including but not limited to:

- "Remembering Cheltenham Township" by Donald Scott, Sr. Said book has 14 pages that mention LaMott. Of these 14 pages, eleven (11) of them spell LaMott without a space. Two (2) of the pages spell LaMott with a space, i.e. La Mott. On one (1) of the pages, it is spelled both ways.

- In the Old York Road Historical Society's "Images of America – Cheltenham Township", there nine (9) pages that refer to LaMott and in each instance, there is not space between La and Mott.

- The History of Cheltenham Township by Elaine Rothschild published in 1976 by the Township's Historical Commission has five (5) pages that reference LaMott. All five (5) pages spell LaMott without a space between La and Mott.

- National Register of Historic Places and the United States Geographical Service identify LaMott as spelled without a space.

- Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission spell LaMott without a space.

- In a letter dated 1998 from the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, which addresses National Register nominations and inventories Wyncote and Camptown, LaMott Historic Districts, LaMott is spelled without a space. The nomination form was prepared by a professional consultant in the 1970's and was the basis for the designation of the Camptown Historic District. Throughout the document LaMott is spelled without a space.

- United States Postal Service website does not use a space.

Mr. Kraynik was not sure if there are other documents but he plans to research it further.

Mr. Simon stated that he was not aware of the research Mr. Kraynik has been doing. This matter will be considered at the June meeting of the Public Affairs Committee meeting, and he hoped that a reasonable determination will be made with no intention of any disrespect which ever way this issue is brought to a conclusion.

Ms. Camerota stated that LaMott is a quiet community that should be respected for what it offers to American history. The Township honored police officers who served in the Armed Forces and many times the solders from LaMott get forgotten. On the historical marker, LaMott was spelled with a space. In conversations with residents and non-residents, the correct spelling does not seem clear. She felt if there is a mixed review, so be it, but the elders, the community, the garden, and its contributions should be respected as much as the great wealth and splendor of the Township's past.

Mr. McKeown stated that his mother was born in 1921 in Cheltenham, graduated from Cheltenham High School, and grew up in Cheltenham Village as did he. When he was a child growing up, if you came from Cheltenham Village, you were referred to as coming from the slum of the Township. Many of his friends are from LaMott. He grew up knowing LaMott as a child. He has lived in Cheltenham for 55-years and never knew of any disrespect for LaMott. Famous athletes came from LaMott. During all the years he has lived in Cheltenham, the question of the spelling of LaMott has not been raised until now. He assured Ms. Camerota that the Board can be trusted to make its decision with respect.

Ms. Camerota felt that the point is to get it right for the record, and begin discussions about LaMott and the Community Garden. She thanked Mr. Kraynik for his research. She felt there appeared to be a negative attitude when Ms. Williams speaks at meetings, and thought there are conflicts about the garden that need to be addressed.

Mr. Kraynik stated that LaMott consists of two (2) historic districts, i.e. Camptown, which is the national designation name for the site, and the state's designation is the LaMott Historic District. The national effort was done in the mid-1980's and designated by the Department of Interior as Camptown.

b. Diane Williams, 1812 Beech Avenue, LaMott, asked for an opportunity to review Mr. Kraynik's research. Mr. Kraynik responded that the books he referred to are available at the Township's libraries as well as bookstores and would share his documentation when it was completed. Mr. Swavola felt that so far, it is evident that there is no single way to spell LaMott. Ms. Williams felt that the community should determine how it should be spelled. It was Mr. McKeown's opinion that the Commissioners would make the final determination. Mr. Simon was of the opinion that anyone who wants to speak to the Board about the issue is free to do so but ultimately, it will be the Commissioners' decision as to how the Township will spell it, and the Township cannot control how private individuals spell it.

Ms. Williams asked how residents can make suggestions about the spelling of LaMott. Mr. McKeown asked how many homes comprised LaMott. Ms. Williams was not sure but thought several hundred. Mr. McKeown suggested that neighbors could provide letters. Ms. Williams felt that the community should be given an opportunity for input, and Mr. Simon stated that it has just been given that opportunity. She felt that Mr. McKeown's remark about LaMott not being disrespected, was subjective. The people of LaMott feel they have been disrespected.

c. Williams Owens, 1426 Wistar Drive, Wyncote, stated that it appears to him there is a lot of tension about the spelling of LaMott. He cited other places that get their names misspelled. He felt that children should be taught the right way of spelling. Mr. McKeown stated that his friends in LaMott never had a problem with how LaMott was spelled. This became a recent issue. Mr. Owens felt that people years ago were not as educated as they are today and are asking questions. Mr. McKeown stated that the Board will make what it deems the correct decision.

30. Upon motion of Mr. McKeown, the Board of Commissioners unanimously approved a change in the procedures for oral examinations of police recruits so that said oral examinations are to be conducted by an oral board selected by the Chief of Police and consisting of police professionals.

31. Upon motion of Mr. McKeown, and unanimously approved by the Board, the Public Safety Committee Regular Meeting Minutes dated May 5, 2010, were accepted.

32. Upon motion of Mr. Swavola, and unanimously approved by the Board, the Building and Zoning Committee Regular Meeting Minutes dated May 5, 2010, were accepted.

33. Upon motion of Ms. Hampton, the Board of Commissioners unanimously approved changes to the Curtis and Glenside Hall Fee Schedules for 2011-2013 (see attached).

34. Upon motion of Ms. Hampton, and unanimously approved by the Board, the Parks and Recreation Committee Regular Meeting Minutes dated May 12, 2010, were accepted.

35. Upon motion of Mr. Haywood, and unanimously approved by the Board, the Pension Board Regular Meeting Minutes dated May 7, 2010, were accepted.

36. Under Citizens' Forum:

a. Diane Williams, 1812 Beech Avenue, LaMott, gave a Right-to-Know Request Form to Mr. Simon. Mr. Bagley advised that under the law, a Right-to-Know Request Form can only be provided to the Right-to-Know Officer. Ms. Williams stated that said form was a hand-out and not the formal request. Mr. Bagley stated that he would return the form to her, and she was told to give it to the Right-to-Know Officer of the Township. Ms. Williams asked which Township officials are speaking on behalf of the LaMott community regarding the preservation of the LaMott Community Garden and about the terms and conditions the Township supposedly negotiated with Temple University regarding the sale of the Tyler School of Art to David Dobson's Land Conservancy of Elkins Park.

Mr. Simon stated that Mr. Portner represents LaMott. The Township is not aware of any signed agreement of sale between Mr. Dobson and Temple University or any other entity under Mr. Dobson's control, as stated by Mr. Dobson by Mr. Dobson in the press.

Ms. Williams stated that she and others spoke with representatives from Temple and Mr. Dobson regarding the sale. It is her understanding that the Township is aware that the LaMott Community Garden was suppose to have homes built on it, was satisfied to include the LaMott Community Garden in any purchase, did nothing to save the garden, and indicated that residents believe that only recently did the Township express concern about the garden, and that there were discussions for years regarding the development of homes for that tract of land. She asked who the residents can go to. Mr. Simon stated that any matters can be brought to the attention of Mr. Kraynik who is the highest level of management in the Township, and he disseminates every issue brought to his attention to the Commissioners. Ms. Williams asked Mr. Kraynik if he could tell her how many years he has known that the garden was a part of the sale or that no effort was made to save the garden.

Mr. Kraynik responded that he did not know Ms. Williams' claims to be the case. The Board authorized him to write letters to the last three presidents of Temple University urging that the LaMott Community Garden not be part of any sale and that when the university sells the Temple Tyler property that the garden remain with the community and/or the Township. Mr. Kraynik stated that he has reiterated this at past meetings.

Ms. Williams asked about the Tyler will. She stated that she knew of two attempts by State Representative Larry Curry in the form of bills to change the will of the Tyler estate, and both attempts failed. She asked if there was any information about these attempts. Mr. Kraynik responded that he could not speak to any relationship of the will to any legislative bill but it is his understanding that there is a portion of the Tyler School of Art property, which before it is sold needs to have the approval of the state legislature or a new bill needs to be introduced and passed that would clear the way for the sale of the property. A portion of the property was state land, and there is a past agreement between Temple and the state for Temple to use the land. If Temple wishes to dispose of the property, it will need some act of the state legislature. Ms. Williams asked that since both of Representative Curry's bills have failed, where it leaves Temple. It was suggested she ask Representative Curry.

Ms. Williams alluded that the Township participated in Temple's negotiations to sell the property. Mr. Simon stated that in his nine (9) years as a Commissioner, there has not been any proposal to build on the garden plot. In his first term, the President of Temple and some Commissioners met and walked through the property, and the Commissioners asked to be made aware in advance of any action that takes place about the property. The same desire was expressed to current President Hart. The Commissioners were never involved in specific negotiations but have simply evidenced their concern about the future of the property in its entirety, which included the LaMott Garden. The Commissioners do not now, nor have they in the past, have any representative involved in any negotiations. Temple indicated to the Commissioners that they were as surprised as the Commissioners to read about Mr. Dobson's comments in the newspaper.

Ms. Williams asked about the tax status of the garden and the dormitory parcels. She was told the best source for tax status information is the Township's Tax Collector/Finance Officer Stephen Burns.

b. Mavra Iano, 157 Greenwood Avenue, Wyncote, asked why the Commissioners were not aware of Representative Curry's attempts to twice put a bill through in Harrisburg to change the will regarding the Temple Tyler property.

Mr. Simon responded stated that he is not aware that there was a bill to attempt to affect anything related to the will only that some of the property may have been state property and may have included the property on which is now the studio building, and for a buyer to purchase the entire property, including the portion subject to legislation, there has to be new legislation.

Mr. McKeown suggested that Ms. Iano speak to Representative Curry. The Commissioners only receive information from Representative Curry when he decides to give it to them. This is a state issue. Ms. Iano said that Representative Curry has been very helpful. Mr. McKeown did not believe so or Ms. Iano would not need to ask the questions she is asking this evening.

Mr. Simon stated that a State Representative is the person who is involved in the state legislative process, and that he has not had any conversations with Representative Curry about this issue in at least several years. Ms. Iano stated that Senator Washington also had legislation in the past. Mr. Kraynik advised that a few years ago Representative Curry and Senator Washington introduced legislation and made the Township aware of it. Both of them have told the Township that they will advisee of future attempts for legislation before it is introduced.

Ms. Iano was concerned that such a change will be negative on the community, and a lot of time has to be spent investigating the past history and status of the land. She claimed that she saw a document prepared by University of Pennsylvania planners with proposals for the Elkins and Tyler estates. The people who will be affected by these changes are not involved. Mr. Kraynik asked if she had copies of the documents and stated that there may be documents out there but nothing has been officially submitted regarding the development of the Temple Tyler property, and he could not speak to any such documents. Ms. Iano felt there should be a meeting about this issue. According to the Home Rule Charter, the community has the right to be informed, heard and participate. The Philadelphia Inquirer, KYW and the Times Chronicle have reported a performance date for the agreement of sale of the Temple Tyler property of June 30, 2010, and she asked who is speaking for the community. She presented an open letter to the Times Chronicle. Mr. Bagley returned the letters, and he stated that on the reverse side of the letter is a copy of the Right-to-Know Request Form. Ms. Iano said she was giving it for information purposes.

Ms. Iano stated that Mr. Dobson met with some residents and was given this letter, which is a request for the continuance of the LaMott Community Garden. The community wants the garden donated before any sale takes place, and wants to know how they are being represented. Ms. Iano asked if the Commissioners have visited the garden. Commissioners Haywood and McKeown acknowledged that they did. The neighbors asked Mr. Dobson how many years it takes for common ground that provides food for all to become sacred and worthy of preservation, and he responded that according to the University, it is 100-years. Ms. Iano felt that the garden is a small farm that has been preserved by the LaMott neighbors for 100-years. Mr. McKeown stated that he has been a Commissioner for 14-years, and only recently has this issue been posed to the Commissioners. It is a new issue, and the Commissioners will do all they can to preserve the garden.

Ms. Iano stated that Mr. Dobson was bold to ask for donations for a National Historic Site, tell the press that he is going to build houses on the site, and insult the neighbors by telling them that they can come up the other side of Beech Avenue. Mr. McKeown suggested that a citizens group go to Representative Curry as a whole. She did not understand why according to the will a line is being drawn down Beech Avenue and the tract seems to be up for grabs. She looked at Mr. Dobson's website.

Ms. Hampton responded that it is Mr. Dobson's right to have a website, speak to the press, to make a purchase, and ask for offers but that does not mean that the Township is supporting what he does nor does it mean that the Township will not react or act based on what its Solicitor advises. The information Mr. Dobson was quoted as giving was new to her. She only found out about it when she read the article. The Township is being accused of ignoring the community, which it is not doing.

Ms. Iano asked who the community can go to. Mr. McKeown asked that she speak to Commissioner Portner but more importantly, President Hart of Temple. Ms. Iano responded that the neighbors have addressed President Hart, and Mr. Dobson. and suggested that a meeting be held by all parties with the neighbors before the June 30, 2010 deadline.

Mr. Haywood stated that he is reluctant to meet on such a topic because the Township does not own the land, and since the Township does not own the land, and there is no proposal to the Township as to what to do with the land from Temple or anyone else, he is not sure what the Township's role would be given this fact. The Township has sent several letters to Temple but since Temple owns the land, the Township's ability to get Temple to change its behavior is extremely limited.

Ms. Iano asked that discussions be more open. Ms. Hampton asked what Mr. Dobson said. Ms. Williams responded that it was too much to say right now. Ms. Hampton asked if his response could be summarized since it seemed that it left a significant impression on them. Ms. Iano responded that the neighbors' intentions was to come to the Commissioners even if they had not met with Mr. Dobson because of the press coverage this has been getting and the performance date of June 30, 2010. The community has rights in this, and does not want any surprises on June 30, 2010 and have the land disappear. She stated that she was speaking on behalf of the people. Mr. McKeown stated that the Township has asked for Temple to donate the land but can only do so much since the Township does not own it.

Upon motion of Ms. Hampton, the Board of Commissioners unanimously agreed that a letter be sent to Temple University asking that the Township acquire by donation the property known as the LaMott Community Garden and that the land be saved from any sale that may take place.

c. Regarding the 'trust' raised by Mr. McKeown, Ms. Williams felt that she hears matching responses from Temple and Mr. Dobson but something else from the Commissioners, and this leads to a feeling of distrust. In response to a suggestion from Mr. McKeown that she get a group together, Ms. Williams stated that there is a LaMott Community Garden Group, and it has 62 families that make up the group, with 25 people on a wait list who want to be considered part of that group. Ms. Williams claimed many were elderly people and would not bring them to meetings. She felt that the Commissioners asking for a group to get together was minimizing their effort. When asked by Mr. Kraynik to whom she spoke at Temple University, she responded that she preferred not to say.

Mr. Simon stated that the Township is doing all it can to acquire some rights to the garden area but has limited legal capability and cannot control Temple and is aware of what the neighbors want. He reiterated that the Township would ask Temple that the LaMott Community Garden land be donated to the Township. Mr. Simon stated that the Township is just as concerned as the neighbors and has been trying to piece together whether or not there is any truth to what is in the newspapers. Temple has told the Township there is no executed agreement of sale. The letter that the Township sends to President Hart will include a request to donate the garden to the Township. If it is donated to the Township, the Township will be in a position to deal with it but the garden land does not belong to the Township now.

Mr. Kraynik advised that the Township received a letter from Temple in response to its March 10, 2010 letter to President Hart but the response was merely an acknowledgement of the Township's letter and that the Township would be advised at the appropriate time. Mr. Simon reiterated that all the Township can do is make another request to Temple to turn the property over to the Township regardless of who they sell it to but the Township cannot compel Temple to do something.

d. Loretta Leader, 542 W. Glenside Avenue, was concerned about the possibility of Mr. Dobson purchasing any more land in the Township. She periodically walks through the property. In the past two weeks, she witnessed conditions that indicate the property is not being maintained, especially the rear of the property, and it is not in keeping with the zoning relief that was granted. There are stone deliveries being trucked into the property coming from the local quarries that are of great value. Mr. Dobson receives $400 for a ton of stone. He leases the space where the stones are stored and covers them so that it appears that it is always the same stones. Mrs. Leader indicated that her information comes from a previous employee who had a problem getting paid for his work. She saw unsavory-looking people living there. Mr. Dobson gets a lot of work done via barter and/or exchange system, which is part of his religion. The greenhouse and garages are being leased. He has plans to buy the Faith Theological Seminary. His wife maintains the books. His staff is very limited, and the people he brings in, do free work in return. He is getting $20,000 for the rental of the facility. He holds weddings and funerals, which the Dominican Sisters never did.

Mr. Simon asked the Township Solicitor about the ramifications of some of Mrs. Leader's comments. Mr. Bagley advised that the Township Solicitor's office attended a County Board of Assessment appeal hearing because Land Conservancy of Elkins Park was requesting to be tax exempt, and the Township opposed the appeal. The Board of Assessment ruled that the property is not tax exempt and that decision has not been appealed. The property was tax-exempt when it was owned by the Dominican Sisters but since the sale, the state has revisited the property and rendered it taxable, and Land Conservancy is appealing the decision at the state level. Right now, it is not tax exempt regarding real estate taxes. Mr. Simon stated that it is the Township's opinion that the activities taking place on the property do not entitle it to be tax-exempt. Mrs. Leader stated that a major film company will be filming a movie on the property and will pay well for its use.

e. Ms. Iano asked what caused the state to consider the tax status of the property.

Mr. Bagley advised that when a property is transferred, there are two tax implications, i.e. for the state and for the county. When the property was transferred, Land Conservancy claimed it was a tax-exempt transaction, and the state reviewed the transfer since most property transfers are taxable. Land Conservancy tried to get tax exempt real estate taxes because of its use. The Township Solicitor's office was at the Board of Assessment Hearing and opposed the exemption claim. The County Board of Assessment decided that it was not tax exempt. Mr. Bagley stated that so far, the property is taxable, and Land Conservancy has not appealed the decision.

37. Under New Business: Mr. Kraynik advised that the Township is not in a position this evening to adopt a new Waster Water Service Agreement with the City of Philadelphia. The document is still in the draft stage and the city is reviewing it, and the city and the Township will meet at a later date.

38. Citizens' Form Continued:

a. Olga McHugh, 127 Hewett Road, felt that there are some Commissioners who are not responsive, and the only course of action for some residents is to come the Board. She felt that even though Mr. Dobson did not submit a plan for the purchase of the Tyler School for Art property does not necessarily mean that he did not contact some Township departments for information to see what he can get away with. She indicated this might be the case and felt that there might be information that was being hidden from the community, and the excuse that an official plan was not submitted is being used.

Regarding the Tookany/Tacony-Frankford Watershed Stormwater Management Ordinance adopted this evening, Mrs. McHugh was concerned about the clause that states that the Township can have access to a home with only 48-hours notice and was concerned about how the Township can gain access to a home. She felt there should be a detailed letter outlining the reasons so the homeowner has time to respond.

There was a review of page 47 of the Ordinance, which contained the clause. Mr. Bagley responded that Mrs. McHugh's interpretation of the Ordinance is incorrect. It is not implied that the Township can access anyone's property with 48-hours written notice. A municipality does not have any authority to walk on or go into a property without permission of the owner. A property owner has the right to refuse, and the Township has the right to appeal through a court order or some other legal provision. Ms. McHugh stated that residents should be told why access is needed to their property. Mr. Bagley responded that the "written notice" referred to in the Ordinance will include all details and reasons why access to a property is needed.

b. David Cohen, 321 Gerard Avenue, Elkins Park, asked about the status of the Age-Restricted Overlay District. Mr. Simon stated that the Township is still considering it but is not sure what action it will take regarding said Ordinance.

c. Robert DeMaria, 65 Limekiln Pike, Glenside, asked to be placed on a future agenda to discuss his proposals. He has a plan to grow lavender and gave a plant to Commissioner Hampton. He has over 200,000 lavender seeds that he germinated. He has lived in Cheltenham for over many years, and he has a lot of roots in Cheltenham and wants to give back to the community. He wants to propagate the lavender for one year and he would plant and maintain it, harvest it, extract the lavender oil and with the balance he would make ethanol and share the revenue with the Township. Cheltenham High School and Cedarbrook Middle School are receptive to his idea.

His revenue would be more than the revenue the Township gets from its compost. A lavender farm in an acre of ground takes 2,500 plants and generates between $30,000 and $50,000 per year. He distributed information detailing how to turn leaf mulch into ethanol and ideas on how to get grants for a sewage treatment plant. He cited Vineland, New Jersey's sewage treatment plant. He detailed his ideas to the Environmental Advisory Council ("EAC").

People who are challenged would have an opportunity to have certified farm stands and home kitchens. He would like a farm stand on every block to cut down on fuel. He detailed the procedure to the Building and Zoning Department.

According to Mr. DeMaria, the Township's old greenhouses are deteriorating. The EAC has proposed uses for the greenhouse. He asked to be placed on a future agenda to discuss his ideas.

Mr. Haywood felt that the Board of Commissioners is not in a position to put business proposals on meeting agendas. There are a number of people with business proposals to start new ventures. The place to get initial feedback on starting a business would be Staff or one of the citizens' committees. He did not see how every time someone had a business idea that it could go on an agenda. He did not think it was an appropriate use of the role of the Board of Commissioners. Mr. DeMaria claimed he was not making a business proposal but to ask about the lavender, home kitchens, and according to state law in terms of food crops, one has the right to sell regardless of zoning. He did not feel this was a business venture. Mr. Haywood felt that the Commissioners were not in a position to start any consideration.

Mr. Simon noted that the Board is aware that the EAC has reviewed Mr. DeMaria's proposals. He noted the many e-mails that Mr. DeMaria has been sending to the Commissioners and suggested that Mr. DeMaria try to write a synopsis of the most simple plan that would minimally involve the Commissioners, the Staff and the Township, and submit it to Mr. Kraynik, and suggested that Mr. DeMaria start with one proposal on one item at a time.

d. Loretta Leader, 542 W. Glenside Avenue, supported Mr. De Maria's proposal to grow lavender. It is a plant with multi-purpose uses.

e. William Owen, 1426 Wistar Drive, Wyncote, was concerned about blackouts occurring on Wistar Drive. He was told that the transformer was outdated and a new one was needed. Weather predictions indicate severe conditions for next winter. Mr. Swavola responded that when property owners report frequent outages to the Township, it is reported to PECO. Mr. Haywood reported that he met with neighbor Joe Lewis, and they are trying to get PECO to investigate the situation.

f. Thomas McHugh, 127 Hewett Road, was concerned about the Township's consideration of whether or not to keep its police dispatchers or go with the county's 911 system. According to what he has read, there is a concern among municipalities about the cost of software and salaries to stay with the local dispatch system. There is an understanding that dispatchers would not be laid off. He supported local dispatching by dispatchers who know the community. Many residents want to keep the local dispatchers.

There being no further business, upon motion of Mr. Swavola, and unanimously approved by the Board, the meeting was adjourned.

David G. Kraynik
Township Manager

as per Anna Marie Felix

PUBLIC ATTENDANCE LIST

Board of Commissioners Meeting

Wednesday, May 19, 2010 @ 7:30 P.M.

Curtis Hall
1250 W. Church Road, Wyncote, PA 19095

(Please Print Clearly)

Print Name	Mailing Address	Telephone Number	E-mail Address
Dr. Klachko	309 Cherry Ln	215[illegible]	
[illegible]			
Sarah Robb Cirillo	TTF Watershed 1 Awbury Rd, Phila	215.208.1613	sarah@ttfwatershed.org
Barb Duffy	8 Hewett Rd	215 885-1506	bedduffy@comcast.net
Robert Hyslop	211 HARRISON	215-886-0813	
DAVID COHEN	321 GERARD AVE. E.P		
JESSE N. Cirillo	148 Mt. Carol Ave Glenside Ave		jcirillo@verizon.net
Tom McHugh	127 Hewett		
Olga McHugh	127 Hewett		
Theresa Cameron	1112 Church Wyncote		

TOWNHIP OF CHELTENHAM

ORDINANCE NO. 2201-10

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE CODE OF CHELTENHAM TOWNSHIP, BY REPEALING THE EXISTING STOMRWATER MANAGEMENT REGULATIONS ENTITLED CHAPTER 290, 'STORMWATER MANAGEMENT' AND REPLACING SAID CHAPTER WITH A NEW CHAPTER 290 ENTITLED, 'TOOKANY/TACONY-FRANKFORD WATERSHED STORMWATER MANAGEMENT ORDINANCE, WHICH SAID REGULATIONS SETFORTH THE IMPLEMENTATION REQUIREMENTS OF THE TOOKANY/TACONY-FRANKFORD WATERSHED STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN FINAL REPORT, DATED MARCH 27, 2008, WHICH SHALL ALSO APPLY TO THOSE PORTIONS OF THE WISSAHICKON WATERSHED IN GLENSIDE, CHELTENHAM TOWNSHIP, UNTIL SUCH TIME THAT THE WISSAHICKON WATERSHED STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN IS COMPLETED AND ADOPTED.

NOW THEREFORE, the Board of Commissioners of the Township of Cheltenham hereby ordains the following:

SECTION 1. The Code of the Township of Cheltenham is hereby amended by repeal of the existing Stormwater Management Regulations of Chapter 290 and add new regulations to address Stormwater Management on a watershed basis to be known as Chapter 290, as follows:

CHAPTER 290

TOOKANY/TACONY-FRANKFORD WATERSHED STORMWATER MANAGEMENT ORDINANCE

Adopted at a Public Meeting held on

Wednesday, May 19, 2010

ARTICLE I

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 290-1. Short Title

This Ordinance shall be known and cited as the "Tookany/Tacony-Frankford Watershed Stormwater Management Ordinance."

Section 290-2. Statement of Findings

The governing body of the Municipality finds that:

A. Inadequate management of accelerated runoff of stormwater resulting from development throughout a watershed increases flows and velocities, contributes to erosion and sedimentation, overtaxes the carrying capacity of streams and storm sewers, greatly increases the cost of public facilities to carry and control stormwater, undermines flood plain management and flood control efforts in downstream communities, reduces groundwater recharge, threatens public health and safety, and increases non-point source pollution of water resources.

B. A comprehensive program of stormwater management, including reasonable regulation of development and activities causing accelerated runoff, is fundamental to the public health, safety and welfare and the protection of people of the Commonwealth, their resources and the environment.

C. Stormwater is an important water resource, which provides groundwater recharge for water supplies and base flow of streams, which also protects and maintains surface water quality.

D. Federal and state regulations require certain municipalities to implement a program of stormwater controls. These municipalities are required to obtain a permit for stormwater discharges from their separate storm sewer systems under the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES).

Section 290-3. Purpose

The purpose of this Ordinance is to promote the public health, safety, and welfare within the Tookany/Tacony-Frankford Watershed by maintaining the natural hydrologic regime and by minimizing the harms and maximizing the benefits described in Section 290-2 of this Ordinance, through provisions designed to:

A. Meet legal water quality requirements under state law, including regulations at 25 Pa. Code Chapter 93 to protect, maintain, reclaim, and restore the existing and designated uses of the waters of this Commonwealth.

B. Preserve the natural drainage systems as much as possible.

C. Manage stormwater runoff close to the source.

D. Provide procedures and performance standards for watershed-wide stormwater planning and management

E. Maintain groundwater recharge to prevent degradation of surface and groundwater quality and to otherwise protect water resources.

F. Prevent scour and erosion of streambanks and stream beds.

G. Provide proper operation and maintenance of all permanent Stormwater Management (SWM) Best Management Practices (BMPs) that are implemented within the Municipality.

H. Provide standards to meet NPDES permit requirements.

Section 290-4. Statutory Authority

The Municipality is empowered to regulate land use and activities that may affect runoff and surface and groundwater quality and quantity by the authority of:

A. Primary Authority.

The Municipality is empowered to regulate land use activities that affect runoff and surface and groundwater quality and quantity by the authority of the Act of October 4, 1978, P.L. 864 (Act 167), 32 P.S. Section 680.1, et seq., as amended, the "Storm Water Management Act" and the Code of the Township of Cheltenham. In addition, the City of Philadelphia's stormwater regulations, revised and implemented in January 2006, prescribe stormwater management requirements for development and post-development stormwater management control. These regulations are available online at: http://www.phillyriverinfo.org/programs/subprogrammain.aspx?Id=Regulations

B. Secondary Authority.

The municipality also is empowered to regulate land use activities that affect runoff by the authority of the Act of July 31, 1968, P.L. 805, No. 247, The Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, as amended.

Section 290-5. Applicability/Regulated Activities

All Regulated Activities and all activities that may affect stormwater runoff, including Land Development and Earth Disturbance Activity, are subject to regulation by this Ordinance. In addition, all applicable development in Philadelphia County must comply with:

A. The latest version of "Stormwater Management Guidance Manual" (currently Version 2.0), prepared by the Philadelphia Water Department Office of Watersheds.

This manual is available online at: http://www.phillyriverinfo.org/PWDDevelopmentReview/RequirementsLibrary.aspx?. The site contains several checklists which have been developed to assist the user in complying with these regulations.

TABLE 290-5.1
ORDINANCE APPLICABILITY FOR THE PHILADELPHIA COUNTY PORTION OF THE WATERSHED

Ordinance Article or Section	Type of Project	Earth Disturbance Associated with Development		
		0-15,000 sq. ft.	15,000 sq. ft.-1 acre	> 1 acre
Article III Drainage Plan Requirements	New Development	N/A**	Yes	Yes
	Redevelopment	N/A**	Yes	Yes
Section 403 Groundwater Recharge Requirements	New Development	N/A**	Yes	Yes
	Redevelopment	N/A**	Yes	Yes
Section 404 Water Quality Requirements	New Development	N/A**	Yes	Yes
	Redevelopment	N/A**	Yes	Yes
Section 405 Channel Protection / Streambank Erosion Requirements	New Development	N/A**	Yes	Yes
	Redevelopment	N/A**	Exempt	Yes (Alternate Criteria)
Section 406 Flood Control / Stormwater Peak Rate Control and Management Districts Requirements	New Development	N/A**	Yes	Yes
	Redevelopment	N/A**	Yes (Alternate Criteria)	Yes (Alternate Criteria)

Yes (Alternate Criteria) – Redevelopment disturbing more than one acre which reduces the DCIA from predevelopment conditions by at least 20% is exempt from the Channel Protection Requirements of this Ordinance, and redevelopment greater than or equal to 15,000 square feet which reduces the DCIA from predevelopment conditions by at least 20% are exempt from the Flood Control Requirements of this Ordinance (See Section 106, Philadelphia County Portion of the Watershed, for further details).

N/A – Not Applicable, development project is not subject to requirements of indicated Regulations section. Voluntary controls are encouraged.

Exempt – Development project is not subject to requirements of indicated Regulations section.

** – If the proposed development results in stormwater discharge that exceeds stormwater system capacity, increases the FEMA regulated water surface elevation, causes a combined sewer overflow, or degrades receiving waters, the design specifications presented in these Regulations may be applied to proposed development activities as warranted to protect public health, safety, or property.

Section 290-6. Exemptions

A. Exemptions for Land Use Activities

Note: Philadelphia County and Montgomery County will follow different Exemption Criteria.

Montgomery County Portion of the Watershed:

1. Disconnected Regulated Activities (Regulated Activities that create Disconnected Impervious Areas) smaller in area than 250 sq. ft. are exempt from the peak rate control (Section 290-23) and drainage plan (Section 290-13) preparation requirements of this Ordinance.

2. Disconnected Regulated Activities (Regulated Activities that create Disconnected Impervious Areas) equal to or greater than 250 sq. ft. and less than 1,000 sq. ft. are exempt only from the peak rate control (Section 290-23) requirement of this Ordinance.

3. Agricultural plowing and tilling are exempt from the rate control and drainage plan preparation requirements of this Ordinance provided the activities are performed according to the requirements of 25 Pa. Code Chapter 102.

4. Forest management and timber operations are exempt from the rate control and Drainage plan preparation requirements of this Ordinance provided the activities are performed according to the requirements of 25 Pa. Code Chapter 102.

Philadelphia County Portion of the Watershed:

1. Development, including new development and redevelopment, that results in an area of Earth Disturbance less than fifteen thousand (15,000) square feet is exempt from certain requirements as outlined in Table 290-5.1. However, applicants must still meet Erosion and Sediment (E&S) Control requirements and coastal water quality requirements from other programs if applicable as described in Table 290-5.1.

2. Redevelopment that results in an area of Earth Disturbance greater than or equal to fifteen thousand (15,000) sq. ft., but less than one (1) acre, is exempt from the Channel Protection/Streambank Erosion (Section 290-22) Requirements of this Ordinance.

3. Redevelopment that results in an area of Earth Disturbance greater than or equal to one (1) acre and reduces the predevelopment DCIA (Directly Connected Impervious Areas) on the site by at least 20% is exempt from the Channel Protection/Streambank Erosion (Section 290-27) and Flood Control/Peak Rate Control (Section 290-23) Requirements of this Ordinance.

4. In District C, development sites that can discharge directly to the Frankford Creek Main Channel (east of I95) and to the Delaware River main channel or Tidal Schuylkill River major tributary without use of City infrastructure may do so without control of proposed conditions peak rate of runoff. When adequate capacity in the downstream system does not exist and will not be provided through improvements, the proposed conditions peak rate of runoff must be controlled to the Predevelopment Conditions peak rate as required in District A provisions for the specified Design

Storms. The Predevelopment Condition for new development is the existing condition. For redevelopment purposes, the Predevelopment Condition is determined according to the procedures found in the Philadelphia Stormwater Guidance Manual.

B. Infiltration Exemptions

1. Depth to Limiting Zone

A minimum of 2 feet of soil suitable for infiltration must exist between the invert of the infiltrating SMP and the top of the nearest limiting zone. Otherwise, the Re_v requirement shall not be applied to the development site, and the entire WQ_v must be treated.

2. Hotspots

Stormwater Hotspots – Below is a list of types of hotspots recognized by the municipality. If a site is a potential hotspot, it has important implications for how stormwater is managed. First and foremost, untreated stormwater runoff from hotspots concentrated into a collection system, shall not be recharged into groundwater where it may contaminate water supplies. Therefore, the Re_v requirement shall NOT be applied to development sites that fit in a hotspot (the entire WQ_v must still be treated). Second, a greater level of stormwater treatment shall be applied at hotspot sites to prevent pollutant washoff after construction. The Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) stormwater program requires some industrial sites to prepare and implement a stormwater pollution prevention plan.

List of potential hotspots:

- Vehicle salvage yards and recycling facilities
- Vehicle fueling stations
- Vehicle service and maintenance facilities
- Vehicle and equipment cleaning facilities
- Fleet storage areas (bus, truck, etc.)
- Industrial sites based on Standard Industrial Codes
- Marinas (service and maintenance)
- Outdoor liquid container storage
- Commercial/industrial facilities
- Public works storage areas
- Facilities that generate or store hazardous materials
- Commercial container nursery

The following land uses and activities are not normally considered hotspots:

- Residential streets and rural highways
- Residential development
- Institutional development
- Office developments
- Nonindustrial rooftops

- Pervious areas, except golf courses and nurseries (which may need an integrated pest management (IPM) plan).

3. Rate of Infiltration:
When infiltration is not feasible due to poor infiltration rates, the water quality volume must be treated by an approved SMP.

C. Additional Exemption Criteria:

1. Exemption Responsibilities - An exemption shall not relieve the Applicant from implementing such measures as necessary to protect public health, safety, and property.

2. Drainage Problems - Where drainage problems exist downstream of the proposed activity, then the Municipality may deny exemptions.

3. Exemptions are limited to specific portions of this Ordinance.

4. HQ and EV Streams – The municipalities may deny exemptions in high quality (HQ) or exceptional value (EV) waters and Source Water Protection Areas (SWPA).

Section 290-7. Repealer

Any other Ordinance, provisions or regulations of the Municipality inconsistent with any of the provisions of this Ordinance is hereby repealed to the extent of the inconsistency only.

Section 290-8. Severability

In the event that a court of competent jurisdiction declares any section or provision of this Ordinance invalid, such decision shall not affect the validity of any of the remaining provisions of this Ordinance.

Section 290-9. Compatibility with Other Ordinances or Legal Requirements

Approvals issued pursuant to this Ordinance do not relieve the Applicant of the responsibility to secure required permits or approvals for activities regulated by any other applicable code, rule, act, or Ordinance including Title 25PA Code, Chapter 92, 102 & 105.

ARTICLE II-DEFINITIONS

Section 290-10. Interpretation

For the purposes of this Ordinance, certain terms and words used herein shall be interpreted as follows:

A. Words used in the present tense include the future tense; the singular number includes the plural, and the plural number includes the singular; words of masculine gender include feminine gender; and words of feminine gender include masculine gender.

B. The word "includes" or "including" shall not limit the term to the specific example, but is intended to extend its meaning to all other instances of like kind and character.

C. The words "shall" and "must" are mandatory; the words "may" and "should" are permissive.

Section 290-11. Definitions

Accelerated Erosion – The removal of the surface of the land through the combined action of man's activity and the natural processes of a rate greater than that which would occur because of natural process alone.

Agricultural Activities – The work of producing crops and raising livestock including tillage, plowing, disking, harrowing, pasturing, mushroom growing, nursery, and sod operations and installation of conservation measures. Construction of new buildings or impervious area is not considered an agricultural activity.

Alteration – As applied to land, a change in topography as a result of the moving of soil and rock from one location or position to another; also the changing of surface conditions by causing the surface to be more or less impervious; land disturbance.

Applicant – A landowner, developer or other person who has filed an application to the Municipality for approval to engage in any Regulated Activity at a project site in the Municipality.

As-built Drawings – Engineering or site drawings maintained by the contractor as he constructs the project and upon which he documents the actual locations of the building components and changes to the original contract documents. These documents, or a copy of same, are turned over to the Municipality at the completion of the project.

Bankfull – The channel at the top-of-bank or point from where water begins to overflow onto a floodplain.

Baseflow – Portion of stream discharge derived from groundwater; the sustained discharge that does not result from direct runoff or from water diversions, reservoir releases, piped discharges, or other human activities.

Bioretention – A stormwater retention area that utilizes woody and herbaceous plants and soils to remove pollutants before infiltration occurs.

BMP (Best Management Practice) – Activities, facilities, designs, measures or procedures used to manage stormwater impacts from Regulated Activities, to meet State Water Quality Requirements, to promote groundwater recharge and to otherwise meet the purposes of this Ordinance. Stormwater BMPs are commonly grouped into one of two broad categories or measures: "structural" or "non-structural." In this Ordinance, non-structural BMPs or measures refer to operational and/or behavior-related practices that attempt to minimize the contact of pollutants with stormwater runoff whereas structural BMPs or measures are those that consist of a physical device or practice that is installed to capture and treat stormwater runoff. Structural BMPs include, but are not limited to, a wide variety of practices and devices, from large-scale retention ponds and constructed wetlands, to small-scale underground treatment systems, infiltration facilities, filter strips, low impact design, bioretention, wet ponds, permeable paving, grassed swales, riparian or forested buffers, sand filters, detention basins, and manufactured devices. Structural Stormwater BMPs are permanent appurtenances to the project site.

Buffer – The area of land immediately adjacent to any stream, measured perpendicular to and horizontally from the top-of-bank on both sides of a stream (see Top-of-bank).

Channel – An open drainage feature through which stormwater flows. Channels include, but shall not be limited to, natural and man-made drainageways, swales, streams, ditches, canals, and pipes flowing partly full.

Channel Erosion – The widening, deepening, or headward cutting of channels and waterways caused by stormwater runoff or bankfull flows.

Cistern – An underground reservoir or tank for storing rainwater.

Conservation District – A conservation district, as defined in section 3(c) of the Conservation District Law (3 P. S. § 851(c)), which has the authority under a delegation agreement executed with the Department to administer and enforce all or a portion of the erosion and sediment control program in this Commonwealth..

Conveyance – A facility or structure used for the transportation or transmission of something from one place to another.

Culvert – A structure with its appurtenant works which carries water under or through an embankment or fill.

Dam – A man-made barrier, together with its appurtenant works, constructed for the purpose of impounding or storing water or another fluid or semifluid. A dam may include a refuse bank, fill, or structure for highway, railroad, or other purposes which impounds or may impound water or another fluid or semifluid.

DEP - The Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection.

Design Storm – The magnitude and temporal distribution of precipitation from a storm event measured in probability of occurrence (e.g., a 5-year storm) and duration (e.g., twenty-four (24) hours), used in the design and evaluation of stormwater management systems. Also see Return Period.

Detention Volume - The volume of runoff that is captured and released into the waters of this Commonwealth at a controlled rate.

Detention Basin – An impoundment designed to collect and retard stormwater runoff by temporarily storing the runoff and releasing it at a predetermined rate. Detention basins are designed to drain completely soon after a rainfall event and become dry until the next rainfall event.

Developer – A person who seeks to undertake any regulated earth disturbance activities at a project site in the Municipality.

Development – Any human-induced change to improved or unimproved real estate, whether public or private, including, but not limited to, land development, construction, installation, or expansion of a building or other structure, land division, street construction, and site alteration such as embankments, dredging, grubbing, grading, paving, parking or storage facilities, excavation, filling, stockpiling, or clearing. As used in this Ordinance, development encompasses both new development and redevelopment.

Development Site (Site) – See Project Site.

Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) – The outside bark diameter at breast height which is defined as four and one half (4.5) feet (1.37m) above the forest floor on the uphill side of the tree.

Diffused Drainage Discharge – Drainage discharge that is not confined to a single point location or channel, including sheet flow or shallow concentrated flow.

Directly Connected Impervious Area (DCIA) – An impervious or impermeable surface which is directly connected to a stormwater drainage or conveyance system, leading to direct runoff, decreased infiltration, decreased filtration, and decreased time of concentration.

Disconnected Impervious Area (DIA) – An impervious or impermeable surface which is disconnected from any stormwater drainage or conveyance system and is redirected or directed to a pervious area which allows for infiltration, filtration, and increased time of concentration.

Disturbed Areas – An unstabilized land area where an earth disturbance activity is occurring or has occurred.

Ditch – A man-made waterway constructed for irrigation or stormwater conveyance purposes.

Downslope Property Line – That portion of the property line of the lot, tract, or parcels of land being developed, located such that overland or pipe flow from the project site would be directed towards it by gravity.

Drainage Conveyance Facility – A stormwater management facility designed to transport stormwater runoff that includes channels, swales, pipes, conduits, culverts, and storm sewers.

Drainage Easement – A right granted by a landowner to a grantee allowing the use of private land for stormwater management purposes.

Drainage Plan – See Stormwater Management Site Plan.

Earth Disturbance Activity– A construction or other human activity which disturbs the surface of land including, but not limited to, clearing and grubbing, grading, excavations, embankments, land development, agricultural plowing or tilling, timber harvesting activities, road maintenance activities, mineral extraction, and the moving, depositing, stockpiling, or storing of soil, rock, or earth materials.

Emergency Spillway – A conveyance area that is used to pass peak discharge greater than the maximum design storm controlled by the stormwater facility.

Encroachment – A structure or activity that changes, expands, or diminishes the course, current, or cross-section of a watercourse, floodway, or body of water.

Erosion – The natural process by which the surface of the land is worn away by water, wind or chemical action.

Erosion and Sediment Control Plan – A plan that is designed to minimize accelerated erosion and sedimentation.

Exceptional Value Waters – Surface waters of high quality which satisfy Pennsylvania Code Title 25 Environmental Protection, Chapter 93, Water Quality Standards, §93.4b(b) (relating to anti-degradation).

Existing Conditions – The dominant land cover during the 5-year period immediately preceding a proposed Regulated Activity. If the initial condition of the site is undeveloped land, the land use shall be considered as "meadow" unless the natural land cover is proven to generate a lower curve number or Rational "c" value, such as forested lands.

FEMA – Federal Emergency Management Agency.

Flood – A temporary condition of partial or complete inundation of land areas from the overflow of streams, rivers, and other waters of this Commonwealth.

Floodplain – Any land area susceptible to inundation by water from any natural source or delineated by applicable FEMA maps and studies as being a special flood hazard area. Included are lands

adjoining a river or stream that have been or may be expected to be inundated by a 100-year flood. Also included are areas that comprise Group 13 Soils, as listed in Appendix A of the Pennsylvania DEP Technical Manual for Sewage Enforcement Officers (as amended or replaced from time to time by PADEP).

Floodway – The channel of a watercourse and those portions of the adjoining floodplains which are reasonably required to carry and discharge the 100-year frequency flood. Unless otherwise specified, the boundary of the floodway is as indicated on maps and flood insurance studies provided by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). In an area where no FEMA maps or studies have defined the boundary of the 100-year frequency floodway, it is assumed, absent evidence to the contrary, that the floodway extends from the stream to fifty (50) feet from the top-of-bank.

Fluvial Geomorphology – The study of landforms associated with river channels and the processes that form them.

Forest Management/Timber Operations – Planning and associated activities necessary for the management of forest lands. These include timber inventory and preparation of forest management plans, silvicultural treatment, cutting budgets, logging road design and construction, timber harvesting, and reforestation.

Freeboard – A vertical distance between the elevation of the design high-water and the top of a dam, levee, tank, basin, swale, or diversion berm. The space is required as a safety margin in a pond or basin.

Grade – 1. (noun) A slope, usually of a road, channel, or natural ground specified in percent and shown on plans as specified herein. 2. (verb) To finish the surface of a roadbed, the top of an embankment, or the bottom of an excavation.

Grassed Waterway – A natural or man-made waterway, usually broad and shallow, covered with erosion-resistant grasses used to convey surface water.

Groundwater – Water beneath the earth's surface that supplies wells and springs and is often between saturated soil and rock.

Groundwater Recharge – The replenishment of existing natural underground water supplies from rain or overland flow.

HEC-HMS – The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Hydrologic Engineering Center (HEC) - Hydrologic Modeling System (HMS). This model was used to model the Tookany/Tacony-Frankford Watershed during the Act 167 plan development and was the basis for the standards and criteria of this Ordinance.

High Quality Waters – Surface waters having quality which exceeds levels necessary to support propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife and recreation in and on the water by satisfying

Pennsylvania Code Title 25 Environmental Protection, Chapter 93, Water Quality Standards, § 93.4b(a).

Hotspots – Areas where land use or activities generate highly contaminated runoff, with concentrations of pollutants in excess of those typically found in stormwater.

Hydrograph – A graph representing the discharge of water versus time for a selected point in the drainage system.

Hydrologic Regime – The hydrologic cycle or balance that sustains quality and quantity of stormwater, baseflow, storage, and groundwater supplies under natural conditions.

Hydrologic Soil Group (HSG) – Infiltration rates of soils vary widely and are affected by subsurface permeability as well as surface intake rates. Soils are classified into four HSG's (A, B, C, and D) according to their minimum infiltration rate, which is obtained for bare soil after prolonged wetting. The NRCS defines the four groups and provides a list of most of the soils in the United States and their group classification. The soils in the area of the development site may be identified from a soil survey report that can be obtained from local NRCS offices or conservation district offices. Soils become less pervious as the HSG varies from A to D (NRCS).

Impervious Surface (Impervious Area) – A surface that prevents the infiltration of water into the ground. Impervious surfaces (or areas) shall include, but not be limited to, roofs, additional indoor living spaces, patios, garages, storage sheds and similar structures, and any new streets or sidewalks. Decks, parking areas, and driveway areas are not counted as impervious areas if they do not prevent infiltration.

Impoundment – A retention or detention basin designed to retain stormwater runoff and release it at a controlled rate.

Infill – Development that occurs on smaller parcels that remains undeveloped but is within or in very close proximity to urban or densely developed areas. Infill development usually relies on existing infrastructure and does not require an extension of water, sewer, or other public utilities.

Infiltration – Movement of surface water into the soil, where it is absorbed by plant roots, evaporated into the atmosphere, or percolated downward to recharge groundwater.

Infiltration basin - A shallow impoundment that is designed to infiltrate Stormwater into the soil. Infiltration basins are believed to have a high pollutant removal efficiency, and can also help recharge the groundwater, thus restoring low flows to stream systems. Infiltration basins can be problematic at many sites because of stringent soils requirements. In addition, some studies have relatively high failure rates compared with other Stormwater treatment practices.

Infiltration Structures – A structure designed to direct runoff into the underground water (e.g., French drains, seepage pits, or seepage trenches).

Inflow – The flow entering the stormwater management facility and/or BMP.

Inlet – The upstream end of any structure through which water may flow.

Intermittent Stream – A stream that flows only part of the time. Flow generally occurs for several weeks or months in response to seasonal precipitation or groundwater discharge.

Invert – The lowest surface, the floor or bottom of a culvert, drain, sewer, channel, basin, BMP, or orifice.

Karst - A type of topography or landscape characterized by surface depressions, sinkholes, rock pinnacles/uneven bedrock surface, underground drainage and caves. Karst is formed on carbonate rocks, such as limestone or dolomite.

Land Development (Development) – Any of the following activities:

(i) The improvement of one (1) lot or two (2) or more contiguous lots, tracts, or parcels of land for any purpose involving:
   a. A group of two (2) or more residential or nonresidential buildings, whether proposed initially or cumulatively, or a single nonresidential building on a lot or lots regardless of the number of occupants or tenure, or
   b. The division or allocation of land or space, whether initially or cumulatively, between or among two (2) or more existing or prospective occupants by means of, or for the purpose of, streets, common areas, leaseholds, condominiums, building groups, or other features;

(ii) A subdivision of land;

(iii) Development in accordance with Section 503(1.1) of the PA Municipalities Planning Code.

Limiting Zone – A soil horizon or condition in the soil profile or underlying a stratum that includes one of the following:

(i) A seasonal high water table, whether perched or regional, determined by direct observation of the water table or indicated by soil mottling.

(ii) A rock with open joints, fracture or solution channels, or masses of loose rock fragments, including gravel, with insufficient fine soil to fill the voids between the fragments.

(iii) A rock formation, other stratum, or soil condition that is so slowly permeable that it effectively limits downward passage of water.

Lot – A designated parcel, tract, or area of land established by a plat or otherwise as permitted by law and to be used, developed, or built upon as a unit.

Main Stem (Main Channel) – Any stream segment or other runoff conveyance used as a reach in the Tookany/Tacony-Frankford Watershed hydrologic model.

Manning Equation (Manning Formula) – A method for calculation of velocity of flow (e.g., feet per second) and flow rate (e.g., cubic feet per second) in open channels based upon channel shape,

roughness, depth of flow, and slope. "Open channels" may include closed conduits so long as the flow is not under pressure.

Maximum Design Storm – The maximum (largest) design storm that is controlled by the stormwater facility.

Municipal Engineer – A professional engineer licensed as such in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, duly appointed as the Engineer for a Municipality, planning agency, or joint planning commission.

Municipality – Cheltenham Township, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania.

Natural Condition – Pre-development condition.

Natural Hydrologic Regime – See Hydrologic Regime.

Natural Recharge Area – Undisturbed surface area or depression where stormwater collects and a portion of which infiltrates and replenishes the underground and groundwater.

Nonpoint Source Pollution – Pollution that enters a waterbody from diffuse origins in the watershed and does not result from discernible, confined, or discrete conveyances.

Nonstormwater Discharges – Water flowing in stormwater collection facilities, such as pipes or swales, which are not the result of a rainfall event or snowmelt.

Nonstructural Best Management Practice (BMPs) – Methods of controlling stormwater runoff quantity and quality, such as innovative site planning, impervious area and grading reduction, protection of natural depression areas, temporary ponding on site, and other techniques.

NPDES – National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, the federal government's system for issuance of permits under the Clean Water Act, which is delegated to DEP in Pennsylvania.

NRCS – Natural Resource Conservation Service (previously SCS).

Open Channel – A conveyance channel that is not enclosed.

Outfall – "Point source" as described in 40 CFR § 122.2 at the point where the Municipality's storm sewer system discharges to surface waters of the Commonwealth.

Outflow – The flow exiting the stormwater management facility and/or BMP.

Outlet – Points of water disposal to a stream, river, lake, tidewater, or artificial drain.

Parent Tract – The parcel of land from which a land development or subdivision originates, determined from the date of municipal adoption of this Ordinance.

Parking Lot Storage – Involves the use of parking areas as temporary impoundments with controlled release rates during rainstorms.

Peak Discharge – The maximum rate of stormwater runoff from a specific storm event.

Penn State Runoff Model – The computer-based hydrologic model developed at Pennsylvania State University.

Pipe – A culvert, closed conduit, or similar structure (including appurtenances) that conveys stormwater.

Point Source – Any discernible, confined, and discrete conveyance including, but not limited to, any pipe, ditch, channel, tunnel, or conduit from which stormwater is or may be discharged, as defined in state regulations at 25 Pennsylvania Code § 92.1.

Post-construction – Period after construction during which disturbed areas are stabilized, stormwater controls are in place and functioning, and all proposed improvements in the approved land development plan are completed.

Pre-construction – Prior to commencing construction activities.

Pre-development Condition – Undeveloped/natural condition.

Pretreatment – Techniques employed in stormwater BMPs to provide storage or filtering to trap coarse materials and other pollutants before they enter the system, but not necessarily designed to meet the water quality volume requirements of Section 406. For example, any inlets draining to an infiltrating system should be sumped and trapped to prevent the system from becoming clogged with excess sediment.

Project Site – The specific area of land where any regulated activities in the Municipality are planned, conducted, or maintained.

Qualified Professional - Any person licensed by the Pennsylvania Department of State or otherwise qualified by law to perform the work required by the Ordinance.

Rational Formula – A rainfall-runoff relation used to estimate peak flow.

Reach – Any stream segment or other runoff conveyance used in the Tookany/Tacony-Frankford Watershed hydrologic model.

Recharge – The replenishment of groundwater through the infiltration of rainfall, other surface waters, or land application of water or treated wastewater.

Reconstruction – Demolition and subsequent rebuilding of impervious surface.

Record Drawings – Original documents revised to suit the as-built conditions and subsequently provided by the Engineer to the client. The Engineer reviews the contractor's as-builts against his/her own records for completeness, then either turns these over to the client or transfers the information to a set of reproducibles, in both cases for the client's permanent records.

Redevelopment – Any development that requires demolition or removal of existing structures or impervious surfaces at a site and replacement with new impervious surfaces. Maintenance activities such as top-layer grinding and re-paving are not considered to be redevelopment. Interior remodeling projects and tenant improvements are also not considered to be redevelopment.

Regulated Activities – Any Earth Disturbances Activities or any activities that involve the alteration or development of land in a manner that may affect stormwater runoff.

Regulated Earth Disturbance Activity – Defined under NPDES Phase II regulations as earth disturbance activity of one (1) acre or more with a point source discharge to surface waters or the Municipality's storm sewer system or five (5) acres or more regardless with or without a point source discharge. This includes earth disturbance on any portion of, part, or during any stage of a larger common plan of development. Activity involving earth disturbance subject to regulation under 25 PA Code 92, 25 PA Code 102, or the Clean Streams Law.

Release Rate – The percentage of existing conditions peak rate of runoff from a site or subarea to which the proposed conditions peak rate of runoff must be reduced to protect downstream areas.

Repaving – Replacement of the impervious surface that does not involve reconstruction of an existing paved (impervious) surface.

Replacement Paving – Reconstruction of and full replacement of an existing paved (impervious) surface.

Retention Volume/Removed Runoff - The volume of runoff that is captured and not released directly into the surface waters of this Commonwealth during or after a storm event.

Return Period – The average interval, in years, within which a storm event of a given magnitude can be expected to recur. For example, the 25-year return period rainfall would be expected to recur on the average of once every twenty-five (25) years.

Riser – A vertical pipe extending from the bottom of a pond that is used to control the discharge rate from the pond for a specified design storm.

Road Maintenance – Earth disturbance activities within the existing road cross-section, such as grading and repairing existing unpaved road surfaces, cutting road banks, cleaning or clearing drainage ditches, and other similar activities.

Roof Drains – A drainage conduit or pipe that collects water runoff from a roof and leads it away from the structure.

Rooftop Detention – The temporary ponding and gradual release of stormwater falling directly onto flat roof surfaces using controlled-flow roof drains in building designs.

Runoff – Any part of precipitation that flows over the land surface.

SALDO – Subdivision And Land Development Ordinance.

Sediment - Soils or other materials transported by surface water as a product of erosion.

Sediment Basin – A barrier, dam, or retention or detention basin located and designed in such a way as to retain rock, sand, gravel, silt, or other material transported by water during construction.

Sediment Pollution – The placement, discharge, or any other introduction of sediment into the waters of the Commonwealth.

Sedimentation – The process by which mineral or organic matter is accumulated or deposited by the movement of water or air.

Seepage Pit/Seepage Trench – An area of excavated earth filled with loose stone or similar coarse material into which surface water is directed for infiltration into the underground water.

Separate Storm Sewer System – A conveyance or system of conveyances (including roads with drainage systems, municipal streets, catch basins, curbs, gutters, ditches, man-made channels, or storm drains) primarily used for collecting and conveying stormwater runoff.

Shallow Concentrated Flow – Stormwater runoff flowing in shallow, defined ruts prior to entering a defined channel or waterway.

Sheet Flow – A flow process associated with broad, shallow water movement on sloping ground surfaces that is not channelized or concentrated.

Soil Cover Complex Method – A method of runoff computation developed by NRCS that is based on relating soil type and land use/cover to a runoff parameter called curve number (CN).

Source Water Protection Areas (SWPA) – The zone through which contaminants, if present, are likely to migrate and reach a drinking water well or surface water intake.

Spillway – A conveyance that is used to pass the peak discharge of the maximum design storm that is controlled by the stormwater facility.

State Water Quality Requirements – The regulatory requirements to protect, maintain, reclaim, and restore water quality under Title 25 of the Pennsylvania Code and the Clean Streams Law. This requires protection of *designated* and *existing* uses (see 25 Pennsylvania Code Chapters 93 and 96)--including:

A. Each stream segment in Pennsylvania has a "designated use," such as "cold water fishery" or "potable water supply," which is listed in Chapter 93. These uses must be protected and maintained under state regulations.

B. "Existing uses" are those attained as of November 1975, regardless of whether they have been designated in Chapter 93. Regulated earth disturbance activities must be designed to protect and maintain existing uses and maintain the level of water quality necessary to protect those uses in all streams and to protect and maintain water quality in special protection streams.

C. Water quality involves the chemical, biological, and physical characteristics of surface water bodies. After regulated earth disturbance activities are complete, these characteristics can be impacted by the addition of pollutants such as sediment and changes in habitat through increased flow volumes and/or rates as a result of changes in land surface area from those activities. Therefore, permanent discharges to surface waters must be managed to protect the stream bank, stream bed, and structural integrity of the waterway to prevent these impacts.

Storage Indication Method – A reservoir routing procedure based on solution of the continuity equation (inflow minus outflow equals the change in storage) with outflow defined as a function of storage volume and depth.

Storm Frequency – The number of times that a given storm "event" occurs or is exceeded on the average in a stated period of years (see Return Period).

Storm Sewer – A system of pipes and/or open channels that convey intercepted runoff and stormwater from other sources but exclude domestic sewage and industrial wastes.

Stormwater – Drainage runoff from the surface of the land resulting from precipitation or snow or ice melt.

Stormwater Management District – Those subareas of a watershed in which some type of detention is required to meet the plan requirements and the goals of Act 167.

Stormwater Management Facility – Any structure, natural or man-made, that, due to its condition, design, or construction, conveys, stores, or otherwise affects stormwater runoff quality, rate, or quantity. Typical stormwater management facilities include, but are not limited to, detention and infiltration basins, open channels, storm sewers, pipes, and infiltration structures.

Stormwater Management Plan – The watershed plan, known as the "Tookany/Tacony-Frankford Watershed Act 167 Stormwater Management Plan," for managing those land use activities that will influence stormwater runoff quality and quantity and that would impact the Tookany/Tacony-Frankford Watershed adopted by Montgomery and Philadelphia Counties as required by the Act of October 4, 1978, P.L. 864 (Act 167).

Stormwater Management Site Plan – The plan prepared by the Applicant or his representative indicating how stormwater runoff will be managed at the particular site of interest to meet the requirements of this Ordinance.

Stream – A natural watercourse.

Stream Buffer – The land area adjacent to each side of a stream essential to maintaining water quality (see Buffer).

Stream Enclosure – A bridge, culvert, or other structure in excess of one hundred (100) feet in length upstream to downstream which encloses a regulated water of the Commonwealth.

Subarea (Subwatershed) – The smallest drainage unit of a watershed for which stormwater management criteria have been established in the stormwater management plan.

Subdivision – The division or redivision of a lot, tract, or parcel of land by any means into two (2) or more lots, tracts, parcels, or other divisions of land including changes in existing lot lines for the purpose, whether immediate or future, of lease, partition by the court for distribution to heirs or devisees, transfer of ownership, or building or lot development; provided, however, that the subdivision by lease of land for agricultural purposes into parcels of more than ten (10) acres not involving any new street or easement of access or any residential dwelling shall be exempted. As defined in The Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, Act of July 31, 1968, P.L. 805, No. 247.

Surface Waters of the Commonwealth – Any and all rivers, streams, creeks, rivulets, ditches, watercourses, storm sewers, lakes, dammed water, wetlands, ponds, springs, and all other bodies or channels of conveyance of surface waters, or parts thereof, whether natural or artificial, within or on the boundaries of the Commonwealth.

Swale – A low-lying stretch of land that gathers or carries surface water runoff.

Timber Operations – See Forest Management.

Time-of-concentration (Tc) – The time required for surface runoff to travel from the hydraulically most distant point of the watershed to a point of interest within the watershed. This time is the combined total of overland flow time and flow time in pipes or channels, if any.

Top-of-bank – Highest point of elevation in a stream channel cross-section at which a rising water level just begins to flow out of the channel and over the floodplain.

Undeveloped Condition – Natural condition (see also Pre-development Condition).

USDA - United States Department of Agriculture.

Vernal Pond – Seasonal depressional wetlands that are covered by shallow water for variable periods from winter to spring but may be completely dry for most of the summer and fall.

Watercourse – A channel or conveyance of surface water having a defined bed and banks, whether natural or artificial, with perennial or intermittent flow.

Waters of the Commonwealth – Rivers, streams, creeks, rivulets, impoundments, ditches, watercourses, storm sewers, lakes, dammed water, wetlands, ponds, springs and other bodies or channels of conveyance of surface and underground water, or parts thereof, whether natural or artificial, within or on the boundaries of this Commonwealth.

Watershed – Region or area drained by a river, watercourse or other surface water of the Commonwealth.

Wellhead – 1. A structure built over a well, 2. The source of water for a well.

Wellhead Protection Area – The surface and subsurface area surrounding a water supply well, well field, or spring supplying a public water system through which contaminants are reasonably likely to move toward and reach the water source.

Wet Basin – Pond for urban runoff management that is designed to detain urban runoff and always contains water.

Wetland – Those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, fens, and similar areas.

Woods – A natural groundcover with more than one (1) viable tree of a DBH of six (6) inches or greater per fifteen hundred (1,500) square feet which existed within three (3) years of application; a cover condition for which SCS curve numbers have been assigned or to which equivalent Rational Method runoff coefficients have been assigned.

ARTICLE III-STORMWATER MANAGEMENT (SWM) SITE PLAN REQUIREMENTS

Section 290-12. General Requirements

For any of the activities regulated by this Ordinance, the preliminary or final approval of subdivision and/or land development plans, the issuance of any building or occupancy permit, the commencement of any earth disturbance, or activity may not proceed until the Property Owner or Applicant or his/her agent has received written approval of a SWM Site Plan from the Municipality and an approval of an adequate Erosion and Sediment (E&S) Control Plan from the Municipality or County Conservation District.

Section 290-13. SWM Site Plan Contents

The SWM Site Plan shall consist of a general description of the project, including calculations, maps, and plans. A note on the maps shall refer to the associated computations and Erosion and Sediment (E&S) Control Plan by title and date. The cover sheet of the computations and E&S Control Plan shall refer to the associated maps by title and date. All SWM Site Plan materials shall be submitted to the Municipality in a format that is clear, concise, legible, neat, and well organized; otherwise, the SWM Site Plan shall not be accepted for review and shall be returned to the Applicant.

The following items shall be included in the SWM Site Plan:

A. General

1. General description of the project.

2. General description of proposed stormwater management techniques, including construction specifications of the materials to be used for stormwater management facilities.

3. Complete hydrologic, hydraulic, and structural computations for all stormwater management facilities.

4. An erosion and sediment control plan, including all reviews and letters of adequacy from the Conservation District.

5. A general description of proposed nonpoint source pollution controls.

6. The SWM Site Plan Application and completed fee schedule form and associated fee.

7. The SWM Site Plan Checklist.

B. Maps

Prepare an Existing Resource and Site Analysis Map (ERSAM) showing environmentally sensitive areas including, but not limited to, steep slopes, ponds, lakes, streams, wetlands, hydric soils, vernal pools, stream buffers, flood plains and hydrologic soil groups. Land development, existing recharge areas, and any other requirements specifically outlined in the municipal SALDO shall also be included.

Map(s) of the project area shall be submitted on 24-inch x 36-inch sheets and/or shall be prepared in a form that meets the requirements for recording at the offices of the Recorder of Deeds of Montgomery County. If the SALDO has more stringent criteria than this Ordinance, then the more stringent criteria shall apply. The contents of the map(s) shall include, but not be limited to:

1. The location of the project relative to highways, municipal boundaries, or other identifiable landmarks.

2. Existing contours at intervals of two (2) feet or less. In areas of slopes greater than [10] percent, 5-foot contour intervals may be used.

3. Existing streams, lakes, ponds, or other waters of the Commonwealth within the project area.

4. Other physical features including flood hazard boundaries, stream buffers, existing drainage courses, areas of natural vegetation to be preserved, and the total extent of the upstream area draining through the site.

5. The locations of all existing and proposed utilities, sanitary sewers, and water lines within fifty (50) feet of property lines.

6. An overlay showing soil names and boundaries.

7. Limits of earth disturbance, including the type and amount of impervious area that is proposed.

8. Proposed structures, roads, paved areas, and buildings.

9. Final contours at intervals of two (2) feet or less. In areas of steep slopes (greater than [10] percent), 5-foot contour intervals may be used.

10. The name of the development, the name and address of the owner of the property, and the name of the individual or firm preparing the plan.

11. The date of submission.

12. A graphic and written scale of one (1) inch equals no more than fifty (50) feet; for tracts of twenty (20) acres or more, the scale shall be one (1) inch equals no more than one hundred (100) feet.

13. A north arrow.

14. The total tract boundary and size with distances marked to the nearest foot and bearings to the nearest degree.

15. Existing and proposed land use(s).

16. A key map showing all existing man-made features beyond the property boundary that would be affected by the project.

17. Location of all open channels.

18. Overland drainage patterns and swales.

19. A 15-foot wide access easement around all stormwater management facilities to provide ingress to and egress from a public right-of-way.

20. The location of all erosion and sediment control facilities.

21. A note on the plan indicating the location and responsibility for maintenance of stormwater management facilities that would be located off site. All off-site facilities shall meet the performance standards and design criteria specified in this Ordinance.

22. A statement, signed by the Applicant, acknowledging that any revision to the approved drainage plan must be approved by the Municipality, and that a revised erosion and sediment control plan must be submitted to the Municipality or Conservation District for approval.

23. The following signature block for the Design Engineer:

    "I, (Design Engineer), on this date (date of signature), hereby certify that the drainage plan meets all requirements of the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP's) regulations and this Ordinance."

C. Supplemental Information to be Submitted to the Municipality

1. The following information shall be submitted by the Applicant and shall include:

    a. The overall stormwater management concept for the project designed.
    b. Stormwater runoff computations required by this Ordinance.

c. Stormwater management techniques to be applied both during and after development.
d. Expected project time schedule.
e. Development stages or project phases, if so proposed.
f. An Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Plan in accordance with Section 702 of this Ordinance.

2. An E&S Control Plan

3. A description of the effect of the project (in terms of runoff volumes and peak flows) on adjacent properties and on any existing municipal stormwater collection system that may receive runoff from the project site.

4. An Approved Highway Occupancy Permit from the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT) District office when drainage towards PennDOT property is proposed.

D. Stormwater Management Facilities

1. All stormwater management facilities must be located on a plan and described in detail.

2. When infiltration measures such as seepage pits, beds, or trenches are used, the locations of existing and proposed septic tank infiltration areas and wells must be shown.

3. All calculations, assumptions, and criteria used in the design of the stormwater management facilities must be shown.

Section 290-14. Plan Submission

The Municipality requires submission of a complete SWM Site Plan, as specified in this Ordinance.

A. Proof of application or documentation of required permit(s) or approvals for the programs listed below shall be part of the plan:

1. National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activities

2. Any other permit under applicable state or federal regulations

B. Six (6) copies of the SWM Site Plan shall be submitted and distributed as follows:

1. Two (2) copies to the Municipality accompanied by the requisite municipal review fee, as specified in this Ordinance.

2. Two (2) copies to the County Conservation District.

3. One (1) copy to the Municipal Engineer (where applicable).

4. One (1) copy to the County Planning Commission/Department.

C. Any submissions to the agencies listed above that are found to be incomplete shall not be accepted for review and shall be returned to the Applicant with a notification in writing of the specific manner in which the submission is incomplete.

D. Additional copies shall be submitted as requested by the Municipality or DEP.

Section 290-15. SWM Site Plan Review

A. The SWM Site Plan must be consistent with this Ordinance. Any SWM Site Plan found incomplete may not be reviewed and may be returned to the Applicant.

B. The Municipality will notify the applicant in writing within (45) days whether the SWM Site Plan is approved or disapproved. If the SWM Site Plan involves a Subdivision and Land Development Plan, the notification period is (120) days. If a longer notification period is provided by other statute, regulation, or ordinance, the applicant will be so notified by the Municipality. If the Municipality disapproves the SWM Site Plan, the Municipality shall cite the reasons for disapproval in writing.

Section 290-16. Modification of SWM Site Plans

A modification to a submitted SWM Site Plan that involves a change in BMPs or techniques, or that involves the relocation or redesign of BMPs, or that is necessary because soil or other conditions are not as stated on the SWM Site Plan as determined by the Municipality shall require a resubmission of the modified SWM Site Plan in accordance with this Article.

Section 290-17. Resubmission of Inconsistent or Noncompliant SWM Plans

A disapproved SWM Site Plan may be resubmitted, with the revisions addressing the municipality's concerns, to the municipality in accordance with this Article. The applicable review fee must accompany a resubmission of a disapproved SWM Site Plan.

ARTICLE IV - STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

Section 290-18. General Requirements

A. For all regulated activities, unless preparation of a Stormwater Management (SWM) Site Plan is specifically exempted:

1. Preparation and implementation of an approved SWM Site Plan is required.

2. No regulated activities shall commence until the municipality issues written approval of a SWM Site Plan that demonstrates compliance with the requirements of this Ordinance.

B. SWM Site Plan approved by the municipality shall be on-site throughout the duration of the regulated activity.

C. The municipality may, after consultation with the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), approve measures for meeting the state water quality requirements other than those in this Ordinance, provided that they meet the minimum requirements of, and do not conflict with, state law including but not limited to the Clean Streams Law.

D. For all regulated earth disturbance activities, E&S control Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be designed, implemented, operated and maintained during the Regulated Earth Disturbance activities (e.g., during construction) to meet the purposes and requirements of this Ordinance and to meet all requirements under Title 25 of the Pennsylvania Code and the Clean Streams Law. Various BMPs and their design standards are listed in the *Erosion and Sediment Pollution Control Program Manual* (E&S Manual), No. 363-2134-008 (April 15, 2000), as amended and updated.

E. For all Regulated Activities, implementation of the volume controls in Article IV is required.

F. Impervious areas:

1. The measurement of impervious areas shall include all of the impervious areas in the total proposed development even if development is to take place in stages.

2. For development taking place in stages, the entire development plan must be used in determining conformance with this Ordinance.

3. For projects that add impervious area to a parcel, Sections 290-20 through 290-23 shall apply to the total impervious area within the limits of earth disturbance.

G. Stormwater flows onto adjacent property shall not be created, increased, decreased, relocated, or otherwise altered without written notification of the adjacent property owner(s). Such stormwater flows shall be subject to the requirements of this Ordinance.

H. All Regulated Activities shall include such measures as necessary to:

1. Protect health, safety and property;

2. Meet the water quality goals of this Ordinance by implementing measures to:

   a. Minimize disturbance to floodplains, wetlands, and wooded areas.

   b. Maintain or extend riparian buffers.

   c. Avoid erosive flow conditions in natural flow pathways.

   d. Minimize thermal impacts to waters of this Commonwealth.

   e. Disconnect impervious surfaces by directing runoff to pervious areas, wherever possible.

3. To the maximum extent practicable, incorporate the techniques for Low Impact Development Practices described in the *Pennsylvania Stormwater Best Management Practices Manual* (BMP Manual) or the Philadelphia Stormwater Management Guidance Manual.

I. The design of all facilities over karst shall include an evaluation of measures to minimize adverse effects.

J. Infiltration BMPs should be spread out, made as shallow as practicable, and located to maximize use of natural onsite infiltration features while still meeting the other requirements of this Ordinance.

K. Storage facilities should completely drain both the volume control and rate control capacities over a period of time not less than 24 and not more than 72 hours from the end of the design storm.

L. The design storm volumes to be used in the analysis of peak rates of discharge should be obtained from the Precipitation-Freuency Atlas of the United States, Atlas 14, Volume 2, Version 3.0, U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), National Weather Service, Hydrometeorological Design Studies Center, Silver Spring, Maryland. NOAA's Atlas 14[5] can be accessed at http://hdsc.nws.noaa.gov/hdsc/pfds/

M. For all regulated activities, SWM BMPs shall be designed, implemented, operated, and maintained to meet the purposes and requirements of this Ordinance and to meet all requirements under Title 25 of the Pennsylvania Code, the Clean Streams Law, and the Storm Water Management Act.

N. Various BMPs and their design standards are listed in the BMP Manual[1].

Section 290-19. Permit Requirements by Other Governmental Entities

Approvals issued and actions taken under this Ordinance do not relieve the Applicant of the responsibility to secure required permits or approvals for activities regulated by any other code, law, regulation or ordinance.

Section 290-20. Groundwater Recharge

Note: Philadelphia County and Montgomery County will follow different Groundwater Recharge criteria.

A. Infiltration Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall meet the following minimum requirements unless the site qualifies for an exemption from the infiltration requirements of this ordinance as listed in 106.B:

1. Infiltration BMPs intended to receive runoff from developed areas shall be selected based on suitability of soils and site conditions and shall be constructed on soils that have the following characteristics:

   a. A minimum soil depth of twenty-four (24) inches between the bottom of the infiltration BMPs.

   b. An infiltration rate sufficient to accept the additional stormwater load and dewater completely as determined by field tests conducted by the Applicant's design professional.

   c. All open-air infiltration facilities shall be designed to completely infiltrate the recharge (infiltration) volume (Re_v) within three (3) days (72 hours) from the start of the design storm.

   d. All subsurface and contained facilities such as capture-and-reuse systems must have storage available equivalent to the Water Quality volume within three (3) days (72 hours) from the start of the design storm.

   e. Pretreatment shall be provided prior to infiltration. See Sec. 202 for definition.

2. The size of the infiltration facility shall be based upon the following volume criteria:

<u>Montgomery County Portion of the Watershed:</u>

Where practicable and appropriate the recharge volume shall be infiltrated on site. The recharge volume shall be equal to one (1.0) inch of runoff (I) over all proposed impervious surfaces.

The Re_v required shall be computed as:

$$Re_v = (P/12) * (I)$$

Where:
Re_v = Recharge Volume (cubic feet)
P = 1.0 inch
I = Impervious Area within the limits of earth disturbance (square feet)

An asterisk (*) in equations denotes multiplication.

Philadelphia County Portion of the Watershed:

The recharge volume shall be equal to one (1.0) inch of rainfall over all **DCIA within the limits of Earth Disturbance**.

$$Re_v = (P/12) * (I)$$

Where:
Re_v = Recharge Volume (cubic feet)
P = 1.0 inch
I = DCIA within the limits of earth disturbance (square feet)

An asterisk (*) in equations denotes multiplication.

B. Soils - A detailed soils evaluation of the project site shall be required to determine the suitability of infiltration facilities. The evaluation shall be performed by a qualified design professional and at a minimum address soil permeability, depth to bedrock, and subgrade stability. The general process for designing the infiltration BMP shall be:

1. Analyze hydrologic soil groups as well as natural and man-made features within the site to determine general areas of suitability for infiltration practices. In areas where development on fill material is under consideration, conduct geotechnical investigations of sub-grade stability; infiltration may not be ruled out without conducting these tests.

2. Provide field tests such as double ring infiltrometer or hydraulic conductivity tests (at the level of the proposed infiltration surface) to determine the appropriate hydraulic conductivity rate. Percolation tests are not recommended for design purposes.

3. Design the infiltration structure for the required retention (Re_v) volume based on field determined capacity at the level of the proposed infiltration surface.

4. If on-lot infiltration structures are proposed by the Applicant's design professional, it must be demonstrated to the Municipality that the soils are conducive to infiltrate on the lots identified.

5. An impermeable liner will be required in detention basins where the possibility of groundwater contamination exists. A detailed hydrogeologic investigation may be required by the Municipality.

Section 290-21. Water Quality Requirements

Note: Philadelphia County and Montgomery County will follow different Water Quality Requirements.

The Applicant shall comply with the following water quality requirements of this Article.

A. Developed areas shall provide adequate storage and treatment facilities necessary to capture and treat stormwater runoff. The recharge volume computed under Section 290-20 may be a component of the water quality volume if the Applicant chooses to manage both components in a single facility. If the recharge volume is less than the water quality volume, the remaining water quality volume may be captured and treated by methods other than infiltration Best Management Practices (BMPs). The required water quality volume (WQ_v) is the storage capacity needed to capture and treat a portion of stormwater runoff from the developed areas of the site.

Montgomery County Portion of the Watershed:

The following calculation formula is to be used to determine the water quality storage volume (WQ_v) in cubic feet for the Tookany/Tacony-Frankford Watershed in Montgomery County:

$$\mathbf{Re_v = (P/12) * (I)}$$

Where:
Re_v = Recharge Volume (cubic feet)
P = 1.0 inch
I = Impervious Area within the limits of earth disturbance (square feet)

An asterisk (*) in equations denotes multiplication.

For a non-infiltrating BMP, release of water can begin at the start of the storm (i.e., the invert of the water quality orifice is at the invert of the facility). The design of the facility shall provide for protection from clogging and unwanted sedimentation.

Philadelphia County Portion of the Watershed:

The following calculation formula is to be used to determine the WQ_v in cubic feet for the Tookany/Tacony-Frankford Watershed in Philadelphia County:

$$Re_v = (P/12) * (I)$$

Where:
Re_v = Recharge Volume (cubic feet)
P = 1.0 inch
I = DCIA within the limits of earth disturbance (square feet)

An asterisk (*) in equations denotes multiplication.

Section 290-22. Stream Bank Erosion Requirements (Channel Protection)

Note: Philadelphia County and Montgomery County will follow different Stream Bank Erosion Requirements.

If a perennial or intermittent stream passes through the site, the Applicant shall create a stream buffer extending a minimum of fifty (50) feet to either side of the top-of-bank of the channel. The buffer area shall be maintained with and encouraged to use appropriate native vegetation (refer to Appendix B of the Pennsylvania Stormwater Best Management Practices (BMP) Manual for plant lists). If the applicable rear or side yard setback is less than fifty (50) feet, the buffer width may be reduced to twenty-five (25) percent of the setback to a minimum of ten (10) feet. If an existing buffer is legally prescribed (i.e., deed, covenant, easement, etc.) and it exceeds the requirements of this Ordinance, the existing buffer shall be maintained. *[Note: The Municipality may select a smaller buffer width (above) if desired, but the selected buffer may not be less than ten (10) feet].* This does not include lakes or wetlands.

<u>Montgomery County Portion of the Watershed:</u>

Applicants shall adhere to the following Stream Bank Erosion/Channel Protection Requirements:

A. In addition to the control of water quality volume (in order to minimize the impact of stormwater runoff on downstream stream bank erosion), the primary requirement is to design a BMP to detain the proposed conditions 2-year, 24-hour design storm to the existing conditions 1-year flow using the SCS Type II distribution. Additionally, provisions shall be made (such as adding a small orifice at the bottom of the outlet structure) so that the proposed conditions 1-year storm takes a minimum of twenty-four (24) hours to drain from the facility from a point where the maximum volume of water from the 1-year storm is captured (i.e., the maximum water surface elevation is achieved in the facility). Release of water can begin at the start of the storm (i.e., the invert of the water quality orifice is at the invert of the facility).

B. The minimum orifice size in the outlet structure to the BMP shall be three (3) inches in diameter where possible, and a trash rack shall be installed to prevent clogging. On sites with small drainage areas contributing to this BMP that do not provide enough runoff volume to allow a 24-hour attenuation with the 3-inch orifice, the calculations shall be submitted showing this condition. Orifice sizes less than three (3) inches can be utilized, provided that

the design will prevent clogging of the intake. It is recommended that the design, to accommodate maintenance, include sand or a porous media filter.

Philadelphia County Portion of the Watershed:

Redevelopment sites with less than one (1) acre of Earth Disturbance or redevelopment sites that demonstrate a 20% reduction in DCIA from predevelopment conditions are exempt from this requirement.

Applicants shall adhere to the following Stream Bank Erosion/Channel Protection Requirements:

A. To meet the requirement, Stormwater Management Practices shall retain or detain the runoff from all DCIA within the limits of Earth Disturbance from a 1-year, 24-hour Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Type II design storm in the proposed site condition such that the runoff takes a minimum of 24 hours and a maximum of 72 hours from the end of the storm event to drain the management facility.

B. The infiltration and water quality volumes may be incorporated into the channel protection portion of the design provided the design meets all requirements concurrently.

C. In "Conditional Direct Discharge Districts" (District C) only (see Section 290-25), the objective is not to attenuate the storms greater than the 2-year recurrence interval. This can be accomplished by configuring the outlet structure not to control the larger storms or by a bypass channel that diverts only the 2-year stormwater runoff into the basin or conversely, diverts flows in excess of the 2-year storm away from the basin.

Section 290-23. Stormwater Peak Rate Control and Management Districts

A. The Tookany/Tacony-Frankford Watershed has been divided into stormwater management districts as shown on the Management District Map in Model Ordinance Appendix A.

In addition to the requirements specified in Table 290-23.1 below, the erosion and sedimentation control (Section 290-20), the nonstructural project design (Section 290-21), the groundwater recharge (Section 290-20), the water quality (Section 290-21), and the stream bank erosion (Section 290-22) requirements shall be implemented.

Standards for managing runoff from each subarea in the Tookany/Tacony-Frankford Watershed for the 2-, 5-, 10-, 25-, 50-, and 100-year design storms are shown in Table 290-23.1. Development sites located in each of the management districts must control proposed conditions runoff rates to existing conditions runoff rates for the design storms in accordance with Table 290-23.1.

TABLE 290-23.1

PEAK RATE CONTROL STANDARDS BY STORMWATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT IN THE TOOKANY/TACONY-FRANKFORD WATERSHED

District	Proposed Condition Design Storm (reduce to)	Existing Condition Design Storm
A	2-year	1-year
	5-year	5-year
	10-year	10-year
	25-year	25-year
	50-year	50-year
	100-year	100-year
B	2-year	1-year
	5-year	2-year
	10-year	5-year
	25-year	10-year
	50-year	25-year
	100-year	100-year
C*	Conditional Direct Discharge District	

In District C, development sites that can discharge directly to the Frankford Creek Main Channel (east of I95) and to the Delaware River main channel or Tidal Schuylkill River major tributary without use of City infrastructure may do so without control of proposed conditions peak rate of runoff.

Projects that are required to obtain a NPDES Permit for stormwater discharges associated with construction activities are required to show no increase in peaks from existing conditions.

When adequate capacity in the downstream system does not exist and will not be provided through improvements, the proposed conditions peak rate of runoff must be controlled to the Predevelopment Conditions peak rate as required in District A provisions for the specified Design Storms. The Predevelopment Condition for new development is the existing condition. For redevelopment purposes, the Predevelopment Condition is determined according to the procedures found in the Philadelphia Stormwater Guidance Manual.

B. General - Proposed conditions rates of runoff from any regulated activity shall not exceed the peak release rates of runoff from existing conditions for the design storms specified on the Stormwater Management District Watershed Map (Ordinance Appendix A) and this section of the Ordinance.

C. District Boundaries - The boundaries of the stormwater management districts are shown on an official map that is available for inspection at the municipal and County Planning offices. A copy of the official map at a reduced scale is included in Ordinance Appendix A. The exact location of the stormwater management district boundaries as they apply to a given development site shall be determined by mapping the boundaries using the 2-foot topographic contours (or most accurate data required) provided as part of the drainage plan.

D. Sites Located in More than One (1) District - For a proposed development site located within two (2) or more stormwater management districts, the peak discharge rate from any subarea shall meet the management district criteria in which the discharge is located.

E. Off-site Areas - Off-site areas that drain through a proposed development site are not subject to release rate criteria when determining allowable peak runoff rates. However, on-site drainage facilities shall be designed to safely convey off-site flows through the development site.

F. Site Areas - Where the site area to be impacted by a proposed development activity differs significantly from the total site area, only the proposed impact area utilizing stormwater management measures shall be subject to the management district criteria. In other words, unimpacted areas bypassing the stormwater management facilities would not be subject to the management district criteria.

G. Alternate Criteria for Redevelopment Sites - For redevelopment sites, one of the following minimum design parameters shall be accomplished, whichever is most appropriate for the given site conditions as determined by Cheltenham Township;

1. Meet the full requirements specified by Table 290-23.1 and Sections 290-23.A through 290-23.F

   or

2. Reduce the total impervious surface on the site by at least twenty (20) percent based upon a comparison of existing impervious surface to proposed impervious surface.

Section 290-24. Calculation Methodology

A. Stormwater runoff from all development sites with a drainage area of greater than 200 acres shall be calculated using a generally accepted calculation technique that is based on the NRCS soil cover complex method. Designer must consult with the municipality to gain approval of design methods prior to design.

Table 290-24.1 summarizes acceptable computation methods and the method selected by the design professional shall be based on the individual limitations and suitability of each method for a particular site. The Municipality may allow the use of the Rational Method to estimate peak discharges from drainage areas that contain less than 200 acres. The Soil Complex Method shall be used for drainage areas greater than 200 acres.

TABLE 290-24.1
Acceptable Computation Methodologies For
Stormwater Management Plans

Montgomery County

METHOD	METHOD DEVELOPED BY	APPLICABILITY
WINTR-20	USDA NRCS	Applicable where use of full hydrology computer model is desirable or necessary.
WINTR-55	USDA NRCS	Applicable for land development plans within limitations described in TR-55.
HEC-HMS	US Army Corps of Engineers	Applicable where use of full hydrologic computer model is desirable or necessary.
Rational Method or commercial computer package based on Rational Method)	Emil Kuichling(1889)	For sites less than 200 acres and with time of concentration less than 60 minutes (tc< 60 min), or as approved by the Municipality and/or Municipal Engineer
Other Methods	Varies	Other computation methodologies approved by the Municipality and/or Municipal Engineer.

Philadelphia County

METHOD	METHOD DEVELOPED BY	APPLICABILITY
WINTR-20	USDA NRCS	Applicable where use of full hydrology computer model is desirable or necessary.
WINTR-55	USDA NRCS	Applicable for land development plans within limitations described in TR-55.

**Note: Successors to the above methods are also acceptable. These successors include WinTR55 for TR-55 and WinTR20 for TR-20*

B. If a hydrologic computer model such as HydroCAD or HEC-HMS is used for stormwater runoff calculations, then the duration of rainfall shall be 24 hours. The rainfall distribution should reference NOAA Atlas 14.

C. For the purposes of existing conditions flow rate determination, undeveloped land shall be considered as "meadow" in good condition, unless the natural ground cover generates a lower

curve number or Rational 'C' value (i.e., forest), as listed in Table E-1 or E-2 in Appendix E of this Ordinance.

D. For Montgomery County only, all calculations using the Rational Method shall use rainfall intensities from the NOAA 14 Precipitation-Frequency Atlas of the United States (2004, revised 2006). Times-of-concentration for overland flow shall be calculated using the methodology presented in Chapter 3 of Urban Hydrology for Small Watersheds, NRCS, TR-55 (as amended or replaced from time to time by NRCS). Times-of-concentration for channel and pipe flow shall be computed using Manning's equation.

E. Runoff Curve Numbers (CN) for both existing and proposed conditions to be used in the soil cover complex method shall be obtained from Table E-1 in Appendix E of this Ordinance.

F. Runoff coefficients (c) for both existing and proposed conditions for use in the Rational method shall be obtained from Table E-2 in Appendix E of this Ordinance.

G. The Manning equation is preferred for 1-D, gradually-varied, open channel flow. In other cases, appropriate, applicable methods should be applied, however, early coordination with the municipality is necessary.

H. Outlet structures for stormwater management facilities shall be designed to meet the performance standards of this Ordinance using the generally accepted hydraulic analysis technique or method of the Municipality.

I. The design of any stormwater detention facilities intended to meet the performance standards of this Ordinance shall be verified by routing the design storm hydrograph through these facilities using the Storage-Indication Method. For drainage areas greater than 200 acres in size, the design storm hydrograph shall be computed using a calculation method that produces a full hydrograph. The Municipality may approve the use of any generally accepted full hydrograph approximation technique that shall use a total runoff volume that is consistent with the volume from a method that produces a full hydrograph.

Section 290-25. Other Requirements

All wet basin designs shall incorporate biologic controls consistent with the West Nile Guidance found in Appendix G.

ARTICLE V-INSPECTIONS

Section 290-26. Inspections

A. The Municipality or his Municipal designee shall inspect all phases of the installation of the Best Management Practices (BMPs) and/or stormwater management facilities as deemed appropriate by the Municipality.

B. During any stage of the work, if the Municipality or his Municipal designee determines that the BMPs and/or stormwater management (SWM) facilities are not being installed in accordance with the approved SWM plan, the Municipality, may suspend or revoke, in whole or in part, any existing permits or other approvals and issue a cease and desist order until a revised SWM Site Plan is submitted and approved, as specified in this Ordinance, and until the deficiencies are corrected.

C. A final inspection of all BMPs and/or SWM facilities may be conducted by the Municipality or his Municipal designee to confirm compliance with the approved Stormwater Management Site Plan prior to the issuance of any occupancy permit.

D. The developer shall be responsible for providing as-built plans of all SWM BMPs included in the approved SWM Site Plan. The as-built plans and an explanation of any discrepancies, which were reviewed and received approval by the Municipality, shall be submitted to the Municipality.

E. The as-built submission shall include a certification of completion signed and sealed by a Qualified Professional verifying that all permanent SWM BMPs have been constructed according to the approved plans and specifications. If any Qualified Professionals contributed to the construction plans, they must sign and seal the completion certificate.

ARTICLE VI-FEES AND EXPENSES

Section 290-27. Municipality Stormwater Management (SWM) Site Plan Review and Inspection Fee

Fees shall be established by the Municipality to defray plan review and construction inspection costs incurred by the Municipality. All fees shall be paid by the Applicant at the time of SWM Site Plan submission. A review and inspection fee schedule shall be established by resolution of the municipal Governing Body based on the size of the Regulated Activity and based on the Municipality's costs for reviewing SWM Site Plans and conducting inspections pursuant to Section 290-26. The Municipality shall periodically update the review and inspection fee schedule to ensure that review costs are adequately reimbursed.

Section 290-28. Expenses Covered by Fees

The fees required by this Ordinance (unless otherwise waived by the Municipality) shall at a minimum cover:

A. Administrative costs.

B. The review of the drainage plan by the Municipality.

C. The site inspections.

D. The inspection of SWM facilities and drainage improvements during construction.

E. The final inspection at the completion of the construction of the SWM facilities and drainage improvements presented in the SWM Site Plan.

F. Any additional work required to enforce any permit provisions regulated by this Ordinance, correct violations, and assure proper completion of stipulated remedial actions.

Section 290-29. BMP Operation and Maintenance Plan Review Escrow Fund

A. The Applicant/Developer/Owner shall fund a BMP Operation and Maintenance Plan Review Escrow Fund to cover the full review costs incurred by the township as noted in §290-27 and §290-28.

The amount of the initial escrow shall be $500.00 minimum or as set by the Township Engineer.

If, at any time or times during or after the review and approval process, the Township believes that the funds necessary to reimburse the Township for the reasonable and necessary expenses incurred or to be incurred by the Township for the review and approval process of the BMP Operation and Maintenance Plan are in excess of the amount then held in the escrow fund, the Township shall notify the Applicant/Developer/Owner, and the

applicant/developer/owner shall deposit with the Township such additional monies as has been determined by the Township to be needed to complete the review and approval process. No further work shall be done until the deposit has been made into escrow.

Township Staff fees shall initially be at the rate of:

Township Engineer	$100/hr
Assistant to the Township Engineer	$ 75/hr
Assistant Building Inspector	$ 50/hr
Clerical services	$ 25/hr

and may be changed from time to time by resolution of the Board of Commissioners. The charges for the Township solicitor and other consultants shall be the actual charges. The escrow amount determinations shall not limit the obligation of the Applicant/Developer/Owner for the payment of all fees charged by Township staff, Township solicitor, consultants, planners, etc. and of all other costs incurred by the Township in the review and approval process of the BMP Operation and Maintenance Plan. Upon completion of review to the satisfaction of the Township, the Township shall bill for any final charges or refund any unused amounts in the escrow fund.

B. Public Utilities are exempt form the requirements of this section.

ARTICLE VII-MAINTENANCE RESPONSIBILITIES

Section 290-30. Performance Guarantee

A. For subdivisions and land developments, the Applicant shall provide a financial guarantee to the Municipality for the timely installation and proper construction of all stormwater management facilities as required by the approved SWM Site Plan. The amount of the guarantee shall be equal to or greater than the full construction cost of the required controls.

B. For other regulated activities, the Municipality may require a financial guarantee from the Applicant.

Section 290-31. Responsibilities for Operation and Maintenance (O&M) of Stormwater Facilities and Best Management Practices (BMPs)

A. The owner of any land upon which stormwater facilities and BMPs will be placed, constructed, or implemented, as described in the stormwater facility and BMP O&M Plan, shall record the following documents in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds for Montgomery County, within ninety (90) days of approval of the stormwater facility and BMP O&M plan by the Municipality:

1. The O&M plan, or a summary thereof,
2. O&M agreements under Section 290-33, and
3. Easements under Section 290-34.

B. The Municipality may suspend or revoke any approvals granted for the project site upon discovery of failure on the part of the owner to comply with this section.

C. The following items shall be included in the stormwater control and BMP O&M Plan:

1. Map(s) of the project area, in a form that meets the requirements for recording at the offices of the Recorder of Deeds of Montgomery County, shall be submitted on 24-inch x-36 inch sheets. The contents of the map(s) shall include, but not be limited to:

    a. Clear identification of the location and nature of stormwater controls and BMPs,
    b. The location of the project site relative to highways, municipal boundaries or other identifiable landmarks,
    c. Existing and final contours at intervals of two (2) feet, or others as appropriate,
    d. Existing streams, lakes, ponds, or other bodies of water within the project site area,
    e. Other physical features including flood hazard boundaries, sinkholes, streams, existing drainage courses, and areas of natural vegetation to be preserved,
    f. The locations of all existing and proposed utilities, sanitary sewers, and water lines within fifty (50) feet of property lines of the project site,

g. Proposed final changes to the land surface and vegetative cover, including the type and amount of impervious area that would be added,
h. Proposed final structures, roads, paved areas, and buildings, and
i. A 15 foot wide access easement around all stormwater controls and BMPs that would provide ingress to and egress from a public right-of-way.

2. A description of how each stormwater facility and BMP will be operated and maintained, and the identity and contact information associated with the person(s) responsible for operations and maintenance,

3. The name of the project site, the name and address of the owner of the property, and the name of the individual or firm preparing the plan, and

4. A statement, signed by the landowner, acknowledging that the stormwater facilities and BMPs are fixtures that can be altered or removed only after approval by the Municipality.

D. The stormwater control and BMP O&M Plan for the project site shall establish responsibilities for the continuing O&M of all stormwater facilities and BMPs, as follows:

1. If a plan includes structures or lots which are to be separately owned and in which streets, sewers, and other public improvements are to be dedicated to the Municipality, stormwater controls and BMPs may also be dedicated to and maintained by the Municipality;

2. If a plan includes operation and maintenance by a single ownership or if sewers and other public improvements are to be privately owned and maintained, the O&M of stormwater controls and BMPs shall be the responsibility of the owner or private management entity.

E. The Municipality shall make the final determination on the continuing operation and maintenance responsibilities prior to final approval of the Stormwater Management Site Plan. The Municipality reserves the right to accept or reject the O&M responsibility for any or all portions of the stormwater controls and BMPs.

F. The O&M Plan shall be recorded as a restrictive deed covenant that runs with the land.

G. The municipality may take enforcement actions against an owner for any failure to satisfy the provisions of this Article and this Ordinance.

Section 290-32. Municipal Review of a Stormwater Facility and BMP O&M Plan

A. Stormwater controls and BMP O&M plans shall be consistent with the requirements of this Ordinance.

B. The Municipality will notify Applicants in writing whether or not stormwater facilities and BMP O&M plans are approved.

C. The Municipality's approval letter will indicate whether or not "record drawings" of all stormwater controls and BMPs are required, including a final "as-built" O&M Plan.

Section 290-33. Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Agreement for Privately Owned Stormwater Controls and BMPs

A. The owner shall sign an O&M agreement with the Municipality covering all stormwater facilities and BMPs that are to be privately owned. The O&M agreement shall be transferred with transfer of ownership.

B. Other items may be included in the agreement where determined necessary to guarantee the satisfactory operation and maintenance of all stormwater facilities and BMPs. The O&M Agreement shall be subject to the review and approval of the Municipality.

C. The owner is responsible O&M of the SWM BMPs. If the owner fails to adhere to the O&M Agreement, the Municipality may perform the services required and charge the owner appropriate fees. Nonpayment of fees may result in a lien against the property.

Section 290-34. Stormwater Management Easements

A. The owner must obtain all necessary real estate rights to install, operate, and maintain all stormwater facilities in the SWM Site Plan.

B. The owner must provide the municipal easements, or other appropriate real estate rights, to perform inspections and maintenance or the preservation of stormwater runoff conveyance, infiltration, and detention areas.

ARTICLE VIII- PROHIBITIONS

Section 290-35. Prohibited Discharges

A. Any drain or conveyance, whether on the surface or subsurface, that allows any non-stormwater discharge including sewage, process wastewater, and wash water to enter the waters of this Commonwealth is prohibited.

B. No person shall allow, or cause to allow, discharges into surface waters of this Commonwealth which are not composed entirely of stormwater, except (1) as provided in subsection C below, and (2) discharges allowed under a state or federal permit.

C. The following discharges are authorized unless they are determined to be significant contributors to pollution to the waters of this Commonwealth:

- Discharges from fire fighting activities	- Flows from riparian habitats and wetlands
- Potable water sources including water line flushing	- Uncontaminated water from foundations or from footing drains
- Irrigation drainage	- Lawn watering
- Air conditioning condensate	- Dechlorinated swimming pool discharges
- Springs	- Uncontaminated groundwater
- Water from crawl space pumps	- Water from individual residential car washing
- Pavement wash waters where spills or leaks of toxic or hazardous materials have not occurred (unless all spill material has been removed) and where detergents are not used	- Routine external building wash down (which does not use detergents or other compounds)

D. In the event that the Municipality or DEP determines that any of the discharges identified in Subsection C significantly contribute to pollution of the waters of this Commonwealth, the Municipality or DEP will notify the responsible person(s) to cease the discharge.

Section 290-36. Prohibited Connections

Any drain or conveyance, whether on the surface or subsurface, which allows any non-stormwater discharge, including sewage, process wastewater, and wash water to enter the separate storm sewer system and any connections to the storm drain system from indoor drains and sinks is prohibited.

Section 290-37. Roof Drains

A. In Philadelphia, roof drains shall comply with Section P-1001 of the Philadelphia Plumbing Code.

B. In Montgomery County, roof drains shall not be connected to streets, sanitary or storm sewers, or roadside ditches, and shall discharge to infiltration areas or vegetative BMPs to the maximum extent practicable.

Section 290-38. Alteration of BMPs

A. No person shall modify, remove, fill, landscape, or alter any existing stormwater facility or BMP unless it is part of an approved maintenance program and written approval of the Municipality has been obtained.

B. No person shall place any structure, fill, landscaping, or vegetation into a stormwater control or BMP or within a drainage easement which would limit or alter the functioning of the stormwater control or BMP without the written approval of the Municipality.

ARTICLE IX - ENFORCEMENT AND PENALTIES

Section 290-39. Right-of-Entry

Upon providing forty-eight (48) hours written notice, the Municipality, or its authorized agents and employees, may enter at reasonable times upon any part of the property within the Municipality to inspect and determine the compliance of the implementation, condition, or operation and maintenance (O&M) of the stormwater facilities or Best Management Practices (BMPs) in regard to any aspect governed by this Ordinance. Inspection includes monitoring and sampling to determine proper operation of stormwater facilities and BMPs. The Municipality shall have the right to temporarily locate on any stormwater control or BMP in the Municipality such devices as are necessary to conduct monitoring and/or sampling of the discharges from such stormwater control or BMP.

Section 290-40. Inspection

BMPs should be inspected for proper operation by the landowner, or the owner's designee (including the municipality for dedicated and owned facilities), according to the following list of minimum frequencies:

1. Annually for the first 5 years.

2. Once every 3 years thereafter.

3. During or immediately after the cessation of a 10-year or greater storm.

4. As specified in the O&M agreement,

Section 290-41. Enforcement

All inspections regarding compliance with the Stormwater Management (SWM) Site Plan and this Ordinance shall be the responsibility of the Municipality.

A. Whenever the Municipality finds that a person has violated a prohibition or failed to meet a requirement of this Ordinance, the Municipality may order compliance by notifying the responsible person. Such notice may include the following remedies:

   1. Performance of monitoring, analyses, and reporting;

   2. Elimination of prohibited connections or discharges;

   3. Cessation of any violating discharges, practices, or operations;

   4. Abatement or remediation of stormwater pollution or contamination hazards and the restoration of any affected property;

5. Payment of a fine to cover administrative and remediation costs;

6. Implementation of stormwater controls and BMPs; and

7. O&M of stormwater facilities and BMPs.

B. Such notification shall set forth the nature of the violation(s) and establish a time limit for correction of these violations(s). If the violator fails to take the required action within the established deadline, the work may be done by the Municipality and the expenses may be charged to the violator.

C. Failure to comply within the time specified may subject a violator to the penalty provisions of this Ordinance. All such penalties shall be deemed cumulative and shall not prevent the Municipality from pursuing other remedies available in law or equity.

Section 290-42. Suspension and revocation of Permits and Approvals

A. Any building, land development or other permit or approval issued by the Township may be suspended or revoked by the Township for:

1. Noncompliance with or failure to implement any provision of the permit;

2. A violation of any provision of this chapter; or

3. The creation of any condition or the commission of any act during construction or development which constitutes or creates a hazard or nuisance, pollution or which endangers the life or property of others.

B A suspended permit or approval shall be reinstated by the Township when:

1. The Township Engineer or designee has inspected and approved the corrections to the stormwater BMPs, or the elimination of the hazard or nuisance; and/or

2. The Township is satisfied that the violation of the ordinance, law, or rule and regulation has been corrected.

C. A revoked permit or approval cannot be reinstated. The applicant may apply for a new permit under the procedures outlined in this Ordinance.

Section 290-43. Penalties

A. Any person violating the provisions of this Ordinance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction shall be subject to a fine of not more that $1,000 for each violation, recoverable with costs, or imprisonment of not more than 30 days, or both. Each day that the violation continues shall be a separate offense.

B. In addition, the Township, through its Solicitor, may institute injunctive, mandamus or any other appropriate action or proceeding at law or in equity for the enforcement of this chapter. Any court of competent jurisdiction shall have the right to issue restraining orders, temporary or permanent injunctions, mandamus or other appropriate forms of remedy or relief.

SECTION 2. All Township of Cheltenham Ordinances or parts of Township of Cheltenham Ordinances in conflict with the provisions of this Chapter are hereby repealed.

SECTION 3. Nothing in this Ordinance or in the Code of the Township of Cheltenham shall be construed to affect any suit or proceedings in any Court, any rights acquired or liability incurred, any permit issued, or any cause or causes of action existing under the said Code, prior to the adoption of this Ordinance.

SECTION 4. The provisions of this Ordinance are severable, and if any section, sentence, clause, part, or provision hereof shall be held illegal, invalid, or unconstitutional by any Court of competent jurisdiction, such decision of this Court shall not affect or impair the remaining sections, sentences, clauses, parts, or provisions of this Ordinance. It is hereby declared to be the intent of the Board of Commissioners that this Ordinance would have been adopted if such illegal, invalid, or unconstitutional section, sentence, clause, part, or provision had not be included herein.

SECTION 5. The Ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after its approval as required by law.

ENACTED into an Ordinance this **19th** day of **May,2010, A.D.**

TOWNSHIP OF CHELTENHAM
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

By: Morton J. Simon, Jr.
Morton J. Simon, Jr., President

Attest: David G. Kraynik
David G. Kraynik, Township Manager
and Secretary

CHELTENHAM TOWNSHIP
PARKS and RECREATION DEPARTMENT
CURTIS and GLENSIDE HALLS
PROPOSED FEE SCHEDULES for 2011-2013

		CURTIS HALL				GLENSIDE HALL			
		2010	2011	2012	2013	2010	2011	2012	2013
Daytime:	**11am-4pm** Monday through Friday	375	375	425	475	275	275	300	325
Evenings:	**7:00pm-12:00am** Monday through Thursday	650	650	700	750	500	500	550	600
	Friday	1750	1750	1900	2050	1150	1150	1250	1350
Saturdays, Sundays & Holidays:	***Select any five hours	2300	2300	2400	2500	1750	1750	1900	2050
Overtime:	Payable in Advance Only	400	400	450	500	400	400	450	500

CHELTENHAM TOWNSHIP
PARKS and RECREATION DEPARTMENT

CURTIS and GLENSIDE HALLS
PROPOSED HOURLY RATES for 2011-2013

[Minimum Three (3) Hours Rental Time]

	Curtis Hall				Glenside Hall			
	2010	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**
Weekdays (7:00am-5:00pm)	$75	$75	$85	$95	$55	$55	$60	$65
Weeknights (5:00pm-12:00am)	$130	$130	$140	$150	$90	$90	$110	$120

*****Prices subject to change without notice*****

CHELTENHAM TOWMSHIP
PARKS and RECREATION DEPARTMENT

GLENSIDE HALL
PROPOSED TENANT'S FEES for 2011-2013

	2010	2011	2012	2013
Thursday Night Dance Group (TNDG) 5Hours per Night, Once/Week	$165	$165	$180	$180
One Saturday per Month	$385	$385	$400	$400