

The regular meeting of the Environmental Advisory Council (EAC) was held tonight. Voting members present were: Barbara Duffy, Miriam Moss, Lorna Rosenberg and David Schultz. Ex-officio member present was: Jonathan Essoka. Also present was Dottie Baumgarten, Bob De Maria, Jim Innes and Tom McHugh. Staff present was: Bryan T. Havir, Assistant Township Manager.

1. ***Call to Order*** – Ms. Duffy called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m.

2. ***Acceptance of Meeting Minutes*** – Ms. Duffy made a motion to accept the September 20, 2010 meeting minutes with inclusion of the attached comments by Mr. Schultz, dated October 16, 2010; seconded by Mr. Rosenberg. The motion was unanimously accepted. (see attached)

3. ***Committee Reports*** -

A. ***Energy Committee*** – Mr. Mettler was not present but e-mailed his report (see attached). Ms. Duffy reported that Mr. Bale was unable to attend but e-mailed his report on EarthAid, a behavioral modification approach to home energy conservation, which Ms. Moss read aloud. (see attached)

B. ***Watershed Committee*** – Ms. Duffy reported on the following:

- The Coventry Park Riparian Planting on Saturday, October 16, 2010 from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. went well and the site looks great. All the plantings were in by 1:00 p.m. and by 4:00 p.m. most of the fencing was up. Ms. Duffy stated that there was help from the Buxmont Community Service Group and Delaware Valley College students as well as a volunteer from Jenkintown.
- Ms. Duffy announced that the Tookany-Tacony/Frankford Watershed Partnership (TTFWP) was featuring a film, “Gas Land” on Thursday evening at 6:00 p.m. at Awbury Arboretum.

- Ms. Duffy stated that the preliminary draft of the proposed Riparian Corridor Ordinance was discussed at a joint Ad Hoc Zoning Committee and EAC meeting on Monday, September 27, 2010 at 6:00 p.m. at the Township Building. Copies of the minutes were available. She noted she did not attend the meeting and had concerns upon review of the meeting minutes with the exemption of certain size lots from the regulation. Following the Montgomery County Model Ordinance, Ms. Duffy's position was to have the ability to work with the smaller lots. Exempting these smaller lots disregards the committee's work. There should be compromises. An example would be reducing the 10 foot buffer zone to 5 foot buffer zone. By allowing property owners upstream doing what they want, infringes upon the downstream property owners rights. Mr. Havir noted that there was a lot of discussion at the meeting, and Ms. Duffy's position was not the majority position. He also noted that Ms. Mazzaccaro stated that there were two additional water bodies not previously mapped. The proposed ordinance will affect more properties than previously discussed. The next meeting of a joint Ad Hoc Zoning Committee and EAC meeting is scheduled from October 25, 2010 at 6:00 p.m. at Curtis Hall. Ms. Duffy will send out reminder e-mails to EAC members to attend this meeting. Ms. Rosenberg asked who will enforce this ordinance. Mr. Havir stated it would be handled on a complaint basis. Mr. Havir also stated, as part of the education piece, it is hoped that the EAC, as well as the (TTFWP) members/staff would be able to monitor and report concerns as they come upon them. Ms. Duffy feels that the EAC should provide more education to Township Staff.

- Ms. Duffy reported that the EAC members had a presence at the Glenside Street Fair on Saturday, October 2, 2010 from 1-6 p.m. PECO also had a volunteer working at the table and provided free compact fluorescent (CFL) light bulbs to promote energy reduction. They had a good response. Additional e-mail addresses were collected at the event for the EAC e-mail list. It was noted that recycling containers on Easton Road in Glenside are not being placed appropriately and are not clearly identifiable as recycling containers. Mr. Essoka volunteered to work with Mr. Havir and the Main Street Manager on recycling bin placement and visibility in that commercial district.
- Mr. Duffy reported that the EAC members had a table at the Community Harvest Festival on Saturday October 9, 2010. They did not have the same exposure as last year as they were placed in the vendor section. There were not as many takers for the CFL's. There was also a lack of recycling containers. Cardboard boxes were put out but not indicated as recycling. In the past, Ms. Duffy has recommended having one or two recycling stations but this was not done this year. Discussion ensued about how to handle going forward.

C. Transportation Committee – Mr. Innes reported some progress made this month as Mr. Dunbar worked on an ambition statement.

Mr. Innes noted that progress on the Cresheim Trail had lost some momentum since there was a change of directors on the Philadelphia side. However, there is a November 16, 2010 regular meeting of the entire Cresheim Trail Project.

On another topic, Mr. Innes finally attended a workshop on rain barrels. Mr. Innes contacted Sarah Robb Grieco about putting together a program to draw people in. Some ideas

were discussed about location and educational program. He will meet with Ms. Grieco next week.

Mr. Innes expressed his interest in getting a pathway/trail approximately one mile long through an un-managed parkland and if anyone knew of funding opportunities for this type of project, such as through PECO programs. Ms. Duffy expressed interest in walking this trail in the spring, if not this fall.

D. Buildings Committee – Ms. Rosenberg reported that the recycling program in the school district is in place. However, only some schools are recycling. The High School needs improvement. Ms. Rosenberg is planning to meet with Dr. Bavi, the United Parent Group and the new school superintendent on November 8, 2010 and plan for a Kick-Off event for recycling.

Ms. Rosenberg provided a brief overview of an Action Plan for a Cheltenham Water Conservation draft that she has prepared. Conversation ensued about what the hospitals and universities in the community are doing and what information they might need to practice conservation. Ms. Rosenberg suggested that there should be a Water Conservation Council with broad representation such as the Township, Public Works personnel, Philadelphia Water Department, EAC and School District to meet quarterly or semi-annually. Ms. Rosenberg will forward her draft to the EAC members. EAC will review with sub-committee and then bring back to the EAC meeting. Ms. Rosenberg announced that she will be meeting with Mr. Lynch the first week in November.

Ms. Moss recommends that written reports from committee members should be sent prior to meetings so that discussion is more focused. Ms. Rosenberg made a request to send reminders to committee chairs about reports the week prior to scheduled meetings.

Mr. Schultz wished to continue the conversation about recycling in the Township and reviewed a handout he prepared for EAC to make a recommendation to the Public Works

Committee. Discussion ensued at length about ways to increase recycling participation among households and in particular increasing commercial and institutional recycling tonnage. Mr. Schultz reviewed national statistics he obtained. He agreed to refine the handout and e-mail to the EAC and Township Staff. The EAC will continue discussion of this matter at the next meeting in order to further its position. (Please see attached).

E. Communication Committee – Ms. Carroll was not present to make a report.

**4. Old Business:**

A. Update on Pennsylvania Electric Choice - Mr. Havir reported that he met again with Constellation Energy, a preferred vendor of the Municipal Utility Alliance who communicated that they have additional options for the Township to consider but will still recommend we only enter a contract for fixed pricing on 15 of the electric accounts. They expect to have this information by the end of the month. This matter will be put on the November 10<sup>th</sup> Public Works Committee agenda. The greener energy choice was discussed. Mr. Havir noted there is a possibility that the Township could forego the green program in 2011 because of budgetary matters. The buying power contract was \$4,487 last year based on 100% of the Township's accounts with Native Energy. Constellation recommended only green 15 accounts at 50% for one year at a cost of \$681.00 (see attached comparison chart). The EAC expressed concern regarding reduced consumption through the recent retrofits for lighting at Azalea Hall, Police and Public Works Buildings and the HVAC retrofits at the Rowland Community Center, affecting the rates if allowed to be a part of the 15 Constellation Energy accounts. The EAC recommended taking the above accounts out of the fixed contract pricing for at least one year to gather consumption data based on the new energy efficiency programs in place. Advantages and disadvantages were discussed about one year and three and four year contracts as well as how they charge out on a monthly basis i.e., minimum payments over the contract period was

discussed. The EAC recommended that a one year contract at a fixed rate appeared to be best. Mr. Havir circulated the latest PECO rates for comparison which were published as of today. The discussion included points by Mr. McHugh that these are just the commodity rates and that distribution rates will be going up in the third and fourth quarter. He added that it is anticipated that rates will go up slightly for residential and large commercial accounts and down for smaller commercial accounts.

**B. PECO Smart Ideas Programs**

Mr. Havir reported that the rebates from the PECO Smart Ideas Program for lighting upgrades completed last fall at the Township's Public Works Building and Emergency Management Services Building have not been reimbursed yet. However, Mr. Havir met with a PECO representative about backup information for the rebates. Rebates could be \$1,166 for the Public Works Facility and \$427 for the EMS Building. Steve Lit, Project Consultant for Rowland Community Center (RCC) Energy Efficiency Project is working with PECO for a rebate under another program. Mr. Schultz stated that he spoke with Mr. Lit regarding the efficiency rating for the boiler at the RCC and understood that it did meet the energy efficiency guidelines for equipment of that size.

**E. Update on Community Sustainability Plan** - Mr. Havir had circulated a report entitled, "Partnerships for Sustainability - A year in Progress for American Communities".

**5. *New Business***

Mr. Havir asked the EAC for suggestions for the PECO Green Region Open Space (\$10,000) matching grant opportunity. Applications are due December 17, 2010. Mr. Innes mentioned a feasibility study is needed for a connector trail from Arcadia University to the Cresheim Trail. Mr. Havir referred Mr. Innes to Mr. Hal Lichtman, Architect, for Arcadia University to contact and develop a project proposal. This matter will be placed on next month's agenda.

Mr. Havar discussed a Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC) Air Quality Partnership event featuring a lawn mower trade-in program that provides consumers with rebates and other discounts on electric powered or push mowers; raise awareness of pollution, changing behaviors and reducing pollution from emissions produced by gas powered equipment. This event could coincide with the annual Earth Day Festival and asked the EAC if they would be interested in hosting the event. The EAC agreed to consider hosting the event but would need to work out the logistics. A sub-committee should be formed to work with Mr. Havar and Ms. Maureen Farrell of DVRPC.

Mr. McHugh stated that he believes this is the abused way of doing greenwashing. While it may reduce a very minimal amount of pollution emissions, it does not reduce the CO2 produced by the utilities when supplying electricity to operate electric powered mowers. Lawn mower manufacturers are ignoring CO2 as a pollutant and would be better served adding a catalytic converter to the gas powered mowers.

**6. Other Business** – None

**7. Adjournment** – Ms. Duffy made a motion to adjourn the meeting which was seconded by Mr. Essoka. The meeting was adjourned at 9:52 p.m.



David G. Kraynak  
Township Manager

Submitted by:  
Kathryn McDevitt



**McDevitt, Kathryn**

**From:** David McVeigh-Schultz [david.mcveigh.schultz@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 16, 2010 4:06 PM  
**To:** Tom Bale; Tom McHugh; William Mettler; Barbara Duffy; Daryl Carrington; Havir, Bryan; Lorna Rosenberg; Mary Beth Carroll; Mirian Moss; McDevitt, Kathryn; Jonathan Essoka  
**Subject:** Fwd: EAC 10-18-2010 Agenda

Dear Bryan and Kathryn,  
 C.C. EAC Voting Members and Energy Committee

Thanks for reducing the scope of your request for advice and consent of the EAC to a possible Constellation Energy agreement to the purchase of green energy to replace the one that the Township has with Native Energy. However, I want comment on one part of the EAC's earlier discussion regarding a broader power purchase agreement. I believe that our Council considered Tom McHugh's comments (as recorded in the minutes) as worthy of serious consideration by the Township's managers in evaluating the prospect of a broader power purchase agreement with Constellation Energy.

But one comment that Tom made there was not recorded in the minutes. I heard him warn us that a purchase agreement could possibly lock the Township into paying for the same amount of energy that we currently consume, regardless of what we actually consume in future months and years. If this provision were a part of the agreement, it would pose a serious threat to the Township's energy conservation efforts, as it would eliminate all financial incentive for future capital investments to conserve energy over the multi-year contract period. I plan to introduce a resolution in this regard at the upcoming EAC meeting.

Now, as to the purchase of "green energy" by Constellation Energy at a rate substantially below that sold by Native Energy, To consider this issue, the EAC will need to see copies of documentation as to exactly how Constellation Energy and Native Energy define the sale of "green energy". Usually what is referred to in these transactions is the purchase of renewable energy credits that are verified as legitimate by a national entity. The purchase and sale of renewable energy credits requires the use and publishing of a verifiable financial accounting of the utility's purchase and sale of renewable energy credits, so that they are not sold multiple times. I want everyone concerned in considering this purchase to be reminded that the Township is not engaged in a public relations effort, but in a very real financial transaction that should have a real impact upon the renewable energy market. Thanks.

Dave

David McVeigh-Schultz

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** **McDevitt, Kathryn** <kmcdevitt@cheltenham-township.org>  
**Date:** Fri, Oct 15, 2010 at 4:11 PM  
**Subject:** EAC 10-18-2010 Agenda and EAC 9-20-10 Meeting Minutes

Please see the attached Agenda for our next meeting on Monday, October 18, 2010 at 7:30 p.m. at the Township Administration Building, and the minutes from the September 20, 2010 meeting.

Please note that the attachments include minutes from the most recent zoning ad hoc zoning committee meeting regarding the riparian buffer ordinance which will be discussed under the Watershed Committee

10/19/2010

**Havir, Bryan**

---

**From:** tombale@comcast.net  
**Sent:** Monday, October 18, 2010 2:44 AM  
**To:** Barb Duffy; Bill Mettler; David McVeigh-Schultz; Mary Beth Carroll; Lorna Rosenberg; Miriam Moss  
**Cc:** Havir, Bryan  
**Subject:** Earth Aid

**Energy Committee Earth Aid Report:**

After the Glenside and Harvest fairs we have 35 people who have signed up with Earth Aid. Some have enrolled in the program. Others are thinking about it.

The 5 members of the Committee, known as the Earth Aid 5 are encouraging all EAC members to enroll by going to EarthAid.net and following the easy directions.

We will be sending out periodically a news bulletin to all those who have given us their email address. It will encourage enrollment, give energy tips and provide news about energy policy in Cheltenham and nearby communities.

The campaign will now focus on providing a speaker at the membership meetings of local group. If you are a member of a group in the area please contact me to discuss this possibility. Also, we will be contacting merchants in the area to see if they are interested in participating in Earth Aid. Currently, 23 small businesses have enrolled within 10 miles of Cheltenham.

Submitted by Tom Bale [tombale@comcast.net](mailto:tombale@comcast.net)

## McDevitt, Kathryn

---

**From:** Meenal Raval [meenal.raval@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 13, 2010 10:33 AM  
**To:** Bill Mettler  
**Subject:** notes from Harvest Fest on 10/9

Hi Bill,

It was a lovely day at the Curtis Arboretum and I missed your presence.

Have marked the map with a green color pencil. No major additions to report.

One woman from Mt Airy that works at RRC said she rides up Mt Pleasant, goes thru the shopping center and the parking lot of the apartments behind, and ends up on Greenwood Ave. I tried this but couldn't figure out how to get from the shopping center to the parking lot.

Bonnie Hay mentioned a grant for promoting bicycling. Will followup with her.

Spoke with a fellow named Frank who lives near New 2nd St & Tookany Creek. Complained that the new trail had a No Bikes Allowed sign. I checked with the EAC folks (Barbara Duffy?) who said the new trail was permeable and building the trail for bikes would have included asphalt, making it non-permeable. I also learned from her that the Tookany Creek Parkway is closed to cars on weekends and therefore perfect for biking.

David Loeb suggested that Greenwood Ave needs repaving between Barker & Church. When the repaving is scheduled, it'd be ideal if a fog lane was painted alongside, making it easier for bikers. He seems to think there's enough space. Is this something we need to recommend to the EAC?

David also suggested that Old York Rd was wide enough for a 3-4 foot bike lane to be painted in, all the way from Cheltenham Ave to Township Line Rd. I need to ride/drive along this to confirm. Do you think this is a candidate for the EAC as well? The lesson from extensively biked Pine & Spruce Streets in Philadelphia (which now have bike lanes along the East-West corridor) simply by painting in the bike lane is about the most inexpensive way to get more folks biking.

Meenal

## **Proposal for Environment Advisory Council Recommendations to the Public Works Committee**

Cheltenham Township's recycling program generates substantial amount of income and avoids substantial land fill costs for the township. I understand from discussion with Cheltenham's Township Manager that this year our town will receive about \$120,000 in payment for recycled material and avoid about \$184,000 in land fill fees. We avoid \$63 in payment for every ton of waste that we divert into recycling. Since we pay more than \$680,000 per year to place about 80% of our waste in landfills, we could avoid \$170,000 of this cost annually if we were to double the output of our recycling program. Doubling the scale of our recycling program would increase fees by about \$120,000. Total savings to the Township could be \$290,000, which could be devoted to balancing our next annual budget.

A U.S. EPA has said that 55% of Southeast Pennsylvania's municipal waste stream is composed of materials that can be recycled under current programs. It is composed of paper (35%) plastic (11%) metal (5%) and glass (3%).

Pennsylvania Dept. of Environmental Protection's 2002 Solid Waste Plan states that Pennsylvania's municipalities have achieved an average 36% waste diversion rate. But municipalities in Montgomery County have fallen behind the rest of the state with a diversion rate averaging 20%.

Waste diversion through recycling has been even more successful in other parts of the nation. For instance, the State of California set a goal for all its municipalities to recycle 50% of its waste by 2000. By 2005 municipalities were recycling 52% of their waste, and 65% of their residential waste by 2009. New York City is now recycling 64% of its waste.

Certainly Cheltenham Township, with a recycling diversion rate of 21% can do better. The Cheltenham Environmental Advisory Council recommends that the Township Commissioners investigate the cost effectiveness of educational and infrastructure investments and waste fee policies that will yield substantial improvements in our residential waste diversion rate.

One option that we would like the Commissioners to investigate is the "pay as you throw" system. The Pennsylvania Dept. of Environmental Protection stated in its Solid Waste Plan (2002) that 211 Pennsylvania municipalities administer "pay as you throw" plans. The town of Phoenixville in 2006 commissioned a study of Chester County townships that administered "pay as you throw" plan, and this should be one point of departure for this investigation.

Cheltenham Township managers have been considering the launch a single stream recycling program fellow townships in Montgomery County for some time. We recommend that the Commissioners determine whether this would be one effective vehicle for expanding Cheltenham's residential recycling rate. Township's such as Abington has recently adopted this system.

Other City's and townships are experimenting with participation in private financial incentive systems for recycling, such as Recycle Bank. These systems also deserve consideration. Finally, Cheltenham's current recycling system only serves single family residences. It does not serve Cheltenham businesses nor does it serve multi-family rental housing facilities. We encourage the Commissioners to explore methods that have been cost effectively adopted to extend recycling services to tenants and business owners.

Cheltenham Analysis

15 100% Green				15 50% Green				34 100% Green				34 50% Green							
Term (Months)	12	24	36	48	Term (Months)	12	24	36	48	Term (Months)	12	24	36	48	Term (Months)	12	24	36	48
Term (kWh)	756,992	1,510,055	2,265,319	3,019,134	Term (kWh)	756,992	1,510,055	2,265,319	3,019,134	Term (kWh)	1,349,624	2,691,757	4,037,671	5,380,965	Term (kWh)	1,349,624	2,691,757	4,037,671	5,380,965
FIXED (\$/kWh)	\$0.077768	\$0.079280	\$0.083391	\$0.087632	FIXED (\$/kWh)	\$0.076868	\$0.078276	\$0.082251	\$0.086219	FIXED (\$/kWh)	\$0.086979	\$0.089979	\$0.095360	\$0.100528	FIXED (\$/kWh)	\$0.086897	\$0.087971	\$0.093080	\$0.097702
Estimated Total (\$)	\$58,870	\$119,717	\$188,908	\$264,574	Estimated Total (\$)	\$58,189	\$118,201	\$186,325	\$260,308	Estimated Total (\$)	\$118,492	\$239,497	\$380,432	\$533,334	Estimated Total (\$)	\$117,278	\$236,796	\$375,828	\$525,730
Cost of Green					Cost of Green					Cost of Green					Cost of Green				

Currently, the projected PECO price to compare for GS accts = \$0.9000  
 I suggest executing on 15 Accounts for the following mathematical reasons

Example 1

Cost of Supply 15 Accts with CNE and 19 Accts with PECO for 12 months = (term kwh x CNE Price) + (remaining kwh x PECO price)	
100% Green	\$ 112,207
Cost of Supply 34 Accts with CNE for 12 months = (term kwh x CNE Price)	
100% Green	\$119,706
<b>Projected Savings</b>	<b>\$7,499</b>

Example 2

Cost of Supply 15 Accts with CNE and 19 Accts with PECO for 24 months = (term kwh x CNE Price) + (remaining kwh x PECO price)	
100% Green	\$ 226,070
Cost of Supply 34 Accts with CNE for 12 months = (term kwh x CNE Price)	
100% Green	\$242,202
<b>Projected Savings</b>	<b>\$ 16,131</b>

Example 3

Cost of Supply 15 Accts with CNE and 19 Accts with PECO for 12 months = (term kwh x CNE Price) + (remaining kwh x PECO price)	
Standard Offer	\$ 110,845
Cost of Supply 34 Accts with CNE for 12 months = (term kwh x CNE Price)	
Standard Offer	\$117,278
<b>Projected Savings</b>	<b>\$6,433</b>

Example 4

Cost of Supply 15 Accts with CNE and 19 Accts with PECO for 24 months = (term kwh x CNE Price) + (remaining kwh x PECO price)	
Standard Offer	\$ 223,038
Cost of Supply 34 Accts with CNE for 12 months = (term kwh x CNE Price)	
Standard Offer	\$236,796
<b>Projected Savings</b>	<b>\$13,758</b>

Confidential

Any information contained in this email or any attachments hereto, including any pricing, is confidential and for informational purposes only and does not constitute a binding offer or agreement to provide electricity and related services. A binding and enforceable agreement shall only exist upon execution and delivery of a written contract (other than this email) on mutually acceptable terms, and nothing herein shall be deemed to require that Constellation NewEnergy enter into any such agreement. Thank you.



