

The regular meeting of the **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE** for March 2022 was held this evening via web-conference, Chairman Mitchell Zygmund-Felt presiding. Members present were Commissioners Areman, Brockington, Holland, Pransky, and Rappoport. Also present was Ex-Officio Member Norris.

Staff present via web-conference were: Christopher Clewell, Public Works Superintendent; Robert Dominick, Parks Superintendent; Henry Sekawungu, Director of Planning and Zoning; Scott Lynch, Fire Marshal; Roger Phillips, Interim Township Engineer; Alyson Elliott, Assistant Township Manager; and Robert Zienkowski, Township Manager.

Mr. Zygmund-Felt made an announcement that the proposed development at 222 Church Road was withdrawn from this agenda due to lack of specific response to issues raised by Planning and Zoning, the Interim Township Engineer, the Shade Tree Advisory Commission, and the Environmental Advisory Council. The developer requested an extension, and a new meeting schedule has been set for April 2022.

Mr. Zygmund-Felt called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m.

#### 1. APPROVAL OF EXPENDITURES

- A. Recommend the Board of Commissioners approve a purchase order for DTN, LLC in the amount of \$5,324 for continued weather service support for the 2022 calendar year.

Mr. Clewell explained that the Township has been members of the DTN program for the past 15 years. They install two microchips underground, for the east and west sides of the Township, to help monitor ground temperatures, which benefit the Township for tracking storms. The Township has the opportunity to talk directly to meteorologists to understand storm conditions.

Upon motion of Mr. Zygmund-Felt, the Committee unanimously approved a purchase order for DTN, LLC in the amount of \$5,324 for continued weather services support for the 2022 calendar year.

- B. Upon motion of Mr. Zygmund-Felt, the Committee unanimously approved a purchase order for Everlasting Fence Company in the amount of \$3,928.34 for fence materials for the Brookdale flood zone.
- C. Upon motion of Mr. Zygmund-Felt, the Committee unanimously approved a purchase order for Original Watermen, Inc. in the amount of \$3,000 for the purchase of lifeguard uniforms.
- D. Upon motion of Mr. Zygmund-Felt, the Committee unanimously approved a purchase order for Buckmans, Inc. in the amount of \$20,000 for the purchase of pool chemicals.
- E. Upon motion of Mr. Zygmund-Felt, the Committee unanimously approved a purchase order for the Triac Mechanical Services, Inc. in the amount of \$3,418 to replace the leaking A/C unit in the Township Manager's office.
- F. Upon motion of Mr. Zygmund-Felt, the Committee unanimously approved a purchase order for Britton industries in the amount of \$9,475 for the purchase of mulch for the Township playgrounds.

#### 2. RECEIPT OF MONTHLY REPORTS AND CITIZEN'S COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

- A. Upon motion of Mr. Zygmund-Felt, the Committee unanimously accepted the February 2022 Report of the Highway Department.
- B. Upon motion of Mr. Zygmund-Felt, the Committee unanimously accepted the January 2022 Report of the Refuse and Recycling Department.
- C. February 2022 Parks Maintenance Department Report.

Mr. Zygmund-Felt asked for an update on the damage to Carroll Brooke Park from people who drove over it with some type of truck and created ruts. Mr. Dominick said top soil will be added

and it will be seeded and it should look good in time for spring sports in mid-May. Mr. Areman asked neighbors to be vigilant and alert the Township if they notice anything like this going on. He asked staff to see if there are low-tech ways to minimize the risk of something like this happening again.

Upon motion of Mr. Zygmund-Felt, the Committee unanimously accepted the February 2022 Report of the Parks Maintenance Department.

D. February 2022 Code Administrator Report.

Mr. Diasio provided an update on the ongoing property violations at Lynnewood Hall. The property owners were recently found guilty for failing to maintain the property and received the maximum penalty. Mr. Lynch explained the code enforcement process.

Upon motion of Mr. Zygmund-Felt, the Committee unanimously accepted the February 2022 Report of the Code Administrator.

E. Upon motion of Mr. Zygmund-Felt, the Committee unanimously accepted the February 2022 Report of the Street & Traffic Light Superintendent.

F. Upon motion of Mr. Zygmund-Felt, the Committee unanimously approved the minutes of the February 10, 2022 Shade Tree Advisory Commission meeting.

G. Upon motion of Mr. Zygmund-Felt, the Committee unanimously approved the minutes for the February 14, 2022 Environmental Advisory Council meeting.

H. Upon motion of Mr. Zygmund-Felt, the Committee unanimously approved the minutes for the February 17, 2022 La Mott Board of Historical & Architectural Review meeting.

1) Upon motion of Mr. Zygmund-Felt, the Committee unanimously concurred with the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for application L21-276 for 7410 Cedar Lane, Elkins Park, PA, for new vinyl siding to replace the old, white wood square capping of the deck spindles and vinyl wrapping around the windows.

2) Upon motion of Mr. Zygmund-Felt, the Committee unanimously concurred with the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for application L22-277 for the installation of a 6' white vinyl PVC fence in the rear and side, and a 4' white picket vinyl fence in the front yard setback of the property, in addition to paving of the driveway with uniform blacktop including any associated stormwater management.

I. Upon motion of Mr. Zygmund-Felt, the Committee unanimously approved the minutes for the February 17, 2022 Wyncote Board of Historical & Architectural Review meeting.

3. OLD BUSINESS

A. Mr. Clewell provided an update regarding the Deer Management Program for the 2021-2022 seasons. Mr. Clewell reviewed the amount of deer that have been culled since the program started in 2016 and the progress that has been made (see attached report).

B. Mr. Brockington asked about potholes on the road and the protocol when one is discovered. Mr. Clewell said residents should call the Public Works office to report it so it can be addressed. If it is on a State Road, Public Works can temporarily fix the issue until PennDOT can address it.

4. NEW BUSINESS

A. Consideration of a Stormwater Fee Credit Policy.

Mr. Zygmund-Felt made an announcement prior to discussion on the Stormwater Fee credit policy, stating that discussions on the stormwater fee started in late 2019 and residents had many opportunities to be involved in meetings and make their voices heard during the process.

Participation was strongly encouraged so residents were aware of the upcoming changes to combat the stormwater issue in the township.

Tony Dill of Arcadis explained the details of the proposed Stormwater Fee credit program, which can reduce a property owner's stormwater fee by up to 50 percent if they implement approved stormwater best management practices (BMPs) to reduce the effect of impervious surfaces on their property. Some features recognized for a credit would be green roofs, retention basins, rain gardens, and riparian buffers. Mr. Dill explained the difference in how the credit policy will be administered for residential and nonresidential properties. Credits for Homeowner's Associations will be calculated based on the number of homes in the community that are treated by/drain into the stormwater management feature, then split amongst all the homes in the HOA. Credit recipients will be required to enter into an Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Agreement, and approved credits will expire with ownership change (see attached for a copy of the PowerPoint presentation).

Mr. Pransky asked that tonight's presentation, including definitions for some best management practices, be posted on the Township website. Ms. Elliott shared the following link for more information on stormwater best management practices:

<http://www.depgreenport.state.pa.us/elibrary/GetFolder?FolderID=4673>

Ms. Rappoport asked for clarification on the word 'dedicated' in the text surrounding property owners' responsibilities where it comes to residential stream buffering modifications. Mr. Dill clarified that residents must make sure that parts of their property, such as vegetation strips near streams, provide a stormwater benefit in order to be recognized for a credit. He said the word 'dedicated' can be revised; it was not meant to infer transfer of ownership to the Township for maintaining. Ms. Rappoport said she would like to see the policy strengthened. Ms. Rappoport also clarified that while there will be a fee for a credit application (to be discussed tonight), there is not a fee for an inquiry into the fee tier in which someone falls.

Mr. Holland asked who will determine what qualifies for an innovation credit and how much of a credit it would qualify for. Mr. Dill said the Township or Township Engineer will be responsible for evaluating credits for proposed features that do not fall into standard BMPs.

*Robert Hyslop, 211 Harrison Avenue*, asked how credits will evolve and be refined. Mr. Dill said the Township will have the opportunity to modify the credit program at any time and can consider feedback as time goes on. Mr. Hyslop hopes discussions on this will be continued.

*Bob Collings, 213 Barker Road*, asked about costs associated with assessing net benefit of stormwater retention on residential properties, as he believes it may outweigh the credit available and further cost the Township. Mr. Dill agreed the initial evaluation may be at a higher cost than the credit itself; however, the credit would pay for itself over time. Mr. Dill also said encouraging property owner awareness of and participation in stormwater management is also seen as a benefit in itself. Mr. Zygmund-Felt said the Township will be better able to understand how the program is performing after the first year or two. Mr. Collings also asked if the Township would consider a one-time credit for a rain barrel to encourage installation, which would not become an annual credit due to the stated reason that it is difficult for the Township to monitor whether residents are properly using the barrel. Mr. Dill said something to this effect could be considered.

*Rhonda Isser 7307 Twelfth Street*, asked whether a stormwater advisory committee would continue to operate now that the fee is adopted and implemented. Mr. Zygmund-Felt said this has not yet been determined, but might be best served by a group of subject matter experts to address

the engineering, legal, and hydrology backgrounds. Ms. Isser asked for assurance that funds are strictly contributed to stormwater and not anything else.

Mr. Norris asked, on behalf of many residents he has talked with, whether a wooded portion of a lot would be considered for a credit, for example, a one acre lot that is half wooded. Mr. Dill said at this time that would not be considered a credit, but noted that if the wooded portion of a property abuts a stream, it could qualify for a riparian buffer credit.

*Edie Cerebi, 300 Maple Avenue*, asked for clarification on why a wooded property would not receive a credit. Mr. Dill explained that for a nonresidential property, the fee is assessed based on impervious surface, so the wooded portion of a lot is not assessed the fee. For residential properties, he said that the credit policy has to be feasible for the Township to administer, and credits based on percentage of tree coverage for residential properties was not considered manageable. Ms. Cerebi expressed her hopes that this aspect could be reexamined.

*Susie Sommovilla, 7716 Lycoming Avenue*, expressed her displeasure of the 3-tier system for residential properties and asked that the Commissioners consider amending the Ordinance to a flat fee next year. She said that creating tiers is unfair because a property that is .49 acres pays half the fee of a property that is .51 acres and there is not much difference between the properties, aside from the .02 acres of land.

*Erick Gavalis, 217 Barker Road*, said he lives on a three-acre lot with over 500 trees on the property and that there should be a way to evaluate his percentage of impervious surface. He also has a pond on his property and asked why they are not included as an option for a credit.

*Dan George, 1413 Juniper Avenue*, emphasized that the stormwater fee is meant not only to address stormwater issues in the Township, but also to incentivize property owners to do so on their own properties, which is where the credit policy comes in. He asked that the Board pay close attention to make sure the credit options are doable, affordable, and implementable on a large scale, which will accomplish this goal and go a long way toward diminishing the problem.

It was a consensus of the Committee to consider some of the comments made at this meeting and bring the Credit Policies back to the Public Works Committee for further consideration.

B. Consideration of a Stormwater Fee Credit Application Fee Structure.

Ms. Elliott reviewed a draft Stormwater Fee Credit Application fee structure. She noted that there are several ways to approach a fee structure: keep the fee low to encourage more applications, but not cover the cost of reviewing the applications; have a flat tiered fee schedule based on the number of ERUs which would cover a bit more of the costs of administering the program; and a more aggressive fee structure, as outlined in the draft resolution, that would be more likely to cover the costs of administering the program, but take longer for the property owner to realize the savings. Mr. Areman expressed his concerns with residential property applicants possibly finding it difficult to afford the application fee.

It was a consensus of the Committee to revise the Credit Application Fee structure for a future meeting.

C. **Recommendation to the Board of Commissioners:** Upon motion of Mr. Zygmund-Felt, the Committee unanimously recommended the Board of Commissioners authorize advertisement of an amendment to the Stormwater Management Fee Ordinance.

Ms. Elliott said this ordinance is to correct a mistake made in cleaning the ordinance up for publication. A line in the ordinance was inadvertently deleted. This ordinance will correct that mistake.

- D. **Recommendation to the Board of Commissioners:** Upon motion of Mr. Zygmund-Felt, the Committee unanimously recommended the Board of Commissioners appoint Arcadis as Stormwater Fee Advisor.
- E. Presentation of a revised Pollution Reduction Plan.

Nathan Walker of Gannett Fleming discussed a revised Pollution Reduction Plan (PRP), which is required for compliance with the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit which allows municipalities to discharge storm water. This requirement was put into place in 2017, at which point, the Township submitted its initial PRP. As part of the PRP, the Township is required to reduce sediment in the Tookany Creek and submit a Water Quality Improvement Plan (WQIP) for the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) of phosphorus, sediment and dissolved oxygen on the Wissahickon Creek.

On the Wissahickon Creek, the Township and other municipalities are working with the Montgomery County Planning, to present an acceptable approach to the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to improve water quality in the Wissahickon Creek. Since the Wissahickon Creek is approximately one percent of the Township land mass, the Township will need to focus most of its efforts in the Tookany Creek.

In 2019, the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) issued comments on the PRP, stating that the Township has to reduce sediment to the Tookany Creek by 153 tons per year.

Mr. Zygmund-Felt asked if the projects proposed in the PRP match up with projects proposed in the stormwater management study and if there are costs associated with these projects. Mr. Walker said they match up and they are chosen based on their ability to meet the sediment reduction requirements and where the Township has control of the property. Mr. Walker said some costs have been estimated; however, until they start designing the project, it will be difficult to determine actual costs.

Ms. Rappoport asked why the DEP and US Army Corps of Engineers Flood Control projects are not listed in the PRP. Mr. Walker said they are “flood first” projects, where the focus is on holding floodwater. There may be some water quality aspects to the projects, but it is not the focus. These projects focus on water quality as a large part of the stormwater management project.

Mr. Walker said this is a preliminary presentation to the Committee to familiarize it with the requirements and depth of commitment required to meet the EPA/DEP goal for water quality in the watersheds. The revised PRP will be submitted to DEP for comments. After the review by DEP, the Township will hold a public meeting on the revised PRP and establish a 30 day public comment period before finalizing the PRP and sending it to DEP for review and approval.

Mr. Areman asked what the Township’s obligation is when this plan is approved by DEP. Mr. Walker said the goal is to be able to work towards achieving DEP compliance. He said it does not look like many communities across Pennsylvania are meeting their goals within the five year timeline. Municipalities will need to show that they are taking serious steps toward meeting the requirements. Mr. Areman asked what DEP’s recourse is if municipalities do not meet their goals.

DEP has been silent on this. Mr. Walker said Gannett Fleming has been advising its goal to be active and focused on achieving this goal by choosing smart projects.

Public Comment

*Robert Hyslop* reminded the Township that any projects it proposes should not impact the cost-benefit ratio of the USACE Flood Reduction Study. He also questioned the consistency of the previous PRP draft to the current draft.

*Bob Collins* questioned whether the Township should look into additional pollutants beyond what the EPA and DEP are asking the Township to manage. Mr. Walker said the Township must report any additional pollutants it finds, but it is required to manage sediment for the MS4 permit.

*Rhonda Isser* questioned whether Cheltenham is being held to a different standard from other municipalities.

5. CITIZENS' FORUM

*Susie Sommovilla* asked if there is a public domain where she can access or gain knowledge of residential properties regarding parcels and acres. The information is available on the Montgomery County Property Records webpage.

*Robert Hyslop* asked questions regarding residential properties that were sampled by Mr. Dill and if the addresses are available to compare tiers.

6. There being no further business, upon motion of Mr. Zygmund-Felt, the meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.



Robert A. Zienkowski  
Township Manager  
Submitted by: Ariel Sykes



# CHELTENHAM STORMWATER FEE CREDIT POLICIES

*Public Works Committee*

March 2, 2022

# Credit Policy

- Promotes fee equity (accounts for varying levels of onsite stormwater management)
- Promotes proper maintenance of BMPs
- Encourages voluntary retrofits on older parcels



# Proposed Credit Program Details

- Available to Residential and Non-Residential Properties
- Requires submission of application and payment of application fee 60 days prior to quarter in which credit becomes effective
- Approved credits expire with ownership change
- Credit holders are required to enter into an O&M Agreement:
  - Proper maintenance of BMPs
  - Routine inspection of BMPs by property owner
  - Inspection reports submitted to the Township
  - Loss of credit for failure to comply



# Credit Program – Nonresidential

Credit Description	Structural BMPs	Non-Structural	Institutional	Maximum Credit Amount
<b>BMP Credits</b>	<b>X</b>			<b>Varies</b>
<b>Fertilizer Management Program</b>		<b>X</b>		<b>15%</b>
<b>Riparian Buffer Preservation</b>		<b>X</b>		<b>15% - 40%</b>
<b>Separate MS4</b>			<b>X</b>	<b>50%</b>
<b>NPDES Industrial SW Permit</b>			<b>X</b>	<b>30%</b>
<b>Innovation Credit</b>				<b>50%</b>

**Maximum Total Credit = 50%**

# Credit Program – Nonresidential BMPs

<b>BMPs</b>	<b>Credit Type</b>	<b>Applicable Credit</b>
<b>Wet Ponds/Retention Basins</b>	<b>Runoff Quality/Peak Rate BMPs</b>	<b>30%</b>
<b>Constructed Wetlands</b>		<b>30%</b>
<b>Dry Extended Detention Basins</b>		<b>30%</b>
<b>Underground Storage Facilities without Infiltration</b>		<b>30%</b>
<b>Hydrodynamic Devices</b>		<b>20%</b>
<b>Pervious Pavement with Infiltration Bed</b>	<b>Volume/Peak Rate Reduction by Infiltration BMPs</b>	<b>35%</b>
<b>Infiltration Basin or Trench</b>		<b>35%</b>
<b>Rain Garden/Bioretention</b>		<b>35%</b>
<b>Green Roofs</b>		<b>35%</b>
<b>Subsurface Infiltration Bed</b>		<b>35%</b>
<b>Underground Storage Facilities with Infiltration</b>		<b>35%</b>
<b>Vegetated Swale or Filter Strip</b>		<b>35%</b>
<b>Dry Detention Basin</b>	<b>Older Stormwater Facilities</b>	<b>10%</b>

# Credit Program – Residential BMPs

<b>Credit Description (BMPs)</b>	<b>Maximum Credit Amount</b>
<b>Rain Garden/ Bioretention</b>	35%
<b>Pervious Pavement</b>	35%
<b>Vegetated Filter Strips</b>	35%
<b>Underground Storage without Infiltration</b>	30%
<b>Underground Storage with Infiltration</b>	35%

Also includes riparian buffer preservation credit up to 40%

**Maximum Total Credit = 50%**

# Credit Program – HOAs

- Same credits as for non-residential properties
- Credit amount is based on percent of HOA properties treated by the HOA stormwater management facilities
- Calculated credit is issued to all HOA residential properties

Questions?



# Deer Management Program

## Mission - Results - Statistics

### Abington Deer Management

Our deer management program provides a free service to Cheltenham Township. All of our archers are proficient shooters, insured and over the past (6) seasons and have been incident free.

#### Goal:

The goal of the program is to continue to maintain a reasonable white-tailed deer herd that will provide a healthier woodland habitat as well as a reduction in human conflict and auto/deer incidents.

#### Donations:

Our program has donated 187 of the 283 culled deer to local food banks, hunters sharing the harvest, local needy families and township residents.

### Deer Harvest Totals Per Year

Season	Doe	Buck
2016-2017	32	2
2017-2018	45	3
2018-2019	50	3
2019-2020	41	4
2020-2021	45	7
2021-2022	44	7
	<b>Total</b>	<b>Total</b>
	257	26
<b>Total Deer</b>		<b>283</b>

### Deer vs. Auto - Reported/Unreported

Season	Total Deer Count	Removed From Roadways
2015-2016	62	No Hunting
2016-2017	58	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Program Started
2017-2018	19	Year 2
2018-2019	23	Year 3
2019-2020	24	Year 4
2020-2021	35	Year 5
2021-2022	31	Year 6
<b>7 Year Total</b>	<b>252</b>	

On average, there have been 35 less deer vs. auto incidents per year since the start of the deer management program in 2016.

## Total Amount of Deer Harvested Per Year At Each Approved Location

Location	2016	2017	2018	2019
Waverly Road Compost Facility	2	6	5	6
Ross/Wyngate	2	12	15	PCTA
Green Valley Open Space	19	1	5	5
Rock Lane Open Space	8	7	PCTA	7
Chelten Hills Open Space	3	2	PCTA	PCTA
Coventry Open Space	PCTA	4	4	PCTA
Parkview Park	PCTA	10	6	7
Tookany Creek Park	PCTA	6	9	6
Gimble Field	PCTA	PCTA	9	4
Glenwood Open Space	PCTA	PCTA	PCTA	10
<b>Totals</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>45</b>

  

Location	2020	2021
Waverly Road Compost Facility	2	4
Ross/Wyngate	6	5
Green Valley Open Space	3	6
Chelten Hills Open Space	2	2
Coventry Open Space	PCTA	PCTA
Parkview Park	10	9
Ashbourne Meadows	16	13
Gimble Field	6	6
Glenwood Open Space	7	6
<b>Totals</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>51</b>

**PCTA - Property Closed To Archers**

<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>283</b>
--------------------	------------