

M I N U T E S
SHALER TOWNSHIP FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING
TUESDAY, JANUARY 26, 2016

The meeting was called to order at approximately 7:56 P.M. by Chairman Boyle. He announced that the meeting was being taped and asked the Secretary to call the roll. The Secretary called the roll as follows:

PRESENT: Boyle, Cross, Skelley
ALSO PRESENT: Timothy J. Rogers, Manager, David Shutter, Chairman, Board of Commissioners; Director; Harlan Stone, Solicitor; Deputy Chief Kevin Boyle; Sherry Martin, Admin. Assistant

Old Business:

Electronic Device Policy for Elected Officials

The first item of business was the possible approval of the Electronic Device Policy for Elected Officials. **Mr. Rogers** stated that the intent of the policy at the direction of the Board was to move forward into the media age in providing the Board with Surface Pros instead of the police delivering the weekly envelopes, the information will be e-mailed. **Mr. Boyle** stated that he reviewed the policy and the policy has the amended changes. **Mr. Cross** suggested that instead of naming the Surface Pro it should read 'computing devices'. Also, in the fifth paragraph adding an 's' to the word official.

Mr. Cross moved, seconded by Mr. Skelley to recommend to the full Board of Commissioners the Electronic Device Policy for Elected Official with amendments as suggested by Mr. Cross. The motion was carried.

Police Video Cameras

The next item of business was not on the agenda but Mr. Cross requested that Deputy Chief Boyle give a report on the video cameras for the intersection of Saxonburg and Route 8. **Deputy Chief Boyle** reported that the intent was that once the Board approves the pricing for the video cameras, a letter would be sent to District Attorney Stephen Zappala for the asset forfeiture grant. The price is \$6,500.00 for the Saxonburg and Route 8 intersection. **Mr. Rogers** requested that the pricing information be sent to him for review and placement on the Public Safety Committee agenda in February. If the Board anticipates going forward with the cameras, it would help to begin the application process with the District Attorney's office. The manager does not want to move forward with the application if it is not the Board's intent to approve the cameras. The pricing includes four license plate readers to be placed within 70 feet of the intersection, north, south, east and west. There will also be a camera placed at Mr. Mihelic's property at 917 Wm. Flinn Highway. **Mr. Rogers** stated that if it is the will of the Board, Deputy Chief Boyle be authorized to move forward with the application for the grant and to proceed with the specifications for the installation of the cameras. The Board can take action at the February full Board of Commissioners meeting. There were no objections.

Deputy Chief Boyle thanked Mr. Rogers and the Board for the pay increase on behalf of Chief Kelly, himself and the police administration.

New Business – no new business

There being no further business, the Chairman asked for a motion to adjourn. **Mr. Cross moved, seconded by Mr. Skelley that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was carried.** The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:59 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy J. Rogers, Manager

M I N U T E S
SHALER TOWNSHIP ENVIRONMENTAL & LAND USE COMMITTEE MEETING
TUESDAY, JANUARY 26, 2016

The meeting was called to order at approximately 7:16 p.m. by Commissioner McElhone. He announced that the meeting was being taped and asked the Secretary to call the roll as follows:

PRESENT: McElhone, Boyle, Fisher
ALSO PRESENT: Timothy J. Rogers, Manager; Harlan Stone, Solicitor; Deputy Chief Kevin Boyle; Sherry Martin, Administrative Assistant

New Business:

Discussion on Recreational Vehicles and Boats, Section 225-5.2

The first item of business was a discussion on Recreational Vehicles and Boats, Section 225-5.2. **Mr. Rogers** invited Mr. Vita, Code Enforcement Officer to speak to the Committee on the issue. **Mr. Vita** commented on how he was concerned that when the late Mr. Vogrin, Township Solicitor was working on the Recreational Vehicles and Boats Ordinance, he passed away and that staff may have missed the desire of the Board on how boats were regulated in the ordinance. Mr. Vita thought that there would be more description on the regulation of boats. As the ordinance is written boats have the same restrictions in the Township as recreational vehicles. **Mr. Rogers** inquired if there have been complaints on boats and the typical size of the boat in the Township. **Mr. Vita** responded that the complaints have been minimal and the most recent complaint was for a 19-foot boat. **Mr. Rogers** commented that one of the issues that staff struggled with when discussing the ordinance was the size of commercial vehicles and equipment parked at residential properties. He felt that this was the same issue. He queried at what size boat does the Board want to regulate on residential properties? After further discussion, **Mr. Rogers** inquired how the Committee and Board would like to proceed on the issue. **Mr. Vita** explained that if the boat is more than 15-feet it must be screened, kept on a paper street or garage or off site. **Mr. Stone** agreed with Mr. Vita's statement and stated that this was the intent of the ordinance. A covered boat is not the same as screening. **Mr. Shutter** commented that a lot of work and thought went into developing the new ordinances and to backtrack by pulling items out of the ordinance is a dangerous road to follow as it jeopardizes all of the ordinances. The reason the Township has not had a lot of issues is that it is only being enforced if someone complains. The ordinance gives Mr. Vita the authority to resolve any issues on boats that may come up. **Mr. Boyle** commented that the Township had a lot of public meetings and residents knew that the regulations were coming and thus the storage facility on Elfinwild Road is now filled with boats. **Mr. Rogers** requested that the Board give Mr. Vita guidance on how to enforce the ordinance. He explained that when a resident is cited for non-compliance to an ordinance, the resident then reports other residents that are not in compliance. **Mrs. Mizgroski** stated that Mr. Vita should then follow through with citing all that are reported. **Mr. Cross** stated that if we re-visit the boat issue, a resident could come in and request for the trailers to be reviewed also. **Mr. McElhone** stated that the Committee needs to give Mr. Vita direction on what to enforce. **Mr. Stone** stated that the smaller the boat, the less likely residents will complain. If that is the case, does the Committee want to open the ordinance up for discussion or do we want to accept the reality that if it is small enough, no one cares. The Committee and Board; may want to keep the ordinance in place. The ordinance will be enforced as written.

Proposed Gas Drilling Ordinance

The next item of business was a proposed Gas Drilling Ordinance. **Mr. Rogers** explained that the Board has the latest Gas Drilling Ordinance as drafted by the Solicitor. The primary decision for the Committee is a location of where drilling should take place in the Township. The Township is required to provide for every classification and land use in the ordinance. After consideration, the Township was reviewing the industrial corridor but the issue is that in Shaler Township it is the main aquifer in the township. The second concern is that should there be an incident in the industrial corridor and if it were to spread to neighboring commercial establishments, the more likely it becomes an emergency management situation because that is where the heavier chemicals are located. After discussion with staff it is Management's recommendation that the location for potential gas drilling be in the cemeteries. **Mrs. Mizgorski** commented that she has four cemeteries in her ward. **Mr. Stone** commented that the advantage to the cemeteries is that in order to meet the requirements for drilling you must have five acres for a single pad. There are not too many places that you will find five acres. **Mr. Rogers** stated that there are two cemeteries that have the five acres, Beth Shalom and Mt. Royal Memorial Park. The likelihood of gas drilling coming into Shaler is pretty slim. There is a likelihood of under drilling as the Catholic Diocese sold all of their drilling rights. There is a potential that this will happen. It is not an immediate issue but the Township needs to get an ordinance adopted. **Mr. McElhone** inquired if the Township makes the cemeteries the designated area, can this be amended if needed at a later time. **Mr. Rogers** stated that yes it can be amended and the Township can grant an exception which would require a variance. **Mr. Stone** stated that the Township cannot regulate sub-surface drilling, it is regulated under the legislation for oil and gas drilling act through the Department of Environmental Protection. It is best to keep the gas drilling as far away from the industrial zone as possible, some municipalities place them in their agricultural districts. The Gas Drilling ordinance that Mr. Stone submitted to the Committee is designed for maximum protection to the residents, to the community and the property owners. The same ordinance has been adopted in other municipalities and it has not been challenged.

Mr. Boyle moved, seconded by Mrs. Fisher to recommend to the full Board of Commissioners the approval of the Gas Drilling Ordinance as presented by the Solicitor and dated December 8, 2015. Under question, Mr. Rogers requested that this be subject to a final amendment drafted by the Solicitor and that cemeteries are the designated area in the ordinance. **Mr. Boyle moved, seconded by Mrs. Fisher that the amendment be made as stated. The motion was carried.**

Mr. Stone requested that the Township hold onto the ordinance and amend the Zoning and the SALDO (Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance) at the same time.

Wind Turbines

The next item of business was for the Committee to give the Solicitor authorization to draw up a Wind Turbine Ordinance. **Mr. Rogers** stated that there has been some interest in small wind turbines in the Township. There is one at the Eat 'n Park at Waterworks Mall. **Mr. Boyle moved, seconded by Mrs. Fisher to recommend to the full Board of Commissioners to authorize the Solicitor to draw up a Wind Turbine Ordinance for the Township. The Ordinance should then be reviewed by this Committee at a future meeting. The motion was carried.**

Public Comment: No comments

There being no further business, the Chairman asked for a motion to adjourn. **Mr. Boyle moved, seconded by Mrs. Fisher that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was carried.** The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy J. Rogers
Manager

TJR:sm

MINUTES
SHALER TOWNSHIP
PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE MEETING
TUESDAY, JANUARY 26, 2016

The meeting was called to order at approximately 6:35 p.m. by Commissioner Fisher. She announced that the meeting was being taped and asked the Secretary to call the roll. The Secretary called the roll as follows:

PRESENT: Fisher, Mizgorski, Skelley
ALSO PRESENT: Timothy J. Rogers, Manager; David Shutter, Chairman, Board of Commissioners; Harlan Stone, Solicitor; Deputy Chief Kevin Boyle; Matthew Sebastian, Township Engineer; Sherry Martin, Administrative Assistant

New Business:

Fall Run Park Restoration

The first item of business was a report from Mr. Matt Sebastian, Township Engineer on the Fall Run Park Restoration. **Mr. Sebastian** reported that the recent heavy storms did considerable damage to Fall Run Park, specifically the bridges in the park. Some of the bridges will need total replacement and some will be in need of repair. There are large silt deposits in the stream that will need to be addressed and there is significant erosion on the stream banks. A contractor was brought in to review the damages in the park and give the Township a cost estimate for repairs. The cost estimate was \$250,000.00. Mr. Sebastian then decided that the Township would need an engineering firm with a structural engineer to review the park damage. Mr. Sebastian has been in contact with Gateway Engineers, who he has worked with on similar projects in the past. Gateway Engineers is a multi-disciplinary firm that do landscape architecture planning, park planning – nature and recreational, and they are also efficient at securing grant funding. This type of work may be eligible for CDBG, DCNR and the Growing Greener grant. **Mr. Rogers** explained that the Township needs an engineering firm with depth. It is not a project that can be performed in-house. **Mr. Sebastian** will be walking the park with Gateway staff for a review of the park and to take pictures. The estimate for Gateway Engineers work is in the \$40 to \$50,000.00 range. Some of the grant funding may be eligible for the engineering fees. The pictures will be sent to the Board for their review. The project may or may not be one project bid. **Mr. Skelley** inquired if he could join in the park review with Gateway. **Mr. Rogers** stated absolutely.

Mrs. Mizgorski commented that it would be a good idea to review the grants ahead of the project planning. **Mr. Rogers** stated that the best case scenario for the project timeline is 4 to 6 months before any physical work will be performed in the park. The park will be closed. Fall Run Park is posted at this time with an “enter at your own risk” signage, but has not been closed. Mr. Rogers is not in favor of closing the park as it is a natural park. **Mrs. Mizgorski** stated since the bridges are not safe, the bridges should be marked off with caution tape. **Mr. Sebastian** stated the overlook is roped off and marked. There is a small landslide in this area. In addition to grants the Township will need to start programming funds from the capital reserve and / or other reserve income. **Mr. Rogers** does not want to piece-meal the project or have it drag out

over years. Mr. Rogers would like to have the project fast tracked through Gateway and if the bid comes in at the \$250,000 estimate from the contractor, he would like to have the work done.

Mr. Sebastian commented that one of the categories that the Growing Greener grant likes to fund is stream bank restoration. Gateway Engineers has experience with stream bank restoration and the Growing Greener grant decision makers favor applications when the improvements are made with more natural materials. **Mr. Rogers** commented that he and Mr. Sebastian are trying to add some stormwater management and MS-4 compliance to the project.

Mr. Rogers is not seeking action from the Committee at this time. He is asking for concurrence from the Committee that Township staff is heading in the direction that the Board is comfortable with. The Committee members agreed to move forward.

Approval Date for the Employee / Volunteer Picnic

The next item of business was an approval date for the Employee / Volunteer Picnic. **Mr. Rogers** commented that Friday, August 5 and Friday, August 12 are the two dates proposed for the picnic. **Mrs. Fisher** explained that the reason the picnic has been held the first Friday in August is the pool staff works the picnic and they still have a full staff at that time. **Mrs. Mizgorski moved, seconded by Mr. Skelley to recommend to the full Board of Commissioners that the Employee / Volunteer Picnic be held on Friday, August 5, 2016. The motion was carried.**

Comments: No comments

There being no further business, the Chairman asked for a motion to adjourn. **Mr. Skelley moved, seconded by Mrs. Mizgorski that the meeting be adjourned at approximately 6:49 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy J. Rogers
Manager

M I N U T E S
SHALER TOWNSHIP PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEETING
TUESDAY, JANUARY 26, 2016

The meeting was called to order at approximately 6:50 p.m. by Commissioner Mizgorski. She announced that the meeting was being taped and asked the Secretary to call the roll as follows:

PRESENT: Mizgorski, Boyle, Skelley
ALSO PRESENT: Timothy J. Rogers, Manager, David Shutter, Chairman,
Board of Commissioners; Harlan Stone, Solicitor; Deputy Chief
Kevin Boyle, Matthew Sebastian, Engineer; Sherry Martin,
Admin. Assistant

New Business:

Possible approval of the 2016 Road Paving List

The first item of business was the possible approval of the 2016 Road Paving list. **Mr. Rogers** stated that the initial road paving list as drafted by the Engineer and Road Superintendent was somewhere in the vicinity of 2.5 million dollars. That amount was not in the budget for road paving. The list was cut down to 1.86 million dollars. Mr. Rogers and the Engineer then reviewed the roads and the list and were able to get the cost down to 1.4 million dollars. Mr. Sebastian urged with Mr. Rogers to consider a few more streets to be added which brought the cost estimate to 1.55 million dollars. **Mr. Rogers** reminded the Committee that the funds are available as the Township had a positive balance at the end of the year of \$500,000.00 additional to the projected beginning balance. The current list that the Committee has is being recommended. Mr. Sebastian was able to balance out the road paving list between the wards, except Ward 4 was on the short list for two years in a row. **Mr. Boyle** inquired how this year's list compared in square feet to last year's list. **Mr. Sebastian** stated that it is pretty equivalent in dollar percentage. Conversations with the paving contractors and project managers are coming out that the cost for paving in 2016 is expected to be equivalent to the 2015 numbers. The five-year paving program that Mr. Creagh had put together had some projections that were outpaced by paving costs. The 2016 projection is using \$17.60 per square yard and it is about 10% higher than what had been projected in the five-year paving plan. The \$17.60 is based on the numbers from the 2015 road paving program. **Mrs. Mizgorski** inquired if this year's road paving square yards is the same as 2015. **Mr. Sebastian** stated that this year's list is estimated at 15% less area than the 2015 road paving list. **Mr. Rogers** stated that there were a few roads on the list that will not need the degree of underdrain work that was needed last year. All of the underdrain work projected is in the current budget unless there is additional work needed. Road Paving will be the only line item needing amended in the budget. **Mr. Skelley** inquired about Erin Street with the alley having a question mark. The alley is currently gravel. **Mr. Rogers** stated the he was not sure what alley it was referring to, but they would meet with Mr. Skelley to review. One of the things that Mr. Rogers is requesting be done when paving is to transition into the alleys approximately a car length with the paving. This was done in the 7th Ward last year. This prevents losing the asphalt at the corner of the road.

Mr. Rogers stated that the Township has been dealing with issues in alleys for years and it is not financially feasible for the Township to pave. Mr. Rogers and Mr. Creagh and now Mr. Sebastian have reviewed stripping the alleys down approximately eight inches and then placing gravel down. It would increase the water retention in the alleys under the stormwater management and MS-4 compliance. He was not sure how popular that would be with the

residents. The Township does 'end loading' which is if there is asphalt left on the truck, the crew drives to an alley and fills potholes. They are reviewing doing a test run on one of the alleys. **Mr. Skelley** inquired if the alley is a connector between two streets, what then. **Mr. Rogers** stated that a lot of the alleys are connectors and they are treated the same and not paved. Some of the alleys have garages off the alley and trash service is rendered from the alley. The issue is if the Township goes through the alleys with the snow plow they can do damage to property such as fences and play equipment. If gravel is placed in the alleys it will be near impossible to plow because the gravel will pulled out of the road. Mr. Rogers was not sure of a solution to the issue. **Mr. Rogers** has also requested that Mr. Zelina and Mr. Sebastian look for alternative ways to dump stormwater besides the water going into the creeks.

Mr. Cross inquired what the notation on Grover to change length means. **Mr. Sebastian** stated that it was a note to himself, as he may have included all of Grover and not all of Grover will be paved. **Mr. Rogers** inquired if this was the road that will be re-profiled because a home is being flooded at the top of the hill. The water is coming from the bank and the Rite-Aid. The storm system must be moved across the street where there are no homes located. The water will be articulated away from 814 Argonne. **Mr. Cross** commented that there has been a consistent water problems on Argonne for years. He explained that as you come down Pennview and right after the bend there is water coming from the hill out of a storm pipe onto Argonne Avenue. It has caused major flooding in some cases.

Mr. Boyle moved, seconded by Mr. Skelley that the 2016 Road Paving program as presented by the engineer's memo dated January 2, 2016 be recommended to the full Board of Commissioners for approval. The motion was carried.

Discussion on Streets that are not adopted

The next item of business was a report from Mrs. Martin, Administrative Assistant on streets that are not adopted in the Township. **Mr. Rogers** explained that at a meeting in 1966 the Board of Commissioners approved a number of alleys and streets to be maintained, some of which do not meet Township requirements. One of the issues is the expectation by residents that live on these streets to receive full service. The Township is being sued on a number of these streets for services rendered. The Township did adopt some of the streets since the 1966 motion to maintain. The Township has provided full service to some of these streets, paving, winter services and sub drains. **Mr. Rogers** requested Mrs. Martin inform the Board on how the list was formed. **Mrs. Martin** explained that there were five or six original street lists, some marked with ordinance numbers and some not. All of the street ordinances were scanned into the computer and reviewed to match up which streets were adopted. There were originally 80 streets listed in the 1966 minutes to be maintained but there were 25 streets that were adopted since 1966 which brought the list down to 55 streets. There are also alleys listed in the 1966 minutes to be maintained. The streets are color coded as paper streets, private streets, streets no longer on the Township map, a portion of the street was adopted and streets that should be considered for adoption.

Mrs. Mizgorski commented that she thought Mt. Ivy Lane was a private road. **Mrs. Martin** explained two issues for examples that had come up in the last two weeks. One was Gulick Avenue off of Glenn Avenue has a street sign and it is on the County website as Gulick but there is no record in the Township and no ordinance. There is an ordinance showing that this street is actually Maple Avenue Extension and Elm Avenue Extension. The other example is Thaden

Street which is off Marzolf Road. The County has it marked as Byrd, which is actually the street before and there are three homes on Thaden but they have a Marzolf Road address. Mr. Rogers stated that Thaden does not meet the Township requirements for a street. The Township now marks the private roads with a black and gold sign indicating they are private. There was further discussion on the private roads. **Mr. Rogers** stated that staff will continue to work on the issue but no action is needed at this time.

Comments:

There being no further business, the Chairman asked for a motion to adjourn. **Mr. Skelley moved, seconded by Mr. Boyle that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was carried.** The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy J. Rogers
Manager