

M I N U T E S
SHALER TOWNSHIP FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2016

The meeting was called to order at approximately 7:12 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: Judy Kording, Director of Finance and Administration, David Shutter, Chairman, Board of Commissioners; Director; Harlan Stone, Solicitor; Chief Bryan Kelly; Sherry Martin, Admin. Assistant

New Business:

Investment Proposals

The first item of business was the presentation of Investment Proposals. **Mrs. Kording** reported that the finance department was directed to obtain a request for proposals for banking services for the capital improvements fund. The Township received proposals from First Commonwealth, Farmers National Bank, WesBanco, PNC Bank and PLGIT. The Board did receive a summary of these proposals. Based on the proposals that were submitted, Township Management is recommending that the capital improvement fund be removed from PLGIT and PNC Bank and placed with First Commonwealth Bank. The interest rates with First Commonwealth were competitive with the others. There are two branches in Shaler Township. They provided the Township with a look-back period and they had the best performance from all the proposals.

Mr. Boyle commented that he reviewed the five proposals and he was disappointed in the proposals from Farmers National Bank, PNC Bank and PLGIT. There was no detail in the proposals. The WesBanco and First Commonwealth proposals gave firm quotes for the next 12 months with much more detail. If needed, the Township can re-visit banking proposals after a year. **Mr. Cross** commented that the increase was significant from \$1,000 to almost \$14,000. The balance of the capital improvement fund is approximately 2.7 million dollars. All of the Township funds are divided between PNC Bank and PLGIT. There is a small fund for the Local Services Tax with Citizens Bank. The Township is diversified with assets, PLGIT holds 3 to 3.5 million dollars of the Township funds. There is money moved back and forth between the two financial institutions as needed.

Mr. Cross moved, seconded by Mr. Skelley to recommend to the full Board of Commissioners that the capital improvement funds be moved to First Commonwealth Bank. Under questions, **Mr. McElhone** inquired to Mrs. Kording how much work is involved moving from one financial institution to another. **Mrs. Kording** stated that with the new financial software packages she can now go online and change the account and routing numbers to move funds. The Township has blank check stock that will imprint with a micro-encoding cartridge. The Township would then get checks from PNC Bank and PLGIT to deposit in First Commonwealth. The Township would need to pass a resolution giving authorization to the bank to be our financial institution and acquire signature cards. **Mr. McElhone** inquired if there is a time limit on how long the fund must stay with First Commonwealth. **Mrs. Kording** stated that one of the requirements in the proposals was liquidity. The Township has a great deal of funds

liquid at PNC Bank and PLGIT. There are times when the Township will lock up an investment for 260 days depending on the Township cash flow. **Mr. McElhone** inquired if there would be a withdrawal penalty. **Mrs. Kording** stated no. **Mr. McElhone** inquired if any of the proposals gave a specific rate of return for a determinate time period. **Mrs. Kording** stated that they did and they did not. It is difficult to demand that the banks give a specific rate of return. They quoted what the rates would be if the fund was moved in that time period. The look-back period was beneficial from the two institutions that provided that information. **Mr. McElhone** inquired if all the deposits would be done electronically. **Mrs. Kording** stated that she is an old-school type of person and she would more than likely send the police to make the deposits. Both banks are in Shaler Township. **Mr. McElhone** inquired if there are any fees involved. **Mrs. Kording** stated that there were no analysis fees from WesBanco and First Commonwealth due to the volume of money that would be moved and the number of transactions that occur. **Mr. McElhone** stated, as you know, he is a trustee on the PLGIT Board and he was asking the questions in defense of PLGIT. PLGIT is severely handicapped by the type of investments they can make. They are more of a secure investment as opposed to a bank that will give you an outlandish interest rate for short period of time. PLGIT cannot give a fixed rate, such as 3 or 5%. It is based on what the market is. He was defending PLGIT from that standpoint, it is not that they do not want the business, they do want the business. The reason that they cannot offer the interest rate that First Commonwealth is offering is because of the market requirements. For the last two to three years, PLGIT has been working on permitted investments. **Mr. McElhone** stated that companies like PLGIT through PFM would be able to expand their investment options. They would be able to get into higher paying, other fields that are still very safe but pay a higher interest rate. If the Township is reviewing in a year down the road and PLGIT is able to acquire this type of investing they would be able to match First Commonwealth and other banks. There are restrictions on PLGIT that are not on banks and visa-versa. Banks can offer a better rate on a short-term basis. **Mr. Boyle** stated that depending on what happens in a year, the Township could review in 12 months. **Mr. McElhone** stated that he is speaking from the standpoint that Shaler Township is his fiduciary responsibility number one and all things being equal, PLGIT is his number two fiduciary responsibility. He is on the Board of Trustees and he does what he can for them. He was bringing the information to light so that they know what is being offered as there is a lot involved in the process. He has been a trustee since 2008 and he is still learning. **The motion was carried.**

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 7:24 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith L. Kording, Assistant Secretary

JLK:sm

MINUTES
SHALER TOWNSHIP
PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE MEETING
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2016

The meeting was called to order at approximately 6:32 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: Judith Kording, Director of Finance & Administration; David Shutter, Chairman, Board of Commissioners; Harlan Stone, Solicitor; Chief Bryan Kelly; Matthew Sebastian, Township Engineer; Sherry Martin, Administrative Assistant

Old Business:

Proposal from Gateway Engineers for Fall Run Park

The first item of business was a proposal from Gateway Engineers on Fall Run Park. **Mr. Sebastian**, Township Engineer explained that a review of the park was performed with Gateway Engineers. The report / proposal represents a raw, big picture view of the Fall Run Park potential project. Within the broad scope, there are multiple ways that the Township can move forward with the project that can shift the projected costs and ideally find ways to get to the lower end of the costs. There will be plenty of opportunity to narrow down the budget and seek grant funding opportunities. Mr. Sebastian introduced Mr. Justin Wagner from Gateway Engineers. **Mr. Wagner, Project Manager** thanked the Board for opportunity to work on Fall Run Park. Pictures of the damage to the bridges and stream were shown on the projector as Mr. Wagner reviewed the proposal. The bridges held up well over the years, some are 30 years old. One of the bridges toward the bottom of the stream was damaged by the high flow of water and trees slamming the bridges. This bridge would be a higher priority in the overall project. There are some bridges near the waterfalls that may not need replaced immediately if the Board would like to cut back on project costs. The stream is in pretty good condition but the banks are eroding in a number of locations, especially near the bottom of the park. There are two or three bridges that are completely wiped out as the stream over the last 20 to 30 years could not accommodate the additional water flows from development upstream. The banks have widened over this time period. The bridge abutments are suspended below the waterfalls. This is also the area where there is a landslide. There are three components of areas and issues that were reviewed, the bridges, the landslide and the steam bank repairs. Gateway Engineers uses as many natural materials from the surrounding landscape to restore the streambed, which allows for a cost savings. The location of the terrain makes hauling materials expensive and difficult. There will be two to three permits necessary from the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP). Gateway Engineers will recommend that a simple analysis of the 100-year storm / floodplain for the area. If the Township decides to invest in the bridge replacement, the bridge could be set above the 100-year storm / floodplain and it would be less likely to be damaged. The old abandoned terra cotta sewer would be implemented into the design but covered up so it does not detract from the beauty of the park.

Mrs. Kording inquired if the Township decided to move forward with all phases of the project, what would be the first phase Gateway would recommend. **Mr. Wagner** stated that he would recommend starting at the bottom of the part and going to the center of the park to the large falls where the majority of damage is located. **Mrs. Kording** inquired where the landslide abatement would fit in to the project. **Mr. Wagner** stated that the landslide repair could be done independently, either the first phase or second phase. This area would work well as an access area for the project. **Mrs. Fisher** inquired what the timeline is for the project if the Township were to approve all phases. **Mr. Wagner** stated that with permits from the DEP which could take up to six months, the project could start in the fall and the estimated total project would be 12 to 15 months. There would be no work performed during the winter months.

Mrs. Kording stated that the Township recently applied for a small grant through the Allegheny County Conservation District (ACCD) to help offset the project. **Mr. Wagner** explained that Gateway Engineers has been very successful in obtaining grant funds through the Growing Greener and the Department of Recreation and Conservation (DCR). There is no guarantee on receiving the grant, but they are typically in the hundred thousand range. **Mr. Skelley** inquired if the Township approves building new bridges can the bridges at the top be handicap accessible to the falls. **Mr. Wagner** stated that there are good possibilities to make some areas handicap accessible. He cannot guarantee that the entire trail would be handicap accessible. **Mr. Cross** inquired what would be the lifespan of the bridge construction. **Mr. Wagner** stated it could be a 30 to 50-year lifespan, maybe longer depending on maintenance. **Mr. Cross** inquired why would we build for a 100-year storm if the bridge lifespan is 50 years. **Mr. Wagner** explained that there is a one percent chance that the 100-year storm could occur every year. Shaler Township has had two already in recent years. **Mr. Wagner** explained that Gateway Engineers recommends if you are going to invest that kind of money into structures, that precautions are taken to protect that investment. **Mr. Cross** inquired if this is for the foundation of the bridge or the entire structure. **Mr. Wagner** explained that it is for the elevation of the bridge. The Township would not be paying more by designing for a 100-year storm, it is just lifting the bridge up in elevation so that the 100-year storm would pass underneath to prevent structure damage. **Mr. Sebastian** stated that management has been conversing internally about raising the bridges regardless whether it is to a 100-year storm or just arbitrarily raising them to give more clearance. He recommended that if we are raising the bridges, we may as well raise to the 100-year storm. **Mr. Skelley** inquired if we receive grant funding, which part would we receive first, the stream, the landslide or the bridges. **Mr. Wagner** stated that he did not know if there would be grant funding available for the landslide repair, it would be for the bridges and stream bank work. **Mrs. Mizgorski** commented that there are grants for accessibility. **Mr. Wagner** explained that the landslide repair would be independent of the rest of the project. He recommended that when doing the bridges, the stream bank also be repaired at the same time. **Mr. Skelley** inquired about project access. **Mr. Wagner** explained that the area suggested would make a good temporary access for the repair work and if the Township desired, it could be made a permanent access to the trail. **Mr. Sebastian** commented that Stoneridge Drive is right above where the falls are located and construction vehicles would be able to use this as an entrance for a construction access area for the project. The access road could be used as a temporary and/or permanent if desired but the Township would have to consider the grade of the road for permanent use. **Mr. Sebastian** stated that if the Board had any further questions while reviewing the proposal to please call. He indicated that Gateway included pictures in the back of the proposal of some of their work.

Mrs. Mizgorski moved, seconded by Mr. Skelley to continue to work with Gateway Engineers on seeking funding. The project will be incorporated into the 2017 budget. 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 6:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith L. Kording
Assistant Secretary

M I N U T E S
SHALER TOWNSHIP PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2016

The meeting was called to order at approximately 6:51 p.m. by Commissioner Bill Cross. He announced that the meeting was being taped and asked the Secretary to call the roll as follows:

PRESENT: Cross, Fisher, McElhone
ALSO PRESENT: Judith Kording, Director of Finance and Administration;
Harlan Stone, Solicitor; Chief Bryan Kelly; Lt. Sean Frank;
Sherry Martin, Administrative Assistant

New Business:

Possible approval of the Allegheny County Hazard Mitigation Plan

The first item of business was the possible approval of the Allegheny County Hazard Mitigation Plan. **Mrs. Kording** reported that the plan was sent to the drop box for Board review because of its size. Mr. Rogers reviewed the plan thoroughly and is recommending approval. Mrs. Kording recognized Lt. Sean Frank for any questions on the plan. **Lt. Frank** reported that the County has been working on the plan for the last year. The plan has to be promulgated every few years to be in compliance. The Township is required to have a plan in order to be recognized to receive funding for disasters. Allegheny County gives the option to approve their plan or to develop our own. The main document in the plan is 5,000 pages. Management and the Police Department recommend adoption of the County plan. The plan will be placed on onenote for the Board to review. **Mrs. Kording** inquired if there is a deadline for the adoption of the plan. **Lt. Frank** stated that it is ready for approval. Mrs. Martin went through the plan also and found items that were not included in the plan. The changes will be forwarded to the County for implementation. If there was a disaster before adoption of the plan, the Township would not be eligible for any federal funding. **Mr. Cross** stated that the Committee can recommend the plan to the full Board, the Board can then review the plan before full Board approval. **Mr. McElhone moved, seconded by Mrs. Fisher to recommend to the full Board of Commissioners that the Allegheny County Hazard Mitigation Plan be approved. The motion was carried.**

Possible approval of the Pennsylvania State Police Agreement and Resolution No. 5-16 for authorization.

The next item of business was the possible approval of the Pennsylvania State Police Agreement and Resolution No. 5-16. **Chief Kelly** explained that the agreement needs approved every two years and it allows the Shaler Township Police Department to enforce the speed on Route 28 from Ann Street to the Millvale exit. **Mr. McElhone moved, seconded by Mrs. Fisher to recommend to the full Board of Commissioners the approval Resolution No. 5-16 authorizing approval of the Pennsylvania State Police Agreement. The motion was carried.**

Possible approval of Resolution No. 6-16 endorsing the Shaler EMS Subscription Drive.

The next item of business was the possible approval of Resolution No. 6-16 endorsing the Shaler EMS Subscription Drive. **Mr. Boyle** stated that Mr. Johnson, Shaler EMS Director was unavailable for the meeting and explained that this is for the yearly subscription drive that provides the main revenue for the Shaler EMS. The subscription drive will be sent out the second week of March. **Mrs. Fisher moved, seconded by Mr. McElhone to recommend to**

the full Board of Commissioners the approval of Resolution No. 6-16 endorsing the Shaler EMS Subscription Drive. The motion was carried. Mr. Cross voted yes also.

Soliciting Issues

The next item on the agenda were soliciting issues. **Mrs. Kording** explained that vendors soliciting in the Township are required to obtain a permit from the Township Manager's office. They must meet certain criteria, background checks, driver's license and there is a fee to apply. There are some issues with vendors circumventing the process. There is a "No Soliciting" list that includes those residents that do not want soliciting at their home. The vendors are required to follow this list. The current list was just started for renewal in January. The Manager was of the opinion that in order to keep our "No Soliciting" list valid, it should be renewed every one to two years.

Mr. Cross stated that he had Verizon come to his door for the third time in the last six to nine months and each time they did not have a permit to solicit. When requested to produce their permit, they state that they do not have one, or they do not need one, or their manager had their permit. **Mrs. Martin** has reached out to Verizon to make them aware of the issues with the contractor. **Mr. Cross** stated that perhaps the Township needs to start citing them or not allowing them to continue soliciting. Based on the Township ordinance they can be given a warning, have their permit revoked or not be given a permit. The contractor for Verizon is not following the Township ordinance. **Mrs. Kording** inquired if there have been a lot of phone calls from residents complaining about solicitors. **Lt. Frank** stated that they do receive a lot of complaints regarding soliciting. Residents that call do not understand the process, sometimes they are not on the "No Soliciting" list. They receive a lot of calls from the elderly who are not aware that they are permitted to solicit until 9:00 p.m. **Mrs. Kording** suggested that the Township will educate the community on the new website. The information has been included in the InShaler Magazine and residents do not always read it. **Mrs. Kording** inquired if the police have much success in tracking down solicitors in these complaints. **Lt. Frank** stated that only when they call at the time the the incident occurs. A lot of time the complaint is days after the incident has happened. There have been permits pulled for vendors violating the ordinance in the past. **Mrs. Kording** stated that it is an education process for the public and if there is an issue they need to call the police immediately. **Mr. Cross** inquired how many complaints has the Township received and how many have been for Verizon. **Mrs. Martin** informed the Committee that there is no tracking of the complaints and there are times that a resident calls to complain and they do not know who it was that came to their door. **Lt. Frank** stated that unless the police are able to speak with the vendor to verify their identity, they do not know if they are in violation. **Mrs. Kording** stated that it is a difficult ordinance to enforce because of the laws. **Mr. Stone** stated that the Township could review the hours and limit the hours in the winter than they are in the summer based on daylight. You have to make sure that you are giving the solicitors an opportunity to reach people in the evening after people come home from work. **Mr. Boyle** stated that when the ordinance was amended the hours were reviewed and the Township amended the ordinance to include that there be no soliciting on the same holidays that Allegheny County adheres to. **Mrs. Mizgorski** inquired if the list prohibits children from selling candy and such. **Mr. Cross** stated that the ordinance allows those under 18 to solicit without a permit. This also includes charitable organizations. **Mr. Cross** was surprised that the Township was only keeping the "No Soliciting" list for two years. He would like to revisit the time frame for the list. **Mrs. Kording** stated that the Township sells "No Solicitation" stickers for \$1.00 and

she is not sure that everyone on the list has a sticker. The sticker is another reminder to the solicitor that they should skip the house. In reviewing the process, she recommended that residents must have a sticker posted. **Chief Kelly** suggested that the Township send stickers to all homes in the Township. **Mrs. Mizgorski** inquired if it is possible to require that residents must have a sticker and eliminate the list which places the responsibility on the homeowner. **Mrs. Fisher** inquired if the sticker could be placed on the website and the homeowner could then print it out. **Mr. Cross** stated that the only downside is that the solicitor is still going to each home before they see the sticker or they will knock on the door anyway with the excuse that they did not see the sticker. **Mr. Skelley** agreed with Chief Kelly to send the stickers out to all residents. **Chief Kelly** suggested that they be placed in the InShaler Magazine. **Mrs. Kording** stated that it is difficult educating the public as they do not all read the InShaler Magazine. **Mr. Stone** stated that he can review how long other municipalities keep their “No Soliciting” list. **Mr. Cross** requested that we wait for a response from Verizon and review how long other municipalities keep their list to be reviewed at the March Public Safety meeting.

COMMENTS:

There being no further business, the Chairman asked for a motion to adjourn. **Mr. McElhone moved, seconded by Mr. Skelley that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was carried.** The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:11 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith L. Kording, Assistant Secretary

TJR:sm