

M I N U T E S
SHALER TOWNSHIP ENVIRONMENTAL & LAND USE COMMITTEE MEETING
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 2016

The meeting was called to order at approximately 7:37 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; Chief Kelly;
Sherry Martin, Administrative Assistant

New Business:

Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Review – Ms. Carolyn Yagle, Environmental Planning and Design (EPD)

The next item of business was a review of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (SALDO). **Mr. Rogers** explained that Allegheny County had some level of dismay that the Township has not had a SALDO since 1954. The Township hired EPD to work with the Township on this project and Ms. Yagle is in attendance to speak and answer any questions. The SALDO was sent to the Allegheny County Planning Department for their review.

Ms. Yagle worked with Township staff over the summer to work on key definitions and potential processes on the SALDO. They have put together a summary table of the preliminary application requirements and the final application requirements and includes three different types of applications which included a simple subdivision, minor subdivision and/or land development and major subdivision and/or land development. The ordinance itself includes definitions and each of the descriptions for the application. **Mr. Rogers** inquired if the SALDO is typical of what EPD has done for other municipalities. **Ms. Yagle** stated yes, the distinction of those applications are the first set of how information comes in and then the review of the preliminary and final application are the two primary steps. Someone can go for the preliminary and final application at the same time, it is a matter of time and review perspective. In each of these, it is a matter of being reviewed and insure that it has all of the requirements that would be identified for the minor subdivision and land development. If these requirements are submitted properly, the Township has the ability to identify in its initial checklist and if an application item is not included, it is not ready to move forward. These items would need to be fulfilled before it goes to the Planning Commission and the Board for approval. **Mr. Rogers** inquired if the SALDO is any more or less restrictive than other SALDO's. **Ms. Yagle** stated that it has a lot of comparability. One of the discussions that came up in the Planning Commission was the distinction of 'what is the square footage' for a development. When EPD and staff were looking at the overall site and once parking requirements are included, they came up with 7,000 square feet. This can be changed if the Board so desires. **Mr. Rogers** inquired if staff was forthcoming in providing EPD with the information needed to consider the development itself. **Ms. Yagle** stated yes, they had work sessions on a week by week basis where they could exchange comments before moving on to another process each week. Some of the changes that occurred for stormwater or state requirements are items that were reflected upon and there are separate ordinances that exist and where it was applicable these documents were being referenced. They reviewed Allegheny County's SALDO as many municipalities rely upon and there are certain components of that ordinance that have been reflected in the Township SALDO. The County will be doing some revisions to their SALDO in the next few years. **Mr. Rogers** inquired if there was any reason for the Township to review the County's recent proposed Act 167

(Stormwater Management Plan) and marry it into the SALDO. **Ms. Yagle** stated that they have referenced in the SALDO that it would be applicable to current regulations.

Mr. Stone commented that this SALDO will constitute an amendment to the current SALDO. **Ms. Yagle** stated that the Township would be replacing the ordinance with a significant update. **Mr. Stone's** concern was that there are different procedural requirements for adopting a new SALDO as opposed to amending an old one. It changes the advertising requirements. **Mr. Stone** wants to call the new SALDO an amendment and reference the fact that it will repeal all prior ordinances that exist therewith. This will also give credence that the Township has not been without a SALDO even though the County may have thought so.

Mr. Boyle inquired if the new SALDO is covering everything from the prior SALDO plus additional items. **Ms. Yagle and Mr. Stone** stated that was correct. **Mr. Stone** stated that he would place a paragraph in the new Ordinance that the old ordinance is being amended, replaced or repealed in its entirety. **Mr. Rogers** commented that this would be done as a precaution because he is not sure that the prior SALDO has been reviewed in detail. **Mr. Stone** stated that he reviewed it and for a 1954 ordinance it was not bad. It covered the basics. The 1954 SALDO is four pages long. The timeline for the introduction and passage of the new SALDO will remain the same, introduction is on October 11 and possible passage and a public hearing is scheduled on November 8. The County was sent the SALDO for review two weeks ago and their review will run concurrently with the Township's review and timeline. **Ms. Yagle** stated that depending on the nature of the comments between now and November and identifying if they are substantive in nature such as if a process is being changed or changing a classification, that might be substantive in nature. If the change is requesting that a document that is 24 x 36 instead of 30 x 42-inch paper, the Township would need to determine if that is substantive in nature or a matter of formatting the receipt of a product. They will need to go through the comments and identify these amendments for potential action. **Mr. Stone** commented that if the amendments are substantive, the Township may have to re-advertise for the public hearing, if they are non-substantive they will not have to re-advertise.

Mr. Boyle commended Ms. Yagle, Mr. Stone, Mr. Sebastian and Mr. Vita for their work on the SALDO.

Mr. Chris Chirdon, 133 E. Undercliff Street, Pittsburgh, PA 15223 inquired what a subdivision entails as he lives in the E. Littlewood Plan. **Mr. Rogers** stated that any development is a subdivision, anytime you take one lot and divide it into two, it is a simple subdivision. **Mr. Chirdon** inquired if the SALDO would capture a housing plan and the fact that they would need to place sidewalks in the plan. What type of situation would prevent someone from receiving a variance from the ordinance? **Mr. Stone** stated that if there was a hardship, it would be typical that the ordinance would allow a waiver, which is not a variance (which is a zoning concept). This must be submitted in writing for any hardship and if there is an alternative that addresses the issue in a less onerous way. **Mr. Rogers** stated that an example would be that if someone was developing on Mt. Royal Boulevard and as there are no sidewalks and there is not enough parking in the facility to provide a sidewalk, it would be considered a hardship. Residents may voice opposition to any hardship or waiver that is submitted.

Mr. Boyle moved, seconded by Mrs. Fisher to recommend to the full Board of Commissioners for introduction at the October 11 meeting the Subdivision and Land

Development Ordinance with the Planning Commission recommendations and to delete the approval by Resolution on the Signature Block on the plan. The motion was carried.

R-3 Zoning District Requirements

The first item of business was a discussion on the R-3 Zoning District Requirements. **Mr. Rogers** stated that Mr. Cross requested the item be placed on the agenda. **Mr. Cross** explained that he had concerns on properties that are one family homes and turned into two-family homes in R-3 Zoning Districts. A particular one in question, a resident took a ranch home that was a one-family home and installed a below level entryway. Mr. Cross thought there were requirements that prevent homes from having a bedroom below level without a window. After discussion with the Building Inspector, he informed Mr. Cross that this could be done under the current ordinance. **Mr. Rogers** stated that he finds it hard to believe that this was the intent of the ordinance. He requested Mr. Stone review the matter and submit an opinion if Mr. Cross was agreeable. **Mr. Stone** stated that this was a home that was built as a single family home in an R-3 Zoning District and allows for two-family dwellings. **Mr. Cross** stated that it was not permitted as a two-family home but the resident did get a permit for a two-family home. **Mr. Rogers** stated that on the street in question, there were side by side two-family homes. The residence in question did not build a side by side two-family home, he built a two-story ranch and converted it to an upper and lower level for two families. This would be abuse of the ordinance. **Mr. Stone** stated that it may go to the definition of duplex. **Mr. Rogers** stated that the Township cannot take the permit from the resident as a two-family home but they will need to correct for going forward. The issue is, does the ordinance clarify that stack apartments are prohibited as opposed to side by side. If the residence in question only has one door on either level, it would violate the ordinance as you must have two methods of ingress / egress and you must have window space. The Township will review the property in particular and have Mr. Stone review the ordinance in general as to the nature of a side by side home.

Gas Drilling Ordinance Review

The next item of business was a review of the Gas Drilling Ordinance. **Mr. Stone** stated that he had drafted the Oil and Gas Drilling Ordinance. The oil and gas industry development is slow right now but it is never a good idea not to have an ordinance for regulation because it would allow any operator to come in anytime and place a well on their property. **Mr. Boyle** stated that the board has reviewed the ordinance and he has several copies of the ordinance. He recommended that a schedule be established for review by the Planning Commission and for the Board of Commissioners. **Mr. Rogers** inquired if this could be scheduled after the SALDO is completed. **Mr. Stone** commented that one of the issues for the Gas Drilling Ordinance was what district it would be permitted. **Mr. Stone** stated that there is a tendency to place these types of industrial nature into the Industrial District but it is safer to be placed in an open area because the industrial area has storage, warehouses and gasoline. This could be dangerous. **Mr. Rogers** stated that the Board was to consider cemeteries for that reason. The Board may want to review an alternative to the industrial district. This will be placed for future scheduling.

Windmill Ordinance Review – Ordinance No. 1938

The next item of business was a review of Ordinance No. 1938 for Windmills. **Mr. Boyle** commented that the Board passed this Ordinance at the July 12 meeting and Mr. Stone stated that it would be amended as necessary. The minutes indicate that Mr. Cross requested that it be brought to the September Committee meeting for further discussion. Mr. Boyle stated that there have not been any further requests for windmills to have this discussion. He thought that if

we receive requests, it could then be placed up for further discussion if any amendments are needed. **Mr. Stone** agreed.

Vacant Properties Program – Allegheny County

The next item of business was a discussion on the Vacant Properties Program through Allegheny County. **Mr. Rogers** explained that there was a request from a potential property owner to consider adopting the Allegheny County Vacant Property Program. This requires the Board passing a resolution and gives the Board another tool for blighted properties. The request came from someone who is interested in developing property on Sharps Hill. Instead of the Township waiting for the School District to place property up for Sheriff's sale, this will assist the Township to place blighted and vacant properties back on the tax rolls. There are a number of municipalities that are members of this program, including Ross Township and McCandless Township. This would require a recommendation by the Committee to the Board to consider passing a resolution joining the Allegheny County Vacant Property Program. The program is for commercial and residential properties.

Mr. Boyle moved, seconded by Mrs. Fisher to recommend to the full Board of Commissioners passing a resolution to join the Allegheny County Vacant Properties Program. 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 8:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy J. Rogers
Manager

TJR:sm

M I N U T E S
SHALER TOWNSHIP
PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE MEETING
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 2016

The meeting was called to order at approximately 6:40 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 Rogers, Manager; Judith Kording, Director of Finance & Administration; Harlan Stone, Solicitor; Chief Bryan Kelly; Sherry Martin, Administrative Assistant

New Business:

Petition for change of use for Kiwanis Park Alcohol Permit

The first item of business was a petition presented to the Committee for the revoking of the alcohol permit at Kiwanis Park. **Mr. Leonard Colaizzi, 3009 Ponderosa Drive, Allison Park, PA**, asked the Committee “What were you thinking?” with children in the park. He was disappointed in the Board for their decision on allowing alcohol in the park, with educators on the Board and people that have kids, grandkids in the park, it did not make sense to him. Mr. Colaizzi told a story of being in North Park and coming upon someone who had a four-tap beer trailer and wanted to know if that was what we want in Kiwanis Park. He commented that it was too close quarters in Kiwanis Park to have alcohol in the park. The “No Alcohol in the Pool” sign on the Pool fence looks like the ghetto. **Mr. Rogers** stated that the purpose of the sign at the pool was because there was a problem at the pool and it was completely unrelated to the alcohol permits at the shelter. The problem developed because people were coming from outside the community with alcohol in a cooler and bringing it into the pool. The Township dealt with this issue by placing police officers on the weekends at the pool. This had nothing to do with the picnic shelter. The issue was with one individual and that individual is no longer welcome at the pool. The sign was there to protect the Township from potential liability and to make it very clear. It was not an issue of ghetto, a ghetto sign would have been on a piece of paper with a marker. It was a well-developed sign that made it very clear that it was unacceptable practice within the swimming pool. **Mr. Colaizzi** stated that it should be an unacceptable practice in the park. For 39 years there has not been alcohol permitted in the park. **Mr. Rogers** inquired what problem has it brought to the park. There has been 16 alcohol permits this past summer. When the petition was received, Mr. Rogers made an inquiry to the Pool Manager and to the Police Department if there had been any issues with the alcohol at the park. The answer was no, there has not been any issues with the people renting the shelter when there are alcohol permits. There is nothing wrong with having a picnic in the park and having a few beers. There are controls in place regarding the use of the facility. There were a number of requests from residents for having alcohol at their picnics. Mr. Rogers stated that Mr. Colaizzi is requesting to fix a problem that does not exist.

Mr. Colaizzi requested action from the Board. **Mrs. Mizgorski** stated that the Police Department has not reported any complaints or issues at the park. **Mr. Colaizzi** stated “Don’t you see the potential? He does not get it.” **Mrs. Mizgorski** commented that it is better that we

allow a permit for alcohol and know that a particular group will have alcohol in the shelter as opposed to someone sneaking it in. The Township then does not know it is there. **Mr. Rogers** stated that Mr. Colaizzi's assumption is that people rent the shelter are irresponsible and the Township has not had any evidence of that. Mr. Colaizzi is requesting the Committee fix a problem that does not exist. The shelter and park is a very heavily patrolled facility. The Board was willing to take on the cost of placing a full-time officer in the facility for four hours a day for one individual who did not live in the Township and bringing alcohol to the pool. The Township had a police officer at the pool for 8-weeks on Saturdays and Sundays because of one person. **Mrs. Fisher** commented that the alcohol permit was requested by residents in the Township.

Walk / Bike Shaler

The next item of business was the newly formed Walk / Bike Shaler organization. Mr. David Lampe, Mr. Joe McLaughlin and Mr. Chris Chardon were present. **Mr. Lampe, 2509 Oakwood Road, Pittsburgh, PA 15209** stated that their group started meeting in April focusing on membership and safety. They would like to work with the Board to promote cycling, walking and jogging in the Township. A long-term project they would like to work on is the trail connector between Shaler and Etna along Little Pine Creek Road once the connector is done between Etna and Millvale. This will provide cyclists who commute the use of a marked route out of Shaler. They have been speaking with groups in Ross and Millvale to organize bike rides which would involve large group rides between the Townships. Within their organization, they have trained cycling instructors and they are offering to provide safe cycling classes and bicycle maintenance which are geared towards adults. **Mrs. Fisher** commented that their organization could become involved in the Township's Bike Rodeo through the Police Department. **Mrs. Mizgorski** commented that she would like to see the classes being offered in winter and spring.

Mr. Rogers informed the organization that he met with PennDOT on moving the line striping on Mt. Royal Boulevard over toward the school. PennDOT is willing to move the fog line toward the school side of the Boulevard which would allow for a wider berth on the left side of the Boulevard on the southbound lane. The PennDOT representative asked why the cyclists just don't use the township streets. **Mr. Lampe** stated that you can use township streets from St. Bonaventure going south. In order to use township streets going north of St. Bonaventure, they would have to come onto Mt. Royal Boulevard at different locations. He also commented on the amount of foot traffic on Mt. Royal Boulevard. **Mr. Rogers** stated that PennDOT is willing to consider the moving of the fog line but only when they next pave Mt. Royal Boulevard because the center of the Boulevard there are rumble strip cuts.

Mr. Joe McLaughlin, 5024 Venice Road, Pittsburgh, PA 15209 had the title Bike Czar in Shaler and he is now a Trail Steward for the trail that connects to the Carnegie Science Center. He commented that there is a lot going on with the trails and cycling groups. The Millvale group has a substantial grant that they administer. Millvale has added sharrows to their streets with this grant. He stressed that there are connections between the different community and their groups. **Mr. Rogers** commented that the Township includes messages on cycling and safety on the Library's electronic sign and the InShaler magazine. The Township has been troubled by some of the roads that were picked to be used on the trail connector as they were hills that were narrow. **Mr. Rogers** inquired if their group is in support of the trail connector that connects from Millvale to Blawnox. This is a very serious commitment for the Board to consider as they are seeking a large amount of in-kind work. The proposal is that the group will build it, but the Township would need to maintain the trail. **Mr. McLaughlin** stated that their group is in

support of the trail connector. **Mr. Rogers** stated that there is no return on investment commercially for Shaler Township. The idea is to have the cyclists visit the businesses along the trail and this would not be the case in Shaler as it would be undeveloped property. If the Board takes on this type of commitment, it would take away from other projects of this nature.

Mr. Christopher Chirdon, 133 E. Undercliff Street, Pittsburgh, PA 15223 lives in Shaler and bikes to Oakland to work. **Mr. Chirdon** wanted to impress that their group wants to improve cycling, walking, jogging and street mobility safety for all residents. One of his goals is to improve existing structure, such as the safety crosswalk that was added at the intersection of Mt. Royal Boulevard and Kleber Road. He would like to improve signage and provide education to residents, as it is the law to 'share the road'. His long-term goal is to have Mt. Royal as a bike corridor. He would like to approach and encourage businesses to add sidewalks. He stated that Rep. Hal English liked the idea of extending the trail out Route 8 along the railroad line. **Mr. Rogers** stated that the Township proposed the abandoned portion of the rail line along through Shaler and Hampton Township for both transit and biking 15 years ago. **Mr. Rogers** stated that the railroad has no interest as they have a fiber optic network along the rail line right of way. **Mr. Cross** inquired if Shaler Township allows a bike lane, how do walkers, cyclists and joggers share the lane. **Mr. Chirdon** stated that he has seen travel lanes divided where cyclists use one side and walkers and joggers use the other side. North Park has a semi-divided lane. **Mrs. Mizgorski** commented that somehow it works as she has been on the trail going into the city.

Discussion on lights at Bauerstown Field

The first item of business was a presentation from Bauerstown Baseball Association. Nate Farree and Paul Sundo from BBSA and Jordan Pierce from Musco Lighting were in attendance. **Mr. Paul Sundo**, outgoing Vice President of Bauerstown Baseball Association (BBA) were there for the Board's consideration on allowing BBA to install lights on field #3. Mr. Sundo has been involved with BBA for over ten years. The organization feels they are falling behind other organizations that have lighting on their fields. This will create an opportunity for them to provide a better experience and more use of the field.

Mr. Jordan, Musco Lighting explained that they have done work on the City of Pittsburgh fields and have a standardized product to control the lighting by keeping it on the field and away from the neighboring residents. **Mr. Rogers** commented that he thinks field 2 or 3 has a significant waterline that passes through the field. This would need to be located before any work is done. This property is owned by the City of Pittsburgh. **Mr. Sundo** stated that it was granted to Bauerstown Baseball and Softball Association back in the 1950's. BBA is in the process of trying to find the charter for that. **Mr. Rogers** was not sure what the charter would be as typically this is done by a lease. The Township's first consideration would be for BBA to find out whose property is it for them to receive permission for lights. The Township has no record of a lease on this property. **Mr. Sundo** stated that they need the lease or charter in order to fill out the application for a license to have small games of chance at their fundraiser. **Mrs. Fisher** inquired if BBA have canvassed the neighborhood regarding the installation of lights on the field. **Mr. Sundo** stated that they have not done that as yet but do intend to speak to the residents. **Mr. Rogers** stated that the lights will impact residents on the three roads around the field, Koehler, Manhattan and Newland Streets. When BBA proposed lighting a few years ago, the Township received phone calls from the neighbors that they were not excited about this idea. The other issue is the sound system as they will be having evening games. **Mr. Sundo** explained that the field that they have chosen for lights is the most community friendly because of its

placement. **Mr. Skelley** inquired what their schedule would entail and how long the lights would be on. **Mr. Rogers** indicated the summer and fall schedule runs for seven months. Parking in the neighborhood could be an issue as the neighbors would assume that the streets are clear from baseball parking once the sun goes down and this would not be the case with lights on the field until 10:00 PM. **Mr. Sundo** feels it would not be an issue as it is only one field and parking has been added. **Mrs. Mizgorski** inquired how BBA would be paying for the lights. **Mr. Farree** stated that they would be fundraising and apply for the 'Baseball Tomorrow' grant. Musco Lighting has a 25-year maintenance with the installation. **Mrs. Mizgorski** inquired what would they do if City of Pittsburgh and PWSA have waterlines in the area of the installation. **Mr. Pierce** stated that they would explore other areas for the placement of the lights. The poles would be located outside the fence and they would be able to service except for the right field location. There is no routine maintenance only trouble shooting work. The electrical components are only 10 feet up on the pole and enclosed. This work can be done with a stepladder. If there are issues at the top of the pole, they would schedule a lift for that work. They will choose their locations carefully so that they are not tearing up the field if they need to bring a lift in for work.

Mr. Rogers inquired if they considered that they are spending money on property that BBA or the Township do not own. **Mr. Farree** stated that they have put monies into the complex and this would be no different. BBA tries to make the complex as nice as possible for the kids playing on the fields. **Mr. Rogers** stated that BBA currently has a loan from the Township for when the concession stand was built. This would be an addition to their debt and inquired if they are confident to carry this debt. **Mr. Farree** stated that they are exploring all options with grants and Bauerstown has had a very successful season. They try to put their funds back into the complex. Other area leagues all have fields with lights and BBA also needs to pursue this avenue. BBA has 400 kids and they need more field time to accommodate the teams. Their fields are not used by adults and they do not rent out the fields. They are used by groups within the organization such as travel teams.

Mr. Cross inquired what type of lights they are proposing to install. **Mr. Peirce** stated that the lighting technology is metal halide equipped with optical design and reflector inserts and shielding, which work together to direct the majority of the light produced onto the field --- out of the sky or neighboring residences. The controls are set up to schedule when they turn on and off automatically or change the schedule online. They will be reviewing the power and electrical system needed and BBA will be using their connections to bring in an electrician if needed.

Mrs. Fisher stated that the Committee would like BBA to have permission from the City of Pittsburgh, PWSA, find their charter, speaking to the neighbors and have a petition signed by the residents on the streets that are shown on the photo submitted which include the following streets; Koehler Street, Manhattan Street and Newland Street. Once they have these completed these requests, they can come back to the Parks and Recreation Committee.

Comments:

Mr. Rogers informed the Committee that he had a meeting with the pool consultants, KLH Engineer and Wade Associates. The Township will need to install a new heater, deck repairs and slide repairs. Wade Associates will be submitting an Executive Summary for the Board. Wade Associates was the same company that designed the pool and indicated that you cannot get slides like the one installed at Crawford and they strongly urged the Township to repair the slide.

There being no further business, the Chairman asked for a motion to adjourn. **Mrs. Mizgorski moved, seconded by Mr. Skelley that the meeting be adjourned at approximately 7:36 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy J. Rogers
Manager

TJR:sm

M I N U T E S
SHALER TOWNSHIP PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 2016

The meeting was called to order at approximately 6:35 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: Timothy Rogers, Manager, Harlan Stone, Solicitor; Chief Bryan Kelly; Sherry Martin, Administrative Assistant

New Business:

Building Code Effectiveness Grading – Insurance Services Office (ISO)

The first item of business was a report on the Building Code Effectiveness Grading through the Insurance Services Office. **Mr. Rogers** explained that every two years the Township is graded by ISO and their grading establishes the baseline for their property casualty insurance. The Township's code rating went down because the grading point comparison, which was comparable to the 2011 grading. The subtotals for the Township portion went up 8 points for commercial and 4 points for residential. The determination of the final score is based on other issues that are outside the control of the Township. In this case, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has not adopted the new 2015 Building Code and are still under the 2009 Building Code. As a result of the state not adopting the new 2015 Building Code, the cost of insurance will increase to all residents and commercial businesses. This is not just Shaler Township. The letter from ISO stated that the primary reason for the regression is 'mandated by a higher authority and not within the control of your jurisdiction'. It is not for the purpose of determining compliance with any state or local laws. When the state of Pennsylvania adopts a current building code, the Township can then ask ISO for a re-evaluation which they have told us they will consider and likely approve. The Township did get an ISO positive rate increase for internal purposes which is primarily education and the location of fire hydrants, but we have to wait for the State to adopt the new code. **Mr. McElhone** inquired if this was a legislative matter. **Mr. Rogers** stated yes.

Police Policy Manual Approval

The next item of business was the possible approval of the Police Policy Manual. **Mr. Rogers** stated that due to the diligent effort of Chief Kelly the police now have a Police Policy Manual. The Board has reviewed and made their recommendations for changes. Chief Kelly is always working with his management staff in his department to keep the policy manual up to date with changes that are promulgated by various agencies. Management is recommending approval of the amended Police Policy Manual.

Mrs. Fisher moved, seconded by Mr. McElhone to recommend to the full Board of Commissioners for the approval of the Police Policy Manual. The motion was carried.

COMMENTS: No comments

There being no further business, the Chairman asked for a motion to adjourn. **Mrs. Fisher moved, seconded by Mr. McElhone that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was carried.** The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy J. Rogers
Manager

TJR:sm

M I N U T E S
SHALER TOWNSHIP PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEETING
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 2016

The meeting was called to order at approximately 6:30 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, Harlan Stone, Solicitor; Judith Kording, Finance & Administration Director, Chief Bryan Kelly, Sherry Martin, Admin. Assistant

New Business:

Republic Services – 2017-2018 Option Years

The first item of business was the Republic Services Trash Contract Extension years 2017 and 2018. **Mr. Rogers** stated that this is for the two-year extension and the only change to the contract is the possibility of not being able to get rid of leaded glass. All the older TV's have leaded glass and the glass is melted down to remove the lead, the lead is placed in the ground in the event that it would be needed at a later date. There may be a point when this glass is not being accepted for disposal as it is toxic. This could create an additional fee for the disposal of older TV's. **Mrs. Mizgorski** inquired if there was any indication that this would take place during this two-year extension period. **Mr. Rogers** stated no, they do not know at this time. Management recommends the approval of the contract extension option years 2017 and 2018.

Mr. Boyle moved, seconded by Mr. Skelley to recommend to the full Board of Commissioners the contract extension option years 2017 and 2018 with Republic Services, dated January 13, 2014. The motion was carried. Mrs. Mizgorski voted yes also.

Comments:

Mr. Rogers commented that the paver is in the Township, where they started on Garden Place and will be moving to Hoffman Road tomorrow. **Mr. Boyle** inquired if this will include the paving of Butler Plank Road and does it need to be coordinated with the state. **Mr. Rogers** stated that this will be coordinated with the railroad for the work at Glenshaw Crossing. The state is still resolving the landslide on Butler Plank Road before they finish their portion of the paving.

There being no further business, the Chairman asked for a motion to adjourn. **Mr. Boyle moved, seconded by Mr. Skelley that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was carried.** The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy J. Rogers
Manager