

ACHD Housing and Community Environment Program

Housing Advisory Committee

October 2, 2025

Meeting Minutes

1. Call to Order

Michelle Naccarati-Chapkis called the meeting to order at 11:02am.

2. Roll Call of Members Tim Murphy called roll.

Members Present: Michelle Naccarati-Chapkis, Jala Rucker, Megan Hammond, Charlise Smith, Bob Damewood, Devon Goetze,

Members Joined After Roll: David Onufer, Gale Schwartz

Members Absent: Sofia Bermeo, John Katz, Sonya Tilghman, Dr. Noble Maseru, Dwight Boddorf

ACHD Staff Present: Tim Murphy, Otis Pitts, Maryann Manown, John Cronin

Other Present: Larry Brooks, Alison Keating

3. Approval of August 7th Meeting Minutes

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis circled back at the end of the meeting to have the minutes approved after quorum was met. She asked if everyone had a chance to review the minutes. With yes responses she asked for a motion to approve the minutes.

Ms. Schwartz motioned, Ms. Goetze seconded.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis asked if there was any discussion needed regarding the August 7th meeting minutes before the vote. She said good afternoon to Mr. Onufer who had just joined and told him they are voting on the August meeting minutes.

All eight members present voted in favor. Motion carried.

4. Update from HCE

Mr. Murphy started off the update explaining that the program is undergoing a big software change for all enforcement activities. This project has been over a year in the making, went live August 11th, but it does come with an adjustment period. The staff have been, and still are, working hard on keeping up with complaints during this transition period. He continued by saying the program is starting to look at Article 9 for updates, though it is not under the committee's purview. That is the county regulation for pools and bathing place and that was last

updated in 2018, but just like Article 6 has been updated recently it is time to look at Article 9. Lastly, he gave an update on vector control, the season is just about finished but it has been busy with multiple West Nile positives. The program does mosquito sampling throughout the county and those samples are sent to the state. The state then gives a report on the samples which has showed multiple positives in the mosquito population, in addition to the three human positives in the county. A lot of press releases and social media posts have gone out regarding these situations. He went on to give some data regarding the busy vector control season starting with the aquatic habitats, the wetlands in the county are treated to help control populations of biting adult mosquitoes before they even take off. Over 3 million square feet were treated with larvicide. There were 7 night time adult control spray treatments throughout the county with high instances. The program collected a total of 239 different mosquito samples that were submitted to the state. The last West Nile positive mosquito was found on September 23rd and the first was July 8th. The traps that were deployed and collected consisted of 565 adult mosquito gravid traps and 45 host seeking traps, which collected over 40,000 adult mosquitoes that were sent to the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) lab this year. There were 522 pools throughout the county for mosquitoes. He mentioned ticks drags.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis asked for clarification of pools, whether that was private pools in yards or pools of water that have collected due to rain.

Mr. Murphy clarified by saying that would be any standing water.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis asked if that would be private property and public.

Mr. Murphy confirmed that it would be private property or public, anywhere there is mosquito activity. It is part of our enforcement activity to go on to private property where there may be a mosquito issue and a pond, water feature, or pool to test those as well.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis asked if the department got any complaints asking to check out specific locations.

Mr. Murphy stated that those complaints come in frequently. He did not have the number of complaints off hand, but the program does receive a large number of complaints about these issues on private property. When appropriate there will be follow up with the owner. He continued by getting back to the tick samples that are collected and also sent off for testing. The program collected 693 nymphal ticks sent to the DEP, over 1,200 total ticks collected for the year. Tick surveillance will continue into the fall and the colder months, but the mosquito activity at this point is basically ended. The program does not foresee any further adult treatments as once night temperatures get around 50-55 degrees the mosquito activity is practically done.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis had a question but encouraged others to chime in if they have questions as well. She asked about the tick samples that are sent to DEP if they then provide a report of the ticks carrying Lyme disease.

Mr. Murphy stated that yes, those results are provided but not quickly, the lab may have a turnaround of weeks at times as they are receiving samples from all over the state.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis asked if those result help in terms of hot spots across the region and identifying an area of larger concern such as in park systems.

Mr. Murphy said that parks are a good example and the program would do increased education and outreach in certain areas, work with park staff as has been done before. Where mosquito enforcement is robust to hold someone accountable for creating a problem with breeding sites, ticks just exist in the environment regardless so there is no enforcement. Therefore, the data would only be used for education and making the local residents aware of what diseases are present. The big reminder for the public is to wear bug spray, wear tall socks, check yourself and your pets for ticks.

Mr. Brooks asked if there is an abandoned property or absentee landlord where a mosquito breeding concern like a pool exists, does the program have the enforcement authority to conduct a summary abatement.

Mr. Murphy answered that the department has the authority to go on to the property, test the pool, and issue orders giving the landlord time to address it. If the landlord does not act a civil penalty can be issued. However, the committee recently approved a change to the Article 6 regulations that will allow the program to do abatement if it is warranted and the resources to do the work exist. That change has not taken affect yet, hopefully County Council will approve it soon and that will give that authority to remediate after the necessary warnings and time have passed. So, the program does hope to be able to do that in the future.

Mr. Brooks then asked if that was triggered by the program finding a lot of abandoned properties or absentee landlords that could not be contacted to correct the problem.

Mr. Murphy answered that there are a lot of cases where the owner is deceased or the owner cannot be found, a civil penalty will not have the same effect as with an owner that can be contacted. So, the department does want to have the ability to conduct abatement where an issue is going to affect a whole neighborhood. Yes, that is correct, those cases are often the ones with an absentee owner or abandoned property.

Mr. Murphy got back to updates by saying the vector control season is winding down, at this point the goal is ensuring grant obligations are met and preparing for the next grant cycle. He moved on by bringing up heating season being in effect as of the beginning of October and emphasizing no heat is an emergency condition. If a tenant has no heat in their unit they should call the health department to enter a complaint.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis asked what phone number people should call to report that so it can be added to the chat and members can take it back to their teams and help spread that message.

Mr. Murphy said the general intake number is 412-350-4046 and that is that same number to report any complaint related to this program, including mosquitoes, a broken toilet, no heat, rats, abandoned property. Please do encourage the people in your networks to call, the flyer that was shared when these meeting first started also has the information.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis asked Mr. Murphy to further explain the meaning of heating season as the committee is hearing it for the first time.

Mr. Murphy stated starting October 1st heat requirements are enforced for dwellings in Allegheny County. He said any tenants in the county deserve a functioning heating system that can keep the dwelling to a minimum of 68 degrees and asked Ms. Manown to confirm.

Ms. Manown stated that is correct, unless it is under 10 degrees outside.

Mr. Murphy said if it is under 10 degrees the minimum is 65, right.

Ms. Manown said she believed it was 63 degrees, it is harder to recall as it is rarely used.

Mr. Murphy continued by saying under normal circumstances starting October 1st all units need to be able to be heated to 68 degrees. The landlord will get an immediate call about the allegation with 24 hours to look into the situation and after that time an inspector will be following up with the tenant. If it has not been fixed an inspection will be conducted and the inspector will have a thermometer to take temperatures throughout the dwelling. Should temperatures be found under 68 degrees the landlord will be cited to remedy the situation. The inspector will check the heating system for venting or other issues.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis brought up in terms of owner-occupied spaces, particularly with all the recent flooding events, there are a lot of people struggling to repair or replace flood damaged heating systems. She asked if there are any recommendations for programs or resources to help particularly lower income communities with purchase and installation.

Mr. Murphy asked to clarify that she was asking about resources for homeowners.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis homeowners that are in areas that have been heavily damaged by flooding this summer and looking for options before the cold weather really kicks in. She heard from someone that had 5 feet of flood water in their home over the summer and were quoted \$9,000 to replace their damaged furnace since insurance would not cover it. That is a huge challenge and she was hoping to learn of any programs that might help.

Mr. Murphy stated he was unaware of any such assistance off the top of his head for homeowners.

Ms. Rucker spoke up that the Smart Comfort program can come out and replace any appliance whether it be a furnace, water heater, refrigerator, non-working stoves. The program can be accessed by homeowners through a referral from Duquesne Light.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis stated she is adding notes in the chat if anyone wants to grab the information on this resource now. Confirmed with Ms. Rucker that it is the Smart Comfort will replace appliances, referral must be through Duquesne Light.

Ms. Hammond getting back to tenant complaints about heating with relation to the subcommittee for displacement prevention wanted to brainstorm if there are community partnerships or what can be done when we get into really cold temperatures. Are there any referrals or existing community resources for tenants if the heat is not being repaired, if not that is what the committee is for. But what, if any, options are there for the tenants especially in such a time sensitive situation.

Mr. Murphy brought up a situation with a large complex last winter with heating issues. The City of Pittsburgh and Department of Human Services (DHS) came together for temporary relocation in hotels. The program did the enforcement and issued some penalties to the landlord since the heat was not restored fast enough. This program is not looking to displace anyone and will not say the occupant must vacate due to habitability. Instead the goal is to get the landlord moving in the right direction and change behavior through enforcement.

Ms. Hammond mentioned fire in Squirrel Hill being the most recent example of the worst possible outcome which is prevalent in our old housing stock with deferred maintenance and

extreme weather. Fires can increase over the winter due to using ovens for heat, using space heaters, and electrical issues. She wants to get ahead of the conversation about how to address preventing tenants from being in harm's way while not shutting down properties and how that is a difficult tight rope.

Mr. Murphy stated that it is and for the program no heat is taken very seriously, one of the biggest emergencies, and receives the largest fines.

Mr. Brooks mentioned a similar situation having to relocate 100 families due to no hot water. Not long after there was another situation with an absentee landlord, possibly overseas, where he was able to convince an elected official to pay for boiler and lien the property for the costs, which prevented the big nightmare of relocating more families. Would the program have that kind of ability?

Mr. Murphy said currently no, the program does not have the ability to directly remediate. On the other point, the program does often put a lien on properties where the owner does not pay penalties.

Mr. Brooks asked we would not try to fix the furnace.

Mr. Murphy stated DHS was able to relocate the tenants to temporary housing while the program continued enforcement with fines and the landlords did eventually fix the heat, allowing the tenants to return. This program does not have the ability to replace furnaces or anything of that nature, it is only the enforcement side.

Mr. Brooks asked how the cost of relocation would be recovered, whether billing or liens if landlord is slow to pay.

Mr. Murphy not sure how DHS did it or how it was paid for, but it was great to see. The program just played the role of enforcement.

Mr. Damewood thanked Mr. Brooks for bringing it up, it is a really important question that he is hoping to figure out a way to address. He asked him what municipality was willing to pay to replace the boiler in his story.

Mr. Brooks stated the first story he was Chief of Code Enforcement in Sacramento County and County Board of Supervisors was not willing to help so they did the relocation. Several months later he was in Yolo County working in the City of West Sacramento where City Council paid for the boiler. The relocation was for several weeks at a time, very expensive, and very uncomfortable situation for many of the tenants. They also had to assign security to the building as not all belongings could be moved and there was fear of theft.

Mr. Damewood believes it is a really important issue and there is no legal reason the county would not be able to do something similar, though there are logistical hurdles and policies to be created. But it is really important and he hopes it is something they can look at.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis thanked both for their input and asked Mr. Murphy if there was anything else he had to share.

Mr. Murphy asked the committee to consider and mull over gaps in terms of bed bug infestations particularly for elderly or disabled needing support. The program plays the role of enforcement on the landlord, get them to look at the whole building rather than just hitting singular units and properly address the problem. But these issues typically also require

significant action from the tenant to have successful Integrated Pest Management (IPM) and that is difficult or even impossible for these populations, especially without family or other support system. The program often comes across this problem and would love to find a solution. Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis thanked Mr. Murphy for bringing that up and mentioned similar concerns from Women for Healthy Environment (WHE). People often call looking for support, especially the older community. She also gets questions about the safest route to treat considering chemical exposure, need to treat but not wanting to add another issue.

Mr. Murphy stated we could do education, there is an updated brochure about bed bugs in the works. There is a lot of misinformation and shame, people may not want to come forward but it causes the problem to get worse.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis asked to confirm it can be brought home from a hotel stay.

Mr. Murphy stated yes, it is not tied to bad behavior.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis said it is not tied to cleanliness.

Mr. Murphy confirmed it is not a cleanliness or housekeeping issue like rats, roaches, or mice may be. We all have blood in our veins and that is what the bed bugs want. It is also not a matter of class, anybody could have them but there is still a lot of shame. He checked with Area Agency on Aging and non-profits and there just is not help for those vulnerable populations, it is a real gap.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis thanked Mr. Murphy for sharing and bringing attention to that gap that needs to be filled. It has been added to the chat so the committee can start having some conversations about that.

5. Update from Subcommittee Talks

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis started off the subcommittee follow up by saying Ms. Hammond and Mr. Damewood to give updates on their subcommittees. She addressed Mr. Brooks attending to follow up on Ms. Hammond's subcommittee and the National Center for Healthy Housing (NCHH) relationship. Ms. Hammond and team have been looking into rental licensing, exploring that and how it might look across the county. Mr. Brooks was introduced during the NCHH presentation at the August meeting where the committee voted to create a standing relationship. As part of that relationship NCHH would possibly do a pilot project with the county this fall to look at best practices in jurisdictions at county level and how that may help Allegheny County as the committee discusses rental units at the county level. Ms. Hammond will report on the subcommittee work, then Mr. Brooks can speak about the discussions NCHH has had on how to support Allegheny County in the coming months.

Mr. Hammond started with an overview working on brainstorming on collaborating across different levels of government that are all working towards the same goal, habitability in our residential housing. Allegheny County has a lot of boroughs, townships, and cities that work alongside county government towards similar goals. This can result in overlap, redundancy, or a lack of communication when all trying to do the same thing. The subcommittee is in the midst of identifying the status on rental inspection, maintenance, registration, or licensing in the over

100 localities in the county. There is a lot of variation, some may have passed compliance with the International Property Maintenance Code but there is no work being done on that, there may be no IPMC but rely on the health department, or they may have robust licensing or registration process with inspection and providing reports with pictures. She believes there is room for collaboration, particularly with her role in Fair Housing of identifying concerns that arise in habitability process especially when it comes to ensuring units are equitable and objectively suitable for different families. This should also recognize work already done by the county to consider fair housing and recognize at what age a child counts towards occupancy load to allow families time to adjust the living situation, if needed, rather than being quickly displaced such as after a birth. Different ways to intersect with how Fair Housing will come in to play with the inspection process while ensuring the nobody is in an unsafe situation. While on the subject, how can we interface with the housing authorities Housing Quality Standards (HQS) process for vouchers. How can we address redundancy and collaborate towards common goals. Ultimately, if the standard maintained is equivalent to the HQS, this could reduce the administrative process for voucher holders because all of the properties would already be meeting the standards set by the municipality. Many different ways to address habitability but the different governments are not interfacing to maximize limited resources we all have towards a seemingly impossible issue. A main barrier is the age of housing stock older than national average, deferred maintenance, need for capital improvement and owners blindsided with large bills for repair to meet baseline requirements. In Pittsburgh homes there is no predicting what could be uncovered when getting into spaces between walls or under floors and may lead to extensive list of repairs to comply with requirements. Still in the information gathering phase, what all localities' statuses are and working with health department on complaint process for residential habitability. Then look at how the county can engage with municipalities, boroughs, and cities to put resources together to tackle the problem. It is an ambitious goal.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis prompted questions for Ms. Hammond before moving on to Mr. Brooks and NCHH's opportunity to engage with the committee. Asked Mr. Brooks if they have discussed internally at NCHH how they may work with the committee to support the region.

Mr. Brooks thanked her for the question and said that they are moving ahead with investigating county level code enforcement models, examples and resources, starting this fall. They would like to hear more if the committee has more questions or types of information that they would like NCHH to look into. All code enforcement models not alike, he has seen multiple throughout the roles in his career and happy to see more models, be able to help, and do a thorough job. Complemented Mr. Murphy and staff for the work that is done and trying to educate the community, tenants, and landlord on IPM. Exciting to research and see what is out there, code enforcement has been called the Swiss army knife of municipal government, a lot to do with not a lot of resources to do it. Programs exist, because of the lack of resources, staff are not trained in IPM, mold, lead, or those may not be included in proactive inspection. Would like to hear any questions or requests to take back to the NCHH team along with the recording of the meeting. Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis asked Mr. Murphy if he anticipated any action items for the November meeting because it does not seem like there are any action items. So, for the November 6th

meeting from 11:00am-1:00pm, one half will be dedicated to one subcommittee and the other half to the other subcommittee. She asked Mr. Brooks to put that November 6th 11:00am-1:00pm meeting date on his calendar to bring any information that NCHH has been able to assess and evaluate by then. She mentioned to support the gathering and sharing information on the state of code enforcement across the region he could assign tasks to the committee to look at data locally to help NCHH.

Mr. Brooks said he would like that because they would like to present at the December 4th meeting with update but may have resources or questions before then. Met yesterday with National League of Cities (NLC) who is creating a website tool kit for different jurisdictions with templates for ordinances or amendments to save time in implementing new healthy homes activities. He suggested they expand to looking at counties as well, not just cities despite being a league of cities and they liked the idea. So, NCHH may be gathering information from there to share as well.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis thanked them for the update and said the subcommittee will move ahead with good thought and discussion. She then turns it over to Mr. Damewood for an update on his subcommittee.

Mr. Damewood said before he gets to that, he reached out to a colleague at the Pennsylvania utility law project during the meeting to ask for resources for emergency repair for heating. The answer was that a lot of utility companies have programs and the LIHEAP emergency services program and a link has been added to the chat. As far as a committee update, at the meeting quorum was not met, but it was discussed to have full committee meetings with dedicated subjects every other month. So, having specific topics having to do with the subject matter of each subcommittee, one hour of Urgent Repair/Non-Displacement and one hour Governmental Cooperation/Proactive Rental Inspection. Also inviting various stakeholders to present such as Change Lab, which researches and advocates for equitable policy to create healthy communities. He thanked Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis as she had volunteered to reach out to them. Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis stated she does need to do that email introduction and will put it on her to-do list.

Mr. Damewood stated that Ms. Hammond suggested inviting a landlord representative to give their experience with rental escrow. He said he reached out to Mr. Onufer to see if Realtors Association of Metropolitan Pittsburgh (RAMP) has any members willing to talk with the committee. He offered to reach out to Neighborhood Legal Services (NLS) for their experience with the county rental escrow program and to invite people from the Los Angeles (LA) rental escrow account program. To recap the subcommittee meeting he said Mr. Murphy gave a basic overview of the county's current rental escrow program. He will refer to his notes from that but Mr. Murphy is welcome to correct him on anything wrong or missed, or if he wishes to clarify anything. There are no local rules or guidelines for the escrow program other than state law. The program only covers residents in Pittsburgh, Duquesne, McKeesport, and Clairton, the cities within Allegheny County. Eligibility is based on inspector's finding of the unit to be unfit for human habitation, the criteria being laid out in Article 6 with some inspector discretion. He would like clarification at some point on the inspector discretion. The process is that a letter is

sent to the tenant after the determination is made informing them on their right to escrow with a flyer explaining the program. He said Ms. Manown shared that flyer and asked that it be shared with the full committee. He had asked Mr. Murphy if ACHD had any data on how often the program is used or what are the results. He said the answer was that Mr. Murphy was willing to gather that data but with the previously mentioned software transition that would not be possible right now but maybe in a month or two. He said Mr. Murphy mentioned the biggest drawback in his opinion is the six month timeframe to make repairs or forfeit rent. He believes a lot of the conditions making a unit unfit cannot wait six months, so it is too long of a timeframe to address serious health and safety matters. He referred to Mr. Murphy for anything that he would like to add.

Mr. Murphy said that explanation is pretty accurate, the department facilitates the state law through the program. The normal enforcement procedure operates a lot faster than six months, so while we facilitate it, usually our enforcement can get repairs accomplished within that six months and it becomes moot. He said being limited to certain jurisdictions by the state law is another drawback. In terms of numbers of cases, it would take some time to get the information and may not be possible at this time with the current software situation. But the department is committed to getting the committee the information.

Mr. Damewood thanked Mr. Murphy. He wanted to point out that the law originated in early 70s, before the Pennsylvania Supreme Court recognized the implied warrant of habitability in all lease agreements in the state. Under that supreme court case one remedy is the right to withhold rent, so in addition to the county program tenants do have an implied contractual right to withhold rent in the event of habitability issues. In his experience as a Legal Aid lawyer that is generally the approach used as opposed to the rent escrow program due to the drawbacks. He hopes to hear from a NLS attorney about their experience, why they would recommend one over the other, and what drawbacks exist for each. He concluded his subcommittee update opening the floor for questions.

Mr. Brooks referred to mention of LA systematic code enforcement, in their tool kit they do have the REAP program, the Rent Escrow Account Program. That has been more effective than telling tenants to withhold on their own, because one big drawback is often times tenants spend the withheld rent. This gives the landlord the upper hand in court during eviction when a judge asks where the withheld rent is being kept. With REAP the money is put somewhere it will not be spent, correct?

Mr. Damewood said that is correct and a related problem is that habitability does not always warrant 100% withheld, typically some rent is owed rather than complete forgiveness. It is hard to figure it out in advance and becomes tricky. But other drawbacks to the county escrow program exist such as if moving, even due to habitability, the money cannot be withdrawn but if done independently that money can be used for moving expenses. There are pros and cons to both and it would be worth diving into those to see if a local escrow policy can be crafted that makes more sense.

Mr. Brooks asked if REAP can use withheld rent to make repairs on the owner's behalf like in a receivership.

Mr. Damewood in an escrow program money can be withdrawn by the landlord or tenant to make repairs, though the process is not clear and it is difficult for tenant to make repairs. There are drawbacks but there is a repair and deduct remedy, but it can depend on the lease term, and how much of the rent can be used. It is difficult to get a contractor to agree to making repairs to property without owner as it can open both tenant and contractor up to liability. Theoretically it is possible but rarely if ever done in reality.

Mr. Brooks referred back to mention of Change Lab, they were on the Zoom call with him and the NLC yesterday and can help with introduction as well.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis thanked Mr. Brooks and continued by saying there are amazing resources across the country and good expertise that the committee can learn from. She asked if there was any further comments or questions from committee members.

Ms. Hammond had one point about repair and deduct and the role of escrow, there has been an increase in repairs needed to property in foreclosure. There is an added complexity when a property becomes bank owned or has another change of ownership during the escrow or repair process which may further delay or prolong mitigation of the living situation. Just another thing to think about as the committee seeks to create solutions.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis thanked Ms. Hammond for bringing that up and shedding light on how many challenges in terms of where the homeowner stands, foreclosure being an interesting one. Cannot recall anyone bringing that up for discussion previously.

Ms. Hammond if an owner knows the foreclosure is going through but a tenant files a complaint there is no financial incentive to put rent money into property for repairs. The property then goes to sheriff sale and becomes bank owned which greatly prolongs the repair process.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis said that is a very complicated situation for the tenant in that space. She asked if there is standard language in leases for tenants' rights in that situation.

Ms. Hammond stated in Pennsylvania unless it is documented in the lease that the tenant waives the right, the lease transfers to any new owner.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis asked if they are obligated for the term of the lease.

Ms. Hammond said yes, but getting repairs made, getting out of the lease, or putting money into the unit becomes even more complicated. She has been brainstorming what is the role of escrow and how to manage it, for instance if a tenant needs temporary housing in a hotel out of pocket, should the escrow be used for that. How can we have a robust program where the tenant is not spending the withheld rent but a fact-finding objective process about the state of the unit and where resources should or should not be going with oversight to protect the tenant from eviction.

Ms. Schwartz joined.

6. Next Full Meeting: Thursday December 4th, 2025 11:00am-1:00pm

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis addressed Mr. Onufer and Ms. Schwartz and directed them to check the chat for items that members thought important for everyone to have right away. She asked if anyone had anything else to share before ending the meeting.

Mr. Brooks to Mr. Murphy, he is working on resurrecting the code enforcement incentive grant in California. It existed about 20 years ago but was suddenly defunded and it never came back but it was about \$10 million for local jurisdictions to help provide resources like training, tools, and equipment. Many programs have responsibilities put on their back but not necessarily with additional resources to do the work. He asked if there is anything similar, a statewide grant program that the department could apply for and if not, please email some wish list items if there was some type of code enforcement incentive grant available in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Murphy stated he is not aware of any such program but it sounds great, he would like to connect offline when back from vacation.

Mr. Brooks stated he will send the legislation that established the original code enforcement incentive grant program. He will also send the Community Code Enforcement Pilot Program Grant to help pay code enforcement to work with non-profits and private sector organizations to improve housing within the community.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis said this is what committee meetings are all about information sharing, being productive, and getting stuff done. She said as a reminder the next meeting is November the 6th from 11:00am-1:00pm and the committee will be asked for agenda items, but she heard a couple already identified here today. If anyone has any thoughts or issues to be raised, please reach out to the committee so their points can be included in the agenda. She gave one last chance for anyone to speak before calling for a motion to adjourn.

7. Adjournment

Ms. Goetze moved to adjourn, Ms. Schwartz second. All present voted in favor. Meeting adjourned at 12:16pm.