

ACHD Housing and Community Environment Program

Housing Advisory Committee

December 11, 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, Dwight Boddorf, Charlise Smith, Robert Damewood, Jala Rucker, Devon Goetze, Sonya Tilghman, Gale Schwartz

Members Joined After Roll: Dr. Noble Maseru, John Katz

Members Absent: David Onufer, Megan Hammond, Sofia Bermeo

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

Other Present: Larry Brooks, Anna Plankey, Sarah Goodwin, Amanda Reddy, Kara Donehoo, 4 members of the public

3. **Approval of October 2nd Meeting Minutes**

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis asked for a motion to approve the minutes.

Mr. Boddorf motioned, Ms. Goetze seconded.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis asked for any discussion and hearing none facilitated the vote.

All 8 members present voted in favor. Motion carried

4. **Presentation from the National Center for Healthy Housing**

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis began to introduce the guests from the National Center for Healthy Housing.

Mr. Katz joined at 11:05am.

Ms. Goodwin began by saying they had a few things to share. After the August meeting they started investigating county level code enforcement at the committee's request but also hearing from other communities over the past couple years. They know of a lot of city and municipal level code enforcement but have been getting more questions from counties about their potential role in code enforcement. There was interest in examples of how it has been done in relation to housing quality, particularly where it comes to things like lead and other healthy

homes issues. This is less a presentation and more a collection of information that they wanted to share after the last couple of months. There are slides but mostly just for a visual. They started by building a list of counties with code enforcement programs for landscape. It is preliminary research as they have not had the chance to speak with the programs yet. Since the committee is interested in this topic as well, they wanted to pass on the information of what they are starting to uncover about potential examples. Would like to hear if any of the examples spark questions or interest related to what the committee has been talking about. This would be helpful for their next steps moving forward in deciding who to reach out to for more information about their programs, how they work, what they have learned, and how they integrate with other local governments. She also said Mr. Brooks would be sharing more of his experience from Alameda County and they have discussion questions to hear from the committee about their conversations and Allegheny County's needs. They have almost 40 examples so far of counties that have some involvement in code enforcement and that looks different in a lot of places. Some have proactive inspection programs, but most do not, but there is some sort of enforcement of housing codes at the county level. They did start to categorize the examples by proactive inspection programs, some programs are county wide, some programs consolidate city with county, and some only serve unincorporated areas of their county. From the publicly available information they have also looked at what kind of housing quality issues they are addressing. Whether they are doing interior inspections or only exterior, proactive or a complaint based model.

Dr. Maseru joined at 11:07am.

Ms. Goodwin shared her screen with examples of Proactive Rental Inspection, all look a little different. Montgomery County, Maryland has a unique radon requirement for testing in rental housing. Ms. Plankey may have information to share about Los Angeles (LA) County, California as she has worked with them. Arlington County, Virginia seems to operate on a mixed proactive and complaint based system. Denver, Colorado is a consolidated city-county and only does exterior inspections, but does seem to have a proactive process of going through neighborhoods on a regular basis to identify issues.

Ms. Plankey stated Montgomery County and LA County have popped up in other work. They have established contacts in these and some other areas. The city and county are separate in LA, so that is not a true county-wide system. They have worked with Montgomery on a codes related project. These would be easy connections to make if the committee is interested in learning more about their programs.

Ms. Goodwin continued sharing the next slide with areas that have their Policy & Procedure documents online though they are smaller than Allegheny. Deschutes County, Oregon and Rogers County, Oklahoma both are written to include opportunities for proactive inspection even if not currently being done. Deschutes has more detail and may sometimes do proactive but limited by area or issue. Rogers has policy written out on how they would do proactive if they ever had the resources.

The next slide is counties using the International Property Maintenance Code (IPMC) without proactive rental inspection. New Castle County, Delaware is primarily complaint based but does regular inspections for vacant units and neighborhood sweeps. Orange County, Florida and Macon-Bibb County (consolidated city-county), Georgia are complaint based but may have more rigorous standards.

The last slide of examples was other unique or interesting situations. First was Fairbanks North Star Borough, Alaska, where counties are called boroughs, does not have interior requirements. They do have an outdoor carbon monoxide monitoring program with requirements for how it is done and reported to the residents. There is also a voluntary woodstove replacement program though it is not regulatory but another avenue to potentially go into homes. Second, Prince William County, Virginia is complaint based but focused on blight with their blight spot program. Lastly, Marion County, Oregon where code enforcement part of Sheriff's department in unincorporated areas. Their website explains that code enforcement for them is complaint based not necessarily focused on interior housing quality.

There was then a slide of resources for other research on county-wide models, links were also shared in the chat. Included was a guide for small towns in Utah. She also mentioned Mecklenburg County, North Carolina which is a complaint based system and their documents online refers to a guide of small towns for their state as well. Again, this is preliminary findings but they wanted to share to see if it brings on more questions, ideas, or interest from the committee.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis thanked Ms. Goodwin and said surely it will take some time to digest what was provided but the links especially are great for the subcommittees. She asked if any of examples included counties with this local municipality structure that is somewhat challenging and different. Were the states approach on small towns the closest government structure they found somewhat similar to Allegheny County.

Ms. Goodwin said she shared that because she thought it would be of interest but needs to look into it more and talk to some locations. So far they have found no examples that are a 1:1 match with Allegheny County situation though that does not mean there are none. Across the counties there are different options, some have a relationship with the cities and some are just working in unincorporated areas.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis mentioned she is aware of one municipality in the county that uses their fire department for code enforcement.

Ms. Goodwin said they had encountered that before and referred to Ms. Reddy about their work with a city in New York that had code enforcement working out of their fire department as one time.

Ms. Reddy mentioned to make is more confusing some locations have split responsibility in that the fire department is responsible for part of the code and another entity other parts, which can result in residents having a not so good experience.

Mr. Damewood brought up a legal decision in a Pennsylvania Appellate Court striking down a municipal proactive rental inspection program due to violating tenants' rights under the state constitution equivalent to the 4th Amendment. The purpose was to identify code violations and potentially expose the violator, presumably the owner but possibly the tenant, to criminal liability or fines. Court held that the borough would need to show individualized suspicion of a violation rather than doing general sweep of all like properties, they must have probable cause. He asked if the guests aware of any other states that require this individualized suspicion of code violation rather than administrative warrant. Immediate answer not expected but if NCHH could give it some thought and consult with their legal department if they have one. It would be great to be able to continue pursuing proactive rental inspection despite this court decision. The link for the story was posted in the chat.

Ms. Reddy appreciated that information and the link so that they can learn more. This is why complaint based systems are used in many places. They are aware of other similar cases in New York state where it was determined compelling inspection of rental units constituted unwarranted search to the landlord. This disturbing trend is not talked about enough and they will be looking into it further, hopefully sharing some work around strategies for these blocks. They will get into preemption and other ways states make things like proactive inspections difficult to impossible.

Dr. Maseru asked Ms. Goodwin and Ms. Reddy if there were any revenue generation models other than general budget and fines. Also, is there any documentation on social and fiscal consequences of not inspecting properties.

Ms. Reddy said good questions, they will add that to the list of research on county-wide models. In terms of revenue, in addition to fines which can be very important, fees can be attached to inspection or certification are main alternative revenue seen in code enforcement programs.

Ms. Goodwin stated some of the examples that have been researched do have things like that in place and they can get more specifics.

Ms. Reddy said there is a whole separate conversation on the art form of how those fees are set to get compliance. There is some data about the impact of these policies being implemented in relation to specific issues but has major gaps. NCHH has been looking for funding to research and document health and economic benefits and unintended consequences, such as effects on affordability and availability of units. Huge need for more robust literature on the subject but no funding identified to support the work yet. The anecdotal information available can be shared with the caveat of significant data gaps.

Mr. Brooks referred to Mr. Damewood's question, he is aware of some case law in California about protecting privacy of tenants while allowing the government to protect their health and safety. He will touch on it during his presentation.

Mr. Damewood would love to see case citations.

Mr. Brooks continued by saying he can speak to the consequences and said this could be a good segue into his portion of the meeting.

Ms. Reddy referred to chat for the two other planned segments including Mr. Brooks describing Alameda County's program in more detail and she would like to hand it off but had one thing to say first. She referred to Mr. Damewood's question and said there is important case law about a tenant asserting their right invite inspectors into the property to assess conditions, even if the landlord does not want it. A tenant has a right to invite anyone they want into their home.

Mr. Damewood stated that has been recognized in Pennsylvania as well. The problem is the extreme power imbalance between landlords and tenants. Tenants know they may be evicted if they complain.

Ms. Reddy said they should look at the totality of what exists and that will help find a path forward. She then turned the floor over to Mr. Brooks.

Mr. Brooks is grateful for being allowed to participate in this discussion as an NCHH representative and apologized for his camera not working. He titled his talk as the tale of 3 California cities and a county. He is speaking of Alameda County across the bay from San Francisco and three of the largest cities Oakland, Berkley and Heyward. He mentioned how Ms. Goodwin spoke about the evolution of reactive to proactive inspection programs, such as moving from the Uniform Housing Code to the IPMC. How the programs are funded going from the general fund to charging an annual "per door" fee per rental unit. Alameda County went even further by charging an additional fee for pre-1978 properties due to lead hazards. He will give some history on these areas and provide links to their current programs to see how they have changed. He is focusing on these locations as he believes they are a representative sample of what motivates jurisdictions in California to implement reactive or proactive inspection program, for better or for worse. Berkley had a tragedy and Heyward had a pilot program taken to court by the rental housing industry. The unincorporated county had a reactive tenant complaint response program that was implemented due to a recent state law requiring all cities and counties to have at least a tenant response program. He thinks of the road the committee and Allegheny County are on and what challenges may arise. Berkley has a history of protests and liberalism, but recently the Berkley Landlord Association had a street brawl with tenants' rights' groups because of a big outdoor party across the street from the main entrance of California University (Cal U). At this party they were celebrating the defeat of tenant protection legislation. He has observed landlord resistance whenever the subject of rental inspection comes up. Which is no surprise as he has heard from rental housing associations that they are concerned about government overreach taking from their pocket causing the resistance. In Berkley some of that resistance was overcome and a proactive rental inspection program for multi-unit residential apartment buildings was established in 2001 after the death of a woman in an apartment due to the water heater venting being blocked by some roof repair work. More recently there was a case of balconies collapsing at a high-rise buildings where Cal U students were having a party. Unfortunately, sometimes the consequences of not doing anything is a

tragedy to get action. As of 2004 the City of Berkeley's Rental Housing Safety Program requires certification annually that units meet minimum safety standards, which is an evolution from multi-unit only. However, owners can self-certify, which a lot of areas in California do. Sacramento has mixture of self-inspection and government inspection. In the City of Hayward enacted a proactive rental inspection program in 1982 after responding to many complaints and recognizing a need to be more proactive. The Rental Association of Southern Alameda County gave a lot of push back and eventually to the city to court which ultimately reduced the proactive program in Hayward. Initially they were entering rentals with property managers even when occupants not home, there had to be modifications, but the program was still able to be established. That program has evolved to include proactive periodic inspections, which typically targets densely populated areas every 3-5 years as well as complaint response. The program is funded through an annual fee. That same Rental Housing Association convinced other city councils to vote down proposals for proactive rental inspection programs, particularly Fremont. As a result, there is recent legislation in Fremont, they did not want proactive inspection, but the code enforcement manager proposed the ordinance that gives code enforcement the ability to inspect neighboring units to a complaint. This is particularly for issues that may affect multiple units such as lead, mold, or pests. California Healthy Housing Coalition supported a law to require all jurisdictions to create a plan for inspecting neighboring units at code enforcement officer's discretion. In reference to another state law that recently passed, the unincorporated area of Alameda had no proactive or reactive inspection program due to the Rental Housing Association influence with elected officials. As a result, with the help California Association of Code Enforcement Officers and California Healthy Housing Coalition, they were able to get a bill passed in 2022 to require all cities and counties to at least respond to tenant complaints. This includes things like lead paint hazards and mold, which even code enforcement officers resisted responding to. Oakland experienced fatalities that sparked a rental inspect program pilot. But it was ended after the infamous Ghost Ship fire tragedy, which also played a role in the City of Oakland defeating state laws proposed to prevent another such tragedy. In the last year Oakland allowed a law to pass giving code enforcement officers and building inspectors the ability to inspect buildings for substandard housing conditions regardless of zoning if they are being used for human occupancy. A key defense in the lawsuits filed by families of the victims of the Ghost Ship fire was the City of Oakland arguing that they were not at fault in any way because the building was not in a residential zone. Though it came out later that the building had been inspected by code enforcement and fire a few times before the tragedy. Oakland has discussed implementing a proactive rental inspection program modeled after Rochester, New York. Code enforcement would inspect for and conduct lead wipe testing for lead paint hazards. As late as 2024 the city worked with consultants for recommendations on lead hazard abatement program, but there is still no report on those recommendations. The program would use lead paint settlement money from a lawsuit after a 20 year battle with paint companies because they sold lead paint long after they knew the harm that it could bring to children. They proposed using their portion of the settlement to help pilot a proactive rental inspection program. If they are successful, it would set them apart from all other cities in

Alameda County and make them one of only three jurisdictions in the state, besides Fresno and LA, to recently implement proactive inspections that are to include lead testing. Alameda County Healthy Homes and Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Department does collaborate with all the cities, not just in the county, but statewide. They provide technical assistance to code enforcement programs that are interested in addressing lead and have coordinated Environmental Protection Act (EPA) Renovation/Repair Lead Safe Work Practices training, certification for code enforcement officers all across the state. He closed by asking if there were any questions.

Mr. Katz logged off the meeting at 11:35am.

Mr. Damewood referred to the situation in Allegheny County with a county health department and local municipalities, many with their own code enforcement offices. He asked the NCHH guests if they are familiar with example with county wide rental licensing program with proactive rental inspection, as a condition for the license, working in tandem with local code enforcement offices.

Mr. Brooks said that Alameda County Healthy Homes Department receives some funding from the California Department of Public Health, as all counties in the state do. However, Alameda, San Bernadino, and LA are the only state funded programs he is aware of that work with code enforcement. All other public health departments in California claim that the state does not provide enough money for them to pay to do that coordination and partnership with building inspection and code enforcement.

Ms. Reddy said as a broader answer, that is part of the next steps for NCHH even before speaking with the committee, as the county wide concept has been coming up in multiple jurisdictions across the country. They wanted to learn more about places with county wide programs and really get into the details, so that sort of thing will be in the next phase of their research. She gave Ms. Goodwin and Ms. Plankey the chance to share anything else that they have already learned. In referring to Ms. Goodwin saying she wants to talk to certain agencies, that is exactly the kind of detail they are looking for. Part of why they wanted to talk to the committee today is to determine what other questions should be asked along the way.

Ms. Goodwin stated so far, she has not found a slam dunk option based on what is online but talking to them will give a better picture of the relationship between the county and municipalities, especially in larger counties where synchronicity may exist. There is no great answer yet but that is what they want to looking in to.

Dr. Maseru asked in terms of insurance companies and real estate, if they have a role in proactive rental inspections.

Mr. Brooks answered that they could, they have talked about incentives for even rental housing industry to partner with code enforcement. It was pitched to insurance companies if owners buy into code enforcement to at least audit some units, allow them to do self-certification with code enforcement auditing to keep them honest. If it is found they are not really self-certifying they

would be put into a routine inspection program for a period of time before being allowed back on the honor system. Could the insurance company give a discount on rates because they are being inspected and he has been working with the executive director of the East Bay Rental Housing Association on.

Ms. Reddy added one caveat she brings up whenever partnership with the insurance sector is talked about, in addition to the potential benefits and incentives, there may be unintended consequences of how insurers could use that data to create barriers or increase rates for insurance. These concerns are not theoretical, anecdotally it has been seen in other communities where they will systematically impose higher rates on black neighborhoods compared to white neighborhoods with similar housing quality. Any engagement with that sector has to be done carefully. The devastating tornadoes in St. Louis were made worse because many properties were uninsured due to affordable insurance being inaccessible. It is a great idea, not to rain on any parades but people need to be protected rather than creating an unintended problem.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis wanted to add another interesting layer to the conversation that may be unique to the region and Allegheny County is the "Councils of Government" (COGs). Not sure if the guests are familiar with them. She believes they are all identified as a 501c3 non-profit and they are facilitators for specific municipalities, each COG has a set of municipalities where they work and collaborate. They do things such as apply for and administer grants for the municipalities, utility billing in some instances, code enforcement has been provided, sewer maintenance, blight mitigations, and other things of the sort. In some areas with smaller municipalities that do not have the capacity for some of those services then the COG can be an administrator and facilitate that on their behalf. In sharing that, with code enforcement as an area of focus, COGs and municipalities generate fees for code enforcement with some revenue generation. As we are discussing these various levels of government, what would it look like on a broader scale while being able to maintain some of the revenue that those local municipalities and COGs rely on for their operations. Yet another complexity that may be specific to Allegheny County, the COGs work well within the county in serving that role for the municipalities. But something to be mindful of as it relates to revenue, the potential for loss, and how to maintain revenue at local level as a facilitator of what we are describing here.

Ms. Reddy said that was great context and another analog the for the team to look at to see if there is anything for other inspection programs in some states like Maine, which has a similar structure for health departments. In areas of the state that are not covered by health department, there are 501c3 sort of health departments, not governmental, that cover different parts of the state and run inspection programs. Not exactly the same thing but might be worth looking at.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis asked Ms. Reddy to get to the third aspect of the discussion.

Ms. Reddy in being mindful of the committee's time they could continue now or follow up in a different way.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis said to keep the momentum going with this crowd. The next item on the agenda is the County Health Department doing their report. We could probably go for another 15-20 minutes and still have sufficient time.

Ms. Reddy continued by saying they may not need that much time as the committee has already started answering some of the questions NCHH had. She reiterated what was presented today is just a preliminary scan of what other models exist, aside from the few they are already familiar with. The next phase is understanding more about how these different county models operate. What kind of housing they cover, the different ways to balance between municipalities that may have their own programs and unincorporated areas. How the systems and programs are built over time, how fees, funding, and revenue aspects are done. Just understanding some basic characteristics of the communities is helpful. Especially for the committee's purposes if any of the communities look like Allegheny County in terms of the housing stock, percentage of renters, municipal vs unincorporated areas, the types of issues they may be facing, whether they have proactive components or not, is it interior or exterior. NCHH already has a long wishlist of items they know they want to understand about these different county models. But they were interested in hearing from the committee as they start to explore the subject. What other questions are on the committee members' minds or would be helpful to committee if NCHH could come back with comparisons how other counties handle those same questions. She stated there have already some ideas shared and the team is taking notes. What has not been raised yet as the committee is thinking about options for putting something into place in Allegheny County. Share any other opportunities, potential barriers, or considerations.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis spoke up that it could depend on difference scenarios and what it could look like across a region. The issue of capacity comes along with that, so do some things get outsourced and what could that mean for the consistency across municipalities. Is there a component that has worked well within health departments and the different roles that they play. The big question is how it is funded to complete those roles depending on which scenario. From a budget perspective is it increased staff time in cost, is there training that is necessary. Some of those things would be interesting to have a better understanding of.

Ms. Reddy said when they previously met with the committee it was considered that there might need to be a phased approach as what the committee is considering is a big undertaking. She asked if that is still the mindset or if it is just a question if that is how other counties did it. How did other counties do it and do they regret it, do they wish they had gone bigger at first. She wanted to check in on where the thinking is as they document the stories.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis said the pros and cons of phased versus not is a good thing to understand. Where phased happened what were some of the lessons learned in terms of the success stories. Did the phasing give sufficient time to build out and have lessons learned each phase.

Ms. Reddy rephrased saying did it allow for the continuous progress or did it stall out because the first step was done and then they were not able to do more.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis continued by saying if there was a phased approach how did that phased approach come to fruition in terms of an analysis of who goes first and who goes last. Is that based on need, geography, health data that has been applied, complaints and evictions, all of those things that could come into play in terms of decision making. Also the age of housing stock, all kinds of things that could be looked at.

Mr. Damewood agreed with everything Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis said, but wanted to add capacity. What is the health department's capacity to staff up and conduct inspections, or to support municipalities with their own code enforcement to conduct inspections. That has to be considered when figuring out how a program like this gets rolled out.

Ms. Reddy said great point and added not just for more inspections themselves, more inspections means more violations. That is an added workload of moving those cases through the process as well. She asked for any other questions on people's minds as they think about designing a program.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis said she had one more before she needs to hop off, she had put a note in the chat with apologies that she has another meeting that she needs to get to. Ms. Goetze will be taking over as chair of the meeting. She had one more thing she wanted to say but lost her train of thought, it was in relation to Mr. Damewood's comment about capacity so she will stick around another minute to see if it comes back.

Ms. Reddy reiterated if anyone has thoughts after the meeting, please do not be shy about contacting the NCHH team. Even if it is a few weeks from now let them know because they may still be able to integrate it into the information gathering.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis remembered the unknown is what she wanted to talk about. Because there is different approaches throughout the 130 municipalities, when Cleveland launched their program, they identified 60,000 additional rental units that they were not aware of. That piece of the unknown could potentially exist here as well. She thanked NCHH and was glad she was present for this presentation and discussion. She was appreciative of their time and all the good work that they do.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis logged off to attend another meeting at 12:04pm.

Ms. Reddy asked if there were other thoughts coming to people's wishlist. They will come back with what they learned about these programs are structured in other places.

Mr. Damewood thought it would be helpful to have a distinction between rental licensing with proactive inspection, with passing an inspection as a condition of receiving a license versus proactive inspection for the purpose of identifying violations and issuing citations. Using the penalty system to address those problems that are identified, as opposed to just withholding the right to obtain a license and operate that property as a rental. It would be great to see the pros and cons of those two separate approaches.

Mr. Brooks referred to it as the certificate of occupancy hammer. He stated he put a link in the chat for the Heyward case law.

Mr. Damewood was thankful and said he had started to read it but stopped to pay attention.

Ms. Reddy said the meeting has been a great exchange of resources for them as well. She stated Ms. Goodwin had added all of their contact information in the chat again if other things come up. Please do not hesitate to reach out. Their next steps are continuing to learn more about some county wide models that have been identified in the initial scan. Especially with the holidays that may take 2-3 months to talk to all the communities and get that information. They will keep the committee updated as they get the information to see if another briefing is wanted. Whether that be verbal like this or a report format, which may take another month or so to get it all written out. They will proceed, it will be valuable to this committee, but they believe it will be valuable to other communities around the country as well. They will keep the committee updated on their timeline for what they are finding out and when it might make sense to circle back. She asked the committee if that sounded like a good next step.

Mr. Damewood said this is very helpful and again thanks the NCHH team for their work on this.

Ms. Reddy said it is a labor of love for them. They appreciate the committee going on the journey with them and helping them think of questions they might not have thought of on their own.

Ms. Goodwin said the staff at NCHH is always happy to have reason to look into code enforcement.

Ms. Reddy said they could talk about this all day, but they will let the committee have the rest of their meeting. She again stated please do not hesitate to be in touch if any other ideas come to them.

Ms. Goetze thanked the NCHH for their presentation. She was not sure if Ms. Naccarti-Chapkis asked, but will the slides be shared.

Ms. Reddy and Ms. Goodwin agreed that they could do that.

Ms. Goetze thought that would be really helpful as they walk through this journey.

The members and NCHH exchange thanks and well wishes as NCHH logged off.

5. Update from the Housing and Community Environment Program

Mr. Murphy confirmed with Ms. Goetze that he can begin and verified quorum. Nuisance abatement draft is going to county council next week, hopefully will vote to approve, then to the county executive's office for signature. The department is excited about it and thanks the committee for their help with that. The idea is to have this ability starting in the new year. The program has some internal work to draft new letters to be able to use this, basically getting the tools in place. The department will also be identifying some properties to start with. The program is hiring for a vector control inspector, currently the program's only open position.

Interviews are in progress but it is important to have them in place for vector season 2026. If the committee is interested he can ask the vector control specialist to join a meeting to give an update on the program, walk the committee through what he does, and what is planned for 2026. If that is helpful for the group that is something to start doing but also understands the desire to keep momentum going in the current direction. Let him know if the members are interested in hearing from any other staff or specific topics.

Dr. Maseru asked if vector control for Allegheny County is solely for commercial and business properties, not residential.

Mr. Murphy stated that it is actually the opposite, it is for unmaintained residential properties. The department gets complaints about properties with such issues as an unmaintained pool causing mosquito breeding problems or a tire pile in a neighborhood affecting neighbors. Nick Baldauf, our vector control specialist, manages the grant through the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP). He does everything from treating catch basins throughout the county every vector season to significantly reduce mosquito populations, especially in high population areas. He treats wetlands at the beginning of the thaw, something proactive that he does every year in the spring to reduce the mosquito population. The program does mosquito trapping all season and submitting those samples to the state. If we get data back that the county has West Nile positives we do respond with adult sprays. We can go door-to-door in certain neighborhoods making sure there is no standing water if there are West Nile positives.

Dr. Maseru asked if rodents are included in vector control.

Mr. Murphy stated rodents are a vector, but the grant is focused on mosquitoes and ticks and the related tracking data. But based on the code, inspectors will cite rodents regularly. Nick's work though is specifically focused on mosquitoes and ticks.

Ms. Rucker logged off the meeting at 12:13pm

Dr. Maseru asked if rodent control is then outside the scope of this committee or no.

Mr. Murphy said it is within the scope in that Article 6 does cover it and if the program sees a landlord with a rat or mouse issue in an apartment building they will be cited for that issue to make sure it gets addressed. So, it is within the scope, but it just is not part of the grant focused on mosquitoes and ticks. Our day to day work and general funds for code enforcement absolutely encompass rodent control as another aspect of the inspections.

Dr. Maseru asked to confirm if rodent control is more of a self-review in terms of businesses and restaurants, the county health department does not have inspection powers in that regard.

Mr. Murphy the department does under the Food Safety Program have that ability. They will absolutely cite for that, they do proactive inspections with their permitted facilities. That is a different program, but HCE will take complaints about rodents and will cite to make sure rodents are exterminated.

Dr. Maseru asked in terms of deconstruction of apartment buildings or commercial buildings, would there be a rodent control response before and after.

Mr. Murphy confirmed that Dr. Maseru is asking about a building being demolished. He stated neighbors may observe an uptick in rodents as a building is being demolished. Since the program is complaint-based if there is a report of rodents it will trigger an inspection and cite if a source is found. It is difficult to assess the source of a rodent issue, but if the rodents are entering a rental property the landlord is responsible for protecting the tenants from rodents. However, if it is a housekeeping issue or a neighbor is feeding animals and attracting rodents they can be cited.

Mr. Murphy returned to his update by reiterating if the committee would like to hear from the vector control specialist that can be set up for next year or a certain meeting, just let him know. He continued by saying the program is in the middle of the heating season, that is an emergency under Article 6 considered a class 1 issue. The program got complaints for 344 no heat situations last winter and this looks like it will be a busy season as well. A lot of no heat complaints are coming in and that is keeping the staff very busy. An update to Article 9 is in progress. This is one project the team is working on right now that is taking up a lot of capacity, as well as the transition to the new software system, Accela. The new software has been and continues to be an adjustment working out the kinks in terms of how letters are generated, how cases are managed, and how enforcement is conducted. Staff is still working with IT staff to finalize it and get the software to where it needs to be, it is a work in progress and probably will not be the last time he mentions it. While it is an ongoing project to transition to this new software the department wants to make sure things are running smoothly. As a final note he wanted to let the group know that Ms. Bermeo has resigned from the committee and the county executive's office is working on finding a replacement. So, right now the committee is down a member and Ms. Bermeo will not be on these calls. He concluded his update by giving the floor to Ms. Goetze.

6. Update from Subcommittees

Ms. Goetze asked Mr. Damewood and Ms. Hammond if they had updates.

Mr. Damewood stated Ms. Schwartz is actually the convener of their subcommittee. But he said in the last meeting Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis gave a great overview of interior environmental issues in Article 6. Essentially, she went through the sections of household environmental regulations. She identified areas that could potentially use improvements specifically around mold and radon. He thought it was very useful information. He apologized he did not take notes to share,

but he thought it was very educational presentation. He asked Ms. Schwartz if he missed anything.

Ms. Schwartz said he got it. She mentioned Ms. Hammond texted her earlier that she was not able to be at the meeting. She then wanted to revisit and possibly get an official vote on eliminating the subcommittees and having monthly meetings so that anybody could participate in the conversations. Then everybody on the committee would be welcome, if that needs to go to a formal vote. It seems silly that the committee has circled around the conversation but still have this exclusionary setup for the subcommittees. She called on Mr. Murphy and health department staff for what the committee would have to do to change this to be open to all members of the committee that want to participate.

Mr. Murphy said it would take a vote, but Ms. Rucker logged off so the meeting no longer has quorum. He was not sure if we could get Ms. Rucker back but the agenda also included a vote on the schedule for next year and vote on issues like this as well. This is something the committee would have to vote and without quorum those decisions cannot be made.

Mr. Damewood asked about the bylaws, he said often bylaws will say once quorum is met the board can continue to make decisions even if quorum is lost during the meeting. He asked if anyone had those handy.

Mr. Cronin stated he does not have the bylaws handy but does not recommend doing anything without a quorum.

Dr. Maseru thought they also should not make decisions without the chairwoman present.

Ms. Tilghman said the committee agreed to use Robert's Rules and that is not a Robert Rule.

7. Proposed 2026 Full Committee Meeting Schedule

•February 5th, April 2nd, June 4th, September 3rd, November 5th

8. Next Full Meeting: Thursday February 5th, 2026 11:00am-1:00pm (pending approval)

Mr. Damewood asked to add the issue to the agenda for the next meeting. He asked if the next meeting is not until February or if there will be another one.

Mr. Murphy stated that was correct, the department wanted to have a vote with everybody. In hindsight it should have been at the top of the meeting with the most attendance. As you see on the agenda these are the dates the department has proposed to the group, February 5th being the first one of the year. But without a quorum we cannot officially have a vote on this.

Mr. Damewood asked if no action is taken the existing policy is a meeting every month, but every other month is the working group meetings or is that just how it has happened.

Mr. Murphy said that is how it has been happening. What he proposed is to set a meeting for February 5th to get the full committee back together, vote for remainder of the dates then and answer Ms. Schwartz question about the subcommittee meetings. That conversation should happen with a full quorum present. If it works for everyone, he will talk to Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis and Ms. Goetze to plan a meeting for February 5th. Then at that meeting voting on the remainder of dates for the rest of the year.

Ms. Goetze said she thought that was fair and what Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis would agree to as well.

Ms. Schwartz recommended meeting on January 8th. We have had off cycle meetings as long as there is enough notice given, which seems to be the issue.

Ms. Goetze confirms with Ms. Schwartz that she is proposing to meet on January 8th to vote on the remaining schedule and fixing the subcommittees.

Mr. Damewood said unless the committee decides otherwise monthly meetings have been the default. Changing to February 5th would be an action of the committee without authority. If we do nothing we meet the first Thursday in January.

Mr. Murphy said not necessarily the meetings have been based on consensus and communication with Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis and Ms. Goetze. If everyone wants to meet in January the department could probably make that work.

Ms. Tilghman brought up that the official schedule is every other month as the default and that the first Thursday in January is New Years Day, so the committee could not meet that day.

Mr. Murphy stated he actually is not available to meet on January 8th.

Ms. Tilghman stated her understanding was that the meetings were every other month and if the timing remains the same she personally would not be able to make the meetings if they were every month.

Ms. Goetze responded that the every month proposal is to allow this type of meeting every other month, then the off months are for the subcommittees. So, she would not need to come every month.

Ms. Tilghman asked if the point is to have quorum at the subcommittee meetings so that decisions could be made.

Mr. Murphy stated no, the subcommittee meetings should not have quorum so nothing official would be voted on.

Ms. Tilghman asked so if quorum is met would that make it a different meeting.

Ms. Schwartz said the issue is that they were only able to have so many members participate in those meetings even if more wanted to because it would trigger quorum and then it was no longer a subcommittee. The compromise is to stop calling them subcommittees, meet every month with even months for general business, and the odd month meetings focus on the two areas of interest.

Ms. Tilghman confirmed one would then be a business meeting and the other a working meeting.

Mr. Murphy reiterated Ms. Schwartz point is what is the point of subcommittee meetings if these are conversations and topics we want to cover with everyone or give everyone the chance to be involved.

Ms. Tilghman said it was the continued use of the word subcommittee that was confusing.

Mr. Murphy stated that if they are advertised as a subcommittee meeting, that is what they need to be and cannot turn into a full committee meeting. He proposed scheduling a special meeting for January or February, whatever the committee prefers to cover this and conduct voting on the 2026 schedule and decide the future of the subcommittees. The original proposed date was February 5th but if the committee wants to meet sooner than that what dates work for everyone.

Ms. Goetze asked Mr. Murphy if he could do January 15th.

Mr. Murphy stated that he could but wanted to check with Mr. Pitts and Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis and get back to her.

Ms. Goetze said she also wanted to check with Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis. We will do a special meeting to talk about this so that it does not interfere with any other action items for February 5th. She asked if that worked for everyone.

All members of the committee present agreed.

Ms. Goetze said she will speak with Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis how the meeting concluded and see everyone in the new year.

9. Adjournment

No motion to adjourn without quorum.

Mr. Murphy adjourned the meeting at 12:29pm with well wishes for the holidays all around.