

# **ACHD Housing and Community Environment Program**

## **Housing Advisory Committee**

August 7, 2025

### **Meeting Minutes**

#### **1. Call to Order**

Michelle Nacarati-Chapkis called the meeting to order at 11:10am.

#### **2. Roll Call of Members** Tim Murphy called roll.

**Members Present:** Michelle Naccarati-Chapkis, Gale Schwartz, Dr. Noble Maseru, Bob Damewood, Sofia Bermeo, Megan Hammond, Jala Rucker, Charlise Smith, Dwight Boddorf, David Onufer

**Members Joined After Roll:** Devon Goetze

**Members Absent:** John Katz, Sonya Tilghman

**ACHD Staff Present:** Tim Murphy, Otis Pitts, Maryann Manown, Elizabeth Rubenstein

**Other Present:** Larry Brooks, Amanda Reddy, Sarah Goodwin, Anna Plankey, Cassidy Coutant, Jennifer Saks, one member of the press

#### **3. Approval of June 5<sup>th</sup> and July 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting Minutes**

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis kicked off the meeting by asking if anyone had questions about the minutes before she called for a motion to accept. Hearing none she asked for a motion.

Dr. Maseru motioned to accept the meeting minutes as written, Mr. Boddorf seconded the motion.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis asked if there was any discussion and hearing none facilitated a vote. All 10 members present voted in favor.

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

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis introduced the National Center for Healthy Housing (NCHH). She introduced Ms. Reddy and asked her to further introduce her team.

Ms. Reddy introduced herself as executive director, Ms. Goodwin as policy and advocacy manager, Ms. Plankey as their analyst, and Mr. Brooks as a new addition to their team with a lot of experience. She continued by saying they appreciate being included in today's conversation and excited to chat. Equitable code enforcement is a powerful tool in protecting health, something they know and care deeply about but always love learning more. She had prepared some slides for the presentation but to help guide the conversation asked what prompted the committee to reach out at this time.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis explained the committee is newly formed, tasked with focusing on Article 6, the housing and community environment section of the county public health code. We have a

unique structure in Allegheny County with 130 municipalities, many with different approaches. Learning how rental housing, inspections, and code enforcement is addressed is an interest area of the committee. The committee would like to get a good sense from the national level how other government bodies address this with various municipalities under one government system. The committee wants to hear what they see and how we can learn from them. Allegheny County Health Department has jurisdiction but currently takes a reactive approach by responding to complaints. She went on to explain the proposed nuisance abatement addition to the code.

Mr. Brooks shared a link to an article about the draft in the chat and asked if that was what she was referring to.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis confirmed that is what she was referring to.

Mr. Murphy chimed in that he was excited to hear about best practices and what other jurisdictions are doing. The program is always looking to update and improve.

Mr. Damewood thanked the guests for agreeing to present. He stated the issue is how to implement rental registry or licensing program while jurisdictions within also have their own code enforcement and registry or licensing.

Ms. Hammond spoke that she is also interested best practices of county relations with local municipalities, if they have adopted an inspection program whether or not it is being used. She cited the City of Pittsburgh registry that is currently paused under an injunction and litigation. She also wanted to point out that housing in Allegheny County is extremely old, older than national average. A big issue is how to get past the initial hurdle of age and delayed repairs feeling insurmountable to get up and running.

Dr. Maseru brought up that HUD is no longer providing funds for healthy homes, particularly when it comes to lead mitigation. He asked if the guests could provide examples for funding for lead and healthy homes.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis asked if anyone else had something to add. With no response she addressed Ms. Reddy that hopefully the responses give them an idea of what the committee is facing.

Ms. Reddy proposed a quick overview of code enforcement and best practices for being proactive. Then get more in depth with what role the county can play in all this by going over some different models, how they have been implemented, and where the money can come from. She will call on her team as needed or they can chime in at will. She decided to only share one slide to set the stage from the national perspective on best practices for rental inspections, and just talk about things starting there. She began by saying proactive rental inspection is a powerful opportunity to improve housing and introduce more equity. Traditional complaint based systems can promote disparities due to unevenness in enforcement discouraging vulnerable populations from accessing the services. The model is developed by NCHH in cooperation with many contributors and contains 10 components for framework of proactive rental inspections. Shared slide and stated there are 8 components here, the other two are the ordinances and the enforcement. When communities go to them for guidance they frequently need help with text of the ordinance or improving weak enforcement mechanisms that are not

getting results. Each part is needed to make the whole system work effectively and equitably, so we will touch on each one before addressing specific questions.

First box on the slide said “Strong Housing Code” and she explained by saying codes especially if adopting a code like International Property Maintenance (IPM), there may be ambiguous language that can but subject to interpretation. Sometimes those codes are inadequate at addressing specific health related threats such as certain pests, pesticides, radon, lead, etc. There can be an unevenness between jurisdictions, giving the county the opportunity to standardize and strengthen protections for residents. She talked about the National Healthy Housing Standard (NHHS), which takes a public health perspective to housing and provides a set of model codes. They shared the Code Comparison tool, referred to as the TurboTax for housing codes, that takes jurisdictions question by question to compare their code to NHHS and IPM, provide a report where they are strong and where they could improve, and suggest codes to consider for improvement. This process lead to Tukwila, WA adopting NHHS. The tool can be used in a modular way to address specific concerns as Dallas, TX did for indoor air quality, but it also lead to them implementing proactive rental inspection.

The second box on the slide said “Adequate Funding”, which she explained is required for these programs to be effectively implemented. There are generic models where the program is funded through general funds, permit and licensing fees, fines or penalties from enforcement action, and Community Development Block Grants (CDBG). There are also other resources like the HUD funding previously mentioned and some other models for how communities finance this work. In a lot of communities CDBG is largely untapped, links were added to the chat to provide guidance on how those funds could be accessed.

The third box on the slide said “Trained Officers”, and she began by saying it seemed obvious that officers should be trained on applicable laws whether federal, state, or local. However, they do not want to stop there, train them on laws, and also best practices, soft skills, translation, relocation, additional help, and resources. Furthermore, train all staff in the program, not just officers, this way they can work cooperatively with owners and tenants. Training also helps everyone to understand their roles and creates a uniform experience. Some links were added to the chat to provide some resources including key elements of a comprehensive training program.

The fourth box on the slide said “Community Partners”, which can be really helpful in messaging and education with landlords and tenants. Services and supports they may provide can be really important.

The fifth box on the slide said “Cross-Agency Collaboration”, which can result in better coordination and improved capacity of the system. Without this piece the system can feel fractured and confusing for the public, may lead to duplication of efforts, or things could fall through cracks. Referenced Erie County where municipal code enforcement was overburdened, particularly with taking on lead regulation. The solution was the City of Buffalo, NY deputized the county inspector to enforce municipal housing codes. Municipalities were less burdened, county officials got their lead poisoning prevention, and the public had a more complete and unified experience, all benefitted.

The sixth box on the slide said “Cooperative Compliance” challenges us versus them dynamic. This allows everybody in the process to be equipped and supported, code enforcement can hand off tenants and owners to resources that can give them the information and tools they need to do their part. This makes it easy for each party to do the right thing and less need for enforcement.

The seventh box on the slide said “Supplementary Programs”, which can be run by a partner or jurisdiction. Provides wrap around services as part of the inspection and enforcement process such as: educational programs, subsidized repairs, relocation assistance, translation services, help with domestic violence situations or food insecurity, etc. This is able to get people out of crisis mode and be able to work with code enforcement. These programs are really important to improving housing quality.

The eighth box on the slide said “Evaluation”, helps to understand where the program stands. It is important to regularly collect and analyze data to find strengths and weaknesses. Monitoring functions of a program not only ensures equity, but also helps to justify requests for additional resources, like more funding. Evaluation also provides accountability.

All of this is part of a functioning system. But this does not have to be done all at once, it is possible to pick one component and start slowly building up to become key building blocks. Even if it starts out imperfect it will have an immediate impact to make code enforcement better.

She moved on to what they at the national level, which is in the past couple of years there has been a lot of interest across the country from counties looking to unify functions when it comes to code enforcement.

Dr. Maseru asked for contrast or obstacles with the city model as well as the county.

Ms. Reddy stated it is NCHH’s wishlist to do a deep dive into county-wide models. Offered to take questions after this meeting for them to address as they deep dive and report back their findings. She will point out some concerns or challenges between city and county lead models.

Ms. Hammond asked if there had been anything about federally funded housing providers, both private and housing authorities. They were previously inspected under react, now inspire, and if that been part of the collaboration regarding habitability. How might the county or local inspection agency work with those federal inspections.

Ms. Reddy started off by saying the NCHH perspective is that there has been unevenness in how municipalities interact with the federally funded housing, particularly with housing authorities. Whether implicitly or explicitly some have been exempted from proactive rental inspection because they are covered under HUD inspections. Some communities have decided it is best to work with the HUD inspectors, if possible, to ensure nobody falls through cracks. She referenced a lawsuit in Annapolis, MD where proactive inspection was implemented, but it assumed public housing authority was doing their own inspections and correcting violations. The suit alleges discrimination for low income housing because the plaintiffs were not covered in the same way as other residents. It is important to make sure there is even application and equal protection under the law.

Mr. Brooks referenced Alameda County in Oakland, CA where the Healthy Homes Department took a mediator role between housing authorities or property owners and tenants. He believed there are real opportunities when you get creative when trying to achieve goals.

Ms. Reddy shared multiple locations looking into countywide models, and included some links in the chat. She recently found a Pennsylvania local government commission report on property maintenance code enforcement that addresses intergovernmental agreements. About ¾ of respondents in the study had not considered countywide or multi-municipality agreements. However, 11% said they are interested and another 46% said they might be interested in an agreement. This really gives an idea of what some of the perceived advantages and disadvantages may be. There are concerns about unevenness particularly between attention on urban and rural areas or smaller communities. The smaller communities often have a higher cost burden of running their own program and may benefit from a multi-municipality or countywide agreement. In New York there are multiple countywide functions where communities opt in to the system. It can be confusing when some communities opt in or out, but it can be easier to start-up a program with smaller area at first. Hopefully as the program is successful more communities would opt in over time. There are hybrid options such as deputizing inspectors as in Erie, multi-municipality agreements. There could be a limited inspection requirement, such as where fire inspections were passed off to the county to allow the municipality more bandwidth to do everything else. Another function sometimes seen is the implementation of countywide housing courts.

Mr. Brooks spoke a little about his background which brought us to a lawsuit in Sacramento, CA brought by tenants in an advocacy group because there was no complaint response program. He spoke on learning about lead hazards versus normal peeling paint. As Alameda County began lead work it was hard to get things done because they had no authority. Their planning department got things in order and made some ordinance changes to allow them the authority. Funding is often the issue with the proactive approach. Now in Kansas City there was a referendum voted on to establish an annual fee on all pre-1978 housing to fund lead poisoning prevention. Alameda also has a fee of \$10 per unit in pre-1978 housing but their funding also came from settlements after suing paint companies. Proactive rental inspection will be implemented with communities of concern being determined by age of housing, childhood lead poisoning rates and other factors. He added some things to the chat about developing cooperative compliance models as were adopted in California Code Enforcement Officers Association. He stated there seems to be more and more desire to get away from traditional code enforcement in favor of ideas from the cooperative compliance model.

Noon

Ms. Reddy returned to the conversation about tensions between municipal and county level programs. The county level can provide uniformity, fill in gaps in services or where there are no inspection services. She stated there is no one right way these things, it all depends on goals, capacity, resources, and the political will. Referenced Dr. Maseru's question and asked if the committee had any further questions or comments based on the information shared so far.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis asked about deep dive that was mentioned and what that looks like to get a better picture of opportunity to collaborate.

Ms. Reddy stated they are currently trying to define what it will look like right now, so hearing from the committee might help with that. They will be looking at counties that already did the work to put a countywide system in place and documenting the range of approaches. They will continue by documenting what has worked or what didn't. More counties are asking these questions, hopefully more will continue to ask, and they want to be prepared with this information.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis said the committee could work with NCHH to look at other models and compile what works and that could help identify what may apply in Allegheny County.

Ms. Reddy believed that made sense and reminded her of how the Pittsburgh ordinance was created. That really helps in understanding the needs, concerns, and hopes of the people interested in creating the program. She pointed out that she can see there were messages but cannot get to the chat so if there are questions either her team can address them or they can be asked to her directly

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis refers to some of the messages in the chat. She shared that Mr. Brooks asked what the legal grounds were for litigation in the Pittsburgh proactive rental inspection program. She went on to read that Mr. Damewood explained that the allegations were the inspection fee exceeds the cost of the program and therefore an illegal tax and that the program exceeds the legal authority under a PA home rule restriction. She continued by saying Mr. Brooks stated some other cities have faced similar challenges.

Ms. Reddy stated that legal challenges and pushback are completely normal. Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis stated here it is different because the conversation is happening within the health department.

Ms. Reddy explained this is another reason to start with one piece at a time rather than trying to do all components at once. If the foundation is strong with good supports in place it can mitigate some concerns from landlords and residents.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis gave an example of things that are already happening in Allegheny County for the NCHH, the Turtle Creek Valley Council of Government (COG). She believed there are 7 COGs in the county, they help facilitate resources and needs in their group of municipalities. She mentioned a tool called Code Enforce that they utilize, it is database of all their code enforcement business. She addressed Mr. Brooks that she would like to tap his expertise to get his feedback on this particular tool as there has been a huge investment in the tool.

Ms. Reddy answered for Mr. Brooks that they would be happy to look at anything we want feedback on and said that was really helpful context. She referenced Broome County, NY where they considered a sub-county regional hub model. Having collections of towns rather than everything at the county level, allows some consolidated functions. If that infrastructure exists that could be an option Allegheny.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis asked if committee members had any questions or comments based on what they have heard so far.

Ms. Hammond was thinking of a system that differentiates between habitability inspections on a regular schedule, connected to an occupancy permit and a mechanism for responding to complaints. Her idea is for the county to maintain the complaint system but also collaborate with localities to do routine inspections. There would need to be a communication loop to connect and possibly trigger an additional inspection or put the occupancy permit at risk. She asked if the guests were aware of any examples where the two have been balanced in the same program.

Ms. Reddy was not aware of any communities that have proactive rental inspection that do not also run a complaint-based system alongside. She believed it is imperative that the two run side by side. Due to capacity issues some communities have multiple years between occupancy inspections and issues do come up in between routine visits. It is worth exploring roles and functions between county and municipal levels to create more bandwidth and clarity. She asked if Mr. Brooks had anything to add.

Mr. Brooks referenced multiple locations that started with a small pilot proactive inspection program covering just one area to collect data. Then taking the data to argue that the program should be expanded system wide. He asked if there is county or state code enforcement association. While working with the Bay Area Code Enforcement network to do pilot programs it was discovered some areas did not have a system for responding to tenant complaints or responsible parties were not being penalized for violations. As a result, state legislature passed a law requiring all jurisdictions to have reactive program to respond to complaints and do inspections. Another piece of legislation required code enforcement officers to inspect adjacent units if violations are discovered that could impact more than the complaint unit.

Ms. Reddy stated there is a Pennsylvania Association. The last President she was aware of was from Norristown PA, and had recently passed proactive lead inspection process. So there is leadership within the state that we could connect to.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis stated mold in Allegheny County is frequent concern. She stated nearly 70% of the 150 or so healthy homes assessments conducted by Women for Healthy Environment (WHE) have visible mold. But it is not addressed at code level so no action can be taken despite being a great concern for residents and WHE.

Ms. Reddy stated mold is a gap that most housing codes do not adequately address. Despite not being a public facing organization NCHH gets calls from individuals and more than half are related to mold. They created a script for how to respond which instructs them to mention a moisture issue to get a code official to intervene. She can provide some sample language collected from around the country if considering encouraging mold in enforcement.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis referenced something about mold passed in Maine and many other jurisdictions looking to replicate that.

Ms. Reddy stated other states and localities are working on that and they can collect examples and highlight some pros and cons of different approaches if it would be useful. She noticed Dr. Maseru using the Teams hand raised feature and said she will be sure to address his question of funding.

Dr. Maseru asked to contact Mr. Brooks for the language used in the legislation for annual fees.

Ms. Reddy stated they would be sure to share all of their email addresses in case of questions after the meeting. She said they could cover the status of HUD funding as well as some models they can recommend. She prompted Ms. Goodwin to speak on the HUD funding.

Ms. Goodwin discussed the federal budget. That in recent years HUD got more funding and have been able to hand out grants. But now it is proposed that HUD may not get any new funding or at least a reduction, possibly \$40 million less. That would give them \$295 million to offer grant programs for the next October-September fiscal year. Significant staff reductions at HUD also raise concerns about their capacity to support the grant operations. There is currently a funding opportunity out for lead hazard control grants due August 14<sup>th</sup>. The requests cover this year and next year so lead hazard control will be funded. Healthy homes and grants for older adult programming is less certain.

Ms. Reddy mentioned the lead grant does have a healthy home supplement possibility. The message they have gotten off the record is that HUD does not intend to release any further lead or healthy homes funding opportunities in the near future. This may or may not be true but impoundment of funds is also a concern. HUD money is very important and we should continue to fight for it, so if any communities are considering requesting funds they should act on it.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis updated Allegheny County Economic Development's HUD grant for 2025-2028. She stated they were awarded \$7.5 million, which includes the supplemental funding. She believed this to be the third grant cycle for the program. She corrected that the total amount was \$7.75 million, with the 10% supplemental.

Ms. Reddy discussed that the fear was funding would be withdrawn but right now that does not seem to be the case. Things could change quickly so they are keeping tabs on funding. If ever there are questions on the status feel free to email them, Ms. Goodwin or Ms. Plankey in particular, for more information on what they are hearing. Regardless how much is allocated it is never enough. She circled back to the age of homes in Allegheny County and the work they may need. She said sometimes there are caps on the money, how much or what it can be used for so other kinds of financing mechanisms should be explored. She prompted Mr. Brooks by mentioning the significant funding from a lead paint lawsuit in California.

Mr. Brooks spoke about the lawsuit against paint companies for selling paint knowing the lead hazards. It took 20 years but the company settled out of court in 2019 with 10 jurisdictions for over \$300 million. The City of Oakland received \$24 million and did a race and equity impact analysis to identify highest priority communities for use of the funds. The settlement is to be used to establish a proactive rental inspection program and possibly doing child blood lead testing.

Ms. Reddy stated other places have used settlement dollars to fund similar activities. New York state and Montana have both used tobacco settlement money for lead and healthy homes programs. NCHH has multiple case studies on innovative financing and would be happy to share with the committee, though some could require action at the state level. She brought up Lead Safe Cleveland bringing together American Rescue Plan Act funds, earmarked congressional directed spending, community benefit dollars, and foundation dollars from a number of sources to create a larger pool of money to work with. In the first year they surpassed the \$100 million

mark raised. There has been so much interest in this model that advocates are pushing Congress to fund similar pilot programs to help stimulate more jurisdictions to replicate the model. She asked Ms. Goodwin to confirm if this proposal made it through Congress.

Ms. Goodwin stated that it is in the House bill.

Ms. Reddy said so it is uncertain if this pilot will make it, but they will stay on that because this might be a financing situation to consider.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis stated NCHH has a lot of expertise and the committee has gotten a lot of insight from the guests. She asked if there were any more specific questions before moving on to next steps, or any feedback on what was learned. She asked if any committee members were interested in working with NCHH on the deep dive into county wide models.

Ms. Goetze, Dr. Maseru, and Ms. Hammond are interested in the deeper dive with NCHH.

Mr. Damewood stated if the focus is on proactive rental inspection, particularly interacting with local code enforcement he would be very interested.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis said it seemed to be approaching a majority. She asked for a motion to formalize this plan and put the committee on this path for meetings going forward. She asked Ms. Goetze if she would like to motion since she first indicated interest.

Ms. Goetze stated she would move for the deeper dive with NCHH.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis asked specifically for further discussions, inviting NCHH to additional meetings, do information sharing, and a landscape analysis to continue conversation.

Ms. Goetze motioned to schedule additional meetings to continue the work in this conversation with NCHH.

Ms. Schwartz and Dr. Maseru seconded the motion.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis stated next is the discussion phase on future meetings and how the committee engages, which fits right in to the next agenda item.

## **5. HCE Update and Subcommittee Discussion**

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis asked Mr. Pitts if he would like to start the next part of the meeting or should she.

Mr. Pitts started off with a note on subcommittees. In following advice from our legal team, going forward all subcommittee meetings will need to be treated the same as full meetings with respect to the State Sunshine Act. This means they will need to be advertised, allow for public and media involvement. He asked the committee to be mindful of staff limitations when planning the subcommittee meetings. He asked if Mr. Murphy had anything to add.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis proposed monthly meetings rather than every other month to ensure compliance with the Sunshine Act. In that case the meetings would be the first Thursday of every month from 11:00am-1:00pm. This would allow everyone to come together as a working meeting since there is so much interest in the subcommittee discussions. Perhaps the committee could merge interests and utilize the time of the ACHD team in a workable way.

Mr. Damewood stated he does not want to abandon the work of the subcommittees. He appreciated the staff involvement and does not want to overburden the department. But he

believes in the value of the deeper dive by subcommittees in the two areas already identified, Proactive Rental Inspection and Anti-displacement/Urgent Repair. He wanted to speak for his subcommittee and their regularly scheduled monthly meetings, he is reluctant to discontinue those in favor of more frequent whole committee meetings. He believed there is value in having specialized discussions and wished for more time to consider this.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis emphasized there is a legal requirement, not just applied to HAC or other ACHD committees but county wide. She referenced an article about jail oversight committee also moving same direction, not just here. Need to find a way for the committee to work cooperatively, and collaboratively within the boundaries. Having monthly meetings to allow for the deep dive is a good next step forward. She suggested setting a September meeting now and filling in the schedule for the rest of the year. Knowing everything that is needed for compliance with the Sunshine Act it is a big lift for the Health Department and we need a happy medium.

Ms. Schwartz cited her 6 years on the Homeless Advisory Board and it was not hard with the schedule set. She does not like the idea of subcommittees going away, but instead a compromise is to use part of the meetings on the odd months to devote time to them. Then utilize full meeting as usual in even months. In the odd months the meeting would have one hour per subcommittee where anybody can participate in that discussion or not.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis stated she was not suggesting the subcommittee work go away, just finding a new framework to continue those goals.

Mr. Pitts liked Ms. Schwartz idea but emphasized the need to specify how the time will be used for the subcommittees, just for advertising.

Ms. Schwartz specified it would be 11:00am-12:00pm for one subcommittee, then 12:00pm-1:00pm for the other subcommittee.

Mr. Pitts stated the need to specify which subcommittee takes which hour and the purpose.

Dr. Maseru wanted to express appreciation for our guests.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis returned to the motion on the table about collaborating with NCHH and apologized to the guests for the diversion to update practices. This does help with engaging guests like NCHH in the months to come.

Mr. Pitts again emphasized for advertising to the public the new meetings must specify the nature of the discussion. He also needed the names of the subcommittees.

Dr. Noble offered to take his motion off the table to allow the guests to leave and resume the conversation at hand.

Mr. Damewood agreed there was no need to waste the guests' time listening to the committee debate if they would like to leave.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis referred to the motion brought by Ms. Goetze and seconded by Dr. Maseru for inviting NCHH to additional discussions. The conversation just gives the committee a way to use that in a meaningful way, the schedule can come later. So, the committee can vote now on the motion unless the second is withdrawn.

Dr. Maseru and Ms. Schwartz both withdrew their second.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis stated it really was not necessary as they were just formalizing the engagement with NCHH.

Dr. Maseru said to leave on a good note he would second and proceed.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis facilitated the vote. All present voted in favor.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis addressed the guests with thanks for wealth of information and will be contacting them for additional conversations on county wide initiatives across the country.

Ms. Reddy thanked the committee for having them and will stay tuned to how they can best support the work.

Mr. Damewood stated he has a hard stop at 1:00pm and agreed with Ms. Schwartz's suggestion. He would like to nail down the times for the added meetings.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis stated the proposed is to continue with the first Thursday of the month 11:00am-1:00pm. Currently ACHD has no amendments proposed at this time for them to address and until then these can be working meetings. We can move forward with the meetings consisting of 11:00am-12:00pm being Mr. Damewood and Ms. Schwarz subcommittee and 12:00pm-1:00pm for Ms. Hammond and Mr. Boddorf's Intergovernmental Agency committee. The descriptions will be provided to Mr. Pitts.

Mr. Damewood moved to accept the proposal.

Ms. Goezte seconded.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis facilitated a vote. All present voted in favor.

**6. Next Meeting: Thursday October 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2025 11:00am-1:00pm**

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis asked Mr. Pitts and Mr. Murphy to schedule the September meeting for the first Thursday the 4<sup>th</sup> 11:0am-1:00pm unless there is some conflict

Mr. Murphy stated that would be fine and the department would send something out ahead of that date.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis stated that the meeting following that would be on October 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Mr. Murphy said that is correct.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis asked if there were any other questions, comments, or concerns.

Dr. Maseru asked about the \$7.75 million HUD money that was mentioned.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis stated \$7 million for lead hazard reduction and \$750,000 for supplemental healthy housing fund.

Dr. Maseru then asked for a quick update about the amendment to Article VI.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis stated County Council is on recess until Aug 19<sup>th</sup> and they will address that when they go back into session.

Dr. Maseru wanted to clarify that it has been endorsed by the Board of Health and will now be presented to County Council.

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis stated that is correct.

**7. Adjournment**

Ms. Naccarati-Chapkis asked if there were any other questions. Hearing no further questions she made a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Damewood seconded.

All present voted in favor.

Meeting adjourned at 1:00pm.