

Minutes of the Regular Meeting
Of the South Park Township Planning Commission
South Park, PA 15129
May 27, 2026

Pledge of Allegiance

Notice to Attendees Notice was read by Russ Bracker.

Roll Call The meeting was called to order by H. Russell Bracker.

Present: H. Russell Bracker, Patrick Sable, Rob Devine, John Papinchak and Bill Matyger. Also present were Joseph Sites, Township Engineer Carolyn Yagle, Planning Consultant, Derek Parker, Code Enforcement Officer, and Irv Firman, Township Solicitor.

Absent: Mark Depretis, James Waychoff

Approval of Minutes

Motion was made by Mr. Devine, seconded by Mr. Matyger to re-approve the minutes from the February 25, 2026 Reorganization & Regular Planning Commission Meetings. *All members voted aye. The motion was unanimously carried.*

Motion was made by Mr. Sable, seconded by Mr. Matyger to approve the minutes from the April 22, 2026 Regular Planning Commission Meeting. *All members voted aye. The motion was unanimously carried.*

**South Park Farm Show Drive
Corridor Improvement Plan-
Minor Land Development-**

Preliminary/Final

Mr. Bracker: First item on the agenda is the South Park Farm Show Drive Corridor Improvement Plan. Minor land development, both preliminary and final approval. Is there someone here to represent that plan? Please come forward and have you signed in? Okay, excellent. Can you speak into the microphone because it's for the secretary?

Ms. Carla Lukehart, EDP: So, thanks for coming, I'm Carla Lukehart, I'm with Environmental Planning and Design. We are working with the Allegheny County Parks Department on improvements at South Park along Farm Show Drive and the amphitheater. So, we kind of broke down all of the site improvements that we are proposing on this visual for everyone to see. And it's mostly, so the county wanted to do some improvements to the infrastructure and the accessibility, mainly along the sidewalks, the roadway, and then along Buffalo Drive. So, kind of going through the area here, everything that you see colored is where the improvements are located. So just to orient you, this is Brownsville Road here. And then in gray, this is Farm Show Drive that curves up into McCorkle Road. So, you probably are all very familiar with the site. There are two existing parking lots that if you can see from where you're sitting, they're indicated with red, a red striped hatch. And what we're proposing is the purple, that you see, three different parking lots that will be a little bit more efficient, well actually a lot more efficient. We were just going through all of the calculations, and it turns out that the existing parking lots, the two here and the parking lot here, turning them into the three parking lots for better efficiency, actually reduces the footprint by 25 square feet, but you get 25 additional parking spaces. So, part of the reason that we're doing this is during the concert event season, the parking lots that are existing which are not striped efficiently, they don't have any ADA standard parking, and during concerts they have an attendant that will give people the tags, the ADA tags, so that they can park in these areas. So, what we're doing is proposing accessible parking along the edges here, and if you can see the orange yellow routes those are the accessible routes so in doing that, we're also creating accessible routes into the concert area creating walkways throughout the concert area and the accessible route up to the restroom as well. So, if you're coming in and wanting to park and if you're parking in this area, you have an accessible route all the way through as well as accessible seating areas that are shown in orange. You'll also be able to get the whole way down here to where the food trucks are located and an area where you can sit and have your, eat your dinner and whatnot. And if you were to park in this parking lot, you would have an accessible route into this space here where there is additional accessible seating. And then the third parking bay up here also allows accessible routes the whole way across. In addition to the improvements along Farm Show Drive, we're doing some improvements in the area by the police station and the new police memorial and the Home Ec building. So, the current parking situation it's not striped and it's a large area. So, we're creating more parking through here. And we're also doing some infrastructure stormwater improvements along the entire corridor for a more efficient stormwater system. The stormwater system, and if anyone has any questions, Luke, our civil engineer, as well, as is Joel Perkovich from the Parks Department can answer any of those questions but the stormwater system is completely subsurface. Because of the nature of the site, we needed to have the whole area open for seating and we also needed the areas for the parking, so we put the whole stormwater system underground so there's nothing above ground for stormwater. The last thing I think, is we are proposing new crosswalks in two places along Brownsville Road similar to the one that's further down the road by the playground with flashing beacons and then crosswalks in blue all through the Farm Show Drive corridor to improve circulation and visibility. We're proposing trees on the edges here of the new ovals around the amphitheater area and the food truck area remains the same down here

as well. We are adding a couple of concrete pads for portable restrooms but there will also be portable restrooms along the bottom here. This crosswalk along Brownsville Road will then lead to the, actually I think it's this one that leads to the green parking area in this direction and then the steps that lead down to the high school are connected to the rest of the circulation system. So that is, that's it in a nutshell. If anyone has any questions between the three of us, I think we can.

Mr. Bracker: Okay, thank you very much. Mr. Sites, as—

Mr. Unknown: Is this in Township or is this in the park?

Mr. Bracker: It's in the park.

Mr. Unknown: Then why is this on the agenda?

Mr. Bracker: Because this portion of the County Park is in South Park Township. So, it we share the park with Bethel and South Park, depending on what area of South Park County Park is in, it may come to us, or it may go to Bethel. In this case it's in our portion of the park.

Mr. Unknown: So, any improvements in the park or changes to the park are subject to the two jurisdictions in this jurisdiction?

Mr. Bracker: Depending on what they're doing, yes.

Mr. Sites: They're no different than any other landowner who wants to do land development within South Park Township. They have to comply with the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinances that exist. Yes, they are a very large property owner in South Park Township, but they still have to comply with the requirements that the Township has in place as the governing body.

Mr. Bracker: So just a moment let me go through. Mr. Sites, as Township Engineer, do you have any comments or questions that you would like to share with the public regarding this plan?

Mr. Sites: All the land development items have been addressed with regards to the improvements that are proposed there. There's a few items regarding the stormwater management that are outstanding, but the applicant should be able to get those addressed prior to the Board of Supervisors meeting. So, any recommendations should be contingent on the outstanding stormwater comments being addressed.

Mr. Bracker: Okay, thank you. Ms. Yagle, as planning consultant, do you have any comments or questions you would like to share?

Ms. Yagle: I do not have any questions and the comment that I offer is this County Park, this facility in it's entirety, this area is in the RP zoning district which is the Regional Park zoning district. There is no change of use to the activities that are proposed as part of the plan, meaning it is coming in front of you all as part of a land development and so there is no sense of consideration for additional things in zoning. And the structures that are in place today are remaining where they are, the amphitheater and the restroom, so the elements of anything that is a current non-conforming setback remains a non-conforming setback because there's no structural change.

Mr. Bracker: Thank you, Mr. Parker as Township Code Enforcement Officer, any questions, comments you would like to share?

Mr. Parker: I think it should be mentioned that this project meets all Township zoning ordinances.

Mr. Bracker: Thank you. Mr. Firman, do you, I know this is not why you're here this evening, but since you're sitting in, do you have any questions or comments you would like to share?

Mr. Firman: Thank God, not any comments or questions.

Mr. Bracker: Thank you. So, we can call on the people if you can come up to the podium, please sign in, okay thank you. Just identify yourself.

Sheila Petruska, 3110 Shelly Drive: Absolutely my name is Sheila Petruska, I live at 3110 Shelley Drive. I have one question and that was you're putting a crosswalk beacon on Brownsville Road? Is Brownsville Road a Township Road?

Unknown: It's a County Road.

Ms. Petruska: . Okay. So, are we getting permission to put it?

Ms. Lukehart: Yes, we are getting is through (inaudible).

Ms. Petruska: Okay. Okay. Okay. The reason that I bring that up is, and of course, this is off topic, sorry, but it would be amazing if we could get a crosswalk beacon by the library. The library would be accessible to parents and children who live on the other side of Brownsville Road. I am one of them. I live on Shelly Drive, which is walkable to the library. I've lived there for 17 years, and we've never been able to walk to the library. My children have not been able to walk to the library because there has never been a crosswalk with a beacon so that my children could safely cross Brownsville Road. And that's unconscionable. Can we please get that done, thank you.

Mr. Bracker: Is Brownsville Road at the library, is that still County Road?

Mr. Unknown: Let me check.

Ms. Petruska: So, if we're getting permission to use it for the park can we also get to use it for the library to get a crosswalk beacon?

Mr. Bracker: That would be something that would have to be brought up at a different meeting. I mean, we don't have the authority.

Ms. Petruska: Okay, I'm just asking. I'm just bringing it up in front of a lot of intelligent people who might have resources that I don't have.

Mr. Bracker: And it's on the public record. Thank you. Anyone else, comments, questions concerning the Farm Show Drive? Okay. Does anyone on the Planning Commission have any questions or comments?

Mr. Devine: One quick question for Mr. Sites. You've reviewed the stormwater runoff plan, and I think what you said was this will not result in any increased runoff?

Mr. Sites: No, it's not. The purpose of the stormwater management is to reduce the post-construction runoff to the pre-construction rate so there's no increase of flow to the existing storm sewer system.

Mr. Papinchak: Mr. Sites, you also stated in your comments that the applicant has some outstanding items related to stormwater management but that you're confident that they would be able to be resolved before the Board of Supervisors presentation is that correct?

Mr. Sites: That is correct.

Mr. Bracker: Should we outline those for the record? Mr. Sites, can you outline those for the record?

Mr. Sites: Sure. Item number one, provide dewatering calculations to support the infiltration period for the detention facility. Install the shutoff valve on the under drain so that you can control the low flow channel through the system. And that note should be added to the plan, those gate valves are to be added. Provide an operation maintenance agreement, which they've acknowledged. They've also acknowledged the NDES permit and they will have to provide a copy of the permit from Allegheny County Plumbing. That is a third party approval, and it should not hold up their approval by the Township. That is all I have.

Mr. Bracker: Okay, thank you very much So we have two items upon our agenda. One is Referring to paperwork is everything in order and complete and the second is for the actual recommendation. So, we need a motion?

Motion made by Mr. Sable, seconded by Mr. Papinchak, to accept this preliminary and final application for a Minor Land Development as being complete per the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. *All members voted aye. The motion was unanimously carried.*

Motion made by Mr. Devine, seconded by Mr. Sable, to recommend table this application for preliminary and final approval for a Minor Land Development, identified as the South Park Farm Show Corridor Improvement Plan, to be located near the corner of Brownsville Road and McCorkle at 100 Farm Show Drive contingent upon resolution of the stormwater management items. *All members voted aye. The motion was unanimously carried.*

Mr. Sable: Mr. Chairman, just a footnote, thanks to the county for investing some resources in this part of the park it's long overdue and I think that part of the beautification plan is going to play well for all those folks that go to those concerts and that in the park. So, thank you to the County for doing that.

SALDO Ordinance Amendment

Mr. Bracker: Next item on our agenda is a draft saldo ordinance amendment. A draft ordinance amending the subdivision and land development ordinance being Chapter 118 of the Code of the Township of South Park as it pertains to definitions and requirements regarding multiple vehicular entrance points for subdivisions and land developments meeting certain criteria. Mr. Firman, would you like to give us an overview of the plan, of the ordinance, what we're looking at.

Mr. Firman, Township Engineer: Sure. And I'll just add that obviously, it's a little bit different than what normally happens at the planning commission. At the last township well, as you recall, at the last planning commission meeting, there was a proposed amendment to the subdivision land development ordinance. It came before this planning commission. The planning commission made a negative recommendation on it. It came before the Board of Supervisors. There was a lot of public comment on it. And the consensus from the Board of Supervisors was, "Hey, let's go ahead, Mr. Firman and Mr. Sites, draft an ordinance that's consistent with the comments that were raised by a couple of residents, Mr. Sobek, Mr. Foster, and documents that were provided by Supervisor Adams." So, the idea was just to prepare an ordinance that reflected those things as consistent with it as could be done. So that's what you have before you and I'll walk through that in a minute. So, the idea is, "Hey, let's rather than go through the idea of drafting an ordinance, you advertise the ability to add and maybe have them redo it," the idea was, "Hey, look, here's a draft ordinance. We can hear from members of the public tonight. We can hear what their views on it are. I know that this board didn't get a copy of it until yesterday, this planning commission. So, to the extent you have comments on it, you can give your thoughts on it tonight. And see, then what the idea would be is to prepare a new ordinance. Then we'd be able to go to the supervisors to determine if it meets with their satisfaction. And then if it does, then we'd go through the normal process or the more formal process of, "Okay, here's an ordinance we and the supervisors are comfortable with. Let's send it to the planning commission. Let's send it to Allegheny County. Let's have a public hearing, and then we'll make a final recommendation." So, this is really a discussion workshop concept to get your views, and we'll get the public's views. And then to the extent you felt you had time, your views on it this evening. So, this is my view on the suggested way to go through it. Let me walk through the ordinance a little bit. If Mr. Sites has anything to add on anything I'm missing because I'm not going to be more technical and then turn it over to the public for their comments. And then the planning commission can do as they see for any recommendation.

Mr. Bracker: Okay. That would be great.

Mr. Sable: So, for clarification, we're not necessarily voting on this to recommend or not recommend.

Mr. Firman: In its capacity, you are not being asked to vote up or down this particular ordinance. What you're being asked to is, on the sections of it, what are your what do you think about certain aspects of it as a planning commission?

Mr. Sable: So, it's a discussion. It's not an official action by the committee, by the planning commission.

Mr. Firman: Right, those comments from you and they, I will take.

Mr. Sable: Yeah. I just wanted the public to understand what we're doing with is we're having basically a discussion on the proposal that you guys are bringing forth.

Mr. Firman: Yes. It's more akin to a workshop than it is a formal proceeding.

Mr. Sable: I understand.

Mr. Firman: And again, just to be clear, this is a legislative act, right? So, this is not matching up to the existing ordinance. This doesn't meet it. This is what makes sense with planning, what makes sense from the ordinance perspective, that type of thing.

Mr. Sable: Understood.

Mr. Firman: Okay. So, what you have, again, I described what was before you, but just to run it through just in order. Section one of the ordinance added some definitions into it, some of which were in other, we've use these terms in other parts of the ordinance, but that were used in this part of the ordinance. Just as a note, there were a couple of items that we defined in this for discussion purposes that are not in here, but the idea was to put the definition in in case people wanted to, "Hey, can we use this term somewhere else to describe something?" So those were constrained structure, independent access, dead-end road, and single-access street. So, they're defined in there, but obviously, if they're never used, we would take them out. But the idea was to give everybody, "Hey, it's already there in case somebody wanted to use it." Section two of the ordinance amends the sidewalk section. And if we look at section two, items, the only changed to items one through five already existed. And A1 through five already existed. Item B already existed. But in section three, it was added, "In addition to land developments that have 50 or more multifamily dwelling units, anything with more than 25 single-family units would trigger the sidewalk requirement." Section three of the ordinance goes back to 118-44L, which is requiring that any new subdivision or land development with more than 25 lots or that generates more than 250 trips be independent vehicular access points that are functionally separate routes from the development to the broader access network. And those definitions are defined in the Code here through this section here to define what separate means. And we can talk about those things if people want to. 118-M adds requirements for block lengths and configuration. That's something that should be discussed. And then *Inaudible*. 118-56 replaced the existing text with the verbatim text out of the MPC under the modification standards. And then that way, you're matching that up with what the actual language is *inaudible* to make your ordinance correct. And similarly, some of the requirements on 118-59(A) in terms of what people are asking for that, how much detail do they need, what should be asked. So that's what those sections reference. So, the idea is, I think, to create the goal of it generally, was to create a situation where you have larger developments and to create two access points not on the same side, two access points that connect to the arterial collector streets in different routes, presumably to protect for emergency and safety provision access. So that's what's done. The only other section of the code that was the only one that was the section for single-access developments, and I want to point that out. This was written as if, "Look, if you meet the standard double map for two access points," right? "You can put in the two access points unless you have a topography problem or whatever, then you have to come back to the board of supervisors to ask for a modification." That's the general two-access point. However, for lots, the way this was written is if people that were I'm sorry, for developments that were allowed to be single primary vehicular access points, there should still be an emergency access point in section three. I'm not sure if that's something that makes sense to this board or even to members of the public.

Mr. Sable: Say that again.

Mr. Firman: So basically, if you have, if you have a development that say is less than 25 lots, under this code, you'd be allowed to have one access point, right? However, this is saying, "Okay, but if you have one access point, if possible," right, it's on a topographical, "you should add in a secondary emergency access point."

Mr. Sable: Going prospectively?

Mr. Firman: Yes. All of this is prospective. This does not have any impact on anything that's built or constructed. This is only for new developments moving forward. So, evaluate that if you might want to

make consensus a little bit about those type of things. But doesn't have anything to do with anything that's already built. Now, the alternative way for the single-access development concept would be to say to build it in and say, "Look, if you, developer, can't meet this two-access point requirement, okay, you can satisfy that by adding in this, by meeting the single, your single-access development, you can't meet it. And then if you meet these criteria, you're okay," right? That would be another way to address that. But I'm not, that was from the information provided, I wasn't sure because I got to go through both ways. So, I wrote it this way, but I'm bringing to everybody's attention as is that something that people want to do. So, the idea again, if you want to make two access points, that's required and the only exception is if you can't do it, you have to go request a hardship if you're a developer. Or do you say, "Hey, we want you to have two access points, but if you can't do it for some reason, okay, but you got to put it in this emergency access route." So that was how that was written, and that was the purpose of that discussion. So, I think the memo that was, everybody has seen it in detail. I think it's attached to the agenda. So those were the concepts at a high level. And that was where you're trying to meet. Mr. Sites, am I missing anything?

Mr. Sites: No, I think you covered everything quite well already.

Mr. Firman: Okay. So that was the purpose. So again, looking to get feedback from the public and from the board on what we want to do with it and then take the next steps.

Mr. Bracker: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Firman. Mr. Sites, any further comments? I assume no, based on what your last comment.

Mr. Sites: We worked through this and developed this with Mr. Firman to address the information we were provided and the definitions and vetted out different items throughout that could be added and identified items that are already existing in the Saldo.

Mr. Bracker: Okay. Thank you. Miss Yagle, as planning consultant.

Mr. Sable: Well, before you go away from Solicitor, one other point of clarification. At this point, the revised ordinance, we're still waiting for comments from the county.

Mr. Firman: I'm sorry. We had prepared an ordinance that had come before you to this board. The county did provide comments on that.

Mr. Sable: And that was the first original ordinance. But on this revised one, we don't have a letter from them yet.

Mr. Firman: Yes, that we do not because it was not sent to the Allegheny County Planning Commission yet.

Mr. Sable: I understand.

Mr. Firman: The idea is once we get back to the board of supervisors and the board gets something that they say, "Okay, yeah, this makes sense," then we would send it, the Township would then send it to Allegheny County Planning Commission. And then also back to this body for some further discussion.

Mr. Sable: But we would receive it before the board of supervisors would vote on it. We'd see a copy of that.

Mr. Firman: Right. All the board of supervisors would do would be direct it back and say, "Okay, hey, this thing's in better form, now send it to the planning commission." Then that would be the one where you'd get a typical recommendation.

Mr. Sable: Understand. Understand.

Mr. Firman: And then at the same time, it would go to the planning commission of the Allegheny County Department of Economic Development where they would then do the same thing.

Mr. Sable: Thank you for that clarification.

Mr. Bracker: Okay. Miss Yagle, as planning consultant, any questions or comments?

Ms. Yagle: I have not been involved in the process. And I think I am clear on what was described this evening and appreciate that explanation. And so, I recognize that there are quite a number of existing developments within the Township where this type of criteria, it's not going to apply. So, someone who has that situation, this is not coming in to add an emergency access point to any of those plans. I think building on one of the questions that was asked earlier. And then things that would be coming in the door, this could potentially apply. I think the components without having any formal review, I've also not prepared any letter of an ask on that step yet, that the consideration for the number of units, it sounds as if, in going through different drafts that there have been different types of things. I think one interesting piece is also helpful in that it also incorporates non-residential, identifying that through the number of trips. And so, it's not tied specifically to units, but it's tied to calculated trips. So that gives you all a broader type of reach with this type of thing. And then knowing that it is in subdivision and land development ordinance that there can be those requests for that modification or waiver as part of that. Not saying it's granted, but it is, of course, different than in a zoning ordinance where variance would need to be applied. That process would not be this route. So, I think that knowing the topography and knowing different situations exist, this gives you all some flexibility to that. Thank you for asking, though.

Mr. Bracker: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Parker, as Township code enforcement officer, any questions, comments you'd like to add?

Mr. Parker: I have no comments at this time.

Mr. Bracker: Okay. Thank you. So, I'm sure everyone in the audience would like to have an opportunity to come up and speak. So, if you could step forward, please sign in if you haven't already done so, please identify yourself and let us know your thoughts.

Mr. Timothy Foster, 1046 Westchester Road: Hi. Tim Foster, 1046 Westchester. I just want to provide a little more background for this board just so you understand some of our comments and where they're coming from. What we went through, and this doesn't particularly pertain to Sleepy Hollow, but I think this is where a lot of this came up, where we had just inconsistencies. We had a lot of ordinances that just weren't clear. And believe me, clear ordinances are our friends so there's not a lot of dispute, there's not a lot of litigation. I think the board was very frustrated by that. A lot of different interpretations. So, one of the things I did after talking to a number of different members of the public,

I've done this before, I wrote an ordinance for this. I worked with Matt Trepal. He reviewed it. I think it was very comprehensive. And Allegheny County has one very similar as do a number of other municipalities, which is key because we obviously know the litigation potential issues that exist with the liabilities of Sleepy Hollow and the bridge, be it that it's a Township-owned roadway and bridge, liability is much higher for the Township. So, I wrote a document. So that was about five and a half pages. Submitted it to the February board of supervisor meeting that night. Irv you weren't there that night, but I think your colleague was there, but you did get it.

Mr. Firman: Yeah. Yeah. Tried to get that be able to do it and try to incorporate it.

Mr. Foster: So that's where we're at. So, we went from the five and a half, very comprehensive. Matt Trepal did review it. And obviously, he reviews anything before it gets finalized anyway. So, I mean, he did me a favor, reviewed it, looked at it, provided some comments. I tweaked them. So, I thought we had a pretty solid document. But then I think all of the frustrations that came out at the town meeting is we went from five and a half pages that were very comprehensive that covered everything. The goal of that process was to try to put the power in the elected officials, the board of supervisors. If they would have a problem with something, they had the language in there unequivocally to reject something if that's what they wanted to do and very little risk of litigation because it was supported by the ordinance. Much different than we have now. And the other thing, if they thought that there was not an issue, even though maybe it didn't meet a particular item or two, they had the latitude to give a variance or whatever necessary so they could still allow something to happen even if by the letter of the law it didn't. We wanted to put the power in their hands and not, no offense to Irv, but we didn't want everything to be under interpretation, right? I think that's what frustrated a lot of the members of the public. So that's just the background where we were at. That's why I think there was a lot of comments because we went from five and a half pages that everyone looked at to a page and a half or a page and a quarter, just so you understand that. So, some of the things that I want to address tonight because I think what it comes down to is just the language in there. Whether it's the language in there that's going to be up for interpretation, which again, clarity is what we're looking for. So, I think the issue really kind of centers on what I was talking about. In Matt Trepal's letter from February of 2023, he outlined very specific concerns involving the bottleneck created by the township-owned bridge, culvert bridge, and the road. These concerns were not theoretical. They involved emergency reliability, structural limitations, evacuation capabilities, very real liabilities, risks that ultimately fall back on this Township. This is why those shortcomings that still remain even in this ordinance, the last version that we've seen. And at first glance, the ordinance appears stronger because now it requires two access points that provide functional separation. And here's really where the problem is. If we look at this Sleepy Hollow development on the Sleepy Hollow Road, we have two access points, 150 feet apart. So, by the letter of the law, it would have been okay. Well, there's all the bottleneck down here. I don't care if you have 12 access points that come out to Sleepy Hollow Road. So, you want some type of clarity to say this has to be done a little bit differently, and your ordinance has to support that. So, I think the question is, are those routes truly independent in a real emergency? Because if both exits rely on the same constrained culvert bridge, the same downstream corridor, or the same flood-prone choke point, then we're not creating any true redundancy. We're simply creating two feeder roads leading to the same main point. And that distinction matters enormously. The development may technically satisfy the ordinance on paper while still becoming effectively isolated during flooding, an accident, structural failure, winter icing event, utility emergency, or an evacuation scenario. These are real-world independent options, and escape routes would be needed. This is just not about paper compliance. The danger here is that the ordinance relies on interpretation phrases like functionally separate and single point of failure. Those definitions may sound protective, but they leave room for subjective interpretation and future weakening through negotiation,

administrative discretion, or legal argument. We have all witnessed this in the prior developments, and we are now the ones left with the consequences long after the developers depart. Developers may claim that two different aligned entrances qualify as separate even if both ultimately collapse into the same vulnerable corridor. This is what we'd better avoid because in a real emergency, residents are not going to care about whether a development technically satisfied a definition. What matters is whether police, fire, EMS, and evacuation traffic can actually move when something goes wrong. If the culvert or downstream corridor becomes blocked, emergency responders and residents could all become trapped simultaneously. This is exactly why false redundancy is so dangerous. Two entrances only improve safety if one remains functional when the other one fails. Otherwise, the redundancy is largely fictional. This ordinance does now require structural evaluations of the bridge and culverts. That is a positive step. So that's something good that was added. But structural adequacy alone does not guarantee operational reliability. A culvert can pass an engineering review and still fail during an emergency because of flooding, debris blockage, roadway washout, accident congestion, or insufficient evacuation capacity. A passing engineering score does not automatically equal resilient emergency access. I also believe the early February draft, the one I originally talked about, contains stronger language when it referred to the access from separate sides or materially different locations. That wording focused more clearly on actual geographic separation instead of interpretive terminology. Stronger ordinances protect the Township, protect residents, and place decision-making power where it belongs with the elected supervisor. Clear standards allow supervisors to reject unsafe developments with far less litigation risk while still preserving the ability to grant waivers when appropriate. Ambiguous ordinances do the opposite. They shift way too much power toward interpretation and create unnecessary exposure for the Township by giving away too much power to unelected solicitors that make decisions based on their interpretations. Tonight, I urge the township to recognize the difference between multiple entrances and truly independent emergency access because two exits that ultimately depend on the same vulnerable bottleneck are not genuine redundancy. There are simply two roads leading to the same point of failure. Thank you.

Mr. Firman: So, I hear what you're saying. So, if I'm looking if you're looking at the draft in front of you.

Mr. Foster: I don't. I'm sorry.

Mr. Firman: Okay. So, if you're looking at section 3, right, which is adding this one in before, this is adding section L.

Mr. Foster: Is there a page number on that Irv?

Mr. Firman: Page 3, bottom page 3. So, this is adding 118-44L or KL. So, it's a new section, right? So, it says minimum access points. So, the first part is any 25 or greater than 250 trips. They have to have no fewer than two access points that provide functionally separate routes. And so, if you go back to our definition we put in, a functionally separate route, that says a roadway for ingress and egress between the development and the external road network that does not share a single point of failure with another access route. And then single point of failure is a critical bridge, tunnel, or corridor which prevents the connection between the proposed development and the external road network. So, if I come back here then to go down to say access points must be located on separate non-adjointing sides, right? So, if you had a rectangle, right, you could have an access point here, but on the adjoining side, that wouldn't qualify. And it wouldn't count to be two on the same side, right? So, I was trying to address that by

putting one at the non-adjointing side and one below. And if you have that, I think they can't share an access route. I thought that would hem in any development.

Mr. Foster: Yeah. And I apologize. I had so little time to look at this because of when it came out yesterday. So, I mean, that's where I grabbed the language, and I just wanted to kind of compare where I thought that may be one of the major issues. So, I.

Mr. Firman: Yeah. And I looked at I really what we did was because you said I tried to take some of the language you did, but then if I put it in a defined term, it reads in the ordinance like it should. But it's all by defining if I had just said, if we had just said, right, functional access, well, what does that mean? But by creating that definition, that was equal, right? So, I was trying to address that issue where, well, what if they just put two on one side? All right. We don't want that, right? Because then even if it gets to the collector street, the property owner has to kind of but if you put it on opposite sides, I won't say non-adjointing sides. Unless you'd have a trapezoid or something. But that was the idea. So, in trying to address that, that's where that came from. And so, it does make it an express criterion. And it's not really, I mean, it's really, I think that's what that means. And I understand maybe you hadn't a whole time to review it or not. But if you had a thought on that, that's where I was trying to hopefully get some input on it and if you see a way around it, if you want to tighten it up, you can tighten it up, but I think that's. It's pretty tight.

Mr. Foster: Okay. Yeah. I'll take a look at this and we'll talk. Yeah. I'll get back to you on that.

Mr. Bracker: Carolyn, you had a comment related?

Mr. Sable: Go ahead, Carolyn.

Ms. Yagle: I think if I may also, in my read this evening of that definition of the functionally separate route, you also have the phrase external road network, which is then looking at the arterial and collector. So further, I'm not interpreting. I'm looking at these words of how the geometry piece works. So, adjointing also wouldn't be, if this is a collector and this is an arterial, that also doesn't count because you're saying that they are separate. So, it has to be opposite. And so.

Mr. Firman: Well, not adjointing.

Ms. Yagle: Not adjointing, excuse me. You identified, I think, in your, a couple of minutes ago that you had the readiness to think about separate sides. And I think from seeing portions of these phrases together, that both of you are seeking to achieve the same element, and it was trying to put a math component to the word separate. So, I can see how there could be support.

Mr. Firman: Well, again, that was the thought. That was the concept of separate non-adjointing. But again, I don't want to and that's ultimately separate.

Mr. Sable: So, Tim, if I'm understanding, your main focus there was on safety and security. Am I right about that?

Mr. Foster: Yes.

Mr. Sable: Primarily, that's what you're looking at. And you've been around here long. You realize we have several very large plans that have one egress, Bonnie Dell, Piney Ridge

Mr. Foster: Of course. With roads, though, Pat, not over a Lane and Half Culvert Bridge.

Mr. Sable: I understand. That's unique to that one area.

Mr. Foster: And I think that's the big difference. And I think that's the type of language that the board was looking for and we were looking for where clearly, there's no way Sleepy Hollow could ever meet any definition. It's funny because even though the owners of the tennis center contacted me and said, "Tim, you know the developers tried to come down. They asked if they could put an emergency exit through the tennis center." And so, all we're looking to do in those situations is to give the board the power to decide thumbs up or thumbs down. Because the problem is when they did a 5-0 rejection, now we're into litigation because our ordinances were weak. If our ordinances were stronger, they could have made the decision and put it to bed. That's the problem with weak ordinances. That's all we're trying to do again, prevent weak ordinances.

Mr. Sable: I understand, sleepy hollow was another issue.

Mr. Foster: Yeah. It was the litmus test.

Mr. Sable: I understand. But this is prospective. And maybe it's just that I'm not around enough, of all these places around, and I checked with the police and emergency units, and I'm not hearing that there's any problem with the setups that we have now with those major egresses. I understand Sleepy Hollow is unique.

Mr. Foster: And there may not. There may not be a problem. I know I'm working with Upper St. Clair right now. The same cast of characters is now trying to build 115 townhouses off of McLaughlin Run Road. They've got to go over a bridge. So, their ordinances are kind of lacking in that area too. So, we don't know where the next one is. But whether it's this ordinances or every ordinance, it should put the power with the board. Anything that's open for interpretation should be clarified.

Mr. Sable: I understand your comments. And I respect the fact that you're doing this primarily for safety and security of emergency vehicles and security issues.

Mr. Foster: Yeah. And that's what I harped on in Sleepy Hollow, just the liability risk to the township on road. That's where the liability is heightened.

Mr. Firman: What I wanted to say, is the reason that and that's why when I put in and I drafted this as requiring the two separate access points on alternate road without basically giving it a safety valve within the ordinance for this alternate safety, I mean, the lack of better the single access, the (inaudible) and that, that the emergency access route for, what it did is it lets the elected official say, "Look, you have to have two. You have to have two." And so, the only way that the developers get to not have two is if the board grants a waiver. So, taking your comments in the letters, right, the idea was, "Hey, make the two mandatory," right and

Mr. Foster: Yeah. And if it's a Bonnie Dell, I mean, there's no issue there. So that gives the board the ability to say, "There's really no issue with one road in or out." What's going to happen?

Mr. Foster: Right. But it starts with the idea that it has to be two, right? So, the board has to, it's not the developer comes in and says it's going to be one because that *inaudible*. It comes in and that's the reason you're not in this right. So, I thought I meant that by saying, "Hey, look, you have the two access points on alternate sides. The board's got to give a waiver if they want to go one." And then the question really is, do you, I think if they're going to give the waiver, they could have they put any emergency requirements they require to not necessarily be limited to what we have for a single point of access development here. So that was the concept, to give the board that.

Mr. Foster: Yeah. And I think that solves the issues that the public had where you had to go through a couple hours of discussion, that that's what people are looking for. Let's fix the lack of clarity.

Mr. Firman: Right. And I think that's what again, it's what the ordinance is, but I think this ordinance really covers those issues.

Mr. Foster: Okay.

Mr. Sable: But again, this issue is unique to the fact that Sleepy Hollow is Sleepy Hollow going over the culvert. I don't know of any other plan that has that issue. Do you?

Mr. Sobek: You have a lot of streams. You never know what plan you're going to.

Mr. Foster: Yeah. That's exactly right.

Mr. Sable: I don't want to do I want to make sure I'm understanding clearly because I can't think of any other plan.

Mr. Unknown: They go over streams and that kind of stuff.

Mr. Foster: Maybe it's the streams. Maybe it's a railroad. Maybe it's as long as the.

Mr. Sable: You got to point that to me in our township because I'm not seeing it.

Mr. Foster: Well, and here's where we run the risk, right? Because Allegheny County has it in their saldo. Other areas have it in their saldo. So, if we're facing litigation, we knew about this. I mean, you get in trouble and you know about a problem and you're aware of a problem. So, we're aware of that. And everyone is going to say, "Allegheny County has this. Why don't you? Matt Trepal warned you about it. Why didn't you fix it?" That's all we're trying to do is fix it.

Mr. Sable: I understand.

Mr. Foster: That's all we're trying to do. It may never come up again, but it may. The same with every ordinance.

Mr. Sable: Right.

Mr. Foster: Thank you.

Mr. Firman: So again, just going back to it, that's what I think this ordinance is.

Mr. Foster: Yeah. I need to take, I need to have a little more time to look through it, but.

Mr. Firman: Okay. Well, then I'm not going to, but again, just when you look at it, that was what was in mind. And I don't know if I'm if I inadvertently missed something, it's possible the goal was just that.

Mr. Foster: Okay. I appreciate that. Thank you, guys.

Debbie Duncan, 2451 Stewart Road: Debbie Duncan, 2451 Stewart Road. Couple of things. Irv, thank you very much for the work that you put into this. This looks a lot more like what we were looking for in the first place. I think there has been a lot of miscommunication, a lot of anger, a lot of hate and discontent over Sleepy Hollow. This is not about Sleepy Hollow. However, to address your issue, there are a lot of areas in South Park that can still be developed and a lot of areas that can have problems.

Mr. Sable: There aren't that many. There are not that many.

Ms. Duncan: They're *inaudible*.

Mr. Sable: There are not that many.

Ms. Duncan: Well, we'll find out as we go forward.

Mr. Sable: There are not that many that are going to take more than 25 homes, I can tell you.

Ms. Duncan: Wilson Road.

Mr. Sable: Wilson Road where?

Mr. Unknown: On the big farm.

Ms. Duncan: The big farm down there.

Mr. Sable: That's one.

Ms. Duncan: Is there a culvert at the end of that, or is that a bridge? I don't know.

Mr. Sable : I don't think so, but you might know. I don't know.

Ms. Duncan: I don't know. I don't know. Anyway, this is like you said, it's proactive. Be proactive so that we have it. Supervisors have a decision if it arises. If it doesn't arise, it's a non-issue. So, we're good. Number two. I do appreciate the open discussion. I think if we had had this to begin with, we'd have been further down the road. Again, we can't keep going back to Sleepy Hollow. That's what it's saying. I mean, that is gone and that's done. But we do need to address the new ones. There are supervisors that do care about this. We don't care about the increase in housing, just to support our school taxes. But we are pro-development if it's safe and if it is not a concern to the public. I mean, we really do, I'm all for more houses in South Park if we can do it safely and effectively. When you voted the last time for Sleepy Hollow, which again has nothing to do with this, you specifically mentioned because of the school taxes.

Mr. Sable: I did. And I'll stand by that because I know what that means to the children in our community and the resources they need and the resources we need to support that public school. Because if that public school isn't good, your property values will diminish.

Ms. Duncan: Absolutely. And our school district I won't even get into it. Anyway, we put in a whole new development at Summit Station. That did not do all that much because our taxes went up and we're looking at a deficit now. So, I don't see how that's solving the problem.

Mr. Sable: And they'd have went up significantly more if Summit Station wasn't there. In fact, several of the renovations would not have occurred if Summit Station wasn't on board.

Ms. Duncan: Okay. Here or there. But again, I do appreciate, I wanted to say I do appreciate what Irv did here. I think he addressed a lot of the issues that we had if we look through it and address it. Sleepy Hollow is not open for discussion. That's in litigation. There's nothing we're going to do to pass now that's going to fix that. But it is something for in the future that it does give the supervisors an opportunity to look at it. It gives you an opportunity to look at it and say, "No, we don't think it's safe. If it's a safety concern, we shouldn't be doing it. Other than that, we should address it." That's it.

Mr. Bracker: Thank you.

Mr. Jason Sobek, 1750 Stoltz Road: So, Jason Sobek, 1750 Stoltz. So, I read the agenda and it said, "Vote to recommend or not recommend." I designed my public comment with that in mind, but my public comment would not change regardless. So again, here to urge you to recommend this ordinance, including both multiple access point provisions and the sidewalk provisions. I was thrilled when I read this ordinance and saw the sidewalk provisions. We've done a lot of canvassing, all other communities that I've been in, you see sidewalks everywhere. South Park lacks sidewalks. And this is not an extreme or unusual requirement. Allegheny County's own SALDO already uses similar language for larger developments, including developments with 25 or more lots or 250 or more daily trips. Jefferson Hills and other municipalities have similar ordinances. The basic idea is simple. When a development reaches a certain size, access, emergency response, traffic circulation, pedestrian safety should all be addressed upfront. So first, this is not a solution in search of a problem. Land development ordinances are supposed to prevent foreseeable problems before they are built into the community. We do not wait for a major emergency, a blocked road, a construction conflict, a storm event, a utility repair, or evacuation issue before deciding that redundant access matters. Second, the fact that some existing neighborhoods may have one entrance does not mean that we should keep approving that design forever. Older development patterns often would not meet modern safety, stormwater, traffic, sidewalk, or emergency access standards. The point of this ordinance is to make sure future development is safer and better planned. Third, this does not stop growth. It channels growth into safer designs. A predictable ordinance actually helps developers because it tells them the township's expectations at the beginning of the process rather than after a plan is already designed. Fourth, the ordinance still allows flexibility. If a developer can show that strict compliance is genuinely infeasible because of tracked contradictions, topography, and other legitimate constraints, and that safety is not a concern, the board of supervisors can grant relief through the modification process. So, this is not a rigid ban. It's a default safety standard with a case-by-case safety valve. The modification process ensures that if an applicant can demonstrate and the board of supervisors expressly determines that a development exceeding the threshold can be safely served by a single access point without creating an emergency access, traffic circulation, or public safety concern, the board retains discretion to grant the appropriate relief. This ordinance simply prevents the township from being backed into a corner. Fifth, the second access point does not create

more traffic. The number of homes creates the traffic. Access design determines whether the traffic is safely distributed or concentrated through one choke point. A second functional route does not double the number of cars. It provides redundancy, improves emergency response, and reduces the risk that one obstruction cuts off an entire neighborhood. Sixth, I understand some of you may have concerns about children playing in residential streets, but that is actually a reason to support this ordinance and the sidewalk provisions. Sidewalks keep children, seniors, families, dog walkers out of the travel lane. I live on Stoltz, and I see children walking to the park with no sidewalks. It's extremely unsafe. A safer neighborhood design is not one where pedestrians are forced into the street because sidewalks were omitted from the beginning. Finally, cul-de-sacs and low-traffic streets can be desirable, but there's a difference between a quiet residential street and an isolated single-axis development where every resident, visitor, delivery vehicle, contractor, school bus, ambulance, fire truck, and police vehicle depends on the same way in and the same way out. This ordinance is aimed at a larger safety and circulation issue. To close, the ordinance is reasonable. It's pro-safety, pro-responsible development. It does not ban development. It does not create traffic. It does not eliminate flexibility. It simply says when a development reaches a meaningful size, the Township should require safe access, reliable emergency response, better circulation, and sidewalks before the plan is built, not after the problem appears. South Park should not wait until a road is blocked, emergency access is compromised, traffic is funneled through a single choke point, or pedestrians are forced into the travel lane before adopting basic design standards that other communities already recognize as necessary. So, when this comes up for consideration, I respectfully ask the Planning Commission to recommend this ordinance. Thanks.

Mr. Bracker: Thank you.

Ms. Petruska: May I have one more time?

Mr. Bracker: Yes. Please come up and just restate your name and.

Ms. Petruska: Sure. Sheila Petruska, 3110 Shelley Drive. I live on Shelley Drive, which comes out onto Southwell Drive. You might know it. It's right up the block from Ricky Dee's, which used to be Gill's Café. It's right up the street; I live right up the street from the closed pharmacy that's been sitting there for a few years. That is a neighborhood that empties out onto one outlet and then onto Brownsville Road. For a little bit of context, Mr. Sable, you might know this as a school board member. There was a lawsuit about 20 or 25 years ago from the parents in my neighborhood because they wanted their school bus to go up the hill. The school bus does not go up the hill because it was determined to be unsafe to pull a school bus from Southwell Drive onto Brownsville Road. I would ask that we remember that when we're talking about single-access routes because I know for myself and for my daughter who drives that it is not always safe for us to pull out from Southwell Drive onto Brownsville Road. Drivers are not cooperative. It is very difficult. It has become much more difficult with all of the recent construction in our township. Our whole end of the township, let's just say from Ricky Dee's all the way down around to Library Road, the firehouse, there have been so many car accidents over the last few years, and it's been brought up at board of supervisors' meetings. And I've been speaking with the police chief about this. Before we put anything more down there, we need to get control over the safety over there. That whole area has so much more traffic, and there are accidents coming off of Sebolt. There are accidents coming off of Cardox. There are accidents in that weird four-way intersection in front of the COEN convenience store. So, before we do anything, we really need to contain that somehow. And with the police department, hopefully, we'll be able to do that to address some of these safety concerns. My biggest concern is safety. I've brought it up to this board about the Stuart-Brownsville-Library Road intersection when the Sunset Gulf development went in. It's going in. We were told there was going to

be some reconfiguration of that intersection. I don't know where that stands, but I would love to see it. I'm waiting to see it. If we could get a traffic light, that would be fantastic. Could we please, please, please, please, please get coordination between the Township, the county, and the state to make our roads safer? Please. Thank you.

Mr. Bracker: Anyone else have any comments?

Paul Smith, 1009 Old Post Road: My name is Paul Smith. I live at 1009 Old Post Road. And anytime you have a document like this, that a lawyer draws up and other lawyers look at it, there's always going to be issues. There's always going to be corrections and changes. Since this is a discussion meeting and you are arguably going to recommend some sort of draft or consensus of what's said, I'd like to bring up a couple of issues because I just don't understand the issues. And I know I'm old and I'm getting senile and all that, but still, I'd like to understand some of these things for the board. One of the things I think I'd like to ask Ms. Yagle about, on page two of the regulation here, there's a definition of external road network for arterial and collector streets that are *inaudible* South Park Township roadway.

Ms. Yagle: Can you speak on the microphone, please?

Mr. Bracker: Yeah. They're having problems hearing you in the back.

Mr. Smith: Okay. Well, on page two, we're talking about the definition of external road network. And I think back to Sleepy Hollow One with the townhouses. And as a result of that, that was voted down. And a correction was made into our ordinances to provide for controlling the access for similar kinds of things on PRCs (*note—he most likely means PRD's Planned Residential Developments*) by the definition of roads. And their use and function. And does this definition conflict in any way, potentially, with those fixes which were necessary to address PRCs in a Sleepy Hollow One situation? Because this ordinance says if there's a conflict, the conflict is repealed. I don't want to see those Sleepy Hollow One requirements repealed.

Mr. Firman: Well, just as the repealed issue, this is a subdivision land development. So, a definition in SALDO is different than a definition of zoning ordinance.

Mr. Smith: Well, I'm not sure whether it's a zoning or a SALDO.

Mr. Firman: Well, this is a SALDO. It's a subdivision.

Mr. Smith: No. Sleepy Hollow One.

Mr. Firman: I don't know if that's right. I'm sorry. Yeah.

Mr. Unknown: PRD

Ms. Yagle: I just want to identify in that set of revisions that you are identifying, I believe the focus of that was in the zoning ordinance because there was not at that time a clear distinction or actually all of the roads within the network were called out in each of the respective definitions for arterial, collector, and then I believe local was added into that. So, there was that distinction. So, I believe by the reference to arterial and collector, that is a tie to the zoning. There is nothing in the zoning, as I recall, and I go back to that amendment when it's time for me to take a look at this, if that is what the township wants

me to do, but to look at an external road network. That's not a phrase that was part of that other amendment from what I recall.

Mr. Smith: So, I use of that phrase here would jeopardize interpretations of that vision.

Ms. Yagle: No, sir, because it is looking at the arterial and collector, and those are consistent terms.

Mr. Smith: Okay. On page five, we have block and configuration requirements. And I'll begin at the top of the page under M, block length and configuration, and a discussion that the blocks have to be designed to accommodate two tiers, double loading of lots except where physical barriers exist. What the hell is that talking about?

Mr. Firman: Well. I mean, it's two sides of the street.

Mr. Bracker: Yeah. I think his question is around what does it, what does two tiers, double loading mean referring to.

Mr. Firman: And that means that we have a street you have to design, or the developer is required to design it for houses on each side of the street unless there was a reason that you had to leave one.

Mr. Smith: Either side is a tier?

Mr. Firman: I mean, that's what it was certainly, that's what it was intended to do.

Mr. Sites: What Mr. Firman is saying is fully discussed to have double-loading on the streets.

Mr. Smith: So, houses on either side down.

Mr. Sites: Houses on either side of the street. Correct.

Mr. Smith: Okay. Now, what does 1,000-foot in length have to do with blocks exceeding the blocks? What's the requirement for, what causes the requirement for that?

Mr. Bracker: Yeah. I think my section two: blocks fronting on arterial streets shall not exceed 1,200 feet in length. I think he's looking for.

Mr. Firman: Yeah, I'm not certain. That was sort of a planning discussion item that I think we should have on whether that solves a problem in a sense. I'm not certain. That was in the materials that were submitted. So, I put it in the ordinance for discussion purposes to get a view. I don't have a strong opinion on it one way or the other.

Mr. Smith: I understand the purpose of it, sir. We have lot sizes and requirements and all kinds of stuff. But here's a new lot size requirement, apparently, potentially. I don't know. I just don't know.

Mr. Firman: Well, you're reading it correctly, that's what it says. The question is, does it meet a goal? Is it something that makes sense? That's a different question. But you are reading it right.

Mr. Smith: Yeah. And blocks running on sounds like multiple street access entering anyway, right?

Mr. Yagle: Could you repeat that?

Mr. Smith: Well, and using the phrase blocks running on implies to me blocks with streets entering in and out, multiple streets. So, what are we addressing here? I don't know. Anyway, I got a couple of other things like that. And the biggest one is the emergency access road. And it says it has to meet these requirements to be fully usable. Well, how do you do that? If you've got a piece of property that's surrounded by other people's property, and you can't make one real road, how can you have a fully usable road with an emergency access road?

Mr. Sites: I think the idea behind that is that if you have a single access point development, the emergency access would be constructed probably out of stone or millings or something and be able to specify width for emergency vehicles to access it. Another way to look at it would be if you have a cul-de-sac street that comes up to another cul-de-sac street, but it's gated. So, I mean, that's open for discussion as to how we want to go about that and address that item. But I think from some of my experiences, I know in Jefferson Hills one time we had a development where they did an emergency access from one road up into the development along an access road that was improved with millings. And it was graded so that the fire truck could get up to that back portion of the development from an arterial road in the event of an emergency because the other end of it was not as accessible to first responders. So, there are certain situations where this will apply.

Mr. Sable: So basically, it's a shortcut.

Mr. Sites: Yeah. It's a shortcut. You can say that. It's one way to put it.

Ms. Duncan: So, if this is a discussion, can I just ask, so will we be able to put something in that said what the service would have to be at minimum and what the width would have to be? Would that be something that we could do?

Mr. Sites: We could do that. I mean, what we need to do is maybe develop a township construction standard for an emergency access route. And we refer to the township emergency access route standard.

Mr. Firman: If you could. I mean, here's what it says now, right? It says, "Emergency access route designed and constructed to allow continuous all-weather ingress and egress for fire, police, and emergency medical services," right? So, whatever you're designing has to be constructed to allow continuous all-weather ingress and egress. Then it says it must be structurally capable of supporting emergency vehicles. It says it shall not rely on private driveways or individual lot access. And then if you want to leave people off of it, it says may be gated, but only if equipped with emergency service-approved access to that would be approved by the various emergency people. And then itself, in the end, one of the other requirements, it says, "Shall be reviewed and approved in writing by the township engineer, the fire, police, and emergency medical services." So, all four those, three entities and the engineer are going to look at it and say, "Yeah, this would work for us." And the other reason I would be hesitant and outperform the engineer is depending on the area, right, a width might not make sense, or a grade might be able to counter it with some type of alternate material or something where because it's an emergency, right? You recognize you already have an issue where you couldn't get if you have trouble with the second access point. So that was my view of it, but I think you're probably covered.

Ms. Duncan: Yeah. I think with good engineering advice from the engineer of the township would have the discretion as to what the standard required.

Mr. Firman: Correct.

Mr. Smith: Would it be a two-way?

Mr. Sites: No. It would not need to be a two-way because you want a way to get everybody in or out.

Mr. Smith: Now, what about the collector roads mentioned along with the arterial roads?

Mr. Firman: I didn't hear you.

Mr. Smith: Collector roads doesn't seem to be mentioned along with the arterial roads only in the definition.

Mr. Firman: Well, all the other terms throughout the ordinance were not using arterial or collector. They're just defined as.

Mr. Smith: There are a few places to say arterial road specifically. It's mentioned there in his.

Mr. Firman: Well, because he was reading the definition.

Mr. Unknown: No, before after that, he was talking about 1,000 feet.

Mr. Firman: Mr. Smith was? Yeah. On the block issue?

Four people speaking back and forth over Mr. Smith and Mr. Firman, making it inaudible.

Mr. Firman: No, no. You're correct. Okay. So, on the block lane, it's only as to arterial streets. So, if it came along a collector street, it wouldn't be that. Again, I don't really, I don't have an opinion on it. I put it in because it was suggested, so I don't know whether it makes sense or not.

Mr. Sites: I mean, when you look at that, I mean, I'm especially looking at either 90 or 100-foot block lengths. So, you have 12 lots along that road. So, you don't want to be adding a lot of homes to your arterial street.

Mr. Papinchak: Try to minimize the entry.

Ms. Duncan: And that ordinance, he did do that, or if we need to do something, does he need to add a wording in there to fix that?

Mr. Firman: I think we need to maybe discuss that further. Or I mean, I think as a group, we need to discuss that.

Mr. Smith: *Inaudible*

Mr. Firman: So, the question, I mean, the first question is, does it make sense to have a block length of 1,200 feet, right? And then the second would be, should it be only on arterial streets or also arterial and collector?

Ms. Yagle: If I may. From in this example that you were given, Irv, incorporated 1,200 feet effectively, if there needs to be an emergency vehicle that needs to pull off the main road, then it can serve from that side or an intersecting street, right, on one side. And it can serve on the other side in that same thing, so that block. So, in the example that you gave, Joe, if they're 100 feet each as 12 houses. It could come at 6 from this side, and it could come from 6 at this side. So the notion of having, I'm interpreting based on, I mean, just looking at this in the discussion this evening, the thought of having something on one of the not primary streets within the township is that it just can't go on house after house after house after house because there wouldn't be a way for, say, an emergency vehicle to pull off at 90 degrees to that main road. So, things could keep going on the main road, but there would be some way to get into at least a portion of it. So, the question, right, of if it's 1,200 feet or if it's 1,000 or whatnot, I don't think any of us have studied what the current pattern of some of those things along the arterial streets are or maybe some people have. And 1,200 makes a whole lot of sense, but I have not done any sort of math to that. But that's how I see that. And I guess the other point of if it is rather than arterial streets in the reference to blocks fronting on the external road, on a road within the external road network. I mean, if it's just.

Mr. Firman: If you're going to switch it to.

Ms. Yagle: Correct. If you're going to switch it to those other.

Mr. Firman: If I'm going to get in my mind where arterials are busier than collectors.

Ms. Yagle: Yes. I would generally think how they have them structured.

Mr. Firman: Right. So maybe that's why you really want it on a collector street, that rule. We don't need it on an arterial, that's much more traffic, that's why. I don't know, but that's.

Ms. Yagle: I'm not trying to not answer the question. We don't have an assessment of where those points actually line up from a number of blocks standpoint. But I think that taking, as you took the suggestion from the other language and looked it in there, I see it as sort of an offshoot, right, to support the emergency access at a 90-degree to the main drag is my interpretation. That kind of thing. I will say one, if I may, and it is with everyone or the people who have expressed the readiness to address this as an emergency-rooted type of discussion, there are, in Section 3, nine mentions of the word emergency, maybe trying to tie this together. And then in the definitions, including the one term itself, there are four. So, there's clearly an emphasis of being able to support, I think, what Mr. Sobek was identifying and the board member too. So, it seems like a lot of it's gone into that concentration of emergency.

Mr. Sable: So, Irv, to kind of bring all of this to conclusion, talk to us about next steps so the board of supervisors know what's happening. So, we as the planning commission know what's happening and how that sequence works.

Mr. Firman: Well, I think where we are now is the board of supervisors would like the planning commission's views on the various things that were talked about in this ordinance. And then listening to that, and I would then take those revisions, not formally, right, just based on the discussion points and what the consensus of the planning commission would be, revise this ordinance, bring it back to the board of supervisors, discuss it there, the final version of it. And then if they're satisfied with it, they would recommend to go through the process, which would be scheduling a hearing 60 days out because

these are significant changes. And then it would then get sent to the planning commission again. Because if you get a version that they would approve, it's different than what you're seeing now potentially, right? So, it would come back to you. And at that point, it would come back to you as a formal, "Hey, here it is. Do you recommend it? Deny it? Conditions, whatever." And then it would also at the same time go to Allegheny County Department.

Mr. Sable: So, does it go to the county before it goes to the board of supervisors?

Mr. Firman: Yes. Well, wait. The supervisors take it. They simultaneously send it to this planning commission and the county at the same time. Then it comes back with comments from the county and from you. Then there's a public hearing. Then the board votes.

Mr. Sable: Understood.

Mr. Firman: That's the order.

Ms. Yagle: I agree. Thank you.

Mr. Firman: That's the process. And so, I think what the board would be looking for is if you've had the opportunity to hear it, if you're in a position tonight to answer that, that's what they would want if you're on.

Mr. Sable: Well, I'd like to see it done fully before I expressed any opinion on it. I'm not disagreeing with the safety and security. I think it's a very valid point. I am concerned about it deterring future development. I'll just be straightforward with you and tell you, "Yeah, I do have concerns about that." But I'd like to see the document. And once the county has made its comments before I would express any further opinion on it.

Mr. Bracker: Before I ask the rest of the board, does anyone in the audience have any further questions or comments that you would like to share with us?

Mr. Foster: I just have one. It was just one point to and I understand your concern, but I think we were clear that this is not meant to eliminate a future development. Only if the board of supervisors, our elected officials, decide that that's what they want and their interests. We just want to give them the support to be able to say no.

Mr. Sable: I understand that point.

Mr. Foster: That's all we're looking to do. We don't want to get into a situation where the board doesn't want to approve it, but the ordinances aren't clear, so they kind of got to approve it or face litigation. That's what we're trying to avoid again. Give them the ability to say yes or no because they have clear ordinances. It should not get in the way of anything that everybody wants. It should easily go forward.

Mr. Foster: Yeah. And I agree with you, Tim. And my point is, as much as you're leaning towards safety and security, I'm leaning toward the idea of future developments. And there has to be an ability to compromise both of them and put them together in the right fashion. So, the township is secure in what they're receiving for safety and security. And all of us are secure in knowing that we're expanding in a proper and appropriate manner.

Mr. Foster: That's what I think we're getting very close. I think we're getting very close to.

Ms. Duncan: I just have a question for the rest of the Board members, okay Sharon go.

Ms. Sharon Adams, 6528 Ventura Drive: Sharon Adams, 6528 Ventura Drive. Pat, that upsets me that you say that.

Mr. Sable: Say what?

Ms. Adams: About future developments. We're not against that. But don't you think developers would like to have safety?

Mr. Sable: I think they do.

Ms. Adams: But you want to stop that.

Mr. Sable: No, I don't. I want them to be able to come in and develop the properties appropriately that meet the requirements of the township.

Ms. Adams: Pat, what we're trying to do is we're trying to, Wait a minute. Let me finish. We're trying to cross our T's and dot our I's. We're trying to look to the future of every possible scenario that might come up.

Mr. Sable: I don't disagree with that. I think you have the authority as members of the board, township supervisors, to do that. You have a responsibility to do that.

Ms. Adams: Okay, right? So, what I'm trying to clarify is we're not anti-development. But if they're.

Mr. Sable: I'm glad you hear that.

Ms. Adams: But we are for safety.

Mr. Sable: And we're all for safety, Sharon. We're all for safety. I'm just.

Ms. Adams: Okay. But what I'm hearing in the audience from you, Pat, is I'm worried about future development. Well, what are you worried about?

Mr. Sable: I'm worried about that this deters, an ordinance, if not put in force properly, would deter developers from coming in.

Ms. Adams: What would deter that?

Mr. Sable: The whole idea of having a requirement for two accesses.

Mr. Adams: But don't you think that's a safety thing? Now you're contradicting yourself.

Mr. Sable: When I looked at Bonnie Dell and Piney Ridge and Maria's Way and Greenbriar, they have one.

Ms. Adams: Oh, that was then. But that's. but now.

Mr. Sable: They have one. And I don't have, show me the issue from the police reports where we're having problems with issues regarding traffic or emergency vehicles coming in and out because I'm not hearing it. Are you hearing it?

Ms. Adams: Well, I'm going to tell you right now. It's a difference, let me finish. It's a difference between going over a culvert or a creek or a stream. And it's a difference between doing that or kicking a tree out of the way. So, if you have the one access.

Mr. Sable: You're talking about a specific, unique issue at Sleepy Hollow.

Ms. Adams: No, no. I'm talking about.

Mr. Sable: Show me the other one, Sharon.

Ms. Adams: Well, we don't know. It didn't happen yet.

Mr. Sable: Show me the other one.

Ms. Adams: It didn't happen yet, Pat.

Mr. Sable: Well, then we're doing what if scenario.

Ms. Adams: There's plenty of property around here that didn't happen.

Mr. Sable: Well then why are we doing guestimates?

Ms. Adams: It did not happen yet. We're trying to protect the future.

Mr. Sable: I understand that. And so am I with our school system and every other taxpayer.

Ms. Adams: The school system should not be part of this conversation right now.

Mr. Sable: Well, it is. It has to be because how do you think?

Ms. Adams: Well, we're talking about the township.

Mr. Sable: How do you think that 67% of the revenues that come to the school district come from property taxpayers?

Random comments regarding decisions and revenue from multiple people in the crowd making it indiscernible.

Mr. Sable: You may not. But what about all the other taxpayers in here?

Mr. Foster: The planning commission shouldn't either.

Mr. Sable: And I'm not doing that. But I am allowed to have an opinion.

Ms. Adams: Okay, I just want to finish up. I just want to finish up. I'd like to thank you all for your time. Thank you all for listening to what I have to say. But I just want you to realize that we're looking into the future, things that haven't happened yet. And what they're trying to do is try to have every possible scenario that could happen that lets be prepared for it. No matter what. Thank you.

Mr. Sable: And I'm on board with that same opinion.

Ms. Duncan: One more comment, please. I'd like to ask the board members. So, Irv is going to go back and maybe incorporate some other things, if necessary, based on what he's heard tonight, maybe nothing, I don't know, and you as well. You two will discuss this. Is there anything that any of you would have that would be a concern that you would like to see incorporated into this type of an ordinance that might be beneficial to this commission in making decisions in the future for development? Anybody?

Mr. Bracker: That was going to be. That was going to be my next question to the board was to ask.

Ms. Petruska: I do want to make one more comment. Sorry. Oh, sorry. Did the board have anything to say before I speak?

Mr. Bracker: Go ahead. Why don't you finish? And then.

Ms. Petruska: I'm sorry. My comment earlier was not complete. As I mentioned, my name is Sheila Petruska. I live at 3110 Shelley Drive. I live off of Southwell Drive. Southwell Drive is a single point of access onto Brownsville Road. The school buses do not go up Southwell Drive. As a result of the school buses not going up Southwell Drive, parents line Southwell Drive with cars in the morning and in the afternoon to drop off and pick up their students at the intersection of Brownsville Road and Southwell Drive. They create a traffic disturbance by doing that because they cut the road down to one lane. Cars coming down Brownsville Road are traveling the speed limit is 35 miles an hour on Brownsville Road at that point. Traffic is routinely going 45 to 50 at that point of Brownsville Road onto Southwell Drive. It is very difficult to decelerate my car to get it to slow down enough that I don't get rear-ended and I'm able to make a right-hand turn onto Southwell Drive. To do that with a line of cars is next to impossible. Thankfully, there is a sidewalk at that spot because Pat Lavelle, when he built that building and he put in that parking lot, put a sidewalk there. The parking lot is apparently private property. Parents don't use it, or some don't use it. And so, they line the road. This is something we need to avoid. This is something we need to protect against. I understand this is protecting the future, but we need safety. And that is not a safe situation. It creates a situation where a car can't come out and go in at the same time as you should be able to at that spot. And it's an accident waiting to happen. Hopefully, that accident doesn't involve a school child. Thank you.

Mr. Unknown: Same thing on Maripat.

Mr. Bracker: For the board, any questions or comments that you would like to share with the audience, with Irv? So why don't you go ahead and start, and we can. Yeah.

Mr. Devine: Yeah. Just a couple of comments I'd like to make first. And that is a lot of people like living on cul-de-sacs, especially people with kids. And that's something to keep in mind here. The second thing is it's like the last development that was approved here is Sunset Hills. And we actually had people here from Ajay Drive saying, "Please don't connect that to, don't put a through road there." So, I mean, you're going to please some people. You're going to displease other people. So that's there. The other thing is it's like not all access points are the same. And I've only had the chance to go through this. I haven't had all that much time. But this is for Irv. Maybe, Tim, if you want to address Jason, whoever wants to address this. But in Section 3, and I'm going to go Section 3L, and I'm going to go start with Sub 1. And to me, this reads as it's a performance standard. So, this means something has to be capable, capable of safely doing this, capable of safely doing that. So that's open to interpretation. So, I mean, that's an issue. I haven't fully thought it out yet, but that's something to keep in mind.

Ms. Duncan: Can you tell me again where that was? In paragraph?

Mr. Devine: Page 4, subsection 1 at the top.

Mr. Firman: I'm sorry. What was the forgive me? What was the concern that was?

Mr. Devine: It's a performance standard. Yeah. Okay. You go to Sub Section B. Each point shall be capable of safely accommodating. That's a discretionary standard. I mean, I don't know what that means. It's like maybe that needs to be refined. Okay. And then you get down to Sub Section 2, and that kind of flips into a semi-technical standard. So, you're going performance and then technical, and then in Sub Section 3, portions of that are, again, performance standards, shall be structurally capable of blah, blah, blah. So, I just think that's a question. Maybe that's something that needs to be looked at a little bit more. I haven't had enough time.

Mr. Papinchak: 3, Sub Section A. If you're capable, again.

Mr. Devine: Yeah. I mean, those are discretionary. I mean, they're performance standards. They're kind of discretionary. I have questions on Section 5, that's on page 5, and that's the waiver section. And that's we got the undue hardship because of blah, blah, blah. Again, that's a discretionary standard too.

Mr. Firman: Well, just to be clear, that language is directly quoted from the Municipality's Planning Code.

Mr. Devine: From what?

Mr. Firman: The Municipality's Planning Code. The Pennsylvania State Law that governs municipal planning. *Inaudible* is stuck with that language, and then there's a body of case law, right, that interprets that. So that really is just a yeah, that's just a cleanup from it's pretty similar to what we've been doing already. We just tightened it up a little bit to match the current Municipality Planning Code, which even if we didn't do that, that's what we govern anyway because you can't do something different than the MPC.

Mr. Devine: Well, is there any way my question then is, is there any way Tim brought up it's like the possibility trying to decrease the possibility of litigation that involves a township by having clear ordinances. It's like, is there any way to change the waiver section such that it's a little bit cleaner and it's

I mean, anybody can say it's like, well, a developer can come in and say, "Hey, it's too hard for me to put in two entrances because of blah, blah, blah." And then, I mean, is there any way to decrease the likelihood of litigation over that section, making it clearer?

Mr. Firman: That's just one where that becomes, when that comes before the board on a modification, the board gets discretion, but at a certain point, it's a legal they're sitting in a quasi at that point, the board is sitting in a quasi-judicial capacity, having to make a judgment call on that modification. Now, again, there's guidance from there's been a lot of situations. The thing about land development, right, is it's always a little bit different. That's why there's not really precedence on individual actions or individual matters. But the standards and the interpretations have been set forth by the courts on different issues over the years. And there's obviously the extreme modifications where there's no question you couldn't do it, and then there's ones that get closer, and that's where it goes. But the board has brought discretion to make those interpretations, and the courts tended to defer to their decision.

Mr. Devine: Okay. Final comment I have and it's kind of a question comment. I don't know what you want to call it. But it's just that not all access points are the same. It's like we all discussed Sleepy Hollow Road presents special challenges. It's a special situation. And we're kind of in my mind, I'm trying to see, it's like, is that an outlier that we're just going overboard to do things to basically wouldn't apply to other situations? I mean, we got right up here, let's look up the street at Park Social. I mean, that's a single entrance that goes to that business and those apartments back there. And I mean, there's no creek. There's nothing like that. I mean, does this have to I mean, is there a way to differentiate what needs to be done in different situations? I don't know the answer to that, but I haven't had a chance to look at this enough. But that's something just to keep in mind, at least in my mind. That's all I have.

Mr. Bracker: Okay, thank you, Rob. John?

Mr. Papinchak: Several of my comments. I agree with Rob on several points of the language. It's not as tight as I would like it, given that we just got this recently to review. It would be nice to look at some benchmarking, to look at some other comparable statutes or ordinances from other townships to see are we being consistent. Again, I think trying to tighten up some of that and being able to better consider all of the points, particularly the exceptions and the exception handling. I feel like some of it is a little open-ended. So personally, I would like, I really appreciate the feedback. I think some of those points that the residents raised, some of the points that Rob raised, if things were tightened up and then we had a chance to look at that maybe, again, as a comparison to some others, it would help me with better making a firm decision.

Mr. Bracker: Thank you, John. Bill, any comments you'd like to share?

Mr. Matyger: No, excuse me. I just want to thank everybody that came this evening and made your comments. I think that the safety is a very important issue. And at the same time, we don't want to we don't want to make sure that we're not holding back any new developments and so forth. So, I think everybody's on the same page on that, is we need some new development to help with the tax money, and we certainly want to make everything safe. And I don't think that we want to worry about going back on any areas that don't have that. But I think going forward, we just have to make sure that we're taking all those things into consideration.

Mr. Bracker: Okay. Thank you, Bill. Pat, anything else you would like to add?

Mr. Sable: No further comments. Thank you.

Mr. Bracker: Okay. Yeah. I guess my thoughts echo a lot of what you've already heard. Obviously, safety is a huge issue for everyone. I think that Sleepy Hollow with the culvert sort of brought that to the forefront that we were lacking in terms of ordinances there. And I like the fact that the board is looking to protect us as a community going forward. So hopefully, none of our community needs emergency access over a secondary road, ever. Hopefully, that never occurs. But Sleepy Hollow did sort of bring that to the forefront. And as Sharon and Debby had said, we don't know what the future holds. If a new development goes in someplace where we aren't even thinking of being possible for development, we need to make sure safety considerations are being taken into account. I like the idea it would be nice to get benchmarks for some of the surrounding communities to see what they're doing with their ordinances. Are we in line with 25 houses or 25 homes and 250 cars? Or should that number be higher or lower? I don't know. And the only other thing I would say is looking at cul-de-sacs, I do see the appeal. Years ago, 26 years ago, when my wife and I were moving into the community, we were looking for a house on a cul-de-sac because you didn't have to worry about the kids going out and riding their bikes on the road or if they were playing. So, I can see definitely an advantage to that for families. And I think we're all in the agreement across the board, safety and continued development where it makes sense. So that's really all I have. Any other questions, comments?

Ms. Duncan: I just want to thank the commission as a whole for entertaining this discussion tonight and giving us an opportunity to air this, giving both our attorneys and our engineers some extra inputs that maybe they can come back and give us another product that we can look at again for the future. And I do appreciate all of you. Thank you.

Mr. Bracker: And we did have one comment?

Mr. Unknown- *never identified himself but it is Stephen Muza of 1835 Edward Dr.:* I just had one for Tim. I had heard something when he had said that a developer had gone on to Glen Creek. Was that before or after the final vote?

Mr. Foster: It was right before the vote. It was about a week before the vote.

Mr. Muza: So, I guess the only other comment I had was the understanding, yes, Sleepy Hollow's dead. I keep hearing it, but somehow, I keep feeling there is slithering. And the only question I had was, no matter what document is nailed down, it's a great idea, but it's also, no matter how clear it is, it's somebody else's interpretation. So, if you had, we get this passed and say, "Okay, this thing's great," and then maybe the Sleepy Hollow development said, "Ooh, look at this. I like this. We could go back for another bite of the apple." And they don't seem like the people that just let it go and move on. I mean, that's just my interpretation of it. I've seen so many all these meetings, I've seen so many lies from them, whether it was about the traffic on Stoltz. "Oh, if we get this in, it's going to be 75 to 100 extra trips." And everybody's going, "What?" And then when they looked at the actual document, it was, "What? 75 to 1,000?" So, he didn't pick the middle of the road. He picked the bottom. And I'm not going to keep beating this to death, but I just have that feeling that no matter how well something's written, that maybe somebody else could come in and look at it and say, "Ooh, boy, they missed this." And then all of a sudden, they come back. And then my personal interest is they align with everybody. Why wouldn't Sleepy Hollow develop, period, ever? But I have an extra interest because I live on Edward Drive. And if they had looked at this and said, "Well, I keep hearing two points of access and everything," and then they go back and go, "Oh, hey, we could open up Edward and Patricia, and now we have our two points

of access." So, what's written is Tim's all over it, but it has to be nailed on the best they can because if they come back and say, "With your own ordinance, we got two streets that we could open up, and let's go back and visit Sleepy Hollow."

Ms. Duncan: So do the best we can do moving forward.

Mr. Converse (*also did not identify himself*): Yeah. One problem is that I own the end of Sleepy Hollow. I own the end of those two roads, and that'll never happen. It's all in our name.

Mr. Muza: Oh, I believe you. All of us prayed you weren't going to build a little monument down there for you. But again, what if somebody moves forward, and I don't know if it's applicable or not, but, well, this is because of the community. He mentioned taxes. It's an eminent domain. What if they come and say, "Well, Jim, we're going to have to move forward with this because we want to open that up"? It's been a concern because it's funny, before all this Sleepy Hollow stuff started this time, evidently, there were two or three other attempts that we never heard anything about. It wasn't in the paper. I didn't see it anywhere. And as a matter of fact, my cousin lives on off of Stewart, and he was filling me in on all this stuff and thinking, "Where did you read this?" I don't remember seeing it. (*Inaccurate-Any/all formal application were definitely advertised and posted.*) So that was it. I don't trust them. Everything they said was just crap, everything. You could go down a bullet point, and the last comment would be what other people would make is, "Even if we were for that development, that particular developer doesn't have the track record that would get my vote to say, 'Hey, if he was renovating my house and a guy across the street said, 'Man, look what he did to my house,' then I says, 'Holy cow. Well, what's he going to do to mine?'" And when he brought all that up, and like I said, I applaud all you guys spending the time. And I think the last election was clear as a bell. It was, A, there were two people added to it because we didn't like the way it was going on. And two, the only guy up for a vote got voted out. So, it's like I think that listening to the people somehow got muddied from all those meetings that it surprised me how, at the time, the supervisors didn't come back from that meeting and just say, "You know what? Shut your mouth. We see things you don't." They didn't even have enough courtesy to explain to us their mind on it. Like, "We voted to move forward with this despite your guys." And they didn't even spend two minutes saying, "Look, this isn't popular. I understand it but shut your mouth and let me talk." And then boom, there's a regular. Gone. Everybody's sitting there going, "Well, what happened? You know what? Nobody even told us and talked to us about it." And I think down at the polling for the voting, I got a chance to talk to some of the people down there. And the one guy knew it. He come up and says, "Well, I'd like your vote for so-and-so." And the guy says, "No, thank you." He goes, "Let me guess. Sleepy Hollow?" I says, "Yeah." I says, "There's 50 things that I felt they could have killed you after they, but it kept coming up again and again and again." I'd be surprised if it doesn't come up again. I hope it's dead forever, but I wouldn't be a bit surprised if maybe somebody takes another look and said, "Hey, I think we could work this." Contracts are *inaudible*. You know what this is? I mean, contracts are made and the minutia, some of the details, that one misses and the other catches. And once it's in writing, I just don't wind up having a hammer to come back with. That's all. That's it. Thank you.

Mr. Bracker: Since this was just a discussion, there's nothing for us to recommend or not recommend.

Mr. Sable: I think we should conclude the meeting. I think we should adjourn the meeting.

**Meeting
Adjournment**

Motion was made by Mr. Papinchak seconded by Mr. Sable to adjourn the meeting. All members voted aye. The motion was unanimously carried.

Time: 8:57 P.M.