

**WEST DEER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
APRIL 22, 2021 (Via Zoom)**

The Meeting was called to order with the following members in attendance:

John Butala, Patrick Stark, Robert Bechtold, Alan Banks, Suzanne Garlena, and Mark Schmidt

Absent Members: Kathy Rojik

Other Attendees: William Payne (Code Enforcement Officer)
Scott Shoup (Shoup Engineering)
Gavin Robb (Solicitor)
Dorothy Moyta (Zoning & Planning Administrator)

Applicant Presenters: Robert Feree, Landmark Properties Group, 910 Flex Bldg.
Jonathon Garczewski, P.E., Gateway Engineers, 910 Flex Bldg.
Scot Kurtz, Kurtz Architecture, 910 Flex Bldg.

Manny Johnson, Vice President, Olympus Energy
Melissa Southern, Stahl Sheaffer Engineers, Olympus Energy
Joe Buckenderfer, Michael Baker Corporation (for Olympus Energy)
Brian Dilleuth, Olympus Energy
Blaine Lucas, Legal Representative, Olympus Energy
Scott Cleveland, Regulatory, Olympus Energy

Outline and Order of Meeting

1. Approval of March Minutes
2. 910 Flex Use Building/ Lot line Revision/ Final land Development
3. Workshop Meeting: Dionysus & Leto Gas Wells -Olympus Answering Questions

Approval of Meeting Minutes

The March Minutes were unanimously approved.

910 Flex Use Building

Mr. Shoup went over his comments sheet dated 4.2.2021 regarding the Consolidation Plan – all appears fine with that and there is no need for the Planning Commission to review.

Mr. Garczewski presented the Land development Plans for the 910 Flex Building to include C101 Site Presentation Plan, C001 Existing Conditions Plan, C100 Overall Site Plan, C101 Site Utility Plan, C201 grading Plan, C310 Lighting Plan, C700 Stormwater Plan, L101 landscape Plan, and a rendering of the proposed building. He stated that it will be 20% office, 20% retail,

and 60% warehouse. The docks will be built out as the tenants move in. The appropriate plans have been submitted to County Conservation District. The following comments were made:

1. Mr. Schmidt asked whether street trees were required and Mr. Shoup answered no.

Mr. Shoup went over his comments sheet dated 4.21.2021 regarding the land Development Plan. He stated that over 20 % retail would prompt the need for more parking. He deferred #11 to Mr. Banks and stated that #12 needed an elevation. The following comments were made:

1. As regards #10, Mr. Garczewski stated that the dumpster area will be shown and clarified in the next submission.
2. As regards #11, Mr. Shoup suggested 25 trees. Mr. Banks asked if any buffers apply here and Mr. Shoup said that they did not.
3. Mr. Banks said that per the Ordinance shade trees should be specified. He suggests an alternative for the American Hornbeams.
4. Mr. Shoup asked whether Mr. Banks had any suggestions along Route 8 and Mr. Banks thought that 25 trees would be a great fit for a streetscape. Mr. Garczewski stated that there's a gas line and overhead lines in that area and asked whether that would interfere with the planting of trees. (The gas line is 3".) Mr. Payne stated that the stricter code always applies.
5. Mr. Shoup stated that the Ordinance states in 21.42 SU Zoning that something else could be substituted in lieu of trees. ed Banks felt that the cul-de-sac would create value in the future.
6. Mr. Feree asked whether Mr. Banks wanted all trees in the front. Mr. Banks said that it would be nice to have a streetscape on Route 910 and Commerce Drive. He added that it wouldn't block the building and would add value.
7. Mr. Garczewski asked if they could do a combination of shade and ornamental trees. Mr. Banks said that shade trees are by code. Mr. Garczewski said that they are fighting the utilities and overhead lines. Mr. Stark stated that looking at Google, that could be a problem.
8. Mr. Garczewski stated that the gas line is a 20' easement so that came into play with the placement of the trees. Mr. banks said that it would be a reason to go to the ornamental trees.
9. In reference to #12, Mr. Kurtz asked according to 14.5.8 Metal siding w stone base, Mr. Kurtz wanted to know what kind of metal siding as it's not clearly defined. Mr. Schmidt said to show us what you're proposing and we'll let you know if it's OK.
10. Mr. Stark asked whether there was a second floor. Mr. Kurtz answered no as it was cost prohibitive with ADA and there is not enough parking.

11. Mr. Schmidt asked Mr. Kurtz to explain the building parameters a bit more. Mr Kurtz stated that the building height was 25' in the front, 22' at the rear, and there was a 3' high stone base in the front. There was 10,00 SF of tenant space and about 5-8 tenants were expected. Mr Schmidt asked if windows were planned. Mr. Kurtz answered at the front and rear of the building but not likely at the canopies. Also, the veneer extends 15' around the sides of the building from the front. Mr. Kurtz also stated that he thought the building contained 10% offices and 90% warehouse.
12. Discussion ensued regard the stone base only wrapping 15' around the sides from the front of the building. Mr. Feree asked whether the stone wrapping around the front met the requirements if our ordinance. Mr. Kurtz said that the ordinance wasn't clear. Mr. Feree asked whether the sides were visible from Route 910. And Mt. Kurtz thought that they were.
13. Mr Payne said that the metal siding shouldn't exceed 60% of the façade and stated the windows counted.
14. Mr. Schmidt wants to see the architectural plans and all 4 sides. Mr. Kurtz said that he will submit plans elevations and sections.
15. Mr. Bechtold said the canopies can be counted as the 40% that is not part of the metal cladding. He also would like to see the sides be more delineated to break up the façade.
16. Mr. Feree asked whether the building across the street matched the current codes. It's a gymnasium with metal siding.
17. Mr. Shoup said the use vertical breaks to create more ornament on the side of the building.
18. Mr. Kurtz said that he was reading the ordinance directly but will work with Mr. Shoup and Mr. Payne to get something that everyone likes.
19. Mr. Payne thought that the building across the street had a 4' stone base.
20. Mr. Schmidt would like to see the architectural and landscape plans updated and Mr. Bechtold agreed.
1. There were no questions from the public.

A motion was made by Mr. Banks to Bechtold and seconded by Mr. Stark to table the 910 Flex Building till the next meeting. The motion was unanimously approved.

Workshop meeting – Gas Wells with Presentation by Olympus

Blaine Lucas, Legal Representative for Olympus announced the attending members the group (See Attendees List) Comments were made as follows:

1. Taige Rosendal, Acoustical Control, Regional Account Manager, was unable to attend tonight but will be at the May Planning Commission Meeting.
2. Mr. Lucas referenced the 31 question sheet with answers supplied by Olympus that is dated April 14th as well as the many attachments supplied by Olympus for tonight's meeting.

Joe Buckendorfer, Engineer at Michael Baker Corporation, reviewed the Site design and Permitting drawings for both the Dionysus and Leto wells. He discussed some overall points as follows:

1. Both wells are on the western side of the Township and both wells are accessed off of Route 910.
2. Dionysus is ½ mile north on middle Rd Extension and Leto is about a ½ a mile north on Oak Rd.
3. Dionysus has Deer Creek to the north and Dawson's Run to the northeast. The DEP permitted this on Oct 16, 2019. 2 wet ponds are located in the filtration basin. Less water may need to be trucked in for this well.
4. Leto will require some upgrades tp middle Rd extension. It is in the Dawson Run watershed. There is 75% release. The DEP permitted this on March 9, 2020. Chapters 1,5 have generated a permit for a culvert pipe and this must be renewed sept 25, 2019 and this permit will be renewed.

Melissa Southern, Stahl Sheaffer Engineers, reviewed the Traffic Study and water haul routes. She discussed some overall points as follows:

1. The water haul route for Dionysus is from Willian Flynn Hwy./ Route 910 to Middle Rd. Extension.
2. The water haul route for Leto is from Willian Flynn Hwy./ Route 910 to Oak Rd.
3. The traffic impact study looked at 5 intersection – each off of 910 . The study looked at turn lanes, capacity analysis, and que analysis.
4. Capacity was looked at both Am and PM.
5. Current levels at both Gibsonia Rd and Middle Rod as well as Gibsonia and Oak warrant traffic signals.
6. The study analyzed intersections for traffic off of Gibsonia Rd. and Middle Rd. All meet warrants for turn lanes. Gibsonia and Middle Road were at capacity with a level of service rating of F and Gibsonia and Oak were at level of service rating of E near capcity. Level of service rating is a scale from A to F with A being the best condition and F being at or over capacity for traffic.

7. Gibsonia and Middle road warrant both turning lanes, Gibsonia and Middle Road Ext warrants a left turning lane, and Gibsonia and Oak warrant a left turning lane.
8. The traffic was analyzed for both current and future projections. Dionysus was looked at for 2020 and Leto was looked at for 2024.
9. Intersections were analyzed for the hydraulic fracturing stage and all intersections were at or near capacity.
10. Analyzing Dionysus for 2022, each intersection is overall acceptable AM and PM. Although Middle Road got an F but this will be remedied in improvements ?
11. Analyzing Leto for 2024, each intersection is overall acceptable although Oak rd was a level F at PM. This will be remedied through improvements.?
12. The final slide showed recommendations, suggestions, and findings. 5 intersections were analyzed and this is on Appendix A1.
13. Analysis showed that Gibsonia and Middle road will continue to operate at level of service F and warrant a traffic signal and turning lanes. Middle road ext intersection will operate at an acceptable level (between A and D) and Oak road intersection will move from a level E to level F (Failure) with the development traffic added.
14. The LOS (level of Service) was analyzed and several intersections warrant traffic signals today outside of any impact from the Gas Well traffic.
15. The driveway entrances were also looked at for each site. Dionysous site will require one lane of traffic in and one lane of traffic out and a stop sign at end of driveway.
16. Coordination on roads with the Allegheny County Dept. of Public Works will continue.
17. Leto well pad will also need 2 lane of traffic and a stop sign at the end of the driveway.
18. Mr. Banks asked whether the study took into effect the traffic during the hydraulic fracturing couple weeks in the worst-case scenario where all the water had to be trucked in. that was confirmed.

Manny Johnson, VP Olympus, is working with 2 water authorities. Oakmont Water is doing a feasibility study and Hampton Shaler Water has a letter of Intent. They are working with these 2 authorities to eliminate as many water trucks as possible, hopefully at least 75%. These studies will be finished in the next couple of weeks. Comments were as follows:

1. Mr. Schmidt asked how many trucks the 75% reduction would take off of the road. Mr. Johnson stated that given about 400-500 trucks a day average this would take you down to about 100 trucks a day. It works out to about 11 trucks per hour during peak hours.
2. Mr. Payne added that is about 1 truck every 5 ½ mins and with them going up the steep hills on Oak Road can make a big difference in traffic because of the slower rate of speed.

3. Mr. Schmidt stated that a large part of the problem is that these trucks tend to travel in packs.
4. Mr. Schmidt asked regarding Dionysus, whether there is a way to consolidate the 2 detention ponds into one to preserve woods and buffer areas. Mr. Buchendorfer replied that in order to meet DEP stormwater requirements, since they are dealing with 2 watersheds, they need the 2 ponds separate to collect and analyze data. Mr. Schmidt still felt that it could be one pond by placing 2 outlet structures out of 1 common pond but Mr. Buchendorfer felt that that would not fulfill DEP requirements. Mr. Schmidt stated that it could be accomplished you would just need to meter them so you do not meet your allowance into each water shed (sides of the hilltop). Mr. Banks also thought that one pond would be enough.
5. Regarding road traffic, Mr. Butala stated that a former consultant said that there may be stoppages on the road. Would this cause delays with the buses and the school schedule? Mr. Johnson replied that it's never their intent to cause any delays with buses and they'll work around that.
6. Regarding water supply, Mr. Banks asked whether in working with the 2 authorities, would that entail existing lines? Mr. Johnson said that yes that is the existing lines. Mr. Banks asked whether there would be temporary above ground lines going through people's property and Mr. Johnson said yes that there are 2 ways to accomplish. The first is the temporary waterlines that would be negotiated with private landowners. The second is to upgrade the existing lines to provide additional access and pressure.
7. Currently they are looking at putting taps into the surrounding water authority's existing lines and then run above ground temporary lines to the well site. Those lines would go through a vault and be metered at the vault.
8. Mr. Banks asked whether these lines would effect current users on the water system. Mr. Johnson stated that the current users would have preference on the water supply.
9. Mr. Payne asked whether they could use an available existing line at Lick Rd. and Middle Rd. extension and extend that line and utilize it during operations but also extending the permanent infrastructure to the community. Mr. Johnson that he wouldn't know if that was an option.
10. Mr. Payne asked whether they could keep in mind that extending those lines will give nearby resident's connection to public water that are now on well water. Mr. Johnson said that they could look into that.
11. Mr. Schmidt asked about water going from the wells and being trucked out. Mr. Johnson said that they'll truck it out at 10-20 trucks a day but after a couple of months it'll be down to 2 or less trucks a day.
12. Mr. Payne asked whether any fracking water will be stored on site. Mr. Johnson said no that the water is placed in tanks and trucked out.

13. Mr. Schmidt asked whether they would be coordinating with the water for several weeks. Mr. Johnson said that they try to reuse water. Mr. Payne stated that he understood 10% of the water used to frack comes out of the ground. If 90% of the frack water stays in the ground and you use already used/contaminated water to frack with there is a higher concentration of the chemicals in the water to start and it then 90% of the total water stays in the ground. Mr. Johnson said no that for this activity that they would be bringing in water for reuse at about 5%.
14. Mr. Bechtold said that they've done the geotechnical engineering for the Dionysus and Leto well pads. He is an employee of the Firm doing this work so he will abstain from commenting on the gas wells.
15. Mr. Butala asked what happens with the fate of the drilling mud and what is the transport of the mud and what happens to it. What's in that mud ? Mr. Johnson said that the composition is the synthetic bayrite. Mr. Johnson stated that they reuse it from site to site. They use high quality mud. Mr. Butala asked exactly what is in that mud? Mr. Johnson said that there is synthetic oil along with a list of chemicals.
16. Ms. Garlena stated that residents have experienced low water pressure due to the higher volume of local water usage with wells. Mr. Johnson said that they will resort back to trucking more water if that becomes an issue.
17. Ms. Garlena asked whether their trucing included the sand trucked in. Mr. Johnson said yes that included about 55-75 trucks a day or 2 to 2.5 million tons of sand a day.
18. Ms. Garlena asked whether the sand trucks could pass safely on Middle rd. Extension. Ms. Southern said that yes they could. There are some tight points but they will be coordinating the truck schedules.
19. Mr. Lucas added that they will get info on composition of the drilling mud for Mr. Butala.
20. Mr. Banks would like more information on the screening and buffers being used (#24 or 27 ?)
21. Mr. Buckenderfer asked whether there was a particular viewpoint that they could study for screening. Mr. Banks stated that his property sits 100' above the Leto well pad and he feels that they need to restore the wooded areas that have to be cleared for this project. Mr. Butala agreed with the deforestation issue. Mr. Buckenderfer said that they would look into the issue.

Mr. Payne went over his comments sheet dated 4.21.2021 regarding West Deer Responses to Olympus responses which included comments from citizens. Comments were as follows:

1. Regarding #2, Mr. Payne feels that traffic will be impacted on Bairdford Rd.
2. Regarding #8, mud on the road, Mr. Payne stated that the PENDOT specifies 50' from the center of the road. Giving you only and additional 25' off of the ROW at Leto and 33' off the ROW at the Dionysus pad. The last time that we talked we had about 100' of

asphalt. He remembered that the last time Olympus had promised 100' of asphalt. Mr. Schmidt stated that we had some bad experiences with bony on the road in Russellton. Mr. Lucas stated that asphalt will make it worse – heavy gravel will scrub the tires. Mr. Payne felt that the additional asphalt will allow the mud to fall off and stated that we did not intend for them to negate the rock entrance but simply add additional paving.

3. Mr. Buckenderfer added that more asphalt paving will increase storm runoff and that Olympus would then need to go back to the DEP for a modification on the permit. Mr. Payne stated that this was brought up in the intital meetings where you stated that you would do 100' and now you are stating that it will only be 50' from the Center line of the road which is a very big difference.
4. Ms. Garlena thought that the cattle guard crossing would help to knock the mud off.
5. Regarding #16, Mr. Payne asked what trigger points would need to take place to make Olympus make changes. Mr. Johnson said that in the event of any incident, each and every event will be looked at. Mr. Payne asked if there are any protocols in place. Mr. Johnson said that there is a chain of command depending on the situation. Mr. Payne asked if there are any procedures. Mr. Johnson said that they have contacts to call in all areas of the operation. Mr. Payne asked if they could write something up as far as a formal procedure for traffic congestion or accidents. Mr. Johnson said that they would get the Twp so standard practices.
6. Mr. Payne asked what the staging of the trucks between trucks is it a 5 min, 10 mins, or 20 mins. Mr. Johnson stated they do not have a standard practice and Ms. Southern stated that she did not include that info in her traffic study. Ms. Garlean further conveyed and explained the need for a back up plan for any staging of trucks.
7. Mr. Payne asked whether there are any plans for the staging of the trucks inside the Township. Mr. Johnson said no, not currently for permanent staging for equipment. Mr. Johnson stated that they will utilize the truck traffic staging in the Twp. Mr. Payne said that if any plans are made that they should be made known and placed in conditional use and must be finalized before land development. If in Twp. noise from that staging location will also need to be addressed.
8. Regarding #19, Mr. Payne asked about the number of trips going to and from. Ms. Southern calculated about 46 trips per peak hour. Mr. Butala asked about the 56-75 sand trucks. Ms. Southern stated that the peak hours were looked at for 1 peak hour in the morning and 1 peak hour in the afternoon. Ms. Garlena asked if that included contractor's in that calculations since there will be about 40 additional contractor vehicles in addition to trucks per day. Ms. Southern stated they did account for 2 additional passenger vehicles (1 entering, 1 leaving). Ms. Garlena did not think that added up to the use.
9. Mr. Payne asked how prolonged delays in production or prolonged stoppage were handled. In thoughts that the site would need secured for safety. Mr. Johnson said that they would maintain security through on site presence or a fence.

10. Mr. Payne asked about the processes and timelines. Mr. Lucas said that they could put out a typical schedule that would include: Construction – 60 days, Vertical and horizontal drilling: 100-150 days, hydraulic fracturing: 30-70 days, Drill out and Clean-up: 30-70 days, Production 30-60 days. There could be up to 5 wells on each pad, but the 5 would be done at the same time. Mr. Johnson said that sometimes equipment waits could cause delays.
11. Mr. Payne asked if the 5 wells on the pad would be the maximum. Mr. Johnson said they could return and do the additional ones on Dionysus. Mr. Lucas said that they would get a follow up letter, and it's more lucrative for Olympus to handle the wells in group fashion.
12. Mr. Stark asked whether Olympus could come back in the future and do more wells. Mr. Lucas said yes but its site specific design.
13. Mr. Payne reviewed that when a complaint happens, Olympus has a 72 hour window to monitor and then respond. Mr. Cleveland said that they will work with homeowners in the case of noise etc. He said that homeowners often call them directly and don't always contact the Township. Mr. Lucas stated that most Townships allow 72 hours to monitor sounds. Mr. Cleveland said that Taige Rosendal will be in the meeting in May and will address all acoustical issue and concerns. Mr. Lucas stated that Olympus monitors all sound.
14. Mr. Payne needs a copy of the State and county standards as it relates to the road mud and cleaning as well as their contact info. Olympus stated they would.
15. Regarding #29, Mr. Payne asked whether we could have a graphic fence detail as currently there is only a narrative detail in the documents. Mr. Lucas said they would be able to do that. Mr. Payne asked whether at least the corners and about every 20' of the fence could be imbedded in concrete. Mr. Johnson stated that he doesn't see an issue of what ones will be concreted in but will provide a firm detail on it.
16. Regarding #30, Mr. Payne asked if Olympus if they could provide general lighting plan for all of the phases. Mr. Lucas said that he'd look into that.
17. Regarding #31, Mr. Payne asked how far the lateral drilling extended. Mr. Johnson said they extended northwesterly and southeasterly at 750-1000' apart. He said that they space them for maximum drainage. Mr. Payne said that residents will want to know if they are extracting gas from under their home. Mr. Lucas cited the Briggs vs. Southwest energy legal case but did not go into specifics. He did state that it would not pull from a 1/4 mile away. Mr. Johnson added that if they get close to a non-leased resident, that they can buffer. Mr. Cleveland added that this involved platts. Mr. Johnson stated that the DEP permit is have that information. Mr. Payne stated that the permit only identifies the vertical drilling and not the horizontal laterals. Mr. Lucas stated that the permits are available for public records.

The meeting was opened up for resident questions and concerns. Comments were as follows:

1. Jo Resciniti, 1006 York Way: Ms. Resciniti asked whether the construction timing starts were still Sept. 2021 for Dionysus and August 2022 for Leto. Mr. Johnson said that currently it is March 2022 for Dionysus and September of 2023 for Leto.
2. Tim Resciniti, 1006 York way: Mr. Resciniti asked if the May meeting will be virtual and if the public can present visual aids. Mr. Robb said that yes that can be provided for but will need to be coordinated with Mr. Payne. The next meeting though is not the official public meeting which will be announced at a later date. Mr. Resciniti asked whether at the next meeting that the 2 wells will be a single or 2 votes. Mr. Schmidt said that it will be 2 separate motions and 2 separate sets of conditions.
3. Mr. Robb said that the public meeting for both gas wells will most likely happen on the 3rd Wednesday of June, June 16, 2021, details to be announced.
4. Mr. Torrick, 1531 Palmer Way: In November of 2020, Mr. Torrick asked some questions of Olympus regarding the 2 page evacuation plan. He received a 2 paragraph answer and was disappointed as was the Josh Wiegand when presented with the 2 paragraphs.
5. Jack Rearick and Marcia Brissett: They want to address safety and health concerns. As regards Middle Rd. Extension, in Indianola, the truck traffic was bad at night. Sometimes there were 20-30 trucks in a row. Could someone speak to this ? Mr. Lucas said that they can't speak about what happens on other well pads - it's the responsibility of the regulatory agencies. Mr. Rearick thought that the wells would be creating noise 24/7 for 14 months. Mr. Johnson stated that well activity is not 24/7, although drilling, completion, and clean-up does involve some 24/7 operations. Mr. Rearick wanted to know if the plans were complete as to compressor and other equipment. Mr. Lucas said that they are only dealing in and around the well pads. (Mr. Lucas added that the Indianola trucks are range Resource trucks.)
6. Laura Henderson, 204 Locust St.: Ms. Henderson asked how the traffic impact study took into account Covid-19 and the altered traffic. Ms. Southern answered that the DOT guidelines have factored in the altered pandemic traffic by using historical data. Laura asked about where the monitoring locations were placed. Ms. Southern said that they were in locations (In traffic Impact study) and left in location for a minimum of 3 days and a maximum of 7 days.
7. Mr. Payne added that about 100 homes had been added off of Route 910 in the past several years after PennDots historical counts were taken.

A motion was made by Mr. Butala to adjourn the meeting and seconded by Mr. Stark.

The May meeting will be on May 27, 2021. It will be conducted via Zoom. The meeting link will be posted on the web site.