

PLANNING COMMISSION  
MAY 24<sup>TH</sup>, 2010 7:00 PM

**PRESENT:**

RICK CUTIA, CHAIRMAN  
KAREN STEPANOVICH, SECRETARY  
ANITA SIMPSON  
JOHN MUNSCH  
LARRY MORRIS  
DAVE KAHLEY

**ABSENT:**

GEORGE SMITH  
JEFF ANZOVINO  
TIM MARUCA, VICE CHAIRMAN

**ALSO PRESENT:** LOU DEROSE, SOLICITOR AND BARBARA J. CIAMPINI,  
PLANNING DIRECTOR

1.) SITE PLAN-SETON HILL UNIVERSITY-PARKING LOT

Rick Cutia: I'd like to call to order the May 24<sup>th</sup>, 2010 meeting of the Planning Commission. Everybody had a chance to review the minutes of the January 2010 meeting. If so are there any changes or corrections to those meeting, and if not can we have a motion to accept the minutes.

Karen Stepanovich: I make a motion to accept the minutes.

All were in favor.

## **Item #1 Site Plan-Seton Hill University-Parking Lot Proposal**

Boyd Ernzer: I am with the Architect firm of Fahringer, McCarty, Grey, Inc. And with me is Charles O'Neill from Seton Hill. We are the engineers, site development consultant for Seton Hill project. I can go through the drawings first. If there are any questions regarding the university I can address those. We did supply a set of drawings about three (3) weeks ago to the City and we had one round of comments and we did submit revised drawings which you have in the front of you. We did today receive from Vicky, she did send us the review comments from Gibson Thomas on the storm water and Doug Siler had also sent them to me. Maybe the easiest thing to do is go quickly through the drawings and if anyone has any questions I can address the comments. This of course is the title sheet, the zoning map is over here, (pointing to the plans) we are actually right about here on S. Main St. and this is Seton Hill University on this location. It kind of designates where the parking lot will be. It's just east of the developed area on campus in the fields essentially between the campus and Route 130. What we are proposing, let me go through the drawings first. This drawing is showing the overall view; this is the campus here and administration building, boiler house and the new McKenna Center here. The blue designates Coal Tar Run and Route 130 is about where my hand is. The entrance to the University is about here and this is a turnaround in the front of the administration building. There is a driveway a two way driveway which goes around the campus past McKenna Center and we will be accessing the parking lot from that driveway. This is an aerial photograph that was taken recently, actually in March. That is the basis that we used for our aerial topography. Again, this is the Administration building and this is the new McKenna Center, this is a roadway--the existing roadway. We would be developing essentially a parking lot in this area here. We are going to try and save some of the trees that are in the immediate area. There are trees along the perimeter of the roadway east of the roadway. This is fairly open in the front of the McKenna Center and then there is a grove of trees here. So we will be able to screen some of the parking lot from Route 130 using some of the existing trees that are present on site. This is our site development plan, again this is the roadway, the boiler house is here; this is McKenna Center and the Administration building is up at the top. What we are proposing is an access drive; a two way access drive the entrance would come down and circle around into the entrance of the parking lot. This would be a gated entrance with a card reader system so a person would be able to pull up flash their card and the gate would go up and then they would find their parking space. We're showing essentially a two (2) sixty (60) foot bays of parking, twenty-four (24) foot driveway and eighteen foot (18) parking spaces, here and here which would be separated by a landscaped island in both incidents about twelve foot wide (12'). These landscape islands we would use to collect storm water but will be piped into ultimately the detention base filtration system which shows on the grading plan. There is a sidewalk proposed from the entrance to the parking lot to the upper level and there is also a set of steps proposed and possibly a second set of steps over here towards the McKenna Center. We are proposing our handicapped parking to be

gathered in the center of the parking lot. Again, I think there is 308 spaces for vehicles proposed and were showing landscaped islands. We have tentatively shown a 12 X 18 shelter and a drop off pick up area in the front of that shelter. The idea is that handicapped persons would be able to use the call system, park their car and wait in the shelter and call to be picked up and dropped off to either class.

Barbara Ciampini: Is the parking designated for a certain group of people at SHU?

Charles O'Neill: Yes, it's going to be used for employees from Monday through Friday. On weekends or in the evenings it can be used for special events.

Boyd Ernzer: The entrance would basically be open for the events; you wouldn't use the card reader. The idea is if there is a basketball game or something going on at the McKenna Center they can use that lot. There is an enlargement of the handicapped area here and as I said there would be a shelter with a call area for the handicapped folks. We're also showing call boxes, there is one right at the entrance to the parking lot, there is one midway and then there is one at the very end. The emergency call system is at the University that they use. This actually is just an overall and it is showing everything on this site, all the utilities, all the grading, shows the layout of the parking lot and it shows the relationship to the existing developed area. It shows coal run and then again Route 130 is a little further down at the bottom of the page. This is our detailed grading plan and drainage plan which shows the 2 to 1 slopes, we would essentially be trying to keep some of the existing trees, the tree bands that are along the west area of the site. These designate 2 to 1 slopes were the contours are close together. The parking lot itself slopes between 2 and 5 percent of the maximum and then the access drive is 10 percent from the existing roadway down to the parking area. We're showing a series of catch basins and piping with three exit points which lead into the stormwater management basin infiltration systems. The water would be held for a period of time then released into Coal Tar Run. We have submitted stormwater calculations to Gibson Thomas and he had a few comments. This is our cut and fill area, the dark areas are fill and the light areas are the cut. Our calculations at this point show that we will have a balance so we would not be hauling any material off site or bringing any material on site. Now we have just this past week got core borings done by the geotechnical engineer and we need those borings to finalize our work numbers depending on the amount of topsoil we may have to do some slight adjustment but our intent would be to balance the project on site. Some of the cut would obviously be coming out of the stormwater basin and the rest of it would be up here and then we would be filling down here. I think the deepest fill I believe is about twenty-feet (20) and the deepest cut is somewhere in the neighborhood of fifteen-feet (15) down in the detention basin area.

Karen Stepanovich: How deep is this grading going to be from the roadway down?

Boyd Ernzer: From the roadway down these are 2 to 1 slopes, that is two-feet (2) of horizontal distance to every one (1) foot of vertical distance. Of course we will have

the geotechnical report. We had given the grading plan to the geotechnical engineer and they will conform whether or not that would be.

Karen Stepanovich: You said you are going to try and save the trees but when you really look at this your cutting that whole band of trees out. There may be a couple right here along this where you're not cutting, but basically you're cutting that whole band of trees out of the plan.

Boyd Ernzer: Let me go to our landscape plan. It shows the trees that would remain along the perimeter. These trees, these trees and of course these trees, (pointing to the plans). We are trying to save as many as we can. There are no trees existing over here in this area that's presently a three (3) to one (1) slope; so we are steeping that slope somewhat but we are trying to save as many trees as we can. We do have to go through that band of trees in order to access the lower area where the parking lot will go. The band of trees here are about thirty (30) feet wide, the band of trees here are about eighty (80) feet wide.

Barbara Ciampini: Are any of those areas, the areas of where the replacement trees are for the entrance?

Boyd Ernzer: The replacement trees actually start over here, it's a little hard to see but here are the trees, I think these are the trees that you're talking about.

Barbara Ciampini: Yes, they sit back from the roadway.

Boyd Ernzer: Yes.

Barbara Ciampini: They're like fanned out the whole way.

Boyd Ernzer: Yes, I don't believe any of these are touched. This one here maybe, (pointing to the plans.) But I think not. This is where the second set of steps comes up.

Barbara Ciampini: If the Sisters of Charity haven't asked you about the replacement trees, they will.

Boyd Ernzer: There is one here, it is in this area. Actually we may be able to work around that. We are really not changing the grades in there so we may be able to keep the, the trees are very small and we could actually have the contractor move that over about ten (10) feet and we can save that.

Lou DeRose: The grove on the lower right hand corner, you're cutting half of that out, yet the parking lot looks like it has room to rotate up to avoid that. Is there a technical reason for that?

Boyd Ernzer: Yes, we actually studied this pretty carefully. This area is a two (2) to one (1) slope so in order to bring this up we would have to build a wall here. You really couldn't go more than two (2) to one (1).

Barbara Ciampini: It's very steep there and that is way they stayed away from it, That is probably the most viable plateau on campus for parking, if you want to call it level you can.

Boyd Ernzer: Yes, if you look at it, this parking lot is staked now it was staked for core borings it kind of looks like a plateau there. It seems to lend itself to parking. There is a lot of parking and there are a lot of students out there. There are some utilities, there is a sanitary sewer line that comes through here and goes out and we will have to relocate a portion of that. This dashed pink line would be removed and a new sanitary line will come down here and go out. Rain is all stormwater those are the only two utilities. Sorry I didn't color this one in; we are replacing this one as well. (pointing to the plans). There is a section of sanitary lines that come through here and from here to here that will be replaced as well.

Barbara Ciampini: Have you talked to Greater Greensburg Sewage Authority?

Boyd Ernzer: Yes I have. I talked to Gino Rizzi and he told me that both of those lines are private lines and he did not need to see the drawings but he would ask when the time comes to have the contractor call and have it inspected and make sure the back fill is properly done. We put a note on the drawing to that affect that they need to be contacted before back filling.

Barbara Ciampini: I am asking that you please provide him with a plan.

Boyd Ernzer: We did send a plan; we sent him a set of drawings when we first sent out the first round of drawings. I can send him an updated plan.

Barbara Ciampini: Please keep him in the loop.

Boyd Ernzer: I'll copy you as well. This is our E&S Plan Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan. I think when we talked last time Barb I said that we were going to try and set up a meeting with Westmoreland Conservation District to go through this and we are not able to do that. We were hoping to meet with them today but their schedule is not such that we can meet with them. We have applied for an NPDES permit and because this is more than one acre disturbed and we sent them a copy of our stormwater ordinance as we did with Gibson Thomas and to Jim Pillsbury and we sent them the narrative for the Erosion Control Plan and these drawings. We are hopeful we can meet with them this week. As of now we do not have the NPDES permit and we have no comments from them at this point. I would say that we've done a lot of work in Westmoreland County over the years and I think we have a good relationship with them. I believe we will get the NPDES permit but we just don't

have it at this time. These are additional detailed construction sequences and these all relate to the permit from the Conservation District, these are erosion control details and this is pretty much what we show. These are our site details, bituminous paving, concrete, the bituminous paving will have to be conformed with our geotechnical engineers they will actually do a calculation as to the required thickness. We're showing something and our detail says that they need to verify that. We will have that information before construction. If I can point out we are using an asphalt wedge curb around the perimeter of the parking lot, the main entrances and all the islands would be concrete curb. We're showing signage, traffic signs. Our light fixtures are detailed, guide rail, we're matching that with the one that is up there.

Barbara Ciampini: Are you matching the lighting with what you have in the other parking lot?

Boyd Ernzer: Yes, they will be identical fixtures. Actually we have two (2) fixtures one would be like the shoe box fixture with the larger lights and then we're going to use the pedestrian lights along the walkways. These are more typical details for the utilities, precast inlets, manholes, trenching details. These are specifications or enlargements and also shows the details for the steps.

Barbara Ciampini: I don't know how that is all going to work with your call system and handicapped parking and the stairs. Is that something that the ADA condones, when you get a review they are going to approve such a concept? Have you done this before?

Charles O'Neill: I can tell you from the experience that we had, we had gone to Harrisburg to meet with Labor and Industry and they gave us a variance for that just because we had made arrangements for people to be able to call security to come and get them and pick them up if they are handicapped. Unfortunately you have to put handicapped spots in the lot even when you know it's not very likely that handicapped people will park there.

Barbara Ciampini: I think one of our planning commission members alerted me today that you are showing an exorbitant amount of handicapped spaces probably to meet our code but I've gotten approval from ADA before for the City when we built the parking lot on the other side of the train station and down at St. Clair Park for a variance---there is no handicapped parking in any of those areas because we provide handicapped parking elsewhere closer to facilities. We managed to get that through. If that is something Seton Hill wants to do to look at centralized parking spaces for handicapped or some sort of mixture thereof, we can look at the campus at large as it relates to handicapped parking needs, real needs, not just to comply with a code.

Dave Kahley: I'd like to talk about that, too. First you can finish up with your plans.

Boyd Ernzer: Okay. These two (2) are stormwater related, those are drawings that we don't typically put in our big packet but they were drawings that were in the stormwater management report. This is the lighting and again we are using the same fixture. We will also have lights going up the steps. We are proposing a number of trees. We are going to try and start a screen along the slope area. We have the screening on this side of the parking lot and we're going to try and get screening on the other side of the parking lot. We are going to use Pines and Hemlocks. We have Serviceberry flowering trees in the middle of the islands and then we have some Littleleaf Lindens around the perimeter of the parking lot. There are some Blackeyed Susans and other different types of flowers. This is where the entrance is with a turn around. That's pretty much it. Let me say one thing about the review from Gibson Thomas. There were three (3) items. (1.) Engineered swales or pipes should be provided to convey the flow from storm outlets. I did send to Doug copies of the drawings that showed the swale and they were on the drawings all along and that layer was turned off and no one noticed it went it went out. Apparently he did his review before he got the second set on the drawings. They are shown on our drawings here as well. We do have an energy dissipater going into the pond; we do have calculations for all of the swales and for the types of lining for all of this. (2). Stormwater report does not include the paving for the proposed additional parking area shown on SD-2.0 in the design of the detention basin. I actually asked our stormwater person and she told me that that is actually included in the calculations but it may not have been clear but what he's asking is if this alternate bid is excepted is there enough detention for this added paved area in the detention base and in the infiltration area? And the answer to that is yes. I'll have to give him a letter to that effect. We did take that into account and we need to clarify that with him. (3). The embankment and the emergency spillway, that all kind of relates to, do we need additional capacity? We have adequate capacity for the additional paving if the University decides to go for the extra forty (40) or fifty (50) spaces. There is actually extra capacity, the detention basin, but he's asking should we take another look at the orifice to see if there might be a better way to look for future development? We can certainly do that although I don't think there are any future plans for development along this side that would be able to use that detention. It's situated pretty much for this parking area and if for some reason if there is additional development that can utilize that sometime in the future would be a simple matter to change the size of the orifice that is existing in the stormwater basin. Again I can talk to Doug about that and we will get a letter out to him tomorrow and I will copy the Planning Department. I'll be glad to answer any questions. I would say since this has been said to me so many times, that the University is very anxious to get started and would like to be finished by the end of summer if possible because of the school schedule. It would be nice if you would consider some sort of conditional approval we could give the NPDES permit when it came through. I am just thinking, wonder if we get the permit next week, we have to wait three weeks then for the Planning Commission wait a week or two for console. That would put us back six (6) weeks so I am just wondering if you might consider it. Again, I would be happy to answer any questions. We can talk about the handicapped spaces as well.

Rick Cutia: Well. I think it's unfortunate that your comments were only dated today from Gibson Thomas and haven't been addressed in an official manner. I believe it's enough of a question to this committee that we won't be able to take an action on the plan until we see something cleared up about Gibson Thomas comments because stormwater in that area is very important. The other thing is an official NPDES Permit is absolutely necessary before we would take any action. If you are unable to have that attached to this plan I believe the Planning Commission would have a difficulty in making any type of interim decision on approving the site plan without that official permit and any other grading permit that would be required for this project. That being said if any other members of the Planning Commission have anything to say. I know Dave does and he would like to address them at this time. Maybe we can discuss those problems and get them out of the way now so that when we do get these items that seem to be most critical taken care of then we can quickly move on.

Barbara Ciampini: Like I said Boyd when we met this NPDES should be attached to the application. I know you're under the gun. I hate to bring this up, we don't meet that often and if the Planning Commission members are willing to meet on June the 7<sup>th</sup>, 2010, that would be two (2) weeks from today, then we can go to the Council agenda meeting on June the 8<sup>th</sup>, 2010 and still keep your same schedule for the June 14<sup>th</sup>, 2010 Council meeting. That would be entirely up to this board if they want to call a special meeting to do that for this project. I don't want to see the Planning Commission doing that on a regular basis, but if that is something we might need to do to keep this project on schedule. We are a week ahead of time because of the Memorial Day holiday.

Karen Stepanovich: That would depend on if they are ready.

Dave Kahley: I have comments about the parking and one about the drainage plan. My thing is the functionality of the parking lot and especially some pedestrian conflicts in the design. Partly due to the absence of sidewalks for pedestrians to get out of the traffic lanes and then also the fact that the long site line of the parking lot and the wide aisle tend to create more of a race track fast travel in this type of configuration of a lot. The specific issues are: first of all I didn't understand the handicapped parking area. I was recommending without knowledge that putting handicapped spaces this far from destinations down a grade seems to be something you were doing because you are required to and not because it makes sense. Even hearing the fact that you have call buttons, I don't think quite frankly that the idea of handicapped parking provides equal parking or equal access and having people wait for somebody to come down and pick them up with a special vehicle that may take a long time. People are waiting down there, unheated, and we all know how nice bus stops are, and I still think, not the ones locally (as he looks at Larry Morris) they are open with no doors; no lounge in them. My thought is that you consider an institutional parking plan that would plan those handicapped spaces somewhere else,

closer to the destinations rather than the thirty (30) foot grade down here. Not to mention the distance that they are from where they could actually use a sidewalk which is up at the curbed road. At least if the spaces were over there and if you weren't going to shuttle people could kind of get up that space but anyway that is a suggestion. I would suggest a wavier so you wouldn't have to have parking down there. Also it would probably give you several more spaces.

Barbara Ciampini: Especially since its employee parking, you know which employees are handicapped and you know where they work on campus. You know their specific destinations and you can be flexible when employees change location.

Boyd Ernzer: That is very similar to the problem we ran into with the LECOM lot. We had to put handicapped spots in there and that is even further away actually. We would be happy to consider, it would probably be much better putting them centrally someplace on campus.

Dave Kahley: I think you have to do more of a global look and you can do that. Those codes were built for parking lot by parking lot. This other island if you have to do it every island they are not used. That was one of the recommendations but to get down to the staircase leading from the lot deposits pedestrians in the middle of the active traffic lane. What I am saying here is, if you go to that central staircase the recurrences when you have pedestrians crossing into the middle of the driving lane they have to walk off angle, if you get my drift, you really want pedestrians walking from one side of the street to another without having to take an angle of being forced into turning traffic. You have that problem right there.

Boyd Ernzer: I understand, you're saying they come down here and they really should be able to go over here, (pointing to the plan.)

Dave Kahley: Yes. Like any traffic intersection off angle intersection they are the most dangerous. Also, the curbs at the entrance off the main road at the top, again to my eye; the curb that you have allowing vehicular access should be more squared for pedestrian holding, where you have that little circle at the top of the staircase then you have the curb on the roadway. I think that should be squared to provide a landing pad for people. What you're doing there is making the pedestrians walk across off angle again across that road. Again, a ninety (90) degree angle for visibility, peripheral vision, visibility is the best. You're actually having someone cross with their backs slightly too oncoming traffic from the north. Do you follow that? I would turn those into ninety (90) degree intersections and not have such a severe curb as you come up from the right lane. You need to make that a squared corner. Do you follow? As you can see here, I drew a ninety (90) degree angles at the top so the people coming up here and swinging fast it slows them down. I think the least curb you can put in there usually helps quiet drivers down and there is probably going to be a stop sign there and there would be more configured crosswalk.

Charles O'Neill: There will be three (3) stop signs there.

Dave Kahley: Yes it's a three (3) way stop. My suggestions are on the bottom of the report I gave you. Other people need to talk. I was going to say eliminate all but 3 handicapped spaces, you can have some in there right towards the entrance. I think you need a much larger landing pad as the staircase comes down so I would eliminate those first three (3) spaces you will more then get them if you eliminate the handicapped. You will create more of a pedestrian waiting zone. I would suggest removing the central turn around where you have it now, you have one where the handicapped is and actually consider.

Boyd Ernzer: Right here?

Dave Kahley: No, the one in the middle. My thought is that people come into the lot and if they miss a space or see one on the other side they have to zoom around, you might consider two (2) cross roads, one there and one further there. (pointing to the plan). That creates a little bit more of a circulation inside, because if someone misses a space they need to come back around towards the entrance were you have incoming traffic. So the two (2) crossing roads beside the lot will give you more internal circulation rather than forcing them back when trying to get out. People would then be swinging around when everyone else is trying to come in. Do you follow the logic on that?

Boyd Ernzer: You're saying to add another one?

Dave Kahley: No, take one out. I think it's unbalanced and it's a judgement call on your part. I'm not saying it's a deal breaker in my mind, but I think it creates more internal circulation; you're going to have a loading problem when people are trying to get out. You will have a lot of cars trying to get out in that area, and now if someone wants to circulate in the lot they almost can't do it. The two crosses tend to help. Again, something to think about, the other thing was sidewalks, if possible, I know you have a grading issue but if there could be sidewalks between the two (2) staircases if would provide possible separation. How I would get there is I would limit your aisle width, you say it's twenty-four feet (24) I think you can go down to twenty-two feet (22) and pick up four (4) feet in surface lot. If you look at the plan, is the existing asphalt paving, the road up there? That's an eighteen foot road (18) right?

Boyd Ernzer: It varies.

Dave Kahley: Is that two (2) way or one (1) way?

Boyd Ernzer: It's two (2).

Dave Kahley: You have a wider driving path down the parking lot; I know you need that for backing up vehicles. You can go down to twenty-two feet wide (22).

Boyd Ernzer: Are you talking about here?

Dave Kahley: From there to there on the hillside. (pointing to the plan).

Boyd Ernzer: Wait, are we talking about in here?

Barbara Ciampini: Yes.

Dave Kahley: Basically what you do is create a little bit of space that people can get to a safe place; otherwise they are going to be walking that whole length of that parking lot out in traffic. Again, it's just a thought. The last thing is, as you can tell I have an issue with alignments. As people enter the pad for the gate, entrance and exit, that width there, if you're an oncoming car, visions yourself, the gate is open and now you have to kind of make a left hand turn to get into that straight lane. I don't know if you can do anything there better, slightly better alignment.

Boyd Ernzer: We have a great shot out, you have a decision to make, do you want to go straight or up.

Barbara Ciampini: You can make them make a right.

Boyd Ernzer: Well, we could but keep in mind as your coming down the hill it's a higher elevation and you should be able to see as your coming around were the parking is and were it's not. In other words, are there more cars up in this area or more cars down this area?

Dave Kahley: Why does the pad have to be oval in shape?

Boyd Ernzer: You need to have a gate on both sides and it certainly does not, it helps a person making a right turn to get into that mode. It does hurt the person who is going straight but they would be hurting anyway because you need an island here.

Dave Kahley: With that I will stop talking about parking but that my thoughts. The other thing just from a standpoint of storm water. I was involved with a master plan at the University of Washington which has a storm drainage issue. I noticed that with some of the acid mine drainage; down at St. Vincent the ponds that they have are really naturally landscaped. What I see here is more of an engineered solution to stormwater and I thought with as prominent as this hillside, for instance there is no blending, if you look at your grading plan, you blob the dirt here and you dig a hole here. There is no natural grading, I think this can be a little nicer, it looks like the engineers just went out there and plopped the pond right here; not that I have anything against engineers or bus stops. I think this can be a bit more artistic.

Boyd Ernzer: I tend to agree with you on that. I wanted to discuss the pond with the Conservation District.

Barbara Ciampini: I called the Conservation District too and they just got the plans and haven't started to review it yet. The Conservation District will probably make similar comments.

Dave Kahley: The last thing on sheet 5.1 it's just a small thing, topsoil, although preferred, no topsoil shall be required on slopes of 2-1 or steeper. This suggests that the whole area that you're going to cut down is not in topsoil?

Boyd Ernzer: It's usually not a good idea to put topsoil on such a deep cut.

Dave Kahley: So it's just going to be on dirt?

Boyd Ernzer: No, it will be with a seed mixture, like a conservation seed mixture.

Dave Kahley: Oh, Okay.

Boyd Ernzer: We have to use a seed mixture. We can't get our permit without it. We used it on the other side and it looks real nice.

Karen Stepanovich: I looked over your landscaped plan and it's not bad.

Lou DeRose: That is actually a great compliment coming from Karen.

Karen Stepanovich: The pine trees down in the front of this, could you bury some of that and put some hardwood down there. If you really want to hide it you can put one or two hardwood trees if you get a disease or bug or something it will wipe out the whole row of pines. Maybe put in some oak something that will replace some of the hardwood that you are taking out; maybe some maples; something other than all pine. If you get all pine in an area it's really not conducive for the wide life or for anything else.

Boyd Ernzer: We do have Hemlocks there.

Karen Stepanovich: I do like Hemlocks, but you know there is disease coming around and will eventually wipe out all the Hemlocks on the eastern seaboard. I do like the Hemlocks. I do like white pine but I just don't see great big clumps of it in the front of there. I think if you put some sort of Oaks that will grow to be mature tree and really accent that area. We get a little more shade with all pines but I think it would look much nicer and be more beneficial to the area.

Barbara Ciampini: They even have Black-eyed Susans for you, Karen.

Karen Stepanovich: I see that.

Lou DeRose: If the members do not have any more questions the issue then becomes a timing issue. With all the corrections to be ready for June the 7<sup>th</sup>, 2010. Because if you say it can be I think this commission would be willing to help you. We can do a little maneuvering that we can use by simply adjourning this meeting until June the 7<sup>th</sup>, 2010 and we don't have to advertise it or anything. But just quite frankly don't waste our time if it can't be done by June 7<sup>th</sup>, 2010.

Boyd Ernzer: My only concern is that we won't have the NPDES permit. We certainly can get our drawings addressed based upon the comments. The most meaningful one right now is the comments from the Westmoreland Conservation District. Not only haven't they completed the review, your saying they haven't really started.

Barbara Ciampini: Vicky spoke to Kathy and they did not review it yet. We can prod them along for you, but it's really your show.. Within two weeks they should have reviewed them. I will nudge them for you. We will massage that too to help you out Boyd. They know what we're looking for already.

Boyd Ernzer: Well is it possible that like June 7<sup>th</sup> we could say we don't have the permit yet. I can certainly make the commitment that we could get our drawings done.

Barbara Ciampini: You can let me know the morning of June 7<sup>th</sup> if we don't have it we won't convene. June the 7<sup>th</sup> is a Monday.

Boyd Ernzer: I would say yes we can do that--if we can get the NPDES permit.

Lou DeRose: If that's the thinking someone could simply move to adjourn this meeting to June 7<sup>th</sup>, 2010 at 7:00PM and we're really not out of session here we will just reconvene.

Boyd Ernzer: That will be very helpful for the University and for us.

David Kahley: I suggest we adjourn this meeting.

Karen Stepanovich: I second.

All were in favor.

Meeting adjourned at 8:00PM