

WILKES-BARRE/SCRANTON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT  
BOARD MEETING  
MARCH 17, 2011

A regular meeting of the Wilkes-Barre/Scranton International Airport Joint Board of Control was held Thursday, March 17, 2011 in the Terminal Building Conference Room at the Airport. The meeting was called to order at 10:50 A.M. with Commissioner Stephen A. Urban presiding.

**PRESENT:** Commissioner Stephen A. Urban  
Commissioner Maryanne C. Petrilla  
Commissioner Thomas P. Cooney  
Commissioner Corey D. O'Brien  
Commissioner Michael J. Washo  
Commissioner A. J. Munchak

**ALSO PRESENT:** Barry J. Centini, Airport Director  
Michael W. Conner, Assistant Airport Director  
Gary Borthwick, Director of Finance  
Stephen Mykulyn, Director of Engineering  
Walter Griffith, Controller, Luzerne County  
Attorney Neil O'Donnell, Luzerne County Solicitor

**ITEM 2:**  
**PUBLIC COMMENTS.**

**COMMENTS:** Mr. Griffith questioned what the status of the Airport Budget is for Year 2011. He went on to say that he received a letter from Attorney O'Brien stating that the Airport is not an 'Authority' but that it is a 'Board' and therefore, the Airport does not fall under Authority laws. Then he questioned if that was correct. He stated that his concern is that without an actual budget for the Commissioners to follow, then where is the financial tract for this Board Meeting. He stated that, because the Airport is not an Authority, that the Board has the authority to mandate that there be a budget passed in a timely manner. He strongly urged the Board to pass a budget so that every year, whoever sits on the Board would have a guideline to follow. He noted that looking at the financial reports it shows no comparison as to what the budget was last year to give the Controller's office a guideline as to what was budgeted and how much is left in the fund. He stated it would help the Controller's office to see that the Airport is following the financial plan of the Board. He also stated that it would be very responsible of this Board to pass a financial resolution stating that there must be a budget passed in a timely manner and if it is not then the Airport can follow the previous year's budget, much as the Counties do.

**COMMENTS:** Mr. Griffith also asked about the status of the ARC payment and if the County is going to receive the \$ 150,000.00 ARC payment from the Airport. He stated that Luzerne County needs that payment for the retirement fund. Commissioner Urban informed Mr. Griffith that regarding the Budget it was decided to not put it on the agenda for this month, that the Board still has some disagreement over salary increases for management employees and there is a disagreement over the ARC payment. He went on to state that this is a two board of commissioners that meet, not under the Municipal Authorities Act but under an agreement that was entered into in the late 40's between the two counties. He stated that as far as he is concerned at this point and time the Airport is operating under the same spending cycle as last year until that budget is passed. As far as the ARC payment is

## PUBLIC COMMENTS – Cont'd...

concerned Commissioner Urban does not feel that the disagreement has reached the point of arbitration.

### **COMMENTS:**

Mr. Griffith asked about the contract award being given to L.R. Kimball for the Airport Access Road during this meeting. He wanted to know if the Airport Board did the due diligence on the vendor they are awarding the contract to. Mr. Centini stated that the Airport followed the FAA Guidelines on Consultant Selection. The Airport did the advertising, interviewing and the scoring and they made the selection on who they feel is the best qualified for the scope that the Airport is looking for. Then after that the Airport negotiated the price for the contract.

### **COMMENTS:**

Charles Adonizio, President, Greater Pittston Chamber of Commerce addressed the Board asking if the vote for the Airport Access Road Roundabout is on the agenda. Commissioner Urban responded that 'yes' it is. Mr. Adonizio then asked that the Board vote in favor of this road and then stated that if the Board cannot vote in favor of it this morning then at least table their vote. He stated that it is a very important matter and he would like the vote tabled until everyone can discuss this matter at a round table, with people from the Board, with people from the park that this affects, and with the citizens of Dupont and Avoca Borough. He asked the Airport Board to support the Community and not just think about the Airport, just as the community has supported the airport. Mr. Adonizio stated that he understands Barry's concerns regarding additional traffic in the roundabout at the entrance to this airport, but he stated this road was designed by PennDOT over a 22 year period and that Barry sat on the Board of the Greater Pittston Chamber of Commerce while this was going on, and Mr. Adonizio then read a excerpt from a letter written by Barry Centini to the State Transportation Commission dated February 23, 1989 as follows "the Airport and the US Government Department of Navy are the only land owners between exit 49 off Interstate 81 and the proposed turnpike interchange. The Airport offers as local share and easement of 85 hundred plus or minus linear feet, the entire length of the roadway, as its contribution to the project. The actual easement width will vary depending on embankments, lands, etc. Further, for the purpose of this presentation we establish an average easement with 100 feet, this will result in approximately 20 acres of land awarded being provided by the Airport to initiate this project. An appraisal has not been completed on this property, but it is sufficient to point out that another recent appraisal of the airport property land is appraised at \$ 50,000.00 an acre. Thus it is, if we establish a conservative estimate of \$ 40,000 an acre the resulting value is \$800,000 of the local share by the Airport". He then proceeded to state that he does not understand what has changed and why at this 11<sup>th</sup> hour would anyone try to derail this project. He also stated that the Pittston Chamber of Commerce had a special meeting at 8:00 A.M. that morning and they voted unanimously to support this roadway project. In conclusion he read a letter from the Chamber to Barry Centini asking for his support for the roadway and to urge the Bi-County Board of Directors of the Wilkes-Barre/Scranton Int'l Airport to approve the required easements.

### **COMMENTS:**

Mayor Daniel Lello, Dupont Borough, stated that he was attending this meeting basically for the safety of 26 hundred people of Dupont and also for the two families that were displaced in Dupont. He said for years citizens of Dupont have been asking how they are going to improve the safety of Suscon road, he said this is the fix for it. He stated that Dupont Borough has always supported Grimes Park by getting the road fixed; Dupont Borough has taken the road over and maintain that road for the infrastructure, not just for Dupont, but for Pittston, Luzerne County, Lackawanna County. He stated they look at the infrastructure building and building and that we need to support that infrastructure right now. He stated that how are the communities going to support this infrastructure, with the roads from Dupont, it

## PUBLIC COMMENTS – Cont’d...

can't happen, he stated, because they don't have the facilities to do it, but this road gives them the facilities to do it. He concluded with urging the Board to vote 'yes' on the road.

### **COMMENTS:**

Mr. Mark Sitkowski, Resident of Lackawanna County and a business man in the Grimes Industrial Park. He stated that he hopes that common sense prevails today with the adoption of this project. He stated that we have a chance to do many great things here, you allow access to businesses, everyone in the private sector talks about jobs, jobs are hard to get and maintain, infrastructure is a big part of that, transportation is a huge part of that, you have a growing industrial park that is choked off by one residential road for its entrance and exit. With the business aspect you also have a great chance to achieve safety in many different ways. An additional egress point from the Industrial Park is a big factor for the Pocono Ridge residents, the workers there and the safety for residents of Dupont. He concluded by urging the Board to allow this access road, allow the Industrial Park to grow, bring jobs to the area, bring safety to the whole area. He stated he would rather the Boards legacy be that they added to the infrastructure of the area and not that they turned down a \$42M project that was set to go.

### **COMMENTS:**

Attorney Bill Burns, Higgins & Associates of Wilkes-Barre and a Lackawanna County resident stated that he was here today regarding the vote on the airport access road. He stated he would like to add another merit to the Board voting for the access road and that is that he has been engaged by a group of property owners within the Grimes Industrial Park. He stated they have concerns about the results of this scope. The property owners have engaged Mr. Burns with respect to potential litigation concerning this vote today. Whether that litigation goes through depends on the outcome of the vote. Mr. Adonizio referred to the letter from Mr. Centini of 1989 committing the local share concerning the airport access road. At that point Commissioner O'Brien asked Mr. Burns if he was at this meeting to threaten litigation. Mr. Burns stated that that was not what he said; he stated he said "potential litigation depending upon the vote". Commissioner O'Brien asked Mr. Burns what that meant. Mr. Burns stated that he has clients that own property in the Grimes Industrial Park and their concern is that they detrimentally relied upon the actions made concerning the airport access road. And their claims, collectively, among his clients, are going to be quite substantial should there be a negatory vote. He stated that his clients are valuable members of the community, collectively, and have acted in reliance on what has transpired to this point concerning the planning, all the engineering that has gone into the planning stages of this project. He stated he would not use the word "threaten litigation" but he would say that his clients are concerned about whether this vote passes, because if it does not pass they will have claims of detrimental reliance upon what has happened in the past concerning their properties and how they kept and maintained their properties to this point. If this does not pass there may be litigation based upon these claims of detrimental reliance against the Bi-County Board and the other responsible parties concerned. In conclusion Mr. Burns stated that if the vote does not pass the Board can expect litigation and perhaps other parties can expect litigation.

### **ITEM 3:** **APPROVAL OF MINUTES.**

#### **MOTION:**

To approve and dispense with the reading of the February 17, 2011 Bi-County Board of Commissioners Meeting minutes.

#### **MOVED BY:**

Commissioner Cooney

#### **SECONDED BY:**

Commissioner Petrilla

#### **VOTE:**

Unanimous

**ITEM 4:**  
**BUSINESS REPORT:**

Passenger Activity

**DISCUSSION:**

Mr. Conner reported on the "Airport Quick Look" charts, passenger enplanements for the month of February 2011 increased 10.4% to 14,832 from 13,439 in the month of February 2010. Enplanements for the month of February 2011 compared to the month of February 2009, decreased by 834 which is -5.3%. In February 2011, 7 departing flights were cancelled due to mechanical problems, 18 departing flights were cancelled due to crew availability, and 51 departing flights were cancelled due to air traffic/weather. This accounts for 2,964 seats (-12.9%) out of a total 22,954 departure seats.

General Aviation Operations.

**DISCUSSION:**

For February 2011, General Aviation had 1,532 operations (one take-off or one landing) which is an increase of 41% from February 2010's 1,083 General Aviation Operations. General Aviation revenues increased \$2,172 or 47% to \$6,794 in February 2011 from \$ 4,622 in February 2010.

Financial Report

Revenue/Expenses Report.

**DISCUSSION:**

Mr. Conner reported on the profit/loss statement for the month of February 2011. Airport Operations had a net loss, which includes funds expended for special project advertising and marketing and interest income totaling \$ 732, compared to a net loss of \$ 61,446 in February 2010, which is a difference of \$60,714. Year to date, our loss for 2011 is \$ 38,758 which is \$ 78,048 less than the comparable 2010 loss of \$ 116,806. Invoices received since the last meeting for supplies and services totaling \$ 331,595.46 are presented on the attached sheets for review and approval of the Board. These invoices include major construction project costs of \$ 46,523.16.

Project Invoices.

**MOTION:**

The following Airport Capital Project Invoices and Applications for Payment have been received since the last Board Meeting and are recommended for payment (AIP Echo Drawdown #2011/2).

Construct South General Aviation Apron  
ACP 10-01

URS \$ 46,523.16

Invoice #4493116, November 17, 2010, in the amount  
\$ 46,523.16 for Inspection Services.

**MOTION:**

**MOVED BY:**

**SECONDED BY:**

**VOTE:**

Request Airport Board app these transactions and payments.  
Commissioner Munchak  
Commissioner Petrilla  
Unanimous

**ITEM 5.**

**DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS:**

Airport Access Road.

**MOTION:**

To proceed with the Airport Access Road Project, Airport Board approval is needed to request Federal Aviation Administration approval, for the Counties of Lackawanna and Luzerne d.b.a. the Wilkes-Barre/Scranton International Airport, to enter into a land easement agreement with PennDOT for the construction of an access road, (approximately 1 mile), through airport property (approximately 33 acres), connecting Route I-81 interchange to Commerce Boulevard in the Grimes Industrial Park.

Move to approve the Airport Access Road Project.

**MOVED BY:**

Commissioner Petrilla

**SECONDED BY**

Commissioner Cooney

**VOTE:**

No Final Vote Taken

**DISCUSSION:**

Commissioner O'Brien asked Mr. Centini for his recommendation. Mr. Centini stated that his recommendation is that at this point and time because of the information that the Airport has received regarding the traffic counts, which originally did not take into consideration the Center Point or any other developments since 2003, that at this point and time he thinks for this Board to make an informed decision, we have information on the Grimes Vogelbacher Park and when they submitted their request to fund this project it included those two parks, and the numbers that the Airport got way back in 1991 were a lot less than they anticipate today for the overall footprint of this development. Taking that into consideration he stated that at this time he believes there should be no vote taken and he recommended that the Airport get consultants that can give the Airport true traffic counts of what is going to occur in the roundabout. He added, by the way, the Airport has no say regarding the interchange or the roundabouts, the airport has voiced their concerns with PennDOT about the roundabouts, they are, as airport management, not in favor of the roundabouts because of the amount of traffic and truck traffic that would occur at the roundabouts. So, at this point and time, Mr. Centini recommended to the Bi-County Board that the Airport solicit for a consultant to do traffic studies, taking into consideration all the development, the Wal-Mart's, Center Point East, West and Phase IIB of the Center Point, and the additional businesses that are along that roadway that fall into the footprint that we have at the Airports front door.

Commissioner Munchak questioned how long this study would take. Mr. Centini responded that to do a full blown study, to do actual traffic counts, it could take possibly three months. Commissioner Urban questioned who would pay for this and Mr. Centini replied that he is recommending that the Airport Board pay for it.

Commissioner Washo asked Mr. Centini to outline his concerns regarding the Access Road. Commissioner Washo stated that Mr. Centini outlined his concerns from a general standpoint, due to the fact that a lot of the data is based on 2003 statistics. He asked if those statistics concern Mr. Centini as well as the unknown. He questioned if Mr. Centini is concerned with the known or just the unknown. Mr. Centini replied that at this point he is concerned about some of the known but he is more concerned with the unknown. Commissioner Washo asked him to tell them about the known that he is concerned with. Mr. Centini stated that the latest information that the Airport got from PennDOT was that the day that that road opens they are looking at an additional 4,233 daily traffic going through the roundabout, and 1,355 trucks. At the end of the 20 year projection they are looking at 19,145 vehicles, 4,212 trucks going through the roundabout right in front of our airport. Those were some of the projections that the Airport received the other day,

## DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS – Cont'd...:

the one projection that PennDOT gave the Airport says only 10% of the traffic at Center Point, at 100% build out would come through this road. Other than that they have a projection that only 3% of the traffic at Center point, at the 25% build out would come to the airport access road. He stated that they have found some problems in some of the studies they have looked at, for instance, for PennDOT to tell the Airport that only 3% of the traffic would come to the airport access road, in one of the studies they read that there would be 3% of Center Points traffic going to Suscon Road, 1% turning right going up the hill, 2% turning left going down the hill. He stated that now when we have the new road they say that there will be no traffic added to the airport access road because it would still be the same 3%.

Mr. Centini continued that there are other concerns. He has read studies that coming out of Oak Street 56% of the traffic turning right are trucks, 45% of traffic turning left are trucks. In the original estimation that the Airport received from Gannett Fleming they had estimated 7,500 vehicles and 15 to 20% being trucks and then he receives another report that the truck traffic could be 32%. He stated that there are problems with this and they cannot seem to get the information as far as what the truck traffic and what the total average daily traffic would be. That is why he is recommending the Airport spend the money, which is approximately \$125,000, to do a study so we can get the exact information that we need to make a decision.

### **DISCUSSION:**

Commissioner Petrilla questioned why the Board would incur the cost of a doing a six figure traffic study when the Board has about seven studies to refer to. She stated that if they do a study today it would be a projection, so we would spend six figures to do a traffic study and probably get the same data handed to them that they have been handed five times.

### **DISCUSSION:**

Commissioner Munchak stated that they can't get the same data because the current studies that they have did not consider the development.

### **DISCUSSION:**

Commissioner Cooney stated that he believes the Board has a moral obligation to go ahead with this road. Basically for 25 years all the County Commissioners from Lackawanna and Luzerne have endorsed this airport access drive. For 25 years industries have located in Vogelbacher and Eastern Distribution Center based on the moral commitment of honorable men and this group saying they were going to build this airport access road. For 25 years, \$500M worth of construction occurred, and now that it is becoming a reality, we are saying let's take a look at the trucks. He said, look at the Philadelphia Int'l Airport that has trucks on 95, they have trucks outside of Kennedy. He stated that we are experiencing growth here; he thinks we are seeing monsters when the monsters are not here. He stated he thinks the Board should approve the access road.

### **DISCUSSION:**

Commissioner Munchak then asked Commissioner Petrilla if that was not her just five minutes ago saying to table this vote until we meet? Commissioner Petrilla replied that she said that I do not want to see this project be defeated. And here's the reason why, Northeastern Pennsylvania has been classified since the mining ages as a depressed area and that is because the elected officials are too afraid to make the tough decisions to make this a progressive area. Commissioner Munchak then asked Commissioner Petrilla to answer his question which is 'didn't you five minutes ago say we should table it, didn't you just say that?' Commissioner Petrilla replied, Mr. Munchak, I said I am in agreement to table it for fear that the project is going to be defeated. Commissioner Munchak and Commissioner Washo replied that she did not say "for fear", they said that she is being political here. They said, in that office you said lets table it and discuss it. That is what you said. You are changing your story.

## DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS – Cont'd...

### **DISCUSSION:**

Commissioner Washo then stated to Commissioner Petrilla that she is changing her story, He said, you did the same thing on the stadium when you talked to the Governor about one thing. He stated that he witnessed the change in stories. Mr. Adonizio stated that he hoped that this disagreement on this access road is not about a feud between the Commissioners. Commissioner Munchak then stated to Mr. Adonizio that he was on the Pittston Chamber for 4 years when Jack Grimes was there and he knows where he is coming from, and he stated that this is a very good package, but what we are talking about right now is that we walked out of that office, very briefly, after signing checks, and I said what are we going to do about this project and the recommendation from our Luzerne County Chair Woman was “lets table it, let’s get a meeting together, have it open, lets discuss it.” That’s what she said; now she wants to take a vote on it. Commissioner Petrilla replied that was because Barry read it as if he was looking for approval, so I made a motion to approve. She went on to say that Barry read the motion as if to approve, that she is an elected official, that she has a right to make a motion to approve when the Director reads it that way. She then stated, “now I’ll say to everyone in this room, I did say lets table it, I don’t want it defeated. Rather than go in there and defeat it let’s table it. So, you are trying to challenge me, I’m admitting it, I wanted to table it rather than disprove it. Barry read a motion; I have a right as an elected official to make a motion.”

### **MOTION:**

Recommend to table the vote based on a prior discussion so all six commissioner can sit in an open forum and discuss the plus and minuses.

### **MOVED BY:**

Commissioner Munchak

### **SECONDED BY:**

Commissioner O’Brien

### **VOTE:**

Unanimous

### **DISCUSSION:**

Commissioner O’Brien then stated that the Luzerne and Lackawanna County Commissioners work together all the time, they disagree, they don’t always agree on everything, but they agree on maybe 99% of things, and if you read vote totals for everything they have done over the last three years, you would see that there may be one, maybe two at the most where they have had a disagreement. He stated that they respectfully disagree on certain issues, and that is healthy and it natural and is part of the democratic process. There is nothing beyond that. They have respect for their colleagues; everybody is trying to do their job. It is not about other votes, it’s not about personalities, He doesn’t feel that the Luzerne County counter parts or the Lackawanna County counter parts come into the room with that attitude. This is simply what they believe to be in the best interest of the airport. In addition, he does not think that anybody does not want to not approve the project. They are all willing to talk and work it out to make it work for everybody. That’s what they are looking for. Typically when it’s all said and done this side got this, this side got that, this side’s not happy, that side’s not happy, that’s usually the way you end up. Nobody’s usually happy so you know you’ve gotten it done and you’ve allowed progress to continue. He went on to say that he thought Mr. Adonizio’s presentation was excellent, it was very articulate, and when you said approve it or table it; he thought that that was a very important point. Because if the votes aren’t here, and he does not believe the votes are here to approve it today, he believes there are questions that the Board would like worked out, nobody wants to be held hostage saying you’re going to approve it now or you’re not, it’s up or down, it’s done or its not done. That does a disservice to everybody in that community of Dupont, everybody in Avoca, everybody who works at that Chamber whose involved in that chamber, and everybody who is sitting here to think anything is that easy. Has this project been going on for 20 years, yes, but you know what, we haven’t been thinking about this project for 20 years, and we are trying to come to a conclusion that works, that works for the chamber, that works for jobs, that works for our community, and works for

## DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS – Cont'd...:

the airport. We all here are all committed to trying to make it work. It's not going to be under someone else's arbitrary deadline, it just can't be, we have serious issues. He thinks that there is a great deal of dialog that's going on, and this is not a Luzerne or Lackawanna County thing. Two people here today are both Lackawanna County residents. There are people here who work in this business park that are residents of Lackawanna County, it's not that, and for anybody to say that it's a smoke screen, it's just simply not true. We have respect for the positions taken, Tom Cooney made an articulate argument, Mary Petrilla made an articulate argument, these are good arguments, it's not like, well that argument is ridiculous, that's not true, so what we are trying to do here is not kill a project, but keep it moving so we can sit down and figure it out. That's what we want to do here. We want to act in the best interest of everyone here. We don't need this to be elevated to a level of heat that makes it hard for people to work together. We have a commitment to work together. I think Commissioner Cooney, Petrilla, Urban, Munchak, Washo and I commit to work together all the time. And, yes, sometimes it's difficult, sometimes we get uppity and things like that, we don't get along, but that's natural. This is not a time for that, we want to all come together, work it out, and we want to talk one on one with some of these people and see what we can do. We have a legitimate concern about truck traffic at the entrance. If you were here for the presentation it showed the trucks come in (I don't know what the footage is but it's not a lot) you are merging on, the trucks, and then at the same time you are merging on, you are starting to merge off to the entrance. That's a legitimate concern. Whether or not you think it's an overriding concern, it is legitimate, just like its legitimate that every elected official in the last 20 years said it was a go, that's legitimate, but to take the airports arguments and say they are illegitimate, or one argument is greater than another, it's unfair. We are not here to do that, we are here to say OK, well if that's a problem, what can we do, can we keep the roundabout right where it is, not make the expense go up, but can you maybe with that road merge it into the roundabout a little bit over to the left. Where you have a longer area, you leave the roundabout where you are, but just move it a little bit. Move it 25 yards so it accesses the roundabout at a different point, so that by the time the trucks are in the roundabout you are not worrying about the merge. You are already in the roundabout so you don't have this merging on and merging off all at the same time. Is that something we can talk about, yes, something we can put on the table and talk about? Is there a way that the trucks can merge after the entrance, then there's not an issue at all. I don't know, but these are things we should talk about and that is what we are trying to do. We are just trying to make sure that when it is all done everybody can say that this is something that works. And to say that anybody's argument is less important than another argument, I think that is selling everybody down the wrong river because we can argue about that all the time. And the fact that it's been going on for 20 years, that is not productive. We are here today, so what are we going to do as we move forward. Are we going to have an ability to tweak this and get it really right, I think that's fair, and its more fair than to vote it down and then eliminate \$42M? It's the only highway project in the Northeast. It's not like there's others. That's what we are trying to do, we are not trying to kill the project, we don't want to do that, we are trying to find a way so that we can continue to have some dialog to try and really make it work, cause at the end of the day I think there is a really good opportunity and chance that it works for everybody, and I think we are getting there.

## **DISCUSSION:**

Mr. Centini then stated that the Airport has asked PennDOT to proceed. First of all, when this project was first proposed back in 1989, 91 and 93, the three times that he met with the State and Transportation Commission, this project was a standalone project. Somehow it got tied into the interchange. We have asked PennDOT to separate the projects, begin the interchange work, which amount I've heard is \$42M,

## DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS – Cont'd...:

I've heard \$37M, the last he heard was \$37.5M, the road is about \$17M, the interchange is approximately \$ 20M, PennDOT should proceed with the interchange today, or as soon as they finish their final design and let the Airport get this right on the connection of the connector road from the park to the interstate. PennDOT kind of turned the Airport down on that and they are saying that the whole project is all together and that and if you don't do the road then you might lose the interchange. Mr. Centini stated that he does not believe we are going to lose the interchange. Number 1 the interchange was done in 1960, 50 years ago, and, we want to make sure we get this right, because we are not going to see PennDOT drop another nickel for another 50 years in this interchange because they are changing all the interchanges. So the Airport asked PennDOT to begin the process, start the construction, spend the \$20 some million dollars, and during that early construction phase the Airport will have been able to obtain the correct traffic count, we will be able to have our studies done, even done by PennDOT, which we asked them to do, to look at their point of access study and update it, and to add all the development. When you look at his proposal back in 1991, it was the Grimes Park and the Vogelbacher Park, our numbers back in 1991 showed something like 2,000 if we connected into the turnpike, which was our original proposal, there would be something like thirteen hundred cars, about 260 trucks. If we did not connect into the turnpike, because that was up in the air at the time, there would probably be about 2,000 cars and maybe about 400 trucks. Very manageable, at that time. In fact, there was no roundabout, there was no cutting through other property, no taking another 13, 14 acres of airport property, it went right up Navy Way Road and came right to a stop sign and you made a left hand turn. There wouldn't even need to be a traffic light based upon those numbers. But so much has occurred in 20 years; that is what is causing the problems as far as traffic counts, truck counts, the number of traffic coming to the airport and the size of the road itself. The size of the road is 150' wide. The Airport talked about some of the benefits of opening up its lands, the elevations of this road is so high; we have to build more roads that would be 600, 500' long just to get into our property in certain parcels that we have listed for development. He feels that what the Chamber and Pittston should be doing is pushing to get the interchange going first and the road could follow if the numbers are there and if this Board agrees.

## **DISCUSSION:**

Ms. Dessoye from the Pittston Chamber attempted to interrupt the meeting and Commissioner Washo responded that that there was an open discussion and that she had the chance to speak and now the Board is just trying, as individuals, express to the public what we think. He stated that Mr. Adonizio made an outstanding presentation, that he would take issue with just one part of it, but he didn't take issue with it when he said nothing's changed over the last 20 years. He could have interrupted him and say, yes this is changed and that is changed. You know one of the problems we have here is that we are not working with a common set of facts, we have good people who are all exercised over this, as well we should be because this is very important, we are not working with a common set of facts. But on our side, our engineers, two generations of engineers, have expressed the need for concern and caution. You can have needs and you can have concerns and you need to articulate them, but we should also be given the opportunity to articulate our concerns so at the end of the day you get the best possible solution rather than cramming anything down anybody's throat. You know there wasn't a hotel over there when all this started and now all of a sudden the hotel is isolated in this project and you should care about that as a part of commerce. It's a part of the greater good in a democracy, nobody wins everything, so it's going to be back and forth and we are going to get the best for the community. If someone says something you don't agree with, you don't have to tear them apart, both sides have a lot of information that has to be looked at, and so Barry comes up with something and says we don't have the traffic data to

## DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS – Cont'd...:

know. I don't know and I am going to vote on this. I want to know before I vote. The only part of the PennDOT presentation that was lacking as far as I was concerned was the traffic part, we don't dispute PennDOT's knowledge of roads and we are not trying to supersede that or bring anyone in to say the thickness of the asphalt is wrong or that there is something wrong with the radius's, we are not trying to do anything like that. You pay us to look at this stuff and to make decisions. This airport, the same people that are quoted along the way, were a part of making this airport the success that it is. And the same kinds of difficult decisions had to be made to get there. It should be a difficult, emotional, messy process because that's the kind of issue it is. He stated the only thing he thought was that it was either going to be pulled from the agenda as I was walking out the door, that is why I became so exercised. It was either being pulled from the agenda or we were going to have a motion to do something or other, but not to do it today because we needed more information, we were going to call for a meeting and I heard Corey say "and let everyone who has an interest in it be in the room for the meeting, not have a secret meeting".

### **DISCUSSION:**

Commissioner Petrilla then stated to Commissioner Washo that she should not have been attacked because she was responding to the Directors request for a motion. And that she has every right to make a motion. She should not have been attacked on that. Commissioner Washo responded that Commissioner Petrilla degraded and denigrated the traffic study. Commissioner Petrilla stated that after hearing all the traffic studies that Barry just recited to us, I don't believe now that we need a traffic study. We have 20 years of traffic studies. I'm entitled to that opinion, I shouldn't have to be criticized for that and called a liar. I should not have been called a liar in a roundabout way because Barry asked for a motion and she made that motion. She should not be called a liar in a roundabout way, because I just heard Barry tell me 20 years of traffic studies are out there and now we want to spend \$100,000 on another one. She should not be chastised for that, I take umbridge to that and she just wanted to go on record. Commissioner Munchak stated that he didn't call her a liar. Commissioner Petrilla then stated that she was talking to Mike Washo for attacking her because she responded to the Director's request to make a motion. She went on to say, I am in favor of this project, I think we need to progress, I think we need to go forward, I think we have 20 years to ask questions. Commissioner Washo then said that he heard her say we haven't had any discussions on this, this is great, we are going to have some discussion. Commissioner Petrilla stated that she sat here and listened to public comment, talking about 20 years of discussion, I listened to Commissioner Cooney talk about Commissioners before us and we want to negate their promises. She stated that they had over a half an hour of discussion and I have a right as a Commissioner to state my opinion, you want to chastise me for it, you want to call me a liar, you want to call me dishonest in a roundabout way publicly, go ahead, I have a right as an elected official to do what I think is right. This project needs to go forward.

### **DISCUSSION:**

Mr. Griffith stated that obviously there was a meeting behind closed doors about this project, that is a violation of sunshine law; secondly if there is a motion to table, all discussions should stop. He then asked Attorney O'Donnell if that is correct. Attorney O'Donnell responded that the motion to table would take precedence over the original motion made by Commissioner Petrilla and seconded by Commissioner Cooney but I have motion on the discussion on the motion to table and that is what I would classify the discussion on. Mr. Griffith then stated the motion was never seconded and Commissioner O'Brien stated that he seconded the motion. Attorney O'Donnell informed them that the motion to table takes precedence and he urged the Board to consider a vote at this time on the motion. Mr. Griffith stated that all discussion should stop, because there is a motion to table the previous motion. So no

**DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS – Cont'd...:**

discussion should be taking place after that point. He then stated that second of all, this Board should not be behind closed doors for this purpose, that is a violation of sunshine law. Commissioner Urban informed Mr. Griffith that the discussion on the motion to table is relevant. It is the reason why people want it tabled, rather than voted on. The reason they want it tabled and not voted off is because they feel they don't have adequate traffic studies and data to make an informed vote today. He stated that if they had a vote today he believed this motion would fail and acting on information that Mr. Adonizio also presented to us and he said that if you don't have the vote to pass this today then table it and I think that is exactly what we are doing here today. Mr. Griffith stated that the violation of the sunshine law will negate the whole discussion.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Adonizio then asked the Board to call an open meeting within the next 15 days where everyone can have an open exchange of ideas.

**MOTION:** To Adjourn Meeting  
**MOVED BY:** Commissioner Cooney  
**SECONDED BY:** No One  
**VOTE:** Failed due to no final vote taken

**Hangar Road Rehabilitation.**

**MOTION:** Recommend the Airport Board approve the Agreement between CDI – Infrastructure LLC, d.b.a. L.R. Kimball & Associates and the Wilkes-Barre/Scranton International Airport for the Design and Necessary Engineering Services for the Rehabilitation of Hangar Road, subject to FAA, PennDOT and solicitors concurrence. Contract amount not to exceed \$ 202,111.57.

**MOVED BY:** Commissioner Urban  
**SECONDED BY:** Commissioner Petrilla  
**VOTE:** Unanimous

**DISCUSSION:** **Aviation Exploration Day.**

Mr. Centini informed the Board that Marywood University's' Aviation Club will host the 6<sup>th</sup> Annual Aviation Exploration Day at the Wilkes-Barre/Scranton International Airport on April 9, 2011. All activities will take place at our FBO Saker Aviation. Plans are to have static display aircraft, aviation exhibits, airplane rides and food will be available for purchase. Hangar doors will open at 11:00 A.M. and the event will end at 4:00 P.M. Marywood Aviation Club is hoping to raise \$ 2,000.00 for Angel Flight of America. The non-profit Angel Flight arranges free air transportation for children and adults to access medical care. The event is sponsored by Marywood University, Saker Aviation, Tech Aviation Flight School and the Wilkes-Barre/Scranton International Airport.

**Conferences/Seminars:**

**MOTION:** Recommend Airport Board approval for one Airport Representative and any Board Members who wish to attend the 83<sup>rd</sup> Annual American Association of Airport Executives (AAAE) Conference and Exposition, May 15-18, 2011, Atlanta, GA.

**MOVED BY:** Commissioner Petrilla  
**SECONDED BY:** Commissioner Washo  
**VOTE:** Unanimous

**ITEM 6.**  
**OTHER MATTERS:**

**MOTION:** Recommend Airport Board conduct a traffic study and put together an RFP to conduct this study. Mr. Centini stated that he feels it is very important, that this is an issue that needs all the expertise we can get to make sure that they are doing the right thing. Not only for our 500,000 plus passengers who utilize this airport from ten counties, not only Luzerne and Lackawanna, but as you remember we had 30 county commissioners sign documents and letters when we went into this terminal building expansion. So he stated he thinks it is very important to get a study done and get the true and correct numbers so the Board can make an informed decision.

**MOVED BY:** Commissioner O'Brien  
**SECONDED BY:** Commissioner Washo  
**VOTE:** Unanimous

**DISCUSSION:** Commissioner Munchak informed Mr. Centini that he would like him to get an estimate of what the cost is going to be and later on he is going to make a motion for everyone to meet based on Commissioner Petrilla's recommendation next week or at a convenient time, an open public meeting, to discuss our opinions, and have the price for the Board at that meeting.

**DISCUSSION:** Commissioner Cooney questioned who was going to write the scope of services for the consultant. Mr. Mykulyn responded that he believes what needs to occur in the scope of services is that the existing point of access study needs to be updated. He continued that the Airport had several problems with the point of access study that was done for the interchange and that those problems were discussed at previous meetings. We had problems with the level of service and referenced problems that the point of access study itself pointed out. In addition, Mr. Mykulyn explained that the Airport had received additional traffic projections from PennDOT only Tuesday of this week. This was the information that Barry had referenced earlier with regard to the percentage of truck traffic. There were several different studies done for traffic in the area (in addition to the point of access study) all done for traffic in the area (in addition to the point of access study) all done independently and non including everything as one picture and without that the Airport has a problem with the traffic counts. As far as who would do the scope of services, the Airport would do it in house.

**DISCUSSION:** Commissioner Cooney requested a copy of the scope of services be sent to him. He stated that he is also interested in the scope for economic development purposes. He stated that he understands the reason we are dwelling on the airport here but Northeastern Pennsylvania is experiencing some economic development opportunities and he thinks we have to realize that the airport can be a stimulant for this and should be looking at it that way also. Mr. Mykulyn stated that you also have to realize that if things go wrong with this interchange they can affect everyone as well.

**MOTION:** Recommend Airport Board meet to discuss this project in an open forum and go over all concerns and have the cost ready to come up with a resolution. He stated he does not feel it should be put off until another month.

**MOVED BY:** Commissioner O'Brien  
**SECONDED BY:** Commissioner Washo  
**VOTE:** Unanimous

**ITEM 7.**

**ADJOURNMENT:**

**MOTION:**

To adjourn the meeting.

**MOVED BY:**

Commissioner Petrilla

**SECONDED BY:**

Commissioner Munchak

**VOTE:**

Unanimous

The meeting was adjourned at 12:05 P.M.