

WILKES-BARRE/SCRANTON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
BOARD MEETING
MARCH 31, 2011

A special meeting of the Wilkes-Barre/Scranton International Airport Joint Board of Control was held Thursday, March 31, 2011 in the Terminal Building Conference Room at the Airport. The meeting was called to order at 10:35 A.M. with Commissioner Stephen A. Urban presiding. Commissioner Urban stated that this is a Special Meeting to discuss the proposed road coming through the airport and also the proposed improvements that are supposed to take place on Interstate 81 with PennDOT.

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

ALSO PRESENT: Barry J. Centini, Airport Director
Michael W. Conner, Assistant Airport Director
Gary Borthwick, Director of Finance
Stephen Mykulyn, Director of Engineering

ITEM 2:
PUBLIC COMMENTS.

DISCUSSION: Representative Michael Carroll stated that he wanted to thank the Board today for calling the meeting to consider what he considers to be a very crucial project for Northeastern Pennsylvania and for Luzerne and Lackawanna County. He stated that he knows the Board has put a lot of effort and energy in coming to a final resolution to this, and he is hopeful that today is the day that they reach that final resolution. He continued that we have a deadline to be faced with the Federal Highway Administration and with PennDOT in order to get this project set and he is hopeful, that with PennDOT, George Roberts is here today to answer some of the Boards specific questions, we can get to some specific engineering questions that might satisfy some of the concerns that the Board has. He went on to say that if he could be so bold as to recommend that George Roberts from PennDOT be called upon first to answer specific engineering questions that the Board might have.

DISCUSSION: Commissioner O'Brien stated that he had some questions for Mr. Roberts to start this off. The first question was that one of the things that has been talked about is traffic counts, traffic studies, whether or not the Board knows whether the estimates are accurate or not. He said one of the things he wanted to get Mr. Roberts "take" on, assuming the worst case scenarios is that the traffic counts are all under estimated; he is not saying PennDOT's office does not know what they are doing, that they are very professional, and he is not saying that PennDOT is wrong, he is just asking if there is a way that you can provide some kind of threshold traffic counts, whereas if the traffic counts at some point exceeded "x" amount of vehicles per day, and if we saw that worst case scenario, that PennDOT could introduce a metering device, or some other way. In other words, could PennDOT provide us with assurance that if we saw that worst case scenario at some point, that PennDOT could count the traffic and then if those traffic counts were accurate, and yes, we are reaching a capacity or over capacity, that PennDOT could try and help mitigate that through metering? He asked if something like that is possible.

PUBLIC COMMENTS – Cont’d...

Mr. Roberts responded that they had a meeting yesterday with the Airport to discuss an option like that. He stated that ramp metering was asked about, they mentioned ramp metering is done in Philadelphia and some other areas. He stated that when you are talking about ramps coming off an interstate system you will have a traffic signal there that won't allow them to enter the interstate until a certain time. That is how they meter traffic, which is a similar thing that Commissioner O'Brien was referring to. He stated that PennDOT looked at that and their concern over whether or not they could meter traffic coming into that roundabout would cause other issues. In other words, it could cause back up issues and those type of things. He stated that he thinks the answer to Commissioner O'Brien's question is the 2 lane highway will only handle so much traffic, and the metering point is going to be back in the Grimes Industrial Park where that one intersection is. He stated there is only going to be so much traffic that is going to be able to get through that intersection. He went on to say that he does not believe it is signalized now so it does not have enough volume, in traffic in terms, to warrant a signal. But in other words, that might be the first thing if the traffic continued to grow and warrant a signal, now your signal could start to do that metering, but essentially that is your metering point because the concern is the traffic coming from the opposite side of the east side of the terminal.

Commissioner O'Brien then asked, so you can, if long term we have a significant issue, PennDOT could look at the potential to adding a traffic light there, which would provide the appropriate metering? Is that what Mr. Roberts is saying?

Mr. Roberts stated that the only thing he would caution everyone to remember is that it is a two non state road intersection. So, in other words, the municipality would have to be the one that would be willing to participate in that, but that would be the option. Commissioner O'Brien asked if that is Dupont. Representative Carroll stated that it was Pittston Township, where the actual intersection is. He also said that the Board is aware that Dupont Borough has agreed to take over the road once constructed, so he stated that he thinks if the day came when a traffic signal was being considered at the intersection of Commerce and the connector road then Dupont and Pittston Township folks would be willing to discuss the options related to how a light like that might proceed.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner O'Brien asked Mayor Lello if that was something that he would be willing to discuss. Mayor Lello responded "no problem". Commissioner O'Brien then asked about Navy Way Road. He stated that one of the other issues has been the loss of access to Navy Way Road with the road going through. He asked if there was some way you could do, maybe the flashing lights or one of those lights where you come up to... He then stated he does not know how much traffic is utilized on Navy Way Road, but when one of the Airport's vehicles come up to Navy Way Road where it can change to red so that the vehicle can cross and then it goes back to green?

Mr. Roberts responded that what was discussed in the meeting the previous day was PennDOT's recommendation for safety purposes would be to consider a connection with Navy Way and the new highway but have it as a gated access with the Airport in control. That way you don't have traffic, unattended vehicles turning into there, because we all know how they pay attention to traffic signals sometimes; because we cannot get the site distance and that is the whole issue, so PennDOT's recommendation is they don't want vehicles pulling in and out of there, but PennDOT felt that if a gated access could be provided, which they could do, and if it was operated safely by the Airport, and only by the Airport, which he thinks is the major concern, he feels that PennDOT could make that happen. Commissioner O'Brien asked, "so then they would be able to cross Navy Way to get over to the other side?" Mr. Roberts stated that he would have to check but he wanted to say that it is

PUBLIC COMMENTS – Cont'd...

not a direct crossing, in other words, the way the road would have to be brought up because of, he thinks it is a 8% grade where you come up to a flat area tying into the road, then they might have to traverse on Navy Way a little to get to the other side. He stated that he thinks they would have to make a right and then a left, only a couple 100'. Someone mentioned that there is a median there and Mr. Roberts stated that that would have to be looked at.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner O'Brien stated that one of the other issues is the grading from Grimes; it is going to be 30' to 50', kind of off the ground, so it would be very difficult to ramp down for Radar Hill. Is there a way that the Airport could ramp down closer to the turnpike, where there is only about a 7' drop off there? Is there any way that PennDOT could backfill or do something there to help provide the Airport with future access?

Mr. Roberts responded that he would be willing to do that and that they had already looked into it. He indicated that the access roadway had been moved further out to provide for a future extension of the runway and that 30-40 feet of fill is needed for the road above the culvert at Lidy Creek however at the connection point for a road to Radar Hill the fill is only 11 feet deep. An alignment and profile had previously been designed for a Road to Radar Hill. He explained that they looked at that connection further and determined what costs would be involved with constructing the fill for the Radar Hill road from the Airport Access Road to a point along the road profile where the proposed profile meets existing grade. He stated that it would need about 200,000 cubic yards of additional foreign borrow placed, costing about \$100,000.00 to the highway. He then stated that what he would be willing to do is go back to the Federal Highway Administration and discuss with them the possibility of 'creating that' he called it. And what that is, it is 11' high at the edge of where that tie-in is, and if you go back 150', that would be the grading we are talking about. Full width of the original design of the road, that ties you into a high point where the rest of the profile pretty much follows the rest of the ground all the way back, but it would at least give the airport the opportunity for a connection that would have guide rails that would wrap around on it, and they could then continue from that point on. But it would help them with that connection. He then said that he would be happy to help get that authorized by the Federal Highway Administration and keep that in mind but he is willing to do that.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner O'Brien stated that one of the things the Airport has been stressing is the problem with the truck traffic coming into the roundabout and merging onto the roundabout at the same time you are merging off to the exit into the Airport. Because you have this truck traffic coming and being dumped right at the entrance of the airport. Is there any way that PennDOT could widen that area so that from a merging standpoint those trucks are fully merged onto the roundabout prior to you merging off to get to the entrance?

Mr. Roberts stated that PennDOT took a look at that as well. He said Representative Carroll had asked him about taking a look at that and see if PennDOT could maximize that area. Mr. Roberts stated that what PennDOT is able to do is actually pick up 25 additional feet, so that they can actually move that point 25 feet away which would provide you with what you just asked for. That would allow those vehicles to merge into the roundabout before the exit road coming off which would lead to the airport.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Cooney stated he was looking at the information provided to him that speaks about 1,300 average truck traffic for the first opening day. He asked, "how many of those trucks would be panel trucks?" In other words, UPS, Fed-Ex? Mr.

PUBLIC COMMENTS – Cont'd...

Roberts answered, “zero”. He stated those trucks are all down in the other industrial park which go onto Armstrong Road and go the opposite way. The trucks that PennDOT calculated there are the vehicles that are Grimes Industrial Park, O’Hara, whatever. He stated that that can tell him that the TIS or Traffic Impact Study that was done for the Industrial Park, the Center Point Industrial Park, sent 3% of their vehicles that leave that park up Armstrong Road. But, really those vehicles were coming up Armstrong Road, he believes as passenger vehicles because trucks cannot go down Suscon Road, as we know. They probably will go down Suscon Road into the valley to go to their homes or up Suscon Road to their residential neighborhood. That is what the traffic consultant did for them. He stated that they did carry that 3% over the interchange, just so you know, when they updated those numbers. He said they don’t believe that is going to happen but they did include them. So they truly believe that those vehicles are from the Grimes area. Representative Carroll did correct Mr. Roberts on one point, and that is that Fed-Ex is located in the Grimes Industrial Park. Mr. Roberts said well then, whatever the Fed-Ex trucks would be, they then would be a part of that calculation. He stated they anticipated everybody north of Suscon Road in those industrial parks that go to the new highway.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Cooney stated that we are looking at 1,355 trucks here, that is 50% in and 50% out, and the ones that are going in, (taking the access road) are they making right turns all the way? Mr. Roberts replied that the only ones coming from the interchange have to go into that Roundabout 2 and would go off, taking that right turn. Commissioner Cooney asked if they would be cutting in front of the airport. Mr. Roberts said no they would not be, he said the only vehicles that would be going around that roundabout further would be if they were coming out of the airport. So Commissioner Cooney reiterated that 50% of the trucks would not be crossing in front of the airport. Mr. Roberts stated that was correct, it would be the other 50% coming out. Commissioner Cooney stated that we are talking about 600 trucks and Mr. Roberts agreed. Commissioner Cooney stated that he understood that the trucks loaded on a 24 hour basis, the tractor trailers in Grimes Industrial Park and Vogelbacher and asked if that was correct. The answer was yes, so Commissioner Cooney estimated that would mean about 24 vehicles per hour which Mr. Roberts agreed with.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Urban questioned Mr. Roberts about the current design of the road with all the accesses that currently come to the airport. Now we can go into Lidy Road, we can come over the bridge out of 315, we can come off of 81 and get into the airport, with this traffic circle, if there is an accident on the traffic circle, is there way in or out of the airport? Mr. Roberts assured Commissioner Urban that there is. He stated that they have just replaced the culvert under Lidy Road or Lidy Road going under Interstate 81. As part of that project, the contractor built a paved road that you can drive back up to, so you have that method to come in by with emergency vehicles which will not only lead you back to Navy Way and back to the main entrance but there are other access points there. In addition to that you can go to Plane Street which brings you back to multiple access points to the airport on your side of the interstate. So there are two emergency access methods that you would be able to get to the airport should there be some situation on that roundabout that vehicles would not be able to get through. Commissioner Urban questioned if those roads will be open to the public on a daily basis? Mr. Roberts replied that he could only talk about the road on the Plane Street side which are all public right of ways. The roads on the Lidy Road side are public right of way all the way until you go through the culvert PennDOT put in there, up to the last few homes. He stated he believes it is the Airport that owns that paved surface from up to the Hotel. He would assume the Airport would allow emergency vehicles to come in that way.

PUBLIC COMMENTS – Cont'd...

Commissioner Urban stated he was not talking about emergency vehicles, that he was talking about passenger traffic in and out of the airport. Mr. Roberts stated that he drove that area himself, both ways, and the best way is to go through the Lidy Street Culvert; There is a nice paved surface that takes you through there. The other way is a more residential neighborhood, a little bit more turns, that sort of thing, but it's a public right of way and it is accessible. Commissioner Urban stated that he asks that because one of his concerns is with Navy Way being closed off and not being able to access Navy Way you still have to go on the roundabout to get in or out of the airport. And with an accident in or off that roundabout, shutting that roundabout down the airport basically shuts down except for emergency vehicles. He stated he doesn't believe the public would be aware of how to get in or out of the airport. That is a major concern of his, and flights don't wait. Mr. Roberts replied that generally what happens, from his experience, is when you have an incident like that, local EMA's are involved and they are directing traffic around the situation so it is not a very convoluted method to get around there, and he believes they could direct traffic that way. Maybe signing would help but you have to be careful with that system, you only want to have that happening in an emergency situation if it should ever occur. But when that kind of incident is under EMA control they are generally the ones directing the traffic for vehicles to get from one point to the point they were trying to get to, so he thinks emergency services would provide that service.

DISCUSSION:

Barry Centini told Mr. Roberts that he thinks the design coming up through Lidy Road is blocked; there is a gate area and the design shows a truck turnaround in case anybody gets into there. He thinks it is gated for emergency vehicles only and there is no through traffic that could get on from Lidy Road. Mr. Roberts stated that we have a connection between Lidy Road and the new highway, that is correct, but it is a gated access, mostly for emergencies only. Mr. Roberts stated that the other thing is that if traffic comes up that way it could obviously, if we make this connection with the gated access to Navy Way at the new road, get into with that method as well.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner O'Brien indicated to Representative Carroll and Mayor Lello of Dupont that for this project, 20 years ago, the idea was, and the idea always has been to develop Radar Hill and to provide access off the turnpike. What Commissioner O'Brien would like to know from Representative Carroll is if he would be willing to support application or support construction of an interchange off of the turnpike in some future transportation bill. Representative Carroll responded that he would absolutely consider it and would like to work with the board and the airport to make sure we accommodate the needs of the airport and work with the Dupont and Pittston Township folks to accommodate them and work with the grants folks to accommodate them. So, provided we can get everybody on the same page and work towards an access for the turnpike it would be something he would consider, provided we could get the airport and everybody, all moving parts, aligned in the same direction, so he stated his short answer is that he would be willing to work toward that. He stated he thinks it would be a good alternative to move traffic onto the turnpike with the full knowledge that we still need to get traffic onto 81. Commissioner O'Brien said once of things they are trying to do is develop Radar Hill so that there are additional opportunities, he then asked Mayor Lello if he would be willing to submit a gaming application on behalf of the airport? Mayor Lello replied 'sure', 'definitely'. Commissioner O'Brien asked, if they would be willing to help with the funding of that? Mayor Lello said the Council Chair is right there and the Council Chair in turn stated that they would start to look into that.

DISCUSSION:

The Representative of Pittston Township, Terry Best stated that he is here today on behalf of the Supervisors and that Pittston Township would also be willing to do something like that. Commissioner O'Brien asked Representative Carroll if that is

PUBLIC COMMENTS – Cont’d...

something he would be supportive of, an application of that nature? Representative Carroll replied ‘yes’, but fair warning, the gaming application operation is very competitive, there are far more applications asked for than there are available funds, but, he said, it is something he would support, again, provided that all the parties, including the Airport and the Board embrace it. Commissioner O’Brien asked Representative Carroll if he would then be willing to do a letter of recommendation or just some letter of support with the application. Representative Carroll replied ‘yes’.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Urban spoke to Representative Carroll, stating that this is his 12th year on the Airport Board and he believed it was 2001 and 2002 when Representative Tigue was trying to get an access ramp on and off the turnpike, and that never happened because of the lack of traffic. He then asked if he had current studies, if there is a certain peak traffic load that needs to be reached before the turnpike commission will entertain putting on a ramp. Representative Carroll replied that he was not sure the turnpike commission, if we had to rely on traffic on the Northeast Extension for an exit for the airport and Grimes, that he is not sure we’d get there. He thinks they’d have to convince the turnpike commission to do the exit for other reasons besides just a gross number of vehicles. And that is not out of the question, it would be a discussion that he would be happy to engage with the turnpike commission, and in some ways he thinks George Roberts would agree, that dealing with the turnpike commission you have a little more flexibilities sometimes than you do with PennDOT in terms of what can and can’t be done. So, it’s not an outright guarantee but it is something we can consider. Mr. Roberts stated that he agreed and that the turnpike commission is operating with non federal funds, state funds, and they have a little more flexibility than the federal government does. Commissioner Urban asked Mr. Roberts if he was aware of that project. He stated that he was only aware of it through reading what the airport had put together back in the early 90’s, that they were looking to try and consider that. He stated that as part of the design project that PennDOT did, they did an O&D Study, an Origin and Destination Study, and tried to determine whether it would be feasible to build an interchange on the turnpike, he believes the results of that was a very small percentage of traffic that wanted to use the turnpike, they wanted to use 81. So he said that is where Representative Carroll is coming in because he does not know what volumes the turnpike would need to be able to consider whether it is worth the investment or not, but he said, they do have traffic counts, they do have some studies, and would be willing to share them.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Washo questioned if Steve Mykulyn, the Airport Engineer had any comments. Mr. Centini stated that the Airport has consultants at the meeting, Ms. Mary Bogart and Patrick McLaine who did some handouts with some information and he asked Ms. Bogart to go over some of the airports concerns and some of the numbers and how they were arrived at. Ms. Bogart first stated that she would like to walk through the exhibits handed out first just to make sure the Commissioners are all comfortable with what’s been put together. She stated Exhibit #1 speaks for itself and it is just a reference, Exhibit #2 works together with Exhibit #3. Exhibit #3 was put together by the Airport, basically it is an overlay of the Center Point Project so that they can get a feel for, in relation to the Airport and in relation to Oak and Armstrong Road, where this project is. She stated that she thinks the point for Exhibit #3 is that this development extends further North than many people envisioned. Exhibit #4 is a marked up version of the Center Point map and she said she sees that the Center Point engineers are here so if they wanted to offer any opinions they would be happy to hear from them. But basically there was a traffic impact study that was completed and submitted and approved by PennDOT. That included all of the areas. There were actually a few

PUBLIC COMMENTS – Cont'd...

studies, and they included the areas to the west of 315 and it also included the area that is outlined in the red dashed area. The results of that impact study showed that the traffic signal at 315, Armstrong and Oak Street would operate at level of service C in the morning and D in the afternoon peak hour. She explained that level of service is basically a measure of delay, and when you get to experience delay that is excessive it begins to be uncomfortable and just as you would be graded in school, levels of service go from A to F. So the afternoon peak hour, looking at that amount of traffic generated by what is outlined in red, and what they felt was a low estimate of trucks based on what they see out there currently today, they would be looking at level of service D. She stated that they were not able to find any document that shows the impact of the areas outlined in blue, that if you add that traffic into the mix, then what happens to that intersection is unknown. She stated that is what their concern is.

Mr. Centini also mentioned that he thinks another level of service C & D, with the outline in red, excludes all of Grimes and Vogelbacher. Ms. Bogart concurred. She continued that Grimes would head north to the interchange that is closer to them and she stated that as this intersection starts to depreciate that's going to draw traffic further to the north and increase the amount of traffic that is diverted up to the new interchange that is being discussed today. She stated that she thinks at this point they are not in a position where they have studied it and can tell the Board definitively what those answers are, but she thinks it would be in the airport's best interest for somebody to do that; for somebody to take a look, do some studies, figure out what those numbers are and write some analysis.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner O'Brien addressed Ms. Bogart saying let's assume worst case scenarios. If PennDOT is willing to, based on some threshold levels that PennDOT considers to be over use/over congestion, if they are willing to, when we report the fact that we believe there to be over congestion which is defined as some PennDOT number, (he does not know what that is), of daily traffic counts, and if they were willing to come out and then do the traffic counts, and if they did indeed meet the definition, whatever that definition may be of over use or whatever the term is, and if they are then willing to find ways to mitigate that through metering and other types of techniques, that may not at this point of time be on the board. He means, maybe it's some innovative thing that they think up 10 years from now, because really, when we are talking about major league traffic as we are talking about, as you just said, over a period of time as some of these other infrastructures degrade, that we are going to see much more volume. So if PennDOT was willing to do that, and at that time that we reported that traffic count, yes indeed, we have over usage here, overcrowding here, that they were then willing to work on metering and other alternatives. Is that going to satisfy our desire here? Ms. Bogart replied that she thinks that those are questions that certainly the department and their consultant and even the consultant for Center Point can get together and draw some conclusions and just do the analysis and let the Board know what the answers are. Because, she said, they can state with certainty, if we experience a low level of service E, or even a low level of service F at 3:15 on Armstrong Road, then you can expect traffic to look for another way to access this project, this vicinity, and right now where is that alternative? It is going to be this proposed interchange. And so the discussion about the turnpike, if we develop these numbers and look at the turnpike, not only with an interchange locally but another interchange as well, to divert some of that traffic along a parallel north south route, not 81, but a route that offers convenient access, convenient on and off; that might be an alternative. There may be simpler alternatives. There may be less expensive alternatives. But the airport's position on this and what the airport is saying is that we think there is a situation down here that is going to make our condition worse, or so we anticipate, so can we please take

PUBLIC COMMENTS – Cont'd...

pause, analyze it, and just give us some information and offer us some alternatives. Commissioner O'Brien asked Ms. Bogart how long she has been reviewing this. Ms. Bogart replied "just a matter of weeks."

DISCUSSION:

Tom Reilly of Reilly Engineering declared that they have done traffic studies on all the different phases of Center Point as well as looking at how it interacts with the airport and the interchange. He stated that one point that Ms. Bogart missed is that there may be improvements needed at Oak and 315 for that to function properly. He stated that what they did is they studied all those Center Point areas and explained some of the summaries that they looked at. The latest traffic study is part of a major improvement project that has been funded and is under design and under PennDOT review for that intersection and that interchange where basically there's a project. It's a casino grant project which is about \$2.5M in construction to upgrade those off ramps and the Oak and 315 intersection and there is a detailed traffic study and alternative analysis that is in PennDOT and Federal Highway review now, which basically factors in all that traffic for all the phases of Center Point. He went on to say that what they looked at, a major point for the Center Point is that even though you are in close proximity to Suscon Road, Suscon Road really acts as a barrier. When Pittston Township approved Center Point's future phases they prohibited any access directly to Suscon Road, because of the steepness of Suscon Road and the narrowness of the road, so basically you look at it and say ok we're close, but we are not really that close because of this road, which disconnects these two areas. The Center Points developments are very close to Exit 175 and surround that exit, and with the quality of roads and the proximity to these interchanges the vast majority of that traffic, especially the truck traffic, is going to gravitate to Exit 175. And then the areas in the Gannet study and their point of access study are much closer to 178. Even some of these other developments like Wal-Mart is right on the interchange and things like Mohegan are much further south, but our studies of this factor in the airport connector road. They factor in the Wal-Mart development and the Mohegan counts. In fact, the counts were updated after a substantial amount of development went in. We counted trucks, we counted truck percentages, we came up with a solution for this Oak and 315, that when built, achieves acceptable levels of service at that intersection, and one thing it does is that it gets all of the traffic, it creates 3 lanes on the northbound exits, so all of the traffic, through being an exclusive lane coming around off the interstate and directly into the park without stopping at either of those traffic signals. It is going to go right into the park. So none of that off I-81 northbound exit traffic is going to have any time on those signals that you are looking at. So, like I said, it is under Federal Highway review right now, achieves acceptable levels of service and opens 315 with all this development. Commissioner Urban asked if the project was funded and Mr. Reilly replied, "yes". The Project is funded and they expect to go through the review process this year and build it next year and the owner of that project is Jenkins Township. He went on to say that as part of looking at this they were asked to see what kind of growth is in the design that PennDOT did and Gannet. Mr. Reilly had handouts and showed a pie chart and stated that the blue is opening day traffic. Based on their destination surveys, PennDOT took all this Commerce Road traffic off into the new interchange towards the airport which is shown on the blue piece of the pie charts. The red is background growth and the current levels of background growth today in Luzerne and Lackawanna County are zero, so they actually used a conservative red background growth. The green part of the pie charts is future development growth, so basically what they are saying is they've done a design to accommodate almost 4 times the opening day level of vehicles. So you take all that traffic you go out there and count today and multiply it by 4, and that is what that design will accommodate. So what he is saying is based on the kind of tricks we've seen generated for this kind of

PUBLIC COMMENTS – Cont'd...

acreage, that is a very high or worst case scenario. And just from a logical standpoint, you know that development has occurred here over the last 40 years, is that traffic coming out of Commerce Road that is now going this way going to increase by 4 times over the next 20 years. These are all projections. We don't have a crystal ball, but when you do these things you base it on what could happen, what are worst case scenarios, and we will work with those worst case scenarios. And yes, it will work well, and we actually think traffic will be half of that in the future which will mean that it will work much smoother than those levels that they are showing. Then the next page of their handouts shows the truck traffic and he said they did a number of different truck counts themselves, and a lot of those truck counts were around the 10-11% range. They also saw truck counts around the 20% range depending on what days you count them. The typical truck percentage number in ITE is 8%, basically PennDOT is using this as part of their design. When they do a roundabout design, they basically reduce the capacity of that model based on how many percent trucks are going to go through there. So they say, OK, if there is 25% trucks then it's going to be 25% less efficient because of those trucks. It's not that simple but basically they ratchet down how well that is going to work based on their trucks and what they've done is they've taken, depending on which approach, they've taken like between 25 and 40% trucks as their design criteria for that, and still, at one point at the bottom of the page (Fed-Ex), they've counted the truck classifications in Commerce and about 30% of those trucks on Commerce Road are the single unit Fed-Ex type trucks. Commissioner Cooney then asked if we further reduce it based on the previous number that was given to them. Mr. Reilly said 'right' a percentage of those are going to be like the Fed-Ex type single unit trucks based on the counts that have been done, and in fact, looking at their classification counts for their ramp counts, their ramp counts had about 40% single unit trucks than PennDOT's counts had. He believes 30% were their counts on Commerce Road. He then said that on the next page, the level of service D is the design criteria for the design here, 20 years out. And what they have come up with is based on all these worst case scenarios, the morning level service is A and the PM is C. So basically, even with these worst case scenarios you could still have even more contributory traffic and still be functioning within the allowable time criteria. The point is it is based on these worst case scenarios; the last page just summarizes those five points and that is based on Reilly's review of that point of access study and Reilly's knowledge and review of recent traffic counts, so all these studies, is that by proximity to this interchange and this disconnect at Suscon Road, basically, it is going to funnel towards Oak and 315. Oak and 315 is going to undergo a major improvement project which is fully funded for design and construction and that project will be built in parallel with this project. So basically this intersection will be meeting acceptable levels of service based on their studies in the design. But on top of that, it still accommodates the worst case scenario of multiplying open gate traffic by four and having these A and C levels of service. So based on that they are saying that Gannett and PennDOT did a proper job of taking into account how bad could it get. It could get 4 times that and it would still work with these acceptable delays and these acceptable design criteria.

DISCUSSION:

Mary Bogart asked if anyone had reviewed this work and if it is under FHWA review and if the local PennDOT people have seen this study? Mr. Reilly replied 'yes' it went to Federal Highway through PennDOT. Mr. Roberts asked what Mr. Reilly submitted for that. He said he is familiar with what was talked about two years ago with the off ramp. He said when they checked their files they only had the two areas that Ms. Bogart has outlined in red and green and black, but nothing for the area outlined in blue. Mr. Reilly stated that it was submitted through Bob Kretschmer and then to our FTP site to Tom Cutrona. Mr. Roberts said he guessed his question is does he know what traffic people; that they had Tom Pichiarella at the meeting the previous day and he was not familiar with this project at all and asked if this was

PUBLIC COMMENTS – Cont’d...

just recently submitted. Mr. Reilly replied since the beginning of January, that they had some back and forth with Bob Kretschmer. Basically they submitted parts of it in early January and then Tom Cutrona asked for more of a detailed study, then all of it was given in the third week of January. Mr. Roberts stated that he was not told about it and that is why he is a little confused because one of the questions he had was concerning when he would be getting the rest of the build out for Center Point Park and that he is surprised that his traffic engineer did not see this project. He said he would have to check into that, he just does not have the answer as to why PennDOT did not have that available to them.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Mykulyn asked if municipal approval has been given for the areas that are Center Point Two East, Phase IIA and IIB. The answer was ‘yes’ Board approval has been given. Commissioner Cooney asked how many parcels are open in Center Point IIB. Mr. Reilly replied indicating that on the map that they have, the gray parcels are the ones that are built and the yellow are the ones that are future. Mr. Mykulyn stated, “but municipal approval for these two sections Phase IIA and IIB was given without any of that additional traffic being studied because this was done for that original study. And the study that Jenkins is currently doing is covering this additional traffic, is that what you are saying?” Mr. Reilly replied, “yes,” the study that’s been done includes all the traffic.

DISCUSSION:

Bill Atrensky with Miracle Real Estate, commented that the projects that we are talking about here today that Mr. Reilly spoke about, these studies Reilly Associates has done for Center Point proper have taken place over the last five plus years. The ramp project that Mr. Reilly is talking about, the study has been contemplated for five years, it has been funded for five years. So these are projects that have been well known about, well planned, contemplated from conceptual stage to schematic design phase and is now at the point where there is more detail that’s been submitted through the federal highway. These are projects that, frankly, Jenkins Township is the owner of the projects. Jenkins Township has been aware of them for five years. For the benefit of this Board, the review engineer for Jenkins Township is the same as the review engineer for Pittston Township and has been familiar with these projects, again, for five years. So, all of what you see here in gray is what contemplates the Center Point Developments, and this ramp project and these various traffic studies have been distributed roundly through Jenkins Township and through Pittston Township as has been appropriate for the past five years. Frankly, it’s been a planned infrastructure project Jenkins Township is very familiar with. Commissioner O’Brien asked when they submitted these plans to the traffic people at PennDOT. Commissioner O’Brien stated that he, Mr. Atrensky, just said everyone has been aware of this for five years, so he would like to know, from him, when he submitted them to the traffic engineer at PennDOT. He replied that he didn’t submit them.

DISCUSSION:

Mary Bogart stated that she thinks those traffic issues obviously need to be addressed and she thinks the Airport Board should be eager to see what those studies say and they should be eager to look at how the reviews go. She thinks there are many questions that hopefully are answered in those studies and then at that time we will have a clearer picture that we don’t have today. Commissioner Cooney asked if, “don’t we have the Gannet Fleming Studies showing that future traffic projections are adequate and include enough trips to account for Center Point? Doesn’t the study include the worst truck case percentages?” Ms. Bogart replied that the 2005 study that was done for Center Point has a traffic count in the appendix and in that traffic count the percent of trucks on Armstrong Road is 50%. It is actually higher, now that it includes Grimes, Vogelbacher, O’Hara, and whatever was built in 2005. She stated the studies need to be reviewed, because in

PUBLIC COMMENTS – Cont'd...

the final condition for that study there was 9% trucks used in the evaluation, 6% in the AM and 9% in the PM. So that's the kind of thing the Department of Transportation needs to look at and advise the airport accordingly. There may be a reasonable explanation for that; she is not at liberty to say right now; all she is saying is that it is an issue this Board should be concerned with because the percentage of trucks greatly impacts how an intersection operates. A large truck is equivalent to more than two cars. Mr. Reilly stated that the Gannet design did not use 10% trucks, it used on the approach, 25-40% trucks in their intersection design and the road design so it's not an ITE based number and they do have many counts that are in that 11% range but even given those numbers, previous studies done for Center Point, he thinks is evident that the Gannet approach, with the worst case scenario, with multiplying the total trips by four, and having 25-40% trucks is clearly a very aggressive number. It allows you to take what's out there today and add multiples and still function very well. So basically it is evident on review of the Gannet study that every reasonable worst case scenario was looked at, that you could lay around pieces of Center Point and still have excellent functionality in these interchanges. He thinks it is very evident reviewing their studies that they have gone to the very worst case and that Center Point would really have to put a huge percentage of traffic there to tip those scales. And that just by proximity it is not going to happen. He said you could drive those roads out there and you could see how, by proximity and travel route you are not going to take your truck up Suscon Road, it's a barrier, it's an impediment. If you drive that, you can see how the trucks are going to gravitate towards Oak Street and Center Point, (and they are going) and the Grimes trucks are going to take the access road.

DISCUSSION:

Ms. Bogart stated that for the Grimes and Vogelbacher Park there are about 200 acres of land that is not included in Gannet's numbers. Mr. Acker also stated that the classification of POA study did not consider Center Point at all. Commissioner Cooney asked how long the Grimes Industrial Park has been under construction. Ms. Bogart answered that it has been under development for a long time and this is the heart of development for the Bi-County area and Gannet's numbers left by the year 2,026 still left the airports 100 acres undeveloped and about 200 acres in Grimes and Vogelbacher undeveloped as well. Commissioner Cooney said the acreage in Grimes Industrial Park is basically nothing to develop because it is very difficult to develop. Therefore, all these void sites are less expensive to develop than Grimes. He continued, in Grimes you have an awful lot of rock and the expense to develop buildings in Grimes exceeds those other areas so developers are going to go to other ways. Mr. Reilly stated that you can see that the sites that have been developed have been the easier sites to develop, and even those easier sites were not very easy. So the sites left undeveloped are very difficult topography with rock at the surface. There is a reason that development has not occurred quickly. Mr. Roberts stated that he understood that Gannet has about 400 acres of still developable land in Grimes, and like Ms. Bogart said, over the next 20 years only anticipate 200 acres, but they don't even know if they can develop all 400 acres. Mr. Reilly stated, "right," and they also put a few hundred houses in the future in the project, which is out towards Pocono Ridge. That is also an extreme scenario given some of the topography out there. Mr. Roberts asked Ms. Bogart about the fact that she mentioned 9% trucks. She stated that that is the number when 'they' originally talked about level of service, C & D, at 315 and Oak Street and Armstrong Road. 9% of trucks is the percent that was established for Armstrong Road and the buildup of the traffic impact study.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Cooney asked when the last project was developed in the Grimes Industrial Park. Ms. Dessoie of Greater Pittston Chamber replied that the last project was the PA Call Center. Representative Carroll stated that he would amend

PUBLIC COMMENTS – Cont'd...

that answer and tell them that the last project being developed in Grimes is Dupont Borough's Municipal garage which is being built to plow the snow on Commerce Road and the connector road that Dupont agreed to take. Site work was done and they are in the process of building the actual facility that will house the Dupont Borough Municipal operations for the sole purpose of making sure that easy access to Grimes and the connector road are easily passable. Commissioner Cooney clarified that he meant to ask what was the last project was that was industrial manufactured for a warehouse base. Ms. Dessoye said it was the PA Call Center, and she stated that of the 200 available acres there is probably less than 60; that not only the topography has to be considered but also there are some wetlands and some environmental issues. There is very little land to be developed still.

DISCUSSION:

Ms. Bogart stated that she believed they covered everything in Exhibit 5 and asked Mr. Acker to go over Exhibit 6. He stated that Exhibit 6 is a listing of possible alternatives or fixes for full build out, assuming the traffic conditions are as bad as potentially expected. He stated they went over a number of them with PennDOT the day before, some warrant considerations, some of them are more difficult to do and there are number of them that involve agencies outside of PennDOT including Municipal, local municipal, and the turnpike authority. He said they also talked about a number of things listed in Exhibit 6. Exhibit 7, Ms. Bogart explained, that basically if you read the point of access studies, this is just basically quotes from the point of access study that talk concerns to roundabouts and they are just summarized there. Commissioner Urban clarified with Ms. Bogart that she is saying that what the study is based on is from 2005. Ms. Bogart explained that she is aware that it is a very long process for PennDOT to spend federal money. There are a lot of rules and regulations for wetlands and endangered species and all kinds of things and it takes time, so by the time you get a project to completion you are looking at older data. Commissioner Urban asked Barry Centini, regarding the study they anticipated doing here and authorized at the last meeting, how long would that take? Barry asked Mary Bogart and she stated that it take a few months.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Washo stated to George Roberts that he (George Roberts) has exhibited qualities that he is a patient person and asked him what the time line is as far as PennDOT is concerned. Mr. Roberts replied that the timeline set up now was to bid the job in November of this year. He stated he has some real concerns over that and the concerns lie solely with getting the right-of-way cleared. The design will be ready, all the other right-of-way acquisitions that the department is doing is in the process. We already relocated two people and are getting ready to relocate three other families and we will have everything perfect timing. The whole issue is going to surround whether the FAA is going to provide the easement, if the Board agrees to allow that to happen, and the airport personnel supporting that conversation with the FAA, of whether how fast that process will move. I would need to ask the Airport to go in and say, "this is my project, I want this built, I want to achieve the easement from the FAA," and work at a positive manner to get that. If he gets that today he is hoping that he can bid this job by early next year because he understands that it could take a year to get that process done. Maybe there are other ways to get FAA to get it done quicker because their intention was to start that process in January, but it was a little controversial between PennDOT and the airport and they did not want to talk to them. So they already delayed it two months beyond the first date he asked for, which is still probably behind schedule, we tried to have an answer by the end of last month. So now here it is the end of March and he is very seriously concerned about whether he can deliver that project for a letting in November, even if he gets the approval today, because of the FAA easement that is required to achieve this. But again, that has to have the airport 100% behind it.

PUBLIC COMMENTS – Cont'd...

DISCUSSION:

Representative Carroll added that the Secretary of Transportation sat in this room in the end of February with Commissioner Urban and Mr. Centini and asked for a decision by the end of March and here we are at the end of March and it seems to him that the commitment was made at that time to provide an answer to the Secretary at that point. Commissioner Urban told Representative Carroll that the Board could have had an answer at the last meeting and it would have been 'no'. Representative Carroll stated that at some point we have to make a decision and if you want to cast a no vote you are welcome to do that, but the fact of the matter is it is time to make a decision. Commissioner Urban stated that what they are trying to do is get accurate data, reliable data, data that is going to tell a true story about the traffic. We are also trying to get information that is going to show true benefits to the airport. He stated that you are going to ask us to sign our name on a line, to send it to the FAA, to say that this project benefits the airport. In that meeting with the Secretary of Transportation, and you, and Senator Blake, and I, and Barry and some of the staff in the 45 minutes that he sat there and listened he did not hear one benefit coming from anybody that said there was a benefit to the airport. But yet, you are asking me and the Board to go to the FAA and tell the FAA there is a benefit to the airport. He went on to say that he thinks some of the things discussed today can provide a benefit to the airport - questions about the fill, questions about giving us access to the other side of the airport, the questions about actually opening up the airports land to development - he thinks those are some of the things that were asked for 21 years ago. A ramp to the turnpike was asked for 21 years ago and we don't have that. This project, in his opinion, has changed significantly. As he drove around this airport several times and looked at it, we have a road to the other side of the airport now, the FAA provided that road. It's a two lane paved road that leads over to the tower on the other side that is being built with federal dollars. There is a road over there now, very similar to what Barry asked for 21 years ago that we got from the FAA for free. He looked at the terrain that this new road goes. He went down and walked it. It goes underneath a glide path with a 25' high road on top of it. A lot of fill is going to have to go in there in order to make that land developable but he still does not see an access along the turnpike to open our land in the backside to development. To him, that is a benefit to the airport if that was included. It is not included here. Those are things he is looking for. He understands that, and he is hearing two different things, in his opinion. He is hearing that the park is almost all built up and there is very little developable land. Then he has to ask the question, "why is the road needed if that is the case?" Representative Carroll stated that we have 2,800 employees in the Grimes Park and the concurrent trucks that serve those businesses and those 2,800 employees in Grimes today, and those folks were placed there with the expectation that a connector road to 81 would be constructed. And the fact of the matter is that, and I know Commissioner Washo mentioned the word patience, he said he would remind the Board that the employers and employees of the Grimes have been asked to have some patience while we contemplate the connector road, and I would remind the Board that the people of Dupont have had great patience while waiting for this connector road to relieve the traffic on Suscon Road and Main Street in Dupont. At the end of the day, the whole idea about traffic conditions being made worse, (he's heard that phrase three or four times), it seems to him the traffic conditions being made worse means there is unbelievable economic activity and job growth in Grimes and Center Point. He stated that for the life of him he cannot figure out why that's not a benefit to the airport. Because economic activity at Grimes and Center Point has to be beneficial to the airport. There is no other airport that he knows of that would discount more work to prevent economic growth and activity near an airport. It is astounding to me that we are having this conversation at all because growth in Grimes and growth in Center Point has to be beneficial to our airport.

PUBLIC COMMENTS – Cont'd...

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner O'Brien asked if he could say something because he has probably been one of the most vocal individuals on this Board with respect to really making sure we get this right and not doing something half hearted or get it going before it is ready to go, so from a perspective standpoint he thinks he has a unique one, to some degree. He stated he thinks we've made incredible progress here today, so far today, and he sees great value in doing this project with respect to the airport, today, and he has not seen that in the past. For example, #1, the gated access to Navy Way Road, he thinks provides an excellent opportunity for the airport, , he thinks provides an excellent opportunity for access by the airport, #2, the placement of the fill for the Radar Hill Road tie-in, he thinks has a great value to the airport. He thinks the fact that Dupont is willing to provide, and to submit on the airports behalf, a gaming application, 'although we have no idea how that goes.' But just the fact that they are willing, on our behalf to submit a gaming application to get the road to Radar Hill built, just the fact they are willing to do that when they've come here looking for our assistance and we've been continually saying, "wait, wait, wait we need more, more, more." And even though, from their standpoint, it probably has not been going as well as they would have liked, the fact that they are here today, and willing to say that they will put their name on the bottom of an application for us, to fund what we've wanted for 21 years, he thinks that is significant. The fact that Representative Carroll is here, who is as passionate as anybody in the room, obviously, on this project, as anybody on the planet, the fact that he is willing to say here today that he would support, as a member of not only the State Legislature but also as a member of the Transportation Committee, - that he is willing to entertain -and if everybody is on the same page, support the potential interchange off the turnpike, just the fact that he is willing to entertain the support of it if everybody is on board, these are things that change, in his estimation, change everything. If PennDOT is willing to look at and if we, if we luckily, if we get into the worst case scenario which means there is a great deal of economic growth and development going on, if PennDOT's willing at some point, worst case scenario, whatever the traffic study says, let's assume all worst case scenarios, if PennDOT's willing to work with us at that time, like they are willing to work with us on this project now, to provide additional metering opportunities, to find ways to reduce congestion, if you are willing to do that kind of stuff, he thinks there is great, great potential in this project. He thinks that they have demonstrated today that there are significant benefits to this airport. He doesn't think there is any question about that. Are there issues? There are issues in every single project, there are far less issues today then there were two months ago. Far fewer. The fact that they are going to move that 25' access, extend it out, that's going to provide the necessary, in his estimation, that's going to provide a lot of additional merging ability there so that we don't see the impact at the entrance, which is something that he has been really concerned with. He thinks now that these trucks will be in that interchange, it will be much easier to navigate over because you are not going to be having merging on and merging off at exactly the same time. So he thinks we've come a long way on this project. There will always be questions; we can study everything to death. We can do studies for the next 4 years on this, and we can update, update, update because once we do the study, then, well that's old now because somebody is now talking about additional development. And if we are going to get into this game of additional development all the time, at some point we are going to have to make the decision whether this has a positive effect on this airport, and while I didn't think it did two months ago, sitting here today and hearing from PennDOT, I think the positive impacts on this airport and this region are tremendous. And he thinks what PennDOT has done here, their ability to work with the Airport on it, not just say it this way or no way, but your ability and willingness to work with us on it, when you believe this has left the station, but you are still willing, even today, to work with us on it, is a real strong indication of how he thinks this project is going to go. He told Mr. Roberts that he has always been

PUBLIC COMMENTS – Cont'd...

very up front; he has always been very professional with us. He's done a heck of a job assisting Lackawanna County in projects throughout their county, and being very patient with them, and he appreciates his patience with us today on this one.

DISCUSSION:

Mary Bogart replied that she thinks all the traffic issues have been discussed and she commented that she thinks the airport staff would probably prefer to go over the last three exhibits. Barry Centini stated that he does not think the last three budget exhibits are not pertinent to traffic studies and he thinks the traffic studies is what is bringing everybody together, to find out the number of vehicles that could potentially impact airport traffic on the roundabout number two. Commissioner Urban asked when that study would be completed. Mr. Centini replied that the study the airport would undertake, - firstly the Board would have to approve that study. He said the airport has the scope of work that is almost completed. Mr. Mykulyn stated that they have the scope of work and they are looking at putting that into an RFQ now.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Petrilla commented that she has not said too much today but the one thing she would like to say is that she thinks it is pretty clear that they are teetering on jeopardizing this project. We've asked umpteen questions, we've gotten tons of answers, but she disagrees with Commissioner Urban in that there is no benefit to the airport. This is a benefit to Northeastern Pennsylvania and any economic growth that we get in Northeastern Pennsylvania is going to benefit our airport. She stated that there are times when this airport is very quiet and we want it to be bustling all day long, and any economic growth will only add to that so she cannot say enough how much she thinks this would be a benefit to the airport. She said that economic growth in our region benefits our airport, there is no arguing with it. Any growth we see in this area is going to show growth in our airport, in our airline tickets, in our passengers. It's a foregone conclusion that one feeds off the other. Commissioner Urban stated that he would agree with that, however, Mr. Centini stated that when you look at what was presented here today, knowing the impacts of Center Point and what they plan on doing, as Mr. Reilly has said, this road is really technically no benefit to Center Point at all, from what you are saying. They are going to be able to handle all their traffic at Oak Street and with that said, we talked about mitigating factors of what happens if worst case scenarios occur. We could hear from Pittston Township who controls Armstrong Road is that right? It was answered that yes they do. Pittston Township controls Armstrong Road, the intersection itself is on the border of Jenkins. The intersection of Suscon and Armstrong Road is Pittston Township. We could talk to Pittston Township and look for a mitigating factor where no trucks are allowed off of Center Point to come to the airport. That's another mitigating factor, we talked about that and that is something that could be pursued. A representative from Pittston Township (did not give name) spoke up saying that he does not think that Pittston Township would do anything to hamper growth in the Center Point Industrial Park, Vogelbacher, or any park within Luzerne County or even bordering Lackawanna County. To stifle any type of growth, and he sits on the Planning Commission of Pittston Township and they are very aggressive, they want businesses coming into here, and if this interchange means that it would flame those businesses then he thinks it is vital that they do have it.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Stanley Golembiewski, Vice Chairman Council of Dupont, stated that he was Chairman of Council from about 1991 and he worked 25 years with PennDOT. During the summer I worked 81, midnights I worked during the winter time and believe me I was on 315 plowing, 81 plowing and believe me the airport won't have a problem with this roundabout that PennDOT wants to put in. Last year there was about 212,000 people board at this airport, take that down a day its only 50 people an hour going on airplanes from here. So, he doesn't think traffic will play a big part

PUBLIC COMMENTS – Cont'd...

coming up to the airport. He stated he has seen traffic a couple of times snarled with tractor trailers being in accidents and so forth, the airport road was closed maybe once or twice, and like he said, the people of Dupont really need this project. You have the money in place, the money is not going to be there forever. If there is another project going, he believes PennDOT will shift the money somewhere else. The people of Dupont need this access road. Dupont is going to take care of it. They are going to put their new garage up at the park on Cedars Drive and there won't be a problem in the winter time. Trucks will be up there plowing and they will be taking care of the roads. So, the people of Dupont really need this project and it is up to the Board to get this through.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Washo stated that he personally appreciated everything he has heard from everyone over the past two meetings. He thinks this is a healthy way to deal with pressing issues and if it were easy they wouldn't be here but they are trying to do something of significant magnitude in terms of dollars and we are trying to do something that has an impact upon the airport, upon the Department of Transportation, upon the municipalities, the State Legislature. There are going to be times when it is contentious, but at the same time it is important to listen to everyone. He stated that he has listened carefully and there is a great deal of passion that we've heard, and there is one thing that stands out in my mind more than anything, and it is what Tom Cooney said, and it has worried him. Tom Cooney said that we have a moral obligation, and he addressed Mr. Golembiewski about being on council since 1991. He stated that he thinks we all believe what we read, even though we say we don't. You know, you see something in print, it says 'this' is going to happen. Then we think it's going to happen and in our minds we accept that, and now we are at the hour when you pull the trigger or you don't and there are questions. It is not unhealthy to have questions but it will be very unhealthy if we don't have a rapid decision, maybe a decision as early as today to resolve any confusion. Now Barry Centini just referred to what Mr. Reilly talked about the upgrade at Oak and 315. The importance of that alleviates some of the anxiety that has been exhibited here, and he was thinking the same thought. He trusts that others were thinking the same thought and he also observed that PennDOT continues to demonstrate, not just patience, but a real cooperative spirit to hopefully ensure that there is something in it for everyone; that the airport is going to see something that is of value and there would be something for the businesses and something for the municipalities. Maybe the final thing he would say is that he always thought the stimulus was too small; he wanted to see that stimulus so big because he didn't have confidence in the private sector to spend the dollars that are necessary to jumpstart this economy and if we vote today he is going to be thinking about the fact that I can't complain about the lack of governmental spending to jumpstart the economy which is desperately needed. He said we are in such dire times right now as a nation. And what is keeping us going? So much of the government spending. (the tower out there). people are getting prevailing wage. Families can't live on \$10.00 or \$12 or \$14 an hour jobs. And thank goodness for our government. A lot of people voted against our government in this last election, people who need government the most. He stated he is not talking democrat or republican; that is not what he is talking about. But the private sector is not going to take one chance right now on investing; that's a bit of an exaggerated statement, but he is in politics and on his way out, so he can say these things. So, he hopes they can vote on this today. He has learned a lot. He knows that this is not perfect, but he does not know that he has ever done anything personally in the perfect manner. He doubts that he has, but jobs, jobs, jobs, prevailing wage jobs. And he thinks today the fact that everyone is here demonstrates for us once again the importance of our government in our lives. It's not all bad, he would conclude with this. Who pays for national parks? We do. Who pays for the national institute of health? Who pays for

PUBLIC COMMENTS – Cont’d...

the national science foundation? Who put us on the moon? It’s been government that’s made those difficult decisions and it is government that’s going to take us out of this horrible recession that we are in. “So, Mr. Chairman, I hope that we are going to vote on this today,” he said.

MOTION: Recommend Airport Board does not provide a study with respect to additional traffic counts
MOVED BY: Commissioner O’Brien
SECONDED BY: Commissioner Petrilla
VOTE: Unanimous

MOTION: Recommend Airport Board 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 dba Wilkes-Barre/ Scranton International Airport to enter into a land easement agreement with PennDOT for the construction of an access road approximately one mile through airport property, approximately 33 acres, connecting Route I-81 interchange to Commerce Boulevard into the Grimes Industrial Park. Also addition of a gated access to Navy Way and for fill for the Radar Hill Road tie-in.
MOVED BY: Commissioner O’Brien
SECONDED BY: Commissioner Cooney
VOTE: Unanimous

MOTION: Recommend Airport Board approve appraisal of airport property.
MOVED BY: Commissioner Petrilla
SECONDED BY: Commissioner O’Brien
VOTE: Unanimous

DISCUSSION: Mr. Centini informed the Board that they will need another motion after this if they receive the FAA approval to ease the road to Dupont. He stated they don’t need that at this time. Commissioner O’Brien asked Mr. Roberts if there were any resolutions or authorizations that he needs. He stated that the only clarification is that he needs the easement from the FAA and as he talked earlier, this is a local job and the match was going to be that easement. He stated he just wanted to clarify that the easement is a donated easement and that is what they are going to have to work on with the FAA and airport, together. Commissioner Urban asked if we are going to need a commitment from Senator Casey on that. Mr. Centini replied that it’s not only a commitment from Senator Casey, that we would work with Senator Casey on this, but there is going to be, as Mr. Roberts said, there could be a problem with, once the appraisal is done and we find out how much the dollars are associated with the amount of acreage we are giving up, 33 acres, it may be in the neighborhood of a couple million dollars that is going to be in question here. So that is why the motion was read to do the application. Even if the application is approved, we get the ‘OK’ from the FAA, and in light of some of the meetings that we sat in with the FAA, they are going to want to see a payment coming to the Board for that property. He stated he does not know how that is going to occur but it is something that they are going to have to think about. Commissioner Washo said that he thinks the message that has to be conveyed is that we voted as a Board today, based upon the fact that we think this project is in the best interest of the airport from an economic development standpoint, and that needs to be our position and the position needs to be carefully articulated, so that there is no ambiguity and that the FAA knows that. Mr. Centini stated that he sent him documentation of all the articles that have to be answered by the FAA, and there is a multitude of them. Not only the benefits to the airport, and it goes back to how the land was purchased originally. I think there must be 30 to 40

PUBLIC COMMENTS – Cont'd...

questions that have to be answered along with the final benefit to the airport itself. He stated that they will start to pull that together with their consultants. It will take them some time to answer all those questions and get that application prepared, but he will move as diligently as possible.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Petrilla stated that, in closing, she knows that Mr. Centini has major concerns about this affecting the airport, but this Board voted unanimously with the absence of Commissioner Munchak to go forward and she thinks it is imperative now that the staff of the airport Cooperate with the FAA, cooperate with George Roberts, so that the airport shows a progressive and positive approach and feeling towards this project because this was our wish that we voted on today. So we have to put our personal opinions in the back of our mind and adhere to the wishes of the Bi-County Board.

DISCUSSION:

A spokesman from Dupont Borough, (did not give his name), addressed the Board saying that he would like to thank them and the Airport for their cooperation today on behalf of the people in Grimes Park, people in Dupont and the Greater Pittston community, and really the residents of Lackawanna and Luzerne County, the employers and employees in Grimes and the adjacent activity, whether its Radar Hill or Center Point. The fact of the matter is this was a giant step forward today and he appreciated the cooperation and especially the cooperation from PennDOT.

ITEM 3:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

MOTION:

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

MOVED BY:

Commissioner Petrilla

SECONDED BY:

Commissioner Cooney

VOTE:

Unanimous

ITEM 4:

OTHER MATTERS.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Centini also stated that there was one more thing he would like to bring up, and that is that he believes when they look at this development, if it occurs, is really in the Phase I development. He is urging this Board and the staff to work with Senator Blake and Representative Carroll, and approaching the turnpike as quickly as possible to get that answer, because the full benefit of this road to the airport is a connection to the turnpike. If we could make a connection north-south, at Commerce Boulevard, and make a connection north of Moosic, just going north on 81, it would alleviate all fears and benefit the airport along with everybody. That also benefits the I-81 corridor and taking traffic off of 81, which is the major concern of PennDOT and Luzerne and Lackawanna Counties, to ease that traffic on 81. So he thinks that connection to the turnpike is imperative. We should be working very hard for it, not only this Board but with PennDOT, and he just wanted to say that he is willing to work with Representative Carroll and Senator Blake in making that happen and report back to the Board. Representative Carroll stated that he couldn't agree more and that he truly believes that a firm policy and a sound transportation policy for our two counties would be to get as much traffic off of I-81 onto the turnpike as possible. It's to the extent that they can work with the turnpike looking for an exit for Commerce Road and the Airport, and also to contemplate what we do with tolling of the Keyser Avenue interchange in Clarks Summit. We ought to contemplate

OTHER MATTERS – Cont’d...

alternatives there because the more traffic we put on the turnpike that's north of Clarks Summit, the better; because it alleviates traffic on a corridor that is overstressed to the point now. Traffic on 81 at the apron of Davis Street, in front of the airport here has somewhere in the neighborhood of 80,000 vehicles a day. That road was constructed to accommodate 40 to 50,000 vehicles a day, and to the extent that we get traffic onto the turnpike that is northbound, it would be a benefit to all.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner O'Brien asked Representative Carroll if he knows of a way, or what is his 'take' on eliminating the toll for Keyser and Clarks Summit. Representative Carroll replied that it is a complicated proposition that would require cooperation between PennDOT and the turnpike, but is one he is willing to engage in. Commissioner O'Brien asked if they are making or losing money on those tolls now. Representative Carroll replied that he does not know but he suspects that the turnpike between Wyoming Valley and Clarks Summit is not making a tremendous amount of money.

DISCUSSION:

A person from the audience, (did not give name) said that you talk about benefits and detriments to the airport. He said "I don't think you are going to see any detriments." He does not think anybody is not going to come to this airport because of truck traffic on their drive up here. When you sell the benefits to the FAA you just make a great stride to help them save the neighbors and the airport. "I assume, the Airport wants to be a good neighbor," he said. Commissioner Urban stated that his concern about the detriments on the circle, why he asked is that he gets stuck on the interstate periodically with traffic jams. The person from the audience interrupted by asking the Commissioner to please just speak up and help them save the other people in town, cause you just made a great accomplishment forward.

ITEM 5.

ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION:

To adjourn the meeting.

MOVED BY:

Commissioner O'Brien

SECONDED BY:

Commissioner Petrilla

VOTE:

Unanimous

The meeting was adjourned at 12:10 P.M.