

## **Exhibit 5**

CENTRE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (CCMPO)  
COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Tuesday, March 28, 2006  
6:00 p.m.  
College Township Municipal Building

Minutes

Coordinating Committee Members Present:

Chris Exarchos	Centre County
Steve Dershem (for Scott Conklin)	Centre County
Dan Klees	College Township
George Pytel	Ferguson Township
Ron Buckalew	Centre Regional Planning Commission (CRPC)
John Elnitski	Benner Township
Chris Lee	Harris Township
Elizabeth Goreham	State College Borough
Bob Neff	Halfmoon Township
Dean Roberts (for Tom TenEyck)	PennDOT Central Office
Frank Royer	Spring Township
Karen Michael (for Kevin Kline)	PennDOT District 2-0 Office
John Spychalski	CATA
Bob Corman	Penns Valley Planning Region
Bryce Boyer	Patton Township
Jack Shannon	Moshannon Valley Planning Region
John Yecina	Mountaintop Planning Region
Bill Griffith (for Tom Poorman)	Lower Bald Eagle Planning Region

Non-Voting Members Present:

Matt Smoker	Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
-------------	---------------------------------------

Others Present: (a full list of citizens and others is attached)

Bob Crum	CRPA
Tom Zilla	CRPA
Trish Meek	CRPA
Tim Geibel	CRPA
Mike Bloom	Centre County
Harold Nanovic	PennDOT Central Office
CNET	
Chris Price	Centre County Planning Office
George Khoury	Citizen
Judy Larkin	Penn State University
Ann Glaser	Citizen

Mike Joseph	CDT
Jaime Bumbarger	The Progress
Pat Boland	Forever Broadcasting
Jim Steff	COG
Anne Danahy	CDT

## 6. Centre County Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)

Mr. Klees stated that the purpose of this agenda item is for the MPO to consider requests for various projects on the current LRTP to be re-ranked in the Plan. He said that for the I-80 Interchange, representatives from Rush Township are going to speak to their request to re-rank this project. The MPO staff will report on issues related to the request, and then the public will be given an opportunity to speak. He said that he had previously announced that input would be limited to 10 minutes and a lot of people felt that this was an unfair amount of time. He said that there may be time for more people to speak. Mr. Crum will time the speakers and each person will have up to 90 seconds to make their point. Mr. Klees asked that comments be limited to those that have not already been stated. He asked also that no noises be made during the input process.

Mr. Elnitski said that if this was a referendum vote, he would probably vote no for a landfill. However, the MPO has heard that the people do not want a landfill and that the people feel that without an interchange there will not be a landfill. He said he would like to hear why the interchange might cause the other roads a problem. He thought that the citizens need to understand that the MPO is not a planning organization, but an allocation organization. If a member has a project in their township that is fully funded by outside sources and the MPO has to put it on the TIP because it is a federal road, he would expect the MPO to support that project. The MPO is here to support each other in road building, not to be political about some project being built. Bringing in the politics of a project rather than a road will undermine the MPO.

Mr. Klees said that the MPO has struggled with how any re-ranking would occur for the eight projects in this agenda item. He said that the goal was to consider whether the MPO wanted to re-rank the projects. How that would be done is yet to be determined. He did not think the MPO could decide how to re-rank them tonight.

Mr. Pytel said that the MPO does not come here to support big money to put interchanges on roads. The MPO's position is to find where interchanges should be, regardless of the amount of money the sponsor has.

### a. I-80 Rush Township Interchange

Mr. Shannon said that under discussion tonight is the Rush Township Industrial Enterprise Zone, which would be made up of a possible project for a landfill and a possible project for recycling. The key point this evening is an interchange to access the area that has been indicated in Centre County. He showed the exact location on a map. He said this was specified in the Rush Township Comprehensive Plan as one of the areas that they would like to see industrial development. This area had been abandoned by the group who took the coal and timber out of it and has not been reclaimed. Due to its proximity to I-80, if an interchange were located there, local homes and roads would not be impacted.

Mr. Shannon said that some of the areas are holding water. There are also some areas that have no algae, as the water is not able to sustain life. The site is located near Red Moshannon,

which is effected greatly by mine acid drainage. It will eventually join the Black Moshannon, where it will sustain life. The advantage of a project here is to start to mitigate the effect of mine acid drainage.

Mr. Yecina said that if this exit is not approved, the truck traffic would come through the local roads. He showed specific routes on slides, including Routes 53 and 144. Only construction traffic would be using Gorton Road. He showed a slide of where the exit would come off of I-80, saying he would much rather see the trucks coming from there than on the local roads. Mr. Yecina stated that all the Supervisors in Snow Shoe Township support the exit over use of local roads. He talked to Borough Council and five of those members also support the interchange. Approval of this motion provides the best access for the landfill. Voting against the interchange is saying that the local roads are a better option. He said he would appreciate it if the MPO would think this through and not put traffic on the local roads.

Mr. Pytel referred to the slide of I-80 and the land there. He asked how many acres of land were shown. Mr. Shannon said that the area in the slide was approximately 2800 acres, with about 300 utilized by the landfill and about 350 acres utilized by the industrial park.

Mr. Pytel asked what made Rush Township think that PennDOT would approve truck traffic on the local roads. Mr. Yecina said that any developer has the right to use the state roads.

Mr. George Rittew, Rittew Associates, said that they prepared the POA and are working with Rush Township on this project. He strongly encouraged MPO members to support fellow members in this request for an interchange. He said this was not a land use issue and the transportation project was fully funded. It would not have an impact on MPO funding or any projects on their list. He said that land use is determined by Rush Township's Comprehensive Plan. The interchange obviously reduces impacts on the local roads in the area. The interchange supports Rush Township's development of an Industrial Enterprise Zone and this is really just a first step in a long process. This is not about a final vote for approving an interchange.

Mr. Pytel asked if Resource Recovery had a permit to put a landfill in. Mr. Rittew said they are working on a permit. Mr. Pytel thought that approval of an interchange would help get the permit. Mr. Rittew said that this was about the transportation issue.

Mr. Zilla reviewed the process involved, saying that the MPO has received a request from Rush and Snow Shoe Townships to amend the current adopted Long Range Transportation Plan. Because the amendment process is similar to the process to adopt a new LRTP, this request is being addressed as part of the new LRTP and not an amendment to the current Plan.

Mr. Elnitsky asked if, during the ranking process, any thought was given to a project funded by an outside source being on a different list than the projects for ranking. Mr. Zilla said that was not discussed and would be up to the MPO.

Mr. Zilla said that options for consideration tonight would include the following:

Defer the request until Centre County determines the consistency of the interchange with the Comprehensive Plan

Include the interchange on the project list for the new LRTP

Include the interchange on the LRTP as a project for future consideration

Not include the project on the LRTP

The adoption process to amend the current long range transportation plan or adopt a new one are very similar. The MPO would approve the Final Draft of the Plan to be advertised for public comment, an air quality conformity analysis would have to be done for projects with air quality significance, a 30-day comment period and public meeting would be held and then action could be considered. Those are the basic steps for either an amendment to the current LRTP or adoption of a new Plan.

Mr. Exarchos said that the mission of the MPO is to prioritize highway projects that are important to the community and allocate the limited resources to take care of more urgent needs. He thought that the LRTP has been designed as a vehicle to achieve those goals. Here there is a project that does not meet two criteria: 1) it is not publicly funded and 2) it is not a project with community benefit. Mr. Exarchos said that he is not saying that there are not implications that would affect the general good. He found it difficult to prioritize a project for which there is no logical basis to set a priority. Mr. Exarchos believed that a different process was needed to deal with fully funded projects that are intended for a limited benefit. Once the project is ranked, it does a disservice to other projects that would be bumped further down on the list. He said that the MPO was not here to pass judgment on the land use issue. That was a decision made by Rush Township. The MPO could instruct staff to develop a process for how privately funded projects would be considered, but not put them on this list. The MPO should probably not have an opinion on those since they do not present a challenge or affect other projects. Or the MPO could say that they have no opinion and it does not belong on the list of projects, but they could pass the POA on to FHWA and tell them to do whatever they do with it.

Ms. Goreham disagreed. She said that it certainly impacts the public and there would be transportation impacts on I-80. The public will bear the cost in many ways, including air quality, water and land use. The MPO found this project inconsistent with land use plans a couple of months ago and decided not to forward the POA to FHWA for further review. The MPO must face the audience, let them speak and determine if we are going to give it special consideration.

Mr. Shannon said that the MPO did not deal with the project in regards to land use, only regards to the LRTP. Land use is another issue. The MPO is to relate the interchange to transportation.

Mr. Lee said that the list of candidate projects were based on criteria. He asked if any of those criteria were based on money. Mr. Bloom said that the Local/Municipal Support Priority criterion was set up with two general project characteristics: the priority ranking assigned by the individual municipality or sponsor of the project and the commitment of the non-federal share. Mr. Zilla said that the cost of the project was not considered in the ranking. Mr. Lee said that none of the projects are ranked on whether it is public or private money. Mr. Zilla said that it was considered only in the above example, where if a sponsor was committing money to a project, they would gain points in that one particular criterion.

Mr. Lee said that highways shape communities and there needs to be a coordination of land use and transportation planning. The impact of highways is on more than the movement of cars and trucks.

Mr. Buckalew said that it is not always clear cut in private or public money and sometimes involves both.

Mr. Exarchos noted that a motion was needed in order to have a debate on the issue. Mr. Klees said that the item under consideration is the re-ranking of the Gorton Road Interchange.

*Mr. Shannon made a motion that the CCMPO incorporate the I-80 interchange project at mile post 140 in the 2007-2010 Transportation Improvement Program and be included in the approved Final Draft of the Centre County Long Range Transportation Plan, with the stipulation that the new interchange will be privately funded and that no public funds will be required for its construction; and further that the CCMPO shall recommend that the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation submit the POA for the proposed new interchange to the Federal Highway Administration for action. Mr. Yecina seconded the motion.*

Mr. Exarchos said that he could not support the motion as stated. He said that he could not support the part of the motion saying that it should be included on the TIP. He did not see the rationale for including this.

Mr. Klees opened the floor for citizen comments.

Ms. Kathi Lewis, Snow Shoe Borough, said that some of the members of the MPO have said that this is not a landfill issue. She said that was good - if you take the landfill out of the picture, what is left is thousands of acres of forested recreation land that is appropriately accessible by adequately maintained dirt roads that impose a minimum cost to taxpayers. These minimal costs are offset in part by seasonal property real estate tax dollars and taxes on goods and services purchased by outdoor recreational enthusiasts. Let's continue to keep the landfill out of the picture. Ms. Lewis noted that Rush Township says that it needs and deserves this interchange, but for what? How could residents even access it, let alone find it useful? Where could it lead in Rush Township? To connect this interchange to Route 504, the nearest existing Township road, it would require the construction of a road more than six miles long through state forest and across rugged terrain. Still keeping the landfill out of the picture, it might be the village of Moshannon, with a population of 528, which can benefit from this interchange midway between Snow Shoe and Kylertown. The newly adopted Rush Township Comprehensive Plan that was so quickly drafted by Rittew Associates and recently adopted by two of Rush Township's Supervisors, states that this interchange will connect to Gorton Road and provide access to Moshannon, which is 5.7 miles to the north.

Mr. Ken Shope, Snow Shoe Township, said that the sole purpose of constructing an I-80 interchange is to enhance the chances of getting a landfill permit approval and greatly increase the volume of trash trucks. Resource Recovery stated they would build an I-80 interchange, trucks in/trucks out with no local roads used, or the project would not go forward. Because they cannot build a private closed-loop interchange, it will have to connect to a public road. Mr. Shope said that it would not be a Rush Township public road, but Gorton Road in Snow Shoe Township. The connection will open the local roads to truck use because you will not be able to stop the trucks from sneaking in the back door through the local roads. We have no local police force and the citizens will have to police the truck traffic and once the drivers know there is a back door to the landfill via Gorton Road, they will use it for shortcuts when I-80 shuts down or it is congested or to avoid safety checks. The trucks avoiding the safety checks will be the ones that are overloaded, leaking and hauling illegal contents, so the worst of the violators will be the ones using local roads. Mr. Shope said that the interchange should not be added to the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP).

Ms. Teresa Burbridge, Snow Shoe Township, said that the Snow Shoe Township Supervisors countered the wishes of their citizens by signing a cooperation agreement with Resource Recovery. The Supervisors caved to this unscrupulous developer's threats and scare tactics. Snow Shoe residents and property owners have not signed this agreement and have no intention of cooperating with Resource Recovery. Residents of Snow Shoe Township and Borough signed

petitions against the interchange over the last three weeks. She said that they tried to limit signers to only those who live on the access route, but others insisted on signing to express their opposition. Out of 154 signatures, only 22 did not live along a proposed local route. Only two households between Exit 147 and Moshannon did not sign because of Resource Recovery's threats. Others simply were not home. Ms. Burbridge stated that 194 signatures collected on a separate petition do not live along the proposed access route. She said that the people are willing to take their chances with local roads and the petition shows that no one should claim support of the interchange to protect the people of Snow Shoe. The people will lose either way with the landfill, interchange or not. They will suffer from increased traffic from the interchange when I-80 is closed or backed up. For health and safety, the people are sold either way. Last September's presentation by Mr. Rittew indicated that Gorton Road would have to be widened and straightened to accommodate the interchange. Ms. Burbridge said that she, for one, could potentially lose her front yard and property value.

Ms. Krista Kahler, Rush Township, said that many Rush Township citizens oppose the interchange and dump, despite what Mr. Shannon may tell the MPO. Likewise, many Philipsburg and South Philipsburg residents, who Mr. Shannon supposedly represents here, oppose this project as well. Over 500 Moshannon Valley residents have signed petitions against this landfill, but their Supervisors do not listen. Rush Township Supervisors never bothered to find out what residents thought before they signed the host agreement. When citizens took it upon themselves to express opposition at meetings and through letters, the Supervisors did not listen. In October 2005, residents pleaded with Supervisors not to amend the host agreement to allow the use of local roads. The Supervisors did not listen. After 20 years of inaction on a Comprehensive Plan, Rush Supervisors quickly pushed through the old plan with a few updates, which were written by a firm involved with Resource Recovery. At the lone public hearing, Supervisors would not even answer questions. Citizens begged for more time to review the plan and provide input, but the Supervisors would not listen. Last November, the true will of Rush residents was finally heard. They voted out a status quo Supervisor and voted in someone who actually listens. Make no mistake, citizens will eventually be heard by all elected officials, they only hope it will not be too late to stop this horrible project.

Ms. Elizabeth Wood, Cooper Township, said that there are people in her township who live less than 1.5 miles from the proposed landfill site and their voices have not yet been heard. She said she is just one Clearfield County resident, but she brings 256 signatures from other Clearfield County residents opposing the I-80 interchange/landfill project. These numbers do not even scratch the surface of those opposing the project. Ms. Wood asked members to consider the detrimental consequences that will result and understand that this is not just a Centre County issue, but a Central Pennsylvania issue. The negative implications will affect every person in Central Pennsylvania, stretching far beyond the borders of Centre County. She said that Centre County has the obligation and responsibility to consider its neighbors when it comes to this issue. She asked that members listen to all the people who will be affected and what they are saying. They do not want the interchange and they do not want the landfill.

Mr. Ken Hall, Snow Shoe Township, said that Dan Hawbaker has said that there will be 600-800 jobs here, but he is full of smoke. There is no question that there will be jobs from the landfill. That is not what is before the Committee. Dan Hawbaker is giving that information so that there is another reason to put an interchange here - the reason being an industrial site. Mr. Hall said that this is the poorest excuse for an industrial site ever seen. This site has no public sewer or water and doesn't even have electricity. The majority of the ground is severely deep mined. Several areas are unsuitable for industrial development. Because there is an interchange, there is going to be industrial development. Mr. Hall said that the closest thing to industrial development Snow Shoe has gotten in 40 years is the Fed Ex building. This interchange is only a half of an interchange. People would have to drive 7 miles to Kylertown, get off and back on I-80, then drive 14 miles west. The employment derived from the people of

Rush Township will have to get on I-80, drive 14 miles to Snow Shoe, then get off and back on to drive back 7 miles to the interchange. He said it was a hell of a site.

Ms. Jean Shufan, Rush Township, said that the most important thing affecting property values is location. Centre County has many beautiful locations and has been blessed with a housing market that shows steady increases in value year after year. It is harder and harder for young families to find affordable homes. As a result, areas that require a longer commute, such as the Mountaintop Bald Eagle area and the Philipsburg area are seeing stronger markets than in the past. The average sale prices in those areas are \$128,000 and \$78,000 respectively and offer a much-needed affordable option. The reality of what the landfill will bring to Centre County is anything but property value enhancing. Buyers want safety first for their families, so trucking is going to lower property values. The stench associated with landfills is going to push them down even more. Throw in the hordes of insects and rodents feeding on garbage and watch those values soar! When informed buyers find DEP's study on landfills and find that 97 percent of them are oozing radioactive leachate, word spreads and values plummet. When toxic landfill leachate contaminates the ground water and streams, most property owners will wind up in foreclosure. Centre County will end up a modern-day glowing ghost town and a massive cleanup bill. Gone will be today's elected officials and gone will be the limited liability corporation named Resource Recovery.

Ms. Pam Steckler, Ferguson Township, said that she was here as a conservationist. The Pennsylvania Constitution, in Article I, Section 27 guarantees citizens the right to clean air and water and preservation of a clean environment for all the people of Pennsylvania, including generations to come. Ms. Williams felt that this project is inconsistent with our Constitution. This is not just a local issue, but involves the entire state. The parcel is in the midst of an outdoor recreational area, bordering Moshannon State Park. A landfill industrial park is definitely inconsistent with maintaining clean air and water in this area. Black Moshannon Creek is designated as a high-quality cold water fish stream. It is known to support native brook trout and should be protected and preserved. Habitat fragmentation caused by this project will negatively affect migratory bird populations. Additionally, the project will permanently affect nearly 11 acres of wetlands, making this project nearly four times as damaging to wetlands. The global warming and pollution caused by the possibility of 900 truck trips needs to be included in this equation. Centre County is already in non-compliance with the Clean Air Act. Ms. Williams said that this project will severely impact our right to clean air, water and environmental resources. As Pennsylvanians, we deserve a no vote for the interchange and landfill.

Ms. Maryann Williams, Rush Township, asked why any economy would allow destruction of its precious natural assets. In addition to the natural beauty of wildlife, such as the bald eagle along the west branch of the Susquehanna, the majestic elk and even the mountain lion, we also claim established recreation on our rivers, overnight hiking on our trails and the multi-use rail trail, which is the envy of any community. A 1997 Study shows that Pennsylvanians spend \$40 billion in outdoor recreation. These tourism dollars will grow with the new Pennsylvania Wild Initiatives. The neighboring counties work to attract, not detract, tourism. For example, a one-hundred foot statue of a white tailed deer will soon be displayed near the Pennsfield exit on I-80. Hopefully Centre County's symbol will not be a landfill along I-80. Nature is our drawing card and our goal is long-range tourism planning.

Mr. Mike Savage, Rush Township, said that the purpose of the MPO is not just to carry out funding allocations for FHWA, but rather to apply sound planning consideration to transportation planning. He said that in this case, the interchange does not meet a transportation need. Without the landfill, it will simply be an interchange to nowhere. Mr. Savage said if the interchange is placed higher on the LRTP planning list; it will push projects that benefit regional interests lower on the list. No matter what is claimed, the project will

probably use taxpayer dollars. Two state Representatives have already noted that state funds are being sought for the project and the Governor's Office has said that it could be eligible for the TOT Program. Both the MPO and PennDOT are listed as potential funding sources in the Rush Township Comprehensive Plan. If the MPO puts the interchange in a priority position, it will be seen by others as a priority for the Centre Region rather than what it really is: a private interchange to serve a for-profit business. Mr. Savage requested that Mr. Yecina and Mr. Shannon recuse themselves from voting because of an obvious conflict of interest.

Mr. Klees noted that there were several more people who would like to speak. He asked the MPO whether they wanted to continue hearing testimony.

*Mr. Neff made a motion to move on with the meeting without additional citizen comment. Mr. Corman seconded.*

Mr. Exarchos said that he had a large stack of correspondence in his office, in addition to that which was included with the agenda. He assured citizens that he has read all the comments. Citizen comments are being read and he did not want anyone to feel that, even if their voices are not heard tonight, their concerns have not been heard.

Several residents voiced the opinion that they had a right to comment tonight. Mr. Klees said that they have taken numerous public comments and have received much written correspondence and petitions. What he heard here tonight covered a broad range of concerns and it may or may not directly affect how the MPO votes on the issue. He felt that the MPO has a right to determine how long that comment period goes on. The MPO has other items on their agenda tonight that need attention as well as this item.

*A role call vote was taken on the motion to end public comment at this time. The motion carried with a vote of 8 for and 7 against.*

Mr. Lachman approached the podium and began speaking, despite Mr. Klees telling him that the vote was taken and comments would not be recognized. Several citizens asked Mr. Lachman to sit down.

Mr. Pytel stated that he has not seen any new information to change the original MPO vote, which found the interchange to be inconsistent with the LRTP. Second, if this request is granted, it will take road planning out of the hands of the MPO and put it in the hands of people with money.

Mr. Elnitsky said that he could not support the full motion made by Mr. Shannon. He thought that a project like this should be on a separate list. The MPO can look at fully funded projects from a transportation standpoint, including air quality and how it affects other roads. He did not think it was appropriate to put the project on the TIP.

Mr. Shannon said that he understood that for the project to happen at all, it must be on the TIP. Mr. Zilla said that in order for the project to be considered by FHWA, it has to be on the LRTP. In order to receive environmental clearance, it must be on the TIP. Mr. Shannon said that was the purpose for the motion as stated. Mr. Elnitsky said that even if it had to be on the TIP, it should not have to be ranked since it was fully funded.

Mr. Smoker said that for conceptual approval, the POA process requires that a project be consistent with local and regional transportation and land use plans. Mr. Klees asked for clarification about the issue of this site connecting to another road. He asked if Gorton Road met the qualifications for a public road. Mr. Smoker said that a new interchange must be

connected to a public road, for public use. The condition of the road would be discussed and analyzed during the POA study process. Mr. Klees said that if the road was inferior, the developer would have to make improvements. Mr. Smoker said he was not sure if that would be addressed through the POA or the rest of the development process for the interchange.

Mr. Klees asked Mr. Jacobs if the fact that Rush Township adopted their Comprehensive Plan affected the previous comments from the County Planning Office. Mr. Jacobs said that with Rush Township adopting a Comprehensive Plan, the issue of consistency has not changed since the original determination last year. Mr. Klees asked if the County had any legislative oversight over Rush Township's adoption of the Comprehensive Plan or the land uses determined within that plan. Mr. Jacobs said that as part of the approval process, Rush Township is required to submit a Comprehensive Plan to Centre County, adjacent municipalities and the school district for review. Centre County completed their review last month, recommending that if there were no changes made to the document, that it would be inconsistent. Since it was adopted, Centre County's position is that it is inconsistent.

Ms. Goreham said that the motion was very broad. She said that she had great concerns about moving the project up to the 2007-2010 TIP right away because that would put it above all the other projects that have not even been discussed yet. Ms. Goreham said that if this motion passed, she asked if that would preempt all the choices for the other projects. Mr. Zilla said that with the stipulation that the interchange project is 100% privately funded, it would not affect other projects on the TIP. Mr. Goreham asked how it would be guaranteed that it will be 100% privately funded because there is pursuit of redevelopment assistance and transportation assistance.

Mr. Klees asked if there have been past projects that were completely funded privately. Mr. Zilla said that he could not remember any such projects. There have been other projects that were private/public partnerships.

Mr. Exarchos said that the process used by the MPO is not designed for this type of project. He thought it was very dangerous to put the project on the LRTP list because after it is listed there, it opens the door for other funding sources and that made him nervous. Mr. Exarchos said that he understood that FHWA did not necessarily need for the project to be on the LRTP and they are more concerned with the consistency. He said that there is not a lot that the MPO can do about the consistency. The Comprehensive Plan for the County never anticipated this kind of land use. He thought that the developer and FHWA should work it out.

Mr. Lee said he was inclined to vote against the motion and thought that the issue should be looked at if and when it is permitted by DEP. Mr. Royer agreed, saying that voting now may be premature.

Mr. Dershem said he was not in favor of the current motion. One motion that he would favor would be that the Centre County Metropolitan Planning Committee not incorporate the I-80 interchange on the 2007-2010 Transportation Improvement Program. This is consistent with the MPO's vote in 2005 when there was a determination of inconsistency with the Long Range Transportation Plan. In addition, staff be instructed to develop a process to review privately funded projects. Further, the MPO shall recommend that PennDOT forwards the Point of Access study to the Federal Highways Administration, with the current findings of Centre County and the MPO.

Mr. Elnitsky asked how the POA is funded. Mr. Smoker said he did not know for sure on this particular study. Mr. Elnitsky asked if there was a way for the public to be involved while FHWA was doing the study. Mr. Smoker said that the POA is not a final approval. There are multiple steps beyond this. The POA determines the engineering and operational characteristics of the

proposed interchange and if it can function and operate as intended. If FHWA conceptually approves the POA, it then moves into a lengthy environmental process. This would provide numerous opportunities for public comment and review.

Mr. Boyer did not feel that the MPO should make a judgment about whether a landfill industrial complex is put there. However, if it is built, the MPO would be remiss in not looking at the impacts to transportation and safety if there were no interchange. It is a different sort of project in that it was privately funded. Mr. Boyer also felt that it would be premature to vote on the interchange now, but that it should be kept in mind if the landfill is actually going to be built.

Mr. Klees said that he was very uncomfortable with the level of detail in Mr. Shannon's motion.

Mr. Pytel said that at the last meeting, the MPO voted down PennDOT using 150 trucks a day for 200 days to haul the acid rock. It would be hard to convince him that 600-1000 trucks a day could use the local roads.

Mr. Elnitsky said that the POA could come back saying that it was not feasible to put an interchange there. He said that if Mr. Shannon would be willing to remove his motion, he would be willing to make a motion to send the POA to FHWA for feedback.

Mr. Shannon said that FHWA was looking for an indication of consistency. When the motion was developed, it was crafted to fit what was thought to be necessary. If those details can be worked out, he did not have a problem with that. However, he did have a problem with the MPO not taking action because there was not a permit or approval. He said that those were part of the steps that are taken. Without the POA, nothing moves forward. This step would start the investigation moving.

Mr. Savage said that Mr. Shannon was one of the people who spoke earlier in favor of the proposal and he is speaking now from the table, and yet the people who have other views are not permitted to rebut. Mr. Klees said that Mr. Shannon and Mr. Yecina are members of the MPO and they have signed agreements that they have to support the interchange. That is not a secret. Mr. Klees said that every one is capable of judging those comments.

Mr. Shannon said that he would withdraw his motion so that discussion can ensue concerning a simpler motion to send the POA to PennDOT and FHWA.

*Mr. Lee made a motion to defer the request until if and when DEP permits the landfill. Ms. Goreham seconded the motion.*

Mr. Exarchos said that the risk of this motion is that if this landfill gets approved, it will use local access. He preferred to have the POA sent to FHWA and it can be figured out between them and the developer.

Ms. Goreham thought that otherwise, the MPO is running the risk of facilitating the project. The landfill should apply for the permit on its own and if it is approved, the MPO will consider the interchange.

Mr. Exarchos said that part of the process is that the developer must show access to the project. If there is no interchange, the developer will have to show access with the local roads. By the time it comes back here, it may be too late to reverse that.

Mr. Pytel said that before PennDOT allows traffic on the local roads, it would probably come through the MPO. This is what happened in Centre Hall.

Mr. Elnitsky asked if it was true that DEP would not even look at the application without the POA. Mr. Shannon said that DEP only requires access.

Ms. Goreham asked if there would be a time when it would be too late to consider the interchange. Mr. Smoker said that was a land development process issue, not an FHWA issue.

*The motion before the MPO was to defer the request until DEP permits the landfill. A roll call vote was taken and the motion passed with a vote of 8 in favor and 7 against.*

There was some discussion concerning how the next agenda items would be discussed and voted upon. It was decided to discuss each item separately.

*Mr. Exarchos made a motion to direct staff to look at the issue of how the MPO deals with privately funded transportation projects and recommend a process for that. Mr. Elnitsky seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.*