Members Present: Robert Corman, Chairman; Dave Breon, Vice-Chairman; Tom Hoover, Cecil Irvin, Freddie Persic and Jack Shannon

Members Absent: Kevin Abbey and Tom Poorman

Staff Present: Bob Jacobs; Chris Price; Anson Burwell; Chris Schnure; Mike Bloom; and Mary Wheeler

Others Present: Jaime S. Bumbarger, Progress; Lara Brenckle, CDT; Brooks Harris, ELA Group, Inc.; Bob Crum, Director of CRPA; Tom Zilla, CRPA, and various citizen visitors (attendance record attached)

1. **Call to Order – Pledge of Allegiance**

Chairman Corman called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

2. **Citizen Comment Period**

none

3. **Approval of Minutes**

A motion was made by Ms. Persic to approve the minutes of July 19, 2005, seconded by Mr. Shannon. Motion carried.

4. **Planning Commission Member Updates**

none

5. **Old Business**

none

6. **New Business**

Mr. Jacobs provided an overview of the review done by the Centre County Planning Office that was required by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) as part of the Point of Access Study (POA) submitted by Resource Recovery and Rush Township to PennDOT. He noted that the review was prepared based on federal guidelines and consistent with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (MPC). The review process includes a report and recommendation from the Planning Office, a recommendation from the Planning Commission to the Commissioners, and action by the Commissioners. In addition, as per FHWA requirements, a separate review is being prepared by the Centre County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) staff for consideration by the MPO Technical and Coordinating Committees regarding consistency with the County’s Long Range Transportation Plan.

Mr. Jacobs noted that, in looking at this proposal, local planning had to be reviewed as to how it relates to the County Comprehensive Plan. Rush Township does not currently have a Comprehensive Plan or land use controls in place. Snow Shoe Township does have a comprehensive plan and local zoning to assist in staff’s review of the regional planning impacts. In reviewing both the County’s Comprehensive Plan and the local land use controls in place within the affected region, the Planning Office recommends a finding of inconsistency with local and County plans. However, staff’s recommendations include a series of actions that could be taken to identify and mitigate impacts on a regional basis through land use planning. Mr. Jacobs stated that Rush Township is in the process of developing a Comprehensive Plan. The Planning Office has encouraged them to work with the Planning Office and Snow Shoe Township in the development of this plan.

Mr. Price pointed out that the question that has been asked of the Centre County Planning Commission is very simply “Is the land use proposal, or is it not, consistent with local and County plans”. It is not “Are you opposed to the project, or are you in favor of the project?” One could be in favor of the project and find it inconsistent or you could be opposed to the project and find it consistent with the plan. So it is important that you keep those two issues separate and recognize that the only issue before the Planning Commission tonight is “Is it or is it not consistent with the local and County Plans as has been outlined in the report.”

Chairman Corman gave the audience guidelines for their remarks to the Commission.

Mr. Herb Flosdorf, representative of Resource Recovery, disagreed with the Planning Office recommendation and noted that Mr. Jacobs did not mention the Solid Waste section of the Plan or the County Solid Waste Authority’s study that identifies this area as an appropriate site for a landfill if there was an interstate interchange. In addition, there is no evidence of negative impacts to seasonal housing and tourism. Resource Recovery has been actively involved in preparing site assessment tests on this property to ensure consistency with all permitting guidelines. Based on the studies done to date, the proposed project meets all applicable environmental standards (water quality, endangered species, hydrology, air resources, soils, geology, etc.) Although not the desired alternative, if the interchange is found inconsistent with the plan, then Resource Recovery may be forced to pursue the use of local roads.

Mr. Tom Hoover, Centre County Planning Commission member, asked when the Centre County Solid Waste Authority study was prepared. Mr. Flosdorf noted that he does not know because he only has a few pages, but he has been trying to get a copy of it. Mr. Ted Onufnak, Executive Director of the Centre County Solid Waste Authority responded that it was prepared in 1991. Mr. Hoover questioned who the study was prepared for and Mr. Onufnak responded Centre County. Mr. Flosdorf commented that it was looking for the best sites in Centre County.
Mr. Hoover asked about the number of trucks proposed to serve the site and mentioned that there were a lot of rumors going around. Mr. Flosdorf responded that it depends if you are talking about just the landfill, or the landfill and the industrial park. Regarding the landfill, 4,000 tons of trash per day is the target. At 20 tons per truck, that would be 200 trucks delivering to that site.

Mr. Hoover questioned if Resource Recovery would have any control over the trucks (e.g. odors associated with back hauls). Mr. Flosdorf responded that Resource Recovery can dictate to customers as to what kind of equipment they use, we can wash them on the way out, and there is a lot of control that we can have over the trucks, particularly if they have to use an interchange to get to our property. If they come through a bunch of back roads, we have no way of knowing which way they get here, but if there is an interchange we do know if they came off of the interstate or not. That is why the interchange is important to control that traffic to the interstate system and keep it away from and homes.

Mr. Hoover asked about the impact on Snow Shoe Borough if there is a breakdown on the interstate and the trucks come through town. Mr. Flosdorf responded that there won’t be additional trucks. Pennsylvania is going to need more landfills in the future that will be located in the northern and western parts of the state, most likely built on brown-field sites and in mines. So to say that our site generates more traffic on that highway, I am not sure if that is accurate, because if our site isn’t there they may be just going past. Our site provides a place for them to get off the highway. We are not putting them on. All of our traffic studies have to be prepared as though our facility generates these trucks. But the truth is that it really doesn’t, and they will be traveling that way.

Mr. Flosdorf asked about the number of trucks Centre County sends to Somerset everyday. Mr. Onufrak responded about 25 trucks per day. Mr. Flosdorf noted that 25 trucks go from Centre County all the way to Somerset everyday. So instead of going that distance, they would be able to come to our site, if the County wanted them to. So yes there will be a change of traffic, but whether or not those trucks on 80 or accidents on 80 isn’t because of our site, those trucks are there anyway, and the trash trucks on that highway are way less that 1% of the total traffic.

Mr. Hoover asked about the level of recycling anticipated from Resource Recovery’s customers. Mr. Flosdorf responded that virtually every state has very strong recycling laws particularly in the northeast: Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Delaware. Mr. Hoover responded that he understood that New York didn’t. Mr. Flosdorf noted New York City is in a big mess. We don’t know where the garbage will be coming from at this point, but hopefully it is Pennsylvania waste. Mr. Hoover responded that he doubts it very much.

Mr. Hoover asked if Mr. Flosdorf believes that it lowers property values to have a garbage dump in the area. Mr. Flosdorf responded that he had seen no evidence anywhere in the United States, but stated that what does temporarily lower property values are fears generated by discussions. Looking at other landfills in Pennsylvania, since the landfills have been built, the housing has gotten closer to the landfill and new houses are being built closer and closer every day, not further away, so there is absolutely no evidence that, other than the short term, someone selling out of fear, because of what they hear that may be not true but not because of the reality once the landfill is in.

Mr. Hoover stated that he believes that once the high speed interchange is in, more people will come to the Mountaintop to build and so forth. I believe that if there is a garbage dump up there that people are going to go down the valley towards Penns Valley or anywhere else. Mr. Flosdorf recommended that Mr. Hoover visits other landfills near here. Mr. Hoover asked about odor control measures taken at the Lock Haven landfill. Mr. Flosdorf did not have a response. Mr. Hoover stated that he heard they use a
mist spray. Mr. Flosdorf responded that most landfills use that on certain days (e.g. foggy days) as an odor control device. Resource Recovery is proposing to have that in place just in case.

Mr. Jacobs offered some points of clarification. He noted that the Planning Office is required to look at both local and County planning efforts, not just the County’s plans. In addition, Mr. Flosdorf referenced the 1979 Comprehensive Plan, however the 2003 County Comprehensive Plan supercedes that document. Page 7 of the review also provides some items in our County Plan that are consistent with their proposal. We did try to take a fair and objective review, so I just wanted to make those clarifications to the group.

Mr. George Rettew, Rettew Associates, noted that his firm has been hired by Resource Recovery to do the POA Study and has been retained by Rush Township to prepare a Comprehensive Plan. One of the things that we are asking you to consider is the desires of the local municipal plans and to recognize that Rush is going to have this economic development activity as a goal in their plan. With regards to the POA process, there are two alternatives for access to this site; the POA process and a Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP) if we would choose to have access off of the local road network. The HOP process is a lot simpler. We are at the beginning of the POA process and it is much more involved process with much more opportunity for input. The purpose of the process is to get FHWA to give a conceptual approval to the design standards for putting in an interchange. With regard to land use consistency, we found that the County’s plan was very absent in speaking to the Rush Township area. There is very little in the land use plan as well as the County’s Comprehensive Transportation Plan that speaks to a privately funded interchange and the economic development plan for Rush. The fact that Resource Recovery owns 5,000 acres in Snow Shoe Township that is a buffer from the activities proposed in Rush Township should be considered. From an economic development perspective, there has been a 7% decline from the 80’s to 2000 so there really has not been economic activity or growth in the region. This is an opportunity to provide the engine to be a catalyst for some economic development. There has been extensive work done with the Headwaters Trust in terms of commitments to what would happen with the trail system if the rail were brought in to minimize transportation impacts and again a logical thing for industry to have rail access there to provide an extensive much more extensive rail trail network than is there now.

Chairman Corman asked if there were any questions for Mr. Rettew. Mr. Hoover asked if any traffic studies have been done for the local roads. Mr. Rettew noted that they extensive traffic study on that local road network surrounding this area. Mr. Hoover asked if the findings were public. Mr. Rettew noted that the findings show that there would be no negative impact on levels of service on Route 80 where the existing interchange is on 80, with the addition of a new interchange. The study also looks at the impacts on the local road network should we be forced to use local roads. Our study concluded that the capacity on the roads is there, although some improvements would be required. The study points out that in terms of community and environmental impacts, the interchange has a lot less impact which is why the interchange is the preferred alternative. But we need to get the POA study before the FHWA so that they can come to that conclusion too, otherwise we may be forced to just use the local road network.

Mr. Hoover questioned the jobs estimates provided by the applicant that range from 35 to 750. Mr. Flosdorf responded that 35 people is the initial employment at the landfill and 750 is the projected employment with full build-out of the industrial park. Mr. Flosdorf noted that the jobs would everything from bookkeepers, scale masters, construction workers, foreman, truck drivers, equipment operators, etc. After construction, there would probably be 60 – 65 fulltime people working for the landfill.
Mr. Rettew noted that the infrastructure developed for the landfill makes the industrial development possible. It’s a fully integrated opportunity and there is plenty of area to make that happen.

Mr. Dave Breon, Vice-Chair of the CCPC, asked how soon the Rush Township Comprehensive Plan was going to be done. Mr. Rettew responded that they are aiming for the end of the year. Mr. Breon noted that municipalities are required to share plans with adjacent municipalities. Mr. Rettew stated that adjacent municipalities and the County will have an opportunity for review as will the public.

Mr. Cecil Irvin, CCPC member, asked about the potential for construction of an incinerator. Mr. Flosdorf responded that the current proposal is just for a landfill and using gas from the landfill to make electricity.

Mr. Price asked to clarify a point made by Mr. Rettew regarding the recognition of local municipal Comprehensive Plans and the buffering of one land use against another, particularly when you are looking at adjacent municipalities. The MPC gives us guidance in making a land use recommendation when two municipalities are involved. We appreciate Rush Township’s proposal to prepare a Comprehensive Plan because it is the first step towards trying to identify and potentially mitigate some of the impacts associated with any large scale land development project that could impact another municipality. But our responsibility at the County level is then to look at both plans and try to smooth out some of the differences when there are conflicts. It is not Snow Shoe Township obligation to buffer themselves from a land use in a neighboring municipality. And that is true across the board in all municipalities. As an example, we are working with Benner College Townships on a joint planning study because the area along Shiloh Road has inconsistent planned land uses around that interchange. There is large scale commercial zoning in Benner Township and agricultural land use designations in College Township. We have planning commission members and supervisors from both municipalities working together to try to resolve the incompatibilities.

Mr. Flosdorf agreed with Mr. Price, but noted that it is also important to recognize that the adjacent land is privately owned by this same user and pledged to the use that Snow Shoe wants to see it as. There is really no conflict between what that forest and open space zoning is in Snow Shoe and what is being proposed in Rush. It is a perfect buffer, there is nobody there.

Ms. Michele Barbin, Snow Shoe Borough Resident, stated that any intensive or industrial land use in that area is unacceptable. It will totally decimate the character of the area that makes it attractive for outdoor recreation. The seasonal and rural properties are diametrically opposed to any kind of industrial development, and they shouldn’t be neighbored. Odors and truck traffic are not desired in this rural area. Ms. Barbin disputed the notion that the trail facility does not provide connectivity to other areas and questioned the validity of the traffic and employment statistics provided by Resource Recovery.

Mr. Shannon, CCPC member, asked Ms. Barbin about the number of residents within 3 miles of the site. Ms. Barbin responded that residences and seasonal properties are apples and oranges that must both be recognized and valued. Mr. Shannon again questioned Ms. Barbin about the number of residences there. Ms. Barbin responded that there are about 300 residents of Moshannon, approximately 4 miles from the property line, that should not have an unwanted project forced on them. Ms. Barbin noted that she would research the numbers.

Ms. Mary Vollero stated that she has some crash statistics from PennDOT’s – Traffic Accident History. In 2001 and 2003 on Route 80 -100 miles from the Snow Shoe exit there were 1,248 accidents in those two years. Ms. Vollero noted that she visited the Tulleytown Landfill and wasn’t impressed.
Mr. Hoover asked Ms. Vollero about the traffic increases on Interstate 80 over the past few years. Ms. Vollero responded that it is not part of the study. An audience member quoted the Centre Daily Times as reporting a 44% truck traffic increase.

Ms. Linda Padisak, People Protecting Communities, stated that many of the Mountaintop Region’s residents have thanked her for trying to protect the community. Landfills are awful. The smells and the fumes will impact the residents, tourists, and motorists on Interstate 80.

Ms. Judith Johnsrud, State College resident, stated that her Doctorial work specializes in the Geography of Nuclear Energy. She has served on Pennsylvania’s Advisory Committee on Low Level Radioactive Waste Disposal and the Sierra Club’s National Committee on Radiation in the Environment. Recent findings note that there is no safe dose of radiation for human beings. Now, why do I bring up this subject which it seems to have nothing to do with a landfill on the mountain. We are facing a proposal which in reality I suggest to you will include radioactive materials, and why do I say this, principally because since the late 1970’s, the Federal Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has been attempting to deregulate substantial amounts of the radioactive waste that generated by commercial activities as well as of course power plants. These are the so called low level wastes and the intent of the NRC as well as environmental protection agency is to permit such materials to be disposed of in ordinary municipal solid waste landfills. We need to think in the longer terms of impact of a landfill. After it has been closed some day, the likelihood for leakage for movement in underground water is almost a guarantee for the kinds of landfill that we permit as solid waste disposal.

Mr. Ken Hall, Moshannon resident, recognized the Planning Commission’s responsibility to vote on whether this use is consistent and noted that the staff has done an excellent job. Mr. Hall disputed some of Mr. Flosdorf’s remarks about the viability of local tourism and stated that Rush Township has given away its rights to land use controls in this area to Resource Recovery. Mr. Hall questioned the responsibility of using Resource Recovery’s consultant to prepare Rush Township’s Comprehensive Plan and expressed his desire to maintain and enhance the existing character of the region.

Mr. Harry Pionke, State College resident, spoke about the positive economic benefits of seasonal recreation and noted the reasons he purchased a seasonal recreation property (e.g. beauty of area, wilderness, etc.) He noted that the area is within a 30 minute drive of Sproul Game Lands 103 and the Black Moshannon State Forest; 100,000 acres that’s not going to be developed. The area offers a seasonal tourism package to build around that would be hurt by this proposal. Mr. Pionke disputed Mr. Flosdorf’s interpretation of Mr. Jacobs’ recommendation and noted that the Planning Office finds the proposal inconsistent and does not support the interchange but recommends that if the project moves forward, the interchange is the only acceptable access.

Mr. George Test, Rush Township Solicitor, stated that report is slanted and biased against the Township’s position. He suggested that everything favorable was left out and everything detrimental was put in. Mr. Test questioned the viability of the water resources suggested for protection and noted the adverse physical conditions of the property as it exists today and disputed its characterization as forested. He stated that no garbage trucks would use Gorton Road under this proposal, that the Township had never discussed abandoning Peale Road, and that the Township received an unsolicited letter of support from a representative of the Rails to Trails group which he distributed. The letter states that the new trail agreement between Resource Recovery and Headwaters would provide a facility that is longer with more variety.
A member of the audience asked who wrote the letter and Mr. Test Responded that its author was Karen Brady. It was noted by the audience that she is no longer with Headwaters Charitable Trust.

Robin Gillette, Snow Shoe Township resident, disputed the characterization of the local streams and said that large mouth bass can be caught on that property

Nancy Albright, stated that she had lived next to a landfill and that there was odor that required spraying and that she does not want to trash this area. She noted that with so many landfills in Pennsylvania; we don’t need another one out there.

Calvin Quick, Moshannon resident, is a local and has made 80% of his business through the camp sites, recreational areas, etc. I would have probably moved away a long time ago if it wouldn’t have been for the area. Mr. Quick stated that pollutants to streams in this area will have long-term effects to residents here and downstream and suggested that odors from the landfill will be noticed as far away as Beaver Stadium.

Joanne Gillette, Snow Shoe Township resident, disputed claims of this site as suitable for a landfill and notes that the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) has not found this site suitable. With regards to the Solid Waste Authority Study, she stated that her understanding was that it was basically a cost analysis; whether it would be more feasible for our County to build its own landfill or export. That was done 14 years ago before the Rail Trail, before the Moshannon property, the seasonal properties, before the FedEx Depot that is being constructed in Snow Shoe, before I-99 and before our County became one of the Pennsylvania Wild Counties. Tourism is the second largest industry in Pennsylvania and is a real opportunity here. Ms Gillette asked Mr. Flosdorf if any companies have contracted to go into the future industrial park. Mr. Flosdorf responded no.

Mr. Hoover asked about Pennsylvania Wilds. Ms Gillette noted that it is project of the Governor to promote outdoor recreation and tourism.

Ed Walsh, State College resident, referenced an agreement between Resource Recovery and the Moshannon Creek Watershed Coalition and suggested that Resource Recovery has bought the support of the Moshannon Creek Watershed Coalition. Mr. Walsh stated that Resource Recovery initially told the public that if we don’t get an agreement from both townships, Snow Shoe and Rush, there will be no dump, there will be no landfill, there will be no incinerator and noted that this turned out to be false. Mr. Walsh stated that Resource Recovery also claimed that if we don’t get an I-80 Interchange, there will be no landfill and noted that this has proved false. Mr. Walsh stated that Mr. Flosdorf noted at the first meeting that the project was going to be a landfill and an incinerator. Mr. Walsh questioned the health effects of chemical by-products from incinerators. He also questioned the efforts of Resource Recovery to communicate with the public.

Allen Albright expressed concern for animals that may drink polluted water.

Mr. Jacobs stated that the Planning Commission has the Planning Office’s recommendation and can attach any other conditions or issues that should be passed on to the County Commissioners as part of this review process.

Jack Shannon, CCPC member, stated that the responsibility was to deal consistency requests for the POA on Interstate 80. There will be another venue for discussing pros and cons of our landfill. The point that we are to take here this evening is “is this consistent with the present plans of the county?” Mr. Shannon also reiterated that Rush Township was preparing a Comprehensive Plan to take the first
steps towards planning for this area and suggested that consideration should be given to that Plan. This development is part of an overall strategy for an economic recovery in some of our areas that could benefit greatly by an industrial development project was. It requires from us at this point a point of access study and access from Interstate 80, it will require no funding from the county funds for roads, townships, states, feds, etc. It will offer that development in that section of Rush Township and it is a project that is we feel very important to us and we are here this evening to discuss the point of access.

Mr. Jacobs expressed appreciation for Mr. Shannon’s comments and for the public and Resource Recovery representatives for attending so that the discussion can be objective with all sides heard. Mr. Jacobs noted that the County has expressed interest in land use planning with Rush Township for some time and stated that the Planning Office cautioned Rush Township about signing a host agreement until such time as all potential issues and impacts could be identified and mitigated. That not only comes from the Planning Office’s perspective, but the Commissioners expressed those concerns as did representatives from the County’s Solid Waste Authority. With regards to land use planning, this portion of Rush Township for all intents and purposes has been annexed to Snow Shoe since I-80 was built. There is no access to it. Rush Township obviously didn’t have any comprehensive plans or zoning, and as we looked at this issue it is tough to say that it is consistent with local and County planning, because really all the impacts are on Snow Shoe Township. Then you factor into that fact that part of your host agreement where Rush Township signed all of your rights away to any land use controls within that area, so really objectively looking at it, we had no choice but to say it was inconsistent in terms of our recommendation.

Freddie Persic, Planning Commission member, asked whether Resource Recovery will have the right to use Snow Shoe roads, according to the agreement, if the POA is denied. Mr. Jacobs stated that the agreement as it exists today doesn’t give them the right to do that.

Dave Breon, Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission, stated that he does not feel that this proposal is consistent with our Comprehensive Plan or the regional look of this area. Having recently gone through a Comprehensive Plan that was regional in nature, it is very important to work with your neighbors on the entire land use scenarios that you are talking about. My biggest concern is that by finding this inconsistent, and if the Federal Government would then say they are not going to consider an access road off the interstate, that we could very well open it up to use of Snow Shoe Township’s local roads.

Tom Hoover, CCPC member, reiterated that based on the host municipality agreement, Rush Township could not interfere with this landfill at all and noted that it is scary to think that Rush Township has no control at all. Mr. Hoover questioned the validity of the trash tonnage and truck volume estimates provided by Resource Recovery.

Tom Hoover, CCPC member, made a motion to accept the Planning Office’s recommendation. Mr. Breon seconded. Vote: 4 in favor – 1 opposed. Motion carried.

Centre County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Update – Mike Bloom

Mr. Bloom gave the Commission members an update of the CCMPO.

7. Review / Approval of Subdivision and Land Development Plans – Anson Burwell & Chris
Subdivisions:

1. Eagle Point Subdivision
   Preliminary Plan
   48-Lots (43 Single-family, 1 Multi-family, 2 Commercial, and 2 Open Space / SWM)
   Benner Township

A motion was made by Ms. Persic and seconded by Mr. Breon to Table the above action until the September 20, 2005 Planning Commission meeting. Motion carried.

Land Developments:

2. Philipsburg-Osceola Area School District, Senior High School Athletic Fields Land Development
   Final Plan
   3-Sports Fields, 1-Parking Lot and Associated Infrastructure
   Philipsburg Borough

A motion was made by Mr. Irvin and seconded by Ms. Persic to approve staff’s recommendation of Conditional Final approval of the above mentioned Plan. Motion carried.

3. Opequon Hill Land Development, Lot 83, Phase 1
   Final Plan
   18-Units (9 Residential Duplexes)
   Benner Township

   Brooks Harris, ELA Group and developer’s agent was present to answer questions.

A motion was made by Ms. Persic and seconded by Mr. Hoover to approve staff’s recommendation of Conditional Final approval of the above mentioned Plan. Motion carried.

Miscellaneous:

* Applicant’s Formal Withdrawal:

   Airport Park Subdivision, Phases 2, 3 & 4
   Preliminary Plan Proposal
   Benner Township

A motion was made by Mrs. Persic and seconded by Mr. Hoover to approve staff’s recommendation to remove the above mentioned Plan from the table and acknowledge the Applicant’s formal withdraw. Motion carried.

Mr. Shannon questioned what would happen if we did not accept their withdrawal.
Mr. Burwell stated what we would have to do if we wouldn’t accept the formal withdrawal of the plan, we would have to take action on it, either approve or disapprove it. Obviously, we are not recommending that you do that and you in turn acknowledge the formal withdrawal request.

Chairman Corman stated that he feels it speaks well for the Planning Office and the activity to bring to light the concern for protecting the State College Borough Water Authority’s well system. It obviously protected the Authority as a result of the subsequent Lot Addition and reploting action.

Mr. Burwell commented that the Commission deserves a pat on the back themselves.

Time Extension Requests:

- Marion-Walker Elementary School Land Development (CFA)  
  Walker Township .................................................................1st Request (No Fee)
- Penns Valley Emergency Medical Services, Inc. Land Development (CFA)  
  Gregg Township .................................................................1st Request (No Fee)
- Forest Heights Subdivision, Phase IV (CFA)  
  Walker Township .................................................................1st Request (No Fee)
- Brookshire Subdivision (CPA)  
  Walker Township .................................................................1st Request (No Fee)
- Stephen S. & Lydia Hostetler Subdivision, Lots 3R & 4 (CFA)  
  Haines Township .................................................................2nd Request (No Fee)
- D. Scott & Wendy D. Summey Self-Storage Facility Land Development (CPA)  
  Union Township .................................................................2nd Request (No Fee)
- J. Stephen & Sherry E. Dershimer Land Development, Phase 1 (CFA)  
  Worth Township .................................................................2nd Request (No Fee)
- Presbyterian Village at Windy Hill Land Development - - Revised (CPA)  
  Rush Township .................................................................2nd Request (No Fee)
- Presbyterian Village at Windy Hill Land Development, Phase 2A (CFA)  
  Rush Township .................................................................2nd Request (No Fee)
- Sports Management Group, Inc. Land Development, Phase IV  
  (aka Woodward Gymnastic/Skateboard/In-Line/Bike Camp) (CFA)  
  Haines Township .................................................................3rd Request (No Fee)
- Hogsgalore Land Development (CFA)  
  Rush Township .................................................................3rd Request (No Fee)
- Woodward Crossings Recreational Land Development, Phase 1 (CFA)  
  Haines Township .................................................................3rd Request (No Fee)
PNW Enterprises, Inc. Land Development (CFA)                      File No. 199-99
Worth Township ...................................................................... 4th Request ($50.00 Fee)

Mensch Estates Subdivision (CFA)                                File No. 161-02
Millheim Borough .................................................................. 5th Request ($100.00 Fee)

Hubler Ridge Subdivision (CFA)                                  File No. 13-04
Walker & Marion Townships................................................. 6th Request ($150.00 Fee)

Centre Hall - Potter Elementary School Land Development (CFA)   File No. 221-03
Centre Hall Borough............................................................ 8th Request ($250.00 Fee)

Benner Chiropractic Land Development (CFA)                      File No. 53-01
Benner Township..................................................................... 10th Request ($350.00 Fee)

Graymont (PA), Inc. Land Development Plan (Bald Eagle Mine Site) (CPA) File No. 235-91
Benner Township..................................................................... 8th Request ($750.00 Fee)

Fedex Freight Land Development Plan (CFA)                       File No. 302-99
Snow Shoe Township................................................................ 19th Request ($800.00 Fee)

Note: CPA = Conditional Preliminary Plan Approval
      CFA = Conditional Final Plan Approval

A motion was made by Mr. Hoover and seconded by Mr. Irvin to approve the above mentioned Time Extension Requests. Motion carried.

8. Director’s Report and Other Matters to come Before the Commission

With no further business to come before the Commission, a motion was made by Ms. Persic and seconded by Mr. Hoover to adjourn at 8:46 p.m. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert B. Jacobs
Recording Secretary