

**MINUTES OF THE 563rd MEETING OF THE OHIO TURNPIKE COMMISSION
August 16, 2010**

Chairman: (10:00 a.m.) Good morning, the meeting will come to order. Will the Assistant Secretary-Treasurer please call the roll?

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer: Chairman Balog

Mr. Balog: Here

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer: Mr. Regula

Mr. Regula: Here

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer: Mr. Dixon

Mr. Dixon: Here

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer: Bonnie Teeuwen

Ms. Teeuwen: Here

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer: Mr. DiNapoli

Paul DiNapoli: Here

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer: Mr. Jerse

Ed Jerse: Here

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer: Senator Patton

Senator Patton: Here

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer: Representative Hagan

Representative Hagan: Here

Chairman: Thank you. Commission Member Ed Kidston called to say he would not be able to attend today's meeting. We have a number of guests here today and in keeping with past practice I'd like everyone to introduce themselves:

Those in attendance: Martin Seekely, CFO/Comptroller, Ohio Turnpike; Eric Erickson, Fifth Third Securities; Debby Sideris, Executive Office, Ohio Turnpike; Jennifer Diaz, Legal Department, Ohio Turnpike; David Miller Director of Internal Audit, Ohio Turnpike; Kathy Weiss, Director of Contracts Administration, Ohio

Turnpike; Roger Hannay, Ohio State Highway Patrol; Pete Perticarini, URS; Don Glosser, Crawford Murphy & Tilly; Chris Hopkins, KeyBank; Chuck Peck, Morgan Stanley; Mark Schwartz, Sandusky County Engineer; Dan Polter, Sandusky County Commissioner; Jim Moyer, Sandusky County Engineer; Chris Matta, Assistant Maintenance Engineer, Ohio Turnpike; Todd Cooper, Hill International; Tom James, IUOE Local 18; Don Taggart, IUOE Local 18; Mark Miller, PNC Capitol Markets; Dennis Gocem, Wells Fargo; Don Lee, RBC Capitol Mortgage; Glen Stephens, G. Stephens; Vince Spinabelli, Hill International; Stefan Holmes, First Merit Bank; Lauren Hakos, Public Affairs, Ohio Turnpike; Daniel Van Epps, West Virginia University.

Chairman: Thank you. This is the 563rd Meeting of the Ohio Turnpike Commission. We are meeting here at the Commission's headquarters as provided for in the Commission's Code of Bylaws for a Regularly Scheduled Meeting. Various reports will be received. We will act on several resolutions, draft copies have previously been provided to the Members and updated drafts are in the Members' folders. The resolutions will be explained during the appropriate reports. May I have a motion to adopt the minutes of the July 19, 2010 Commission Meeting?

Mr. Regula: So moved.

Chairman: Is there a second?

Ms. Teeuwen: Second.

Chairman: Questions or additions, comments? Please call the roll.

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer: Chairman Balog

Mr. Balog: Yes

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer: Mr. Regula

Mr. Regula: Yes

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer: Mr. Dixon

Mr. Dixon: Yes

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer: Ms. Teeuwen

Ms. Teeuwen: Yes

Chairman: If there's no questions or comments, we will proceed with the report of the Secretary-Treasurer, Mr. Dixon.

Secretary-Treasurer: Thank you Mr. Chairman. The following items are in the Commission Members' folders or have been previously sent to the Members since the last schedule meeting of the Commission on July 19, 2010 and they are:

1. Minutes of the July 19, 2010 Commission Meeting
2. Traffic and Revenue Report, July, 2010
3. Total Revenue by Month and Year, July, 2010
4. Investment Report, July, 2010
5. Financial Statement, July, 2010

Thank you, Mr. President that concludes the report.

Chairman: Are there any questions or comments for Mr. Dixon? Thank you Mr. Dixon.

Secretary-Treasurer: Thank you sir.

Chairman: Next the report of the Executive Director, Mr. Distel.

Executive Director: Thank you Mr. Chairman, Commission Members. I just want to report very briefly that construction of service plaza one towards Indiana is on schedule and we hope to reopen it prior to Memorial Day of next year. We are anticipating opening RFPs for service plaza operators for SP1 later on this week. As you will see in reviewing our Agenda we are busily working to get the plans and specifications in place to hopefully start construction on SP8 against the Pennsylvania border next year. To date we have now issued over 80,000 transponders, we are currently working on a retail program that we'll bring to the Commission here shortly and that concludes my report Mr. Chairman. I will be happy to answer any questions.

Chairman: Questions or comments for the Executive Director? Thank you. On to Resolutions, Chief Engineer, Dan.

Chief Engineer: Thank you Mr. Chairman and Commission Members. I have three resolutions for your consideration this morning. The first resolution is awarding Contract 59-10-04 for resurfacing of Interchanges 142 and 151, both located in Lorain County. The funding for these projects was on our 2010 approved budget. We received five bids in response to the contract invitation. The apparent lowest responsible and responsive bid was submitted by Erie Blacktop, Incorporated, of Sandusky, Ohio, in the total amount of \$1,316,234.50. The total amount bid is below the Engineer's estimate. Furthermore this contractor has performed satisfactorily in the past for the Commission. The resolution also includes a provision to assign DLZ, Incorporated of Cleveland, Ohio, for the purpose of performing construction inspection, and CTL

Engineering, Incorporated, of Cleveland, Ohio for the purpose of performing materials testing. If the General Counsel will please read the Resolved?

General Counsel: RESOLVED that the bid of **Erie Blacktop, Inc.** of **Sandusky, Ohio**, in the amount of **\$1,316,234.50** for the performance of **Contract No. 59-10-04** is, and is by the Commission, determined to be the lowest responsive and responsible bid received for the performance of said Contract, and is accepted, and that the Chairperson and Executive Director, or either of them, hereby is authorized to: 1) execute a Contract with said successful bidder in the form heretofore prescribed by the Commission pursuant to the aforesaid bid, 2) direct the return to the bidders of their bid security, when appropriate, and 3) take any and all action necessary or proper to carry out the terms of said bid and of said Contract; and

FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission hereby authorizes the Executive Director and the Chief Engineer to assign to Contract No. 59-10-04, **DLZ, Inc.** of **Cleveland, Ohio** for the purpose of performing construction inspection, and **CTL Engineering, Inc.** of **Cleveland, Ohio** for the purpose of performing material testing and inspection, with such assignments in accordance with the 2009-2010 General Engineering Services Agreements between the Ohio Turnpike Commission and said engineering firms; and

FURTHER RESOLVED that Contract No. 59-10-04 is designated a System Project under the Commission's 1994 Master Trust Agreement.

Chairman: Is there a motion to adopt the resolution before the Commission?

Ms. Teeuwen: So moved.

Chairman: Is there a second?

Mr. Regula: Second.

Chairman: Questions or discussion?

Ms. Teeuwen: Just one question, President.

Chairman: Yes, Bonnie:

Ms. Teeuwen: What percentage is this below the Engineer's estimate?

Chief Engineer: Mr. Chairman and Commission Member Teeuwen, the Engineer's estimate on this project was \$2.1 million dollars.

Chairman: About two-thirds of it, so one-third below approximately?

Chief Engineer: Pretty typical on all of our asphalt paving projects except for the one in Williams County that we were forced to reject earlier this year.

Chairman: It was nice we had five bids and they were all somewhat grouped, five quality companies. Further comments or questions? Please call the roll.

Mr. Dixon: Mr. Chairman.

Chairman: Oh I am sorry. Excuse me.

Mr. Dixon: Just briefly I haven't spoken on this subject in awhile, so I figured it is about time. How many minorities did we get a response from?

Chief Engineer: Mr. Chairman, Commission Member Dixon, I can't answer the question on minority contractors, but I know DLZ, Incorporated, our engineering inspection firm is a minority firm.

Mr. Dixon: DLZ is a sub on this?

Chief Engineer: They are doing our inspection on the job.

Mr. Dixon: They're doing the inspection?

Chief Engineer: Yes.

Mr. Dixon: Did we send out any bid packages to minority companies?

Chief Engineer: I would defer to Contracts.

Director of Contracts Administration: Mr. Chairman, Commission Member Dixon, offhand by looking at this list of sixty-two that were sent to I am sure there are minority firms on this list, but I couldn't tell you how many without taking the time to go back through the list and analyzing it.

Mr. Dixon: I am not going to go through and ask you the same questions about every contract here. You know how I feel about this, and your efforts in the past I have been very pleased with, I just want us to continue down that road, okay.

Director of Contracts Administration: Absolutely.

Mr. Dixon: Because I haven't been up here pounding, okay.

Director of Contracts Administration: We are very mindful of that and we have a very strong list of firms that are certified to, minority firms that are certified to perform these types of services and they are all on our list. I just don't know the exact number on this particular list.

Mr. Dixon: Okay, maybe you and I will talk later, okay.

Director of Contracts Administration: Sure.

Mr. Dixon: I appreciate it, thank you. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman: I am just going to comment real quick for once second. That when you get into the paving contractors, you know it is hard for us to even sometimes secure the proper two or three bidders for it.

Mr. Dixon: I understand.

Chairman: And this is a job that has to be done in a short time and these are really traditionally these are very big companies. The biggest asphalt pavers in the State of Ohio and you know who are there with Shelly and Kokosing for example.

Mr. Dixon: Mr. Chairman and again my questions weren't actually toward this particular contract. I just want to ask it now, so they understand all the way through, and you know what my attempt is, my attempt is to change the culture. So it is not something that we just do for one particular contract, but that we do for all the contracts.

Chairman: Correct and that is the concept we've had this discussion even in your absence.

Mr. Dixon: Yes.

Chairman: And especially if we can go ahead do some of the inspections and testing companies, where we can go ahead and select those it also makes it easier for us in those situations.

Mr. Dixon: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Chairman: Representative.

Representative Hagan: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I guess my concern too is to follow-up on that is there a Commission list, so that we can identify the minority contractors? So we have that list that we can cross-reference as well.

Chairman: Noelle, are you going to respond?

General Counsel: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Member Hagan, we have a list of prequalified MBE and FBE contractors and we will circulate it to all the Commission Members. Offhand, Mr. Dixon, I do not know offhand how many minority paving companies there are, but we will check, I will get you all that information and

where we are at this point in the year as far as percentage of contracts, break it down by general...

Mr. Dixon: Okay, percentage of contracts would be great.

General Counsel: commodities and engineering and I will say that historically that the Engineering Department has had a very high percentage or a good percentage of MBE firms at were awarded work.

Mr. Dixon: And I understand it will vary based on the type of work that we are putting out there.

General Counsel: But we will get you a breakdown with categories of the types of companies. So we will circulate that to everybody.

Representative Hagan: Mr. Chairman, follow-up please. I am interested as well in making sure that there's fairness in some of these contracts. On the other hand is there a program that I may have missed, a discussion about it prior to this, a program that makes it obvious that we are reaching out and making sure that minority contractors are given every opportunity not only through just the bidding process, but the learning process as well.

General Counsel: Mr. Chairman, Commission Member Hagan, actually in the last few years we partnered with the Purchasing Department to attend more and more conferences to solicit MBE and FBE companies. We've made a concerted effort to advertise and we are just about to do a conference in the next few weeks for blacktop, I believe.

Director of Contracts Administration: Matchmaker.

General Counsel: Matchmaker, where we go out of our way to solicit them, to get them on the bid list, to make sure they are participating in these contracts. We do still have a voluntary policy.

Representative Hagan: I appreciate that, thank you. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Chairman: Thank you.

Ms. Teeuwen: Follow-up.

Chairman: Bonnie.

Ms. Teeuwen: These prime contractors do we monitor their subcontractors and whether they're minority contractors or not?

Chief Engineer: Mr. Chairman, Commission Member Teeuwen, yes their subcontractors do not have to be identified at the time of contract award, they do have to identify prior to doing work on the project. There is a self-performance percentage that the prime contractor has to do by with their own forces. However, every subcontractor that is assigned to the project we approve and we keep track and we do know or not if they are on our MBE list.

Ms. Teeuwen: And of the subcontractors do they need to be prequalified to do the work or are they taken under the umbrella of the prime contractor?

Chief Engineer: Under the umbrella of the prime.

Ms. Teeuwen: Okay.

Chairman: Please call the roll.

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer: Chairman Balog

Mr. Balog: Yes

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer: Mr. Regula

Mr. Regula: Yes

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer: Mr. Dixon

Mr. Dixon: Yes

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer: Ms. Teeuwen

Ms. Teeuwen: Yes

RESOLUTION NO. 31-2010

Resolution Awarding Contract No. 59-10-04

WHEREAS, the Commission has duly advertised according to law for bids upon a Contract for Repairs and Resurfacing of Interchange 142 at Milepost 142.8 and Interchange 151 at Milepost 151.8, both located in Lorain County, Ohio, herein designated **Contract No. 59-10-04**; and

WHEREAS, expenditures for the Contract to be awarded will exceed \$150,000.00, and, therefore, in accordance with Article V, Section 1.00 of the Commission's Code of Bylaws, Commission action is necessary for the award of said Contract; and

WHEREAS, the Commission received five bids for the performance of said Contract; and

WHEREAS, said bids have been reviewed and analyzed by the Commission's Chief Engineer, whose report concerning such analysis is before the Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Chief Engineer reports that the lowest responsive and responsible bid for the performance of Contract No. 59-10-04 was received from **Erie Blacktop, Inc.** of **Sandusky, Ohio**, in the amount of **\$1,316,234.50**, which bid he recommends be accepted by the Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has been advised by the Director of Contracts Administration that all bids for Contract No. 59-10-04 were solicited on the basis of the same terms and conditions and the same specifications, that the bid of Erie Blacktop, Inc. for Contract No. 59-10-04 conforms to the requirements of Ohio Revised Code Sections 5537.07, 9.312 and 153.54, and that a performance bond with good and sufficient surety has been submitted by Erie Blacktop, Inc.; and

WHEREAS, the Commission's Executive Director has reviewed the reports of the Chief Engineer and the Director of Contracts Administration and, predicated upon such analysis, has made his recommendation to the Commission to award Contract No. 59-10-04 to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, Erie Blacktop, Inc.; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has duly considered such recommendations.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

RESOLVED that the bid of **Erie Blacktop, Inc.** of **Sandusky, Ohio**, in the amount of **\$1,316,234.50** for the performance of **Contract No. 59-10-04** is, and is by the Commission, determined to be the lowest responsive and responsible bid received for the performance of said Contract, and is accepted, and that the Chairperson and Executive Director, or either of them, hereby is authorized to: 1) execute a Contract with said successful bidder in the form heretofore prescribed by the Commission pursuant to the aforesaid bid, 2) direct the return to the bidders of their bid security, when appropriate, and 3) take any and all action necessary or proper to carry out the terms of said bid and of said Contract; and

FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission hereby authorizes the Executive Director and the Chief Engineer to assign to Contract No. 59-10-04, **DLZ, Inc.** of **Cleveland, Ohio** for the purpose of performing construction inspection, and **CTL Engineering, Inc.** of **Cleveland, Ohio** for the purpose of performing material testing and inspection, with such assignments in accordance with the 2009-2010 General Engineering Services Agreements between the Ohio Turnpike Commission and said engineering firms; and

FURTHER RESOLVED that Contract No. 59-10-04 is designated a System Project under the Commission's 1994 Master Trust Agreement.

Chief Engineer: Thank you. The second resolution is awarding a contract for the Furnishing and Installing of Truck Stop Electrification Units at our Indian Meadows/Tiffin River Service Plazas. As the Director said in his report construction continues on time on service plaza number one in Williams County. As part of this project it was the Commission's desire to implement several green initiatives into this project. One of which is including a pilot program at the Indian Meadows Service Plaza under which twenty-two truck stop electrification units will be installed in the truck stop parking area. An electrification unit will allow the truck driver to shut down their engines and have access to power and HVAC systems thereby reducing engine wear and tear, conserving fuel, and reducing diesel emissions. On June 10th, the Commission issued a RFP for these services. On July 1st, proposals were received from two firms. An evaluation team consisting of my staff in the Engineering Department conducted a technical review of the proposals and ranked the proposal submitted by Craufurd Manufacturing, LLC of Belchertown, Massachusetts, as the best technical proposal. Following the technical rankings the price proposals were then opened. The price proposal submitted by Craufurd Manufacturing in the amount of \$332,990.00 was also the lowest price proposal submitted, thereby resulting in Craufurd receiving the best overall score. It is our recommendation to proceed with Craufurd Manufacturing, LLC, of Belchertown, Massachusetts. If the General Counsel would please read the Resolved?

General Counsel: RESOLVED that the proposal submitted by **Craufurd Manufacturing, LLC of Belchertown, Massachusetts** is, and is by the Commission determined to be, the best of all proposals received in response to the Commission's RFP for Furnishing and Installation of Truck Stop Electrification Units and is accepted, and the Executive Director and Director of Contracts Administration hereby are authorized to: 1) execute a Contract with Craufurd Manufacturing in the form heretofore prescribed by the Commission pursuant to the aforesaid RFP, 2) direct the return of the proposal guaranty provided by all RFP respondents as soon as said Contract with Craufurd Manufacturing is executed, and 3) to take any and all action necessary or proper to carry out the terms of said RFP and said Contract.

Chairman: Is there a motion to adopt?

Mr. Regula: So moved.

Chairman: Second?

Ms. Teeuwen: Second.

Chairman: Discussion or questions? Yes sir Senator.

Senator Patton: This is relatively, obviously this is a pilot project. I am just thinking, just curious is there a charge levied on those trucks that will then side up to these things and is it something that has been analyzed so that it appears that this at best

is a break even for the Commission on both the installation, the creation and ultimately what we charge the individual trucks to idle, excuse me, to sign up verses idling?

Chief Engineer: Mr. Chairman, Commission Member Patton, yes the truckers are charged, they are charged by the hour when they use the facilities. We have done analysis of it projecting, I think, about fifty percent utilization of the equipment, payback is between eight and ten years.

Senator Patton: Thank you.

Chairman: I would say that many of the green initiatives are long term projects; but if this works there then I assume we can incorporate it in other facilities, for example the new facilities we are going to be building at the eastern end of the state. We're just doing the north side, correct?

Chief Engineer: That is correct, Indian Meadows.

Chairman: So we can do it on the south side and other locations if it is widely accepted. Bonnie.

Ms. Teeuwen: One other question. Did we do the cost benefit ratio for the truck drivers to see if what we are purposing to charge is a benefit to them, because if it is too expensive for them they are not going to use it, and then our fifty percent (*inaudible*)...

Chief Engineer: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Teeuwen, that was a prime consideration on how much does it cost them to run their engine for an hour, also any wear and tear that may be incurred on that engine, we had to keep that price point below that.

Ms. Teeuwen: Okay, thank you.

Executive Director: Mr. Chairman is I might just jump into this discussion. This is something we have been looking at for quite sometime. We investigated whether we could apply for some C-Mack funding and found that, that wasn't going to work. Obviously this initiative is for several reasons, one mainly it is to cut the emissions. Obviously when we are looking out towards the Indiana line it is not in a non-attainment area, but certainly this would be something I'd like to pursue if this does work out, this pilot program and the results come in some of those non-attainment areas to help some of the reductions in those areas, reduction, emissions reductions in those areas.

Chairman: Thank you.

Mr. Regula: If I may Mr. Chairman. Was the reason not putting them on the south side is you kind of want to get a feel for how they were going to work on the north

side and on the south side will the electric and everything be run underground, so that you can pop them in relatively easily if it does work on the north end?

Chief Engineer: Mr. Chairman, Commission Member Regula, yes one of the reasons was to see a pilot to just run it on the one side, on the north side, Indian Meadow where we ended up installing this we had a tentative area where we could expand the parking lot by twenty-two places just for larger parking, so we went ahead and put this in without losing some standard parking spaces. However, on the south side we have made the provisions in the future to install it if we had to.

Mr. Regula: And does this company that won the bid do they currently have units being used on other turnpikes and/or other...

Chief Engineer: Yes Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Member Regula, as a matter of fact as we speak they are finishing up a project in Maine is it Kathy? Maine Turnpike.

Mr. Regula: Thank you.

Chairman: Please excuse me, Representative Hagan.

Representative Hagan: Let me follow-up on Mr. Regula's comments there, if they have done this in other areas and we only have two RFPs here, was it because there are only a couple that have done this, that have a history of this ,or is because we didn't have an opportunity to try to get some from Ohio or some closer, or is it just because we are limited in scope.

Chief Engineer: Mr. Chairman, Commission Member Hagan, no this is a pretty specialized undertaking. These are the same two players that have bid in the past in other states. As a matter of fact, Craufurd, the one we are looking at for this project is a newer company now that has started up and started to do this work also.

Representative Hagan: Thank you, thank you Mr. Chairman.

Chairman: Thank you. Please call the roll.

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer: Chairman Balog

Mr. Balog: Yes

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer: Mr. Regula

Mr. Regula: Yes

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer: Mr. Dixon

Mr. Dixon: Yes

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer: Ms. Teeuwen

Ms. Teeuwen: Yes

RESOLUTION NO. 32-2010

Resolution Awarding a Contract for the Furnishing and Installation of Truck Stop Electrification Units

WHEREAS, the Commission is currently engaged in the reconstruction of the Indian Meadow/Tiffin River Service Plazas, and desires to integrate several “green” initiatives during said reconstruction project, including a Pilot Project at the Indian Meadow Service Plaza under which twenty-two truck stop electrification units will be installed in the truck parking area; and

WHEREAS, the “electrified” parking area that will be created under the Pilot Project will allow truckers to stop and rest comfortably without having to idle their engines, thereby reducing engine wear and tear, conserving fuel and reducing diesel emissions; and

WHEREAS, on June 10, 2010, the Commission issued its Request for Proposals (“RFP”) for the Furnishing and Installation of Truck Stop Electrification Units at the Indian Meadow Service Plaza with the possibility of additional future installations depending on the success of the initial Pilot Project; and

WHEREAS, on July 1, 2010, proposals were submitted by two (2) firms; and

WHEREAS, an Evaluation Team comprised of the Assistant Chief Engineer, Staff Design Engineer and the Staff Construction Engineer conducted a technical review of the proposals and ranked the proposal submitted by **Craufurd Manufacturing, LLC** of **Belchertown, Massachusetts** for its “**AireDock**” electrification units, as the best technical proposal; and

WHEREAS, upon completion of the technical evaluation, price proposals were then unsealed and evaluated, and the lowest price proposal in the amount of **\$332,990.00** was submitted by Craufurd Manufacturing, thereby causing that company’s proposal to receive the best overall score; and

WHEREAS, expenditures by the Commission under the Contract to be awarded to Craufurd Manufacturing will exceed \$150,000.00, and, therefore, in accordance with Article V, Section 1.00 of the Commission's Code of Bylaws, the Commission must authorize the Executive Director to enter into the Contract; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has been advised by the Director of Contracts Administration that: 1) all legal requirements with respect to the RFP have been performed and that the aforesaid proposals were solicited on the basis of the same terms, conditions and specifications with respect to all respondents and potential respondents, 2) due and full consideration has been given to the Proposals received, the respondents' qualifications and their abilities to perform the required services, and 3) Craufurd Manufacturing has provided a proposal bond of good and sufficient surety, and has demonstrated its ability to provide the requisite performance bond or letter of credit insuring performance as well as the levels of insurance coverage required under the RFP; and

WHEREAS, the Executive Director has reviewed the reports of the Evaluation Team and the Director of Contracts Administration and, predicated upon their analysis, concurs with their recommendation that a Contract for the Furnishing and Installation of Truck Stop Electrification Units be awarded to Craufurd Manufacturing of Belchertown, Massachusetts; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has duly considered such recommendations.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

RESOLVED that the proposal submitted by **Craufurd Manufacturing, LLC** of **Belchertown, Massachusetts** is, and is by the Commission determined to be, the best of all proposals received in response to the Commission's RFP for Furnishing and Installation of Truck Stop Electrification Units and is accepted, and the Executive Director and Director of Contracts Administration hereby are authorized to: 1) execute a Contract with Craufurd Manufacturing in the form heretofore prescribed by the Commission pursuant to the aforesaid RFP, 2) direct the return of the proposal guaranty provided by all RFP respondents as soon as said Contract with Craufurd Manufacturing is executed, and 3) to take any and all action necessary or proper to carry out the terms of said RFP and said Contract.

Chief Engineer: Final resolution this morning is Reauthorizing Third Lane Program Management Contract with URS Corporation. Pursuant to Resolution 26-1995, the Commission authorized URS Corporation to perform Program Management Services for design and construction of the third lane from Milepost 59 to Milepost 218. Right now we are about ninety-five percent complete with the third lane, we have two segments yet to be completed from Milepost 178 to 185 and also 59 to 64. After a lengthy delay on the project the Commission is now in the position to resume construction. We are recommending that we proceed with construction of the segment from Milepost 178.0 to Milepost 185.3 in Summit County beginning in the 2011 construction season. URS Corporation has submitted a proposal dated August 2nd, in the not-to-exceed amount of \$148,373.94 for the performance of preconstruction services for the aforementioned third lane segment. If the General Counsel would please read the Resolved.

General Counsel: RESOLVED that the Commission hereby reauthorizes the Third Lane Program Management Services Contract with URS Corporation and re-designates it as Project No. 71-10-04, and further directs the Executive Director and the Director of Contracts Administration to amend the Contract with URS Corporation to include the performance of the required additional services.

Chairman: Motion to adopt?

Mr. Regula: So moved.

Chairman: Second?

Mr. Dixon: Second.

Chairman: Questions or discussion? Please call the roll.

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer: Chairman Balog

Mr. Balog: Yes

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer: Mr. Regula

Mr. Regula: Yes

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer: Mr. Dixon

Mr. Dixon: Yes

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer: Ms. Teeuwen

Ms. Teeuwen: Yes

RESOLUTION NO. 33-2010

**Resolution Reauthorizing Third Lane Program Management
Contract with URS Corporation**

WHEREAS, via Resolution 26-1995, the Commission authorized URS Corporation to perform Program Management Services for design and construction of the Third Lane from Milepost 59 to Milepost 218; and

WHEREAS, the Commission is now in a position to resume construction of the Third Lane Program, and the Chief Engineer's recommendation to proceed with construction of the Third Lane segment from Milepost 178.0 to Milepost 185.3 in Summit County during the 2011 and 2012 construction seasons is before the Commission; and

WHEREAS, the project for Program Management Services has been re-designated as Project No. 71-10-04; and

WHEREAS, URS Corporation has submitted a proposal dated August 2, 2010, in the not-to-exceed amount of \$148,373.94 for the performance of pre-construction services for the aforementioned Third Lane segment; and

WHEREAS, the Executive Director concurs with the Chief Engineer's recommendation that the Project Management Services Contract with URS Corporation be reauthorized and amended to allow for the performance of the required services for completion of the Third Lane segment from Milepost 178.0 to Milepost 185.3, as well as the completion of the Third Lane segment from Milepost 59.5 to Milepost 64.1 in Lucas and Wood counties; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has duly considered such recommendations.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

RESOLVED that the Commission hereby reauthorizes the Third Lane Program Management Services Contract with URS Corporation and re-designates it as Project No. 71-10-04, and further directs the Executive Director and the Director of Contracts Administration to amend the Contract with URS Corporation to include the performance of the required additional services.

Chief Engineer: Thank you that is all I have this morning, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman: Thank you. General Counsel?

General Counsel: No report Mr. Chairman.

Chairman: Thank you. CFO/Comptroller, Martin?

CFO/Comptroller: Good morning Mr. Chairman and Commission Members. I have an update on our traffic and revenue for the month of July. This first chart shows the monthly passenger car miles traveled on the Ohio Turnpike over the past two years. Passenger car vehicle miles traveled continue to improve and in June were 4.1% above the total from 2009.

Commercial vehicles miles traveled declined from June, but were still .5% above July of last year.

This chart shows year-to-date total vehicle miles traveled through the month of July during each year for the past decade. Total vehicle miles traveled for the first seven months of this year were 1.1% above the amount from last year. This chart shows the

total revenues, the total toll revenues over the last two years. Total toll revenues in June were 35.6% higher than last year. This chart shows the year-to-date toll revenues through the month of July for each year over the past decade. Toll revenues for the first seven months of this year were \$32.8 million or 33.1% above the amount from last year.

Next I would like to discuss an opportunity that the Commission has to save a significant amount of money by refinancing some of our bonds. The Commission currently has approximately \$620 million in bonds outstanding. Of these about \$93 million in 1998 Series B Bonds are currently callable and about \$46 million in 2001 Series A Bonds are callable in February of next year. These are the same series of bonds that we refinanced last year, but at that time some of the maturities did not meet our savings threshold. Recently interest rates on tax exempt bonds have fallen to near the lowest levels on record, which now provides us with an opportunity to refinance the remaining bonds. This chart compares the coupon rates on the outstanding 1998 Series B Bonds and the 2001 Series A Bonds to the current yields on tax exempt bonds. The spread between the two lines on this chart represent the potential savings. It should be noted that bond yields are constantly changing and if tax exempt interest rates start to rise much of the potential savings could evaporate. However, interest rates are not expected to rise dramatically in the next few months and this appears to be a good time to consider a bond refinancing. With your permission Mr. Chairman, Eric Erickson will provide an overview of the potential bond refunding.

Financial Advisor: Good morning.

Chairman: Good morning.

Financial Advisor: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission.

CFO/Comptroller: Put up the next chart.

Financial Advisor: I have before you a graph looking at interest rates over time for the municipal bond industry. What this is, is the Bond Buyer Index, the Bond Buyer Index is an index similar to the Dow Jones for the municipal industry, and I put in the rate since 1980 to provide a bit of historic perspective. As you can see in the early 80's it was obviously very high. In fact the all time high for the Bond Buyer was 13.44 interest rate. Today, today at the far end far, right you can see that is was at 4.06, the all time low for the Bond Buyer and you can see in the box down below was 3.94, so we are actually approaching that, that was last October. Just as a matter of record the two prior issues that we're considering, that we are asking you to consider advance refunding or current refunding are the 1998's and 2001's. When the 1998 issue was issued the Bond Buyer Index was 4.88, when the 2001 issue was sold the Bond Buyer Index was 5.14.

Moving on to the next chart, we actually ran the numbers ourselves and have come up with a proposed target if you will, these numbers were done based on an interest rate scale of two weeks ago, but you can see that the gross savings over the remaining life of the issue is a little over \$16 million. If your present value that income stream back to

today's dollars at a discount rate on the rate on the bonds you have approximately 9.7 current dollar savings, which reflects approximately 7% of the refunded principal. Now the GFOA uses a guideline and the Commission has always used approximately 3% or better as a target for present value savings. As you can see 7% is very attractive. I have included in your packet a recommendation to move forward with the selection of underwriters and it is pulling together an underwriting team. Hopefully, we will have a resolution for you at the next meeting with a recommendation on the terms of the underwriting group and then proceeding with an advance and current refunding sometime probably in October or November. Open up for questions.

Chairman: Questions?

Mr. Dixon: *(inaudible)*

Chairman: Bonnie.

Ms. Teeuwen: It seems like we're refunding a lot of bonds. Are we to the point where the maturity of all of these are going to be at the same time and what are we doing at the end of all of these terms? How does that work?

Financial Advisor: Well, the refunding is just replacing bonds that are currently in existence and they go to the maturity of the existing bonds. So we are really replacing bonds.

Ms. Teeuwen: Of the existing, not extending them?

Financial Advisor: You cannot extend maturities under IRS rules. So we are just replacing bonds, we are not extending maturities here, just with lower interest rate bonds.

Ms. Teeuwen: So we still have an even distribution of when all of our bonds are maturing at different times over years?

Financial Advisor: That is correct, yes.

Ms. Teeuwen: Okay, thank you.

Chairman: Mr. Dixon.

Mr. Dixon: Yes, clarify this for me, so the savings is \$16 million.

Financial Advisor: Gross savings, yes.

Mr. Dixon: Gross savings, but the actual net benefit will be \$9 million?

Financial Advisor: Well, what that says Commissioner Dixon is that the present value in today's dollars of that income stream over the remaining life of the issue at a discount rate equal to the rate on the bonds is \$9.7 million. So in other words in present value that income stream back to today's dollars it is 9.7, that is not saying you are going to have 9.7 when you close. You have this saving stream assuming you structure it this way over the remaining life of the issue, so in year two for example you save approximately \$445,000 in debt service and your \$321,000. But for analytical purposes to make a decision whether you move forward or not, you look at it in present value basis.

Mr. Dixon: Okay and the team that we put together to sell these bonds is it the same one we use all the time George?

Executive Director: No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Dixon: They different?

Executive Director: Member Dixon, what we are asking for in this resolution is issue a RFQ for those underwriting services...

Mr. Dixon: Okay.

Executive Director: And for obviously we will go forward with bond counsel. We have used a team that I've seen in the last, I think, three or four bond deals has been the same after consultation with the Office of Budget and Management, we decided to pursue this in this fashion by issuing a Request for Qualifications and then we will analyze and come back with a recommendation to the Commission.

Mr. Dixon: Okay that's good, thank you. Thank you.

Executive Director: If I might jump in a little bit Mr. Chairman and again Paul I think you might jump in, I did as you may remember last year when we went through this same process, these were not callable at that time these have now become callable that's why we are pursuing it after we looked at the potential savings. If you do recall we have to have approval from the Office of Budget and Management and then the method of sale then has to be approved by the controlling board. I don't know if Paul would like to speak to that or not?

Mr. DiNapoli: Yeah, I had the opportunity to speak with Larry Surlock of our Debt Office last week and shared with him the draft that the Executive Director had sent to us and we also spoke with Director Sabety and Larry and the Director's opinion was that this was a prudent action that OBM supports the Commission in this effort to refund these bonds and is available to lend support throughout the process.

Chairman: And again these bonds were not callable when we went through this process last year. We now can go ahead call these bonds and pay these bonds off and then reissue them at a lesser interest rate. So that is found money for us.

Mr. Jerse: Does the benefit include the cost of re-issuing the bonds, bond counsel, and underwriter?

Financial Advisor: Chairman Jerse, yes all the expenses are included in the savings, so the savings reflect an after cost basis, absolutely.

Mr. Regula: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to say I applaud all your efforts; this is the right thing to do in the present environment we're in so thanks.

Chairman: So it is equivalent to the consumer refinancing a house at a lesser interest rate.

Financial Advisor: Thank you.

Chairman: Thank you. Last question; is there any future callable bonds?

CFO/Comptroller: These are the last two issues of callable bonds. The other issues of bonds are not callable.

Chairman: So this is the last time we can do this?

CFO/Comptroller: Well provided that we are able to call, the payback works on every one of these bonds and we actually go to market and we call all these bonds, this will be the last time we can call these bonds.

Chairman: Yeah, if we do all of these there are no other ones.

CFO/Comptroller: There are no other ones until we get to the ones that we issued that would be callable in 2019, I believe.

Financial Advisor: Yeah.

CFO/Comptroller: The 2009's would be callable in 2019.

Financial Advisor: The ones we did last year.

Chairman: We will worry about those maybe a few years from now.

Mr. Dixon: Yeah, you will still be here.

Chairman: Other comments or questions? Thank you. Are we going to read the Resolved, correct?

General Counsel: RESOLVED, that the Executive Director and CFO/Comptroller in consultation with the Commission's Financial Advisor are authorized to issue a Request for Qualifications from those companies interested in furnishing underwriting services for the potential refunding of all or a portion of the 1998 Series B Bonds and/or 2001 Series A Bonds that the Commission may consider refunding if market conditions permit a sufficient and appropriate savings; and

FURTHER RESOLVED, that the CFO/Comptroller shall prepare a report and recommendation regarding the proposals received to provide underwriting services to the Commission.

Chairman: Thank you, motion to adopt the resolution?

Mr. Regula: So moved.

Chairman: Second?

Ms. Teeuwen: Second.

Chairman: Any further questions or comments? Please call the roll.

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer: Chairman Balog

Mr. Balog: Yes

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer: Mr. Regula

Mr. Regula: Yes

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer: Mr. Dixon

Mr. Dixon: Yes

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer: Ms. Teeuwen

Ms. Teeuwen: Yes

RESOLUTION NO. 34-2010

Resolution Authorizing the Issuance of an RFQ for Underwriting Services for the Potential Refunding of 1998 Series B and 2001 Series A Bonds

WHEREAS, the Commission is authorized by Section 5537.08 of the Ohio Revised Code to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of refunding previously issued revenue bonds;

WHEREAS, the Commission previously issued 1998 Series B Bonds and 2001 Series A Bonds that may be refunded by the Commission;

WHEREAS, the Commission's Financial Advisor, Fifth Third Securities, Inc. of Columbus, Ohio has issued a written recommendation to the Commission that it consider refunding all or some portion of the **remaining** 1998 Series B Bonds and/or 2001 Series A Bonds that were not included in the series of bonds refunded by the Commission during 2009, if market conditions permit a sufficient and appropriate savings to the Commission;

WHEREAS, the CFO/Comptroller and Financial Advisor have recommended that the Commission issue a Request for Qualifications to solicit proposals from investment banking firms to serve as either senior managing or co-managing underwriter on one or more potential transactions, and the Commission's Executive Director concurs in said recommendation.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

RESOLVED, that the Executive Director and CFO/Comptroller in consultation with the Commission's Financial Advisor are authorized to issue a Request for Qualifications from those companies interested in furnishing underwriting services for the potential refunding of all or a portion of the 1998 Series B Bonds and/or 2001 Series A Bonds that the Commission may consider refunding if market conditions permit a sufficient and appropriate savings; and

FURTHER RESOLVED, that the CFO/Comptroller shall prepare a report and recommendation regarding the proposals received to provide underwriting services to the Commission.

Chairman: Anything further for Martin?

CFO/Comptroller: That's all I have Mr. Chairman.

Chairman: Thank you.

Mr. Dixon: Real quickly, does the approval of the bonding company come before the Commission?

General Counsel: Yes it does.

Mr. Dixon: Okay, thanks.

Chairman: Anything further from Mr. Erickson?

Financial Advisor: Nothing.

Chairman: General Consultant?

General Consultant: We have nothing to report at this time Mr. Chairman.

Chairman: Thank you, Trustee?

Executive Director: He is not here today.

Chairman: He is not here, Ohio State Highway Patrol?

Captain Hannay: Good morning Mr. Chairman and Commission Members, just a brief report. We investigated a fatality last week on Wednesday morning at about 11:00 a.m. We had a vehicle go off the right side of the road in the area of Milepost 191. The driver is deceased. There was vehicle fire involved in that, but as a result of the fast action of our maintenance crew that was working in the vicinity and our officers that arrived on the scene were able to get both people out of the vehicle. Unfortunately, the driver did not survive, the elderly 82-year old female passenger did survive, and that I understand will survive from her injuries. But we did avert a more serious tragedy by getting the people out of the vehicle. That is all I have today sir.

Chairman: Thank you, any questions?

Mr. Regula: If I may was it assumed that she fell asleep at the wheel?

Captain Hannay: Mr. Chairman, Commission Member Regula, right now we're asking the coroner's office to try and discern if there was a medical issue. No evasive action, no other vehicles around, no reason really to explain why that vehicle ended up off the right side of the road, down into the trees, and no reduction of speed prior to impact. So there could very well be a medical issue involved and if there is I will follow-up through the Chief Engineer's Office and let him know that.

Mr. Regula: And Dan we should commend our maintenance crews for being there.

Chief Engineer: Yes, we certainly will.

Mr. Regula: And taking their lives at risk as well. So thank them all please.

Captain Hannay: Commission Member Regula, yes I also have our Post Commander, Lieutenant Worth is going to draft up a letter recommending your maintenance people be recognized for their heroic actions, yes sir.

Mr. Regula: Thank you.

Captain Hannay: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman: Thank you. Senator Patton you held a meeting this past week. Do you want to talk a little bit about that?

Senator Patton: Thank you Chairman and Members of the Commission. As you'll recall, and those of you that may or may not, we had in a couple of transportation budgets ago set aside through the State, and I think we went through ODOT, as a delivery source to the Turnpike, a grant to study the sound noise within the corridor that the Commission serves. That was about that thick and it basically said we're making noise. We further then in a more recent budget using GRF funds or Transportation, I believe it was GRF not Transportation funds, set aside a half a million dollars to study some possibilities of cost effectively trying to reduce the sound levels and working with Director Distel, I thank you Director, we first tried to address in that study the hot spots or the areas cause clearly on the 241 miles there is not going to be a sound issue throughout, and his staff and working with the folks involved we were able to ascertain just which areas were more greatly impacted. Now the communities for several years, and this predates Director Distel, have had some concern over the additional two lanes, one in each direction and the addition of the concrete divider that some will call to be more of an amplifier, and to be very fair the initial reaction for the Turnpike has been at that time, I think fair to characterize that we were here first you built yourself around us, so you deal with it. The counter argument to that if one were to make one was that when the deeds to the property were purchased in the 50's, early 50's for project number one was for construction of a four lane highway. So simply put the rules of the game have changed, it is now a six lane highway. I would hope that my fellow Commission Members and anybody connected with the Turnpike would like to be viewed as a good neighbor. That being said I applaud, again, the direction that the Commission took by taking a very serious undertaking of the task to study and even put in a couple pilot projects of what they felt might be adequate, you know sound suppression systems that would be less expensive alternatives to the actual sound walls that you'll see throughout the interstates throughout the state, and I think that the folks that were in attendance of the meeting, some of the local mayors, some of local councilman need to have some sort of a direction that they hoped that the Turnpike Commission having had the initial do we have a sound problem study done some years back and the more recent pilot project study identifying in special the areas of what could possibly work. What is their plans going forward? Now I think everybody is aware of the fact that we're in a difficult economic environment and I don't think the Turnpike Commission is in a position to say okay, you know that starting in X date we are going to start working at X miles per year. But, I think it's prudent to and I think it's almost fair to let these folks know, people that live over a mile away from the Turnpike, that when it was three or four, four lanes rather, didn't know they lived a mile away from the Turnpike and now they do and in summertime especially is where the volume of the complaints will come forward. So there is one of two ways to go, you can take the way to go where again going back to previous administrations where they said We were here first and we are going to take a bunker mentality and not do anything, you know, or we can attempt to be better neighbors, better stewards, of the trust put into them by the folks in Ohio, when they

agreed, supported and continued to remain there. Now that being said, current construction companies or current builders that are building homes up and around the Turnpike Commission is kind of the old expression shame on you, because of the fact they know the noise is there. I saw going out 71 South in the Medina area a newer development came in, you may have noticed that the builder themselves put up some sound walls, actually had some glass or plexiglass as an insert which separates them from those that I see ODOT perform. So there is an area along 71, they wanted the property, they wanted to build, they knew it was going to be close to a highway, they knew it was going to be close to the point where their residents would receive potential sound noise, so they, the builder, practically did it, and I would submit going forward that any builder that builds homes close enough to the turnpike that is so effected by the sound noise again that should be their responsibility, having said that it is my hope that at some point in the very near future that the Commission will at least issue a statement recognizing there's a problem, a willingness at some point in the future to be determined that they will attempt to address the problem. I think that was the request made of the local mayors and I promised them that I would bring that to this Commission's attention.

Chairman: Comments, I think Commission Members probably need to think about the concept, the idea, and have a little time to mull it over.

Senator Patton: Absolutely.

Chairman: The budget issues and some thought in it. Thank you, appreciate it.

Executive Director: Mr. Chairman, just as a reminder that if you would like a copy of that noise, Alternative Noise Study, we do have that, it is also on the internet, you can get it by going to our website if you would like to refresh, but something that we are also very careful and clear in that study to do is to identify, obviously as the Senator has so well pointed out, not all 241 miles of the turnpike need any kind of treatment, so we did endeavor and did identify what we call noise sensitive areas and those are all identified in that study. So if you want to refresh your memory or if you need another copy of that we would be happy to provide you with one.

Chairman: Thank you.

Mr. Regula: Yeah, and one comment I think and I know the federal government got into this when they started putting noise walls on interstates, first of all, and if Bonnie correct me if I am wrong, they are a major source of funding when it comes to rebuilding interstates and therefore they are a major source of funding when it comes to putting those walls in and I think and correct me as I go here, when they started those walls it was originally to change the amount of noise that affected those neighbors, but I know in the Canton area and these walls have recently gone up on Interstate 77 through downtown Canton, what they found is they put the walls up and now it's the neighbor that's a half mile away that's getting the noise, because it's coming up and around and over, so one wall affects the one close, but it also has an adverse effect on those farther away. Have

you found that to be in some of your situations on ODOT? Has there been complaints in regards to that once walls have been erected?

Ms. Teeuwen: There's two answers to that question. New technology has allowed for noise absorption walls, wherein the old days it was just a hunk of concrete and there was a lot of reflectivity. Now a lot of the walls you see they're absorptive walls, so it eliminates some of the rebound noise. However, if you are looking to minimize, eliminate the noise half a mile away, noise walls don't have any impact on homes that far away. The immediate benefit is to the adjacent property owners and as you move away from the walls the effect of the walls become less and less. So the perception might be that the noise is higher because as you get closer to the walls it's less. So, I don't know if that answers your question, but there's a lot of pros and cons to the benefits of using noise walls.

Chairman: Does ODOT have much resource studies that they've prepared in that?

Ms. Teeuwen: Yes.

Chairman: Could we impose on you to possibly provide to us some of those things?

Ms. Teeuwen: Yes.

Chairman: To the Commission and they could copy it, get it to us, so we can go ahead and take a look because, I think, one of the issues is we really don't know how they work. I heard your comment that it will work well for a person who is next to it, but makes it noisier farther away. Senator Patton talked about people that are farther away now complaining that didn't complain before because of the noise coming off of the center wall that we have constructed. What your comment seems to contradict, the comment that a house a mile away will have more noise, it might seem like it is what you've indicated, I would kind of like to see some of the reports and studies and have a chance for us all to look at it so we can make intelligent decisions on it. We surely don't want to go ahead and spend money to create a problem elsewhere.

Ms. Teeuwen: There's actually computer programs that estimate or they take the current situation and then they throw the additional noise on due to adding an additional lane and then they create kind of like a noise contour map, so you can see what the affects are beyond on the property and it also is dependent on the contour of the lands, so they kind of overlay the contour of the lands with, you know, noise barriers and how that impacts. So, it's a pretty cool program.

Mr. Regula: And I think the other thing we have to look at is not only residential, but correct me if I am wrong, from the federal side, not only do you have to erect these walls where there is actually communities, you have to erect them where there is churches or soccer fields or other facilities if I am not mistaken. I mean, I think we

need to look at whatever their current philosophy is as to where they go as well because once we go down this road there maybe, do you know, do you skip a church or do you skip a school or that type of thing? There's a lot of different situations that are going to be impacted as we go with this so.

Chairman: Well we need to get the data and the research. Appreciate that, thank you Senator. Has anybody had an opportunity to look at the Jacob Road Report that was provided to the Commission last week? I would like if all the Commission Members could go ahead and take a look at that, there's a couple of questions in there I think engineering would like some ideas from us, what we think of it and what the opportunities are.

Chief Engineer: It was in their folders last month, not last week.

Chairman: I am sorry, if I said last week I apologize, last month, so if everybody would go ahead and take a look at that and then have any comments to get back to the Executive Director or the Chief Engineer and chat about that. We need to make some decisions on that and go forward with that project with what we are going to do. Any further questions or comments for the Commission? Entertain a motion to adjourn. Our next meeting is set for Monday, September 20th at 10:00 a.m. Is there a motion to adjourn?

Ms. Teeuwen: So moved.

Chairman: Is there a second?

Mr. Regula: Second.

Chairman: Question or comments? Please call the roll.

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer: Chairman Balog

Mr. Balog: Yes

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer: Mr. Regula

Mr. Regula: Yes

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer: Mr. Dixon

Mr. Dixon: Let's stay here, no, yes.

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer: Ms. Teeuwen

Ms. Teeuwen: Yes

Chairman: We are adjourned until September 20th at 10:00 a.m. Thank you.

Time of adjournment is 10:50 a.m.

Approved as a correct transcript of the proceedings of the
Ohio Turnpike Commission

George F. Dixon, Secretary-Treasurer