

**MINUTES OF THE 566<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF THE OHIO TURNPIKE COMMISSION**  
**November 15, 2010**

**Chairman:** (10:02 a.m.) Good morning everyone, will the meeting 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:** Mr. Kidston

**Mr. Kidston:** Here

**Assistant Secretary-Treasurer:** Ms. Teeuwen

**Ms. Teeuwen:** Here

**Assistant Secretary-Treasurer:** Mr. DiNapoli is not here, Mr. Jerse. Senator Patton

**Senator Patton:** Here

**Assistant Secretary-Treasurer:** I think that's it Mr. Chairman.

**Chairman:** Thank you. Commission Member DiNapoli and Commission Member Jerse said they would not be able to attend today's meeting. We have a number of guests here today and in keeping with past practices 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; Tom Breckenridge, Plain Dealer; Roger Hannay, Ohio State Highway Patrol; Kathy Weiss, Director of Contract Administration and Government Affairs, Ohio Turnpike; Dave Miller, Director of Audit, Ohio Turnpike; Frank Bronzo, KCI Associates of Ohio; Neil Gresham, URS; Doug Hedrick, Assistant Chief Engineer, Ohio Turnpike; Larry Antoskiewicz, North Royalton City Council; Bill Daley, Morgan Stanley; Tim Ujvari, Maintenance Engineer, Ohio Turnpike; Robin Carlin, Director of Human Resources, Ohio Turnpike; Dennis Avery, G. Stephens; Chris Hopkins, KeyBank; Lauren Hakos, Public Affairs & Marketing Manager, Ohio Turnpike; Frank Lamb, Huntington Bank; Tom James,

IUOE Local 18; Daniel Van Epps, West Virginia University; Tara Cottrell, Communication Center Supervisor, Ohio Turnpike; Bill Keaton, Telecommunications Manager, Ohio Turnpike; Dick Morgan, Director of Information Systems, Ohio Turnpike; Kathy Petrey, Squires Sanders.

**Chairman:** Thank you. Before we go into the regular meeting, I would like to take time to recognize several people for their contribution to the FBI investigation on behalf of the Ohio Turnpike Commission. Captain Hannay, Tara Cottrell, and William Keaton if you are here would you, the Captain's here...

**Assistant Secretary-Treasurer:** They're here, they're here.

**Chairman:** Like to come forward so we can make a presentation.

**Executive Director:** Mr. Chairman, if I can just for a moment, obviously we don't want good deeds to go unrecognized, and we received a letter actually this came to Chairman Balog earlier this year, after which all of you had a role in helping the FBI in an investigation effort that was ongoing. We received a letter that we framed for all of you. I am going to read it, it says,

“Dear Chairman Balog, I am writing to extend sincerely appreciation for the assistance of Captain Roger Hannay, Bill Keaton and Tara Cottrell in conducting an investigation into the tri-state serial homicide investigation conducted by the FBI and other state and local enforcement agencies...”

You all provided critical evidence and information that helped them solve this crime, so on behalf of the Turnpike, we would like you to have this framed letter from the FBI, Roger, Bill and Tara thank you all very much for your help.

**Chairman:** Sincere thanks from the Commission for your great work. Today is the 566<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Ohio Turnpike Commission. We are meeting here at the Commission's headquarters as provided in the Commission's Code of Bylaws for a Regular Meeting. Various reports will be received. We will act on several resolutions, draft copies have been provided previously 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 October 25, 2010, Commission Meeting?

**Ms. Teeuwen:** So moved.

**Chairman:** Is there a second?

**Mr. Dixon:** Second.

**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:** Mr. Kidston

**Mr. Kidston:** Yes

**Assistant Secretary-Treasurer:** Ms. Teeuwen

**Ms. Teeuwen:** Yes

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

**Secretary-Treasurer:** Thank you Mr. President. The following items are in the Commission Members' folders or have been previously sent to the Members since the last scheduled meeting of the Commission on October 25, 2010. They are:

1. Minutes of the October 25, 2010 Commission Meeting
2. Traffic and Revenue Report, October, 2010
3. Total Revenue by Month and Year, October, 2010
4. Investment Report, October, 2010
5. All News Releases

That completes my report Mr. President. If there are any questions, I will be happy to try and answer those.

**Chairman:** Any questions or comments for Mr. Dixon? Thank you.

**Mr. Dixon:** Thank you Mr. President.

**Chairman:** Next Executive Director, Mr. Distel.

**Executive Director:** Thank you Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission. I very briefly want to point out that as you will see in our Traffic Revenue Report we had a good October. Both commercial and passenger vehicle traffic in October almost rose by about 5% as compared to last year. As I indicated to you before, in December I will be presenting to you a budget for 2011. We will hear today from our CFO/Comptroller, Mr. Seekely, from Bill Daley and from Eric Erickson on our successful bond sale here a few weeks ago and just to let you know that the Turnpike now, the Ohio Turnpike, has now issued about 89,000, just under,

transponders for the E-ZPass use. That concludes my report Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to answer any questions.

**Chairman:** Questions or comments? Thank you, before we get into the resolutions, just from a housekeeping standpoint, the January and February regularly scheduled Commission meetings fall on a holiday, both in January and February, so we are proposing to change those meetings by one week, the January 17<sup>th</sup> will be January 24<sup>th</sup>, that's a Monday, and the February 21<sup>st</sup> will be February 28<sup>th</sup>. So we've kicked both of those meetings back, or set those meetings back one week in January and February. Go to the Resolutions, Chief Engineer Dan.

**Chief Engineer:** Thank you Mr. Chairman. I have two resolutions for your consideration this morning. The first is a resolution authorizing renewal of an agreement for the maintenance of the Commission's business applications system software. Back in 1996, the Commission entered into an agreement with Ross Systems, Incorporated, to furnish and install software for the Commission's business application system. The original contract also contained provisions for a twenty year software license. In 2001, a portion of Ross Systems that maintained the human resources and payroll modules was purchased by a company known as Now Systems of Toronto, Canada. Since that time, Ross Systems and Now Solutions have both been maintaining and supporting the Commission's software modules for the business application system. The most recent renewal of this Contract was made in December of 2007, and expires at the end of this year on December 31<sup>st</sup>. We received annual renewal prices for the components of the system. Ross Systems providing us with pricing in the amount of \$64,000.00 for 2011, \$68,480.00 in 2012, and \$73,273.60 for 2013. These numbers are greatly reduced from our 2010 prices of \$128,000.00; we reduced the number of users for the system. We also received pricing from Now Solutions in the total amount for the three year period of \$76,545.00. All the department heads, namely the CFO/Comptroller, Director of Human Resources, and the Director of Information Services, have been satisfied with the performance of the contractors to date. If the General Counsel would please read the Resolved?

**General Counsel:** RESOLVED that the Executive Director and Director of Contracts Administration are authorized to enter into annual extensions of the original Maintenance Agreement with **Ross Systems, Inc. of Atlanta, Georgia** in amounts not to exceed **\$64,000.00 for 2011, \$68,480.00 for 2012 and \$73,273.60 for 2013** under which Ross Systems shall provide continued maintenance and software support services for the software modules used to perform the Commission's equipment maintenance, financial reporting, inventory and purchasing functions; and

FURTHER RESOLVED that the Executive Director and Director of Contracts Administration are authorized to enter into a three-year extension of the original Maintenance Agreement with **Now Solutions, Inc. of Toronto, Canada** for **calendar years 2011, 2012 and 2013** in the total amount of **\$76,545.00**, under which Now Solutions shall provide continued maintenance and software support services for the software modules used to perform the Commission's HR and payroll functions.

**Chairman:** Is there a motion to adopt the resolution?

**Mr. Kidston:** So moved.

**Chairman:** Second?

**Mr. Regula:** Second.

**Chairman:** Resolution has been, resolution has been properly before the Commission, is there any discussion on the resolution?

**Mr. Dixon:** Mr. Chairman?

**Chairman:** Yes sir.

**Mr. Dixon:** I am a low tech sort of guy, so you are going to have to help me with this; we are dealing with a company in Georgia and a company in Toronto, Canada?

**Chief Engineer:** That is correct.

**Mr. Dixon:** Are we kind of locked in with these companies because of some specific things in the software in the equipment that we are using?

**Chief Engineer:** Mr. Chairman, Commission Member Dixon, unless the Director of Information Services, who is here, I believe so for the term of the maintenance period which expires in 2016. There would be one more renewal after this. Is that correct Dick?

**Director of Information Systems:** That is correct.

**Mr. Dixon:** There would be one more renewal after this?

**Chief Engineer:** Yes.

**Mr. Dixon:** So there is no other, I guess I answered my question with the first question, but I am going to ask it anyway. There is no American or Ohio Company that can perform this maintenance? Or do we even look for them because of the specificity of the.....

**Chief Engineer:** I would have to defer to the Director of Information Services for the nuances of maintaining the software. I think it is fairly proprietary.

**Director of Information Systems:** The software is quite proprietary. We are locked in with a twenty year licensing agreement that was originally signed. We do occasionally look at other software products that are available to provide the same function and as a matter of fact in the next couple of years we will be looking for a new one to go to because it will take three to four years to migrate from an existing platform of this size.

**Mr. Dixon:** Okay, I am just a little perplexed, and I understand and I accept that answer. I am just a little perplexed and concerned that we are locked in with a foreign company and a company so far outside of Ohio for this long length of time. Thank you, sir.

**Chairman:** Thank you, the original contracts are from 1996, so you know the people that are sitting up here and there could be different thinking at that point in time to, between Commissions. I agree with you and I am sure all the other Commission Members would rather work with an Ohio Company that's for sure. Further 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:** Mr. Kidston

**Mr. Kidston:** Yes

**Assistant Secretary-Treasurer:** Ms. Teeuwen

**Ms. Teeuwen:** Yes

**RESOLUTION NO. 46-2010**

**Resolution Directing the Executive Director to Take Immediate Action  
Concerning Extension of Ross Systems, Inc. and Now Solutions, Inc. Software  
Maintenance Agreements**

WHEREAS, pursuant to Resolution No. 68-1996 adopted on November 12, 1996, the Commission authorized an Agreement with Ross Systems, Inc. of Atlanta, Georgia ("Ross Systems") to furnish and install software for an Integrated Business Application System, incorporating six different modules to assist in the performance of the Commission's equipment maintenance, financial reporting, inventory, purchasing, human resources and payroll functions; and

WHEREAS, the Agreement also included a twenty-year software license (through 2016) and all necessary software maintenance and support services; and

WHEREAS, in 2001, a portion of Ross Systems' business pertaining to the software modules related to human resources ("HR") and payroll was purchased by a company known as Now Solutions, Inc. of Toronto, Canada ("Now Solutions"); and

WHEREAS, since that time, Ross Systems has maintained and supported the software modules used for the performance of equipment maintenance, financial reporting, inventory and purchasing functions, and Now Solutions has maintained and supported the software modules used for the performance of HR and payroll functions; and

WHEREAS, the most recent renewal of the Ross Systems and Now Solutions Maintenance Agreements occurred in December 2007, via Resolution 47-2007, under which the Commission authorized renewals for a three-year period, which period expires December 31, 2010; and

WHEREAS, upon expiration of the current Maintenance Agreement with Ross Systems, the annual fees for maintenance and support services may increase by a maximum escalator of 7%, however, the Commission has determined that it can enjoy considerable cost savings by reducing the number of Ross user licenses; and

WHEREAS, costs for annual renewals of Ross Systems' software maintenance and support services will, therefore, decrease to **\$64,000.00** for 2011 and will increase by 7% for 2012 to **\$68,480.00** and 7% for 2013 to **\$73,273.60**; and

WHEREAS, maintenance and support services provided by Now Solutions will be billed at the annual rate of \$26,250.00, with a maximum annual fee escalator of 5% per year, unless the three-year amount is paid up front, in which case the entire amount will be reduced by 7.5% to a total of **\$76,545.00**; and

WHEREAS, the CFO/Comptroller, the Director of Human Resources and the Director of Information Systems are all satisfied with the performance of the Integrated Business Application Systems applicable to their respective departmental operations, and agree that the Commission should renew the Maintenance Agreements with Ross Systems and Now Solutions as negotiated; and

WHEREAS, the Director of Contracts Administration also advises that both Ross Systems and Now Solutions have indicated compliance with new Executive Order 2010-09S Banning the Expenditure of Public Funds for Off-shore Services; and

WHEREAS, because proposed expenditures under these Maintenance Agreement extensions will exceed \$150,000.00, in accordance with Article V, Section 1.00 of the Commission's Code of Bylaws, Commission approval to extend these respective Maintenance Agreements is requested; and

WHEREAS, the Commission's Executive Director has reviewed the reports submitted by Commission staff, and, predicated upon such analysis, has recommended to the Commission that

the Maintenance Agreements with both Ross Systems and Now Solutions be extended as outlined herein; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has duly considered such recommendations.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

RESOLVED that the Executive Director and Director of Contracts Administration are authorized to enter into annual extensions of the original Maintenance Agreement with **Ross Systems, Inc.** of **Atlanta, Georgia** in amounts not to exceed **\$64,000.00 for 2011, \$68,480.00 for 2012** and **\$73,273.60 for 2013** under which Ross Systems shall provide continued maintenance and software support services for the software modules used to perform the Commission's equipment maintenance, financial reporting, inventory and purchasing functions; and

FURTHER RESOLVED that the Executive Director and Director of Contracts Administration are authorized to enter into a three-year extension of the original Maintenance Agreement with **Now Solutions, Inc.** of **Toronto, Canada** for **calendar years 2011, 2012 and 2013** in the total amount of **\$76,545.00**, under which Now Solutions shall provide continued maintenance and software support services for the software modules used to perform the Commission's HR and payroll functions.

**Chief Engineer:** Thank you, the final resolution I have this morning is for awarding nine crew cab pick-up trucks pursuant to Invitation No. 4150. This purchase was included on the 2010 Capital Improvement Budget which was approved by the Commission last December. The Invitation provides for furnishing six, pardon me, nine six-passenger crew cab pick-up trucks with a gross vehicle weight rating to be at least 11,200 pounds. The Ohio Revised Code grants exclusive authority for furnishing of this size vehicle to the Department of Administrative Services. These specific vehicles are not on the ODAS State Term Contract. The Commission had requested and received permission from the ODAS to procure the vehicles via the OTC Bid Invitation Process. We did receive six bid Invitations in response to the subject contract. The apparent low bid was submitted by Montrose Ford of Akron, Ohio, the vehicle proposed to be furnished does not comply with the minimum GVR vehicle rating. The apparent second low bid was submitted by Middletown Ford, Incorporated, of Middletown, Ohio, in the total amount of \$263,725.00. The vehicles proposed to be furnished complies with the specifications, and the total amount is below the contract estimate. If the General Counsel would please read the Resolved?

**General Counsel:** RESOLVED that the bid of **Montrose Ford** of **Akron, Ohio** is deemed not responsive and is rejected; and

FURTHER RESOLVED that the bid of **Middletown Ford** of **Middletown, Ohio**, in the total amount of **\$263,725.00** for Invitation No. 4150 for furnishing nine, 2011 Ford Model F350 Super Duty crew cab pick-up trucks with manuals is, and is by the Commission, determined to be the lowest responsive and responsible bid received, and is accepted; and



FURTHER RESOLVED that the Executive Director and the Director of Contracts Administration, or either of them, hereby is authorized: 1) to execute a Contract with the successful bidder in the form heretofore prescribed by the Commission pursuant to the aforesaid bids; 2) to direct the return to each of the bidders of their bid security, when appropriate; and 3) to take any and all action necessary or proper to carry out the terms of said Contract; and

FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission's Executive Director and Purchasing Manager are authorized to proceed with the disposal of the nine crew cab pick-up trucks identified for replacement by the Commission's Maintenance Engineer in accordance with the Commission's Property Disposal Policy.

**Chairman:** Motion to adopt?

**Ms. Teeuwen:** So moved.

**Chairman:** Is there a second?

**Mr. Regula:** Second.

**Chairman:** Discussion? Senator.

**Senator Patton:** Number one, I think it's great that the bid came in below the estimate. As I read this it looks like the other bid that was actually even lower still, bid on a vehicle that had a weight that was 11,100 and 11,200 was what was required, and obviously the bids is the bids and specs are specs so obviously it did not meet specs, and I have no problem with that other than I don't know if by going for that extra 100 pounds it was, you know, your folks would be able to tell me if it was actually required or not. The question that I have is that it looks like we are paying the successful bidder, the unit price of nearly \$29,000.00 plus we are paying an additional almost \$4,000.00 for required vehicle manuals. You know in the times I have bought cars, the manuals always kind of came in the glove compartment, so I am just wondering if this is unusual or in this type of vehicle, you know?

**Chief Engineer:** Mr. Chairman, Commission Member Patton, I will answer the second question first. These are not your typical owner's manuals, these are complete parts service manuals that we use in our mechanics to maintain these and actually they're electronic. The price is a maximum on there of \$3,850.00 for the total number for a maximum number of manuals that we could require. The Maintenance Engineer is currently looking at that to see if we can reduce the number that we do actually buy.

**Senator Patton:** Okay.

**Chief Engineer:** As far as the first question about that extra 100 pounds for the GVWR on the vehicle. We did take a look at that and I met with the Maintenance Engineer on that Friday. What this apparent low bidder was actually doing is, they were taking a 10,800 pound rated truck and changing the tires out on it to get it up to the 11,100 weight rating, and the tires that he proposed to furnish to get to the 11,100 was not original equipment manufacturer's recommended tires for the vehicle. So that is why we stayed away from that.

**Senator Patton:** That's a good explanation of that, thank you Chairman.

**Chairman:** I see that one of them is a 350 and it says a W3A and the other says 350 Super Duty, so I assume that's the difference?

**Chief Engineer:** That is correct. He was taking the first bidder with the W3A, that was actually a 10,800 pound vehicle in the manufacturer's data and then he was bumping it up with the tires.

**Chairman:** Thanks you any further questions. 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:** Mr. Kidston

**Mr. Kidston:** Yes

**Assistant Secretary-Treasurer:** Ms. Teeuwen

**Ms. Teeuwen:** Yes

**RESOLUTION NO. 47-2010**

**Resolution Awarding a Contract for the Purchase of  
Nine Crew Cab Pick-up Trucks under Invitation No. 4150**

WHEREAS, the Commission has advertised in accordance with law for bids in response to Invitation No. 4150 for the furnishing to the Commission of nine, six-passenger 2010 or 2011 crew cab pick-up trucks with a minimum gross vehicle weight rating ("GVWR") of 11,200 pounds; and

WHEREAS, Ohio Revised Code Section 125.832 grants "exclusive authority" to the Ohio Department of Administrative Services ("ODAS") "over the acquisition and management of all motor vehicles [under 12,000 lb. GVWR] used by state agencies," which pursuant to this Code section includes the Ohio Turnpike Commission; and

WHEREAS, due to the fact that the specified crew cab pick-up truck is not available under ODAS State Term Contract, ODAS has authorized the Commission to proceed with the proposed purchase of the nine trucks via an OTC Bid Invitation; and

WHEREAS, expenditures for the Contract to be awarded under Invitation No. 4150 will exceed \$150,000, 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 six bids in response to the Invitation, and said bids were reviewed and analyzed by the Commission's Maintenance Engineer, who has submitted a report concerning said analysis; and

WHEREAS, the Maintenance Engineer reports that the apparent low bid was submitted by **Montrose Ford of Akron, Ohio**, however, this bidder has proposed the Ford Model F350 W3A crew cab pick-up truck that does not comply with the minimum GVWR of 11,200 pounds, and, therefore, this bid is not responsive and should be rejected; and

WHEREAS, the Maintenance Engineer further reports that the second low bid was submitted by **Middletown Ford, Inc. of Middletown, Ohio** in the total amount of **\$263,725.00** (nine 2011 Ford Model F350 Super Duty trucks at \$28,875.00 each plus \$3,850.00 for the required vehicle manuals), and that the proposed crew cab model complies with the Specifications and the total bid amount is below estimate; and

WHEREAS, after the new vehicles are placed into service, the Maintenance Engineer has further recommended disposal through auction of nine crew cab pick-ups that have reached the end of their useful life, in accordance with the Commission's Property Disposal Policy; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has been advised by the Director of Contracts Administration that bids for Invitation No. 4150 were solicited on the basis of the same terms and conditions and the same specifications, that the lowest responsive and responsible bid of Middletown Ford qualifies for consideration under the Commission's "Domestic and Ohio Preference" Policy and conforms to the requirements of Ohio Revised Code Section 5537.07 and Section 9.312, and that a bid guaranty with good and sufficient surety has been submitted by the aforementioned bidder; and

WHEREAS, the Commission's Executive Director has reviewed the reports of the Maintenance Engineer and the Director of Contracts Administration and, predicated upon such analysis, has made his recommendation to the Commission to award the Contract for Invitation No. 4150 to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, Middletown Ford; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has duly considered such recommendations.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

RESOLVED that the bid of **Montrose Ford** of **Akron, Ohio** is deemed not responsive and is rejected; and

FURTHER RESOLVED that the bid of **Middletown Ford** of **Middletown, Ohio**, in the total amount of **\$263,725.00** for Invitation No. 4150 for furnishing nine, 2011 Ford Model F350 Super Duty crew cab pick-up trucks with manuals is, and is by the Commission, determined to be the lowest responsive and responsible bid received, and is accepted; and

FURTHER RESOLVED that the Executive Director and the Director of Contracts Administration, or either of them, hereby is authorized: 1) to execute a Contract with the successful bidder in the form heretofore prescribed by the Commission pursuant to the aforesaid bids; 2) to direct the return to each of the bidders of their bid security, when appropriate; and 3) to take any and all action necessary or proper to carry out the terms of said Contract; and

FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission's Executive Director and Purchasing Manager are authorized to proceed with the disposal of the nine crew cab pick-up trucks identified for replacement by the Commission's Maintenance Engineer in accordance with the Commission's Property Disposal Policy.

**Chief Engineer:** That's all I have this morning Mr. Chairman.

**Chairman:** Thank you, Comptroller, Martin?

**CFO/Comptroller:** Good morning Mr. Chairman and Commission Members. I have an update on our Traffic and Revenue for the month of October. This first chart shows the monthly passenger car miles traveled on the Ohio Turnpike over the past two years. Passenger car vehicle miles traveled increased in October and were 5.1% above the total from 2009. Commercial vehicle miles traveled also increased in October and were 3.9% higher than last year. This chart shows the year-to-date total vehicle miles traveled thru the month of October during each year over the past decade. Total vehicle miles traveled for the first ten months of this year were 1.4% above the amount from last year. And this chart shows total toll revenues over the last two years. Total toll revenues in October were 2.4% higher than last year. On October 1<sup>st</sup> of last year the Commission implemented E-ZPass and the new toll rate structure, so this is the first month we are comparing against the higher toll rates. This chart shows the year-to-date toll revenues through the month of October during each year for the past decade. Toll revenues for the first ten months of this year were \$43.8 million or 28.8% above the amount from last year. With your permission Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce Bill Daley from Morgan Stanley to review some of the details of the recent bond transaction.

**Chairman:** Thank you, Mr. Daley.

**Bill Daley:** Thank you Mr. Chairman and Members of the Commission. I will just take a few minutes to briefly walk through the refunding transaction 2010, a refunding transaction that was completed earlier in this month. On slide two, we just layout a few of the key components here. The first being the significant cash flow savings that the Ohio Turnpike Commission captured by completing this successful transaction. 8.6 million in net present value

savings and the structure allowed the Commission to take the majority of that funding and savings up front; 4.2 million in 2011 and 2.5 million of cash flow savings in 2012, the remainder then throughout the course of the transaction. We did complete a successful transaction with a very good amount of diverse investor participation. I will talk a little bit more a few slides later about who participated, but we did see bond funds and traditional tax exempt buyers participate in a significant way, and as the Commission is well aware, the strong credit ratings were reaffirmed, the double Aa3, AA, AA, which puts the Commission as one of the highest rated toll roads around the country. Very briefly on slide three, this is just a depiction of the tax exempt market, tax exempt municipal rates. You can see over the course, this shows that since 2005 actually, and obviously the trend here is positive from the perspective of going to the market. We have indicated here both last year's transaction, where it priced on this interest rate curve, and also this year's transaction you can see on the far right, so clearly the trend has been favorable for the Commission, as you see on the right-hand, or left-hand side I am sorry, the current rates are approximately for the in the ten year spot, 250 and about 350 in the twenty year spot, which is well off even the average, you know since the inception of this indicator. On slide four just another summary of the financing results, we completed \$131.29 million refunding transaction fixed rate all in cost of just about 4.25% and again \$8.6 million in savings, which represents over 6% of the refunded bonds. I want to thank all members of the transaction, the working group and the syndicate, especially our Co-Senior J.P. Morgan and the Co-Managers Blaylock Robert Van, KeyBank, Capitol Markets, and PNC Capital. Everyone participated in the transaction and we are very pleased with the results. Excuse me. Slide four, not to be repetitive here, but this is just another indication for the 1998 Bs and 2001 A Series of bonds that we refunded out, it just shows you each of the bonds that we refunded and defeased in their entirety. Slide six gives a little bit more detail to the savings. I will just point out two columns here on the left-hand side, the prior debt service indicates the debt service to the Commission before we obviously completed the transaction. The next column over, refunding debt service shows the new debt service at post refunding transaction, and again you can just as a visual on where the savings was taken, or the majority of it and again there is positive savings in every year through the course of the transaction. The slide seven, we've just shown a graph here of the debt service profile to indicate, you know, the same pattern, the same shape frankly that we had pre-transaction and with some savings up in 2011 and 2012. Slide eight, just to go back on what I had said about the distribution of the bonds, we saw a number of large institutional investors participate in this transaction. I will just point a few out, Northern Trust, Blackrock, Vanguard, Fidelity; these are quality investors that we see in the tax exempt market, we are very pleased to have their participation in this transaction, and then just in conclusion, one, I want to thank the Commission again for the ability, on behalf of Morgan Stanley, to work with you on this transaction and you know there has been a significant amount of volatility in the market even since the refunding transaction. We saw it, in the days leading up to the financing and we took an extra day or two to market the bonds and to really talk to investors, that we had a successful deal, and even since that November 2<sup>nd</sup> pricing date there has been a lot of volume and rates are frankly moving up, so I would commend the Commission for moving when you did and congratulate you on a successful transaction. If there are any questions I am happy to answer them?

**Chairman:** Questions, comments? Thank you.

**Bill Daley:** I will turn it over the Marty.

**CFO/Comptroller:** Thank you, as Bill mentioned we were able to take most of the savings of the bond refunding up front, which will reduce our debt service payments over the next two years by \$6.7 million. These funds will be now be able to be used to increase the amount of capital projects that we will budget in 2011. That completes my report Mr. Chairman.

**Chairman:** Thank you. Um, any questions for Marty? Financial Advisor, Eric Erickson?

**Financial Advisor:** I just want to add a couple of comments. The syndicate as led by Morgan Stanley and J.P. Morgan did a really a very, very good job, it was a little more challenging of a market than what Bill had presented and the Commission did get in, in a timely fashion. It effectively took about two days and there was a real mix between the structure and the interest rates that really had to be moved around and changed a bit to capture the savings that you had, so I just wanted to compliment the team. They did a nice job and that is all I have. Thank you.

**Chairman:** Thank you. General Consultant?

**General Consultant:** No report.

**Chairman:** Trustee?

**Trustee:** No report, Mr. Chairman.

**Chairman:** Ohio State Highway Patrol, Captain?

**Captain Hannay:** No report, Mr. Chairman.

**Chairman:** That is good to hear. General Counsel?

**General Counsel:** Mr. Chairman, Commission Members I do have a report briefing for you on the upcoming negotiations with the Teamster's Local Union 436.

**Mr. Regula:** Mr. Chairman, I'll move that we recess this meeting to hold an Executive Session to confer with General Counsel regarding the upcoming collective bargaining negotiations with the Teamster's Local 436 under the provisions of Ohio Revised Code Section 121.22(g)(4). At the end of such executive session the committee meeting shall resume.

**Chairman:** Is there a second to the motion?

**Mr. Kidston:** Second.

**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:** Mr. Kidston

**Mr. Kidston:** Yes

**Assistant Secretary-Treasurer:** Ms. Teeuwen

**Ms. Teeuwen:** Yes

**Chairman:** (10:29 a.m.) We are going to go into executive session. I assume when we resume the meeting we will probably resume the meeting for the purposes of adjourning it. So thank you for coming. December 20<sup>th</sup> is the next Commission Meeting.

**Chairman:** (11:18 a.m.) I request a motion to resume out of executive session.

**Mr. Regula:** So moved.

**Chairman:** Is there a second?

**General Counsel:** No, you have to make that, no it does not matter. We will write it into the minutes.

**Chairman:** He made the motion to resume out of executive session. Is there a second?

**Ms. Teeuwen:** Second.

**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:** Mr. Kidston

**Mr. Kidston:** Yes

**Assistant Secretary-Treasurer:** Ms. Teeuwen

**Ms. Teeuwen:** Yes

**Chairman:** Is there a motion to adjourn?

**Mr. Kidston:** Other business?

**Chairman:** Other business, sir?

**Mr. Kidston:** I like to ensure that we are going to see a resolution on our speed limit at the next Commission Meeting.

**Chairman:** Put it on the agenda? Thank you.

**Executive Director:** What would you, wait a minute, wait a minute. I just want to be clear on what you would like us to present.

**Chairman:** I think we put a resolution on discussions that kind of, I feel for would put a resolution on to increase the speed limit to 70 miles an hour for cars and trucks effective as soon as we can have it effective.

**Executive Director:** Just a point to consider, I am sure we can prepare that resolution, but we tend to have more accidents in the winter, so if the effective date could at least go a little bit towards the end of winter, beginning of spring. I think when you start analyzing the data for accidents it might help justify the action.

**Mr. Regula:** Effective May 1<sup>st</sup>.

**Mr. Kidston:** Effective April 1<sup>st</sup>, effective April 1<sup>st</sup>.

**Chairman:** I don't see why, I mean if you take that philosophy then you should never increase it because you are going to have a winter next year.

**Mr. Kidston:** Right.



**Chairman:** Bonnie, you have a question?

**Ms. Teeuwen:** Do we go right to a resolution, or do we need to look at what adjacent states are doing, what the cause and effects are?

**Chairman:** They are all 70 or 75 if you go any place west of here.

**Executive Director:** Bonnie I have looked, somebody help me out, Michigan is 70 right? Indiana Turnpike, 70.

**Ms. Teeuwen:** For cars, for cars, 65 for trucks in Indiana.

**Executive Director:** That is correct. I have a chart on my desk, I would be happy to share it.

**Ms. Teeuwen:** Pennsylvania is 65.

**Executive Director:** Correct.

**Ms. Teeuwen:** My concern is the safety and the differentiation in speed between the trucks and passenger vehicles. Now over 50% of the trucks are governed at 65 or below, so now you have trucks going one speed, and that is beyond their control that is as fast as they can go and now we are saying we are going to let the vehicles travel that much faster that's where we get into trouble is where we have the differentiation in speed between trucks and other vehicles. I think we need to look at this closer and see what the cause and effects are going to be.

**Mr. Kidston:** We are planning on 70 for all vehicles, so that is what I would like to see.

**Mr. Regula:** My next question is Senator, what are your thoughts? Isn't there a bill before the House or Senate regards to putting all the interstates in Ohio to 70?

**Senator Patton:** That happened in the House. Tim DeGeeter put that forward about a minute and a half after we raised the truck speed limits to 65 for trucks on the interstate, cause before that it was 65, but then 55, and we decided to make it uniform and we pointed out the Turnpike's success in being able to accomplished that a few years before, and so I remember when I bumped into Representative DeGeeter, you know cause I still get letters from people, obviously the worry warts, every death, you know that's on the highways now will be on my head because I am the one that signed the bill that raised the speed limit to 65 and every time we get the accident reports from here I forward a copy to that same one woman in particular, who has a voodoo doll with pins in it, that she sticks in, cause she is so angry, but I think there was although that bill did not really get, to answer your question, that bill never really got out of the House to get over to the Senate.

**Mr. Regula:** I did not know where it was at.

**Senator Patton:** That is what I mean, it doesn't.

**Executive Director:** Didn't it have sponsor testimony Tom? I followed it. It had sponsor testimony and that was all I ever saw.

**Senator Patton:** That may have been all that it was, and but it doesn't mean that this isn't something, from my..... I am very sensitive to Bonnie's suggestion, that you know cars at 70 today, with everything, the brakes are better, they handle better, and trucks are still trucks, are still trucks, you know but from a business standpoint, you know if we are running this as a business, we get more truck traffic on this turnpike if we raised the speed to 70.

**Ms. Teeuwen:** But do we really, do we really?

**Mr. Kidston:** From a business standpoint, we get those trucks off Route 20, and off Route 6, and of Route 2, and onto a highway that can handle it and at least out my way for sure getting those trucks off Route 20 is a big win.

**Mr. Regula:** There is also an incentive factor there from the standpoint of with our toll increases that we are saying you know you can run faster here. You are paying more than you did a couple of years ago, but you have the ability to do that, and from the governing standpoint, those governors on those trucks can be changed speed wise.

**Ms. Teeuwen:** Yeah, but.

**Mr. Regula:** It is a matter of an adjustment by the local mechanic.

**Ms. Teeuwen:** But you have to understand, the majority of our trucks are company owned trucks that are out here and the company is saving money by governing those trucks lower on fuel cost. That is why they do it, it's not for safety, it's for fuel savings. So they're going to, in spite of what the speed limit is they're going to keep it at 65 or below. So whether we pump it up to 70 or not, the company owned trucks are still going to be at 65 or below, because they are saving money on fuel.

**Executive Director:** Mr. Chairman, I am not sure if the Commission Members are aware, but every once in a while the Highway Patrol will take a survey of the actual speeds that is being traveled on the Turnpike. They do it through aerial surveillance. Dan, you provided me with those last week if I am not mistaken and memory serves me right, the average speed being traveled by commercial vehicles was like 68 and the average speed being traveled by the passenger vehicles was like 73 or 74. So you know I realize that governors are on there Bonnie, but based on and I will asked for more data, actually I have quietly asked the Captain to get more data for us, just so we can look at it to see exactly what they're doing. I would be happy to do this I tell you I have assembled some information with Noelle's help and Dan's help on changing speed limits. How you set them, where you should be, this and that. I would be happy to send that out to the Commission Members, I mean if it is your intent for us to present this resolution, I would be happy to prepare that for you, but I would just ask for ample time, effective date, to give our Sign Shop and our maintenance people the ample time that they need in order to post whatever it is we come up with.

**Mr. Kidston:** I am fine with an effective date of April 1<sup>st</sup> or May 1<sup>st</sup>, I am fine with that. I would like to get the vote taken, so that we know where we are at, but taking three or four months to implement, I am fine with that.

**Ms. Teeuwen:** Can I ask what we are trying to accomplish with this? Is it truly trying to get more vehicles on the Turnpike and off the local routes?

**Mr. Kidston:** It is.

**Ms. Teeuwen:** And is there a way that we can actually study that and determine if that is actually true? Because in my mind, if I am a truck driver and I can go 65 and that is it, why even bother with the Turnpike. I am going to go the route that is most convenient and it is actually better if I don't go on the Turnpike because you don't have to pay. There is actually, and my boyfriend works for Schneider, so I know the inside scoop, but there's actually guys in Schneider who are not allowed to go on the Turnpike, they don't have a Turnpike pass that they're told to go on parallel routes. Now there's other guys depending on what their routes are travel the Turnpike, but they are allowed to, so....

**Mr. Regula:** Why aren't they?

**Ms. Teeuwen:** Because they don't want them paying the toll.

**Mr. Regula:** So it is a toll issue, it is not a speed issue.

**Ms. Teeuwen:** Right, exactly, cause Schneider is paying the toll. So is there a way, if we can talk to the trucking industry that we can find out if there is truly going to be a benefit to us, if we increase the speed? I guess I would like to go that route and see.

**Chairman:** I guess my response to that would be is that is if you believe that 65 is the correct speed? We had 70 mile per hour on the interstates previous to the gas crunch. Cars are much safer, trucks are even much safer.

**Mr. Regula:** Absolutely.

**Chairman:** And you know, and to me as I drive a fair amount, you know all the way from Arizona, I was in Tennessee last week, you know everything west of here is basically 70 miles per hour or more. Some states have a differentiation between the cars and the trucks, but many of the states; you know have the same speed limit. I believe that when you look at the safety of vehicles today compared to what it was in the olden days that they can travel at 70 miles an hour, just as safe as they could 20 years ago at 65 miles an hour.

**Ms. Teeuwen:** And I don't disagree with any of that, my concern is you have the trucker going this fast and you have other truckers and other vehicles going this fast.

**Chairman:** That is why we did away with the differentiation of speed, which we had for many years on the Turnpike and I am just suggesting that especially when we look in the three lane areas, you quite often have vehicles passing other vehicles. Everybody does not travel at the same speed. Just as George pointed out there is a differentiation of now of about four or five mile an hour from the cars to the trucks.

**Ms. Teeuwen:** Because of the governors.

**Chairman:** Back to my comment.

**Ms. Teeuwen:** If we don't control the governors, those trucks will always go that speed no matter what. We are going to have that differentiation no matter what we make the speed limit.

**Chairman:** And if you have a hill, you have differentiation. When you are going up a big grade and you are going 65 or 70 miles an hour you come on a truck going up a big grade very quickly.

**Ms. Teeuwen:** And I bet you we have more accidents in those areas than we do on straight flat sections.

**Chairman:** We have one best roads from an elevation standpoint, it is relative flat; our grades are very gentle compared to any other type of road around. We've got three lanes for a large portion of it, you know if, it goes back to my comment it doesn't make sense to me that a car and a truck can go 55 miles an hour on that section of Route 2, which is only one lane in each direction with no median, no ability to pass or anything and say that they can go 55 there and you can only go 65 on the Turnpike. There's, it's a much more inherently dangerous situation going 55 over there than it is 65 or 75 on the Turnpike. I mean you know there is a trade off, I mean there's lives that are involved when there's accidents, I certainly acknowledge that, but basically it's a trade off. You know, you got to weigh the safety verses the convenience, does it bring vehicles from the other roads? You know, do we have more traffic on it? Is it a safer road? I rather, if we can attract one person of off 2 and onto the Turnpike, then we have probably accomplished something, because we have taken them of off a very dangerous road and put them on a much safer road. You know if you look back at our fatalities over the last few years, I can think of a couple, a person walking across the road got hit by a car or truck, that was drunk, it wouldn't matter if the truck was going 65 or 70. The triple that didn't stop and just plowed into the back of the people, if that truck was going 65 or 70 wouldn't make any difference, the truck driver fell asleep, he was dazed and just plowed into the car. I don't think speed would have had much effect in most of those accidents. I am a supporter of the 70 mile per hour speed limit.

**Executive Director:** And another thing Bonnie you know, most of our commercial traffic is transit that coming through east, west, west, east. Do we have some intra-Ohio, absolutely, but the majority of the commercial traffic is probably running from Chicago to New York, or New York to Chicago.

**Ms. Teeuwen:** Right.

**Executive Director:** If they are running 70 in Indiana, I don't understand how those governors are exactly set and maybe that is something I need to check. You know and based on what I got last week.

**Ms. Teeuwen:** They are not running 70 in Chicago, they are running 65.

**Executive Director:** I mean through Indiana. Through Indiana they are going 70 so, you know they are adjusting. So if the governors are set at 65 for fuel savings and we are already seeing that they are running 68 on average, obviously there is going to be some way above and some way below.

**Ms. Teeuwen:** On average is the owner-operators, they don't have their vehicles governed.

**Executive Director:** Right, time is money.

**Ms. Teeuwen:** Right, it is the company trucks that are governed.

**Executive Director:** I don't know if we can survey our trucking companies, to see if they are governed or not. I imagine we might be able to pick-up some information, but again.

**Mr. Regula:** We could go through a real long process on this, or we can just take the initiative and put it on, some of us actually were in agreement on 75. I grew up in the 70's and it was 75 miles per hour speed limits.

**Executive Director:** Tom what is the political out fall, you are the Chairman of Transportation I mean, I just wonder, again it's food for thought.

**Senator Patton:** I think 70 is a much more palatable, than jumping from 65 to 75, but I grew up as David did in the 70's and I always thought that rolling it back to 55 was just a backwards step in transportation in general. But, I also think that through the course of doing studies there will always be, you know, people you're wasting more fuel, so you got the greenies out there saying that the fuel consumption is greater and you're using more verses safety. My own personal recommendation is to be like a surgical, you know put it in and get it done, and just for the sake of having people read about it in the paper when there's not six inches of snow on the ground because you know whenever it does get published that'll be the day we get bombarded with snow, and they will say, "How can these knuckleheads raise the speed limit in the middle of a snowstorm", so that's why I think the suggestion, although I am sensitive to the Chairman's thought that it will be operating next year.

**Chairman:** Next year there is going to be snow.

**Senator Patton:** Next year there is going to be snow, but it's all a question of when they hear the message. You know if they hear the message in April or May when the leaves are

starting to bloom back on the trees, you know I again, am the non-voting member of the Commission, so I can sit back here.

**Executive Director:** You are the link to Columbus.

**Senator Patton:** Huh.

**Executive Director:** You are the link to Columbus.

**Mr. Regula:** You make a very good point because the picture of it you are getting a snowstorm and somebody taking a picture of the new speed limit going up, it is bad P.R., let's face it.

**Chief Engineer:** Mr. Chairman, if I may, back when we had the Northern Ohio Freight Study, back in 2004, when we raised the speed limit, right after Labor Day the way the media reported on the accidents was they took four months of accident numbers after the speed limit increase, which took us through the winter and the winter weather and compared it to prior. So that was the initial numbers that were reported.

**Commission Member Dixon left the meeting at 11:35 a.m.**

**Chairman:** Papers can always, they'll figure it out the best way, so that they can have controversy. What I heard from the Senator was a comment that a surgical strike was the terminology that you used, which says to me at least if you think it's what you want to do, just ought to go ahead and do it.

**Senator Patton:** In lieu of having a study.

**Chairman:** I also heard the comment about the wintertime and as Dan points out if they use the four months before and the next four months for their eight month study; if our four months in the winter we are going to have a lot more accidents, you know, so maybe then we yield to the April 1<sup>st</sup>, you know, timeline.

**Senator Patton:** Avoid St. Patrick's Day completely, because you know there is going to be a lot Irish on the road on St. Patrick's Day and you know you don't want that on anybody record.

**Chairman:** But, I still think if we're going to do it I think the December meeting is the time to do it, but I'll.

**Mr. Kidston:** It is a much more sensitive issue out in the West, there's not doubt about it for two reasons. One is we only have one main highway it's the Turnpike. We don't have a 275. You've got all kinds of highways around here, alright. You either got to go on a two lane road out there, or you have to go on the Turnpike. The second issue is we are close to Indiana and we are close to Michigan and I can tell you right now if you are not driving 80 mile an hour you better be in the right hand lane in Michigan because that's the way they do it, okay. So I'm not, I

don't want to encourage accidents by any stretch of the imagination, but I think we are going to lower the total accident count if we take in the Route 20's, the Route 6's, the Route 2's, the Route 24's if we can get truck traffic encouraged to get on this Turnpike, I think we should do it and I'll stand by that.

**Chairman:** One last comment, you started to make the discussion about when we increase the speed limit which I think was in September right after Labor Day.

**Chief Engineer:** Yes.

**Chairman:** And then we, they compared like June, July, August, September or May, June, July, August statistics to October, November, December, and January, so ours were skewed with the higher speed limit. But the other issue was we had a I want to say a 10% or 6% increase in revenue from commercial traffic.

**Chief Engineer:** If I remember it right Mr. Chairman, when the speed limit was increased in September that brought approximately 12 to 13% more commercial vehicles to the Turnpike. Then in January when we reduced the tolls that brought an additional 7 to 8%. So we actually, Senator Patton you remember you were here, the only other thing was when the three components of the freight study were discussed at the time, increasing the speed limit, lowering the tolls, and increasing the weight enforcement there was quite a bit of deliberation and input from also the Department of Public Safety about increasing the speed limit.

**General Counsel:** Oh yeah.

**Chief Engineer:** I would expect they are going to weigh in on this.

**General Counsel:** They are going to oppose it, they opposed it last time, so just be prepared.

**Mr. Regula:** But they also said our accident counts were going to come up, the same type of things as you got through the legislature, we are going to be killing people left and right, and none of it ever happened. The Highway Patrol said the say thing, it never happened.

**Senator Patton:** You know the other counter to the public safety argument is the fact that you hire the Highway Patrol. You pay an annual, was it \$11 or \$12 million.

**Chief Engineer:** \$12 million dollars now.

**Senator Patton:** \$12 million dollars a year and maybe it is in statute in the constitution, but I know that the one department that continues to grow, I say this not in a mean-spirited way, but you know we have the second largest highway patrol in the United States of America. Only California has a larger highway patrol than Ohio does, and so I would hope that the Public Safety folks would realize that, you know, you can almost hire your own, for \$12 million dollars a year you can have your own Turnpike police department. That's a big chunk of change for, obviously I am not suggesting that we go that route, but I think Public Safety and

again I think with the administration change, you don't know who the new head of Public Safety is going to be, you know, but they will undoubtedly take that position, they always do.

**Chairman:** Candidly that is one of the reasons why I think that December is a good time to do it.

**Senator Patton:** Yeah, because if you get into January, then you have the changeover in people.

**Chairman:** The political pressures would come into play potentially at that time, because they don't want to be perceived, I think, with the changing of the guard, that the December meeting is the appropriate time to do it if we are going to do it.

**Senator Patton:** Short of the Governor saying he wishes he would have had some input, the Governor Elect, saying he wishes he would have had input and I don't know that he would say that, I don't know him well enough to suggest what he might say, but something as such as a serious decision as that, you know, I am just saying if you are looking at every angle, the four month look back, your looking at what the Public Safety is going to say, you are looking at do we do it in December or January rather than wait until April, you also have to take a look at if the executive might come back and issue a statement criticizing this body for acting, you know without giving him the benefit of having his representatives from OBM and ODOT per se, they will be here to weigh in on it. I personally think 70 miles per hour is a good idea, I personally think that December is a good time to do it, and personally think April is a good time to implement it, you know, that gives everybody the excuse for that would be that we are going to make it 70 and we need time to get the signage, we need time to be up-to-date and let people know, and having said all that you just got to throw that out that there is a potential, you don't want to give anybody else the excuse to think about leasing the Turnpike, which I have not heard that come out of this campaign, but on the other hand you did hear that there is no sacred cows, and so for what that is worth.

**Chairman:** Okay, what are we doing?

**Mr. Kidston:** I want to see a resolution.

**Executive Director:** It will be on your agenda.

**Mr. Kidston:** Implemented April 1<sup>st</sup>. Vote next meeting.

**Executive Director:** 70 uniform.

**Mr. Regula:** I move to adjourn.

**Chairman:** Is there a motion to adjourn?

**Mr. Kidston:** So moved.



**Chairman:** Call the roll.

**Executive Director:** Who second?

**Chairman:** Ed.

**Executive Director:** Ed, I am sorry I did not catch that, alright Chairman Balog.

**Mr. Balog:** Yes

**Assistant Secretary-Treasurer:** Mr. Regula

**Mr. Regula:** Yes

**Assistant Secretary-Treasurer:** Mr. Dixon is not here. Mr. Kidston

**Mr. Kidston:** Yes

**Assistant Secretary-Treasurer:** Ms. Teeuwen

**Ms. Teeuwen:** Yes

Time of adjournment is 11:43 a.m.

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

---

George F. Dixon, Secretary-Treasurer