

MINUTES OF FORTY FOURTH MEETING
JULY 1 and 2, 1952

Pursuant to adjournment the Ohio Turnpike Commission convened in regular open session in Hearing Room No. 4, State Office Building, Columbus, Ohio, at 10:30 a.m. on July 1, 1952 for its 44th meeting with its General Counsel, Bond Counsel, Consulting Engineers, representatives of the press, and others also in attendance.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman and the roll was called and the attendance was reported to be as follows:

Present: Allen, Teagarden, Shocknessy, McKay, Kauer

Absent: None

The Chairman announced that a quorum was present and stated that the meeting would be held in two sessions because the business of the Commission would extend over a two day period.

Mr. Dunbar reported that pursuant to the resolution adopted by the Commission at its last meeting authorizing the preparation of specifications for the printing of temporary bonds and the publication of notices in newspapers of general circulation in the cities of Columbus and New York, notices were duly published on the 17th and 24th days of June in the Columbus Citizen, a newspaper of general circulation in Columbus, Ohio, and the Wall Street Journal, a newspaper of general circulation in New York City. He handed evidence of those publications to the Secretary. Mr. Dunbar stated that bids had been opened in the office of Mr. Kauer at 10:00 a.m. on July 1, 1952 and that documents had been received from printing companies as follows:

a. A letter from the Columbian Bank Note Company as follows:

"Ohio Turnpike Commission
Room 907 State Office Building
Columbus, Ohio

June 30, 1952

Re: Bid for preparation of Temporary Ohio Turnpike
Revenue Bonds - Project No. 1

Gentlemen:

We have carefully reviewed the specifications governing the submission of bids on Tuesday, July 1, 1952 at 10:00 A.M. We fully intended to submit a proposal on the presumption that actual printing order would be released at some future date when the Supreme Court of Ohio issues writ of mandamus requiring attestation of the bonds by the Secretary of the Commission.

However, we now understand from several officials and counsel, that the printing is to begin immediately after the successful bidder is determined on July 1. We further understand that if award is made by 11:00 A.M. on July 1, the initial delivery of 26,000 bonds will be required by 5:00 P.M.

Thursday, July 3, or with the initial delivery deferred until 11:00 A. M. Monday, July 7 in the event contract is awarded later in the day on July 1.

Our commitments for the first two weeks of July are such that it would be physically impossible for us to deliver your Temporary Bonds in the very limited time allowed.

We regret, therefore, we are unable to submit a quotation, but we do appreciate the opportunity afforded. When the Definitive Coupon Bonds are being considered, we will be happy to submit a proposal as we know we will be able to effect delivery in ample time, and at costs that we are sure will be attractive to the Commission.

Yours very truly,

C. P. Conley
President"

b. A letter from the American Bank Note Company is as follows:

"Ohio Turnpike Commission
Room 907
State Office Building
Columbus, Ohio

June 27, 1952

Re: Temporary Turnpike Revenue Bonds

Gentlemen:

We acknowledge receipt of the copy of your Bid Papers dated June 17th, covering the preparation of the above bonds, which our representative in Ohio obtained from Mr. Frank Dunbar, Jr., on June 24th.

After careful study of the terms and conditions of bidding, we regret that we must ask to be excused from submitting a bid. In view of the stipulation that your obligations to pay for the bonds shall depend upon the outcome of the pending litigation, which will presumably not be determined until after delivery of the bonds by the successful bidder, we do not feel that we can incur the costs incident to preparing the bonds and run the risk of sustaining this loss.

We are sorry that this is so, for we would otherwise be very happy to place our facilities at your disposal and to serve you in every way within our power. We sincerely hope that, when you are ready to proceed with the definitive bonds, we may be privileged to render the same high quality of service to you that we have furnished to others in the past.

Very truly yours,

AMERICAN BANK NOTE COMPANY

James K. Kerr (sgd)
Manager of Domestic Sales"

c. A bid from Security Bank Note Company of Philadelphia in the form prescribed by the Commission setting forth a price of \$.054 per bond.

Mr. Dunbar stated that the bid of Security Bank Note Company appeared to be in all respects in compliance with the terms and conditions and specifications prescribed by the Commission; that it was accompanied by a non-interest affidavit; that there had been submitted a certified check of the Cleveland Trust Company in the sum of \$5000 and that there was also tendered a performance bond in the sum of \$9000. He stated that the documents appeared to be satisfactory from a legal standpoint and were accompanied by a proper power of attorney.

Mr. Henry Crawford stated that on the basis of price bid and the confidence of Bond Counsel in the ability of the bidder to perform that he would definitely recommend the proposal of Security Bank Note Company. Mr. Fogg, a representative of Security Bank Note Company who was present in the room, stated that he was certain of the ability of his firm to perform the work in accordance with the specifications.

A motion was made by Mr. McKay, seconded by Mr. Teagarden, that the following resolution (No. 36 - 1952) be adopted:

"WHEREAS, the Ohio Turnpike Commission (herein called the Commission) advertised for bids to furnish temporary bonds in connection with the issue and sale of \$326,000,000 principal amount of Ohio Turnpike Revenue Bonds, Project No. 1, and

WHEREAS, said advertisement has been duly published for not less than two consecutive weeks in a newspaper of general circulation in Franklin County, Ohio, namely, the Columbus Citizen, and the Wall Street Journal, a newspaper published in the City of New York (as appearing from evidence filed with the Commission), and

WHEREAS, the notice so published stated the general character of the bonds to be furnished and the place where the terms and conditions and specifications therefor might be examined and the time and place of receiving bids, namely, 10:00 o'clock a.m., Eastern Standard Time, on July 1, 1952, at the office of T. J. Kauer, Director of Highways of the State of Ohio and ex officio member of the Commission, Room 907, State Office Building, Columbus, Ohio, and

WHEREAS, the terms and conditions and specifications for temporary bonds and form of bid and form of legal notice in the form attached to this resolution and marked Exhibit B, were on file with and available at the aforesaid office of T. J. Kauer, Director of Highways of the State of Ohio, and ex officio member of the Commission, and on June 20, 1952, forms of bonds and coupons with changes from those on file with the terms and conditions of bidding but substantially the same as those so on file, were filed at the office of said T. J. Kauer, and were then and thereafter available to bidders, all as provided in the specifications, and

WHEREAS, said terms and conditions and specifications were prepared with the view of obtaining the maximum of security consistent with receiving the necessary supply of temporary bonds in the shortest possible time, and

the security requirements being predicated on the requirements developed through many years experience by the New York Stock Exchange and generally recognized as proper security requirements for the protection of issuers and purchasers of temporary bonds, and

WHEREAS, two of the large bank note companies, namely, The American Bank Note Company and Columbian Bank Note Company, have respectively informed the Commission that (1) in the case of Columbian Bank Note Company its plant was not available for printing a job of this size before the middle of July and (2) in the case of American Bank Note Company it was not prepared to bid because its payment would be dependent upon the results of the pending litigation in the Supreme Court of Ohio and the sale and delivery of the bonds, and

WHEREAS, Security Bank Note Company has, on the basis of the aforesaid terms, conditions and specifications, in due time furnished to the Commission its bid on the prescribed form, which bid has been publicly opened and read and is the only bid that has been received by the Commission, which bid is for \$.054 per bond, and

WHEREAS, the Commission has examined said bid and has received the advice of counsel to the effect that said bid conforms to the requirements of Section 1203 of the General Code of Ohio and conforms to the terms and conditions and specifications and legal notice applicable thereto, and that by the terms of the statute the Commission is authorized to accept said bid as the lowest and best bid, and

WHEREAS, it appears to the Commission that said bid represents a fair charge for furnishing such bonds on the delivery schedule required by the Commission and with the security requirements of the terms and conditions and specifications, and that said low bidder is fully qualified to furnish such bonds and to perform the obligations of the contract to be entered into pursuant to the terms and conditions aforesaid, and

WHEREAS, said low bidder has submitted to the Commission a performance bond with good and sufficient surety, in an amount equal to at least 50% of the contract price, conditioned upon the faithful performance of the contract, on which a recognized surety company is surety, and is prepared to enter into the contract constituting a part of the terms and conditions,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Ohio Turnpike Commission that:

Section 1. The forms of temporary bonds which bear the labels "Exhibit 5" and "Exhibit 7", respectively, and which have been presented to this meeting, and which have heretofore been submitted to the individual members of the Commission and informally approved by them, are hereby approved.

Section 2. The bid of Security Bank Note Company of \$.054 per bond for furnishing of temporary bonds in accordance with the legal notice published as aforesaid and the terms and conditions and specifications aforesaid, be and it is hereby determined to be the lowest and best bid and is accepted and the performance bond submitted by said bidder is

approved, and the Chairman of the Commission is authorized and directed to execute a contract with said bidder in the form provided by the terms and conditions aforesaid, and upon such contract being entered into the Secretary-Treasurer of the Commission is directed to return to said bidder its check for \$5,000, and said officers are authorized and directed to take any and all action necessary or proper to carry out the terms of said contract for the furnishing of temporary bonds.

Section 3. The officers of the Commission are directed to inform the successful bidder that the maximum number of temporary bonds is 250,000 coupon bonds and 1,000 registered bonds, and that such successful bidder is authorized to print up to such maximum number of bonds and deliver the same to The Signature Company except as said number of bonds is from time to time revised within the terms and conditions and specifications of bidding by sufficient notice to the successful bidder, which notice may be given by the Commission's bond counsel or general counsel."

A vote by ayes and nays was taken and all members present responded to roll call. The vote was as follows:

Ayes, Allen, Teagarden, Shocknessy, McKay, Kauer
Nays, None

The Chairman declared the motion adopted and advised Mr. Fogg that as of 10:57 a.m., Eastern Standard Time, the proposal of Security Bank Note Company had been accepted.

The Chairman announced that the litigants at Maumee had presented a petition to the Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States for a writ of certiorari based upon the denial by the Supreme Court of Ohio of their motion to intervene in the Allen case. He stated that he had learned of the new action from the newspapers.

The Chairman reported that he had received a letter from Mr. Robert Dow Hamilton, a lawyer of Columbus, in which Mr. Hamilton presented arguments favoring the use of flexible pavement for the Ohio Turnpike. The Chairman discussed in detail with Mr. Hamilton who was present in the room the content of the letter and the activities of Mr. Hamilton and those whom he purported to represent in behalf of the use of flexible pavement by the Ohio Turnpike Commission. The Chairman stated that he would not talk to the producers of construction materials or to their representatives except in public or in the presence of other members of the Commission. In the absence of objection the letter from Mr. Hamilton was referred to J. E. Greiner Company for study and for the preparation of a reply.

Mr. John Goshorn, Ohio representative of the Asphalt Institute who was present at the meeting, advised the Commission concerning a letter which had been sent by Mr. Bernard E. Gray of the Asphalt Institute to Mr. H. H. Allen of J. E. Greiner Company. Mr. Donnelly stated that he would furnish copies of the letter from Mr. Gray for the several members of the Commission.

Mr. Kauer submitted to the Commission the proposed specifications for the

services to be performed by contracting engineers and explained to the Commission the important provisions of the specifications relating to surveys and design and supervision of the construction of the turnpike project. He submitted separate proposed specifications pertaining specifically to the major structures on the project. The specifications were taken under consideration by the Commission.

Mr. Kauer then presented a proposed basic schedule of fees for the services to be performed by contracting engineers and reviewed for the Commission the extended studies which had been carried out by the General Consultant and by Mr. Kauer himself in developing a formula for such fees. He recommended the adoption of the basic fee schedule. Mr. McKay stated his opinion that further consideration should be given to the fee schedule prior to its adoption by the Commission. The proposed fee schedule was received and taken under consideration.

Mr. Donnelly then reported concerning the procedure followed by J. E. Greiner Company leading to its recommendation to the Commission as to consulting engineering firms to be designated as contracting engineers for the project. He stated that J. E. Greiner Company had interviewed all engineering consultants who had indicated during the past two years any interest in furnishing engineering services for the turnpike project; that the General Consultant had weighed three principal factors in making its studies and recommendations. These factors were adequacy of qualified personnel for assignment to the Ohio project. He pointed out that several consulting engineering firms were not recommended but that it was not to be implied that such firms lacked full qualifications to perform engineering services to the Commission. At the request of the Chairman he then made a specific recommendation as to the assignment of a contracting engineering firm to each design section of Ohio Turnpike Project No. 1 and presented to the Commission for interview representatives of each of the selected firms.

The Chairman inquired of each representative of an engineering firm presented to the Commission as to whether the firm was willing to proceed with the work at once without assurance of reimbursement and with the understanding that payment for services would be only from revenues of the Commission. All answered in the affirmative except the representative of Frederick R. Harris Associates who was unwilling to proceed. The Chairman inquired of each representative as to whether he would use Ohio personnel, services and materials to the maximum practicable extent with the understanding that the Commission would never attempt to dictate to a contracting engineer whom it should employ or what materials it should use. All representatives of engineering firms responded in the affirmative. The Chairman asked the representatives of each engineering firm whether his firm had employed any person outside its regular organization to assist in obtaining business with the Commission. Each replied in the negative.

Representatives of the following engineering consultants were presented to and were interviewed by the Commission:

Richardson, Morehouse, Ramsey & Fisher, a general partnership,
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Ammann and Whitney, a general partnership, New York City
Howard, Needles, Tammen & Bergendoff, a general partnership, Kansas
City and New York
Hazelet & Erdal, a general partnership, Cincinnati, Ohio
Knappen, Tippetts, Abbett & McCarthy, a general partnership, New York
Charles E. DeLeuw, an individual, Chicago, Illinois
Hardesty & Hanover, a general partnership, and Andrews, Clark and
Buckley, a general partnership, comprising a joint venture,
New York
Balke and Watkins, a general partnership, Cincinnati, Ohio
Brown and Blauvelt, a general partnership, New York City
Leonard C. Urquhart, an individual, and O. J. Porter and Com-
pany, a general partnership, comprising a joint venture, Newark,
New Jersey
Sanzenbacher, Morris and Taylor, a general partnership, and Brookhart
& Tyo, a general partnership, comprising a joint venture,
Toledo, Ohio
Alden E. Stilson & Associates, Limited, a partnership association,
Columbus, Ohio
Vogt, Ivers, Seaman & Associates, a general partnership, Cincinnati, Ohio
General Industries Engineering Company, a general partnership, Philadelphia,
Pennsylvania
Consoer-Townsend & Associates, a general partnership, Chicago, Illinois

Mr. Quirin, representative of Frederick R. Harris Associates stated that a proposal he would submit to the Commission would contain qualifying reservations with respect to the time of completion of contract plans and with respect to the willingness of the firm to proceed with the work at once without assurance of reimbursement. It was the consensus of the Commission that a qualified proposal of Frederick R. Harris Associates would not be acceptable.

Mr. Kauer recommended that J. E. Greiner Company be designated to design and supervise the construction for the major structures over the Cuyahoga River and the Maumee River, because the preliminary engineering work on these structures was more extensive than on other structures in the project and because J. E. Greiner Company would be able to perform this work at a lesser fee and more expeditiously than would be possible by another firm since a new firm must necessarily duplicate the preliminary design already accomplished by J. E. Greiner Company. Mr. Donnelly recommended his firm for the design of the two river crossings and stated in response to a question from Mr. Teagarden that it is the usual practice for a General Consultant to participate in design and construction functions of a project.

The first session of the 44th meeting was recessed by the Chairman at 4:00 p.m. until 9:30 a.m. the next morning. At 9:30 a.m. on July 2, 1952 the meeting, after the recess, was called to order by the Chairman and the roll was called and the attendance was reported to be as follows:

Present: Teagarden, Shocknessy, McKay, Kauer, Allen

Absent: None

The Chairman announced that a quorum was present.

The Chairman stated that Mr. Crawford and his associates had worked intensively on the matter of the petition which is proposed to be filed by the Maumee litigants in the Supreme Court of the United States and that it was his belief that the employment of Squire, Sanders & Dempsey in the Green case and in the Balduf case was adequate to permit that firm to take whatever action may be necessary wherever any proceeding in those two cases might occur. Mr. Crawford advised the Commission that he would report progress and developments and would recommend to the Chairman, if the occasion should arise, that the Commission convene if any action of the Commission may be necessary.

The Chairman inquired of Mr. Donnelly whether or not J. E. Greiner Company in seeking employment by the Ohio Turnpike Commission employed anyone other than its own usual representative. Mr. Donnelly answered in the negative and stated that an affidavit to that effect had been executed and would be submitted to the Commission.

The Chairman reported the receipt of a letter from Mr. Win S. Miller, Vice President of Capitol Engineering Corporation, in which a complaint was uttered because that firm was not being recommended to the Commission for the design of a section of the turnpike. He also advised the Commission of a telegram received from Western Reserve Engineering Company of Cleveland and of a telephone call in behalf of William H. McFarland of Binghamton, New York uttering the same complaint. The Secretary was instructed to advise all engineering consultants who had not been recommended for designation as contracting engineer that the Commission was not able to avail itself of the services of all who wished to perform such services.

The Secretary-Treasurer reported that the following documents had been filed with him and that a copy of each had been or would forthwith be placed in the hands of each member of the Commission for his information and consideration:

1. Letter of the Director of Highways to the Commission dated June 30, 1952 pertaining to the design of two major structures by J. E. Greiner Company
2. Memorandum from J. E. Greiner Company with respect to the employment of contracting engineers dated May 16, 1952
3. Report by Mr. Kauer for the committee appointed to meet with representatives of the City of Elyria dated June 30, 1952.
4. Report of the committee to study a plan of organization dated June 30, 1952
5. Progress report of the committee to secure office space
6. Report of the committee to select an appraisal consultant

The report of the Secretary-Treasurer was received and the Chairman stated

that the Commission would expect to take action upon all of the committee reports not later than the next meeting.

A motion was made by Mr. Kauer, seconded by Mr. McKay, that the following resolution (No. 37 - 1952) be adopted:

"WHEREAS the committee on contract engineers has rendered its report approving the specifications for design and other engineering services for those portions of Ohio Turnpike Project No. 1 other than major bridges, and also approving the specifications for design and other engineering services for the design sections which are composed of major bridges, which have been prepared and recommended by the Commission's Consulting Engineers under date of June 15, 1952, and is satisfied that the same should be approved and adopted, as submitted to this meeting;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the said specifications be, and hereby they are, approved and adopted."

A vote by ayes and nays was taken and all members present responded to roll call. The vote was as follows:

Ayes, Teagarden, Allen, Kauer, McKay, Shocknessy

Nays, None

The Chairman declared the motion adopted.

Mr. Donnelly recommended that the firm of Howard, Needles, Tammen & Bergendoff be designated as contracting engineer for design section #D-3 for which a qualified proposal had previously been received from Frederick R. Harris Associates. He stated that Howard, Needles, Tammen & Bergendoff had agreed to present a proposal which would meet the schedule established for that design section.

A motion was made by Mr. Kauer, seconded by Mr. Allen, that the following resolution (No. 38-1952) be adopted:

"RESOLVED that the basic schedules of fees for contracting engineers services which have been prepared and recommended by the Commission's Consulting Engineers under date of May 16, 1952 be and hereby they are approved and adopted.

Mr. McKay objected to the procedure of the Commission and stated that adequate consideration had not been given to the recommended schedules of fees. He compared the recommended basic fees with the fees established by American Society of Civil Engineers for heavy construction. He pointed out that it was possible that the recommendations of the Consulting Engineers would be proven to be correct but that it was his opinion that the evidence was insufficient to support the recommendations of the Consulting Engineers. Mr. Allen stated he had knowledge of the recommended schedules of fees on May 16, 1952 and that he had in the interim checked the schedules with competent authority and had satisfied himself that the fees were fair and correct. Mr. Kauer stated that

he had spent two months in analysis of engineering fees and had compared the proposed fees with those established by the Ohio Society of Professional Engineers. Mr. Kauer stated his opinion that the proposed fees were uniformly fair. Mr. Teagarden stated that he had been aware of the proposed schedules of fees since May 14, 1952. A vote by ayes and nays was taken and all members present responded to roll call and voted aye except Mr. McKay who voted nay. The vote was as follows:

Ayes, Teagarden, Kauer, Allen, Shocknessy.

Nays, McKay

The Chairman declared the motion adopted.

A motion was made by Mr. Kauer, seconded by Mr. McKay, that the following resolution (No. 39-1952) be adopted:

RESOLVED that the Chairman is authorized and directed to enter into contracts on behalf of the Commission with the following engineers to perform engineering services with respect to the design sections designated, and at the rates of fees set forth opposite their respective names, to wit:

NAME	DESIGN SECTION NUMBER	DESIGN PHASE FEE	CONSTRUCTION PHASE FEE
Richardson, Morehouse, Ramsey & Fisher, a general partnership	D-1	3.9%	3.2%
Ammann and Whitney, a general partnership	D-2	4.0%	3.2%
Howard, Needles, Tammen & Bergendoff, a general partnership	D-3	3.7%	3.1%
Howard, Needles, Tammen & Bergendoff, a general partnership	D-4	3.6%	3.0%
J. E. Greiner Company, a general partnership	D-5	3.5%	2.0%
Hazelet & Erdal, a general partnership	D-6	3.3%	2.7%
Knappen, Tippetts, Abbett & McCarthy, a general partnership	D-7	3.6%	2.9%
Charles E. DeLeuw, an individual	D-8	3.6%	3.0%
Hardesty & Hanover, a general partnership, and Andrews, Clark and Buckley, a general partnership, comprising a joint venture	D-9	4.3%	3.4%
Hardesty & Hanover, a general partnership, and Andrews, Clark and Buckley, a general partnership, comprising a joint venture.	D-10	4.0%	3.0%

NAME	DESIGN SECTION NUMBER	DESIGN PHASE FEE	CONSTRUCTION PHASE FEE
Balke and Watkins, a general partnership	D-11	4.0%	3.2%
Brown and Blauvelt, a general partnership	D-12	4.3%	3.3%
Hardesty & Hanover, a general partnership, and Andrews, Clark and Buckley, a general partnership, comprising a joint venture	D-13	4.0%	3.0%
Leonard C. Urquhart, an individual, and O. J. Porter and Company, a general partnership, comprising a joint venture	D-14	3.9%	3.2%
Sanzenbacher, Morris and Taylor, a general partnership, and Brookhart & Tyo, a general partnership, comprising a joint venture	D-15	3.3%	2.8%
J. E. Greiner Company, a general partnership	D-16	3.5%	2.0%
Alden E. Stilson & Associates Limited, a partnership association	D-17	3.5%	3.0%
Vogt, Ivers, Seaman & Associates, a general partnership	D-18	4.5%	3.4%
General Industries Engineering Company, a general partnership	D-19	4.5%	3.5%
Consoer-Townsend & Associates, a general partnership	D-20	4.1%	3.3%

FURTHER RESOLVED that said contracts shall be in the forms and contain the terms and provisions as presented to the Commission at this meeting; provided, however, that the Chairman is authorized to modify the provisions of paragraph 3 of each or any of said forms of contract, which relates to "Time of Performance", if he shall be advised by the Commission's Consulting Engineers that such modification will not result in any delay in the taking of bids for construction work or in the commencement or completion of construction work.

FURTHER RESOLVED that the Chairman is authorized, on behalf of the Commission, either to modify paragraph 22 of any of said contracts before they are entered into, or to contract for a modification of paragraph 22 of any of them after they are entered into; and that any such modification shall be in any form which is satisfactory to the Chairman, in his discretion. "

A vote by ayes and nays was taken and all members present responded to roll call. The vote was as follows:

Ayes, Teagarden, Kauer, Allen, McKay, Shocknessy

Nays, None

The Chairman declared the motion adopted and stated that the contracts would be executed in accordance with the terms as soon as practicable.

Mr. Kauer reported that a final invoice in the amount of \$10,000.00 had been received from Parsons, Brinckerhoff, Hall and Macdonald for services performed in the preparation of a traffic report and that the invoice had been processed through the Auditor of State and that the check in payment thereof was ready for delivery.

The Chairman announced that Mr. McKay had been relieved from assignment to the committee to select an appraisal consultant at the request of Mr. McKay and he appointed Mr. Allen to the committee and named Mr. Teagarden as chairman of the committee.

A motion was made by Mr. Teagarden, seconded by Mr. McKay, that the following resolution (No. 40 - 1952) be adopted:

"RESOLVED that the Chairman of the Commission be, and he hereby is, authorized, in his discretion, to employ the Columbus Real Estate Board or any qualified real-estate appraiser to do whatever is necessary and to furnish any professional appraisal advice which he may deem to be desirable and useful to the Commission in connection with the securing of offices for the Commission."

A vote by ayes and nays was taken and all members present responded to roll call. The vote was as follows:

Ayes, Allen, Teagarden, McKay, Kauer, Shocknessy

Nays, None

The Chairman declared the motion adopted.

A motion was made by Mr. McKay, seconded by Mr. Teagarden, that the following resolution (No. 41 - 1952) be adopted:

"RESOLVED that the Chairman of the Commission be, and he hereby is, authorized, in his discretion, to employ an architect or firm of architects to make, in consultation with the Commission's Consulting Engineers, any plans, cost estimates, and reports which the Chairman may require with respect to any proposed offices."

A vote by ayes and nays was taken and all members present responded to roll call.

The vote was as follows:

Ayes, Allen, Teagarden, McKay, Kauer, Shocknessy

Nays, None

The Chairman declared the motion adopted.


There being no further business to come before the meeting a motion was made by Mr. Allen, seconded by Mr. Teagarden, that the meeting adjourn subject to call of the Chairman. A vote by ayes and nays was taken and all members present responded to roll call. The vote was as follows:

Ayes, Allen, Teagarden, McKay, Kauer, Shocknessy

Nays, None

The Chairman declared the meeting adjourned. The time of adjournment was 11:15 o'clock a.m.

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



A. J. Allen
Secretary-Treasurer