

MINUTES OF THE ONE HUNDRED SECOND MEETING  
NOVEMBER 22, 1955

Pursuant to bylaws, the Ohio Turnpike Commission met in special session in its offices at 139 East Gay Street in Columbus, Ohio at 11:10 A. M., on November 22, 1955 with the key members of its staff, representatives of the Consulting Engineer, of the trustee, members of the press, and others in attendance.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman who remarked that the meeting had been called as a special meeting, albeit it was the only meeting so far in that month. He said further that the regular meeting had been cancelled rather than postponed because at the time that it had been cancelled there had been no way to determine which date would be the best for holding a monthly meeting of the Commission and accordingly, the regular meeting had been cancelled and the meeting called as a special meeting.

The roll was called, and the attendance was reported to be as follows:

Present: Allen, Beightler, Teagarden, Linzell, Shocknessy.

Absent: None.

The Chairman announced that a quorum was present.

A motion was made by Mr. Allen, seconded by Mr. Teagarden, that the minutes for the meeting of October 18, 1955 which had been examined by the members of the Commission and on which the corrections suggested by the members had been made be approved without reading.

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

Ayes: Allen, Teagarden, Beightler, Linzell, Shocknessy.

Nays: None.

The Chairman declared the motion carried.

The Chairman reported that he would like first to advert to a letter that he had addressed to the Governor of Ohio under date

of November 10, 1955 and which had been released to the press and television and radio at the time it had been delivered to the Governor and to the members. He said further that the report had been offered to the Governor and with copies to the members as a statement of the business of the Ohio Turnpike as a going concern during the first month of its 241-mile operation. He said also that the letter had adverted to the income which the Commission had derived during the month's operation and to the several sources of the Commission's income, and also had suggested that any comparison between the operating statement for the month of October 1955, and 1/12 of an estimate made on an annual basis would not be anything better than a mere speculation because in order to offer a valid comparison with an estimate which had been made on an annual basis, the Commission would have to have an annual experience. The Chairman said that the facility was likely to have its period of greatest use during the first year of its operation, the months of May, June, July, August, September, and so any comparison of October 1955 with 1/12 of an annual estimate was no better than speculative and not worthy of consideration. He said further that the thing that had been of most interest to the Commission in October had been that during the first month of the operation of the Ohio Turnpike it had paid its total expenses, including the interest, fixed charges, and all other expenses, and had showed a profit. The Chairman, commenting on a mention by some writer that no provision had been made in the statement issued by the Chairman under date of November 10, 1955 contemplating the retirement of the Commission's bonds, said that the indenture under which the Commission's bonds had been sold did not provide any specific amount of money which was to be set aside or applied at any time for retirement of bonds. He said further that he believed the provision was that all moneys in addition to those required for the expenses and operation of the turnpike, including its interest, were assignable to the retirement of the bonds.

The Chairman said that he did mention specifically in the statement of November 10 the use of the facility by commercial vehicles. He said further that since the last meeting, and indeed even since the letter of November 10, the Commission's staff has had conferences at the Commission's headquarters with representatives of the trucking industry. He said also that the Commission has had requests made to it to re-examine the tolls charged on the Ohio Turnpike, and that the Executive Director had consulted with an engineering firm as to whether or not in

due course the firm would be available to make an examination of the toll cost, and that that firm was of the opinion that no re-examination of tolls should be made, with which he heartily concurred, until after the Commission had had a somewhat longer experience with the operation of the Ohio Turnpike than it had had that far. The Chairman said also that certainly no re-examination could be made, justifiably, until after the first of 1956. He said further that by the first of the following year the Commission would have had a three-months experience and at that time it could consider whether or not the toll schedule should be re-examined. He said also that the Commission had had some complaint about the inexorableness of the weighing devices. He said that the Commission was in constant communication with the firm that had furnished the weighing equipment and was doing whatever was humanly possible to eliminate any factors which might work a hardship upon the operators of the vehicles which were being weighed.

The Chairman reported that the Commission had been asked by a newspaper man recently whether or not it would be willing to advise the Ohio State Highway Patrol on the state system of the exit from the Ohio Turnpike of vehicles which exceeded in weight the weights permitted by law on the Ohio roads. He said that he had told the man who had inquired that it was the Chairman's opinion that as an agency of the State of Ohio it was unquestionably a duty of the Commission's to cooperate with the state in any respect possible in assuring compliance with its laws with respect to weights on its highways. He said further that no one had asked the Commission formally to make any such arrangement. He said also that the Commission was handling overweight vehicles on the turnpike, for the purposes of the turnpike, in accordance with a definitely defined technique, for the benefit of the turnpike. The Chairman referred to a press release from the New York Thruway Authority with respect to its experience on the 398-mile New York Thruway during the month of October 1955 and said that during the month of October that highway, which had been in partial operation for about 15 months, had collected \$427,056 in commercial tolls as compared with \$269,981 in commercial tolls collected on the Ohio Turnpike during October 1955. He said further that passenger-car tolls on the New York Thruway during the month of October had been \$804,222 and on the Ohio Turnpike had been \$764,132. He said also that the New York Thruway had had 136,225 commercial trips and the Ohio Turnpike had had 101,670. He said also that the New York Thruway had had 1,209,874 passenger cars and the Ohio Turnpike had had 854,982. He said further that the comparison made the Ohio Turnpike look even

better than he had thought it might look by comparison with a facility as long as the New York Thruway and in business as long as that one.

The Chairman reported further that the public had established a speed pattern on the turnpike which was generally satisfactory. He said also that the vehicle operator had generally been a reasonable man or a reasonable woman. He said that Director Felty of the Ohio Department of Public Safety had advised the Commission that additional patrolmen would be made available on the Ohio Turnpike as soon as possible.

The Chairman reported that some statements which he considered nothing less than irresponsible had been made with respect to drainage with respect to the prospective construction of a second turnpike and that certain county engineers had been frightened by statements made by a certain county engineer in Ohio, who should remain nameless. The Chairman said further that because of the fact that that county engineer had been scaring county engineers in counties which the second turnpike would be expected to traverse the Commission had asked the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, Inc., with which it had cooperated throughout the construction of the Ohio Turnpike, to advise it what the experience of the Ohio Farm Bureau had been with respect to drainage, as learned from its members. He said further that the Commission had a letter under date of November 21, 1955 which had been procured particularly for the meeting so that it could be brought to the attention of the members and to the attention of the public and to the attention of those people in the parts of Ohio where the next turnpike would be expected to be routed. The Chairman then read the following letter signed by Mr. D. R. Stanfield, Executive Secretary, the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, Inc., and addressed to the Executive Director of the Commission:

"We commend the Ohio Turnpike Commission for the fine manner in which it has handled the farm drainage problem in connection with the Ohio Turnpike. It is superior to anything which has been done previously.

"We appreciate the fact that the Commission cooperated with farm organizations and the Ohio State University in working on this problem and as a result employed Henry Leubcke, a drainage engineer, who was responsible for seeing that the drainage problems of the farmers were adequately met.

"I understand that Indiana is following much the same plan as has been followed by the Ohio Turnpike Commission with respect to meeting their drainage problems.

"Also, it is significant to note that the American Society of Agricultural Engineers has recently appointed a committee to set up standards in the field of drainage and this activity was stimulated by the work that has been done on the Ohio Turnpike."

The Chairman said that as far as he was concerned the letter laid to rest the irresponsible statements which had been made with respect to the matter of drainage by the Ohio Turnpike Commission and its engineers and contractors in dealing with drainage problems during the period of construction. He said further that Governor Lausche had mentioned in a letter of his recently that in a conference he had been having on the subject of conservation mention had been made of the very satisfactory way in which drainage had been handled on the Ohio Turnpike. The Chairman said that he thought that any other responsible farm organization would uphold the methods that the Commission had followed in assuring the farmers adequate drainage and adequate, careful address to drainage problems during the period of construction.

Mr. Allen said that if there was any way that the Commission could find a way to do a better job on Project No. 2, it would do that. The Chairman agreed.

The Chairman reported further that he had intended to indicate in the letter of November 10 to Governor Lausche that the use of the turnpike in the months after October 1955 might be expected to fall off until those months of greatest use in the spring and summer of 1956. He said further that he did not want anybody to interpret anything he had said in the letter as offering the experience in October for any purpose other than a statement as to the experience in October, and that if the use of the turnpike and the revenue of the turnpike in November should be less than in October, that was to be expected. He said further that the Commission would stand, when the time should come on the 30th of September 1956, justified or not, on the basis of the use and the revenue of the facility during the first year. The Chairman said also that he wanted to emphasize again that no estimate had ever been made upon which the Commission had proceeded, or upon which any financing had been predicated, which had been a monthly estimate. He said further that the sole estimate had been an annual estimate.

The Chairman then addressed himself to the drafts of the reports on prospective Project No. 2 which the Director of Highways recently had made available to the Commission. He said that those

drafts were mere drafts, that they were not the reports which the Director of Highways would accept as compliance with the contracts he had made with the engineering firms, nor were they the reports which would come to the Commission for its action in proceeding with a second project.

The Chairman reviewed the origin of the reports, saying that the drafts were the result of a request made by the Commission to the Director of Highways, pursuant to law, that engineering reports -- construction, traffic and revenue -- be prepared; that they be studies of a prospective second project which would originate in Cincinnati and connect with Toledo as a terminal and Conneaut as a terminal. He said also that the reports were financed from funds by law provided to the Director of Highways and used with the approval of the Controlling Board. He said also that the Director of Highways had entered into contracts with two engineering firms -- the one, the J. E. Greiner Company, and the other, Coverdale & Colpitts, of Baltimore and New York, respectively, and respectively also, for construction and for traffic and revenue. He said that the problem which the State of Ohio had and which the Commission had, as an agency of the State of Ohio, was to fulfill a mission to provide adequate, safe, serviceable, suitable highways -- avenues of transportation of persons and goods within the state. He said that the Governor of Ohio had been of the opinion, when he had suggested to the Commission that it seek to have the Director of Highways have studies made, that a highway as a toll facility might well be constructed connecting the three points that he had mentioned.

The Chairman said further that the Director of Highways had proceeded in accordance with the request made to him and had first procured a preliminary report from each firm, and then had procured the drafts, and had submitted the drafts to the Commission in what might be considered a sensible caution so that, when they were finalized, they would represent views which the members of the Commission and the staff of the Commission would respect. The Chairman said that he was not speaking or pretending to speak for the Commission, that he was stating to the Commission his own views with respect to the reports which had been offered. He said further that he was not indicating any personal criticism of anybody who had had anything to do with the reports, nor any criticism that was not in good faith and that was not intended to be constructive. He said also that he could not say that he was not a bit dismayed by the vast amount of money which would be required to complete the highway as originally contemplated. He said also that there were things in the reports which he wanted to suggest might be re-examined.

The Chairman said further that in the production of an adequate, serviceable highway connecting the points that he had mentioned, he did not consider that the highway produced need be a great monument.

He said also that the Commission was not seeking to build a great monument; it was seeking to build a serviceable, adequate transportation facility for people and for goods. He said also that he did not think that a toll facility was, itself, the answer to all problems of the production of facilities needed by the public, or that the revenue-bond method was the final answer to all problems of the public in developing and producing facilities needed by the public. He said also that he did not believe that a highway as extensive as the one being considered must be designed upon the exact same standards for portions of lesser as well as those of greater use. He said also that he believed that what the Commission was confronted with at that time and what the Director of Highways was confronted with and what the Governor of the State of Ohio was confronted with was the development of a highway by a cooperative effort on the part of the several agencies involved. He said further that adjustments in the reports must be made so that as they would finally evolve from the drafts they would assure an adequate, serviceable highway connecting the originating and terminal points.

The Chairman said further that the Commission was constrained to consider whether or not a portion of the highway might not be toll-free and constructed by the state, and whether or not a portion of the highway might not make use of facilities already provided from the general revenues of the state and not suffer the competition of free roads of comparable standard where such free roads were existent. He said also that the road as contemplated by the drafts would not take advantage of, for instance, the four-lane facility between Columbus and Springfield. He said also that he hoped that the engineers would consider whether or not the facility from Cincinnati to the central Ohio area might not connect rather than compete with that portion of Route 40 which, east of Springfield and west of Columbus, was controlled-access in part and was in a great many respects as good a highway as the Turnpike Commission would be justified in building in certain areas which had been studied. He said that he would like to know, before the drafts were returned to be finalized by the engineers, whether or not it could be considered that the toll facility might have an interchange with Route 40 someplace immediately east of Springfield so that Route 40 would become part of the highway. He said also that he did not think of the highway as a great, continuous toll highway if a great, continuous toll highway was not the best way of providing the transportation facility which the State of Ohio needed. He said further that he was also suggesting that consideration be given to the improvement of Route 42 as a possible connection, or part of a possible connection, from Route 40 to the Ohio Turnpike, having in mind that funds might be available from the United States under the so-called Eisenhower plan to improve Route 42. He said also that perhaps 25 million to 30 million dollars, or even twice those amounts, could be saved by using Route 40, where it was in part controlled-access, and Route 42 as part of the transportation facility which was required. He said also that he

wanted to divorce himself from considering the highway as a toll-financed monolith; that he wanted the Commission to consider it as a service which the State of Ohio needed; and that he wanted the State of Ohio and the Commission, an agency of the State of Ohio, working together, to produce a serviceable highway. He said that he was not addressing himself to a so-called 1.46 coverage, nor a 1.21 coverage, nor to any such figures, and that he was not addressing himself to a 3-3/4% interest coupon, or at all to the question of interest rates.

The Chairman urged that the Commission, in the consideration of the facility which was required, not limit itself to the consideration of a great toll facility, but get from the State of Ohio the things that the State of Ohio could produce and provide, and already had produced and provided, and from the Commission and from the whole public, those things which the public could provide. He said that all those things were things which must be considered by the joint cooperative-effort committee. He said further that the Commission might not have considered them had the draft reports looked as lush as had been hoped, but that they didn't look that lush. He said that the draft reports indicated to him that he must, as a reasonable man, address himself to them in such a fashion as to evolve final reports which would produce a feasible facility. He said that there was no sense in the world in proceeding down a broad highway, in the consideration of the reports, which was going to terminate in a dead end. He said also that unless the Commission addressed itself to the reports realistically and promptly, it was going to terminate in a dead end and that the Commission must not terminate in a dead end. He said that the State of Ohio and the Commission, working together, could produce the kind of transportation facility which the people of Ohio required. He said that the facility would be developed, but that it was probably not going to be developed as a toll-road facility in its entirety.

The Chairman said further that there were other things in the reports whose validity he would like further assurance upon. He said that in the very first month of the operation of the Ohio Turnpike, the revenue from the Ohio Turnpike concessions had been approximately 16.6% of the toll revenues. He said also that the draft revenue report with respect to Project No. 2, which suggested 7% revenue from concessions, was unrealistic. He said that he was not saying that either 16% or 17% or 18% was right or that 7% was wrong but that he was of the opinion that 7% ought to get a good close examination before it should be accepted. He said further that for the purposes of the Commission's 1956 budget it had estimated approximately 20% from concessions and that in the first month of the operation of the turnpike, a month when both the restaurant facilities and the gasoline facilities had not been at their peak efficiency, they had produced about 17% of the total revenue derived by the Commission from operation of the turnpike. The Chairman said further that he was not criticizing the engineers who had made the traffic and revenue report on the Ohio



Turnpike for their suggestion of a return of approximately 7% or 8% from the concessions because that firm of engineers had contemplated ownership of the facilities by the concessionaires, whereas the Commission had been able within its available funds to provide the concession buildings itself and to lease them at a figure which approximated 18% of the gross revenue received for food and approximately 6-1/2¢ per gallon of gasoline sold and approximately 10% for other goods sold and services provided.

The Chairman said further that he was of the opinion that if it were to develop that a toll road should connect Route 40 with the Ohio Turnpike, consideration must be given to whether or not the design of that toll road should equal that of the most heavily traveled portion of the prospective turnpike and of the Ohio Turnpike. He said further that there were twin bridges on the Ohio Turnpike and that in the report it was suggested that there be twin bridges for the total extent of the prospective Project No. 2. He said that he was not at all certain of the validity of that suggestion and that he would like to be advised whether or not a sizeable saving might not be effected by using single bridges on that portion of the facility which was not expected to bear the burden of traffic in the foreseeable future which the other portions would bear and which the Ohio Turnpike already bore.

The Chairman said that wherever the Ohio Turnpike Commission should acquire right-of-way he would have no question about acquiring the same amount of right-of-way in one portion of the state as in another because the cost of right-of-way was pretty generally in the severance damages rather than in the cost of the acreage. He said further that he did question whether or not the very same highway was needed. He said that the Ohio Turnpike had 36 feet of flexible paving in addition to the main body of the highway and that he was not at all certain that on a lightly used portion of Project No. 2 the Commission would have to have the same 36 feet in addition to the main roadway. He said further that neither was he suggesting that the construction of the road from end to end, as to paving or as to anything else in the design of the road, must be the same. He said further that the State of Ohio in the past had invariably assigned different standards to different uses and that the reports did not contemplate that but rather contemplated a toll monolith, a highway that was the same in every inch from its beginning to its terminal point. He said that he did not consider that was necessary; that he was of the opinion that consideration could be given, in an extent of highway as great as that one, to many features, especially to features which would be responsive to the burden which the road would bear in the respective areas.

The Chairman said that he was recommending to the Commission and suggesting to the Director of Highways, the ex officio member of

the Commission, that without any delay the Commission and the Consulting Engineers and the Director of Highways address themselves to the reports with an end in view of being able to build the road. He said further that he did not want to develop beautiful reports upon a dream highway, that what was wanted were reports and recommendations of a highway that could be built. He said further that he did not want to see a facility built only from Cincinnati to Route 40 and from the Ohio-Pennsylvania line at Conneaut to the Ohio Turnpike. He said that what he would like to see and what he knew the Commission wanted to see and what he had no doubt the Director of Highways and the Governor of Ohio wanted, was a facility which ultimately would provide a service comparable to the service which the reports would contemplate if a toll road of the kind and quality suggested were feasible.

Mr. Allen said that he would be a little bit inclined to think that the Chairman's statement was overly critical of the reports to date. The Chairman said that he had not so intended. Mr. Allen said further that the reports were pretty much what he had expected they would be. He said further that he was entirely in agreement that the Commission had arrived at a time at which it must look them over. He said also that to his mind both reports were excellent, and that, although there were details in both of them that were open to criticism, he did not think that the Commission wanted to give the impression that it thought those reports were not excellent jobs. He said also that the reports had been asked for, that they had been submitted to the Commission, and that it would go on from there.

General Beightler said that he had not yet read the traffic and revenue report because it had not yet reached him. He said that he thought the civil engineering report had been splendidly prepared, that it was much more realistic in its conclusions than the previous report. He said further that he had long had the idea that there would have to be some combined effort in the construction of a complete facility from Cincinnati to Conneaut and to Toledo -- effort by the Commission to construct a toll facility plus some effort on the part of the state to construct a portion of the facility as might be indicated in the traffic and revenue report.

Mr. Teagarden said that he was convinced that it would be impossible for the Commission to build the kind of a road that had been planned by the engineering report and to pay for it from the revenues as they had been set up in the traffic and revenue report. He said further that without being at all critical of the reports, he concurred heartily in what the Chairman had said with reference to various agencies sitting down and trying to evaluate the reports, not with the idea of trying to make a report to fit the financing but,

as the Chairman had said, being realistic and developing a report that was based upon the convenience of the people who were going to use and to pay for the turnpike, and then coming up with a final report on what could be financed.

The Chairman said that he wanted to say again that the vigor with which he spoke was not intended to indicate any hostility to the reports. He said further that he had no hostility toward anybody with respect to the reports. He said also that all he suggested was their re-examination, that he thought the reports had to be re-examined, not on a basis of refining them as presented, but by re-examining the project from the beginning.

Mr. Linzell said that the proposal the Chairman had made of getting together and cooperating and trying to have a live-born child instead of a stillborn child was excellent. He said further that in preparing the rough draft it had been agreed between himself as Highway Director and the engineers preparing the reports that they would come out with what they considered a design comparable with the Ohio Turnpike and with untampered traffic and revenue statements, all without pressure by him on either side. He said further that the members had now seen how they were coming out, and that he thoroughly agreed with the Chairman that something had to be done and that he was very glad to have the Commission's offer of cooperation so that all concerned could arrive at a project to build a highway facility. He said further that he did not care whether it was a toll road or a free road. Addressing himself to the possibility that mileage of the proposed turnpike might have to be dropped off or the scope modified, Mr. Linzell said that he was very optimistic that Congress would provide a substantial appropriation of some sort for the building of highways in Ohio, particularly on the interstate system, which would roughly parallel what was being proposed to be constructed as a turnpike. He said also that if that money should be forthcoming in anything like the degree that had been talked of the previous year, it would be possible then to concentrate, if it should become necessary, on the building of Route 42 or something that would give the same sort of service as Route 42.

The Chairman said that service was what was being sought. He said that the State of Ohio and the Commission as its agency were not seeking to build a toll road; they were seeking to build a facility which would provide adequate, safe highway service. He said further that the thing that he was personally envisioning was a continuous facility to serve all the needs and purposes that were envisioned in the engineering reports, but that he was not of the opinion that that

continuous highway must be continuous toll.

Mr. Linzell said that the Chairman's statement covered his views on the matter.

General Beightler said that he was quite in agreement with the Chairman that the Commission, the Highway Department and the consulting engineering firms should address themselves to some plan for constructing a complete facility cooperatively. He said further that time was not so of the essence that the project could not be delayed somewhat because, as he saw it, the Commission could not undertake a bond issue at a more inopportune or unpropitious time than right then, with the rediscount rate at 2-1/2%, and money as "tight" as it was. He said also that the Commission knew that it could not finance a project and pay 3-3/4% as had been done in Illinois. He said that the Commission was going to have to have an interest rate something like the one it had paid before if it was going to be able to finance any sort of an undertaking satisfactorily.

In response to a question by the Chairman as to when final reports could be expected, Mr. E. J. Donnelly, a partner in the J. E. Greiner Company, said that his firm's contract with the Director of Highways was to produce a draft of a report on November 1, 1955, following the submission of a preliminary statement which had been submitted sometime previously. He said further that, however, the standards of design set out in the preliminary draft had been carried through in the final draft for the simple reason that the J. E. Greiner Company knew nothing at all about traffic and revenues. He said that what had been discussed at the meeting would take considerable time to do.

Mr. Russell Passano of the engineering firm of Coverdale & Colpitts said that there was no specification in the contracts with the engineering firms as to the time required by the state to review the reports in draft form; that the only time limit was that after the reports had been finalized, they would be delivered in 15 days.

Mr. Allen said that he thought that the Commission ought to be very careful that it did not give the impression that, for any reason, it wanted to see the project delayed. He said further that he did not think that the fact that at that time money was at a high price was any reason to allow the addition of one day's delay.

The Chairman said that the only reason he was raising the question of time was so that no one would be misled as to the fact

time was going to be required to do the things the Commission had been discussing.

General Beightler said that his only thought had been that the Commission just couldn't possibly go into the money market at that time and finance the project.

Mr. Allen said that he would hate to subscribe to that. He said further that if everything had been ready for the Commission to proceed with the project, he certainly would have proceeded with it and that he would not have been afraid of the money market.

The Chairman said that as far as he was concerned, and that he knew the whole Commission concurred, whenever the Commission had a project on the basis of the engineering reports that looked as if the Commission could safely take it to the money market, then the Commission would go. He said further that if the reports had come to the Commission in a form which would have given it courage in proceeding, of course it would have had no choice except to go to the money market. He said also that he thought that he would be willing to agree that if the Commission went to the money market and could not make a better deal than a certain sister state recently had made, that he would be inclined to come home.

At this point the meeting was recessed, at 12:42 P. M. The meeting resumed at 2:07 P. M. with all members present.

The Assistant Secretary-Treasurer reported for the Secretary-Treasurer that since the last meeting the following had been sent to all members:

1. Unaudited financial reports for the period ending September 30, 1955, mailed October 24, 1955.
2. Detailed investment transactions during October, 1955, mailed October 31, 1955.
3. Copy of letter dated November 9, 1955 making certain comments and comparisons with respect to the 1956 preliminary budget.
4. Audited financial report for the third quarter ending September 30, 1955, mailed November 11, 1955.
5. Traffic and revenue report for October, 1955, mailed November 15, 1955.
6. Draft of the minutes of the meeting of October 18, 1955, mailed November 17, 1955.

7. Copy of letter dated November 17, 1955 giving various concessionaire statistics for the month of October, 1955.

The Assistant Secretary-Treasurer reported further that income from investments at the end of October 1955 had been \$16,495,000 compared to the original forecast for that same period of \$6,665,000 or a gain of \$9,830,000. He said also that in October 1955 the traffic had been composed 89% of passenger cars and 11% of commercial vehicles. He said further that there had not been much difference in the mileage per trip for passenger cars and that for commercial vehicles, and that passenger cars had accounted for 74% of the toll revenue and commercial vehicles for 26% of the toll revenue. He said also that there had been 21,938 vehicles, or 2.3% of the total, that had made an uninterrupted trip across the entire turnpike. He said also that the heaviest traveled section of the turnpike had been between Route 8 and Route 21 westbound, followed closely by the section between Route 10 and Route 57, also westbound, and that those two sections also had been the most heavily traveled eastbound. He said also that from the opening of the Eastgate Section on December 1, 1954 to November 22, 1955, more than 4,000,000 revenue automobiles and trucks had traveled about 140,000,000 miles on the Ohio Turnpike.

The Assistant Secretary-Treasurer reported further that concessionaire income in the month of October 1955 had been \$52,435 from the restaurants and that food sales had amounted to \$291,272 in spite of some restaurants not being in full operation. He said further that the service stations had sold 1,754,000 gallons of gasoline and had had sales of oil, tires, and accessories of \$28,700, and that one station alone had pumped 183,000 gallons of gasoline. He said that the Commission then had 19 charge accounts with companies operating commercial vehicles, as compared with 12 reported by him at the preceding meeting of the Commission.

Resolution No. 63-1955 adopting annual budget for the fiscal year 1956 was moved for adoption by Mr. Allen, seconded by Mr. Teagarden, as follows:

Resolution No. 63-1955

"WHEREAS the Commission, by resolution No. 60-1955, adopted a preliminary budget for the fiscal year 1956, and caused copies thereof to be filed with the trustee and mailed to the consulting engineer and the principal underwriters;

WHEREAS no request whatsoever for a public hearing thereon has been made to the Commission by any person or persons whomsoever; and

WHEREAS pursuant to §505 of the trust agreement dated June 1, 1952, entered into between the Ohio Turnpike Commission and The Ohio National Bank of Columbus, as trustee, and The National City Bank of New York (now The First National City Bank of New York), as co-trustee, the Commission desires to finally adopt the budget of income and current expenses for the fiscal year 1956, to be designated the "Annual Budget";

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

RESOLVED that the Commission, having duly and fully considered the same, hereby adopts the following budget:

Annual Budget of Income and Current Expenses  
For the Fiscal Year 1956

Income \$ 18,240,000

Current Expenses:

Administrative Services \$ 407,400

Operations 3,360,100

Trust Indenture Expense 135,000

Inventory Increases and  
Accruals 90,000

Total Current Expenses \$ 3,992,500;

FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission hereby determines that the total appropriations in any division of the budget aforesaid do not exceed the total appropriations in the corresponding division in the preliminary budget heretofore adopted by resolution No. 60-1955; and

FURTHER RESOLVED that the assistant secretary-treasurer is hereby instructed to file a copy of said "Annual Budget" with the trustee and to mail copies thereof to the consulting engineer and to the principal underwriters forthwith.

The Assistant Secretary-Treasurer said that the budget and the figures that appeared thereon were identical to those that had been in the preliminary budget.

The Chairman said that there had been no comment and no exceptions taken to the preliminary budget, and accordingly it was appropriate to adopt the budget for the year as it had been submitted in the preliminary report.

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

Ayes: Allen, Teagarden, Linzell, Beightler, Shocknessy.

Nays: None.

The Chairman declared the resolution adopted.

The Chairman thanked the Assistant Secretary-Treasurer for his report.

The Executive Director reported that the accident record on the Ohio Turnpike during the 31 days of October, 1955 was a very fine one and one of which the Commission might be quite proud. He said that during October some 956,862 vehicles had traveled a total of nearly 64,000,000 miles on the turnpike and that in that period and with that amount of travel there had been one fatality and a total of 27 personal-injury accidents involving injuries to 38 persons. He said also that there had been 39 accidents during that same period in which there had been property damage of over \$100, and some 31 accidents in which there had been very minor property damage. The Executive Director said further that the admirable accident record was attributable in large measure to the design of the turnpike and probably above all else to the wide center median with the ditch down through it. He said that it was attributable also to the policing job, which had been good as limited by the number of men available to do it, but somewhat inadequate as to the aggregate amount, and to the Commission's program of signing, of delineators, of fire protection, and of various others of the features of the service that the Commission endeavored to provide to the motorist.

In response to a question by General Beightler, the Executive Director reported that the accident rate for October, 1955 was 1.05 accidents per million vehicle miles of travel and that that record compared very favorably with the general experience on public highways.



The Executive Director reported further that over the previous weekend the first snowfall of the season had been experienced on the turnpike and had constituted the first test of the functioning of the maintenance organization. He said further that on the whole that reaction had been quite good, that the turnpike roadways had been substantially clear of snow before noon of the morning following the beginning of the snowfall at midnight. He said also that a number of vehicles had slid off the pavement into the center median or off the outside of the roadways and that they had been removed in pretty good order. He said also that he felt fairly confident that the Commission was then in shape to do a good job in meeting the problems of snow and ice, which were critical since virtually the entire turnpike was in the area which was commonly referred to as the snow belt across the northern part of Ohio. He said that not all of the snow-removal equipment which had been ordered by the Commission had been on hand during the first snow storm but that all of it should be available shortly.

The Executive Director reported further that that part of the Commission's service to patrons which it had contracted with garages to furnish to patrons on the turnpike should improve in the near future, that some of the garages were not yet equipped with the full complement of equipment that they were required to maintain under their contracts with the Commission. The Executive Director reported that the contract with one of the garage operators who had had an assignment to furnish service to disabled vehicles on the turnpike in a particular zone and who had proved simply unable to maintain the service which the contract required that he maintain, had been cancelled, and that bids had been secured from another and sufficiently qualified operator in the vicinity.

The Executive Director reported further that the operating organization was being gotten into better shape almost day by day. He said further that the maintenance engineer had conducted schools and otherwise had furnished schooling to his supervisory personnel and on down to the lowest level of the organization. He said also that the quality of the toll collection personnel had proved on the whole to be very fine. He said that the major problems had been those of furnishing adequate instructions to meet unusual situations and special problems that had come to be known to exist since operations on the entire turnpike had started on October 1, 1955. He said further that experience in the early weeks of operation had demonstrated the need for bolstering the manpower at the operations headquarters at Berea, as a consequence of which the Project Manager had been furnished with an assistant Project Manager in the person of Mr. L. G. Byrd, formerly of the Commission's engineering staff. He said also

that Mr. Harry Metcalf had been appointed to the position of Maintenance Engineer and had done a beautiful job with outstanding devotion to duty. He said also that Mr. LeEldon Cheffey, an engineer who formerly had worked in the engineering department of the Commission, had been employed as an assistant to the Maintenance Engineer. The Executive Director said further that the radio operators on the turnpike had started absolutely "green", not with respect to radio but with respect to the Ohio Turnpike and its problems, and that the Commission had gotten over the very high hurdle of the first few days of operation by virtue of the fine help that had been furnished by some of the engineers of the J. E. Greiner Company sitting at the radio console day and night. He said also that subsequently those men and women operators had reached a good state of efficiency in the handling of the radio traffic, which was the lifeline of operations on the turnpike.

The Executive Director reported further that on October 21, 1955 the Commission had had a conference in the Commission's headquarters with representatives of the Government and Civic Employees Organizing Committee of the C. I. O. and that the meeting was open to the public and the press was present. He said further that Antonino Fiorello of Philadelphia, whose title was that of national staff representative of the union, had sought the conference and had been the principal spokesman of the persons who attended it on behalf of the union. He said also that Mr. Fiorello had stated that it was his purpose to negotiate with the Ohio Turnpike Commission with the objective of entering into a collective-bargaining agreement between the Commission and his union whereunder that union would serve as the bargaining agent for the toll collectors and the maintenance personnel employed on the Ohio Turnpike. He said that Mr. Fiorello had been advised that based upon advice which the Commission's counsel had given, in the absence of statutory authority the Ohio Turnpike Commission was without power to enter into a collective-bargaining agreement designating any agency as an exclusive bargaining agent, either for all employees or for any employees. The Executive Director said further that Mr. Fiorello had told the Commission that he had encountered the same condition of the law in New Jersey, that the attorney general of that state had ruled that the New Jersey Turnpike Authority was without power to enter into an agreement with Mr. Fiorello's union as a collective-bargaining agent. The Executive Director said further that the conference with Mr. Fiorello had ended with Mr. Fiorello's saying that he would confer with his counsel and that the Commission might expect a letter from him informing it of the interpretation which his counsel would place on the law of Ohio as related to the power of the Commission to enter into an agreement with his union or any other as a collective-bargaining agent. He said further that to November 22, 1955 the Commission had

not heard further from Mr. Fiorello with respect to that matter but that, however, Mr. Fiorello had by a telegram addressed a request to the Commission that the status quo remain the same in hours of work and wages and working conditions of the employees of the Ohio Turnpike Commission pending further negotiations with what he denominated as local #1035 GCEOC-CIO, and that a meeting be held further to clarify the union's collective-bargaining position. He said that the telegram had been dated November 18, 1955. The Executive Director said that Mr. Fiorello was being advised that the Commission could not tie its hands in discharging the duties that devolved upon it and therefore could not accede to his request that it agree to maintain the status quo in the respects which he had mentioned, and further that the Commission would be perfectly happy to confer further with him in accordance with that portion of his request.

The Executive Director reported further that under date of October 22, 1955 Mr. Frank P. Converse, President and General Business Representative of the International Union of Operating Engineers, had sent the Commission a letter which had been received on October 24, 1955 saying that on behalf of the several and many employees of the Ohio Turnpike Commission who were engaged in maintenance and toll-collecting divisions he was bringing to its attention the desire of that organization to enter into negotiating sessions for the purpose of culminating a collective-bargaining agreement for the toll collectors and maintenance personnel. He said further that Mr. Converse had been informed by a letter from the Executive Director to him under date of October 24, 1955 that the Commission had already had communications from the union represented by Mr. Fiorello and at an earlier date another one, the United Steel Workers of America, earlier advising that the toll collectors and maintenance employees who had earlier, as they had stated, signed membership cards in the United Steel Workers of America and subsequently had transferred their membership to the Government and Civic Employees Organizing Committee of the C.I.O., and also that pursuant to Mr. Fiorello's request the Commission had conferred with him and several others in Columbus on October 21, 1955. He said also that he had told Mr. Converse in his letter what the Commission had stated to Mr. Fiorello to be the position of the Commission with respect to the matter, and also that the Commission would be glad to hear further from him. He said that subsequently he had had a telephone call from Mr. Converse wanting to confer at a specific time but that prior engagements had made it impossible for the Executive Director to see him. He said that he had told Mr. Converse that he would be glad to speak with him later, and that Mr. Converse had said that he was going out to the west coast and would call the Executive Director upon his return. The Executive Director said that on November 21, 1955 he had had a call from Mr. Possehl of the same union but that he had been engaged at the time and had not received Mr. Possehl's call.

The Executive Director reported further that on November 8, 1955 the Director of Information and Research and he had conferred at considerable length with Ellis S. Perlman, managing director of the Ohio Trucking Association and with Herschel C. Atkinson, Jr., assistant to Mr. Perlman, on the subject of truckers' safety patrols on the turnpike. He said further that he had already advised the members about that conference and that it would suffice for current purposes to remind the members that he had pointed out that various trucking companies and organizations of trucking companies maintained in Ohio and in other states so-called safety patrols which, from what he had learned of them, seemed to perform a very worthwhile function -- a service not only to themselves but indirectly to the public at large in increasing the safety of travel on highways. He said that the Commission had not developed that matter any further but was awaiting a memorandum promised by the Association setting forth its views and suggestions with respect to the operation of such patrols on the Ohio Turnpike.

The Executive Director said further that on November 21, 1955 representatives of the Commission had conferred with Clarence A. Kelley of Akron, President of the Ohio Trucking Association; Earl Sowers of Akron, Vice-President and Operating Manager of Motor Cargo, Inc. of Akron, one of the best customers on the turnpike, and Mr. Perlman and Mr. Atkinson. He said further that Mr. Sowers had said that his company had constructed at a cost of about a million dollars a new truck terminal just off the turnpike near the Route 21 interchange specifically for the purpose of enabling it, with the greatest of convenience and economy, to use the Ohio Turnpike. He said also that Mr. Sowers had said that the company was using the turnpike on all its runs to the east and on all its runs to the west which had as their western terminal point the city of Chicago but not on runs to points west which lay beyond Chicago for the reason that there was an element of economy in Chicago runs which was not achieved in others, mainly that the entire run to Chicago could be made on one driver's shift, which might not exceed ten hours. The Executive Director said that Mr. Sowers had said that his company could not quite afford the toll, at least on the cost analyses he had made so far on the longer runs to the west.

The Executive Director reported further that various problems had been discussed at the conference and that the trucking representatives had made some suggestions about some changes in classifications of trucks for toll purposes. He said further that he had asked the trucking representatives to furnish certain statistical information with respect to their own and other people's operations,

and had told them that the Commission would be glad to examine and fully consider any such information which they might submit. He said that an offer by Mr. Sowers to arrange with the chairman of a committee of the dozen or so large motor carriers which operated between the Chicago area and the New York area to confer with the Commission at some time in the near future to discuss problems of that whole group had been accepted.

The Chairman said that he was sure the Commission was glad to know of those discussions. He said further that the genuine interest of the trucking industry as evinced by the discussions was heartening.

The Executive Director reported further that Mr. Sowers had made certain estimates of his company's costs and savings in using the turnpike which were not final since there were some factors it had not yet succeeded in evaluating, there not yet having been adequate experience. He said further that Mr. Sowers had said that one such factor was an offset to expense -- the gaining of greater utilization of equipment by not having it idle in eight-hour layovers and in generally speeding up the use of the equipment. He said also that Mr. Sowers had apparently thought that the greatest single cost saving which might accrue to his company or to any other comparable operator by the use of the turnpike would be through reduction in insurance rates. He said also that Mr. Sowers had said that during the 36 days beginning with October 1, 1955 and ending with November 5, 1955 his company's trucks had operated 307,000 miles on the Ohio Turnpike without accident, and that the company's system-wide experience was one accident for every 151,000 miles. He said that Mr. Sowers had said further that he anticipated that his company's accident record on the Ohio Turnpike over a sufficient period would not be worse than one accident every 500,000 miles and that, if that should be the case, the company's insurance rates were going to go down possibly in the magnitude of several tens of thousands of dollars a year.

The Chairman said that Mr. Sowers had said that his company's rate was variable based upon accident experience, and that the non-accident experience it was having on the Ohio Turnpike was an economic justification for its use. He said further that in the course of the discussion the trucking representatives had said that the Ohio Turnpike was the safest highway in the country.

The Executive Director reported further that one of the sad stories coming out of the operations of the first seven weeks had to do with the ABC Vending Company which held the contract for the operation of the four restaurants at the center of the turnpike. He said further that the Commission had been literally deluged with

complaints about the food and the service of that organization. He said also that it was a serious situation and that several members of the staff of the Commission had had a conference the previous week with representatives of the company and had told them very plainly and specifically that the Commission regarded the company's operations in all aspects as being wholly unsatisfactory, that it was the Commission's opinion that the company was utterly lacking in any management worthy of the name in the operation of those restaurants. He said that the representatives had assured the Commission that the company was going to do a good job, and that they had been told that the Commission would look to see what the results might be in the future. The Executive Director reported further that a story in the Wall Street Journal about the good earnings of the ABC Vending Company for the year 1955 had contained a statement: "ABC also acquired concessions at several locations on the Ohio Thruway which will add an estimated \$2 million annually to revenues, according to Mr. O'Reilly, "who was described as board chairman. He said also that Mr. O'Reilly was going to have another guess coming if he thought that the kind of operations the company had been doing on the Ohio Turnpike was going to add to its revenues. He said also that the Commission had a contract with that operator and under the terms of the contract, if the operator breached it, the Commission could give it a notice and that in such instance the company would be required to repair its breach within a limited period else the Commission could terminate the contract. He said also that the members of the staff of the Commission had conferred a few days previously with representatives of Harris, Kerr, Forster & Company, the Commission's restaurant consultants, and had asked them to undertake an immediate examination into the operations of the ABC Vending Company on the Ohio Turnpike, to make a full and complete inspection of the company's equipment, food, and service, and to examine in full and to give the Commission a report as promptly as the firm could upon the results of its examination. He said also that there were indications that the company had improved just a little bit in some respects so that at that moment he did not think he could make any recommendation or take any positive action, but that the situation would be watched from day to day and as full information as possible would be obtained and the members of the Commission advised later.

The Executive Director reported further that Harris, Kerr, Forster & Company had been asked simultaneously to start an examination of the other restaurant concessionaires in the nature of a shopping examination. He said further that the Commission's Supervisor of Patron's Services was doing all he could to watch the situation, but that the Supervisor was not a specialist in restaurants and that, further, his job embraced not only restaurants

but the supervising of service-station contracts and disabled-vehicle services and several other things.

Mr. Allen said that the Commission would get constant complaints about the restaurants as long as it was in the turnpike business. He said further that while he was very pleased with all the action that had been taken "to put the heat on," the Commission must, as an "operating company," look upon the restaurant contractors and upon the emergency roadway-vehicle contractors as part of its organization, and that he hoped that he would see very little in public print where any of the Commission's people were publicly criticizing those who were helping the Commission run the turnpike. He said also that he did not believe that one could ever improve operations through threats. He said that he was tickled to death to see any work with the concessionaires of a cooperative nature, but that in observing threats being tried over a long period of years of giving service, he was sure that service could not be gotten through threats.

The Executive Director said that the Commission had been endeavoring to cooperate with and aid the concessionaires in every way possible. He said that the restaurant operators had had problems, especially the ABC Vending Company and the restaurant operator on the eastern section of the turnpike, due to the fact that those restaurant buildings were not all completed at the first of October and the operators had had to operate on a partially make-shift basis during some of that period. He said also that the disturbing and distressing thing about it was that whereas the Commission had been literally snowed under with complaints about the ABC Vending Corporation, there had been relatively few with respect to the other restaurant operators, and that the Commission had gotten compliments on some of the others.

The Assistant to the Executive Director reported that all of the 16 restaurants on the turnpike with the exception of the four restaurants being operated by Olympic Commissary Company in Portage County and Cuyahoga County were in full operation. He said further that the last estimate he had had was that those four restaurants would be in operation by the first of December, 1955.

The Executive Director reported further that the lack of certain kinds of signs, on the turnpike and off the turnpike, had attracted great attention from patrons. He said further that the Commission had had complaints that the names of towns, such as Kent, Milan, and Akron, were not displayed upon the turnpike. He said also that the Commission had had suggestions, many of them constructive, with respect to the placing of additional signs on the

turnpike to aid persons in knowing where they might best leave to reach their destinations. He said the Commission itself had seen indications that there were deficiencies in its program of lean-in signing, and similar signing, and that an extensive study was underway, and that additional signs would be manufactured and installed as fast as possible.

The Executive Director reported further that a toll collector, who was employed at one of the interchanges near the eastern end of the turnpike, had finished his tour of duty at 4:00 P. M. on November 17, 1955 and had later been discovered by a group of three of the Commission's executive and supervisory people in the utility building of the next interchange at the desk which was utilized by the senior toll collector and was rifling through the files of the senior toll collector. He said further that the collector had made an explanation that he had been trying to find some information bearing on some overtime pay that he thought he had been entitled to. The Executive Director said that the episode had been reported to him on November 20, 1955 and that he immediately had instructed that the man be discharged. He said that he was of the opinion that neither the Commission nor any other organization could have in its employ people who would, without any right or authority, have no respect for the rights of others.

General Beightler said that of course, the collectors at any given toll plaza all had access to the records filed in the utility building at that plaza. The Executive Director confirmed that statement with the qualification that access under such conditions could be had for proper purposes. General Beightler said that what he had wanted to bring out was that the incident reported by the Executive Director had taken place at a plaza other than that at which the collector concerned was employed.

The Executive Director reported further that regretably the incident he had reported was the second instance of conduct reflecting unfavorably upon an employee. He said further that sometime previously an employee who had stolen gasoline had been discharged summarily.

Mr. Dunbar said that he would like to be relieved of serving as acting General Counsel. He said further that Mrs. Ruth L. Wilkins had done, with a high degree of proficiency and devotion to duty, all the work which acting General Counsel might be expected to do. He thereupon tendered the Commission his resignation as acting General Counsel and requested that he be relieved of the duties of that office.



Resolution No. 65-1955 appointing General Counsel was moved for adoption by General Beightler, seconded by Mr. Teagarden, as follows:

Resolution No. 64-1955

"RESOLVED that Ruth L. Wilkins be, and hereby she is, appointed general counsel, effective immediately, to serve at her and the Commission's mutual pleasure, and that her compensation be at the rate of \$15,000 per annum; and

FURTHER RESOLVED that Frank C. Dunbar, Jr. is hereby relieved of duties as acting general counsel pursuant to resolution No. 35-1955."

General Beightler said that he was very happy to present the resolution because it concerned a lady with whom he had been associated when he was Executive Director and that he had found her to be not only a most competent lawyer but also a most graciously charming lady.

The Executive Director said that he and Mrs. Wilkins had been closely associated, and that there had never been a finer association or a finer associate than she. He said further that in very large measure, if he had accomplished something worthwhile during the previous four years, it was attributable to her.

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

Ayes: Beightler, Teagarden, Linzell, Allen, Shocknessy.

Nays: None.

The Chairman declared the resolution adopted.

Mrs. Wilkins thanked the Commission. She said further that the Commission had given her a very difficult, albeit a very challenging task, because of the very high standards of performance for that particular job that Frank C. Dunbar, Jr. had established. She said also that Mr. Dunbar had had the respect of every member of the staff of the legal department and that she hoped that in some small measure she could attain the same respect. She said that she would not have considered accepting the appointment at all if it had not been for the very fine men in the legal department. She said that Francis Cole, the chief contract attorney; Charles Westervelt, the chief right-of-way attorney, and James Stegmeier, the chief condemnation attorney, had

given unstintingly of their devotion and their loyalty, that they had a wonderful spirit of cooperation and above all that they were very fine lawyers. She said that the same thing could be said for the other men in the legal department.

The Chairman said that the Commission had known Mrs. Wilkins a long while and that she was a good lawyer and a good human being. He said that it was his personal knowledge that she had from the staff of the legal department a loyalty comparable to that enjoyed by her predecessor.

The Executive Director reported further that the Chief Engineer's staff was spending a great amount of time in the field on preliminary, and semi-final and final inspections of the construction work.

The Chairman asked that the record show that the matter of group life insurance was being considered by the Executive Director; that the Executive Director had advised the Commission informally, prior to the meeting, that he was doing so; that he had advised the Commission at the meeting that he was doing so; and that at the next meeting he would expect to have offered to the Commission a program for group life insurance for the employees of the Commission.

The General Counsel reported that she had submitted to the members the report of pending litigation. She said further that within the last several weeks three of the condemnation cases listed in that report had been settled, which meant that just four of those cases were yet to be tried. She said also that the status in the other cases remained pretty much the same as of that report.

The Director of Information and Research reported that all the activities of the Department of Information and Research had one objective which was the encouragement of the use of the Ohio Turnpike by operators of all the sorts of automotive vehicles which were allowed on the turnpike under the Commission's rules and regulations. He said further that that objective had been found to be necessary because, despite the fact that the Ohio Turnpike had always received very fine coverage by all forms of news agencies, many people, not only outside of Ohio but even in Ohio, were not aware of where the Ohio Turnpike was located in Ohio, nor how to get onto it, nor where it would take the traveler, nor how it could serve him. He said that in addition to providing information of that sort, it was necessary also to keep up a constant flow of information regarding tolls, and food and fuel services and other services available on the turnpike.

The Director of Information and Research reported also that in order to encourage the use of the turnpike by automobiles, the efforts of the department were directed at reaching operators of automobiles when they were planning trips or at reaching drivers of automobiles as they approached Ohio on trips, and that the department recently had developed a leaflet which was being distributed to operators of gasoline filling stations, motels, and other places along main roads in northern Indiana where automobile drivers and truck drivers were apt to stop and ask information about how to get to the Ohio Turnpike. He said also that it was rather amazing to find out that those operators in a state adjacent to Ohio were unable to answer inquiries about how to reach the Ohio Turnpike. He said that the reaction to the distribution of the leaflets had been very fine. He said further that similar leaflets would be developed for distribution in Michigan, showing how to reach the turnpike from Michigan, and later for distribution in western Pennsylvania and western New York.

The Director of Information and Research reported further that his department had had printed a folder descriptive of the Ohio Turnpike which had been distributed in the total of 260,000 copies to some 400 automobile clubs and travel bureaus and other agencies which supplied information to the traveling public, and that there had been great interest reflected in that folder particularly by such agencies in the state of Michigan, Pennsylvania, New York, Ohio, and California. He said further that those folders were being distributed on request at the turnpike toll plazas at the rate of about 20,000 a week, and that distribution at the 16 service plazas at an estimated rate of 20,000 a week was just beginning. He said also that as an experiment 25,000 folders had been sent on request to a large petroleum company which wished to place them in its gasoline-service stations in northern Ohio all along the route of the turnpike because of the great demand for information.

The Director of Information and Research reported further that in order to get information to the operators of trucks it seemed best to direct it to the people who owned the trucks, i. e., the motor-carrier companies and industries which operated trucks, and that for that purpose the department had been compiling a mailing list with the assistance of the Comptroller and from other available sources, such as listing the names of carriers and industries actually using the turnpike. He said further that those on the mailing list were sent a packet of turnpike information which included the schedule of tolls, the rules and regulations, a map, and information about the ruling of the Interstate Commerce Commission on the use of the turnpike as an alternative route. He said also that the department had asked a

number of chambers of commerce in Ohio and in the larger cities outside of Ohio to make known to their members that that material being sent to truck owners and operators was available on request. He said that the reaction to date from that particular program had been very fine.

The Director of Information and Research reported further that radio spot announcements for use on a public-service basis had been sent all radio stations in Ohio and to 300 radio stations in Illinois, Michigan, and Indiana. He said that those 15-to-30-second announcements were aimed at the drivers of automobiles and trucks, to tell drivers where they could get on the Ohio Turnpike if they were eastbound. He said that the department expected to repeat that program in Pennsylvania and in New York. He said also that the department was working on a program of developing spot announcements which might be used by television stations for the same purpose, and that it supplied newspapers, magazines, radio, and television with pictures and information for editorial use. He said that members of the department appeared before service clubs and other organizations to make talks, usually illustrated by slides, about the turnpike.

The Director of Information and Research reported further that information of particular interest to truck owners and operators had been sent to a number of publications serving the trucking industry. He said further that in the issue of Transport Topics, which described itself as the national newspaper for motor-freight carriers, for November 7, 1955, had appeared two articles on the front page, one of which stated that a daily check had disclosed that truck traffic was growing on the new Ohio Turnpike while the other article related that the Ohio Turnpike Commission was reminding carriers of the alternate route order of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. Allen said that he thought that the activities of the Department of Information and Research were extremely valuable. He said further that there just was not anything in the line of goods and services of which one could sell all that could be sold without selling activity. He said also that the United States was a nation that advertised and that he thought that the Commission was fortunate to have a good promotion program started and that the Commission probably would have to do a great deal more.

The Chairman said that one of the things reported by the Director of Information and Research that had appalled him when he had first heard it was that people not too far distant in Indiana did not know exactly how to get to the Ohio Turnpike. The Executive Director said that one such person did not even know that the turnpike had been opened. The Chairman said that a communication had been received

from one of the radio stations to which spot announcements had been sent saying that the writer did not know the turnpike was so far along.

Mr. Allen said that several years ago the telephone company of which he had been an official had started some door-to-door salesmen out to sell telephones and had found thousands of people in Cincinnati who could afford to have a telephone but who just did not know how to go about getting one. He said further that the salesmen had sold telephones to those people and that the company had continued that activity as worthwhile.

General Beightler said that the program of lead-in signs which had been mentioned by the Executive Director could be expanded greatly, that lead-in signs would pay dividends for considerable distances from the turnpike. The Chairman said that there was no doubt that the Commission could not do enough of the lead-in sign program.

Resolution No. 65-1955 fixing rate of compensation of John Soller, Assistant Secretary-Treasurer and Comptroller, was moved for adoption by Mr. Allen, seconded by Mr. Linzell, as follows:

Resolution No. 65-1955

"RESOLVED that the rate of salary for the Commission's assistant secretary-treasurer and comptroller, John Soller, effective December 1, 1955, be, and the same hereby is, fixed at \$16,000 per annum."

The Chairman stated that the current salary of the Comptroller was \$14,000 per annum. Mr. Allen said that earlier the Assistant Secretary-Treasurer had read the earnings on the invested funds of the Commission and that such results had not just happened. He said further that the Commission had had great help from the co-trustee but that Mr. Soller deserved real credit for carrying on that program in addition to his other duties. He said also that Mr. Soller had been of great value to the Commission on its earnings on money during construction. The Chairman said that Mr. Allen had discussed the matter of Soller's salary with members of the Commission individually and that he believed that all of the members were of the mind that Mr. Allen's evaluation of Mr. Soller was justified.

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

Ayes: Linzell, Teagarden, Beightler, Allen, Shocknessy.

Nays: None.

The Chairman declared the resolution adopted.

The Chairman referred to a letter of the Governor's which he had mentioned earlier which had been addressed to the Chairman and in which he had said that the members of the executive committee of the Governor's "Plant Ohio" program had discussed the Commission's drainage problems and the address which the Commission had given them on the construction of the Ohio Turnpike. He read the letter from the Governor, in part, as follows:

"\*\*\*At the meeting, contrary to the reprehensible statement that was made by one or two of the persons who attended my meeting in the State Office Building where we listened to complaints about the one on which the Turnpike ought to be built, the Turnpike Commission was commended for the excellent approach it gave to the long-range program to protect farm drainage. It was suggested that the Turnpike Commissioners could adopt a long-range program of planting and beautification which would serve as a great example of what can be done in conservation and landscaping.

Sincerely yours,  
/s/ Frank J. Lausche  
Frank J. Lausche"

The Chairman said that the suggestion by the Governor about long-term planting and landscaping was consistent with the program the Commission had undertaken. He said further that the Executive Director had sent the Governor's letter to the Chief Engineer and to the Director of Information and Research to consider further implementing the program in accordance with the suggestion and recommendation of the Governor.

The Chairman said further that he then had the letter from the engineering firm of Coverdale & Colpitts under date of November 17, 1955 in reply to some discussion that the Commission had had with that firm about re-examining toll schedules which he had mentioned earlier in the meeting. He read from the letter as follows:

"When Mr. Passano was in Columbus the latter part of October you asked him about our experience in studies of tolls on projects that have been in operation for some time. We have had a number of such cases although the majority of them have been

reviews of existing tolls with the idea of reducing charges or providing for commutation rates where daily travel of an individual was fairly frequent. Such projects include many bridges in Kentucky, bridges in Maryland and San Francisco Bay bridges.

\*\*\*\*\*

"We think, in fairness to the existing toll schedule and to the basic information on which revision of that toll schedule would have to be based, that the proposed study might well be postponed until the results of at least three months' operation would be available or possibly a longer period depending on circumstances. As stated above, we are now in process of restudying the tolls on Pennsylvania Turnpike, which report will not be completed until approximately the first of the year. We believe that this experience will be rather definitely applicable to the problem which you presented to us.\*\*\*"

The Chairman said further that he just wanted to let the record show that the Commission had been competently advised to postpone any consideration of toll revisions for some time, and, further, in conclusion and apropos of what Mr. Allen had said earlier that soon the Commission could tell people to get on turnpike No. 2 to get to the Ohio Turnpike, he hoped that the Commission would have Project No. 2 soon. He said further that he personally endorsed Mr. Allen's sentiment and that he was sure every member of the Commission did and that it was his hope that what would be developed by the cooperative effort which had been discussed that morning would be a "package" which would definitely outline a program of highway construction whereunder the efforts of the state of Ohio and of the Commission could be definitely and intelligently integrated.

Resolution No. 66-1955 ratifying actions of administrative officers was moved for adoption by Mr. Teagarden, seconded by Mr. Allen, as follows:

Resolution No. 66-1955

"WHEREAS the executive director, deputy executive director, executive assistant, chief engineer, assistant chief engineer, acting general counsel, assistant general counsel, assistant secretary-treasurer, comptroller, and chief, right-of-way department of the Commission have,

by various written and oral communications, fully advised the members of the Commission with respect to their official actions taken on behalf of the Commission since the Commission's last meeting, and the Commission has duly reviewed and considered the same;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

RESOLVED that all official actions taken by the aforesaid administrative officers of the Commission on its behalf since the Commission's meeting on October 18, 1955, are hereby ratified, approved, and confirmed."

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

Ayes: Teagarden, Allen, Beightler, Linzell, Shocknessy.

Nays: None.

The Chairman declared the resolution adopted.

The Chairman asked that the record show that the J. E. Greiner Company and the firm of Coverdale & Colpitts had been represented at the meeting, and that the Director of Highways had present his liaison officer.

There being no further business to come before the Commission, a motion was made by Mr. Linzell, seconded by General Beightler that the meeting adjourn subject to call of the Chairman.


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

Ayes: Linzell, Beightler, Allen, Teagarden, Shocknessy.

Nays: None.

The Chairman declared the meeting adjourned. The time of adjournment was 4:07 P. M.

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

  
A. J. Allen, Secretary-Treasurer.