

MINUTES OF THE ONE HUNDRED NINTH MEETING
JUNE 19, 1956

Pursuant to bylaws, the Ohio Turnpike Commission met in special session at its headquarters at 139 East Gay Street in Columbus, Ohio at 11:13 A. M. Eastern Standard Time on June 19, 1956 with the key members of its staff, representatives of the Consulting Engineers, of the Trustee, members of the press, and others in attendance.

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

Present: Allen, Beightler, Teagarden, Shocknessy.

Absent: Linzell.

The Chairman announced that a quorum was present.

The Chairman said that the 109th meeting was probably the last meeting the Commission would hold in the headquarters at 139 East Gay Street and that probably the Commission would not expect to hold meetings in Columbus often in the future. He said that he wanted to thank all those who had served with the Commission in Columbus and to take special note of the working press that had been with the Commission the past several years and to say that those members of the press who would not continue to be with the Commission and cover it in the future would be missed. He said also that the success the Commission had achieved in the past several years had been in very large measure due, as he so many times had said, to the cooperation of the working press and those others who had control of the dissemination of information in television and radio who presented to the public the activities and purposes of the Commission.

A motion was made by Mr. Teagarden, seconded by Mr. Allen, that the minutes for the meeting of June 5, 1956 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 present responded to roll call. The vote was as follows:

Ayes: Teagarden, Allen, Beightler, Shocknessy.

Nays: None.

The Chairman declared the motion carried.

The Chairman reported that preparations for moving the principal office of the Commission to Berea were well along and that the business of the Commission would be conducted during the moving without any interruption. He said that the Commission should unquestionably be able to do business at Berea on the first business day of July.

The Chairman reported further that June 5 was the 90th day upon which there had not been a fatal accident on the Turnpike.

The Chairman reported further that the report of revenue for May 1956 was to be released that day. He said that during the first 17 days of June 1956 cash revenue from tolls had been about \$683,000 which, together with the charges and concessions, should make a total revenue for the 17 days of about \$825,000. The Chairman said that he was especially proud of that and that he wanted to make special mention of it at that time because the Commission was there in special meeting particularly to consider revision in toll schedules as affecting commercial vehicles. He said that he wanted to advert to a statement he had made to the Governor the previous February 29 which had been challenged in certain quarters and which he believed was valid that whether the commercial vehicle used the turnpike as expected or not the passenger vehicle would assure its success. He said that upon June 18, a single day, with \$54,000 in cash revenue and a prospective \$10,000 in addition to that from concessions and charges the statement of February 29 was reinforced and that he was restating it at that time prior to the Commission's taking any action upon a revision of the schedule. He said further that he did not consider that any action the Commission should take that morning was under the economic compulsion which had been thought the Commission suffered at the time it had sought advice with respect to the revision of the schedule. He said that the revision of the schedule, whatever it was, if adopted would be adopted not because there was a gun at the Commission's head in the form of economic compulsion because there was no such gun. He said that the turnpike could succeed without changing the schedule but that the Turnpike Commission wanted to deal fairly and would deal fairly with all segments of the economy it seeks to serve and if its dealings with any segment of the economy dictated a revision

of the schedule, that was the motivation that the turnpike commission would manifest, whatever action it might take that morning.

The Chairman said that he was willing to take up out of order, if it was agreeable to the members of the Commission, a settlement with a contractor, The Herkner Construction Company, whose counsel Mr. Robert L. Barton was present.

The Deputy Executive Director said that on March 13, 1956 the Commission had authorized the negotiation of a reduction in the retained percentage held by the Commission on the Herkner contract. He said that the staff had been enabled to conclude arrangements on the contract on the basis of the authority in that resolution and wished to recommend to the Commission that the 10% retainage on the Herkner Construction Company contract be reduced to 5% in keeping with the majority of the construction contracts. He said that the Herkner contract was one of the earlier ones on which there had been 10% retainage and a liquidated-damage clause. He said that in order that a possible agreement could be reached with The Herkner Construction Company the staff wished to recommend to the Commission that it be authorized to renegotiate with The Herkner Construction Company to the end that the retained percentage be reduced from 10% to 5%. The Deputy Executive Director said further that The Herkner Construction Company had indicated to the Commission that in connection with its contract it had certain unresolved claims against the Commission. He said that the contract had not been finished on time and, of course, the Commission had a potential claim against the contractor. He said that those unresolved problems could be resolved if the contractor would so agree, and a mutual release would be the result. He said that the staff had kept the Commission informed of the particular details and was recommending to the Commission that the staff be permitted to make an effort to negotiate with the contractor for a resolution of claims by the contractor against the Commission and, if possible, claims of the Commission against the contractor and reduce the retained percentage from 10% to 5%. He said that the Consulting Engineers and the Chief Engineer joined in the recommendation to the Commission and that he had been informed that the General Counsel recommended adoption of the recommendation.

The Chairman asked Mr. Barton to read the resolution which was to be presented to the Commission and to indicate to the Commission whether or not, if the resolution should be adopted by the Commission, the contractor would accept it and enter into an agreement in accordance with its terms.

Mr. Barton said that it was his understanding that the contractor

would do so. He said that there were certain other little matters that the contractor wanted included that he had taken up with the General Counsel but that the contractor was not standing on those and that the inclusion of the exceptions to the work orders that were specifically mentioned in the resolution were satisfactory to him. He said that he was sure that a settlement on the basis as set forth in the resolution would be acceptable to Mr. Peter Herkner and his company.

The Chairman said that on that basis he would entertain the resolution, the understanding being that if the Commission adopted the resolution the contractor would proceed to conclude the arrangement with the Commission in the form of a contract or otherwise, as counsel for the contractor had just indicated.

General Beightler said that he had discussed the matter with the Executive Director, the Deputy Executive Director, the Chief Engineer and the General Counsel that morning. He said that the resolution involved the payment of about \$281,000. He said he thought that the settlement tentatively agreed upon of releasing one half of the retained percentage with certain understandings on the part of both the Commission and the contractor was a proper one. He said that he thought it was quite a satisfactory settlement on both sides.

Resolution No. 39-1956 authorizing partial payment and waiver of damages for delay upon certain conditions -- Contract C-16 was moved for adoption by General Beightler, seconded by Mr. Teagarden, as follows:

"WHEREAS the Commission has heretofore, by and in its resolution No. 18-1956, provided for the payment to The Herkner Construction Company, contractor under Contract C-16, of one half of the 10% 'retained percentage' withheld from said contractor pursuant to the terms of said contract, upon certain conditions;

"WHEREAS certain controversies have arisen between the Commission and said contractor, from time to time, and said conditions are not acceptable to said contractor;

"WHEREAS said contractor is willing to agree to other conditions, and the Commission's consulting engineer, chief engineer, and general counsel have recommended that the aforesaid moneys be paid to the contractor and that the Commission release the contractor from any claim which it might otherwise assert against him for delay in performance, as hereinafter provided; and

"WHEREAS the Commission has fully considered the matter and desires to provide for the release of said moneys and said claim, as aforesaid;

"NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

"RESOLVED that the Commission finds that it is in the best interests of the Commission to pay forthwith to The Herkner Construction Company one half of the sum withheld from said company as 'retained percentage' under Contract C-16 and to release said contractor from any liability to the Commission on account of delays in the performance of said contract only, in consideration of a release of claims to be furnished to the Commission by said company, which release shall be qualified as hereinafter provided;

"FURTHER RESOLVED that, in view of its aforesaid finding, the comptroller shall, upon direction of the Commission's chief engineer and general counsel, cause payment to be made to The Herkner Construction Company, contractor under Contract C-16, of 95% of the total of monthly estimates for work performed and materials furnished pursuant to said contract (including estimates for work performed and materials furnished, pursuant to extra-work orders approved by the chief engineer), less the total of all partial payments previously made;

"FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission's general counsel and chief engineer be, and hereby they are, instructed jointly to execute on behalf of the Commission and deliver to said The Herkner Construction Company a release releasing said company from any and all damages to which the Commission might otherwise be entitled on account of the failure of said company to complete said Contract C-16 or any portion thereof within any of the times prescribed or required by said contract;

"FURTHER RESOLVED that the foregoing partial release of retainage shall be made, and the foregoing release shall be executed and delivered, only upon condition that The Herkner Construction Company shall release the Commission from any and all claims, and demands, actions, and causes of action of said contractor against the Commission, except said contractor's claim for the balance of the aforesaid 'retained percentage'; provided, however, that said release shall provide that it shall not prevent the routine adjustment of quantities to reflect final measurements nor affect the continuing obligations of the contractor or its surety with respect to defective work or materials and indemnification of the Commission, or affect any obligation under the contract or the bond with respect to work yet to be performed and the agreed compensation

therefor, nor shall it preclude the contractor from asserting and pursuing his rights to payment on account of the matters identified by the following extra-work orders:

EW(FA)11, Drying Blue Till
EW(FA)12, Re-design of 66" Corrugated
Metal Pipe
EW(RV)18, Salvage of Timber
EW(RV)21, Scoring Parapets
EW(RV)23, Expansion Joints
EW(RV)28, Box Culvert Extension

"FURTHER RESOLVED that the instruments executed in carrying out this resolution shall be in form satisfactory to the Commission's general counsel and may contain other stipulations deemed requisite or appropriate by general counsel, and that this resolution shall be carried into execution only upon general counsel's satisfaction that the surety has furnished any and all requisite consents; and

"FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution shall supersede resolution No. 18-1956."

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

Ayes: Beightler, Teagarden, Allen, Shocknessy.

Nays: None.

The Chairman declared the resolution adopted.

The Chairman reported further that the Commission had with it its new Executive Director, Mr. Herman F. Tornau of Cincinnati, Ohio, a man of long and brilliant experience in the transportation field. He said that Mr. Tornau had come on duty immediately after the last meeting of the Commission and had been most of the time since then at the headquarters at Berea absorbing or being absorbed by the Ohio Turnpike. He invited Mr. Tornau to address the Commission.

Mr. Tornau said that already he had been able to travel from one end of the turnpike to the other, spending approximately two days in doing so stopping at many points en route. He said that it had been his first experience on the Ohio Turnpike and he was glad that he could join in the feeling of the staff that it was probably the finest turnpike in the United States.

The Chairman said that the whole world thought that. He said further that the Commission also had with it Judge Lockwood Thompson whom the Commission would consider later in the meeting for appointment as its General Counsel.

The Chairman reported further that with respect to proposed Ohio Turnpike Project No. 2 he had heard reports that he had some information to the effect that the investment bankers in New York and elsewhere were prepared to finance that portion of the prospective project from the Ohio Turnpike to Conneaut. The Chairman said that he had no such information and never had had any such information. He said further that he had said at the last meeting that the project from the Ohio Turnpike to Conneaut was an absolute must however financed but that because it would be part of an existing toll-road system there was more justification for its being considered as a toll-road project than there otherwise would be. He said that was all that the Chairman of the Turnpike Commission knew and all that he had recently said about any portion's construction. The Chairman said further, however, that because the Governor of Ohio had heard that the Chairman of the Turnpike Commission had the information which the Chairman of the Turnpike Commission had just said that he had heard he had, the Governor of Ohio had asked the Chairman of the Turnpike Commission to determine definitely whether or not the investment bankers were then interested in financing a project from the Ohio Turnpike to Conneaut. He said that the Governor was profoundly concerned about the need of that connection just as he also had indicated that he was profoundly concerned about the necessity of providing the whole facility from Cincinnati to Conneaut. He said that not only because of what it had been reported to him the Chairman of the Turnpike Commission had been told by bankers but because of conflicting statements that had allegedly emanated from the Highway Department with respect to what the Highway Department had been doing, the Governor was confronted with making an exact determination and declaration for the benefit of the public and the economy with respect to the construction prospects for that facility from Cincinnati to Conneaut. The Chairman said that accordingly the Governor had asked him to address the investment bankers directly and ask whether or not the letter applicable to the whole project, which had been read at the last meeting of the Commission was applicable also to that portion of it from the Ohio Turnpike to Conneaut. He said that accordingly he had asked Mr. Dennis Murphy of the Ohio Company who was present as one of the managers of the syndicate formed to consider the second prospective project's financing if he would be willing to advise the Commission of the disposition of the investment bankers with respect to financing that portion of the proposed project from Cincinnati to Conneaut which lay between the Ohio Turnpike and Conneaut. He invited Mr. Murphy to address the Commission.

Mr. Murphy said that in the consideration which the investment bankers had given to the financing of Project No. 2 they had not been furnished with a detailed breakdown of any particular segment of the proposed Ohio Turnpike Project No. 2. He said, however, that the basic considerations which they had had before them in making a determination of whether they thought the Project No. 2 was financially feasible were applicable to the financing of the segment or section of the project from the Ohio Turnpike to Conneaut. He said that the same factors which they had set forth in their letter, namely, the revenues on the Ohio Turnpike since its opening to operation, the effect of any adjustment of tolls which the Turnpike Commission might decide to make as a result of the report or analysis of the toll schedule which was being made, and the market conditions for turnpike bonds were all applicable to the financing of a section of the project alone. He said that since their letter had been written the market position of some turnpike bonds, not meaning the Ohio Turnpike bonds, was less favorable than formerly. He said that the Illinois turnpike bonds were then down about 1-1/2 points from the price indicated in their letter; that the Indiana turnpike bonds were down about 2-1/2 points; but that Ohio turnpike bonds were up about 1-1/2 points from what they had been then. He said that it was his personal judgment that the financing of project No. 2 at that time was not propitious. He said that Mr. Henry Boyd of Blyth & Co., Inc. had informed him that he shared the views which he was expressing.

The Chairman reported further that despite what had been said and published the Commission was not going to increase passenger rates. He said that the Commission had not even thought of increasing passenger rates. He said that the Commission had not sought a recommendation with respect to passenger rates, that the Commission had limited itself to action on commercial rates when it had sought the recommendation of its Consulting Engineers. He said that the Commission had sought recommendations only on those classifications in the schedule denominated two through nine inclusive. He said that the Commission was having a magnificent experience with passenger revenue at that time, so it had limited its consideration of revision to vehicles other than passenger vehicles and whatever other vehicles fell in class one of the schedule.

Mr. Allen asked with respect to Mr. Murphy's statement regarding proposed project No. 2 whether, assuming that at some future time financing might change, there was any further work that had to be done so that the Commission could submit for financing a portion of the route from the Ohio Turnpike to Conneaut.

The Chairman said that he thought that consideration was being given by the Governor to having that information on the portion

from Conneaut to the Ohio Turnpike separated in the report and having its engineering done.

Mr. E. J. Donnelly a partner of the J. E. Greiner Company, Consulting Engineers to the Commission, said that there was no problem in taking the cost data out for that particular section of proposed project No. 2.

Mr. Samuel Brown of the consulting engineering firm of Coverdale and Colpitts said that separating the revenue for that portion was not a large or difficult problem but that there would have to be some work done because the traffic estimated to use that northeast end section together with the revenue to be derived therefrom had been estimated on the assumption of the continuous road so that some of the longer distance trips would have to be reexamined. He said that the work could be done within three to four weeks time and thus produce figures that pertained solely to the construction by itself of the portion described and that it would be in as thorough final form as such things could be done.

The Chairman said that he thought the length of that portion was about 65 miles and that the best estimate of construction costs, including financing charges, was probably in excess of \$150,000,000.

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

- 1 - draft of the minutes of the June 5, 1956 meeting.
- 2 - traffic and revenue report for May 1956.

He reported further that the coupon books for the prepayment of tolls by governmental organizations had been ordered and were to be delivered by June 28, 1956. He said that prior to that date the Commission would write those organizations that might be interested and solicit their orders. The Assistant Secretary-Treasurer reported further that the Commission then had 43 toll charge accounts, the last of which had been Norwalk Truck Line, a large and well known common carrier.

The Chairman said that the Commission had before it the letter of the Consulting Engineers responsive to the Commission's letter of April 25, 1956. He said that the letter of the Consulting Engineers was dated June 14, 1956 and was signed by Mr. E. J. Donnelly. He obtained the agreement of the Commission to call upon Mr. E. J. Donnelly to address the Commission on the rate schedule.

Mr. Donnelly read the following letter:

"The Ohio Turnpike Commission
139 East Gay Street
Columbus, Ohio

June 14, 1956

Gentlemen:

"Pursuant to your letter dated April 5, 1956, and in accordance with the terms of the Trust Agreement dated June 1, 1952, by and between the Ohio Turnpike Commission and the Ohio National Bank of Columbus, Trustee, and the National City Bank of New York, Co-Trustee, we submit herewith our recommendations concerning modifications of the toll rates for commercial vehicles (Classes 2 through 9 inclusive) for the Ohio Turnpike.

"In accordance with our request of April 27, 1956, as approved by the Ohio Turnpike Commission by Resolution No. 27-1956, dated May 1, 1956, we retained the firm of Coverdale and Colpitts to collaborate with us in conducting the rate study.

"Our detailed conclusions and recommendations are set forth in the report of Coverdale and Colpitts dated June 14, 1956, attached hereto, which we have adopted as our own and accordingly, so submit it. Set forth below is the summary of our recommendations.

- "1. We recommend changing the upper limit of Vehicle Class 2 from 15,000 to 16,000 pounds and changing the upper limit of Class 4 from 32,000 to 33,000 pounds. We further recommend that, at the present time, no other changes be made in the weight classification ranges.
- "2. We recommend the following schedule of tolls for a full length trip for Vehicle Classes 2 through 9 inclusive. For your information, we have also tabulated the existing fare schedule.

	<u>PROPOSED RATE</u>	<u>PRESENT RATE</u>
Class 2 - Vehicles weighing from 7,001 pounds through 16,000 pounds, gross weight.	\$ 5.00	\$ 4.75

	<u>PROPOSED RATE</u>	<u>PRESENT RATE</u>
<u>Class 3</u> - Vehicles weighing from 16,001 pounds through 23,000 pounds, gross weight.	\$ 6.50	\$ 7.25
<u>Class 4</u> - Vehicles weighing from 23,001 pounds through 33,000 pounds, gross weight.	\$ 8.00	\$ 8.25
<u>Class 5</u> - Vehicles weighing from 33,001 pounds through 42,000 pounds, gross weight.	\$ 9.50	\$11.50
<u>Class 6</u> - Vehicles weighing from 42,001 pounds through 53,000 pounds, gross weight.	\$10.60	\$14.50
<u>Class 7</u> - Vehicles weighing from 52,001 pounds through 65,000 pounds, gross weight.	\$12.75	\$17.75
<u>Class 8</u> - Vehicles weighing from 65,001 pounds through 78,000 pounds, gross weight.	\$18.50	\$21.50
<u>Class 9</u> - Vehicles weighing from 78,001 pounds through 90,000 pounds, gross weight.	\$26.50	\$30.00

- "3. We recommend that all qualified charge account commercial vehicle customers be granted a discount of 10 per cent on all business done in any one month above a base amount of \$2,000.00.

"4. In the event that the Ohio Turnpike Commission should adopt the recommended revisions contained herein, we recommend, for the purpose of initiating the proposed schedule as quickly as possible that the revised schedules be printed on separate handbills which can be utilized in conjunction with the present stock of tickets. In this fashion, the proposed schedule can be placed in effect weeks earlier than if it should be delayed until new toll tickets electroplates are made and new tickets are printed. In our opinion, the revised schedule of tolls can be placed in effect 7 days after adoption of said schedule.

"We do not recommend a comprehensive study of the complete toll schedule, including Class 1 vehicles, until there has been a full year of operating experience on the Ohio Turnpike.

Very truly yours,

J. E. GREINER COMPANY

by /s/ E. J. Donnelly"

Mr. Donnelly said also that his firm's letter of recommendation was silent on one section of the report dealt with by Coverdale and Colpitts, i. e. the matter of house trailers. He said that his firm was not prepared at that time to make a specific recommendation to the Commission for special handling of that class of vehicle and it would suggest that both it and the Turnpike Commission follow closely the operating procedures of the Ohio Turnpike through the ensuing months of traffic before the firm was called upon to make such a specific recommendation. Mr. Donnelly then asked Mr. Samuel Brown, a partner of Coverdale and Colpitts, to speak to the matter.

The Chairman said that before Mr. Brown spoke he wished to emphasize that the Greiner Company had adopted in its entirety, as its own, the report of Coverdale and Colpitts which was the basis for the recommendations which the Greiner Company had submitted. Mr. Donnelly said that was correct. The Chairman said further that he wanted to take note especially also of the fact that Mr. Donnelly had stated in his letter that he did not consider a full-scale restudy, including Class 1, to be warranted at that time. Mr. Donnelly said that also was correct.

Mr. Brown said that in the preparation of his firm's report dated June 14, 1956 his firm had made a study which was necessarily limited by the time available but that his firm concurred with the J. E. Greiner Company that it had been more desirable, in fact, highly preferable to

make such a study initially of the classes of vehicles which had been covered, namely, Classes 2 through 9, and to get such new rates instituted at the earliest possible time following their adoption by the Commission. He said also that his firm concurred with the recommendation which Mr. Donnelly had expressed to the Commission that a comprehensive study including all classes of vehicles, including Class 1, should not be made until there had been a full year of experience on the turnpike and perhaps some three months experience under some revised commercial-vehicle rates.

Mr. Brown said further that the making of a study within the limited amount of time it had had and getting results in which his firm could have confidence had been made possible only because his firm had made a number of other such studies both on operating and on under-construction turnpike projects within the last year. He said that in perhaps three or half a dozen such studies his firm had worked with the J. E. Greiner Company so that the two firms combined had had considerable inventory of facts and data upon which to draw. Mr. Brown said further that his firm had conducted limited field origin and destination studies, the primary one of which had been studies for a 48-hour period during the middle of the week of all the traffic entering and leaving the Ohio Turnpike at interchange 16, south of Youngstown. He said that that was the only factual data that it had had with respect to the manner in which truck traffic was selecting its routes to the west of that interchange as between the turnpike and the free roads. He said also, however, that his firm had had its engineers ride and follow the trucks to the extent of several miles of driving at truck speeds and riding loaded trucks all the way across the state on both the turnpike and the free-road routes. He said that his firm had adhered to a rather fundamental belief on its part that on toll roads of substantial length, as distinct from the 25 to 40 mile-long ones, the value of the turnpike to users would vary from section to section depending upon its relative superiority over the free-road routes. He said that his firm's thinking in that respect was summarized in a table on page 7 of its report from which he would read some toll rates as they applied to Class 6 trucks, the weight class from 42,000 to 53,000 pounds, and that he would read those rates in cents per mile. He said that those were cash toll rates, not reflecting discount. He said that reading from the west end of the turnpike on the section from Westgate to Interchange 4 west of Toledo the firm had determined the optimum toll rate to be approximately 3.7¢ per mile. He said that from Interchange 4 west of Toledo, to Interchange 5, Stony Ridge-Toledo, east of Toledo, the optimum toll rate was approximately 4.9¢ per mile. He said that from Stony Ridge-Toledo, Interchange 5, to the North Olmsted-Cleveland Interchange No. 9, the one that primarily served traffic in and out of Cleveland to points west, a toll rate of 4.35¢ per mile was the optimum. He said that from Interchange 9 to Interchange 11, a relatively short distance of 21 miles, a toll rate of approximately 5.25¢ per mile was the optimum. He said that from Interchange 11 to the eastern terminus of the turnpike, Eastgate, a distance of 68

miles, 4.7¢ per mile was the optimum rate. He said that those rates added in composite - considering a 10¢ reduction below the aggregate sum of the individual rates, to the toll rate of \$10.60 which Mr. Donnelly had read for Class 6 vehicles for the full length truck trip. He said that that worked out to an average of 4.4¢ per mile and a reduction of approximately 27% below the existing rates. He said that the Class 6 and Class 7 trucks were the primary classes of vehicles studied by his firm, that they were the heavily loaded over-the-road trucks. He said also that sufficient study had been given to the other classes of vehicles to set rates for them which were, as Mr. Donnelly had read, for the full length trip, and that he would read two series of percentage comparisons in respect to the other classes. Mr. Brown said that first, considering Class 6 as the basic rate, or 100%, the other classes bore a relationship to it as follows: First, reading down from Class 6, the Class 5 rate was 90% of Class 6, the Class 4 rate was 80% of Class 6 in certain cases but 75% of Class 6 for a full-length trip, the Class 3 rates were approximately 61% and the Class 2 rates 47% of the basic Class 6 rate. He said that on the up side of Class 6 the Class 7 rates were 20% higher, the Class 8 rates 75% higher, and the Class 9 rates, covering vehicles that were not of significance either in traffic volume or aggregate volume, 250% of the Class 6 rate, or 1-1/2 times higher as an increase and 2-1/2 times as high on a dollar basis.

Mr. Brown said further that the other percentages that were of interest were the percentage change from existing rate, again speaking in terms of the cash total without reflecting discount. He said that the Class 6 and Class 7 rates represented reductions of 27% and 28% respectively, and that the percentage changes then ranged downward, with Class 5 being a 17-1/2% reduction, Class 8 a 14% reduction, Class 9 less than 12% reduction, Class 4 a 3% reduction, Class 3 a 10% reduction, and Class 2 a 5% increase on the cash toll basis, which would be the equivalent of a 5% decrease after discount. He said that all of those percentage reductions would, of course, be greater to the user who had qualified for discount on his trips once he had passed the \$2,000 per month level. He said further that as to the effect of the proposed new rates if they had been in effect during March 1956, the month for which his firm had complete detailed traffic figures available, it estimated that of the recovered traffic which the firm believed would use the turnpike under the proposed new rates for considerable distances to the west of interchange 16 there would have been in the month of March 1956, even after reflecting such discounts as the firm estimated would have been earned, an increase of approximately \$120,000 in the month of March 1956 due to added revenue from those truck trips which would have used the turnpike for considerably longer distances instead of using it only to the east of interchange 16.

Mr. Brown said that he would like to interpolate something about what

his firm had found of that traffic that had been entering and leaving the turnpike at interchange 16. He said that in the two-days survey period there had been 2,174 such commercial vehicles and that of that number 643 had been bona fide users of interchange 16, that is, they had been going to Youngstown or other points directly served by that interchange. He said that there had been 1,531 of those trucks which could have used the turnpike advantageously to points further west, and that of that 1,531 which could have found advantage in staying on the turnpike 800 had been going to Indiana or points west such that they could have used the turnpike all the way to Westgate. He said that approximately 550 others could have used the turnpike either to Cleveland or to interchange 5, serving Toledo and Michigan points. Mr. Brown said that, therefore, he was talking about a sizeable amount of traffic that could have used the turnpike advantageously to the west of interchange 16. He said that, obviously, if the proposed lower rates had been in effect during March 1956 in respect to the other trips that actually did use the turnpike and which paid the existing toll rates in March 1956, they would have paid somewhat less and the Commission would have received a lesser amount of revenue therefrom. He said that that amount was not merely an estimate but subject to precise calculation and that it had been calculated and was approximately \$50,000 in the month of March. He said that his firm had not had in hand sufficient facts about the other shorter trip traffic, a good example of which was Cleveland to Toledo or Cleveland to Detroit, to be able to make a precise estimate of the many thousands of trips currently being made on the free roads and which his firm was confident would use the turnpike under those recommended rates but that his firm had had sufficient data in that respect to be convinced that the \$6,000 of calculated decrease would be materially more than offset so that the Turnpike Commission was assured, in his firm's opinion, as a floor of a net gain, based on the actual traffic of March 1956, at the rate of \$120,000 per month. He said that his firm had put in its report a purely projected figure to project that \$120,000 in the month of March to an annual basis on the premise of a pure assumption which it knew was not a valid assumption and it had said so in the report. He said that his firm believed that on the Ohio Turnpike or on any other new major turnpike project a seasonal pattern could not be said to have been established with any accuracy until the project had been open not merely a year but 18 months or more. He said that, obviously, on the Ohio Turnpike no seasonal pattern had been developed and that that was particularly true when one considered total traffic and total revenue because the passenger cars varied a great deal more in that particular traffic corridor between winter and summer and among all months of the year than did the trucks. He said that, therefore, to guard against anyone reaching and taking a seasonal factor that they might have been able to get hold of, based on either the free roads in Ohio or on a toll turnpike in another state, where they might have taken March or the February-March average and said that such a

month, based on the total revenue on a turnpike or the total traffic on a free road might be subjected to multiplication of a factor as high as 15 or 16 times to get an annual basis and that, in his firm's opinion, would not be warranted for trucks. He said also that his firm had just said, in effect, that if one wanted a closer estimate than that, one could assume March as one-twelfth of the year and that his firm had done that and that, of course, twelve times the \$120,000 was the magnitude of \$1,500,000 a year of added revenue from that recovered traffic. He said that his firm had not assumed that the turnpike would recover all those trips which currently were using the free roads to the west of Youngstown. He said that his firm's experience on other toll highways showed that the toll road would never, no matter how reasonable its toll schedule nor no matter how fine its advantages, get 100% of any segment of traffic. He said that his firm was confident, based on empirical data from other roads, that at least 60% of that present traffic not using the pike would come to use the pike over a period of a few months if the proposed new rates were adopted and that his firm's estimates of the money to be gained were based on a 60% usage. He said that, obviously, if that turned out to be as high as 75% usage, there would be somewhat more revenue benefit to the authority.

The Executive Director said that he had studied the report and had discussed it with the staff. He said that, evidently, with the time factor allowed, it was an adequate study of that portion of the rate schedule in which the Commission was especially interested.

The Chairman said that the portion of the Coverdale and Colpitts report with respect to house trailers to which Mr. Donnelly had adverted warranted further examination and was not in fact a firm recommendation of Coverdale and Colpitts for action at that time although it was not excluded as a suggestion of theirs which could be the basis of a recommendation by J. E. Greiner Company if that firm chose to include it. He said that it was not the purpose of the Commission nor would it be the purpose of the Commission by any action of its own to pre-empt the use by the house trailer but the accident rate had been examined by the Executive Director and by the Deputy Executive Director and there was not any doubt in the minds of either of them that the Commission would have to address itself to the problem of the house trailer if the traffic on the turnpike increased as extensively as it was expected to increase with the normal seasonal passenger car increase irrespective of the sanguine hopes expressed in the Coverdale and Colpitts report with respect to increase in truck traffic if the revision should be adopted.

The Executive Director said that with respect to the safety problem of the house trailer by nature of its width which was approaching ten feet and its length which was in some cases 60 feet, there was considerable amount of use being made of the turnpike by companies delivering such

trailers from the manufacturer to the eventual retailer and that the trailers were light in weight. He said that all of those factors taken together possibly might contribute to accidents on the turnpike.

The Chairman said that the Deputy Executive Director had observed that the trailers were highly susceptible to jack-knifing in bad weather. The Deputy Executive Director said that the accident-rate figures on house trailers were incomplete to the extent that the rates pertained to all house trailers that had used the turnpike and the only count on house trailers was for those for which special permits for being over-length or over-width had been issued. He said that there was an unknown quantity between the accident rates pertaining to all house trailers and those pertaining to house trailers on which special permits had been issued which would have to have some study before a good approach to the problem could be made. He said that the whole house trailer problem required study.

Mr. John Blanpied representing the Ohio National Bank, the Trustee, said in response to an inquiry by the Chairman that the Trustee had received a copy of the Coverdale and Colpitts report. The Chairman said that he wanted the record to show that the Trustee had had the report before the Commission proceeded to take any action on it. He said that the record should show also that pursuant to the terms of the indenture all correspondence with respect to the proposed revision with respect to the recommendations of the Consulting Engineers had been submitted to all those who, under the terms of the indenture, were entitled to receive it. The General Counsel said that that was correct. The Assistant Secretary-Treasurer said that that was correct. Mr. Dennis E. Murphy of the Ohio Company, a principal underwriter, stated for the record that the Ohio Company had received a copy of the report and that he knew that Blyth & Co., Inc. had received a copy and asked if B. J. VanIngen & Co. had received a copy which he presumed that it had. The General Counsel said that she could assure that B. J. VanIngen & Co. had been sent a copy of the report.

The Chairman said that the record would show that the report had been sent and the Consulting Engineers were possessed of the correspondence.

Resolution No. 40-1956 revising the schedule of tolls adopted July 15, 1955 by Resolution No. 38-1956 was moved for adoption by Mr. Allen, seconded by Mr. Teagarden, as follows:

Resolution No. 40-1956

"WHEREAS, pursuant to §501 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's consulting engineer, J. E. Greiner Company, was requested by the Commission in meeting on April 3, as confirmed by letter dated April 5, 1956, signed by the chairman of the Commission and addressed to the J. E. Greiner Company, to make an immediate study of the toll rates established under the Commission's schedule of toll rates for vehicles in class VI and to re-examine the rates in other classes immediately related to such class, if, in the opinion of said consulting engineers, such re-examination be appropriate, and to advise and recommend to the Commission accordingly; and

"WHEREAS the consulting engineers by letter dated June 14, 1956, addressed to the Ohio Turnpike Commission and signed on behalf of said engineers by E. J. Donnelly, submitted to the Commission certain conclusions and recommendations as set forth in a report entitled 'Report on Ohio Turnpike Truck Toll Study With Recommended Revised Truck Toll Schedules,' dated June 14, 1956, by Coverdale & Colpitts, which report the Commission's consulting engineers advised the Commission it has adopted as its own and accordingly makes to the Commission as its own;

"NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

"RESOLVED that the Commission having duly and fully considered the four recommendations of its consulting engineers as set forth in the aforesaid letter of June 14, 1956, hereinabove mentioned, does hereby adopt the same, including the revised schedule of tolls as set forth therein, and does hereby revise the schedule of rates of tolls heretofore fixed by it under resolution No. 38-1955, adopted July 15, 1955, accordingly;

"FURTHER RESOLVED that the discount provided for commercial customers shall be computed upon a calendar-month basis beginning July 1, 1956, but for the purpose of such computation, that period immediately following the effective date of the revised schedule to and including June 30, 1956, shall be considered as one calendar month;

"FURTHER RESOLVED that said revised schedule of tolls be made effective as soon as appropriate arrangements necessary to place it in effect can be accomplished, which shall in no event be later than 12:01 a. m., June 26, 1956, to be and remain in effect until midnight, September 30, 1956; and

"FURTHER RESOLVED that the aforesaid revised schedule of tolls is as follows:

OHIO TURNPIKE

SCHEDULE OF TOLLS

CLASS 9

Vehicles, Weighing from 78,001 pounds through 90,000 pounds Gross Weight

No.	Name	1 - Westgate	2 - Montpelier	3 - Wauseon	4 - Maumee-Toledo	5 - Stony Ridge-Toledo	6 - Fremont-Port Clinton	7 - Sandusky-Norwalk	8 - Lorain-Elyria	9 - No. Olmsted-Cleveland	10 - Strongsville-Cleveland	11 - Cleveland	12 - Akron	13 - Streetsboro	14 - Warren	15 - Niles-Youngstown	16 - Youngstown	17 - Eastgate
1	Westgate (Ind. Tpke.)	1.25																
2	Montpelier (SR 15)	3.25	2.00															
3	Wauseon (SR 108)	5.50	4.25	2.25														
4	Maumee-Toledo (US 20)	7.00	5.75	3.75	1.50													
5	Stony Ridge-Toledo (SR 120)	9.25	8.00	6.00	3.75	2.25												
6	Fremont-Port Clinton (SR 53)	12.10	10.85	8.85	6.60	5.10	2.85											
7	Sandusky-Norwalk (US 250)	14.95	13.70	11.70	9.45	7.95	5.70	2.85										
8	Lorain-Elyria (SR 57)	15.70	14.45	12.45	10.20	8.70	6.45	3.60	.75									
9	No. Olmsted-Cleveland (SR 10)	16.95	15.70	13.70	11.45	9.95	7.70	4.85	2.00	1.25								
10	Strongsville-Cleveland (US 42)	18.45	17.20	15.20	12.95	11.45	9.20	6.35	3.50	2.75	1.50							
11	Cleveland (US 21)	19.20	17.95	15.95	13.70	12.20	9.95	7.10	4.25	3.50	2.25	.75						
12	Akron (SR 8)	19.95	18.70	16.70	14.45	12.95	10.70	7.85	5.00	4.25	3.00	1.50	.75					
13	Streetsboro (SR 14)	22.70	21.45	19.45	17.20	15.70	13.45	10.60	7.75	7.00	5.75	4.25	3.50	2.75				
14	Warren (SR 5)	23.95	22.70	20.70	18.45	16.95	14.70	11.85	9.00	8.25	7.00	5.50	4.75	4.00	1.25			
15	Niles-Youngstown (SR 18)	25.45	24.20	22.20	19.95	18.45	16.20	13.35	10.50	9.75	8.50	7.00	6.25	5.50	2.75	1.50		
16	Youngstown (SR 7)	26.50	25.25	23.25	21.00	19.50	17.25	14.40	11.55	10.80	9.55	8.05	7.30	6.55	3.80	2.55		
17	Eastgate (Penna. Tpke.)																	1.25

- 147 -

OHIO TURNPIKE SCHEDULE OF TOLLS

CLASS 8

Vehicles Weighing from 65,001 pounds
through 78,000 pounds Gross Weight

Interchange																		
No.	Name																	
1	Westgate (Ind. Tpke.)																	
2	Montpelier (SR 15)	85																
3	Wauseon (SR 108)	2.25	1.40															
4	Maumee-Toledo (US 20)	3.80	2.95	1.55														
5	Stony Ridge-Toledo (SR 120)	4.85	4.00	2.60	1.05													
6	Fremont-Port Clinton (SR 53)	6.40	5.55	4.15	2.60	1.55												
7	Sandusky-Norwalk (US 250)	8.40	7.55	6.15	4.60	3.55	2.00											
8	Lorain-Elyria (SR 57)	10.40	9.55	8.15	6.60	5.55	4.00	2.00										
9	No. Olmsted-Cleveland (SR 10)	10.95	10.10	8.70	7.15	6.10	4.55	3.40	1.40	.85								
10	Strongsville-Cleveland (US 42)	11.80	10.95	9.55	8.00	6.95	5.40	3.40	2.45	1.90	1.05	.55						
11	Cleveland (US 21)	12.85	12.00	10.60	9.05	8.00	6.45	4.45	3.00	2.45	1.60	.55						
12	Akron (SR 8)	13.40	12.55	11.15	9.60	8.55	7.00	5.00	3.00	2.45	1.60	.55						
13	Streetsboro (SR 14)	13.95	13.10	11.70	10.15	9.10	7.55	5.55	3.55	3.00	2.15	.55						
14	Warren (SR 5)	15.90	15.05	13.65	12.10	11.05	9.50	7.50	5.50	4.95	4.10	3.05	2.50	1.95				
15	Niles-Youngstown (SR 18)	16.75	15.90	14.50	12.95	11.90	10.35	8.35	6.35	5.80	4.95	3.90	3.35	2.80	.85			
16	Youngstown (SR 7)	17.80	16.95	15.55	14.00	12.95	11.40	9.40	7.40	6.85	6.00	4.95	4.40	3.85	1.90	1.05		
17	Eastgate (Penna. Tpke.)	18.50	17.65	16.25	14.70	13.65	12.10	10.10	8.10	7.55	6.70	5.65	5.10	4.55	2.60	1.75	.85	

OHIO TURNPIKE

SCHEDULE OF TOLLS

CLASS 7

Vehicles Weighing from 53,001 pounds through 65,000 pounds Gross Weight

Interchange																			
No.	Name																16 - Youngstown	17 - Eastgate	
1	Westgate (Ind. Tpke.)																		
2	Montpelier (SR 15)	.60																	
3	Wauseon (SR 108)	1.55	.95																
4	Maumee-Toledo (US 20)	2.65	2.05	1.10															
5	Stony Ridge-Toledo (SR 120)	3.35	2.75	1.80	.70														
6	Fremont-Port Clinton (SR 53)	4.45	3.85	2.90	1.80	1.10													
7	Sandusky-Norwalk (US 250)	5.85	5.25	4.30	3.20	2.50	1.40												
8	Lorain-Elyria (SR 57)	7.25	6.65	5.70	4.60	3.90	2.80	1.40											
9	No. Olmsted-Cleveland (SR 10)	7.60	7.00	6.05	4.95	4.25	3.15	1.75	.35										
10	Strongsville-Cleveland (US 42)	8.20	7.60	6.65	5.55	4.85	3.75	2.35	.95										
11	Cleveland (US 21)	8.90	8.30	7.35	6.25	5.55	4.45	3.05	1.65	1.30	.70								
12	Akron (SR 8)	9.25	8.65	7.70	6.60	5.90	4.80	3.40	2.00	1.65	1.05	.35							
13	Streetsboro (SR 14)	9.60	9.00	8.05	6.95	6.25	5.15	3.75	2.35	2.00	1.40	.70							
14	Warren (SR 5)	10.95	10.35	9.40	8.30	7.60	6.50	5.10	3.70	3.35	2.75	2.05	1.70	1.35					
15	Niles-Youngstown (SR 18)	11.55	10.95	10.00	8.90	8.20	7.10	5.70	4.30	3.95	3.35	2.65	2.30	1.95					
16	Youngstown (SR 7)	12.25	11.65	10.70	9.60	8.90	7.80	6.40	5.00	4.65	4.05	3.35	3.00	2.65					
17	Eastgate (Penna. Tpke.)	12.75	12.15	11.20	10.10	9.40	8.30	6.90	5.50	5.15	4.55	3.85	3.50	3.15					
															1.80	1.20	.60		

126

-25-

OHIO TURNPIKE SCHEDULE OF TOLLS CLASS 6

Vehicles Weighing from 42,001 pounds
through 53,000 pounds Gross Weight

Interchange																		
No.	Name																	
1	Westgate (Ind. Tpke.)																	
2	Montpelier (SR 15)	1 - Westgate																
3	Wauseon (SR 108)	2 - Montpelier	3 - Wauseon															
4	Maumee-Toledo (US 20)	3 - Wauseon	4 - Maumee-Toledo															
5	Stony Ridge-Toledo (SR 120)	4 - Maumee-Toledo	5 - Stony Ridge-Toledo															
6	Fremont-Port Clinton (SR 53)	5 - Stony Ridge-Toledo	6 - Fremont-Port Clinton															
7	Sandusky-Norwalk (US 250)	6 - Fremont-Port Clinton	7 - Sandusky-Norwalk															
8	Lorain-Elyria (SR 57)	7 - Sandusky-Norwalk	8 - Lorain-Elyria															
9	No. Olmsted-Cleveland (SR 10)	8 - Lorain-Elyria	9 - No. Olmsted-Cleveland															
10	Strongsville-Cleveland (US 42)	9 - No. Olmsted-Cleveland	10 - Strongsville-Cleveland															
11	Cleveland (US 21)	10 - Strongsville-Cleveland	11 - Cleveland															
12	Akron (SR 8)	11 - Cleveland	12 - Akron															
13	Streetsboro (SR 14)	12 - Akron	13 - Streetsboro															
14	Warren (SR 5)	13 - Streetsboro	14 - Warren															
15	Niles-Youngstown (SR 18)	14 - Warren	15 - Niles-Youngstown															
16	Youngstown (SR 7)	15 - Niles-Youngstown	16 - Youngstown															
17	Eastgate (Penna. Tpke.)	16 - Youngstown	17 - Eastgate															

OHIO TURNPIKE

SCHEDULE OF TOLLS

CLASS 5

Vehicles Weighing from 33,001 pounds through 42,000 pounds Gross Weight

No.	Name	1 - Westgate	2 - Montpelier	3 - Wauseon	4 - Maumee-Toledo	5 - Stony Ridge-Toledo	6 - Fremont-Port Clinton	7 - Sandusky-Norwalk	8 - Lorain-Elyria	9 - No. Olmsted-Cleveland	10 - Strongsville-Cleveland	11 - Cleveland	12 - Akron	13 - Streetsboro	14 - Warren	15 - Niles-Youngstown	16 - Youngstown	17 - Eastgate
1	Westgate (Ind. Tpke.)	.45																
2	Montpelier (SR 15)	1.15	.70															
3	Wauseon (SR 108)	1.95	1.50	.80														
4	Maumee-Toledo (US 20)	2.50	2.05	1.35	.55													
5	Stony Ridge-Toledo (SR 120)	3.30	2.85	2.15	1.35	.08												
6	Fremont-Port Clinton (SR 53)	4.35	3.90	3.20	2.40	1.85	1.05											
7	Sandusky-Norwalk (US 250)	5.40	4.95	4.25	3.45	2.90	2.10	1.05	.25									
8	Lorain-Elyria (SR 57)	5.65	5.20	4.50	3.70	3.15	2.35	1.30	.70	.45								
9	No. Olmsted-Cleveland (SR 10)	6.10	5.65	4.95	4.15	3.60	2.80	1.75	.70	.45	.55							
10	Strongsville-Cleveland (US 42)	6.65	6.20	5.50	4.70	4.15	3.35	2.30	1.25	1.00	.80	.50						
11	Cleveland (US 21)	6.90	6.45	5.75	4.95	4.40	3.60	2.55	1.50	1.25	.80	.50	1.00					
12	Akron (SR 8)	7.15	6.70	6.00	5.20	4.65	3.85	2.80	1.75	1.50	1.05	.50	1.00	1.00				
13	Streetsboro (SR 14)	8.15	7.70	7.00	6.20	5.65	4.85	3.80	2.75	2.50	2.05	1.50	1.85	1.00	1.45			
14	Warren (SR 5)	8.60	8.15	7.45	6.65	6.10	5.30	4.25	3.20	2.95	2.50	1.95	1.70	1.45	.45			
15	Niles-Youngstown (SR 18)	9.15	8.70	8.00	7.20	6.65	5.85	4.80	3.75	3.50	3.05	2.50	2.25	2.00	1.00	.55		
16	Youngstown (SR 7)	9.50	9.05	8.35	7.55	7.00	6.20	5.15	4.10	3.85	3.40	2.85	2.60	2.35	1.35	.90		
17	Eastgate (Penna. Tpke.)																.45	

- 23 -

OHIO TURNPIKE SCHEDULE OF TOLLS CLASS 4

Vehicles Weighing from 23,001 pounds
through 33,000 pounds Gross Weight

Interchange																		
No.	Name																	
1	Westgate (Ind. Tpke.)																	
2	Montpelier (SR 15)																	
3	Wauseon (SR 108)																	
4	Maumee-Toledo (US 20)																	
5	Stony Ridge-Toledo (SR 120)																	
6	Fremont-Port Clinton (SR 53)																	
7	Sandusky-Norwalk (US 250)																	
8	Lorain-Elyria (SR 57)																	
9	No. Olmsted-Cleveland (SR 10)																	
10	Strongsville-Cleveland (US 42)																	
11	Cleveland (US 21)																	
12	Akron (SR 8)																	
13	Streetsboro (SR 14)																	
14	Warren (SR 5)																	
15	Niles-Youngstown (SR 18)																	
16	Youngstown (SR 7)																	
17	Eastgate (Penna. Tpke.)																	

1 - Westgate

2 - Montpelier

3 - Wauseon

4 - Maumee-Toledo

5 - Stony Ridge-Toledo

6 - Fremont-Port Clinton

7 - Sandusky-Norwalk

8 - Lorain-Elyria

9 - No. Olmsted-Cleveland

10 - Strongsville-Cleveland

11 - Cleveland

12 - Akron

13 - Streetsboro

14 - Warren

15 - Niles-Youngstown

16 - Youngstown

17 - Eastgate

OHIO TURNPIKE SCHEDULE OF TOLLS

CLASS 3

Vehicles Weighing from 16,001 pounds
through 23,000 pounds Gross Weight

No.	Name	Exchange																
		1 - Westgate	2 - Montpelier	3 - Wauseon	4 - Maumee-Toledo	5 - Stony Ridge-Toledo	6 - Fremont-Port Clinton	7 - Sandusky-Norwalk	8 - Lorain-Elyria	9 - No. Olmsted-Cleveland	10 - Strongsville-Cleveland	11 - Cleveland	12 - Akron	13 - Streetsboro	14 - Warren	15 - Niles-Youngstown	16 - Youngstown	17 - Eastgate
1	Westgate (Ind. Tpke.)	.30																
2	Montpelier (SR 15)	.80	.50															
3	Wauseon (SR 108)	1.30	1.00	.50														
4	Maumee-Toledo (US 20)	1.65	1.35	.85	.35													
5	Stony Ridge-Toledo (SR 120)	2.15	1.85	1.35	.85	.50												
6	Fremont-Port Clinton (SR 53)	2.85	2.55	2.05	1.55	1.20	.70											
7	Sandusky-Norwalk (US 250)	3.55	3.25	2.75	2.25	1.90	1.40	.70										
8	Lorain-Elyria (SR 57)	3.80	3.50	3.00	2.50	2.15	1.65	.95	.25									
9	No. Olmsted-Cleveland (SR 10)	4.10	3.80	3.30	2.80	2.45	1.95	1.25	.55	.30								
10	Strongsville-Cleveland (US 42)	4.45	4.15	3.65	3.15	2.80	2.30	1.60	.90	.65	.35							
11	Cleveland (US 21)	4.70	4.40	3.90	3.40	3.05	2.55	1.85	1.15	.90	.60	.25						
12	Akron (SR 8)	4.95	4.65	4.15	3.65	3.30	2.80	2.10	1.40	1.15	.85	.50	.25					
13	Streetsboro (SR 14)	5.65	5.35	4.85	4.35	4.00	3.50	2.80	2.10	1.85	1.55	1.20	.95	.70				
14	Warren (SR 5)	5.95	5.65	5.15	4.65	4.30	3.80	3.10	2.40	2.15	1.85	1.50	1.25	1.00	.30			
15	Niles-Youngstown (SR 18)	6.30	6.00	5.50	5.00	4.65	4.15	3.45	2.75	2.50	2.20	1.85	1.60	1.35	.65	.35		
16	Youngstown (SR 7)	6.50	6.20	5.70	5.20	4.85	4.35	3.65	2.95	2.70	2.40	2.05	1.80	1.55	.85	.55		
17	Eastgate (Penna. Tpke.)																	.30

- 22 -

The Chairman said that the Resolution incorporated the revised schedule of rates which had been discussed at the meeting, which had been the subject of consideration by the Commission ever since the Commission had been in receipt of the recommendation of the J. E. Greiner Company embodying the Coverdale and Colpitts report the previous Friday, June 15, 1956. He said that he regretted exceedingly that Mr. Linzell, as the corporate representative of the Governor of Ohio on the Commission, was not present when that very important action was being considered.

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

Ayes: Allen, Teagarden, Beightler, Shocknessy.

Nays: None.

The Chairman declared the resolution adopted, then he said, "Let the trucks roll."

The General Counsel said that she had no oral report to make. She said that she had placed in the hands of each of the members of the Commission a written report which was in considerable more detail than that which she customarily made.

The Chairman remarked that the meeting would be the last for Mrs. Wilkins in her capacity as General Counsel of the Commission. He said that the members of the Commission could not like less to have her leave them because she had contributed wisdom, charm and pulchritude and with all due respect to her prospective successor as to wisdom and charm he could say nothing of the third quality.

Mrs. Wilkins responded that the nearly four years of her service had been exceptionally challenging ones and very happy ones for her and that she certainly regretted leaving the Commission. She said, however, she was sure that the Commission would place the job of General Counsel in hands much more competent than hers. The Chairman replied that with all due respect to her successor the Commission would be satisfied if the hands were as competent.

The Chairman said that the Director of Highways had indicated that he would like to have the building at 139 East Gay Street which the Commission then was occupying as its principal office. He said that the Director would like to have it without declaring the price and subject to approval by another agency and that meanwhile he would like possession. He said that the Commission would have before it the resolution which would accommodate the transfer to the Department of Highways if the transfer could be accomplished within its terms on the part of the Highway Department.

Resolution No. 41-1956 determining that it is in the best interest of the Commission to sell certain real estate and authorizing Chairman to execute necessary instruments was moved for adoption by Mr. Teagarden, seconded by Mr. Allen, as follows:

Resolution No. 41-1956

"WHEREAS the Commission, by resolution No. 34-1956, authorized and empowered its chairman to negotiate for the sale of certain real estate situated in the city of Columbus, Franklin County, Ohio, and commonly known as 135-141 East Gay Street and 40-46 North Lazelle Street; and

"WHEREAS the consulting engineer has approved said resolution by letter, dated June 8, 1956;

"NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

"RESOLVED that the Commission, being fully advised does hereby determine that it is in the best interest of the Commission to sell its interest in and to the aforesaid real estate for and in consideration of an amount equal to the capital investment of the Commission in said property as of May 31, 1956; and

"FURTHER RESOLVED that the chairman, acting for and on behalf of the Commission, be, and he hereby is, authorized to enter into a contract with the state of Ohio for such sale by the Commission and purchase by the state upon the terms hereinabove set forth, and, further, upon the payment to the Commission of the aforesaid consideration, to execute any and all instruments necessary and proper to quitclaim all interest of the Commission in and to the aforesaid real estate, and to relinquish possession thereof, at 12:01 a.m., on July 1, 1956, or as soon thereafter as practicable."

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

Ayes: Teagarden, Allen, Beightler, Shocknessy.

Nays: None.

The Chairman declared the resolution adopted.

Resolution No. 42-1956 amending Article II, Sec. 2.00 of the Commission's Code of Bylaws with respect to the place of regular meetings of the Commission was moved for adoption by Mr. Allen, seconded by Mr. Teagarden, as follows:

Resolution No. 42-1956

"WHEREAS the Commission has determined to consolidate its principal office with the operations office in the administration building on the Ohio Turnpike, effective July 1, 1956;

"NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

"RESOLVED that Article II, sec. 2.00 of the Commission's code of bylaws be, and the same hereby is, amended, effective July 1, 1956, to read as follows:

'Sec. 2.00 Place. All regular meetings of the commission shall be held at its office in the administration building on the Ohio Turnpike, or at such other place as may from time to time be designated by the commission at a preceding meeting or be designated by its chairman by mailing or delivering written notice, or by causing the same to be mailed or delivered, to the other members of the commission at least forty-eight hours before the regularly scheduled time for such regular meetings. The place where each special meeting shall be held shall be designated in the call thereof. '"

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

Ayes: Allen, Teagarden, Beightler, Shocknessy.

Nays: None.

The Chairman declared the resolution adopted.

General Beightler said to the General Counsel that he was another one of the members of the Commission who was definitely going to miss her. He said that he had spent quite a number of years in public service and quasi-public service and that he wanted to say quite sincerely that one of the most pleasant associations and experiences that he had had had been his association with her, first when he had been Executive Director and thereafter as a member of the Commission when she was serving as Assistant General Counsel and thereafter as General Counsel. Mrs. Wilkins thanked General Beightler.

General Beightler said that he was happy to introduce a Resolution appointing Lockwood Thompson as General Counsel. He said that he had known Judge Thompson principally from reputation although he had met him

on several occasions and that he knew he was a very highly respected member of his profession and that he thought the Commission was fortunate to be able to secure his services.

Resolution No. 43-1956 appointing General Counsel was moved for adoption by General Beightler, seconded by Mr. Teagarden, as follows:

Resolution No. 43-1956

"RESOLVED that Lockwood Thompson be, and hereby he is, appointed general counsel of the Commission, effective July 1, 1956, to serve at his and the Commission's mutual pleasure; that, as general counsel, he shall devote such time to the performance of the duties of general counsel as shall be required that he may adequately discharge said duties as they are set forth in the code of bylaws; and that his compensation be at the rate of \$18,000 per annum."

The Chairman said that Mr. Allen had indicated his friendliness to Judge Thompson and his friendship for him over the years. He said that General Beightler had similarly expressed himself and Mr. Teagarden likewise and that he himself had known Judge Thompson a long while. He said that he concurred in what General Beightler had to say, that the Commission was fortunate to have Judge Thompson come with it as General Counsel. He said that it was particularly desirable that a Cleveland man be the Commission's General Counsel as it moved its headquarters to Cuyahoga County and that it was certainly a propitious circumstance that one so qualified would be the Commission's General Counsel.

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

Ayes: Beightler, Teagarden, Allen, Shocknessy.

Nays: None.

The Chairman declared the resolution adopted.

Judge Thompson expressed his appreciation to the members of the Commission. He said that he was not coming into his new work totally blind because he had had the pleasure of working through the General Counsel as trial counsel in Cuyahoga County for two years and that he had followed with a great deal of respect and a great deal of interest the work of the Commission. He said that he was very happy to be connected with the Commission.

The Chairman asked Mr. Donnelly if it was his belief that the Commission should be able to make the new schedule of rates effective at

12:01 a.m. the following Sunday, June 24, 1956. Mr. Donnelly suggested that it be made effective at 12:01 a.m. Monday, June 25, 1956.

The Chairman said that the Commission would not discharge the committee which had been cooperating with the trucking industry. He said he hoped that the committee would continue to observe the effect of the new schedule that it would feel free to make further recommendations. He said further that the schedule was effective until midnight September 30, 1956. He said he assumed that if the Commission wanted to continue the schedule beyond September 30, 1956 it would ask the Consulting Engineers for a further recommendation but that he would assume in the absence of circumstances then unforeseeable that the Commission might continue it without having a full scale study, subject to its satisfaction with the results. He said that the Commission was putting the schedule into effect until September 30 to derive an experience and it would be his hope that it would be a successful experience but if the experience was not successful then the Commission expected to do something about it. He said that meanwhile, of course, there was nothing to stop the Commission from changing the schedule, from revising it again, if a lack of satisfaction was demonstrated between then and September 30. He said that the matter of full-scale study could be the subject of consideration by all concerned as they derived experience upon the new schedule.

Resolution No. 44-1956 ratifying actions of administrative officers was moved for adoption by Mr. Teagarden, seconded by Mr. Allen, as follows:

Resolution No. 44-1956

"WHEREAS the executive director, deputy executive director, assistant to the executive director, chief engineer, assistant chief engineer, general counsel, assistant secretary-treasurer, comptroller, chief, right-of-way department, and the director of information and research 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 June 5, 1956, are hereby ratified, approved, and confirmed."

The Chairman said that the Resolution was probably the last that the Commission would have offered in that building save the adjournment resolution of the day. He said that it had been a nice experience there, that all had enjoyed it. He addressed Mr. Vincent Faller, liaison engineer of the J. E. Greiner Company to the Ohio Turnpike Commission, who was being transferred from

that post by his firm and said that Mr. Faller had been a very fine representative of his company and that he would be missed. He said that Mr. Faller had been grand, that he had been a good man, that he had done his company proud.

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

Ayes: Teagarden, Allen, Beightler, Shocknessy.

Nays: None.

The Chairman declared the resolution 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, Beightler, Shocknessy.

Nays: None.

The Chairman declared the meeting adjourned.

The time of adjournment was 12:56 p. m.

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

Approved
John Faller
Asst. Secy.-Treas.

A. J. Allen, Secretary-Treasurer