

MINUTES OF THE 409th MEETING OF THE OHIO TURNPIKE COMMISSION

June 12, 1995

Pursuant to the bylaws, the Ohio Turnpike met in regular session in the Administration Building at 682 Prospect Street, Berea, Ohio at 10:17 a.m., on June 12, 1995, with Members of the staff: Allan V. Johnson, Executive Director; Gino Zomparelli, General Counsel; G. Alan Plain, Deputy Executive Director; Robert P. Barnett, Director of Information and Research; Craig Rudolph, Comptroller; Donald M. Sharp, Director of Operations; David H. Ransbury, Chief Engineer; Alice Linn, Director of Patron Services; James H. Brennan, Development Coordinator; and others in attendance.

Present: M. Ben Gaeth, Jerry Wray, Earl W. Williams, Ruth Ann Leever, Edwin M. Bergsmark, Umberto P. Fedeli

Absent: None

A motion was made by Mr. Bergsmark, seconded by Mrs. Leever, that the minutes of the meetings of April 24 and May 10, 1995, which had been examined by the Members, 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: Mr. Bergsmark, Mrs. Leever, Mr. Wray, Mr. Williams, Mr. Fedeli

Nays: None

The Chairman declared the minutes stood approved with all Members voting in the affirmative.

The Chairman said there were a number of guests at the meeting and he would like them to identify themselves as follows: Leah Fox, ODOT; Diane Pring, Legal Department; Barbara Lesko, Executive Director's secretary; Gordon Reis, Seasongood and Mayer; Ken Becker, Smith Barney; Bob Arlow, Construction Coordinator; Kerry Ferrier, Engineering Department; Dan Becker, OCDC; Gillett Cobb, OCDC; Kathleen Collins, Society Bank; Ed Presley, Society Bank; Rob Fleischman, Greiner Engineering; Harv Callahan, Ohio State Highway Patrol; Pat Patton, Government Liaison Officer; Joe Rice, Joseph D. Rice Consultants; Chris Randolph, Lehman Brothers; Wendy Franklin, Lehman Brothers; Keith Rosbury, HNTB; Frank Lamb, Huntington Trust; Pieter Wykoff, ODOT; Jerry Corbo, citizen; Felix Spittler, citizen; Cleve Brooks, SBK; David Patch, The (Toledo) Blade; Ann Shook, Mrs. Leever's daughter; Mark Tylicki, taxpayer; William Hall, Ohio Trucking Association; Mary Shirley, Assistant

Superintendent of Toll Collections; Sharon Isaac, Assistant General Counsel; Dan Castrigano, Maintenance Engineer; Tony Palombo, Staff Counsel; Joe Disantis, Right of Way Coordinator; and John Lavelle, Key Corp./Society Bank.

The Chairman said the meeting was the 409th meeting of the Ohio Turnpike Commission and it was being held at the Commission's administration building as provided for in its bylaws.

The Chairman said further that various reports would be received and the Commission would act on several resolutions, draft copies of which had been sent to the Members previously. He said the resolutions would be introduced during the appropriate reports.

The Chairman said that if there were no further questions, the report of the Secretary-Treasurer, Mr. Bergsmark, would be received.

Mr. Bergsmark said the following listed items had been sent to the Members since the last regularly scheduled meeting of the Commission, April 24, 1995:

1. Weekly Traffic Statistics
2. Investment Transactions which occurred during April and May 1995
3. Draft of the Commission Meeting Minutes of April 24, 1995, and May 10, 1995
4. Financial Statement for April and May 1995
5. Traffic Accident Summary Report for April 1995
6. Traffic and Revenue Report for April and May 1995
7. Independent Auditor's Reports
8. OCDC Report May and June 1995
9. News Releases #7, 8, 9, and 10 - All dealing with the Commission's decision to raise tolls; gradually raise tolls; necessity of third lane, etc.

The Chairman said the report of the Secretary-Treasurer was accepted as offered. He ascertained that there would be no report on Budget and Finance and Audit/Legal. He said the report on Service Plazas would be received.

Senator Gaeth said that last weekend he had driven down to Nashville, Tennessee. He said the rest areas along the way were competitive in their food and beverage prices and they were well maintained. He said that when the Turnpike service plaza restaurant areas were renovated under the new contracts, which would become effective in 1996, they would be something the Commission could be proud of.

The Chairman said Mr. Johnson would address that topic later in the meeting. He said the restaurant bids were due at the end of June and he expected them to be somewhat involved and complicated. He said Mr. Johnson would be recommending that a group of people sit down and review them. He said the Commission was

definitely going ahead with its plans to renovate or replace the restaurants at all 16 service plazas. He said that would be done despite objections from those who had said the restaurants were acceptable and needed no work. He said the new or renovated facilities would be the most up-to-date and would compare quite favorably to those found on other toll roads.

The Chairman said the report on Service Plazas was accepted as offered. He said the report on Employee Relations would be received.

Mr. Disantis said that, as the Chairman reported at prior meetings, a subcommittee of the Committee on Employee Relations had been holding the annual meetings with the various non-union employee groups. He said those meetings were completed on the Thursday before the Commission meeting.

Mr. Disantis said several items were covered of a departmental nature. He said they had been handled by the appropriate department heads. He said the subcommittee had explained to all the groups that the Commission was in the process of reviewing its sickness and accident policy. He said expected a complete review of that policy would be done during the next year.

Mr. Disantis said that there had been a recommendation to the Executive Director, which had been discussed with the Chairman, of a general wage increase of four percent. He said it was close to the Consumer Price Index for the year.

The Chairman said that if he was not mistaken, he thought July 1st was also the same time that ODOT had their annual wage review and instituted increases.

Mr. Wray said the Chairman was correct.

The Chairman said that the report on Employee Relations was accepted as offered. He said the report of the Executive Director would be received.

Mr. Johnson said that, to follow-up on the general wage increase for certain Commission employees, there was a draft resolution in the Members' folders entitled "Resolution Approving and Adopting General 1995 Wage Increase for Certain Commission Employees."

Mr. Johnson said that the employees covered by the resolution were those regular, full-time employees who were not part of the collective bargaining units. He said there were three collective bargaining agreements. He said one of them covered full-time Maintenance and Toll Collection employees. He said a second covered the part-time Toll Collectors and a third agreement covered the Radio Room employees.

Mr. Johnson said that, again, the group the Commission's resolution addressed were those employees who were not part of the collective bargaining units. He said

there was a blank left in the resolution but, as Mr. Disantis stated, the recommendation was that a wage or salary increase be four percent effective July 1st. He said the last time an increase went into effect for that group of employees was July 1, 1994, so it was an annual increase which had been the practice of the Commission in past years.

Mr. Johnson said he would read the resolved of the resolution as follows:

"RESOLVED that the Ohio Turnpike Commission hereby approves the recommendations of the Committee on Employee Relations, which recommendations have had prior approval of the chairperson and the executive director, and adopts such recommendations granting regular, full-time Commission employees, who are not members of a collective bargaining unit, a general wage or salary increase of 4% effective July 1, 1995."

Mr. Johnson said that he recommended that the resolution be adopted.

Mr. Wray said he had some questions about the wage or salary increase. He asked if the employees in the bargaining units were going to get a four percent increase on July 1st.

Mr. Johnson said those in the largest collective bargaining unit, which covered full-time Maintenance and Toll Collection employees, would not get an increase on July 1st. He said it was the last year of the collective bargaining agreement for the full-time Maintenance and Toll Collection employees. He said the last increase they had was last July 1st.

Mr. Wray asked if the four percent increase had a direct correlation with the contracts.

Mr. Johnson said that was not correct.

Mr. Disantis said the last increase for employees in the full-time Maintenance and Toll Collection bargaining unit was July 1, 1994. He said it was a five percent increase that ran for eighteen months. He said the contract was for three and a half years and it terminated on December 31st of 1995. He said the staff would be beginning negotiations soon on a new contract.

Mr. Wray asked if the increase would be for everybody not in a collective bargaining unit who would be classified as supervision or management.

Mr. Johnson said the increase was for those individuals, as well as office employees in the administration building.

Mr. Disantis said that the category also included all custodial, janitorial and field secretaries.

Mr. Wray asked how many employees were involved.

Mr. Johnson said there were a little over 200 employees eligible for the increase.

Mr. Wray asked if those individuals got an automatic four percent increase without productivity or performance evaluation or quality of work involved.

Mr. Johnson said it was a general or cost-of-living increase. He said that performance evaluation came into play when employees became eligible for certain step increases associated with their job classifications. He said the wage or salary step increases generally occurred in the first five years of employment.

Mr. Williams asked if there were opportunities throughout the year when merit increases were recommended for various employees.

Mr. Johnson said that, again, that generally happened in the first five years of their employment. He said the step increases were merit increases.

Mr. Disantis said the step increases had a minimum waiting period between evaluations. He said employees had to qualify for the step increases based on merit. He said the step increases were available for the first three, four or five years of employment depending on the job classification.

Mr. Williams asked if approval of step increases came before the Commission or were done in-house.

Mr. Disantis said they were done departmentally with recommendations to the Executive Director.

Mr. Wray asked if the wages or salaries of Commission employees were comparable to the private sector, the Ohio Department of Transportation, to other government agencies or local governments.

Mr. Disantis said that he had been providing information on the Commission's increases to various people at ODOT who called him. He said he thought ODOT employees had their general increases tied into exactly the figures from their union contracts. He said that ODOT did not run into the situation currently before the Commission.

Mr. Disantis said further that ODOT employees covered by negotiated union contracts received their wage or salary increases automatically. He said the Commission's non-union people did not. He said the last increase the Commission's union-represented employees received was five percent. He said that future increases for those units would be based on union negotiations.

Mr. Wray said he would be interested in seeing a breakdown of the wages or salaries for individual job positions within the Commission's staff.

Mr. Disantis said he could furnish the Members with a master list showing the wage or salary scales for all positions.

The Chairman said he thought the four percent increase was comparable to what ODOT employees had received.

Mr. Wray said the four percent figure was correct. He said that, however, the non-bargaining unit employees had not had an automatic four percent increase every time. He said that the last time there was a union contract it was 18 months before they got their increases.

Mr. Wray said further that it was not his concern about how the Commission wage or salary rates compared to ODOT. He said his concern was how they compared to the marketplace.

Mr. Disantis said that the range of wages or salaries was very wide because there were dozens of separate job categories. He said he would have copies of the list prepared and distributed to the Members later in the meeting.

(It was determined that the Commission would return to the discussion on the wage increase later in the meeting after the information on positions and wage scales was available.)

Mr. Johnson said there was one other resolution in the Members' folders. He said it was entitled "Resolution Authorizing Declarations of Official Intent Under U.S. Treasury Regulations with Respect to Reimbursement from Note and Bond Proceeds of Temporary Advances made for Payments Prior to Issuance, and Related Matters, Including Repeal of Resolution No. 21-1992."

Mr. Johnson said it was a housekeeping item to get the Commission in conformity with new Internal Revenue regulations. He said the Commission did Declarations of Intent before. He said that in case the Commission sold bonds in the future and wanted to cover certain projects already being done it was necessary to execute the Declarations of Intent.

Mr. Johnson said the resolution was long and it was mainly legal language in order to comply with those regulations.

A resolution authorizing declarations of official intent under U.S. Treasury regulations with respect to reimbursements from note and bond proceeds of temporary advances made for payments prior to issuance, and related matters, including repeal of

resolution No. 21-1992 was moved for adoption by Mr. Bergsmark, seconded by Mr. Wray as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 19-1995

"WHEREAS, United States Treasury Regulations prescribe conditions under which proceeds of bonds, notes or other obligations used to reimburse advances made for certain expenditures paid before the issuance of such obligations, will be deemed to be expended (or properly allocated to expenditures) for purposes of Sections 103 and 141 to 150 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (the Code), so that upon such reimbursement the proceeds so used will not further be subject to requirements or restrictions under those sections of the Code; and

"WHEREAS, the Commission adopted Resolution No. 21-1992, on June 15, 1992, to take steps for compliance with the regulations then in effect that governed such reimbursements;

"WHEREAS, those regulations have been superseded by new regulations that mandate, among other requirements, that there be a Declaration of Official Intent not later than 60 days following payment of any expenditure expected to be reimbursed from proceeds of such obligations, and that the reimbursement occur within prescribed time periods after the expenditure is paid or after the property is placed in service; and

"WHEREAS, the Commission desires to take steps for compliance with those newer regulations presently in effect;

"NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

"RESOLVED by the Ohio Turnpike Commission as follows:

"Section 1. Definitions. The following definitions apply to the terms used herein:

"Authorized Officer" means the Chairman of the Commission or any person designated for the purpose by the Chairman.

"Bonds" means and includes bonds, notes, certificates and other obligations included in the meaning of "bonds" under Section 150 of the Code.

"Declaration of Official Intent" means a declaration of intent, in the form and manner and time contemplated in the Reimbursement Regulations, that the advances for expenditures referred to therein are reasonably expected to be reimbursed from the proceeds of Reimbursement Bonds to be issued after those expenditures are paid.

"Reimbursement" or "reimburse" means the restoration to the Commission of money temporarily advanced from its other funds and spent for capital expenditures (and certain other types of expenditures qualifying under the Reimbursement Regulations, including any issuance costs for Reimbursement Bonds) before the issuance of the Reimbursement Bonds, evidenced in writing by an allocation on the books and records of the Commission that shows the use of the proceeds of the Reimbursement Bonds to restore the money advanced for the original expenditure. "Reimbursement" or "reimburse" generally does not include the refunding or retiring of Bonds previously issued and sold to, or borrowings from, unrelated entities.

"Reimbursement Bonds" means Bonds the proceeds of which are to be used for reimbursement of such capital or other qualifying expenditures paid before issuance of the Bonds.

"Reimbursement Regulations" means Treasury Regulations Section 1.150-2 and any amendments thereto or superseding regulations, whether in proposed, temporary or final form, as at the time applicable, prescribing conditions under which the proceeds of Reimbursement Bonds when allocated or applied to a reimbursement will be treated as expended for all or any purposes of Section 103 and 141 to 150 of the Code.

"Section 2. Authorization and Requirement of Declarations of Official Intent. Each Authorized Officer is authorized to prepare and sign Declarations of Official Intent with respect to capital and other expenditures to which the Reimbursement Regulations apply (and including any costs of issuance of the Reimbursement Bonds) to be made from money temporarily available and which are reasonably expected to be reimbursed (in accordance with applicable authorizations, policies and practices) from the proceeds of Reimbursement Bonds, to make appropriate reimbursement and timely allocations from the proceeds of the Reimbursement Bonds to reimburse such prior expenditures, and to take any other actions as may be appropriate, all at the times and in the manner required under the Reimbursement Regulations to satisfy the requirements for the reimbursement to be treated as an expenditure of such proceeds for purposes of Sections 103 and 141 to 150 of the Code. No advance from any fund or account or order for payment may be made for expenditures (other than expenditures excepted from such requirement under the Reimbursement Regulations) that are to be reimbursed subsequently from proceeds of Reimbursement Bonds unless a Declaration of Official Intent with respect thereto is made within the time required by the Reimbursement Regulations. All Declarations of Official Intent heretofore made on behalf of the Commission are hereby ratified and adopted.

"Section 3. Repeal of Prior Resolution. Resolution No. 21-1992 adopted on June 15, 1992, is hereby repealed; provided, however, that such repeal shall not affect the validity or effectiveness of any action heretofore taken under authority of that resolution."

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

Ayes: Mr. Bergsmark, Mr. Wray, Mr. Williams, Mrs. Leever,
Mr. Fedeli

Nays: None

The Chairman declared the resolution was approved with all Members voting in the affirmative. The resolution was identified as No. 19-1995.

Mr. Johnson said also that, as the Members would recall, at the April meeting when the Commission first adopted the resolution for the toll increase one of the things mentioned or discussed was for him to come back to the Commission with at least a discussion on a possible commuter discount program.

Mr. Johnson said further that such a program had been reviewed internally and there was no question that it could be implemented for non-commercial users. He said the Commission already had a discount program for commercial users who reached a certain monthly volume and who were part of the Commission's charge program. He said there were charge accounts with many of the commercial trucking companies.

Mr. Johnson said that program was fairly easy to administer because of the charge aspect. He said that instituting a commuter discount for passenger cars was a more difficult administrative problem. He said it could be done with the Commission's computerized toll system, but he thought it would have to involve some sort of prepaid account. He said he would suggest that the Commission implement something like that with a minimum of perhaps \$50 payment in advance for tickets for specific trips. He said they would be for those people who traveled the Turnpike regularly to get to and from their jobs between specific interchanges.

Mr. Johnson said further that he would not suggest that the Commission do that before the toll increase became effective on July 1st. He said that it might be done on January 1, 1996. He said the staff had to give itself enough time to develop the program and also publicize it. He said it probably would be necessary to have a pre-paid program.

The Chairman asked Mr. Johnson if he knew of any other toll roads in the country which offered commuter discounts.

Mr. Johnson said the Indiana Toll Road had a commuter discount program and he was trying to get details on it. He said that some of the toll roads that offered discounts were barrier systems where patrons were sold pre-paid tokens. He said that, on the other hand, the Ohio Turnpike was a closed ticket system where tolls varied due to how far the patron traveled.

Mr. Wray asked if Mr. Johnson was talking about discounts for all urban areas along the Turnpike.

Mr. Johnson said he would suggest that it be for all traffic and not for any specific area.

The Chairman said that, obviously, the Commission was trying to be as sensitive as possible to the needs of people in Toledo because of their situation of having to pay a toll to go from the east side to the west side. He said that situation did not occur in the Cleveland area or any where else along the Turnpike. He said that, at the same time, the Commission had trust agreements. He said the Commission had to make sure that they maintained the integrity of the Turnpike because the Commission had to deal with bonding authorities. He said that maybe a small group should be put together to study a commuter discount program and really look at all the various alternatives such as commuter cards and prepaid tickets.

Mr. Wray asked if one method would involve the prepurchase of a book of tickets.

Mr. Johnson said that was one method. He said a book of prepaid tickets could be purchased in advance and one of those tickets would be submitted along with the toll ticket received at entrance when the patron exited the Turnpike. He said the computerized equipment at the exits could be programmed to read the second ticket so that the prepaid ticket would be accepted instead of cash. He said the prepaid tickets would have to be sold in groups.

Mr. Wray asked if an individual entered the system at a particular point and exited at a particular interchange they would have to have a combination of tickets for every entrance and exit.

Mr. Johnson said Mr. Wray was correct and that was why the system was so cumbersome.

Mr. Wray said that, therefore, every combination of entrance and exit would have to have a separate book of tickets.

The Chairman said that he would ask Mr. Johnson and some other staff members to come up with some ideas for the commuter discount program. He said the Commission could then possibly hold a future Commission meeting or a separate public meeting in Toledo to get some opinions on those ideas. He said the Commission would emphasize that it still had certain restrictions and still had to run a toll road.

Mr. Williams said that he assumed that the commuter discount program would be only for those in the Toledo area.

The Chairman said what the Commission was trying to accomplish was to provide some type of relief from the people in Northwest Ohio. He said that at the same time he wanted to make sure that the Commission was still collecting tolls from out-of-state visitors, which accounted for almost 50 percent of the Turnpike's business.

Mr. Johnson said that he suggested the commuter discount program apply to all the urban areas along the Turnpike. He said that even if somebody was driving the road every day from one end to the other he thought they ought to be entitled to receive the discount.

Mr. Bergsmark said that there were major east-west routes in the Cleveland, Youngstown and Lorain areas, while such routes did not exist in the Toledo area. He said that the Toledo area was kind of captive to the Turnpike.

Mr. Bergsmark said further that perhaps a discount could be provided for those Toledo-area residents who commuted between exits 3A and 4A. He said he didn't feel that discount tickets were needed for such a commute.

Mr. Johnson said that there could be a different toll schedule for certain interchanges. He said that situation would be examined.

The Chairman said he would ask Mr. Brennan for his comments since he lived in the Toledo area. He said he also would ask Marilyn Baker, who would become a Commission Member of July 1st, for her comments since she was a Wood County Commissioner.

Senator Gaeth said that he thought the commuter discount should be offered to residents of all the major cities along the Turnpike.

Mr. Brennan said that he would disagree with Senator Gaeth in that he thought the discount should apply to commuters in Northwest Ohio.

Mrs. Leever said that it was imperative that the Commission hold public meetings on the discount.

The Chairman said that he thought the Commission had been criticized in the past for making quick decisions. He said the Commission would make sure that it took its time on this matter.

Mr. Johnson said that copies of two letters he had received were put in the Members' folders. He said one was from the City of Maumee and the other from an organization called Arrowhead Park. He said they both related to the interchange between I-475 and Salisbury Road, which was located south of the Turnpike in Maumee.

Mr. Johnson said further that those letters proposed that the Commission get involved in an upgrade of the interchange, which was not on the Turnpike. He said he wanted to bring the letters to the attention of the Members. He said the proposal had come out of the blue and he needed more information on it.

Mr. Bergsmark said he could capsulize the situation for the Commission. He said the Salisbury interchange on I-475 was the main exit or entry point for many things such as Arrowhead Park and the Trinova Corporation. He said it also was the means of getting to the Toledo Mud Hens' stadium. He said he was the President of the Mud Hens minor league baseball team.

Mr. Bergsmark said further that almost eighteen percent of the Mud Hens attendance came from Michigan, so traffic from that state came down I-475 to the Salisbury exit. He said the interchange has become a major safety hazard due to heavy traffic. He said he had been contacted by the chairman of Trinova about traffic congestion encountered by his employees.

Mr. Bergsmark said further that there had been a kind of coordination of all affected bodies. He said it was Lucas County's number one priority project from a safety standpoint. He said that perhaps a combination of public and private funds could be used to alleviate the situation.

Mr. Bergsmark said further that he thought the Commission and ODOT could work together to provide a solution to the problem.

Mr. Brennan said that the interchange was not built properly. He said that the people in the area were so insistent upon having it and it took so long to get it that they were satisfied with anything.

The Chairman said that the Commission's involvement in the situation was consistent with its three major concerns of safety, accessibility and economic development.

Mr. Johnson said he would acknowledge the letters from the City of Maumee and Arrowhead park regarding the interchange between I-475 and Salisbury Road.

Mr. Wray said he had talked to John Platt from ODOT about needed modifications to the interchange.

The Chairman said the report of the Executive Director was accepted as offered. He said the report of the Development Coordinator would be received.

Mr. Brennan said that, starting at the west, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers had not yet given their decision regarding the Commission's wetlands mitigation plan for the interchange at County Road 24/State Route 66 in Fulton County. He said the

Engineering staff had hoped to have the decision by the end of May, but it appeared it would be done by the end of June.

Mr. Brennan said further that design engineering would begin soon for the interchange with State Route 109 in Fulton County. He said a design engineering firm had been selected. He said Worthington Steel had announced that they would build a \$65 million facility at that location which would employ 180 to 200 people. He said the plant would process some of the steel produced by North Star Steel, a soon to be constructed steel mini-mill in the area. He said Worthington would process some of North Star's output.

Mr. Brennan said further that on May 15 Dave Ransbury, Kerry Ferrier, Joe Disantis and he had met with interested property owners near the new State Route 51 interchange in Ottawa/Sandusky Counties. He said that also at the meeting to review interchange plans were Steve Arndt, Ottawa County Commissioner and Paul Liser of the Sandusky County Engineer's Office. He said that as a result of that meeting he believed the Commission could proceed in an orderly fashion. He said design plans were scheduled to be completed by the end of June. He said that perhaps construction could begin yet in 1995.

Mr. Brennan said further that construction on the interchange with Baumhart Road in Lorain County began shortly after the favorable court decision on April 25.

Mr. Brennan said further that the Commission was waiting for the Ohio Historical Society to determine their interest in a rail line and associated bridge located at the new Turnpike interchange at State Route 58 in Lorain County.

Mr. Brennan said further that the access justification study continued on the interchange with Interstate Route 77 in Summit/Cuyahoga Counties.

Mr. Brennan said further that design engineering continued on the connection with County Road 18 in Mahoning County.

Mr. Brennan said further that the access point study continued on the interchange with State Route 11 in Mahoning County.

Mr. Brennan said further that he would provide the status of the nine tasks associated with the Great Lakes/Mid-Atlantic Corridor (I-73/74). He said tasks 1, 2 and 3 were 100 percent complete. He said task 4 was 99 percent complete. He said communication plan assistance was 85 percent complete and consultant management was 95 percent complete. He said public input was 65 percent complete and determination of project feasibility was 45 percent complete. He said those figures were as of May 31. He said defining and adherence to federal and state environmental processing requirements was five percent complete.

Mr. Brennan said further that the feasibility study was on schedule to be presented to the Commission by the end of June. He said the Commission's commitment as of the end of May was about \$4,530,000, which was an increase of approximately \$150,000 since April 1.

The Chairman asked Mr. Brennan if he thought there would be any delay in construction of the State Route 58 interchange because of the railroad situation.

Mr. Brennan said the interchange had been delayed considerably to date. He said that if the Ohio Historical people decided to review it in detail there would be additional delay.

Mr. Johnson said that the project was definitely delayed. He said the plans for the interchange were virtually finished. He said the staff had been working with the Corps of Engineers to get a permit because there were wetlands involved, but the review process of the Corps was stopped because of the historical aspect of the situation.

Mr. Johnson said further that the Ohio Historical Society did not meet again until September 15. He said the Commission was probably faced with an additional three month delay before any indication about whether the Society would be declaring the railroad bridge an historical landmark.

The Chairman said he wanted to move as quickly as possible on building the interchange because there had been tremendous consensus in that area for the interchange.

The Chairman said the report of the Development Coordinator was accepted as offered.

Mr. Johnson said he would like to mention two things before the meeting proceeded. He said that, as the Chairman had mentioned, the bids for the new restaurant contracts were due to be opened on June 30th. He said he expected that there would be a complex review process on those bids. He said he suggested that a group of Commission Members and staff members be formed to review those bids, evaluate them and make recommendations to the Commission for award.

Mr. Johnson said further that he would like to suggest that the group consist of Mrs. Leever, Mr. Williams, Senator Gaeth, himself, Alan Plain, Alice Linn, Gino Zomparelli, Sharon Isaac and Bob Arlow. He said that if it was acceptable to all those parties he had named, the group would be set to do the review.

Mr. Johnson said that the second matter was the project management consultant for the third lane project, which the Commission authorized at the same time it approved the toll increase. He said the Commission had a request for proposals out on

that and they were due on June 14th. He said there needed to be a review, evaluation and recommendation so that a selection of a consultant could possibly be made at the July meeting.

Mr. Johnson said he suggested that another group be formed to do the review on those proposals. He said he proposed that the group consist of Director Wray, Senator Gaeth, himself, Alan Plain, Dave Ransbury, Gino Zomparelli and Bob Arlow.

Senator Gaeth said that he would be available in the month of July to aid in reviewing the bids on the new restaurant contracts. He said he would not have time to participate in the review of consultant selection for the third lane project because of his Senate obligations for the rest of June.

The Chairman ascertained there would be no reports from the Director of Transportation and General Counsel. He said the report of the consulting engineers would be received.

Mr. Fleischman said that the consulting engineers had completed the annual inspection of the Turnpike culverts and all of the Turnpike bridges, with the exception of those with special access and those in construction areas.

Mr. Fleischman said that the consulting engineers would be furnishing those bridge inspection reports to Mr. Ransbury's office starting that week.

The Chairman said the report of the consulting engineers was accepted as offered. He ascertained there would be no report from the trustee and the financial advisor.

Senator Gaeth said an industrialist had asked him to inquire of the Commission whether it might have a plan, similar to that proposed by the Indiana Toll Road Commission, whereby funds are provided for infrastructure projects off the Turnpike to promote economic development.

The Chairman said he had asked Mr. Brennan to look into the Indiana plan.

Mr. Brennan said that very little money had been spent since the program was announced. He said \$12 or \$13 million had been spent and \$10 million had gone to South Bend and St. Joseph County, which was the same thing.

The Chairman said the Commission had been focusing its resources on new interchanges. He said the new interchange at State Route 109, which encouraged the location of North Star Steel, would cost close to \$10 million. He said the building of new interchanges was the Commission's way of promoting economic growth. He said the Commission did not want to get into the business of building sewer lines and water lines for every community through which the Turnpike passes.

The Chairman ascertained there would be no report from Lieutenant Callahan, Ohio State Highway Patrol.

The Chairman said he would like to make a couple of comments. He said he had a phone call last week from the Governor's Chief of Staff, Paul Misfud, who said he would like to attend a future Commission meeting, perhaps in July, to talk some more about economic development.

The Chairman said further that Mr. Misfud had been asked by the Governor to head up that whole area. He said he was referred to as the Jobs Czar in the State of Ohio. He said Mr. Misfud wanted to talk to the Commission about economic development and specifically about some things in Northwest Ohio.

The Chairman said further that he told Mr. Misfud that the Commission would be honored if he would appear at a meeting. He said he also told Mr. Misfud that he also was welcome to bring the Governor.

The Chairman said also that the meeting was the last for Ed Bergsmark as a Commission Member. He said Mr. Bergsmark had been a Member for eight years. He said he did not know Mr. Bergsmark until four years ago when he was appointed to the Commission. He said he thought Mr. Bergsmark was probably one of the brightest financial specialists he had ever met.

The Chairman said further that Mr. Bergsmark offered a unique dimension to the Commission because he was an attorney, an ex-banker, an entrepreneur, a businessman and a business leader. He said the Members would miss Mr. Bergsmark and a formal resolution would be prepared and adopted at a future meeting praising Mr. Bergsmark for his service on the Commission.

Mr. Johnson said that, on behalf of the staff, it had been an honor and a pleasure working with Mr. Bergsmark over the past eight years. He said Mr. Bergsmark brought to the Commission a wide range of experience in areas that had helped the Commission a great deal. He said he thanked Mr. Bergsmark very much and wished him well in the future.

Mr. Bergsmark said he thanked the Chairman and Mr. Johnson for their comments. He said that eight years appeared to be a long time, but it had gone by extremely fast. He said he had been fortunate to see an awful lot of changes that had happened on the Turnpike. He said he had enjoyed working with the staff.

Mr. Bergsmark said further that the Commission's staff was one of the best, if not the best, that he had ever been involved in. He said he thought everyone had done an outstanding job. He said he would keep watching the activities of the Commission in the years ahead and he would be available to offer any assistance to the Commission, if so needed.

The Chairman said that, although he didn't know how to technically do it, he wanted to ask OCDC if they could look at the Maumee River Crossing from the Commission's prospective. He said there was no disrespect to ODOT which had been working on the project with the firm of Burgess & Niple. He said he wanted OCDC to look at the project to see if there was any creative ways of getting the cost down. He said he would ask OCDC to look at the project and report back to the Commission later.

The Chairman said also that in looking at the monthly reports from OCDC on the corridor project one thing had become very evident to him and that was the lack of matching funds of ISTEA. He said at one time the Commission thought those funds could have been as much as five to one. He said he didn't know where those funds had gone, but they kind of dried up.

The Chairman said further that building the entire corridor had become less and less probable just because of the dollars. He said the Commission didn't have three billion dollars laying around to complete the project. He said there were, however, some significant traffic congestion areas which he would like to examine.

Mr. Becker said that there were some segments of the project where some improvements could be made to get the overall project underway. He said that everyone knew that a project of that nature would take probably 20 years to develop. He said that there were some things that could be addressed early to get it started.

Mr. Johnson said the stage one feasibility study would be completed at the end of June. He said it would identify those things in the corridor that might be some early-action items. He said the Commission was reaching the point where it had to decide if it was going forward with any or all parts of the project to go to stage two studies.

Mr. Johnson said also that the Chairman mentioned the Maumee River Crossing. He said the crossing is mentioned in the corridor studies as one of the alternatives. He said that was because the corridor went up into Michigan. He said the stage one study had one segment utilizing I-75 and also I-280, which was the connection of the existing Maumee crossing.

The Chairman said the report of the Construction Coordinator would be received.

Mr. Arlow said there were two resurfacing projects that remained on the Turnpike. He said they would be completed by June 28th so that there would be no obstruction on the Turnpike mainline during the peak months of July and August.

Mr. Arlow said further that construction of the new Turnpike interchange at Baumhart Road was moving along on schedule. He said it was still scheduled for completion on November 30th.

The Chairman said the report of the Construction Coordinator was accepted as offered.

(At this point in the meeting, there was a brief recess while Mr. Disantis passed out of list of Commission job classifications and associated salaries.)

Mr. Disantis said he gave the Members a list of job classifications and a corresponding biweekly salary list. He said all the positions, with the exception of the Members and Executive Director, were affected by the proposed wage increase.

Mr. Disantis said further that the biweekly salaries were from the beginning salary at Step A running through whatever number there were. He said some were cut off because they wouldn't fit in the sheet, but they were available from him if anyone was interested.

Mr. Disantis said that by multiplying any of the salaries by 26 one could produce the annual salaries of any of the classifications.

Mr. Wray asked if the increase would affect every step in each job classification.

Mr. Disantis said that was correct. He said that, again, the step increases were merit increases. He said the four percent increase was, in effect, a cost-of-living increase.

Mr. Disantis said the first step in the salary schedule was a probationary step with a minimum of a six-month waiting period. He said every other step had a minimum one-year waiting period.

Mr. Wray asked if an individual could get a merit increase once a year for five years.

Mr. Disantis said that could happen, but it was not automatically done. He said longevity and merit had to be taken into consideration.

Mr. Williams asked if only one step increase could be given at a time or could more than one step be given.

Mr. Disantis said that the only time there was an exception was when someone was given a promotion and they were in a higher step than the base step in the new job. He said that, in that case, they were put in the next higher salary step rather than the next letter step. He said that was done so that when somebody was given a promotion they didn't lose money.

Mr. Disantis said the list of positions did not cover toll collectors and maintenance people in the field. He said included were clerical workers, custodial

workers, janitorial workers, all the people in the administration building and field supervisors.

Mr. Williams asked how the four percent increase compared to the last increase given to the largest bargaining unit.

Mr. Disantis said that unit was given a 5 percent increase on July 1, 1994, but it was for an 18-month cycle which expired on December 31, 1995.

Mr. Wray asked if this group of non-union employees could be classified as supervisors or managers.

Mr. Disantis said the group was about 50-50 percent between supervisory and non-supervisory. He said that, of course, custodial, janitorial and clerical were not supervisory.

Mr. Wray asked if the salary of the front-line supervisors was in the 30's and graduated up from there.

Mr. Johnson said their salaries were in the low 30's.

Mr. Wray said it would be nice to have some sort of generic description of a job category and salary range so the Members would know what they were voting on.

Mrs. Leever said she thought that was a good idea. She said it also would be helpful if there was a comparison in wages for non-union and union-represented employees.

Mr. Disantis said that information was not made available because the salary increases were traditionally developed without the Commission being involved. He said that under the bylaws it had always been done by a recommendation to the Executive Director and then for approval by the Commission.

Mr. Williams asked that, when the next wage or salary increase came up for approval by the Members, they be given more information so that they could better understand what they were voting on.

Mr. Disantis said that would be done. He said the Commission would next be considering increases for the bargaining units.

A resolution approving and adopting general 1995 wage increase for certain Commission employees was moved for adoption by Mr. Bergsmark, seconded by Mr. Williams as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 20-1995

"WHEREAS, the Commission, acting through its Committee on Employee Relations, has conducted discussions with representatives of various regular, full-time employee groups, who are not part of a collective bargaining unit, concerning wages and salaries;

"WHEREAS, the Commission's Committee on Employee Relations has made a recommendation to the executive director and the executive director in turn has made a recommendation to the chairperson concerning wage and salary adjustments for certain of its regular, full-time employees, who are not part of a collective bargaining unit, and the chairman has approved such recommendation;

"NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

"RESOLVED that the Ohio Turnpike Commission hereby approves the recommendations of the Committee on Employee Relations, which recommendations have had prior approval of the chairperson and the executive director, and adopts such recommendations granting regular, full-time Commission employees, who are not members of a collective bargaining unit, a general wage or salary increase of 4% effective July 1, 1995."

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

Ayes: Mr. Bergsmark, Mr. Williams, Mr. Wray, Mrs. Leever,
Mr. Fedeli

Nays: None

The Chairman declared the resolution stood adopted with all Members voting in the affirmative. The resolution was identified as No. 20-1995.

Mr. Johnson said that when future wage or salary increases came before the Commission the Members would be supplied with a great deal more information.

Mr. Wray asked what was the cost to the Commission for the four percent increase just adopted. He said he thought it was about \$200,000 to \$300,000.

Mr. Johnson said Mr. Wray was correct.

There being no further business to come before the Commission, a motion was made by Mr. Bergsmark, seconded by Mrs. Leever that the meeting adjourn until the next meeting on July 10.

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

Ayes: Mr. Bergsmark, Mrs. Leever, Mr. Wray, Mr. Williams,
Mr. Fedeli

Nays: None

The Chairman declared the meeting adjourned. Time of adjournment was 11:38 a.m.

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



Allan V. Johnson
Assistant Secretary-Treasurer