MINUTES OF THE 415th MEETING OF THE OHIO TURNPIKE COMMISSION

December 20, 1995

Pursuant to the bylaws, the Ohio Turnpike met in regular session in the Administration Building at 682 Prospect Street, Berea, Ohio at 11:16 a.m., on December 20, 1995, with Members of the staff: Allan V. Johnson, Executive Director; Gino Zomparelli, General Counsel; G. Alan Plain, Deputy Executive Director; Craig Rudolphy, Comptroller; Stephen G. Lorton, Director of Public Affairs; David H. Ransbury, Chief Engineer; Robert P. Barnett, Director of Information and Research; Alice Linn, Director of Patron Services; James H. Brennan, Development Coordinator; and others in attendance.

Present:

Richard A. Hodges, M. Ben Gaeth, Earl W. Williams,

Ruth Ann Leever, Umberto P. Fedeli

Absent:

Marilyn R. Baker and Jerry Wray

A motion was made by Mrs. Leever, seconded by Mr. Williams that the minutes of the meeting of November 1, 1995, which had been examined by the Members, 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:

Mrs. Leever, Mr. Williams, Mr. Fedeli

Nays:

None

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

The Chairman said that Marilyn Baker and Jerry Wray could not be at that day's meeting, but a quorum was present.

The Chairman said that there were a number of guests at the meeting and he would ask them to identify themselves as follows: Heidi Jedel, Information and Research; Troy Atkins, Atkins Professional Advantage; Connie Atkins, Atkins Professional Advantage; Sharon Isaac, Assistant General Counsel; Eleonore Spencer, Legal Department; Charles Pinzone, MBE Coordinator; Fred Newman, Society Bank; John Petty, National City Investments; Jim McGrath, the Commission's former General Counsel; Fred McFall, Host Marriott; Mike Kurey, Advanced Restaurant Concepts; Herb Gill, Advanced Restaurant Concepts; Gary Joseph, ODOT; Dean Berry, Squire, Sanders and Dempsey; David Millstone, Squire, Sanders and Dempsey; Lou Disantis, Director of Administrative Services; Joe Disantis, Right of Way Coordinator; Tony Palombo, Staff

Counsel; Dan Castrigano, Maintenance Engineer; Mike McIntyre, <u>The (Cleveland) Plain Dealer</u>; Rob Fleischman, Greiner Engineering; Keith Rosbury, HNTB; Gillett Cobb, OCDC; Kerry Ferrier, Engineering Department; Don DePaulo, Traffic and Safety Engineer; Dan Becker, OCDC; Nick Fedeli, the Chairman's son; Bob Arlow, Construction Coordinator; Barbara Lesko, the Executive Director's Secretary; Diane Pring, Legal Department; Leah Fox, ODOT; Mike Cox, Key Corp.; Alan Shaftsfall of Elyria; Stratford Shields, Prudential Securities; Frank Lamb, Huntington Trust and J. D. Lavelle, Key Corp.

The Chairman said he wanted to give a special welcome to Mr. McGrath, who was the Commission's past General Counsel. He asked Mr. McGrath how long he had been with the Commission.

Mr. McGrath said he had been with the Commission for thirty-seven years plus.

The Chairman asked him how long he had been retired.

Mr. McGrath said it would be a year next January.

The Chairman said he also would like to introduce and welcome a new member to the staff, Steve Lorton. He said Mr. Lorton had been recently appointed to be the Director of Public Affairs for the Commission. He said that was a full-time, administrative staff position.

The Chairman said Mr. Lorton had an extensive background which should serve the Commission well. He said he was an editor for the New York Times from 1963 to 1969. He said he was then with NBC-TV in Cleveland as an Editorialist and a Producer/Writer from 1970 to 1976.

The Chairman said further that Mr. Lorton served as Assistant Manager of Public Relations for Ohio Bell from 1977 to 1979, and, finally, he served for 15 years with CEI and Centerior Energy Corporation from 1979 to 1994. He said he served the last seven years as Director of Corporate Communications.

The Chairman said Mr. Lorton would be the Commission's principal spokesman in its relationship with the outside media. He said he welcomed Mr. Lorton.

The Chairman said the meeting was the 415th meeting of the Ohio Turnpike Commission. He said the Commission was meeting at the Commission's headquarters as provided for in the Commission's Code of Bylaws.

The Chairman said the various reports would now be received and the Commission would act on several resolutions. He said copies of the resolutions had been sent to the Members and the resolutions would be explained during the appropriate reports.

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

Mr. Johnson said that he was reporting on behalf of Mrs. Baker, who the Chairman had said could not be at the meeting.

Mr. Johnson said that the following listed items had been sent to the Members since the last regularly scheduled meeting of the Commission, November 1, 1995.

- 1. Weekly Traffic Statistics
- 2. Draft of the Commission Meeting Minutes of November 1, 1995
- 3. Investment Transactions October and November 1995
- 4. Financial Statement October and November 1995
- 5. Service Station Audit by Internal Audit Department
- 6. Traffic Accident Summary Report October and November 1995
- 7. Traffic and Revenue Report October and November 1995
- 8. OCDC Report December 1995
- 9. News Release #16 Temporary Closing of Exit 9A

The Chairman said the report of the Assistant Secretary-Treasurer was accepted as offered. He said the report on Budget and Finance would be received.

Mr. Johnson said that, as the Members recalled, at the last Commission meeting the Commission adopted a preliminary budget for 1996 which was required under a provision of the Trust Agreement. He said that the Trust Agreement also provided for the Commission to adopt a final budget for 1996, which was before the Commission. He said the resolution was entitled resolution adopting proposed budget for the year 1996 and providing for deposits required under the 1994 trust agreement during said year.

Mr. Johnson said that the budget was essentially the same as the preliminary one that was adopted last month, except for one item relating to the revenues. He said the revenues were changed slightly to accommodate the improved commercial discount that the Commission adopted when it modified the toll rate schedule at the last Commission meeting.

Mr. Johnson said that he considered it to be a housekeeping item. He said that, as he reported at the last Commission meeting, it was inevitable that the budget would require further adjustments as the Commission proceeded during the year in 1996 because of launching the third lane project, which almost certainly would require the issuance of additional revenue bonds to help finance that program.

Mr. Johnson said again, that he considered it was a housekeeping item, to comply with the provisions of the Trust Agreement and he recommended that the Commission adopt the resolution with the understanding that it would be reviewed throughout the year in 1996.

A resolution adopting the proposed budget for the year 1996 and providing for deposits required under the 1994 trust agreement during the year was moved for adoption by Mr. Williams, seconded by Mrs. Leever as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 58-1995

""WHEREAS, the Commission by Resolution No. 50-1995 of November 1, 1995, adopted its Preliminary Budget for the Year 1996;

"WHEREAS, Section 5537.17(F), Revised Code of Ohio, requires the Commission to submit a copy of its Proposed Annual Budget to the Governor, the Presiding Officers of each House of the General Assembly, the Director of Budget & Management, and the Legislative Budget Office of the Legislative Service Commission, no later than the first day of the calendar or fiscal year;

"WHEREAS, the Master Trust Agreement between the Commission and The Huntington National Bank (Trust Agreement) provides that the Commission shall adopt an annual budget on or before the first day of each fiscal year and shall file same with the trustee;

"WHEREAS, the Commission in order to comply with the provisions of Section 5537.17(F) of the Revised Code of Ohio, and the provisions of the Trust Agreement, takes the following action;

"NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

"RESOLVED that the Commission hereby adopts the following as its Proposed Annual Budget for the Year 1996 and the executive director and comptroller are directed to transmit a copy of the budget to the appropriate officials set forth in Section 5537.17(F) and to The Huntington National Bank, trustee, under the Commission's Trust Agreement as is provided in Section 5.01(a)(iii)."

"1996 Proposed Budget of Revenues, Expenditures and Deposits for Projects

	<u>Pledged</u>	Non- <u>Pledged</u>	<u>Total</u>
REVENUES	\$125,004,986	\$17,414,591	\$142,419,577
EXPENDITURES Administration Insurance & Retirement Total Administration & Insurance	\$ 6,084,214 \$ 14,953,000 \$ 21,037,214		
Maintenance of Roadway & Structures Services & Toll Collections Traffic Control, Safety & Patrol TOTAL OPERATIONS	\$ 19,686,960 \$ 21,595,062 \$ 9,420,529 \$ 50,702,551		
TOTAL OPERATIONS, MAIN- TENANCE & ADMINISTRATION (OM&A)	\$ 71,739,785		
BOND INTEREST FUNDING	\$ 6,596,923		
BOND PRINCIPAL FUNDING	\$ 2,062,500		
RENEWAL & REPLACEMENT FUND REQUIREMENT	\$ 12,000,000		
TRANSFER TO SYSTEM PROJECTS FUND	\$ 32,605,798"		

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

Ayes:

Mr. Williams, Mrs. Leever, Mr. Fedeli

Nays:

None

The Chairman declared the resolution stood adopted with all Members present voting in the affirmative. The resolution was identified as No. 58-1995.

Mr. Johnson said that he had one other item he considered to be a housekeeping item which was not presented when the agenda was sent out earlier in the week.

Mr. Johnson said further that, as the Members recalled, the Commission opened the new interchange earlier that month with Baumhart Road. He said it was interchange 7A in Lorain County. He said that, at the last Commission meeting, the Commission adopted a toll schedule for that interchange that would carry the toll rates through the remainder of that year.

Mr. Johnson said further that when the Commission did that, however, it did not adopt a toll schedule that would go into effect on January 1st, when the 15 percent increase went into force, that the Commission also adopted.

Mr. Johnson said further that the Commission would be rescinding a previously adopted schedule of tolls and provide for a revised schedule of tolls. He said it was not an increase. He said it was just consolidating the toll rate schedule that had already been adopted and providing for the increased toll rate schedule for interchange 7A that would go into effect on January 1.

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

Mr. Williams said it was his understanding that the resolution had nothing to do with the increase in tolls, but because of the opening of the new Turnpike interchange.

Mr. Johnson said Mr. Williams was correct. He said the Commission was not changing the toll schedule that it already had been adopted. He said it was just putting it all together in one package so that it wasn't just in bits and pieces.

Mr. Johnson said further that it was a resolution which the Members had in their folders. He said there were no changes other than what he had described. He said he would propose that it be adopted so the Commission was prepared to implement the 15 percent toll increase on January 1, 1996, which the Commission had already adopted. He said it just incorporated that into a single schedule.

A resolution rescinding previously adopted schedule of tolls effective January 1, 1996, and providing for a revised schedule of tolls was moved for adoption by Mrs. Leever, seconded by Mr. Williams as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 59-1995

"WHEREAS, by Resolution No. 16-1995, adopted April 24, 1995, the Commission adopted a revised Schedule of Tolls which was to become effective June 1, 1995;

"WHEREAS, by Resolution No. 18-1995, adopted May 10, 1995, the Commission adopted four Schedules of Tolls to be implemented in the time period from July 1, 1995, to January 1, 1998;

"WHEREAS, by Resolution No. 56-1995, adopted November 1, 1995, the Commission adopted a revised Schedule of Tolls to be made effective as of 12:01 a.m. July 1, 1998, instead of January 1, 1998;

"WHEREAS, the Schedule of Tolls, effective January 1, 1996, adopted by Resolution No. 18-1995, did not incorporate the toll rates for the Commission's newest Interchange 7A (Vermilion) which opened December 13, 1995;

"WHEREAS, revised and updated toll rates should be incorporated into the proposed Schedule of Tolls, effective as of 12:01 a.m., January 1, 1996;

"WHEREAS, the Commission desires to implement a revised and updated Schedule of Tolls, to be effective as of 12:01 a.m., January 1, 1996, as set forth and attached hereto as Exhibit "A";

"NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

"RESOLVED that the Schedule of Tolls, effective as of 12:01 a.m., January 1, 1996, adopted by Resolution No. 18-1995, hereby is rescinded;

"FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission does hereby adopt a revised and updated Schedule of Tolls as set forth and attached hereto as Exhibit "A", to be made effective as of 12:01 a.m., January 1, 1996, and that the subsequent Schedule of Tolls, to be made effective as of January 1, 1997, January 1, 1998, and July 1, 1998, be revised and updated accordingly in the future to incorporate any future new interchanges; and

"FURTHER RESOLVED that the above-mentioned revisions and updated toll rates shall be incorporated into the proposed Schedule of Tolls, as set forth and attached hereto as Exhibit "A" effective as of 12:01 a.m., January 1, 1996."

																			X. X.							
																			1.05							
																			.70							
																			¥X							
0.00	5.30	4.75	4.25	4.05	3.90	3.80	3.20	2.75	2.55	2.05	N.A.	1.85	¥ž	1.85	₹	1.05	8	2	59.	5	*	N/A	N/A	N/A	W/A	
2	5.20	4.60	4.15	3.90	3.80	3.70	3,10	2.65	2,40	1.95	N/A	1,75	N/A	1.50	1.25	58.	57.	장	.45	N/A	5	NA	5	28	4/8	9
2 !	4.35	4.25	3.75	3,55	3.40	3.30	2.70	2.30	202	1.55	N/A	1,30	∀ /2	1.15	.85	59:	95	£.	ΚX	45	58	N/A	2	1.05	N/A	
	7.60	4.15	3.55	3.35	3.20	3.10	2.55	2.05	96	1.45	A/A	1.15	ďŽ	8	57.	50	45	Ϋ́	.	25	2	K/X	200	1,15	N/A	
3 !	4	3 80	335	3.15	3.05	2.95	2.40	1.95	1.75	1,25	N/A	6.	ΝΆ	.80	ξį	54.	ΝΆ	.	ξį	52.	8	ΥX	20	55	×	
	Ş	3.75	3 20	3.05	2.95	2.75	2.25	1.80	1.50	1.05	Ϋ́Z	37.	A/A	.65	₹	NA	4 ,	5	.65	.85	1.05	K/A	1.15	1.50	ΝΆ	
	3	3.35	8	2.65	2.55	2.40	1,90	1.40	1.15	52,	A/A	8	A/A	54.	K/K	45	S	.75	35	1.25	1.40	K/A	1.50	1.90	ΥN	
	3	3 15	2 60	240	2.30	2.15	1.60	1.15	8	99	Α¥	45	Ϋ́	¥/X	.45	59.	80	1.0	1.15	1.50	1.65	ΚX	1.80	2.15	ΝA	
	3	3 15	2 60	240	2 30	2.15	1.80	1,15	8	.65	ΥN	.	Ϋ́	ď	N/A	Ϋ́Z	∀/X	K/A	Ϋ́	A/A	¥	ΑN	N/A	ΥN	Ϋ́Х	
	2	2 32	5 40	2 25	2 05	1 95	1.45	8.	Ę	\$	K.Y	Ν	ž,	4 .	Σį	75	1.00	1.15	1.30	1.75	.85	NA	8	2.30	A.M.	
5	2	2 95	2.40	2 25	2 05	1 95	1.45	1.00	2,	£.	K/X	N/A	K/X	ΝΆ	ΝΆ	ΑχΑ	Υ/X	¥X	N/A	Ą,X	A/N	ΥX	N/A	Ν	N/A	
5	77.	2 70	520	1 95	1.85	1.75	1,15	S,	£.	ΚX	45	Ą.	55	.65	52	1.05	1.25	1.45	1.55	1.95	2.05	X/A	270	2.60	N/A	
	2 1	2.25	1 75	1 50	7 40	125	2.	45	K.	45	2	2	58	85	1.15	8	1.75	96	5 00	2.40	2.55	Ϋ́Z	2.65	3,05	Ϋ́	
37.0	7 4		. 45	1.25	1.15	1,05	5	×	₹.	80	8	8	1.15	1.15	£	1 80	36.	2,05	2.30	2.65	2.75	42	2.95	3.30	Υ/N	
6	3 4	Ž,	6	8	2	S,	V/V	₹ ;	2	1.15	1.45	1.45	1 60	1 60	6	2.25	24.0	2.55	2.70	3.10	3.20	Κ'n	3.35	3.80	N/A	
	3 5	90.0	8	5	45	Υ/X	8	50.	55.	1.75	1.95	8	2.15	2.15	2.40	2,75	2.95	3,10	3.30	3.70	3.80	ď.	3.90	4.30	N/A	
4		e i	Ç.	45	K/X	ξ	2	5	9	1.85	2.05	2.05	2.30	2.30	2.55	2.95	3.05	3.20	9.6	5 5 7	3.90	¥,	4.05	4.45	Σ¥	
30	1	ô	54.	ΑίΛ	45	5 ,	8	\$2	9	1.95	2.25	2.25	2.40	2.40	2.65	3.05	3.15	3.35	3.55	3.90	4.05	ΥX	4.20	4.55	ΥX	
*	2	Ŷ.	Y.	₹	¥.	8	1.05	\$	1.75	2,2	2.40	5.40	2.60	2.60	2.90	3.20	3.35	3.55	3,75	4.15	4.25	Ϋ́Z	4.35	4.75	XX	
ç	1	2	ę,	59:	52,	1.80	5.50	1.95	225	2.70	2.95	2.35	3.15	3.15	3,35	3,75	3.90	4.15	4.25	4.60	4,75	N/A	4.90	5.25	Ϋ́	
4/14		7	1.10	2	140	55	58	2.45	2.70	320	3,50	S :	3.60	3.60	3.90	4 25	4.45	8	4.85	2,50	5.30	¥.	5.40	5.75	XX	
Y	į	Ç.	9	1.50	1.75	1.90	2,40	2.30	9 10	3.55	3.80	6 6	3.95	3.95	4.25	\$.50	4.85	4 .95	5.10	5.50	5.65	ΚX	5.75	5.05	ΝΑ	
•	1 6	?	\$ '	•	4	Y)	•	4 P	'	4	₹	E	8	Ø.	5	Ξ	5	ţ?	₹ F	14	14A	148	ħ	10	16A	•
													०९४५ ५ ५ ५ ७ ५ ८ ५ ६ ८	n 4 4 4 4 0 0 4 7 4 4 6 6 8	n ર 4 વૈતા ૧૧૫ પ્રવૃત્ત ૧૧૧ ૧૧	. લં 4 વૈત્ય જ વૈપ્યું થ વૈત્ય ઇ	u 복 4 축 n n 축 L 도 쪽 n 복 u ii ii	u र 4 दं n n दे v दं द्र m दे u o i i i i i		. 복 4 축 a n 축 L 독 목 n 축 u 증 L L L L L	u ម	6 4 4 4 4 0 0 6 7 4 4 9 8 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	υ ຊ	u u u u u u u u u u u u u u u u u u u	6 4 4 4 4 9 6 7 4 4 8 8 8 8 8 11 11 12 14 14 14 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15	3 1.85 4 4 1.164 4 4 1.164 5 6 2.40 6 6 2.40 6 7 7 7 3.165 7 7 3.165 8 8 3.80 8 9 3.85 9 9 3.85 1.10 10 10 4.85 1.10

OHIO TURNPIKE COMMISSION Schedule of Tolls Class 2 Effective January 1, 1996

																											8 3	
į	Agr	X	¥	ž	¥	ž	ΥN	XX	Z.	¥% ¥X	Ν̈́Α	Ž	×	¥¥	ž	N/A	Ž	XX	K/A	2	ž	X	ž	ž	ΝΆ	×	≨ 5	ł
,	٩	9.10	9.70	8.00	7.55	7.35	7.05	6.85	6.20	5.60	5.25	4.45	Ϋ́	8,4	Υ/X	3.80	3.35	2.90	2.35	1.90	1.60	1.00	Ϋ́	8	₹;	Z.	¥ 5	j
,	î	6.70	30	33	7.8	8.8 8.8	6.55	6.35	5,70	5.65	4.75	8	Ϋ́	38	ΧX	3.35	8	2.40	8	1.45	1.15	S,	¥	S	ž	S ;	¥ %	}
977	f	¥.	2	ď.	ž	2	¥	Ž	ž	ž	ž	ž	ž	ž	ž	Ϋ́	×	Ϋ́	Ϋ́	N/A	Ϋ́	XX.	ΧX	ž	S, S	8	X 50	!
14.0		4	8 6	cr.	6.85	5,65	9.40	6.15	2.50	8	55.	3.75	ź	3.60	۷ 2	3.15	2.65	2.25	1.75	52	50,	Sį	K/X	K.	ž :	ž	<u> </u>	
7		P i	P :	8	6.50	90.0	6.15	5,85	9	29	e :	3.45	¥ ;	3.35	ž	2.83	2.40	1.90	1.45	1.00	9 6	Š	S.	2	તે ક	2 2	ž 3	
13A		8	3 5	2	20.0	0.7	2.50	5.75	20 1	8 6	3.7	2.80	ž	2.70	ž	2.25	1.80	52	S,	.50	×	S	1.05	ζ,	e 6	2 4	1.95	
13	1	3 ;	9 6	<u>.</u>	2 5	9 6	9.5	Ą.	2 1	2 5	2 4	66.7	ď.	0 :	ď.	8	1.45	S :	S,	N/A	S,	8	2	4	2 5	N/A	2.30	
12	2 20		9 2	9 5	e i	n (n .	e .	9.6	2 6	3 6	207	ž ,	6.	2	1,45	8	ξ,	Š	ģ	8;	1.45	5.7	§ §	3.5	N/A	2.75	
Ξ	2, 3	7	5 £	2 5	2	1 u) (2 5	9 6	2 5	7	e e	ć ;	0	Ź.	8	જ	š i	De:	Š.	2	9.50	0 1	45.	3 6	Ϋ́	3.20	
2	5 80	2 4	7 2	3 6	9 9		9 6	9 6	966	3 5	2 2	9 5	E S	0.7	()	?	ΚŅ.	G, (0.1	1.45	Q.	2.40	7.07	£ 6	3 35	×	3.70	
(J)	۶	36 7	2 2	27.6	7 2	2	9 6	 	27.	3 4	2 2	2	Š	2	.	ď.	8	8 5	9	8 1	2	2.90	9 2	9	3.80	ž	4 .20	
€	5 30	7 85	2	27.5	, F	5	2 6	3 5	175	145	? 2	25	S	2 2		ž	ď :	4	2	۲ :	X	¥ \$	(d	(A/A	×	N/A	K/A	
æ	95	38	3.70	2	50 6	27.6	i c	9 9	7,	8	3 5	V V	2/2	.	ş	ñ ;	8 9	2 6	8 6	0 P C	5 5	9 6	3.60 A/A	3.80	4.30	¥	4.65	
æ	4 90	7 35	3.70	3.20	90.6	27.5		1 8	1 25	8		N/A	N/A	V 2		()	Ž	2 2		2 3	2	¥ 2	2	×	N/A	Š	N/A	
χ.	4.85	4 30	8	3.15	300	2 70	245	58.	1 20	8	N/A	ç	S	55	9	9 6	ă ș	8 8	3 6	6 6	3 4	3 6 4 7 5 8	× ×	6.6	4.45	N/A	4.75	
7	3.90	3.40	2.70	2.30	2 05	1.85	50	8	05	K.X	8	60	8	1.45	*	2	2 5	2 6	30.5	5 6	2 6	55.5	ž	4.75	5.25	K/X	5.65	
64	3.60	3.10	240	1 95	8	1 60	30	8	ďŽ	S	22	125	52	1.75	175	,	3 5) in		2 6	3 5	8 8	×	5,05	5.60	ΑN	5.90	
9	2.95	2.45	1 80	1 30	1.5	8	20	N.Y	65	9	58	1 90	1 90	2 35	25.0		2 2	9 2	6	3 5	2 4	9 49	×	5.70	6 20	N/A	6.55	
5	2.30	1.80	1.15	2	8	S,	A/N	02	130	1.80	2.45	2.55	2.55	5.05	20.5	2	9 6	4.00	4 05	, r,	2 4	5.15	ž	6.35	8.85	Ν	7.20	
44	2.00	1.50	\$8	90	S,	A'S	S	1.00	1,60	1.85	2.70	2.75	2.75	3.30	3.30	6	3 7	4.65	5	5	4	5.0	N/A	6.55	7.05	N/A	7.50	
4	8	8	2.	8	42	S,	S,	1,15	1.80	2,05	3,00	3.05	3,05	3,55	50.50	3 05	4.45	58.	5.40	2 20	ų,	6.65	N/A	6.85	7.35	N/A	7.70	
శ	1.80	1,15	Ŗ,	ž	25	<u>8</u>	5.	33	<u>.</u>	2.30	3.15	3.20	3.20	3.75	3.75	70	4	5.10	8	585	8	6.85	¥.	7.00	7.55	X	7.95	
۳	1,15	99,	ΑN	8	67.	8	1,15	1.80	2.40	2.70	3.60	3,70	3,70	4.20	2	4.65	5 50	9.60	6.10	6.40	8	7.35	X	7.55	8.00	Α'n	8.35	
7	Ŗ,	ž	59.	1.15	1.30	1.50	1.80	2.45	3.10	3.40	4,30	4,35	4.35	₹.85	4.85	Ş	S 4	6.25	6.75	200	7.70	8.00	X.	8,15	8.70	Ϋ́	9.05	
-	¥.	S,	1.15	9,	1.80	2,00	2.30	2.95	3.80	3.90	4.85	6 ,	4.90	5.30	5.30	5.80	6.25	6.75	22	7.55	8	8.45	ΚX	8.70	9.10	ΝΆ	9.50	
NTERCHANGE	-	'n	e	¥	4	₹	V)	9	€,	7	₹	8,4	89	8	67	5	:	12	13	134	7	14. A4.	148	ħ	9	\$	17	
NTER															_	8	9	1	6	-								

OHIO TURNPIKE COMMISSION Schedule of Tolls Class 3 Effective January 1, 1996

17	12,35	8	10,75	10.10	8,6	8	9.25	8.30 SC	7.40	6.95	6.10	Ϋ́	5.85 53	ž	5.05	4.55	39	9	8	2.55	59.	ž	ž	1,10	8	8	¥X
3	N/A	ž	ž	K/X	×	ΝΆ	ΧX	ž	ź	ž	ž	Ϋ́	K Ž	ž	ž	ž	ž	ž	ž	X.	2	2	Ž	Χ¥	ž	ž	g
18	12.00	11.40	10,45	9.70	9.50	9.25	8.85	7,95	2.00	6.55	5.70	₹	5.25	Ϋ́	4.75	4.20	3.55	3.05	2,55	2.15	1.25	Ϋ́	85	2,	Ϋ́	¥	8
15	11.40	10.75	9.85	9.10	8.85	8.65	8.20	7.20	6.35	5.85	2.00	ź	4.55	¥	£.15	3.55	2.30	2.40	1.90	1.45	8	Ϋ́	8	Ϋ́	2.	N/A	1.10
148	A/A	¥	ďŽ	¥	×	Ϋ́	ž	¥	Ϋ́Х	Ϋ́	×	Ϋ́	ΥN	¥.	Ϋ́	¥	¥	¥	ΥX	ΥN	ş	ž	¥2	8	Xj.	×	55
14A	11.15	10,50	9.60	8.30	8.70	8.35	8	2.00	5.15	5.70	4.85	ΑŽ	4.35	ΥN.	8.	3.35	2.65	2.25	1.75	1.30	8	ΚV	¥2	×	ΚX	ž	ž
2	10.75	10,15	9.25	8,55	8.30	8.00	7.60	6.65	5.75	530	4.45	ž	3,95	K.	3.55	3,0	230	1.85	6.1	8	Ϋ́	8	×	99	2	ž	1.85
13A	9.90	\$7. 6	8.35	7.65	7.40	7.05	6.75	5,75	8,	4,45	3.55	N/A	3.10	ΚX	2.65	2.05	9	.00 00	9.	N/A	SS.	30	¥	1.45	2.15	×	2.55
13	9,50	8.85	7.95	7.20	6.95	8,75	6.35	5,40	4.45	3.95	3.0	ΑN	2.65	A/N	2.25	1.65	50	9	∀ /2	99	6.	1.75	¥¥	- 30	2,55	ž	8
12	8.85	8.35	7.40	8.75	6,45	6.20	5.80	8.	3.95	3.55	2.70	K.Z	2.25	N/A	1.75	1.15	8	A/A	9.	8	£8.	2.25	ž	2,40	3.05	¥.	3.40
÷	8 45	8	9 1	6.25	8	5.0	13 16	4.45	8	8	23	ź	2	<u>ب</u>	X.	Ę	* *2	8	8	ă	2.8	2.65	ž	2,80	3,55	<u>.</u>	8 8
5	7,75	7.28	6.35	5.65	5.30	5.05	4.65	3.80	2,30	2.40	1.55	K/A	1,10	×	8	×	٤,	1,15	1.65	205	38	3,35	ΝĄ	3.55	4.20	¥%	4.5S
đ	7.20	6.85	5 70	8	4 75	8	4.15	3.15	2.30	£.90	1.05	¥	8	Ϋ́	¥,	89.	1.25	175	2.25	2.65	3.55	3.90	×	4.15	4.75	¥	5.05
₩.	7.20	8.55	5.70	2.00	4.75	9	4.15	3.15	2.30	8	1.05	¥.	99.	ž	¥	¥	Ϋ́	N/A	Ϋ́	Š	Κ¥	Ϋ́N	N/A	N/A	N/A	×	Ϋ́
80	6 80	8.20	5.25	4.55	8.3	3.95	3.60	2.65	1,80	1.30	89	ΥX	ΥN	8	8	5.	1.75	2.25	2.65	3.10	36.	4.35	Ϋ́	4.55	5.25	Ϋ́	5.65
వ	6 80	6.20	5.25	4.55	6 .3	3.95	3.60	2.65	80.	1.30	8,	ΥX	N/A	ΝV	N/A	Ϋ́	N/A	Ž	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	×	ΚΆ	X.X	ν.	Ϋ́
₹	6 35	5.75	4.75	4.10	3.85	3.50	3.15	5.20	1.30	85	Α¥	8	9	1.05	1.05	1,55	2.20	2.70	3.10	3.55	4.45	4.85	ΝΆ	5.00	5.70	K/N	6.10
7	5.45	6.4	3.90	3.20	3.00	2.65	2.30	1.30	8	ΚX	85	1.30	1,30	1.90	1.90	2.40	3.05	3,55	3.95	4.45	5.30	5.70	K/X	5.85	6.55	N.	6.95
64	5.00	4.45	3.50	2.75	2,55	2.25	1.85	85	N/A	8	1.30	1.80	1,80	2.30	2.30	2.90	3.50	3.95	4.45	4.90	5.75	6,15	ΝA	6.35	7.00	N.A	7.40
ь	4.15	3.55	2.55	1 30	1.65	1,30	8	N/A	.85	1,30	2.20	2.65	2.65	3,15	3.15	3.80	4.45	4.90	5.40	5.75	6.65	7.00	A/N	7.20	7,95	×	8.30
ĸ	3,15	2.55	1.65	9,1	۶.	99:	N/A	1.00	1.85	2,30	3,15	3.60	3.80	4.15	4,15	4.65	5,30	5.80	6.35	6.75	7.60	8.00	V/N	8.20	8.85	Ϋ́	9.25
4	2.75	2.15	1.25	9	8	N/A	9	1,30	2.25	2.65	3.50	3.95	3,95	4.50	4.50	5.05	5.70	6.20	6.75	7.05	8,00	8.35	A/N	8.65	9.25	ΝΆ	9.60
. •	2.55	1.90	1.00	8	Ϋ́	8	2.	1.65	2.55	3.00	3.85	4.30	4,30	4.75	4.75	5.30	6.05	6.45	6.95	7.40	8.30	8,70	XX	8.95	9.50	ΚX	9.90
క	2.30	1,65	202	¥.	8	8	8	8	2.75	3.20	2	4.55	4.55	8	200	5.65	6.25	5.75	2	7.65	8.55	8,30	ΥN	9.10	9.70	¥.	10.10
ю	1.50	8	N/A	2	8	52	165	2.55	3.50	390	4.75	5.25	5 25	2.70	5.70	6.35	6.95	7.40	7.95	8.35	9.25	9.60	X	9,85	10.45	×	10.75
6	50	N/A	8	65	90	2.15	2.55	3.55	4.45	90	5.75	6.20	8 20	6.65	8.65	7.20	7.95	8.35	28.85	9.25	10.10	10.50	N/A	10.75	11.40	N.	11.80
-	A/S	8	Ş	230	25.5	2.75	3.15	4.15	80	5.45	8 35	6.80	8 30	7 20	7.20	7.75	8.45	28.85	9.50	9.90	10.75	11 15	d/Z	11.40	12.00	A/A	12.35
NGE	Ī		۳.	Ą	4	4	¥	9	Ą	^	¥ 2	8	ď	8	0	ç		: 2:	1 6	134	7	14.6	48 F	ų.	9	4	4
INTERCHANGE													-8	35) ^	17	7_					•	-				

	1																			500							
	İ																			A/N							
	١																			2.95							
ŧ	43.70	2 5	44.75	57.05	56.35	10.09	6	9.25	800	7.40	8,35	4/2	5.70	X	505	4.45	9	8	2.55	1.95	75	×	55	N/A	8	N/A	5
148	V.V	4/2	2	N/A	N/N	ž	2	2	×	A/V	X	N/A	ž	2	×	N/A	×	ž	N/A	Y.	¥2	XX	XX	8	1.15	¥X	17.
144	13.50	12.75	1	10.65	10.25	8.85	8.30	8.90	7,65	7.05	6.00	N/A	5.40	X	4.85	4.15	5.5	2.65	2.25	1,75	8.	N/A	×	×	ž	2	928
7	13.30	10.00	11 40	10.35	10.00	9.55	9.05	80 57	7.20	5.65	5.50	W.A	7	ΚΆ	4.45	3.80	2.65	2.25	1.75	5.2	N.	3 5	ΑN	.75	1.75	ž	233
₹ <u>5</u>	12.10	11.35	10.20	9.20	8,80	8.35	7.80	7.30	6.05	5.45	5	K/Z	3.70	Ş	3.20	2.40	55,5	1.15	.85	Ϋ́	5	1,75	A/A	1.95	2.95	ž	3.50
t	11.55	10.75	96	3.65	8.23	7.80	7.35	6.80	5.50	4.95	3.80	ΑX	3.15	N/A	2.65	1.90	£.	8	K/X	89	1.75	2.25	N/A	2.55	3.40	×	3.95
5	11.15	10.35	9.10	8.15	7,75	7.35	6.85	6.35	5.05	4.45	3.30	ΥN	2.65	Š	2.25	1.45	S 6	ΚN	59	1,15	2.25	2.65	ž	3.00	3.90	Ϋ́	4.45
=	10.65	86	8,70	7.70	7.35	8.90	8.35	5.80	4 .55	3.95	2.90	ΑVA	2.25	Ϋ́	1.75	8,	ž	.65	1.05	1,50	2.65	3.10	×	3.40	4.35	Ν	4.95
5	3.65	8.90	7.70	8.75	6.35	5.90	5.45	6 .90	3.60	3.05	1.90	N/A	1.25	ΚX	7.	Υ.	9.	1.45	1.90	2.40	3,50	4.15	Ϋ́	4.45	5.30	ΚŅ	5.85
o	8,85	8.23	6.95	6.10	5.70	5,25	4.65	4.15	2.8	2.30	22	∀/Z	.65	ΥN	Ϋ́	5,	1.75	2.25	2.65	3.20	4.45	4.85	ΚX	5.05	6.10	×	6.65
8	8.85	829	6.95	6.10	5.70	5.25	4.65	4.15	2.90	2.30	1.20	K/N	25	Ϋ́	Ϋ́	K/N	¥.	K/N	۷ X	Š	ΚX	×	K Z	Y.	N/A	X/A	∀ /2
80)	8.70	7.95	6 65	5.70	88	4	4 45	3 60	2.45	8	2	4	ΝΆ	35	8	1.25	2.25	2.65	3.15	3.70	8	9.40	Ϋ́	5,70	6.55	ž	7,15
\$	8.70	7.95	8.65	5.70	5.30	£.95	4 45	3 60	2.45	. 8	2.	ΚΆ	χX	N/A	Ϋ́	ΝΆ	N/A	Ϋ́	ΝA	ď.	Ϋ́	Ž.	K/A	ΚX	W.A	ΝΆ	ΑN
¥.	8.05	7.30	8.05	5.05	€ .70	£30	3.80	8	480	130	X	2.	2,	120	2	8.	2.90	3.30	3.80	4 .30	5.50	6.00	ž	8.35	7.20	¥X	7.75
4	5.35	6.20	4.95	3,35	3.60	3.15	2 65	1.90	3 5	×	2	5	1.90	2.30	2.30	3.05	3.95	4.45	4.95	5.45	8.65	7.05	¥	7.40	8,35	Ϋ́	8.90
\$	6,55	5.75	8	3.55	3.15	270	2 25	125	W.A	8	8	2.45	2 45	2.90	5.80	3.60	55	5 05	5.50	6.05	7.20	7.65	ΥX	8.8	8,90	XX.	8.50
w	5.70,	4.90	3.60	2.65	2.30	1,85	30	N/A	125	90	3.00	3.60	3.60	4.15	4.15	4 90	5.80	6,35	6.80	7.30	8.45	8.90	W/A	9.25	10.10	N/A	0.75
																				7.80							
	l																			8,35							
																				8.80							•
																				9.30					•		•
																				10.20							•
- 1																				11.35							
																				12.10							
																				<u>\$</u>							
INTERCHANGE																							-				
1													-8	38	1	1	5										

OHIO TURNPIKE COMMISSION Schedule of Tolls Class 5 Effective January 1, 1996

13	18.05	17.20	15.80	14.80	14.40	13.90	13,30	11.80	10.45	9.85	8.50	X.	7,75	Ϋ́	7.35	6.45	5.45	4.95	4.45	3.85	2.55	Ž	1.95	1,75	\$3	8	Ν̈́
15	ΥN	×	×	×	ž	ž	Ž	Χ×	×	Ϋ́	N/A	Ϋ́	Ϋ́	Ϋ́	N.	Š	ΧX	¥	ΜĄ	W.	W.	Ϋ́	¥.	ž	ž	ž	8.
92	17.40	18.45	15.20	\$. 10	13.70	13,25	12.65	11.15	9.70	9.10	7,80	*	7,15	Χ×	6.85	5.80	4.75	8.3	3.80	3.20	1.30	Š	1,30	1.1 12	N/A	¥	.85
15	16.35	15.55	7.15	13.10	12.65	12.20	11,55	10.10	8.75	9.	6.85	×	6.10	Š	5.70	4.75	3.80	3.30	2.75	2.25	8	Ϋ́	2	¥X	9	ž	1,75
148	ΝΆ	K/A	Ϋ́	ž	Ϋ́	ΧX	Ϋ́	¥	×	×	Ϋ́	ď.	Ϋ́	ž	×	ž	Š	×	ΥN	*	¥	¥	ž	2	30	¥	1.95
14A	16.00	15.10	13.85	12.75	12.35	11.90	11.25	9,85	8.40	7.75	8.50	N/A	5.75	¥	5,30	4.45	3.40	3.00	245	5.30	2	ΧŽ	ž	×.	Ž	Ž	¥.
*	15.55	14.55	13,30	12.20	11.80	11.35	10.75	925	7.80	7.20	5.90	¥	5.25	Ϋ́	4.75	3.90	2.30	2.40	1,90	130	×	۲.	N/A	8	1.30	ΚX	2.55
\$	14.15	13.30	11.35	10.85	10.45	10.00	9.45	7.95	6.50	5.85	6.60	Ž	3.90	ΥN	9 9	2.60	1.65	8	尺	×	1.30	1.90	N/A	2.25	3.20	Ϋ́	3,85
13	13.65	12.70	11.40	10,30	9.90	9,45	8.85	7.35	8	5.30	4,05	N/A	3,35	Ϋ́	2.90	8	5.	2	ΥX	5	96	2.45	Ϋ́	2.75	3.80	Ν¥	4.45
12	13.10	12.25	10.95	9.95	9.50	8,95	8.35	6.85	5 50	96.	3.60	Ϋ́	2.90	Y.Y	2.40	5	2.	¥	2.	12	2.40	3.0	Ϋ́	3.30	8,3	¥ 2	4.95
11	12.65	11,80	10,45	9.30	8.85	B.	7.95	6.35	50.5	4.45	3.15	Ϋ́	2.40	N/A	190	1.10	ΝA	2	1,1	1.65	2.90	3.40	Ν¥	3.80	4.75	Ϋ́	5,45
10	11,55	10.75	9.50	8.35	7.95	7.50	6.25	5.30	3.95	3.35	2.05	N/A	1.40	¥2	3 5	Κ¥	1,10	1.50	2.00	2.60	3.90	4.45	N/A	4.75	5,80	ΥX	6.45
£5	10.75	8	8.55	7.0	5.95	8	\$ 05	4.65	3 15	2 55	-	×	2	×	ž	22	5 9	2.40	230	340	4.75	8.3	₹/2	5.70	6.65	ş	7.35
. %	10.75	9.30	8.55	9	5.95	8.50	6 05	4.45	3.15	2.55	6 .	Y/Z	20	×	ΚŅ	ΥN	K/X	ΝA	X/X	N.	ΝA	ΚV	¥ 2	ΚX	¥	Ν¥	N/A
83	10.25	9.50	8,10	8	6.55	6 15	5 50	3.95	2 65	5.00	ξ.	¥.	ΑΝ	8	۲.	4.	2.40	2.90	3,35	3.90	5.25	5.75	Ϋ́	6.10	7.15	Ϋ́	7,75
á	10.25	9.50	8.10	8	6 55	6 15	5 50	3 95	2 65	2 00	<u>.</u> 75	Ν̈́	N/A	N/A	Ϋ́Х	Ν¥	×	N/A	K/X	N/A	ž	ž	Ϋ́	Y/V	N/A	ΝA	Ϋ́
¥.	9.50	8.75	7.35	6.25	2 80	5.40	¥ 82	330	195	1.25	Y/A	72	.75	.40 64.	1,40	2.05	3.15	3,60	4.05	₩.60	5.90	8	N/A	6.85	7.80	Χ×	8,50
7	8.20	7.40	6.10	5.00	4.55	4 15	3 55	2.00	2	ΝΆ	1 25	2.00	2.00	2.55	2.55	3.35	4.45	₹	5.30	5.85	7.20	7.75	ΥX	8 10	9.	Ϋ́	9.85
ž	7.50	6.80	5,45	₹,35	3.90	3.50	2.95	40	Š	7.0	1.95	2.65	2.65	3.15	5	3.95	5.05	5,50	5.90	6,50	7.80	8.40	¥	8.75	9.70	¥	10,45
w	6.35	5,45	4.15	3.05	2.50	2.15	1,50	N/A	1.40	50	3.30	3.95	3.95	4.45	4,45	5.30	6.35	6.85	7.35	56'2	9,25	9.85	N/A	10,10	11.15	ď.	11.80
5	4.75	3.90	2.60	35	100	2	N/A	50	2.95	3 55	4.85	5.50	5.50	6.05	6.05	6.85	7.95	8.35	8.85	9.45	10.75	11,25	N/A	11.55	12,65	Š	13,30
\$	4.25	3.30	1,95	8 9	2	ΑX	۲.	2.15	3.50	4.15	5.40	6.15	6.15	6.50	6,50	7.50	8.40	8.95	9.45	10.00	11.35	11.90	W/A	12.20	13.25	ΝΆ	13.90
4	3.80	2.90	. 50	7.	¥/X	2	1.10	8	3.90	4.55	5.80	6.55	6,55	6.95	5.95	7.95	8.85	9.50	9.90	10.45	11.80	12.35	A/A	12,65	13.70	ΚX	14,40
¥	3,35	2.40	1.10	ΥN	2	.85	1.50	3.05	4.35	5.00	6.25	7.00	7.00	7.40	7.40	8.35	9.30	9.95	10.30	10 85	12.20	12,75	A/A	13.10	14.10	ž	14.80
m	225	1,30	X.A	1.10	35	58.	28	4,15	5.45	6.10 0.10	7.35	8.10	8.10	8,55	8.55	9.50	10,45	10.95	11.40	11.95	13,30	13.85	ΚΆ	14,15	15.20	Κ	15,80
0	8	Ν	1,30	240	2.90	3.30	3.90	5.45	6.80	7,40	8.7.5	9,50	9.50	9.90	8.90	10,75	11.80	12.25	12,70	13.30	14.55	15.10	ΝA	15.55	16.45	ΑX	17.20
•	¥X.	8	2.25	3,35	3.80	4.25	4.75	6.35	7.60	820	9,50	10.25	10,25	10.75	10,75	11.55	12.65	13,10	13.65	14.15	15.55	16,00	ΑŻ	18.35	17,40	N/A	18.05
HANGE	-	8	n	æ	4	\$	10	ŲĐ	¥	٨	₹	æ	ä	æ	G	e	Ξ	12	t	¥.	*	14 4	148	15	92	16A	17
INTERCHANGE													_	.8	9	1	9										

17	20.15	19.15	17,70	16,45	15.95	15,40	14.80	13.10	11.60	10.95	9.55	ΧX	8.75	ž	8.20	7.20	6.10	5.50	4.95	8	2.90	ΥX	2.15	1.90	9.	1.00	¥
16A	N.	×	ž	¥.	Z.	Ž	×	×	¥%	ž	ž	ž	XX X	Ν¥	×	¥	N.	N.	¥	N/A	ΝĄ	Ϋ́	Ν	×	×	κX	8
16	19,40	18.35	16.90	15.70	15.20	14.65	¥.85	12.35	10.80	10,10	8.75	ž	8,00	Ϋ́	7.40	6.45	5.30	4.75	4 .20	3.55	208	×	5.	1,15	Κ¥	Ϋ́	1,00
:5	15.25	۲ <u>۲</u>	88	* 55	7	55 53	12.80	2	6	& \$3	7.65	ď.	6.85	××	6.35	8	ģ	8	3.05	2.43	5	K.X	Ş	۲ ۲	1.15	X	8
14B	ΝA	ΑŅ	Ν	ΚX	Ν	N.	¥,X	ΧX	ď.	N.	Ϋ́	Š	¥	¥	ΑŅ	Ϋ́	ΑŅ	Ϋ́	ΝΆ	ď Ž	¥	Ϋ́	Ϋ́	5.	1	۲ ۲	2.15
14A	17.85	16.90	15.40	14.15	13.70	13.25	12.60	10,80	9.35	8,70	7.25	×	6.45	Ϋ́	5.90	5.00	3.80	3.20	2.65	2.05	Κ.	ž	W.	×	¥	××	N/A
14	17.25	16.35	14.80	13.65	13,10	12.65	12.00	10.25	8.80	8.10	8.65	¥	5.85	ΜĄ	5.30	4.45	3.15	2.65	2,05	1.45	¥¥	52.	Ϋ́	9.	2,05	×	2.90
ı																			.75								
13	15.20	2,2	12.65	11.50	11.88	5.50	8.90	8.20	6.75	6.05	60	¥	3.80	ž	3.15	2,30	1.15	22	N/A	25	2.05	2.65	¥	3.05	6,20	X.	4.95
12	14.55	13,70	12.15	10.95	10.45	9,95	9.30	7.60	6,15	5.45	3,95	Ϋ́	3,15	ΚŅ	2.65	1.75	57:	X.	7.	1.30	2.65	3.20	ΥN	3.60	4.75	ΥN	5.50
ı																			1.15								
																			2.30								
																			3.15								
																			3								
																			3.80								
		•																	N/A								
	ľ																		69.								
																			6.05								
																			8.75						•		•
																			8.20						•		
																			9.90								•
																			10.50 9	•		•			•		•
																			11,00 10								
	İ																		11.50 11								
																			12.65 11								
																			14.25 12								
																											20.15 19.
	L																										23
INTERCHANGE				•		•			•							20				#	•	4	* 1		•	\$	_

OHIO TURNPIKE COMMISSION Schedule of Tots Class 7 Effective January 1, 1996

17	24.20	22,	21,30	18.80	19.15	18.55	17.85	15.80	13,95	13,10	11,45	Ϋ́	10.45	N.		2 :	8.70	7.35	999	5.05	25	3.40	ž	2.60	2,30	1,15	1.15	Ž	
16A	ž	ž	ž	Ϋ́	×	X	Ϋ́	ΑX	N/A	ž	¥	N.A.	A/N	N.		Ž	ž	×	ž	Ϋ́	ΝΆ	ž	ž	XX.	Ϋ́	ΑN	Ν	1,15	
18	23,30	27	20.25	18.80	18,25	17.65	86.90	14.80	13.00	12.15	10.45	ž	65	MIZ	Ç 1	0 0	7.70	8.35	5.70	50.5	4.30	2.55	ž	1,85	1.25	ΥZ	N/A	1.15	
15	21.95	20.85	19.00	17.55	16.90	16.35	15.60	13.45	11.80	10.95	9.20	Ϋ́Α	8	972	9 6	2	8.35	5.05	4.45	3.80	3.00	51.	ž	8	Š	5	N.A	2.30	
148	ď.	ž	ž	¥	X.	ž	ž	¥	¥	¥	Š	ž	NIA	4.2	<u> </u>	Ž.	¥.	×	×	ΧX	ΑΝ	¥X	ΚX	Ϋ́	8	1.65	×	2.60	
14A	21,55	20.35	18,50	17.10	18,50	15.85	15,10	13.05	11.25	10.45	8.70	N/A	7.70	N.A	Ç 2	53	5.90	6.60	3,90	3.35	2.60	뚕	Ą	WA	Ν	Υ×	×	Š	
‡	20.85	19.60	17.85	16.40	15.80	15.20	14.45	12.35	10.50	3,65	7.95	K/A	9	9714	(i	6.35	5.25	3.90	3.15	2.60	1.80	N/A	g	×	1.15	2,55	XX	3.40	
£34	19.05	17,85	15.05	1,60	25.05	13.40	12.65	10,60	8.75	7.95	6.15	¥X	50		ξ.	55	3.50	2.05	Ş	8	¥.	8	260	×	3.00	8	N.A	2	
13	18.25	17.10	15 30	13.85	13.33	12 65	8	13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 1	8	7.15	246	XX	57.7		Ś	38	5.65	Ą	8	ΚX	8	8	33.33	Ϋ́	8	5.85 SS	ΝA	6.05	
17	17.50	16.45	14.55	13,10	12.55	11.95	11.20	9.10	7.30	6.45	4.75	A/A	68.6	2	2	3.15	2.00	.80	N/A	8.	1.50	3,15	3.90	N/A	4.45	5.70	ΚX	6.65	
F	16.90	15.80	13.90	12.50	11.90	11.35	10 80	8 45	8 65	5.80	4.15	A/A	7	2	Ć,	2.45	1.30	×	80	1.25	2.05	3.90	4.60	X/A	5.05	6.35	N/A	7.35	
5	15.60	14,45	12,65	11.20	10.60	10.00	9.25	7 15	5.30	4.45	2.75	4/2	4	0.1	ď.	1,15	ď	1.30	2.30	2.65	3.50	5.25	5.90	N/A	6.35	7.70	N/A	8.70	
ø.	14.45	13.30	11,50	10.05	50	88.8	51.6	8 05	22	335	1.75	A/N		8	ď.	Y/Z	5.	2.45	3.15	3.80	4.55	6.35	7.05	N/A	7,60	8.85	\$	9.85	
\$	14.45	13,30	11.50	10.05	25	58.5	5	£ 5	20	333	175	4/2		ō,	ď	×	Ϋ́Α	Ϋ́Z	۷/Z	A/N	ΚŅ	¥	¥	N/A	¥	K/A	Α'n	ΥN	
83	13.80	12.65	10.75	930	8.75	α 13	2 6	2 2	200	285	8	4/2		X	29:	.80	1,85	3.15	3.80	4,45	5.20	6.95	7,70	N/A	9.20	9.50	N/A	10,45	
																					A/A								
≴.	12.80	11.65	28.0	27.6	, ,	3 6	2 4 0		3 4		4/N		3 9	0 1	1.75	1,75	2.75	4.15	4.75	5.0	6.15	7.95	B.70	Y.	9.20	10.45	¥	11.45	
7	11.15	90 01	50	3 4		2 2	2 4		3 8	3 7	, Y	3 4	6.00	2.55	3,35	3.35	4.45	280	846	7.15	7.95	9.65	10.45	*	10.95	12 15	ž Ž	13.10	
3																												13.95	
9																												15.80	
40																												17.35	
44	ĺ																								Ť			18.55	
,	١																											19.15	
47	ı																											19.80	
	ı																											¥ 5	
•	1																											2 4 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	•
,	1																											¥ 5	-
Ţ	١																						_					16A	•
	NIEKCHANGE																				•			_	-		•	*-	
	= 1												-{	8	9	2	1	_											

OHIO TURNPIKE COMMISSION Schedule of Tolis Class 8 Effective January 1, 1995

3 3A 4 4A	3.55 5.30 6.05 6.80	205 385 455 530	N/A 180 245 320	1 8 N/A 85 1.45	2.45 85 N/A 85	3.20 1.45 .85 M/A	420 240 1.75 .85	6.80 5.00 4.30 3.55	8.95 7.20 6.50 5.75	10.60 8.30 7.60 5.85	12.10 10.35 9.60 8.90	13.30 11.50 10.75 10.05	13.30 11.50 10.75 10.05	13-90 12-20 11-50 10,75	13.90 12.20 11.50 10.75	14.55 13.75 13.00 12.20	17.10 15.30 14.55 13.85	18.05 15.25 15.60 14.90	21.05 19.00 17.20 16.45 15.75 14.90	19.85 18.10 17.30 16.60	21.85 20.05 19.40 18.70	22.65 20.95 20.20 19.45	NA NIA NIA	23.15 21.40 20.70 19.95	24.85 23.15 22.50 21.70	NA NA NA	25.95 24.15 23.45 22.75
φ	10.25	28.8	580	909	4 30	3 55	2.55	N/A	2.15	3,15	5.25	6.45	6.45	7.30	7.30	8.70	10.25	11,40	12.35 10.10	13.25	15.20	15.95	N/A	15 45	18.15	ΑŅ	19.30
	ľ			•															9.05 8.95			•		•	•		•
																			N/A 5.80								
																			N/A								
	ĺ																		5.05 3.60								
																			2.00								
																			2,0								
																			N/A .85								
			-	-															5 2.90								
14A	26.15	24.80	22.65	20.85	20.20	19.45	18,45	15.95	13,80	12.75	10,70	ΥX	9.50	ΥX	8.75	7.35	5.70	4.55	3,70	2.75	385	Ϋ́	¥.	Ϋ́	ΚN	ş	ž
																			WA.								
			•																4.20 5.85								
																			Y.								
#	9.45	8	5.85	4.15	3,45	275	1.85	9.30	7,00	5.95	3.85	×	2.65	ž	2,00	0.60	8.85	7.95	6.95	6.10	4.15	Ź	3.15	2.75	1,25	125	ž

9 of 11 Pages

OHIO TURNPIKE COMMISSION Schedule of Toils Class 9 Effective January 1, 1996

43	8	47.95	44.15	41.10	39,85	38.60	37.05	32,80	28.50	27.30	23.85	Á	21.95	¥.	20.60	18,15	15.20	13,90	12.50	10.85	7,30	¥ 2	5.60	4.90	2.40	2.40	ž	
類	.Y.Y	ž	ž	ž	2	ź	ž	χ	Ϋ́	ž	ž	ź	ž	52	ž	ž	ż	ž	1	ž	ž	ź	Ź	ž	ź	×	2.40	
\$	0.40	45,95	42.15	39.15	37.95	35.70	35.15	30,75	27.10	25.30	21.85	ď	19.95	×	18.50	\$6,15	13.30	1.90	10.45	8.85	5.25	K.	3,55	2.30	ď.	Ϋ́	2.40	
15	45.55	43.00	23.23	36.30	35.15	33,85	32.25	27.85	24.20	22.55	19.05	Ϋ́	17.10	Ϋ́Х	15.70	13.30	10,45	9.05	2,60	\$.05	240	¥	1.45	N.	2.90	ΝΆ	90	
148	ΑVA	ž	Ϋ́	ž	Α×	ž	¥	¥	ΧX	ž	¥	ž	ΥN	ď2	Χ¥	ž	N/A	×	×X.	¥%	××	ž	Ž		3.55	×	5.60	
14A	44.60	42.20	38.40	35.35	34.15	32.90	31.35	27.05	23,35	21.60	18,15	Ϋ́	16.20	N/A	14.80	12.40	9.55	8.15	6.75	5.10	2 .	¥	Ϋ́	X	¥.	¥	ž	
7	43.00	40.85	37.05	33.85	32.60	31,35	29.75	25.65	21.90	20,15	16.70	ΝΆ	14.70	W.	13.30	10,95	8.10	6.65	5.25	3.60	ž	52	¥	2,40	5.25	ΧX	7.30	
13A	39.55	37,10	33.30	30,30	28.10	27.85	28.30	21.90	18.30	16.50	13.05	V/V	11.15	××	9,65	7.35	4,50	3.05	1.65	×	3.60	5.2	¥/¥	6.05	8,85	W.A	10.85	
ជ	37.95	35.40	31.65	28.70	27.55	26.30	24.65	20.25	56.60	14.95	11.45	ΚŅ	9.50	A/A	8.10	5.70	2.90	1.45	Ϋ́	1.65	5.25	8.75	Ϋ́	7,60	10.45	ΝΆ	12.50	ĺ
ij	36.45	34.15	30.35	27.20	25.95	24.65	23.10	19.00	15.25	13,45	10.00	Α'N	8.10	N/A	8.65	6.4	1.45	K/X	1.45	3,05	6.65	8,15	ΑN	9.05	11.90	N/A	13.90	į
F	35.15	32.65	28 85	25.90	24.65	23.40	21.85	17.40	13.75	12.00	8,50	Ϋ́Z	6.55	N/A	5.40	2.90	WA	1.45	2.90	4.50	80 5	9.55	N/A	10.45	13,30	Ϋ́	15.20	
₽	32.25	29 75	25.95	8	21.85	20.60	19.00	14.55	10.95	9.25	5.75	√/N	3.80	K/K	2.40	N/A	2.90	4.30	5.70	7.35	10.95	12.40	ΑN	13,30	16,15	A/N	18.15	
o	29.75	27.55	27.75	20 65	19.40	18.10	15.45	12.35	3,65	6.85	3.50	¥/N	1.60	A/V	Y/X	2.40	5.40	6.65	8 10	3.65	13,30	14.80	ΑŅ	15.70	18.50	N/A	20.60	
₹6	29 75	27.55	27.75	20 65	19.40	18 10	16.45	12.35	3,65	6.85	3.50	¥	1.60	V/X	Ϋ́	¥/X	ζ/X	A/N	N/A	A/X	Ϋ́	A/N	ΥX	ΑX	ΑN	N/A	A/A	i
60	28 45	25.95	; ;	2 2	18 05	16 80	2	10 75	7.15	5,45	1,95	N/N	A/X	e e	8	3.80	8.55	8 10	9.50	11,15	14.70	16.20	X.	17.10	19.95	N.	23.05	3
æ	28 45	26.05	200	2 2	50 61		15.20	10.75	7.15	5.45	195	¥.	Ą	4/2	A/A	N/A	d/X	Ž	Ϋ́	N/A	ΝĄ	ΑN	N/A	N/A	N/A	ΑX	A/N	í
Α.	26 55	2	200	17.55	1 5	14.80	44 44	 	52.5	65	¥	56	8	6.6	2.50	5.75	258	90 01	11.45	13.05	16.70	18,15	K/K	19.05	21.85	Ž	28	Z.5.00
7	23 50	4	70.07	10.00	3 5	3 5	6 45	3 4	8 6	N/N	200	5.45	5 45	2	8.5	32.0	5 5	13.45	14.95	16.50	20.15	21,60	A/N	22.55	25.30	ž	02.70	7.77
Ą	21.35	70 07	2 5	3 8	3 2	3 4	200	3 5	, A	5	7,5	7. 7.	. r.	2 4) v	8 5	1 2 2	26.34	2 2	13.30	21 90	23 35	Š	24.20	27.10	N/A	0,00	2
ú	47.50	9	07.51	9 6	0 t	2 48	3 6	2 2	2 2	2 7	8 8	40.75	9 4 6	9,00	45.54	14.55	7 7 7	2	20.55	21.90	25.65	27.05	A/N	27 RS	30.75	7 X		32.85
v	2 20	2	2 1	2 .	n 6	20.4	7.2	¥ 5	9 6	9 0	2 4	, i	9 0	3.20	9 4	2 0	9 4	מייני	22.40	26.30	25 25	31.35	4/2	30.05	35.45	2 2	1 5	37.05
4	77. 27.	2	6.30	9 6	66.7	0.0	ξ,		0 0	7	7 6		0.0	0 0	2 9	2 6	20.00	2 1	25.25	27.85	5	6 6	N/A	73 67	25.70	20.72	Ç (38.60
•		2	2	6. 4 6. 7	÷	£ .	C 6	2 1	2 6	9 5	, i	2 5	19.03	3.5	3 5	9 6	61.03	66.65	3 2	2 5	33.60	3 7	9774	75 45	9	CE: 20	5	39.85
4	5	67.5	6.85	8	Š.	ę.	2.55	£.	, i	3 6	5 į	27.5	2.5	15.20	8.5	20.02	23.00	25.90	02.72	20.02	32.56	35.25	200		3	00.75 01.75	Š	1.10
•	,	0.20	3.80	¥	3.05	2	5.60	91.7	13.40	0.0	ě č	50.25	SZ.72	22.15	23.73	2.5	Na. a	28.85	30.35	6.5	34.54	20.50	20.40	C	23.40	57.13	Š	4.15
•	7	2.40	¥ Ž	3.80	6,85	9.10	8.35	10.95	15.20	18.85	20.65	C 1	25.35	25.95	27,55	27.55	29.75	32.65	£ 5	4.6	27.75		7	S 5	00,00	5.95	K.Z	47.95
,	-	ž	2.40	6.20	9.25	10.45	11.75	13.30	17.60	21,35	23.10	8	28.45	28.45	29.75	29.75	32.25	35.15	36,45	2 2	66.00	43.00	44.00	Y Y	Č,	48.40	¥	50.30
Ţ	Ę.	-	7	6	₹	4	ď,	ν,	و	\$	-	₹ .	⋨	∞.	₹	0	9	~	72	2 :	<u> </u>	4	4	9	ē	ŵ	3	7
	INTERCHANGE														9					,		•	.~			•		

	45	33; 1 33; 1	3 g	ξ. Ω	8	52	9 9	8	S S	Q Ki	Z :	Š	8 :	ž ž	2 ¥	3 4	1 1	Į,	12	8	3	8	Ž	3 3	8
·	148	¥X	<u> </u>	ž	Y.	×	¥	ž	∀	¥	ž	Š	2 2	Ž	Z 7	4/2	(*	4/7	Y.Y	A/A	Ϋ́	×	2.05	2	6.85
	14A	55.75	277.0	125	42.85	41.25	39,35	34.05	29,50	27.30	23.00	₹	20.55	2 5	18.70	5 5	2 5	6	9	210	¥	ΝĄ	ž	¥ 4	N/A
	7,	53.75	8. S.	42.40	40.90	39,35	37.35	32.30	27.65	S. 55	21.15	ď	18,65	¥ ç	16.85	6.5	9 9	, W	\$77	2	2,10	ΥX	8.6	7 ×	8.95
	13.4	49.45	£.33	37.95	8,58	8	33.05	27.65	23.20	20.95	16.60	×	14.25	2 5	12.30	2 8	2 4	, ,	4/2	44.	9.40	Ϋ́	8	8 %	13.45
	13	47.45	4 8	96.95	8	33.05	31.80	25.65	21.05	18.90	14.55	ž	12.15	2	50.35	કું કુ	200	4/2	3,5	1 4	8.50	W.	9.50	13.00	15.50
	ij	45.30	1,50	33.95	32.40	30.85	28.90	23.80	19.20	17.00	12.70	ž	10.35	¥ ;	9, 9	0 6 6	2.7X	, c	20.4	3 5	10.40	Ν¥	11.45	14.95	17.30
	#	43.60	40.60	3,00	30.70	29.10	27.15	21.85	17.25	15.05	10,70	ž	8,30	ž	88.	20.00	2 2	6.6	9 6	2 5	12.20	ΧX	13.35	16,85	19.10
	5	00°03	36.95	32.30	27.15	25.55	23.65	18.35	13.85	11.65	7.30	K/A	4.90	X .	8 :	¥ 8	2.00	. t		4 6	15,75	N/A	16.85	80.3	22.70
8	Ø	36.95	8 8	2 2	24.15	22.60	20.60	15.50	10.95	8.75	4.55	Ϋ́	2.20	¥.	¥ ;	8 6	0 0	2 4		70.21	18.70	×	19.85	23.25	25.65
OHIO TURNPIKE COMMISSION Schedue of Talls Class 10 Effective January 1, 1996	₩.	36.95	3,20	\$ 62 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	24 15	22 60	20.60	15.50	10.95	8.75	55	N/A	2.20	¥,X	ž:	¥ :	ď i	X :	2 5	2 5	¥ ×	N/A	Ϋ́Z	X S	Z Z
O TURNPIKE COMMISS Schedut of Talls Class 10 Effective January 1, 1996	Ø	35.25	32.15	27.40	22.35	20 75	18.80	13 40	8,95	5.75	2.55	ž	Ž	2.20	220	6.9	8.30	5,01	5.77	C7 # 5	20.55	N/A	21.65	25.20	27,60
OHIO J	\$	35.25	32.15	27.40	23.75	20.75	18 80	13.40	8.95	5.75	2.55	N/A	¥.	×	X.	Ž	Ý.	ž	Ž	Ž	Z Z	N.	¥.¥	X :	Z Z
	7.4	Ì																		9.9	23.52	ž	24.05	27.55	Z9.85
	7	1			17.00			8.75					6.75						18.90	2 1	2 25	2	28.40	31.85	25 25 25 25
	Ą	ļ			14.75								8,95								27.50				36.50
	ď	21.7			10.25																32.30				41.10
		ĺ																							N/A 46.30
		l																						-	AB.20
		ı																							N/A 49.75
		١																							N.A.
		1								•		•					•		•	Ī	•		•		A N/A 54.90
	,	١															Ī	Ī	•						A N/A 5 59.75
		1	Š	7.8	11,5		4 6	18.4	21.72	K 1	200	6.75	8 %	1 5	36.98	5	43.64	45.30	47.4	49.4	53.7	25.7	ž	9	N/A 62.65

INTERCHANGE

17 58.25 58.20 58.

\$\\\ \angle \ang

-8924-

OHIO TURNPIKE COMMISSION Schodule of Talls Class 11 Effective January 1, 1996

																				N/A 16.95								
æ	65.80	62.40	57.35	53,25	51.65	49,95	47.80	19		9 ;	34.40	29.65	¥	27.10	ž	25.15	21.95	18.05	18.20	14,25	12.05	7.15	ž	4.85	8	ž	ΥX	3.25
\$2	<u>م</u> 8:	33	53.33	48.43	1	45.55	28 67	8	3 2	# 1 	8	8	ž	R E	ž	<u>2</u>	9 9	7	53.33	10.35	8.8	KI M	* *	2.15	<u> </u>	8	ź	9
148	ž	ž	×	ž	×	X	A/A	4/2	\$	<u> </u>	Š	ž	¥	ž	¥2	×	ž	Ϋ́	ž	Ν	\$	Ϋ́	ž	ž	2.15	4.85	ΝΑ	7.55
14A	60.60	57.30	52.25	48.10	48,50	44.80	42 RO	8	20.00	5.15	28,35	24,65	ž	21,95	Ž	20.10	16.85	12.95	11.15	8.20	7,00	220	×	ş	×	¥,	Ν	N/A
ž	58.55	55.40	50.35	48.05	4,40	42.70	\$ 04	24.00	0.00	2 :	27.35	22.60	× Z	19.95	ž	18.05	14.85	5.9	\$.05	7.15	5.90	ž	220	ź	3.25	7,15	¥	9.85
134	53,70	50.40	45.25	41,15	39.55	37.85	35.75	8	23.00	87.1	23	17.65	ž	15.05	X	13.05	9.95	6.15	4.25	2.35	Ϋ́	8.3	8.	ž	8.30	12.05	×	14.70
13	51.50	48.10	43.05	39.00	37.45	35.75	5	22.55	8 1	8	2	5.5	ž	12.85	ž	1.08	7,70	8.9	2.15	Ϋ́	2.35	7,15	9.20	ž	10,35	7.25	ž	18.95
12	49.55	46.40	41.30	37.15	35.45	33.60	37 12	20.00	60.07	20.75	18,35	13.60	۷X	11.00	X.	9.05	5.80	2.15	ΝΆ	2.15	4.25	9.05	11,15	Ϋ́	12.35	18.20	ΚX	18.85
11	47.80	44.45	39.30	35.20	33.50	31.80	00 00	20,000	67.67	18.80	18.45	11.65	ΥN	8.95	N/A	7.30	£.00	Y.	2.15	8	6.15	11.00	12.95	ΧX	14.25	18.05	Ž	20.65
10	43.80	40.50	35,45	31,35	29 80	28 10	34.50	40.04	08.5	14.90	12.60	7,80	ΝA	5,20	N/A	3.25	Ϋ́N	4.00	5.80	7.70	9.95	14,85	16.85	¥	18.05	21.95	ΝΆ	24.60
Or .	40.50	37.45	32.30	28.05	26.35	24 60		2	16.80	11.80	9.40	4.90	Ϋ́	2.30	Υ/A	K/Z	3.25	7.30	9.05	11,00	13.05	18.05	20.10	ΧX	21.40	25.15	ΧX	27.95
8	40.50	37.45	32.30	28.05	26.35	24.60		2 5	16.80	11.80	9	4.90	N/A	2.30	N/A	A/N	N/A	A/N	N/A	N/A	N/A	X/A	ΚX	N/A	A/X	N/A	N/A	N.
80	38.70	35.45	30.25	26.20	24.5	22.02		2	14.70	80	7.45	2.70	ΚΆ	Y/X	2.30	2.30	5.20	8,95	8	12,65	15.05	19.95	24.95	W/A	23.23	27 10	N/A	29.70
88	38.70	35 45	30.25	26.20	25.50	30.00	2	2	14,70	9.80	1.45	2.70	Ϋ́	N/A	ΑX	Α/X	A/A	ď.	ΚX	ΑN	ΑN	A/N	ΑŅ	N/A	X/A	ΥX	ΑN	K/N
₹.	35.05	32.80	27.60	23.50	24.85	200	2 4 4 4 4	3	12.15	7.20	4.75	¥ 2	2.70	2.70	4.90	4.90	7.80	11.65	13.60	15,50	17.65	22.60	24.65	Ν	25.90	29.65	×X	32.35
7	31.30	28.05	20 05	28.85	47.45	2 4		13.20	7.45	2.50	¥/X	4.75	7.45	7.45	9,40	9.40	12.60	16.45	18.35	20.25	22.35	27,35	29.35	Ν	30.65	\$	N/A	37.15
\$	28.95	25.85	62.00	16 35	3	2 4	2 :	65.01	5 10	۷ ۲	2.50	2,2	9,8	9.80	11.30	11.80	4.90	18.80	20.75	8	24 80	28.70	31.75	ž	32.95	8	Ν	39,55
9	23.95	20.65	45.55		44.0	0.0	8 1	2.80	ΥX	5.10	7.45	12.15	14.70	14.70	16.80	16.80	19.85	23.75	26 85	27.60	29.85	34.90	36.90	K/N	37.95	41.90	∀ /¥	44.60
¥0	18.05	74.04	35.0	90.0	6.6	00.4	Z. 13	V/N	5.80	10.95	13.20	18.00	20.70	20.70	22.50	22.50	25.85	29.80	21.45	33,50	35.75	40.50	42.50	N/N	43 80	47.80	V/N	50.35
\$	16.00	43.04	1	2 5	9 1	, i	2	2,15	8,00	13.05	15.40	20.20	22.95	3	24.50	24 80	28 10	21.80	32.60	35.75	37.85	42.70	44 80	A/N	46.05	40.05	N/A	52.50
4	14.25		3 4	0 1	6.10	ž,	2.3	9.00	9,75	14.70	17.0	21.85	24.60	24 60	8	26.35	0800	9 2	34.46	37.45	39.55	4	65.5	2	47.80	2 2	1 2	54.25
ă	12.60		7.0	2 :	¥ .	Ç. Z	e e	5,65	11,40	16.35	18.80	23 50	26.20	8	1 2	2,00	24 34 34 34 34 34 34 34 34 34 34 34 34 34	60.30	37.55	36.00	41.15	46.05	48.10	N/A	707	2	4/2	55.90
e	8.45	1	2 :	§ ;	6.5		Ç,	5.75	15.55	8,52	28	27.80	30.05	35.05	3 6	5	32.25	2 5	23.30		75.25	5	3, 54	N/A	7 27	3 2	777	59.95
~	3.25		S S	6 10	9.25	11.00	12.65	14.85	20.65	25.85	28.05	25	35.45	24.45	47.45	77.45	9	0.04	į	4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	5.6	65.40	2 6	05.75	77 07	5.00	25.74	85.15
٠	4/8	2	e i	P 1	12.60	7.73	16.00	18.05	23,95	28.95	5	36.05	07.00	9 6	9	9	200	25.00	9,760	2 5	3 5	2 22	000	00,00	2	06.10	95,00	68.35
MTCOCHANGE	1	- 1	٧,	m .	38	4	\$	S	9	¥	*	. 4	6		8					2 5	2 5	<u> </u>	•	3	24	<u> </u>	2 6	<u> </u>

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

Ayes:

Mrs. Leever, Mr. Williams, Mr. Fedeli

Nays:

None

The Chairman declared the resolution stood adopted with all Members present voting in the affirmative. The resolution was identified as No. 59-1995.

The Chairman said the report on Budget and Finance was accepted as offered. He said the report on Audit/Legal would be received.

Mr. Rudolphy said the Commission's outside auditors, Coopers and Lybrand, had begun their audit for the period ending December 31st. He said they would be at the administration building on and off through the middle of February when he expected that the audit would be completed.

Mr. Rudolphy said he also had two resolutions that he would like to propose to offer for the Commission to adopt. He said the first one was entitled resolution designating certain projects as "System Projects" under the Commission's Master Trust Agreement of 1994.

Mr. Rudolphy said that it was somewhat of a housekeeping matter. He said the Commission had approved several of those in the past. He said it was a listing of projects that had work begun on them but the dollar amount was below the \$500,000 threshold that the Commission would have to award the contract for. He said he would like the Commission to designate them as System Projects so that they might be paid for with funds from the System Projects Fund.

He said he would read the Resolved as follows:

"RESOLVED that the Commission hereby designates the projects set forth in "Exhibit A" as System Projects under the terms and provisions of the Commission's Master Trust Agreement of 1994 and payable from the System Project Fund."

The Chairman asked Mr. Rudolphy to go through each item that the resolution would put into the System Projects.

Mr. Rudolphy said that exhibit A was a listing of about a dozen projects. He said work had begun on those projects. He said the dollar amount of each project was not in excess of \$500,000, so there would be no reason that the Commission would have had the occasion to award contracts for those.

Mr. Rudolphy said that they were according to the definitions contained in the Trust Agreement, and to a working definition that the Commission had adopted for what

types of projects qualified to be designated as System Projects. He said those dozen projects met that definition. He said they were essentially additions to the system, the system being the Turnpike system. He said that, for example, radio and toll equipment was being purchased for the new toll plaza 5A. He said that since it was an addition to the system he wished to designate those costs as a system cost so they could be added to the cost of the System, and the benefit would accrue to the bondholders under the Trust Agreement.

- Mr. Rudolphy said further that repainting of the Old State Route 8 bridge was essentially the same thing. He said that there was a contract, he believed, in the folders for action on that today. He said that, however, some preliminary costs had been incurred to prepare them for the resolution. He said those costs he desired to have designated as System Projects.
- Mr. Rudolphy said he had the same type of explanation for the concrete barriers. He said there was some preliminary cost that had gone on for those projects and he wished to designate them as System.
- Mr. Rudolphy said further that the contract for the construction of the safety wall at toll plaza 9A was awarded by the Executive Director because it was under the designation of \$500,000. He said he wished to designate that as a System Project.
- Mr. Johnson said he would correct that statement. He said the cost of the safety wall exceeded \$500,000 but the Commission gave him authority at the last Commission meeting to award that contract because there was a need to do that quickly.
- Mr. Rudolphy said that the ones designated in the exhibit as starting with the number 71 were engineering and consulting services. He said they were essentially preliminary design costs that were leading up to the preparation of plans. He said they were for the third lane and the new S.R. 109 interchange. He said the construction contracts would be presented to the Commission once they were advertised and awarded. He said those were preliminary design costs.
- Mr. Rudolphy said further that the 74 number was for purchase of right-of-way at toll plaza 15. He said the renovation had begun. He said the costs were for some additional right-of-way was needed for that work. He said the General Counsel had undertaken that and it was not something that would normally come before the Commission.
- Mr. Rudolphy said the last item on the list was the installation of the Sonic Nap Alert Pattern.
- A resolution designating certain projects as "System Projects" under the Commission's Master Trust Agreement of 1994 was moved for adoption by Mr. Williams, seconded by Mrs. Leever as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 60-1995

"WHEREAS, on February 15, 1994, the Ohio Turnpike Commission adopted the Master Trust Agreement with Huntington National Bank, as trustee, ("Trust Agreement") securing State of Ohio, Turnpike Revenue Bonds;

"WHEREAS, the Trust Agreement of 1994 established certain Projects and certain Project Funds, including System Projects and System Project Funds;

"WHEREAS, the comptroller has reviewed proposed projects and recommends that certain projects shall be paid from the System Project Fund and in order to make such payment, these projects must be officially designated by the Commission as "System Projects";

"WHEREAS, there is attached hereto "Exhibit A" which lists a number of the ongoing projects, and the Commission, pursuant to the request of its comptroller, desires to designate these projects as "System Projects";

"NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

"RESOLVED that the Commission hereby designates the projects set forth in "Exhibit A" as System Projects under the terms and provisions of the Commission's Master Trust Agreement of 1994 and payable from the System Project Fund."

-8929-

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

Ayes:

Mr. Williams, Mrs. Leever, Mr. Fedeli

Nays:

None

The Chairman declared the resolution stood adopted with all Members present voting in the affirmative. The resolution was identified as No. 60-1995.

Mr. Rudolphy said further he had one more resolution. He said it was entitled a resolution authorizing the transfer of moneys from the Capital Improvement Fund to the System Projects Fund.

Mr. Rudolphy said further that, as the Commission embarked upon its third lane project, it would be appropriate to commit any and all moneys that were available to the Commission for projects in anticipation of issuing bonds.

Mr. Rudolphy said further the money currently resided in the Commission's Capital Improvement Fund. He said it approximated \$90 million. He said he felt it should be dedicated to the System and be used on System Projects like those just authorized.

Mr. Rudolphy said further that he would read the Resolveds as follows:

"RESOLVED that the comptroller be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed, to permanently transfer the funds currently on deposit from the Capital Improvement Fund to the System Projects Fund; and

"FURTHER RESOLVED that with the prior recommendation and approval of the executive director and general counsel, that the comptroller be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to determine and permanently transfer future funds which may be on deposit in the Capital Improvement Fund to the System Projects Fund, as needed."

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

Mr. Williams asked if "transfer of future funds on deposit" meant that any future funds that came up that where under the resolution could be transferred by his authority.

Mr. Rudolphy said that the transfer could be done upon recommendation and approval of the Executive Director. He said that the way the Trust Agreement was written there were not any concession revenues and other miscellaneous revenues. He said they were considered non-pledged revenues. He said those moneys on a monthly basis were going into the Capital Improvement Fund. He said that in the future there would be funds from, essentially, the concessions. He said as the Commission

progressed the need might arise to tap into those funds and the Commission wanted the authority to do that.

A resolution authorizing the transfer of moneys from the Capital Improvement Fund to the System Projects Fund was moved for adoption by Mrs. Leever, seconded by Mr. Williams as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 61-1995

"WHEREAS, it has come to the attention of the Commission that expenditures have arisen and shall arise from future commitments on the Ohio Turnpike, including, but not limited to, design costs, project management, actual construction and other project-related costs for toll plazas, the third-lane project and other projects;

"WHEREAS, after careful review of the operations and finances of the Commission, the comptroller concludes that it is in the Commission's best interests to transfer the funds which the Commission currently has on deposit from the Capital Improvement Fund to the System Projects Fund;

"WHEREAS, the transfer of the above-described funds are not currently restricted by the Commission's 1994 Master Trust Agreement by and between the Commission and Huntington National Bank;

"NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

"RESOLVED that the comptroller be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed, to permanently transfer the funds currently on deposit from the Capital Improvement Fund to the System Projects Fund; and

"FURTHER RESOLVED that with the prior recommendation and approval of the executive director and general counsel, that the comptroller be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to determine and permanently transfer future funds which may be on deposit in the Capital Improvement Fund to the System Projects Fund, as needed."

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

Ayes:

Mrs. Leever, Mr. Williams, Mr. Fedeli

Nays:

None

The Chairman declared the resolution approved with all Members present voting in the affirmative. The resolution was identified as No. 61-1995.

The Chairman said the report on Audit/Legal was accepted as offered. He said the report on Service Plazas would be received.

Senator Gaeth said he had no report.

Mr. Johnson said he would like to add on the area of Service Plazas. He said the Commission did seek proposals for a food service consultant to assist the Commission and the staff in the process of the bidding and awarding of the contracts for the renovation or replacement of the Service Plaza restaurants.

Mr. Johnson said further that there was a resolution in the Members' folders relating to that consultant proposal request. He said that in response to the Commission's RFP two proposals from two different consultants were received to provide those services. He said that it was the conclusion and recommendation of the staff that those proposals that were received be rejected. He said there was a resolution in the Members' folders for that purpose. He said he would read the Resolved as follows:

"RESOLVED that the proposals received in response to the RFP for Food Service Consultant be and hereby are rejected, and the executive director and general counsel are authorized and directed to notify the bidders of such rejection;

"FURTHER RESOLVED that the executive director and general counsel are directed to continue to evaluate its food service consultant requirements and adjust the RFP where necessary, and to reissue it as soon as possible."

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

A resolution rejecting proposals for food service consultant was moved for adoption by Mr. Williams, seconded by Mrs. Leever as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 62-1995

"WHEREAS, on November 9, 1995, the Commission issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for Food Service Consultant to assist the Commission and its staff in the process of obtaining bids and awarding contracts for the renovation or replacement, construction and operation of the service plaza restaurants;

"WHEREAS, proposals were received on December 1, 1995, from two consultants to provide food service consultant services and such proposals were reviewed by various members of the Commission's staff and review group;

"WHEREAS, under the terms and conditions of the documents for the RFP for Food Service Consultant, the Commission has reserved the right to reject any and all proposals; and

"WHEREAS, it is the recommendation of the executive director, general counsel and review group that the proposals received pursuant to the RFP for Food Service Consultant be rejected and that additional evaluations be made of this project;

"NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

"RESOLVED that the proposals received in response to the RFP for Food Service Consultant be and hereby are rejected, and the executive director and general counsel are authorized and directed to notify the bidders of such rejection;

"FURTHER RESOLVED that the executive director and general counsel are directed to continue to evaluate its food service consultant requirements and adjust the RFP where necessary, and to reissue it as soon as possible."

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

Ayes:

Mr. Williams, Mrs. Leever, Mr. Fedeli

Nays:

None

The Chairman declared the resolution stood adopted with all Members present voting in the affirmative. The resolution was identified as No. 62-1995.

Mr. Johnson said that he had one other item relating to that topic. He said that, as the Members were aware, earlier that year the Commission did issue invitations to bid for the operation of the sixteen service plaza restaurants along the Turnpike.

Mr. Johnson said further that the Commission did not receive bids on all of the contracts. He said the Commission, at a prior meeting, did reject all the bids received except the one for Middle Ridge and Vermilion Valley Plazas in Lorain County.

He said that after a long and serious deliberation it was his conclusion that the Commission should also reject the bid on those plazas so the process could be started over again. He said there was a resolution in the Members' folders for that purpose and he would recommend that the resolution be adopted.

A resolution rejecting certain bids for contract TR-7-E and providing for readvertisement of certain service plaza restaurants was moved for adoption by Mrs. Leever, seconded by Mr. Williams as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 63-1995

"WHEREAS, on March 31, 1995, the Commission issued an invitation to bid for contracts for the operation of the Commission's sixteen restaurants along the route of Ohio Turnpike Project No. 1, bearing the general designation of Restaurant Contract TR-7, and to cause advertisement for said contract to be published;

"WHEREAS, the proposals were reviewed and evaluated by a group consisting of two Commission members, several of the Commission's staff members and a representative of outside special counsel;

"WHEREAS, under the terms and conditions of the bidding documents for Contract TR-7, the Commission has reserved the right to reject any and all proposals; and

"WHEREAS, as a result of said invitation to bid, and prior Commission action, only the proposals submitted by McDonald's Corporation, Host Marriott Corporation and Advanced Restaurant Concepts, Inc. (ARCI) relating to Proposal TR-7E: Service Plaza 5 (Middle Ridge/Vermilion Valley) are available for review by the Commission;

"WHEREAS, on August 14, 1995, the review group recommended that the bids received for contracts for operation of the following restaurants: Proposal TR-7E: Service Plaza 5 (Middle Ridge/Vermilion Valley) not be rejected and kept for future consideration;

"WHEREAS, the review group has performed subsequent reviews and evaluations of the bids submitted in response to Proposal TR-7E: Service Plaza 5 (Middle Ridge/Vermilion Valley) and recommends that the bids submitted for contracts for operation of Service Plaza 5 (Middle Ridge/Vermilion Valley) be rejected and that the Commission re-advertise for bids for contracts for the operation of Service Plaza 5 (Middle Ridge/Vermilion Valley), Proposal TR-7E;

"WHEREAS, as provided in Resolution No. 27-1995, the Commission reiterates its authorization to the executive director to retain, as soon as possible, a consultant to assist the Commission and its staff from this point forward in the process of obtaining bids and awarding contracts for the renovation or replacement, construction and operation of the service plaza restaurants;

"NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

"RESOLVED the Commission concurs in the review group's recommendations and the bids submitted for Proposal TR-7E: Service Plaza 5 (Middle Ridge/Vermilion Valley) are rejected, and authorizes and directs that the bids for contracts for operation of those restaurants be re-advertised;

"FURTHER RESOLVED, as provided in Resolution No. 27-1995, the Commission reiterates its authorization to the executive director to retain, as soon as possible, a consultant to assist the Commission and its staff from this point forward in the process of obtaining bids and awarding contracts for the renovation or replacement, construction and operation of the service plaza restaurants;

"FURTHER RESOLVED that the executive director and general counsel hereby are authorized and directed to take any and all action necessary to readvertise for bids for contracts for the operation of the restaurants: Proposal TR-7E: Service Plaza 5 (Middle Ridge/Vermilion Valley).

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

Ayes:

Mrs. Leever, Mr. Williams, Mr. Fedeli

Nays:

None

The Chairman declared the resolution stood adopted with all Members present voting in the affirmative. The resolution was identified as No. 63-1995.

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 Members knew, the Commission's negotiators and representatives had been meeting and conducting negotiations with the union group. He said the meetings were held in an attempt to enter into a new contract with the Commission's field toll and maintenance employees.

Mr. Disantis said the negotiations were progressing well. He said that a meeting was scheduled for the next day. He said SERB had appointed a factfinder in accordance with SERB regulations and a hearing was set in early January in the event that they didn't reach an agreement prior to that time with the union.

Mr. Disantis said that there were some items that he felt should be discussed separately with the Commission. He said the Commission's chief negotiator was at the meeting. He said it was his recommendation that the Commission have a short executive session prior to the end of the meeting to review those items with the Commission Members.

The Chairman said the executive session would be held toward the end of the Commission meeting.

The Chairman said the report on Employee Relations was accepted as offered. He said the report of the Development Coordinator would be received.

- Mr. Brennan said the Members had a copy of his report in their folders. He said he would read it briefly starting at the west.
- Mr. Brennan said further that the project to build a new interchange at State Route 66, County Road 24, Fulton County, Archbold was on schedule and he felt confident that it would be built in 1996.
- Mr. Brennan said further that the construction of an interchange at State Route 109, Fulton County, Delta was on schedule to be built in 1996. He said its opening would coincide with the opening of the North Star steel plant. He said those openings would be next October.
- Mr. Brennan said further that the National Park Service had decided that the railroad right-of-way at State Route 58 in Lorain County would not be designated an historical place. He said that staff was working with the Corps of Engineers for approval of the design for an interchange at that location.
- Mr. Brennan said that late the previous afternoon the Federal Highway Administration had approved (verbally) the Commission's access justification study. He said the FHWA would forward a letter to the Commission as soon as they got back in business pending the resolution of the budget difficulties in Washington.
- Mr. Brennan said further that engineering continued for an interchange at County Road 18 in Mahoning County. He said the project was on schedule to begin construction in 1996.
- Mr. Brennan said further that the access justification study continued for the proposed interchange at State Route 11 in Mahoning County. He said a date for the public hearing had not yet been determined. He said the earliest date would probably be next spring.
- Mr. Brennan said further that the environmental study continued for the Maumee River Crossing at Toledo. He said funding sources had not been identified. He said it was known that on the basis of current, anticipated funds, ODOT would not be able to finance the project before the year 2005 under their new rating procedure. He said it did not score very well under the new rating procedure.
- Mr. Brennan said further that the status of the remaining tasks assigned to OCDC for the Great Lakes/Mid-Atlantic Corridor were:
 - Task 5 Communication Plan Assistance, which was expanded 77 percent.
 - Task 9 Defining and Adherence to Federal and State Environmental Processing Requirements 80 percent.
 - Task 11 Major Investment Study in the Delaware Bypass 60 percent. Completed in the spring.

Mr. Brennan said further that the Commission's financial commitment at that point in time remained at approximately \$5,300,000.

The Chairman asked Mr. Brennan to expand on his comments regarding the I-77 interchange.

Mr. Brennan said that when the Commission got the letter from FHWA the engineering process would begin, which would probably take up most of 1996. He said construction could take place in 1997.

The Chairman asked if it could open in 1997 or more toward 1998.

Mr. Brennan said it would probably open in 1998.

Mr. Plain said it could probably open in 1997, depending on how quickly the staff could get the design plans. He said the staff is waiting for approvals from the Federal government before a consultant could be hired.

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

Mr. Arlow said there were four construction projects under way at that time. He said there was renovation of two toll plazas and expansion at Exit 14 and Exit 15. He said renovation work at the entrance at Exit 9A should be done in the next three weeks. He said construction of the safety wall at Exit 9A would be done next spring.

Mr. Arlow said further the work continued at the new interchange 5A in Elmore.

Mr. Arlow said further that, as the Members were aware, the new Vermilion interchange opened on December 13 and the traffic was heavier than expected on that day.

The Chairman said the report of the Construction Coordinator was accepted as offered. He said the report of General Counsel would be received.

Mr. Zomparelli said the only thing he wished to report on was to follow up with what Mr. Disantis said about having an executive session. He said the Chairman had already said that it would be held toward the end of the Commission meeting.

The Chairman said the report of General Counsel was accepted as offered. He said the report of Captain Ash would be received.

Captain Ash said that troopers on the Turnpike seized \$837,000 cash on the Turnpike, out in Senator Gaeth's area.

Captain Ash said that he wanted the Commission to be aware that a good portion of that money would come back to the Ohio State Highway Patrol, District Ten on the Turnpike, to be used for training equipment and some overtime hours and things of that nature.

Captain Ash said it was the largest cash seizure the Ohio State Highway Patrol had ever made in Ohio.

The Chairman asked where the money came from.

Captain Ash said the money was on its way to New York from Chicago. He said it was being transported by a husband and wife that were stopped for traveling 71 miles per hour in a 65 mile per hour zone.

Captain Ash said the husband and wife had no idea that the money was in the vehicle. He said they were just paid \$5,000 to drive it from Chicago to New York.

Mr. Brennan asked why weren't they indicted.

Captain Ash said they were arrested on a drug charge. He said there were no real drugs, other than trace drugs, in the car that the Patrol's canine found. He said that no other charges could be filed.

The Chairman asked how the money was discovered. He asked if the dog smelled some trace of drugs.

Captain Ash said that initially the people didn't know whose car they were driving.

Mr. Johnson asked if they were stopped for speeding.

Captain Ash said they were stopped for speeding and then two bags were found in the car which they said they didn't know why they were there, so the canine was alerted to the bags. He said they also said they didn't know who owned the bags.

Captain Ash said further that what drug traffickers do was carry cocaine in the same bag, usually to save money on bags. He said the canine sniffed out the drug residue in the bags.

Captain Ash said that the amount of money was \$837,000.

Captain Ash said also that traffic fatalities on the Turnpike were down 37 percent as compared to 1994. He said the enforcement activity on DUI cases and, in general, was up over 1994, so the Patrol was having a very good year.

The Chairman asked if the accident on the Turnpike the previous day affected accident statistics.

Captain Ash said that accident hurt the statistics. He said it was a double fatality. He said there had been a lot of one-car crashes on that day. He said that it had been fortunate that more accidents had not taken place considering the bad weather.

Mr. Johnson asked if the double fatal was weather related.

Captain Ash said it was weather related. He said excessive speed for the conditions caused many accidents.

The Chairman said that Captain Ash's report was accepted as offered. He said the Executive Director's report would be received.

The Executive Director said that he had a number of resolutions. He said the first involved a bridge painting contract to repaint the Olde State Route 8 bridge over the Turnpike in Summit County. He said there was a resolution in the Members' folders to award that contract.

Mr. Johnson said further that there were a number of bids on the project. He said the low bid was submitted by John B. Conomos, Inc., of Bridgeville, Pennsylvania, in the amount of \$997,500.00.

Mr. Johnson said further that bridge repainting was an important part of the Commission's program in the years ahead. He said it was going to be an expensive program, as the Members could see from the bid in the contract. He said a million dollars is a lot just to repaint one bridge. He said the expense was mainly related to the requirement to remove the existing paint which contained lead. He said that it was done in containment systems so that it didn't get scattered and then to dispose of it in an appropriate way.

Mrs. Leever asked how many more bridges did the Commission have to repaint.

Mr. Johnson said that most of the existing bridges had to be repainted.

Mrs. Leever asked if the program was just beginning.

Mr. Johnson said that a few had been done already. He said that, for example, the Huron River Bridge had been repainted. He said it was one of the Commission's major bridges and was over 1100 feet long. He said that it was repainted under a \$2 million contract over two years ago. He said that it was ironic that in many cases just repainting those bridges could cost more than it would to build a new bridge. He said that was because of the environmental requirements involved.

Mr. Johnson said further that he expected that as the program proceeded in the years ahead it would exceed \$100 million in cost. He said the program would run as long as 20 years.

Mr. Johnson said further that Olde State Route 8 Bridge was one of the picturesque bridges over the Turnpike. He said it was an arch bridge that was in Summit County that was an award winner when it was built many years ago. He said it was the highest bridge on the Turnpike.

Mr. Johnson said further that the Commission had sought bids on repainting the Cuyahoga River Bridges a few years ago and the bids were rejected at the time and the staff was still working on what to do on that. He said those bids ranged between \$5 and \$15 million.

Mr. Johnson said further that the Commission could expect a lot of those contracts in the future and it was a program that needed to be done.

Mr. Johnson said that he recommended that the contract be awarded to get the project under way.

A resolution awarding contract No. 40-95-01 was moved for adoption by Mr. Williams, seconded by Mrs. Leever as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 64-1995

"WHEREAS, the Commission has duly advertised according to law for bids for a contract to repaint the Olde State Route 8 Bridge which crosses over the Ohio Turnpike at Milepost 179.5 in Summit County, Ohio, which project has been designated Project No. 40-95-01;

"WHEREAS, four bids for the performance of said contract were received;

"WHEREAS, said bids have been reviewed and analyzed by the Commission's chief engineer, and he has submitted a report concerning such analysis and his report is before the Commission, and the Commission's executive director has made his recommendation to the Commission predicated upon such analysis;

"WHEREAS, the Commission's minority business enterprise coordinator has reviewed the documents submitted by the bidders and has determined that there is satisfactory evidence of compliance with the Commission's Minority Business Enterprise Program;

"WHEREAS, all bids for said contract were solicited on the basis of the same terms and conditions and the same specifications, and the bid of John B. Conomos, Inc. of Bridgeville, Pennsylvania in the amount of \$997,500.00 for the performance of Contract No. 40-95-01 has been determined by the Commission to be the lowest responsive and responsible bid received;

"WHEREAS, the Commission has been advised by its general counsel that said bid conforms to the requirements of Section 5537.07, Section 9.312 and Section

153.54, all of the Revised Code of Ohio, and that a performance bond with good and sufficient surety has been submitted by John B. Conomos, Inc.;

"NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

"RESOLVED that the bid of John B. Conomos, Inc. of Bridgeville, Pennsylvania, in the amount of \$997,500.00 for the performance of Contract No. 40-95-01 is, and is by the Commission, determined to be the lowest responsive and responsible bid received for the performance of said contract, and is accepted, and that the chairman and executive director, or either of them, hereby is authorized (1) to execute a contract with said successful bidder in the form heretofore prescribed by the Commission pursuant to the aforesaid bid; (2) to direct the return to the other bidders of their bid security, when appropriate, and (3) to take any and all action necessary or proper to carry out the terms of said bid and of said contract, and

"FURTHER RESOLVED that Project No. 40-95-01 is designated a System Project under the Commission's 1994 Master Trust Agreement."

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

Ayes:

Mr. Williams, Mrs. Leever, Mr. Fedeli

Nays:

None

The Chairman declared the resolution stood adopted with all Members present voting in the affirmative. The resolution was identified as No. 64-1995.

Mr. Johnson said the next item was a resolution awarding contract No. 43-95-02. He said it was a bid to renovate and replace the decks on the twin bridges carrying I-480 over the Turnpike in Portage County.

Mr. Johnson said further that a tabulation of the bids that were received was in the Members' folders. He said the bids were opened the day before the Commission meeting.

Mr. Johnson said further that seven bids were received on that contract and they were excellent bids. He said they ranged from the low of just over \$2.9 million to a high of about \$3.9 million. He said the staff's estimate was over \$3.7 million. He said the low bid was submitted by the S. E. Johnson Company of Maumee, Ohio in the amount of \$2,931,288.13.

Mr. Johnson said further that it was part of the Commission's ongoing program to renovate and replace bridge decks of bridges. He said the mainline bridges were

essentially done. He said the others were bridges over the Turnpike that were the Commission's responsibility. He said he recommended that the contract be awarded.

A resolution awarding the contract No. 43-95-02 was moved for adoption by Mrs. Leever, seconded by Mr. Williams as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 65-1995

"WHEREAS, the Commission has duly advertised according to law for bids for a contract to renovate the twin I-480 Bridges which cross over the Ohio Turnpike at Milepost 186.8 in Portage County, Ohio, which project has been designated Project No. 43-95-02:

"WHEREAS, seven bids for the performance of said contract were received;

"WHEREAS, said bids have been reviewed and analyzed by the Commission's chief engineer, and he has submitted a report concerning such analysis and his report is before the Commission, and the Commission's executive director has made his recommendation to the Commission predicated upon such analysis;

"WHEREAS, the Commission's minority business enterprise coordinator has reviewed the documents submitted by the bidders and has determined that there is satisfactory evidence of compliance with the Commission's Minority Business Enterprise Program;

"WHEREAS, all bids for said contract were solicited on the basis of the same terms and conditions and the same specifications, and the bid of The S. E. Johnson Companies, Inc. of Maumee, Ohio, in the amount of \$2,931,288.13 for the performance of Contract No. 43-95-02 has been determined by the Commission to be the lowest responsive and responsible bid received;

"WHEREAS, the Commission has been advised by its general counsel that said bid conforms to the requirements of Section 5537.07, Section 9.312 and Section 153.54, all of the Revised Code of Ohio, and that a performance bond with good and sufficient surety has been submitted by the S. E. Johnson Companies, Inc.;

"NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

"RESOLVED that the bid of the S. E. Johnson Companies, Inc. of Maumee, Ohio, in the amount of \$2,931,288.13 for the performance of Contract No. 43-95-02 is, and is by the Commission, determined to be the lowest responsive and responsible bid received for the performance of said contract, and is accepted, and that the chairman and executive director, or either of them, hereby is authorized (1) to execute a contract with said successful bidder in the form heretofore prescribed by the Commission pursuant to the aforesaid bid; (2) to direct the return to the other

bidders of their bid security, when appropriate, and (3) to take any and all action necessary or proper to carry out the terms of said bid and of said contract, and

"FURTHER RESOLVED that Project No. 43-95-02 is designated a System Project under the Commission's 1994 Master Trust Agreement."

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

Ayes:

Mrs. Leever, Mr. Williams, Mr. Fedeli

Nays:

None

The Chairman declared the resolution stood adopted with all Members present voting in the affirmative. The resolution was identified as No. 65-1995.

Mr. Johnson said also that there was another resolution in the Members' folders entitled resolution authorizing the Executive Director to take immediate action concerning award of contract under invitation No. 3456.

Mr. Johnson said further that it was a contract to provide purchase of some 453,000 linear feet of portable concrete barrier. He said that was over 80 miles. He said the barrier was an essential portion of the project to add the third lane on the Turnpike. He said bids were opened on the barriers the other day and he was going to ask Mr. Plain to give the Members further explanation on it.

Mr. Johnson said further that he was asking for authority to award the contract. He said he had bids tabulated, but it was a complicated bid that was offered in eight different groups. He said the staff had not completed the analysis, but it was crucial that the contract be awarded.

Mr. Plain said it was a very complicated bid to review because of the nine bidders. He said there were eight groups. He said that what further complicated the situation and what the staff needed more time for was to check all the possible ramifications. He said bidders had all listed the quantity limitations that they either could not exceed or because of the capabilities of their plant.

Mr. Plain said further that what had to be factored in was not only how they bid, where they bid, but also that they can't exceed those particular linear feet of limitation. He said that more time was needed by the staff.

Mr. Plain said further that Mr. Rudolphy was trying to develop a program with the computer to assist the Engineering staff in making sure that they got the best possible combination for the lowest and best bids.

The Chairman asked when the contract had to be awarded.

Mr. Plain said as soon as possible.

Mr. Johnson said he wanted to award it that day. He said the reason it was being done early is that the barrier was going to be needed to start the project. He said there would be 84 miles of it. He said that in 1996 it would be a 40-plus mile program.

Mr. Johnson said the barrier was going to be set along the inside shoulder throughout the areas where those projects were going to be constructed. He said it had to be done at the very start of the projects which were going to begin next March.

Mr. Johnson said further that the 84-mile requirement exceeded the capacity of existing supplies, so most of it was going to have to be manufactured between now and the time the projects started in March. He said that was why it was crucial that the contract be awarded to get the barrier under way.

Mr. Plain said that one other thing was that the Commission was purchasing the barrier so that it might be used in future contracts as the third lane projects continued. He said it would be stored on Commission property so that the Commission didn't have to keep paying the same price for barrier.

The Chairman asked how expensive the barriers would be.

Mr. Plain said the total cost would be around \$9 million.

Mrs. Leever asked if the barriers would belong to the Commission.

Mr. Plain said that when the 1996 season was complete the barriers could be picked up and used again the next season. He said the Commission would not have to pay for new barrier. He said that if the Commission had their own barriers the barrier moving companies would charge for handling, transportation to the job site, erecting the barrier and taking it down and transporting it back to the Commission's storage location. He said it would be cheaper than having to pay the initial price the first year.

Senator Gaeth said he thought it was fair to say that whatever barrier was still in good condition after the construction season the Commission would want to keep it. He said he wondered if the Commission already had some barrier on hand.

Mr. Johnson said there was about 15 miles of it that was being used for resurfacing projects. He said it was used in bi-directional traffic zones. He said the barrier did deteriorate after a while. He said that at the end of the third lane program, which would probably be five years from then, a surplus of barrier might be on hand so that it could be offered for sale and sold.

Mr. Plain said it would be sold to contractors.

The Chairman asked how much the Commission could recoup from selling surplus barrier.

Mr. Plain said it would not be known until bids were taken on surplus.

Mrs. Leever said she thought \$9 million was a lot of money just to disintegrate at the end of five years.

The Chairman asked if the Commission couldn't buy some good used barrier.

Mr. Plain said the difference between the existing barrier and the new ones necessary for the third lane project was that they had more reinforcing. He said they had different types of connections that the older ones did not. He said ODOT had approved new standards for the barriers.

Mr. Johnson said that the Commission would recoup something, but it was a construction cost. He said that ordinarily the barriers would have to be put in the construction contracts. He said that if the Commission waited to do that the contractors would not be able to get them. He said that was why the Commission was going ahead with a separate contract to buy it and then use it over and over throughout the course of the third lane program. He said that for the first year it had to be done that way or it wouldn't get done.

Mr. Williams said it was his understanding that the real problem was the fact that the bidders, based on their bond, were not able to bid on the whole thing.

Mr. Johnson said Mr. Williams was right. He said there was no way one bidder could provide all the barrier and get it done on time. He said most of them had limitations.

Mr. Plain said the first column (of the bid tabulation) showed the limitations of each bidder. He said it showed the maximum quantity that they could supply. He said sometimes it was by capacity and other times it was because it would exceed their bonding authority.

The Chairman asked if the award could wait until the next Commission meeting.

Mr. Plain said that would lose too much time and the full quantity could not be received.

Mrs. Leever asked Mr. Johnson what exactly was he asking for that day.

Mr. Johnson said he was asking for authority to complete the evaluation and then for him to go ahead and make the awards. He said that was similar to what the Commission did at the last meeting for the 9A project.

Mr. Johnson said further that it was a bid thing and he would be making the awards to the lowest possible bidders. He said he could assure the Commission that the staff would come up with several combinations.

Mr. Johnson said further that he was not sure the lowest bidder had been determined. He said there were eight different groups and nine bidders. He said there was probably 300 or 400 different combinations that had to be looked at. He said the staff wanted to make sure that it was picking the lowest of them all.

The Chairman said his only concern was the size of the contract. He said that typically the Commission approved anything over \$500,000. He asked if the staff had looked to see if it was cheaper to buy them than to just rent them out for the year and then rent them again the next year.

Mr. Plain said that the problem was that a lot of contractors didn't have the barriers. He said that if the Commission waited until the contracts were awarded the contractors would not be able to produce them quick enough for the contract. He said the Commission would not be able to let all the contracts.

Mr. Johnson said further that the staff had explored the job. He said there was not 84 miles of barrier available in the area of the Turnpike at that time. He said much of it had to be produced. He said some contractors had small supplies of their own.

The Chairman asked if the staff had checked with ODOT about striking a deal with them for barriers.

Mr. Johnson said he didn't think ODOT kept a stock of it either.

The Chairman asked if anybody was in the business of used concrete barriers.

Mr. Johnson said the Commission would be in that business.

Mr. Zomparelli said there might be a mark-up if the Commission didn't buy them. He said it might be the cheapest cost with the Turnpike directly purchasing the barriers and reselling them at a later date.

Mr. Plain said the Commission would still need the barriers for resurfacing projects and the excess could be sold.

The Chairman said that he was just confused about why there were not some used quantities available somewhere from other people who had done similar work.

Mr. Johnson said nobody else had done anything like that.

Mr. Plain said that transportation costs were the major obstacle on that.

Mr. Zomparelli said that one of the bidders was in Virginia.

Mr. Johnson said out-of-state bids were higher, as could be seen. He said part of the higher bid was the transportation cost to get the barriers to the Turnpike.

Senator Gaeth asked if the portable barriers would be available for permanent barriers along the Turnpike in the future.

Mr. Plain said they were the removable kind, but they could certainly use them on any construction projects. He said he thought there will be a market for them. He said contractors working on ODOT's programs were going to need more barrier.

Senator Gaeth said ODOT was using hundreds of them for improvements of I-270 around Columbus.

Mr. Plain said that was part of the problem. He said some of the contractors bid on a number of jobs across the state. He said they were already tied up and committed to ODOT projects and were not going to be able to furnish the Commission with barriers.

Mr. Plain said further that it was the staff's idea of getting the barriers early so that there was enough time to construct them because they had to cure. He said they came in 10 and 12 foot sections.

Mr. Plain said the barriers had to have forms and they had to have rebar. He said there were special connections to them.

The Chairman asked if there were forms and were they poured.

Mr. Johnson said they were poured into steel forms.

Mr. Plain said they had to cure for a certain length of time before they could be handled and they could be lifted.

The Chairman asked how the Commission could go ahead and review the Executive Director's recommendation and vote on it.

Mr. Zomparelli asked if the Chairman could call a special meeting before the next Commission meeting.

Mr. Johnson said he thought that should be done the next week.

The Chairman said he would rather call a special meeting just because of the magnitude of the costs involved in purchasing the barriers. He said he also would like to see if there was a way to call other toll roads and other Departments of Transportation to see if there was any barriers available.

Mr. Castrigano said the problem with current barrier stocks and renting the barrier was that ODOT recently changed their design standard on them. He said it went into effect in June, so any existing barrier that was out there was not the new design.

Mr. Johnson said that the Commission needed to go with the current design for legal reasons.

Mr. Arlow said it was the least expensive way to do it. He said that if the Commission could get the contractors to provide barrier, he said the contractors would charge for it and then at the end of the project they would take it with them. He said the contractor would charge for it again on the next bid. He said the Commission planned to buy it only once and pay only once. He said there would be five years of construction. He said it was the least expensive way to do it.

The Chairman said he recommended to the Members that the staff go ahead with its analysis and come up with as many options as possible, make the recommendations and have a special vote on it. He said the Commission would look at the recommendation and make sure it was comfortable approving something of that magnitude. He said that was his opinion because of the size of the contracts and the complexity.

Mrs. Leever asked if the special meeting needed to be held the following week.

Mr. Johnson said the meeting needed to be held the next week.

Mr. Peca said there couldn't be a telephone vote. He said it had to be an open meeting. He said any deliberation of the Commission had to be open to the public.

Mr. Hodges asked what if the Commission bought the barriers and two years from now ODOT changed the specifications again.

Mr. Johnson said he didn't think new barriers would have to be bought.

Mr. Zomparelli said that was a possibility, but the Commission had to deal with the current specifications required of it now. He said it was the Commission's position that it always tried to have safety as a primary goal on the Turnpike. He said the barriers they were to buy had the most up-to-date specifications available and he'd like to comply and have all the Commission's contractors comply with them.

The Chairman asked if the Commission was allowed to have its own specifications.

Mr. Johnson said the Commission could have its own.

The Chairman said he needed a little more time to understand everything. He said it was prudent to have the staff go out and do its research, come back and maybe

look at some other options. He said the staff should show the Commission what the costs were of renting versus purchasing. He said the staff should also show the Commission what the costs were for used barriers, if there were such things.

Mr. Zomparelli said the staff had to look at availability.

Mr. Johnson said the Commission still had the bid on the table. He said the Commission needed to act on the bid by either awarding the bid or rejecting it. He said he didn't mean it had to be done that day.

The Chairman said he was not ready to vote on it.

Mr. Johnson said a meeting would be set up for the following week.

The Chairman said a date for that meeting would be coordinated with the members.

Mr. Johnson said that another thing he had was a supplement of Mr. Brennan's report on the OCDC. He said Mr. Brennan gave the Commission a rundown of the various tasks that were under way. He said he just wanted to say that the last task was the major investment study for the bypass around the Delaware area was scheduled to be completed early next year. He said he thought that would be the case.

Mr. Johnson said the last item he had related to the speed limits on the Turnpike. He said he thought the Members were aware of the publicity that had surrounded the recent action in Congress to remove the so-called national speed limit or at least take it out of the hands of the federal government.

Mr. Johnson said further that none of the current Commission Members were on the Commission when the speed limits currently in effect on the Turnpike were implemented. He said the Commission had the authority under the statute to set the speed limits on the Turnpike.

Mr. Johnson said further, however, that the federal government got into the business of establishing national speed limits and at first set it at fifty-five miles per hour. He said the federal government then relaxed and let it go to sixty-five miles per hour in rural areas of the interstate system.

Mr. Johnson said further that the Commission acted to lower or raise the speed limits in the appropriate cases to comply with the national speed limits because, had it not done so, there would have been sanctions taken against the state and ODOT would have lost all of their FHWA funding.

Mr. Johnson said further that the Commission did not want to be the cause of that. He said the Commission did set the limits at sixty-five miles per hour the whole length of the road when the federal government allowed sixty-five miles per hour on rural roads.

He said the Commission then was forced to go back to fifty-five miles per hour in socalled urban areas. He said that was done in the late 80's under protest.

Mr. Johnson said further that the speed limit on the Turnpike had always been the same from one length to the other. He said the Turnpike had been designed and built for a seventy miles per hour plus speed limit its entire length.

Mr. Johnson said further that, at one time, the Turnpike had five fifty-five miles per hour zones in so-called urban areas. He said he had argued over the years that there was nobody living on the Turnpike and it didn't matter what the population was next to the Turnpike because it didn't affect the speed limit.

Mr. Johnson said further that there was still one zone, between Exit 8 and Exit 10 that was in an area that was defined as an urban area. He said the Turnpike's design was the same through that area, as it was for the rest of the Turnpike.

Mr. Johnson said further that he was proposing to remove the last fifty-five mile per hour zone between Exit 10 and Exit 8. He said the sixty-five mile per hour speed limit would be re-established through that area for passenger cars. He said it could be done with simple sign changes.

The Chairman asked how many miles were involved.

Mr. Johnson said it was 16 miles.

The Chairman asked what cities were within the 16-mile stretch of roadway.

Mr. Johnson said it was between Lorain and Strongsville.

The Chairman said he got a letter last week from Senator Dewine with a bunch of backup materials opposed to changing speed limits and that had been his position statewide. He said Senator Dewine had a bunch of statistics.

The Chairman said further that the Turnpike might be a different situation, but his recommendation was that he wanted the increase in speed studied from a standpoint of safety.

The Chairman said he had placed the information from Senator Dewine in the mail to Mr. Johnson and copies to all the Members.

Mr. Johnson said he had not received that material.

The Chairman said Senator Dewine's letter specifically talked about the Turnpike and had a tremendous amount of backup material with statistics and studies. He said he wanted all the Commission Members to review the material and then have some discussion on it before acting on it.

The Chairman said that he sent Senator Dewine back a letter promising that his recommendation was that the Commission would study the speed limit increase before taking any action on it and he didn't want to be in haste on it.

Mr. Johnson said that, again, he had not seen that material.

The Chairman said that he had asked that copies be made to everyone and sent out. He said it was very good information. He said there were good materials in there regarding all kinds of statistics and research that had been done. He said he did promise the Senator that the Commission would check into it and discuss it before any action was taken.

Senator Gaeth said it would be interesting to know how many arrests were made for speeding in the fifty-five mile per hour zone. He said he never noticed any slowdown going through that area.

Mr. Johnson said that, notwithstanding what Senator Dewine was saying, he thought it was a unique situation on the Turnpike. He said the Turnpike was designed as a rural interstate from one end to the other. He said the design from Exit 8 through Exit 10 was the same as it was everywhere else.

Mr. Johnson said further that, in his opinion, the fifty-five mile per hour urban zone was an artificial designation that was based on a census of the population adjoining the road. He said it made absolutely no sense. He said Captain Ash could tell the Members, as he already said, that the Turnpike's safety record had been outstanding.

Mr. Johnson said that the staff would be happy to look at the statistics through that particular zone.

Captain Ash said he thought Senator Dewine was talking about increasing speeds for trucks and cars in general. He said the people at the Ohio State Highway Patrol headquarters in Columbus and everyone he had been talking to recently had no problem with raising the fifty-five mile per hour limit to sixty-five miles per hour on the Turnpike.

Captain Ash said it was not a source of revenue to the Patrol and it was not a crash problem. He said he didn't expect the crash picture to change when the speed limit was raised to sixty-five miles per hour. He said that, like the Director said, there was nobody living out there. He said there was really no reason from day one to have it fifty-five miles per hour on the 16-mile stretch of Turnpike.

The Chairman asked how long it had been fifty-five miles per hour.

Mr. Johnson said it was 1974 when the speed limit first went from seventy down to fifty-five on a national level. He said that he thought the Congress said that it could go to sixty-five on rural interstates in 1987.

Mr. Johnson said again that the Commission's position was that the whole Turnpike was designed as a rural interstate so the speed limit was raised to sixty-five miles per hour for a short time. He said the federal government picked out the five urban zones. He said some of them were as short as three miles out in the Youngstown area. He said the federal government said that if the speed limit through those zones was not set at fifty-five miles per hour, they would take away the state's federal money.

Mr. Johnson said further that the Commission did place the speed limit at fifty-five-miles-per-hour in those zones. He said that a couple of years later the federal government finally relaxed and said the only one would be between Exits 8 and 10. He said the speed limit everywhere else on the Turnpike was sixty-five miles per hour.

The Chairman asked what was the speed limit for trucks.

Mr. Johnson said it was fifty-five miles per hour for trucks and that speed would remain the same.

The Chairman said he thought everyone should be getting their copies probably in the mail, and he thought everyone should review those statistics and discuss it. He said he thought some consideration should be given to the Senator.

Senator Gaeth asked if Senator Dewine specifically cited the Turnpike.

The Chairman said the letter was sent to him as Chairman of the Ohio Turnpike Commission. He said it was not a form letter, but it was a personalized letter talking about what happened in Ohio. He said Senator Dewine's letter opposed speed limit increases and he included all kinds of backup materials.

The Chairman said further that Senator Dewine might be talking about increasing the speed of the entire Turnpike which the Commission had the authority to do. He said that Senator Dewine might not realize that maybe having traffic slowed down in those 16 miles and then sped up again might be dangerous.

The Chairman said further that he was not disagreeing with the recommendation, but he thought that everyone should get Senator Dewine's letter and the Commission should contact him back. He said the Commission had really tried to make a major emphasis on working with legislators and he was a United States Senator. He said the Commission had a very good working relationship with him.

Mr. Johnson said that he could assure the Commission that a lot of comments had been received on that particular zone. He said the comments came especially from out-of-staters expressing amazement about the reduced speed.

The Chairman said that he thought the decision on raising the speed limit should be postponed for a month or two. He said that with the recent bad weather conditions nobody should be going sixty-five miles per hour, so the Commission would be okay for a month or two. He said that was his recommendation.

Mr. Johnson said he would assemble the necessary statistics. He said he would be curious to see whether any of the information that Senator Dewine sent to the Chairman involved any of the statistics along the Turnpike. He said they probably didn't because the staff was not asked to provide them with any.

The Chairman said Senator Dewine didn't, but he had other documented information about traffic and safety. He said the Senator had taken a personal interest in it. He said he thought the Commission should get back to the Senator on the matter. He said he was not disagreeing with the recommendation, but he thought it should be discussed a little bit.

The Chairman said the report of the Executive Director was accepted as offered.

Mr. Williams said that he would like to address an issue of concern that he had as a Commission Member, and he hoped the other Members also would be sensitive to it. He said he had requested from the Executive Director a copy of the EEO status of employees in the Commission. He said he also requested an update on the MBE program.

Mr. Williams said further that he had reason to believe, based on previous information that had been supplied, that the Commission was far below what he thought it should be in terms of taking affirmative steps relative to its employment of minorities.

Mr. Williams said further that it was very obvious, by looking around the room and observing the individuals who were representing various departments, what the picture was like. He said he didn't know what steps could be taken in terms of improving the Commission's image in that direction, but it's something that needed to be done.

Mr. Williams said further that the Commission had over a thousand employees and less than 10 percent were minorities. He said most of those employees, he believed, were in toll collection and maintenance. He said there were very few minority employees in the administration building, maybe eight or ten or less. He said he didn't think that was a good image. He said that was not an image that the Commission should be projecting. He said he thought the Commission ought to take affirmative steps in terms of setting into motion a plan by which some changes were made in that direction.

The Chairman said the Commission would take every step possible to give every opportunity to minorities.

The Chairman said that since it was the last meeting of 1995 he would like to spend a couple minutes just summing up what the Commission had accomplished over the year. He said he wanted to stress there were three major areas that he talked about all the time on which the Commission was concentrating.

The Chairman said further that in order they were: number one, safety; number two, accessibility; and number three, economic development. He said those were three areas on which the Commission had been concentrating. He said the Commission's mission statement also was to be a catalyst for economic development and/or accessibility.

The Chairman said further that October 1st marked the Commission's 40th anniversary of the opening of the entire Turnpike. He said that during that year the Turnpike had broken records for traffic. He said that as of the first eleven months of traffic was 39.2 million. He said it appeared that the traffic would be in excess of 43 or 44 million. He said that last year the traffic total was 40.6 million. He said that traffic on the Turnpike the first year was somewhere in the area of 5 million.

The Chairman said further that the Commission was going ahead with its third lane project. He said that, unfortunately, the third lane project would cost more than the Turnpike originally cost when it was built, but it was needed to maintain the integrity of the Turnpike and have it be the premier toll facility in the country.

The Chairman said further that the Commission also was planning improvements to service plazas and restaurants and the physical facilities and the choices of foods, which would start next year.

The Chairman said further that the Baumhart Road Interchange, No. 7A, named Vermilion, was recently opened up. He said it was the 28th interchange and the 8th new one since Governor Voinovich took office. He said the 29th would be opened next year at State Route 51 in Ottawa County. He said the Commission also expected to start four additional interchanges: County Road 24 in Fulton County; State Route 109, Fulton County; State Route 50 in Lorain County; and County Road 18 in Mahoning County.

The Chairman said further that if one looked at the economic development that had happened around the Turnpike interchanges, and there were articles that he was assembling, it was absolutely astounding. He said that around Lordstown there were all kinds of industrial parks and he thought that the Turnpike had not only helped retain jobs in Ohio, but also helped create tens of thousands of new jobs.

The Chairman said further that, also, if one looked at the growth in the state of Ohio and looked along the Turnpike, maybe it was just coincidence, but the largest growth patterns in the state were right along where the Turnpike existed. He said the Turnpike was a key part of the way people came to Ohio and its transportation system. He said jobs were important.

The Chairman said further that, as he indicated in the past, Ohio had lead the United States two years in a row for new plant openings and expansions by a 2 to 1 margin. He said Texas was number two and Ohio was 2 to 1 over Texas. He said Ohio's economy was among the strongest in the entire country.

The Chairman said further that this year Allan Johnson marked his 25th anniversary as Executive Director. He said Mr. Johnson was the only person in the entire world that had ever gotten that accomplishment.

The Chairman said further that the Commission had a lot of things going on in 1996 and, he thought that at the next meeting he would like to outline some of the Commission's goals for 1996.

The Chairman said further that he would like to thank his fellow Commission Members, staff, and associates on the Turnpike for making the Turnpike the finest road in the country.

The Chairman said that the Members would go into executive session.

Mr. Zomparelli said that the Members and selected staff should go into executive session to discuss and review the Commission's labor matters and collective bargaining negotiations which currently affected the Commission.

Mrs. Leever said she moved that the Commission recess the meeting to hold an executive session in order to discuss, prepare, and review labor matters in connection with the current collective bargaining negotiations. She said that at the end of the executive session, the Commission would reconvene the meeting.

The Chairman said the meeting would be reconvened but it would be, for all practical purposes, complete other than maybe discussing the date for the next meeting. He said there also was an annual Christmas lunch after the meeting.

Mr. Williams said he seconded the motion to recess the meeting.

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

Ayes:

Mrs. Leever, Mr. Williams, Mr. Fedeli

Navs:

None

The Chairman declared the meeting adjourned.

(The time of recess was 12:36 p.m. and it reconvened at 1:29 p.m.)

The Chairman said the meeting was reconvened. He said the meeting would end until the next meeting.

Mr. Johnson said that he would suggest that the next regular Commission meeting be held on Monday, January 22nd. He said the meeting would adjourn with the knowledge that, as discussed before the Commission went into executive session, that

there would be a special meeting next week to consider the contract that was still outstanding on the concrete barriers. He said he would try to set that meeting up for Wednesday, December 27th, but he would confer with the Commission Members to confirm that date and to set the time. He said it would depend upon being able to get a quorum of Members.

There being no further business to come before the Commission, a motion was made by Mrs. Leever, seconded by Mr. Williams, that the meeting adjourn until the next regular meeting on January 22nd.

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

Ayes:

Mrs. Leever, Mr. Williams, Mr. Fedeli

Nays:

None

The Chairman declared the meeting adjourned. Time of adjournment was 1:31 p.m.

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

Marilyn R. Baker, Secretary-Treasurer