

**THE OHIO TURNPIKE COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE
SEARCH SUBCOMMITTEE**

November 12, 2002

Note: On August 12, 2002, the Search Subcommittee was created pursuant to Resolution No. 22-2002 consisting of the following members: Mr. Wilkins, Mr. Dixon, Mr. Strnisha and Senator Armbruster.

Time: 9:08 a.m.

Roll: Mr. Wilkins-here; Mr. Dixon-here; Mr. Strnisha-here.

Also present were: Tim Greenwood, Jack Marchbanks, Tom Amato, Lauren Dehrmann, Kathy Dolbin, John Peca, Jim Drew and Diane Pring.

Mr. Strnisha said he passed around, since he got the dubious honor of chairing this subcommittee, the thing I said I would do was sort or order the discussion for this meeting that we set up a couple of weeks ago when we last met at one of the service plazas. If there are no particular objections or additions, I would just start through this. I'd just like to talk about where we are right now. I'd like with #1 – Jack, would you and Kathy kind of tell us – we have a deadline of this Friday, November 15th – I believe with the applications but maybe you can tell us what we received to date in terms of quantity – any comments you want to make about it – and anything leading up to the 15th.

#2 was discussion that we just touched on last time – that for this group to talk about a little bit those kind of standards that we want to have in reviewing these applications in terms of education, experience. Different issues were brought out. Staff said they would do some research on that – that's why I thought you might like to make some kind of informal report to us and we can have some discussion about it.

#3 is obviously deals with post this Friday, November 15th – what kind of process we want to start off with in terms of who does what, schedule of it, what kind of input we want to get into that. I then put other – if I forgot – if I forgotten something and maybe just summarize with review of what

happens next. So if anyone things anything major is missing for our discussion today, maybe we ought to raise it now or just plow into #1.

Mr. Dixon said nothing major but just as a point of order, I don't know if I'm correct, but should we just enter the minutes and approve those just as a point of order.

Mr. Strnisha - Good point. Because we got Minutes from the last Search Subcommittee meeting of October 15th. Mr. Wilkins moved and Mr. Dixon seconded.

Roll: Mr. Wilkins-yes; Mr. Dixon-yes; Mr. Strnisha-yes.

Thank you, Mr. Dixon. Mr. Strnisha said without any objections or additions, let's start off with #1 – and Jack, maybe you and Kathy can tell us where we are at. I think this is a pretty quick review and report.

Mr. Marchbanks reported that since the Search Subcommittee last met at Middle Ridge Service Plaza about a month ago, we have received over 190 applications for the position of Executive Director. We have drawn candidates from peer-toll authorities and we have as you have requested looked into some of the other toll authorities that have recently (within the last 3-5 years) selected an Executive Director or General Manager to run their facilities. I have in your packets a yellow sheet which is dated November 6th. Before I hand off to Kathleen Dolbin for whatever additions and facts which she wants to bring, that I spoke personally to Celia Kupersmith who is the General Manager of the Golden Gate Bridge Hwy. & Transportation District which operates the Golden Gate Bridge, toll, ferries and bus lines out there in the Bay area.) She is an engineer. She has been in the post three years and the skillset that won her the job in her estimation was her experience in both highway and transit management; she operated transit in the Reno area in addition to working for the Nevada DOT. She had the proven ability to navigate an organization out of financial crisis – the Golden Gate Authority was in some financial trouble which is unlike the Turnpike Commission which is not in financial trouble – but she had the proven ability to lead “cultural change” in an organization in both Reno and Nevada DOT. She thinks those are the three critical elements in her skills that won her the job.

I also spoke to Jack Gaffney of the New York State Bridge Authority. They run the toll bridges over the Hudson River.) He was very frank. A key factor in his skillset that helped him get the job was that he had a pre-existing relationship with Governor Pataki. The Governor trusted him and respected his expertise. He has proven financial management expertise and his background is in Information Technology and Business Management. He made a point of telling me it was not necessary for him to be an engineer to run the N.Y. State Bridge Authority and in fact, Governor Pataki was looking for someone who is not an engineer.

I also spoke with the North Texas Toll Authority - that's the metro-Dallas area. It used to be the Texas Toll Authority but they shrank that actual organization to an area around the Dallas-Fort Worth region. Mr. Heibert is not an engineer. He has been in the position for 5 years – just like Mr. Gaffney. The elements of his skillset that helped him was his proven managerial experience. I believe he was former Tulsa City Manager. The second critical aspect of his skillset was his ability to craft and implement a strategic vision & plan in a political environment. These are the elements that were used to filter and select candidates for some of the major toll authorities in the United States. This was a request made by Senator Armbruster. Unfortunately, he can't be here to hear this report, but this was something he had requested at our last meeting. Kathleen, anything you'd like to add?

Kathy Dolbin said the only thing I'd like to add is that Tom Amato and Lauren Dehrmann have been putting together a very comprehensive criteria listing that other toll roads have used in the past while searching for their executive director. I believe it is in your packets. When we were going through the 100+ applicants that we received thus far – in compiling our short list we were looking for similar things that other toll roads had been looking for as well. I do need to state that every toll road is unique in nature and criteria that we are looking for may be somewhat different than what the State of New York or Golden Gate Bridge may have been looking for. What we were looking for was individuals who had past transportation experience, experience in the public sector and maybe in the political environment and interaction in other state authorities and bodies and who have significant depth and breadth in the leadership role including managerial experience. Also we were looking for similarity in terms of operating budgets revenue, staff and organization size. Anyone who has similar experience in an

organization with that criteria in mind – then they would be a close fit to assume the possibility of being interviewed with the Search Subcommittee.

Chairman Strnisha inquired if there were any questions from the committee.

Mr. Dixon asked Mr. Marchbanks – did we ask any of the authorities if they had used a search committee in looking for their new Director.

Mr. Marchbanks replied in the three that I polled, no they did not.

Mr. Strnisha asked search firm or search committee because you said search committee. Mr. Dixon said – search firm is what I meant. Thanks.

Mr. Dixon asked Kathy Dolbin if she had any conversations with any other authorities as to whether they used a search firm?

Ms. Dolbin said in the conversations she has had with some of the toll authorities, they have not used a search firm. The problem with using a search firm is obviously the exorbitant cost – which is usually 20-35% of the base fee.

Mr. Dixon said – exorbitant? You get what you pay for.

Chairman Strnisha said I don't know if we want to have more discussion on this point. It seems that there's some issues about how much to value because you have some different things - the issue of whether someone needs to be an engineer or not? If you go from this and my senses that might be nice but that isn't essential. It seems like all these people have strong management experience – so I'm kinda of speaking my review of all this information. I'd be curious of the committee's observations because the next step would be starting to review these applicants more thoroughly and obviously we have to have a similar mindset as to what is important. It seems to me that the management experience particularly management – I made a note in the Golden Gate example – organizations in change – leading an organization down a different path whether it's financial which I don't think obviously is the case here, but making some changes and I think there is some opportunity to do that here. That seems to be key. In my mind having the transportation background is important but probably not absolutely critical if you had a very strong candidate and then I think there are some base educational standards that are probably important, if not at a

graduate level at least at a bachelor's level. That's kind of my general take of both my own internal feelings about it and in hearing some of the commentary today.

I don't know if anybody else – I guess I would throw in there maybe an offshoot of the management side is having a familiarity and comfort and maybe some experience in dealing in an operation like this that has a political component to it because of our establishment as a state agency needing to interact with both General Assembly and Governor, etc. It doesn't necessarily have to be in the Ohio context but I think having knowledge and appreciation of that is also important.

Does anyone else like to chime in on that? So my strongest point is the management side with a transportation background preferred but not absolutely critical.

Mr. Wilkins said I'll give you my list. I agree first item on my list is strong management experience. Second, a person of strong integrity and character and third, a history of getting things done; fourth – I think the person should be a good communicator, have good people skills and lastly, I think some government experience.

That goes to my last point in terms of having worked in that context helps to appreciate the uniqueness of this kind of operation.

Mr. Wilkins said I've seen a lot of good business people and then put them in government it they just explode. It doesn't work. (I agree, Mr. Strnisha.)

Mr. Dixon I'm not far away from where the two of you are in thinking but I do think at some point and probably today, we need to set some minimal requirements just to eliminate the easy ones – and deal with the some of the things that are more difficult. Like education, I think at some point we should decide at what's the minimum education requirement. Maybe that's something we should discuss right now. And then I think we should address the notion or question, should this person have toll road or transportation experience? I think we need to address that. Will we consider someone that does not have those qualifications. The others are not so straight-forward, like strong management. We have to judge that we make within ourselves because that's more objective than the others. Ability to lead a cultural change – I like that, that hits us -- the nail right on

the head – that’s what we want to go here – a cultural change, a different way of doing business. We are doing great business but we have to go about doing it in a different way. We don’t want to decrease the quality of that business but we want to take a different road to get to similar ends. Am I on track there? OK. All those are more objective but these first two – I think those are questions that maybe we can address. It’s difficult without our fourth member but maybe we can address and resolve without him being here – the education and the technical skills.

Mr. Marchbanks stated realize if you set transportation background and experience or toll authority experience as a minimum requirement, you will get rid of $\frac{3}{4}$ or 95% of the candidates. So realize that’s a pretty high bar.

Mr. Dixon said I’m just throwing it out there. I’m not saying we should or should not, I’m just saying it’s something we can decide. Based on what you just said we might say OK, they don’t have to have that experience or we may say maybe that makes our work a lot easier and we should put it up there. I don’t know what the mindset of the committee, but it’s just something that needs to be discussed.

Mr. Strnisha said I’ll chime in on your list there, on the education I start off with the basis of people with a bachelor’s. There are occasionally people in that situation who don’t have and do a lot of things, but I think bachelor’s is a minimal and obviously a higher level graduate level is preferred but not necessary. So on education I think a BA is a minimal. I don’t think experience in transportation is -- I think that’s preferred but not absolute because I think we would want to consider somebody who comes with a lot of strong management experience and maybe they have been in organizations where they had to pick-up experience in that particular area quickly and they have demonstrated an ability to do. To lock it in and say they have to – having said that I think somebody who comes from a transportation background has some things going. In your minimal vs. preferred, I would put transportation experience in the preferred but not in the absolute. One point that you raised I would say on the management experience you say we have to judge that. I agree but I think there has to be some based on their resume where we can judge. Somebody can’t serve in a lot of different positions that really were not management and say they have management experience. I think there has to be some demonstrated period of time whether it’s 5 or 10 years or some amount where we can say they

were in a management position and they led an organization or a section or division within an organization. That's my response to your list.

Mr. Marchbanks stated I think Commissioner Wilkins hit upon a very critical criterion that is – experience in government, you can call it political or whatever. I think this is very critical – someone who has never dealt in a political environment – this is a public agency. It reports in many ways to the Governor's Office. I think it's critical for any candidate to have some experience working in government. You can make it 3 years or 5 years, but I think that's a critical element in the matrix of experience when you are looking at managerial experience.

Mr. Strnisha said I'm close to that but I hesitate making that an absolute. I have the same reaction that Bill has that a lot of people come in and because they don't have that you are right, but I don't know if I wanted to shut the door absolutely.

Mr. Marchbanks replied, it wouldn't direct, it could be working with government.

Bill Wilkins said I agree with you on a bachelor's degree – preferred. I think to require that would exclude a lot of people that we might want to look at. We don't have to pick them.

Mr. Strnisha said if you required a higher level degree, you are saying. I agree.

Mr. Dixon said will we accept – is that an absolute or will we accept years of experience as an equivalent for a bachelor's degree. Are we in stone on these? Do we just tell the staff don't even show us someone that doesn't have a bachelor's degree?

Mr. Strnisha and Wilkins said –yes. Mr. Strnisha said minimum means a minimum.

Mr. Dixon, OK.

Mr. Wilkins said hopefully we get that one nailed down. Mr. Strnisha said I think we do. Let's go through all these. I don't think we need to make a motion or if we just need to record these in the minutes as – Tom, do you

have a point of view on this? It seems we are having a discussion about creating some standards that will be used to review – I don't know the difference between formally adopting them vs. recording them in the minutes and staff using them. Do you have a direction for us to take on this discussion?

Mr. Amato replied and said we should record them in the minutes and after at the end of your discussion, I'll give a tally of the minimums and the preferred. We will record that in the minutes as the recommendation for the deliberations.

Mr. Strnisha said OK. Do we want to keep going, Bill did you have any thoughts on that? We kinda cut you off there – on either management or the transportation issue. It seems like there was a couple of things, the education which I think we have nailed down. There is the transportation experience issue, how to measure the management issue and there's the government experience issue. If there is any others –

Mr. Amato said working in the concept of minimum and preferred. So far we have bachelor's - minimum, graduate-preferred. I have transportation experience as preferred. Mr. Strnisha said that was my point of view so I don't know I'd like to see if that is shared by the committee.

Let's just take the matrix that Jack gave us. Of the three candidates he gave us, Celia has transportation experience, Mr. Gafney doesn't look like he does. Mr. Marchbanks said, he worked with government. He's a contractor.

Mr. Dixon said what about transportation experience? Mr. Marchbanks said no, he does not. What about Mr. Heibert? Mr. Marchbanks said he had transportation experience as a city manager.

Mr. Wilkins said I wouldn't call City Manager transportation experience. Mr. Marchbanks said he worked with and Mr. Strnisha said he probably ran the Public Works Dept. You'd call that transportation. Mr. Wilkins said I'd call that a manager as opposed to the guy who is the department head.

Mr. Dixon said of the three here, I would say Celia is the one that is not typical. OK. I know Celia personally and he's the present head of APTA. Her field is transportation and she has been general manager of a couple of authorities. This Golden Gate thing is a quirky thing – it's buses, bridge,

ferry. It's really a hodgepodge of things. It's not typical. We could throw her out.

The other two guys don't have transportation experience so maybe – Mr. Dixon asked Mr. Greenwood, do you have any experience, you have been on the Commission for a while – any of our neighbors or heads have transportation experience?

Mr. Greenwood said I haven't had any contact with any commissions. Mr. Strnisha said I've met the guy out at IBTTA who is head of PA – I think he came up through the ranks. There was a guy who moved up and obviously had transportation experience. The guy who is the New York State Turnpike came from Ohio so he had transportation experience. Those are the two I had some familiarity with.

Mr. Amato said on the Director profiles that I handed out, there is 12 authorities on there that you can peruse them to determine who many actually had transportation experience before taking that job. I think you'll find it might be 50/50 or 60/40.

Mr. Dixon said my gut feeling and I hope the transportation gods don't strike me off their list for this, I would think in my mind – I don't think I would put transportation experience as being a cut-off – preferred but not necessary.

Mr. Marchbanks asked, what is your minimum managerial requirement experience level?

Mr. Strnisha said I'll cut you off. I want to see if Bill agrees with that relating to the transportation and then we'll get into the management. Mr. Wilkins said absolutely, and said I think we probably have more transportation experience here than – with the senior staff – than any other toll authority in the country. Mr. Strnisha said I agree. That's the other part of the equation here. We have strength within the senior staff on that as well.

I think Jack, we were turning to how we measure and if we create a minimal or preferred standard on management experience and maybe how we define it. We'll talk about management first and then we'll talk about government.

Mr. Dixon said I think that's going to be one of our highest areas that we really put under the microscope and look at. But the problem is going to be – how do we define it? That's going to be the problem, do we look at it as years served or some people can just get by. How deep do we look to define if it is a quality manager?

Mr. Amato said I've asked Mr. Marchbanks in a recent meeting with the State Auditors if he had some insights into that job – the Executive Director's job and its similarities to a CEO. Maybe he can share it with us today and I think it would be helpful since he has been in the job for two months.

Mr. Strnisha asked Mr. Marchbanks if he wanted to respond to that? Mr. Marchbanks stated I would liken this position to the CEO because in many ways the Turnpike Executive Director reports to a Board of Trustees or that being the Commission. You have a General Counsel, an auditor much like a corporate board and you have a facility that is based on revenue-generation – far different from ODOT. I look at every day what our toll revenue tallies are because it's critical. It is much like gauging sales of a going enterprise be it a restaurant chain in Cleveland or a major business like Martin-Marietta. Yes, it is business experience would be very critical.

Mr. Wilkins, OK a suggestion – minimum 5 years experience leading a complex organization – whether that's a company, department, division within a company, but they should have at least 5 years experience being the head person in a reasonably complex organization. I intentionally don't say the head of the company or head of the department, because a division could be huge in a big organization and should count. In other words, a staff engineer who manages a couple engineers probably would not qualify.

Mr. Strnisha said I would agree and I kind of like that. You would define complex organization with some of the terms that Jack used in terms of you have to manage revenues, manage legal issues, may also.

Mr. Wilkins you have the newspaper to worry about the politics – you have to be watching yourself 360 degrees around.

Mr. Strnisha said I'm reasonably comfortable we could look at a situation and decide whether that would be a sufficiently complex organization to

qualify. And I think 5 is the right number, but the more experience you have the better. And if it's multiple –

Mr. Wilkins said that's the minimum. Mr. Strnisha agreed.

Mr. Strnisha said let's turn to the government issue and the issue about whether that is some government experience and maybe how that's defined as either minimum in some way or preferred. I think I have stated my point of view. I think there is a strong benefit to those who have some experience but I'd hate to create that as a minimum.

Mr. Dixon said I would also agree because there are so many attributes some many qualifications necessary to run this job that people have in the private sector and are very good at it and to eliminate that entire private sector we would be hurting ourselves, I believe. I think there is some way that we could connect private sector jobs that do business per se with the government agencies. I mean we all that relationship is going to be very important. That ability not only to deal with running a bureaucracy here but being able to deal with the other bureaucracies – the other arms of the government and making it all cohesive and making it run smoothly. That's going to be one of the important qualifications for leading the cultural change within our organization. It's important but I don't know how to word it . We need to narrow it down or pinpoint so we can put it down on paper.

Mr. Strnisha said I would take a stab that we are saying that experience in or with government is not a minimum but experience in or with in a business relationship if not actually within a public agency is preferred. There is some strong preference to that. That language may be artful as it should be but I'm trying to capture the idea that it is not necessarily those who have had direct governmental experience. Before I became finance director in Cleveland 10 years ago, my background was totally in the private sector but I did work as an investment banker – I didn't work for government so I worked with City Councils, Mayors, etc. I think that's what you are driving at to try and pick up that kind of person who may not have actually worked within the public sector, but has done a lot of work with the public sector.

Mr. Dixon – preference given to individuals who have experience working in governmental agencies or the private sector organizations doing business

with or having a relationships with government agencies. Tom, you can find more flowery language.

Mr. Amato said preferred or minimum. Mr. Dixon and Mr. Strnisha said that's a preferred not a minimum.

Mr. Dixon said we're not going to cut them off if they don't but they get points if they do.

Mr. Strnisha, is there agreement on that description? Are there any other ones that we want to record for the purposes of the Minutes and for purposes of moving forward with the review of the applications in this category of minimum or preferred? Good, we'll move forward.

Mr. Strnisha said kind of moving into the third item of this agenda, I know where the ongoing process of receiving them – we have until the 15th so more are coming in. I think there has been some review obviously categorization done by staff. One of my questions to the group here is: In the review and venting and weeding down of this list, I really think some or all of the Commission Members and Search Subcommittee need to be part – it should not be candidly something that is totally done by staff – that breaks down that list to whether it's 10- 20- 30 people. Some of us have to say, the Commission Members or appointed number of its member participated with staff and actually saw and agreed on that venting process and went through all those applications. I think we have a strong obligation as the ones ultimately to make that decision for not necessarily for all of us but for some of us to participate and come back to the group with the benefit of staff's insights to say here's how we have broken this group down. Let me throw that thought out there for everyone.

Mr. Dixon said this is the perfect time for me to bring up my point about the search firm again. I think it's also a good time for either to say yes we are going to do it or we are not just to eliminate it so I won't discuss it any more. I feel a little uncomfortable because Senator Armbruster is not here but I also think we know where he stands on the topic. Again, only because it's so fresh in my mind what we went through, looking for a General Manager at the RTA. We had no where near 191 applications. I know that there is a price to having a search firm but if the price is the only reason that we don't use a search firm then we are really selling ourselves short because we are looking for an individual that is going to lead this organization hopefully for

the next 5-10 years or beyond. The \$40,000 or how much might it be, (Kathy said 20-35%) Let's say \$30,000 to \$40,000 that we spend on it would be money well spent. It's just these qualifications – with candor – done this backwards but I'm working it in my mind, but it's still going to work out – because this would be a point that we would give what we are looking for to a search firm and say this is the type of individual that we want. I think a lot of people are intimidated because they think that the search firm takes away any authority that this group would have. But it does not. You guys – we, in fact, make the final decision. What the search firm does is do our work for us. And they will go through all of those with the help of the staff. They will do whatever we tell them and how we'll tell them. But they will take their expertise in doing this and help us to do our job better and make it more efficient. They will dot all the I's and cross all the T's and at the end of the day, we can say, if we want to, that's fine, but or we can say, thank you for us and we can look at the one or two that they give us and they will rank them and we can make that decision with their help or without their help. So I'm just – I don't know how many of you have been through this procedure before but it's a lot of work. I know you guys have spent a lot of work on it already. I know you have – 191 – oh my God – so far. We still got until Friday. OK – So I think I have 191 phone calls – got so many friends I don't know (cross that off the record) .

Mr. Strishna said we have to break 200.

Mr. Dixon -- kidding. I'm glad I said that as a matter of fact because that also is a check and balance in the process. OK, that's what this cultural change that we are talking about. Here again, we have an outside organization coming in and it kind of validates what we are doing. We did everything we could to have a fair and open and inclusive process and at the end of the day we made the best possible decision. It's another tool. Unfortunately, that tool may cost us \$40,000, but when we lay road and we have these long discussions on the type of cement that we are going to use – asphalt and we ask the question – does this one contain the recycled particles and the chief engineer says we are going to use the slag which is better but it will cost us \$500,000 more, but it will last. This \$40,000 may buy us some longevity and improve the quality of the decision we make. That's my position on this. I think we should. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to hear discussion from the other committee members as to where they are on this topic.

Mr. Strnisha asked Bill Wilkins, do you want to chime in on this? I will reserve the right to speak last.

Mr. Wilkins said I have involved in a lot of different searches and I have good experiences with search firms and I've had bad experiences. If you have a good pool of applicants and an active committee and help internally I think you can find a good leader without one. It's a lot of work. You have to check their references and spend a lot of time outside of the committee meeting. I could really go either way. I don't think just because you spend \$40,000 it ensures that you get the best person. I think we obviously have attracted a lot of interest. To me it would be interesting to go to the next step to sit down with our minimum criteria and our preferred criteria and see how many candidates we have left and if we have what we consider to be good candidates or not. If we do, I could support not using the search firm. If we sit down using our criteria and decide hey, there's nothing here. Then maybe we do need to go outside. I think I'd like to spend another week and sort out what we have before we make that decision.

Mr. Strnisha asked Chairman Greenwood what his thoughts were, although you are not a member of this committee, I'd be interested in your point of view on this and Director Proctor, too.

Chairman Greenwood said I don't think it is necessary to have an outside firm. I am confident with the people in the process and I would concur with Mr. Wilkins. We seem to have a pretty extensive pool. It's not a matter of people not knowing about it. We don't seem to have any hidden agendas on the Search Subcommittee or on the Commission. I'm thinking in terms of organization, a close family or something or deep-seated emotional factions or another organization that is a little bit more politically charged than this organization. Would this be a constant deadlock where if Person A on the Board says I think this person is qualified no matter how qualified that person is, another person on the Board just because he brought it up says No – I don't want that person. I don't think we have that situation here to kind of elevate the search to a third-party. And I think we have a pretty good idea, consensus and clarity of what type of individual we are looking for. Obviously, there has to be a thorough venting process – I think I jokingly said to Jack, three to four weeks ago – in a side-bar conversation which is popular in college that hires a football coach that didn't have the credentials – I don't think we want to be in that position either. We will definitely have

to have a good venting process. Again, I think we can do that ourselves. That's just my thoughts.

Mr. Strnisha said I would agree with both Mr. Greenwood and Mr. Wilkins. I won't repeat a lot of the reasons they gave. I do think and I think we have to be very hands-on - this Commission, with the assistance of staff, in this venting process to say we went through all these. I do think we have a clear when you look what the search firm brings I'm going to say it would be hard to imagine they would bring more here than what we have already gotten. I think we have a pretty good idea of what we are looking for. We have a lot of different types of people to look at relative to that. I do think we have to show a very hands-on review of that and I agree with you in terms of the Commission's perspective on that. I think there is a very open-minded desire to get the best person that we can judge. I do think there may be a point, even if we feel we have a good crop of whatever number we chop it down to that we could still pause and consider some assistance from a firm to help us. Maybe in the reference checks and the questions to review. But at this point, I think would agree with the other Commission Members on this that we ought to proceed without some a firm as it is not necessary at this time.

Mr. Dixon said it's obvious as to the way this is going, I'm out-voted, but you know, let me just say this, based on the comments that you all have given you don't know what a search firm does. I'm just being honest. OK. Especially based on what Mr. Greenwood said. There is not a clear understanding as to what the things that a search firm does. I think there is a limited perception as to what a search firm does. OK and a search firm does far more and a search firm can do far less but I just think we are making a mistake but I always when there is a decision made, then I will work my damnest to make sure that I follow the line of the majority and we will make the best of the decision we have made. But I think we are making a mistake by not using a search firm. I won't bring it up again.

Mr. Strnisha said I raised the issue of once November 15th comes and goes and we know we at least have 190 if not more by that date, I do think we have to have fairly quickly jump into this review or venting process and as I said I think some of us need to participate directly in that. Credibly we have to do that. I think that's what we want to see with the assistance of staff certainly. But I would feel uncomfortable with the process that takes this 190-200 names and simply gets a recommendation through staff as to who the best 10-25-30 people are we ought to focus on. Being up here in

Cleveland I will reluctantly volunteer for such duty but obviously others ought to participate. That's probably convenient for me to do that and maybe George you could help and I think the more assistance the better. I would throw that out for consideration. I don't think we have to decide on that today. But any comments or thoughts on that?

Mr. Wilkins said Mr. Chairman, talking about convenience, what makes you think we have to do it in Cleveland?

Mr. Dixon said it's the Chairman's prerogative.

Mr. Wilkins said if you try to piggy-back it around some other activity, I'd be willing to participate. I think in two hours, with staff's help, we could go through them with the minimum criteria and sort these. I don't think it's going to take that long.

Mr. Strnisha said I'd be happy to work with you Mr. Wilkins and the staff to set that up. It can be Cleveland or Columbus. I occasionally travel to Columbus, but staff is up here, too. I have a few more and with others who want to participate. If people are comfortable, we could start with at least Mr. Wilkins and I try to organize that, but it's open for other Commission Members to participate in and we would try to get on that as quickly as possible. I don't want to try to look at calendars right now, because it usually isn't that efficient use of our time. But to figure out how to do that as shortly as the 15th as possible – not to let a whole lot of grass grow here.

Mr. Marchbanks then stated the staff is prepared to go through the applications that are received as of close of business on November 15th. Next week do a preliminary sort and then show you what that preliminary sort was based on the minimum criteria you presented us today. And we can do that in the presence of whatever Search Subcommittee Members are available on your calendar-preferred date. So we are preferred to do that.

Mr. Dixon asked what staff members will be on your team, Mr. Marchbanks? Mr. Marchbanks said Kathy Dolbin, Mr. Dan Castrigano, Diane Pring and myself.

Mr. Wilkins said Mr. Chairman, may I make a suggestion? I think it would be helpful if staff goes through the resumes, but not do the sort. Because I don't want to be influenced by. I would rather come in and have some

participation in the sort as opposed to saying, I challenge your sort. Do you see what I mean?

Mr. Marchbanks replied we'll have a stack ready for you on the day you meet with us.

Mr. Wilkins said I think if you are familiar with them I think that's great.

Mr. Marchbanks said we are.

Mr. Strnisha asked Jack, when is our next Commission Meeting? Don't we have a scheduled Commission Meeting?

Mr. Marchbanks replied December 9th. I would throw out and I'd like to move toward the end to stay on time- I do think obviously we want to go through this process well prior to that and my best thought on schedules is we try to accomplish that within the week or two following the 15th. Maybe our goal is prior to Thanksgiving. Then we communicate back to the rest of the Commission and see whether we need to convene this group prior to the 9th or whether we convene the next discussion on this around the meeting on December 9th.

Mr. Strnisha said I'll throw this out, too. I don't have in my mind in terms of that process that 200 should be cut down to 10 20 30 - I don't have an arbitrary number in my head. Actually I'm looking for some direction if someone would participate with Mr. Wilkins. I don't think we ought to. I think we ought to get it down to some number that we can deal with but not be so arbitrary to say we are not going take you because you are the 26th person. Do you agree, Mr. Wilkins?

Yes said Mr. Wilkins. If we get it down to 3 that's all that meet the minimum. If 100 meet the minimum, I think we need to come back with the people that meet it.

Mr. Strnisha said this would be the group that not only meet the minimum but we would want to take the next step with in terms of reviewing and talking to.

Mr. Wilkins said and get points for the preferred. But you're not talking about -- we would do this before we talk to anybody, right?

Mr. Strnisha said we would do this review process before we talk to anybody, right. But this would be a group that in some way we would then proceed to talk to – call it an interview, or it could be done in a variety of ways. If it's 30 people you do it one way and if it's 3 people you do it another way, I would suggest.

Mr. Strnisha said I would think we would come back to this group again either the Search Committee or the full Commission to say where we are and review what the next steps are prior to taking the next step with that group of either 3-10 or 30. Does that seem acceptable to everybody – those not on the committee but obviously? OK.

Mr. Strnisha said I think with those next steps if there is anything further to discuss, I would suggest we are through the agenda. The next steps is for Mr. Wilkins and I to work with staff to start that process and be prepared to come back again either to at the December 9th meeting or prior to the 9th if we feel so to report back to this subcommittee.

Mr. Dixon said I don't want to open up a can of worms but if we're not finished with this process by the end of November and I know we won't, Mr. Marchbanks are you ..

Mr. Strnisha said we have Director Proctor here too who can chime in on this question that I sense is coming.

Mr. Dixon said are you going to be here at our next meeting or where are we at – I know the agreement was until November 29th, correct? What's happening there?

Mr. Strnisha said, Director Proctor do you want to address that question – either one?

Director Proctor said he deferred to Jack.

Mr. Marchbanks said well if we are looking at making a decision or some determination shortly after or during the meeting on December 9th, my contract says it can be extended by mutual agreement. If that's the wishes of the Commission to have me stay on a few more days into December while we close this process, I'm fine with that.

Mr. Dixon said stay how long?

Mr. Marchbanks repeated a few more days in December. We can discuss it more precisely later. That would be something-- we would have to have a resolution.

Mr. Strnisha said my sense is that I think from this review we'll get a sense as Mr. Wilkins said, about the type and quality of the candidates and I think we'll get an idea of who long it will take. It's my hope that we'll not only know who the candidates are but if we have some strong candidates that we ought to pursue hard and try and get a decision on or whether it might take longer which would be a different issue for Jack.

Not to punt on that questions, but I think we'll have a better idea on how much – my sense of it – how much that is an issue for the Interim Executive Director through this next process.

Mr. Wilkins said I would like to say now that you brought this up how appreciative I am of Mr. Marchbanks and Director Proctor for making Jack available. I know it's been a considerable sacrifice not only being away from his family most of the time but I also know that he is working 7 days a week trying to keep up with everything that he has on his plate. I very much appreciate it and I know he'll stick with us here for whatever it takes – assuming we do our job with moving in a expeditious way. But I think this has been a very seamless transition and many of them are not. I think a lot of that is credit to Jack and his staff for making that way. I feel confident that the Ohio Turnpike is doing a great job. You've got a few more days, Jack.

Mr. Strnisha said I have a liberal interpretation of that so. Any other business or discussion? Can we move to adjourn this subcommittee?

Mr. Dixon moved, and Mr. Wilkins seconded.

Roll: Mr. Dixon-yes; Mr. Wilkins-yes; Mr. Strnisha-yes.

(Adjourned at 10:07 a.m.)

/dsp