

MINUTES OF THE 522nd MEETING OF THE OHIO TURNPIKE COMMISSION

April 25, 2006

Pursuant to the bylaws, the Ohio Turnpike Commission met for a special meeting at the Commission's Administration Building at 11:11 a.m. on April 25, 2006, with members of the staff: Jerry Pursley, Deputy Executive Director; Dan Castrigano, Chief Engineer; Noelle Tsevdos, General Counsel; James T. Steiner, CFO/Comptroller; W. R. Fleischman, Assistant Chief Engineer; Tim Ujvari, Maintenance Engineer; Richard Morgan, Director of Information Systems; Andrew Herberger, Director of Service Plaza Operations; Heidi Jedel, Assistant Manager, Public Affairs; Crickett Jones and Diane Pring.

Chairman Balog thanked everyone for their indulgence as the meeting was starting a little later today. He said, we have a significant issue on the agenda today so we thought it was important that we have a majority of the Commission Members present, and a few of us were running a little late. I apologize for the delay to all the people in the audience.

Chairman Balog asked the Assistant Secretary-Treasurer to call the roll.

Present: Mr. Balog, Mr. Regula, Mr. Dixon, Deputy Director Mo Darwish and Senator Armbruster.

Absent: Mr. Kidston and Representative Buehrer.

Chairman Balog said Gordon Proctor was unable to attend today's meeting, however, Deputy Director Mo Darwish is here and is authorized to vote in his place. The Chairman called the meeting to order.

The Chairman said we have a number of guests here today, so I'd like everyone to introduce themselves as we customarily do: Eric Erickson, Fifth Third Bank; Gil Brindley, Mike Swan, Dick Corp.; Tony Yacobucci, Jacob Merriman, HNTB; Stephen Szanto, Tiffany Love, Cabrera Capital; Glen Stephens, Glen Stephens, Inc.; Don Glosser, Lichtenstein Associates; Donald Bank, Butler, Wieck & Co.; Don Rohr, RBC Capital; Ron Johnson, Amtek Computer Services; Sherri Warner, Ohio Trucking Association; Steve DeLong, Don Taggart, Local #18; Mark Fisher, A. G. Edwards; Frank Lamb, Huntington Bank; Tim Reidy, Nat City Investments, Debby Bayes, OTC Interchange 91 and Cheri Srodes, OTC Interchange 39.

The Chairman said this is the 522nd meeting of the Ohio Turnpike Commission, and we are meeting here in the Commission's headquarters as provided for in the Commission's Code of Bylaws for a special meeting as we observed the Easter holiday last week. Various reports will be received, and we will act on several resolutions, draft copies of which have been previously sent to

Members and updated drafts are also in the Members' folders. The resolutions will be explained during the appropriate reports.

The Chairman said could I have a motion to adopt the minutes of the March 20, 2006 Commission Meeting?

Commissioner Dixon moved and Commissioner Regula seconded. All other Members voted in the affirmative, and the minutes were adopted.

The Chairman said we'll proceed with the report of the Secretary-Treasurer, Mr. Dixon.

The Secretary-Treasurer said, the following items have been sent to the Members since the last scheduled meeting of the Commission on March 20, 2006:

1. Minutes of the March 20, 2006 Commission Meeting
2. Traffic & Revenue Report, March, 2006
3. Total Revenue by Month and Year, March, 2006
4. Investment Report, March, 2006
5. Financial Statements, March 31, 2006
6. Budget Report – Three Months – 2006 *
7. Traffic Crash Summary, February 2006 (*Revised*)
8. Traffic Crash Summary, March, 2006 *
9. Various News Releases

* *in Member's folders*

The Chairman asked Director Suhadolnik for his report. The Director said I have two (2) items to report on. First, my Administrative Assistant, Diane Pring, whom you all know and interact with on a monthly basis, will be retiring on June 30th after 27 years with the Ohio Turnpike. There will be some festivities between now and that time. Taking her place will be Heidi Jedel, who is sitting next to her. Heidi comes from our Public Affairs Department. Tracy Cowley who shares the front office with Diane will be taking Heidi's place. By reassigning some duties, we'll be reducing our staff by one full-time employee as a result of these moves.

Commissioner Dixon suggested giving Diane a round of applause.

Director Suhadolnik said the second item I'd like to report on is we had a conference call yesterday with Fitch Rating Agency. We talk and/or meet with the various rating agencies about once a year. We talked with Fitch's four (4) analysts: Cherian George, Chad Lewis, Scott Trommer and Michael McDermott. We talked about a host of issues including: our traffic and revenue, maintenance, operating expenses, salaries and health care costs, union

contracts, trucks returning to the Turnpike, impact of Indiana's change in toll rates, electronic toll collection, ATPMs and long-term capital needs. I think they are generally pleased with our efforts and where we are financially today. They have, however, expressed some concerns about where our revenue will be in future years. I think that summarizes our discussions, and I think perhaps Jim Steiner or Eric Erickson may be able to make some additional comments when they give their reports. That concludes my report, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Balog said thank you, Gary. We'll proceed with the report from our Deputy Executive Director, Jerry Pursley.

Mr. Pursley said thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have two (2) resolutions to present this morning. The first is a resolution awarding a contract for desktop computer equipment maintenance. The Commission issued an RFP in March for two (2) possible contracts to provide maintenance for the Commission's desktop computer equipment and for its data center computer equipment. The RFP was posted on the Commission's website, advertised in two (2) newspapers of general circulation and also mailed to over sixty (60) providers of computer maintenance services. Four (4) companies submitted proposals and an evaluation committee consisting of myself, the Director of Information Systems and the Commission's Systems Administrator reviewed the proposals, awarded technical scores for both the desktop computer equipment maintenance and data center computer equipment maintenance. The Commission's Purchasing Manager then unsealed the cost proposals for each category and calculated a Cost Performance Index for each category. The best Cost Performance Index for desktop computer maintenance was determined to be **Amtek Computer Services, Inc.** located in Upland, California. The best Cost Performance Index for data center computer equipment maintenance was determined to be **SMS Systems Maintenance Services** of Hudson, Massachusetts.

As a result of this process, the evaluation committee recommends that an initial two (2) year contract be awarded to Amtek and to SMS with three (3) possible one-year extensions on their contract. The anticipated five (5) year cost on the Amtek contract would be approximately \$164,640.00 and the anticipated five (5) year cost on the SMS contract would be approximately \$81,780.00. Since the SMS contract is within the Executive Director's spending authority, it is only necessary for the Commission to approve the Amtek contract.

Would General Counsel, please read the Resolved?

General Counsel read the Resolved as follows:

"RESOLVED that the proposal submitted by **Amtek Computer Services, Inc.** of Upland, California is, and is by the Commission determined to be, the **best** of all proposals received in response to the Commission's Request for

Proposals for desktop computer equipment maintenance services and is accepted; and

“FURTHER RESOLVED that the executive director and director of contracts administration hereby are authorized to execute a Contract with Amtek for an initial two (2) year term commencing **May 6, 2006**, with an option to extend the Contract for three (3), one (1) year periods, and further authorizes them to take any and all action necessary or proper to carry out the terms of said proposal and said Contract; and

“FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission directs the return of the proposal guaranty provided by all respondents to the RFP for desktop computer equipment maintenance as soon as said Contract with Amtek is executed.”

Commission Regula moved and Deputy Director Mo Darwish seconded.

The Chairman said, are there any questions?

Commissioner Dixon said, we have to go all the way to California to find somebody to work on those computers?

Deputy Executive Director Pursley said, both these companies have national reputations and have local offices. That was one of the criteria we rated them on. Sometimes, we need fairly quick response time if we have a problem with our computer system. They do have local offices.

Commissioner Dixon said I understand that and I’m not being critical about that, but this sort of thing – maintenance – I just have to believe there is an Ohio company that could have matched their price. It seems to me it would be cheaper and we’d have somebody local.

I support it and I know you guys did your “due diligence” but I just have to believe there is an Ohio company out there that could do this work. I’m just wondering if there was a breakdown somewhere.

Mr. Pursley said, Mr. Dixon, sixty (60) RFPs were sent out to companies including local companies, and we only got four (4) responses back.

Mr. Dixon said, so what does that tell us?

Mr. Pursley said, maybe the local companies are too busy.

Mr. Dixon said, I’m not debating, but was there something in the RFP or specifications that scared off the local, smaller firms that could have done this work?

Mr. Pursley said, the proposals are what they are. There was a list of the equipment that needs to be maintained. It's up to the company that bid. With sixty (60) RFPs sent out, we would hope that more local companies would bid.

Mr. Dixon said that's disappointing; thank you.

Chairman Balog said, this actually follows George's comments. Out of the four (4) people that responded, we only considered only two (2) because the other two (2) did not have "Alpha Servers" listed in the resume for their technicians. Those happen to be Ohio, Cleveland-based companies. Mr. Pursley, was that a requirement in the bid specifications that was included that they didn't meet?

Mr. Pursley said, the RFP said the successful vendor had to have experience both with desktop computers and our data center which is the larger computers. The companies that don't have experience with the large equipment like the data center companies cannot be considered for that kind of contract.

Deputy Director Darwish said, there is a state-term bid and there are minorities also in the state-term bid for maintenance. We use some of these. I just wanted to clarify one thing; we use the minority firms and use the MBE requirements.

Mr. Pursley said, I'd just like to make one comment as to the cost of these contracts. Our current contract for the desktop computer equipment is over \$4,000 a month. Under the new contract, that amount has dropped to \$2,700 a month.

On the data center equipment maintenance, we are currently paying over \$4,000 a month for maintenance, under this contract we'll be paying \$1,600 per month which is also a substantial reduction.

Chairman Balog said so we're saving in excess of \$4,000 per month.

Mr. Pursley said, over the five-year life of the contracts, we are saving over \$250,000.

Commissioner Dixon said that's great, but prices go down all the time, I'm not trying to discount what you're doing. You understand what I'm trying to say?

Senator Armbruster asked on the desktop side, not on the data center computers, what does that equate to, i.e., the cost per unit for maintenance?

Mr. Pursley said they are located in this building, the satellite building, maintenance buildings, toll plazas and service plazas, but I'd have to ask Dick Morgan, our Director of Information Systems.

Senator Armbruster said, the maintenance cost per desktop computers and their locations.

Mr. Morgan said, the current cost is between \$4 and \$8 per month per unit.

Senator Armbruster said, how many data centers do we have?

Mr. Morgan at this point we have approximately sixteen (16) and those vary in cost between \$15 and \$32 per month per data center.

The Chairman said, are there any further questions? If not, please call the roll.

The "Resolution Awarding Contract for Desktop Computer Equipment Maintenance" was moved for adoption.

Resolution No. 15-2006

WHEREAS, on March 3, 2006, the Commission issued its Request for Proposals (RFP) for two (2) possible Contracts to provide computer equipment maintenance for the Commission's desktop computer equipment and data center computer equipment, with said equipment located at the Commission's Administration Building in Berea, Ohio and at the recovery center located at Ohio Turnpike Interchange 161 (Milepost 161.8 at the intersection of Interstate 71 and the Ohio Turnpike); and

WHEREAS, the Commission's RFP was posted on the Commission's website, was advertised in two (2) newspapers of general circulation including *The Plain Dealer* and *The Daily Reporter* and, in addition, copies of the RFP were mailed to over sixty (60) companies identified as major participants in the computer equipment maintenance field; and

WHEREAS, proposals were duly opened on March 28, 2006, as provided in said published notice, with four (4) companies submitting proposals to furnish the above-mentioned services for the Commission; and

WHEREAS, an Evaluation Committee consisting of the Commission's deputy executive director, the director of information systems ("IS") and the systems administrator of the IS department reviewed the proposals submitted and awarded separate technical scores for desktop computer equipment maintenance and for data center computer equipment maintenance; and

WHEREAS, the Cost Proposals for each category were then unsealed by the Commission's purchasing manager who divided the technical scores

awarded by the total monthly cost submitted by each respondent in order to identify the best cost performance index among the respondents for the maintenance of the desktop computer equipment and the data center computer equipment; and

WHEREAS, the best cost performance index for desktop computer equipment maintenance was achieved by **Amtek Computer Services, Inc. (“Amtek”)** of Upland, California, and the best cost performance index for data center computer equipment maintenance was achieved by **SMS Systems Maintenance Services, Inc. (“SMS”)** of Hudson, Massachusetts; and

WHEREAS, as a result of this process, the evaluation committee has recommended that initial two (2) year Contracts be awarded to Amtek and SMS with three (3) possible one (1) year extensions pursuant to the following cost proposals:

Amtek Desktop Computer Equipment	\$2,744.00 per month, plus any per call rates for equipment added during the Contract term. One Year: \$32,928.00 Five Years: \$164,640.00
SMS Data Center Computer Equipment	\$1,363.00 per month, plus any after hour rates and per call rates for equipment added during the Contract term. One Year: \$16,356.00 Five Years: \$81,780.00

WHEREAS, based on the aforementioned cost proposals, only the Contract award to Amtek for desktop computer equipment maintenance with all of its possible extensions will exceed \$150,000.00, and, therefore, in accordance with Article V, Section 1.00 of the Commission’s Code of Bylaws, Commission action is necessary for the award of this Contract; and

WHEREAS, the executive director, pursuant to his contracting authority, may award the Contract for data center computer equipment maintenance to SMS as that Contract with all of its possible extensions is **not** anticipated to exceed the \$150,000.00 threshold for Commission approval; and

WHEREAS, the director of contracts administration has reviewed the recommendations of the Evaluation Committee and has also advised the Commission that: 1) the RFP conformed to the requirements of any applicable

statutes, 2) the aforesaid proposals were solicited on the basis of the same terms and conditions with respect to all RFP respondents and potential respondents; and 3) due and full consideration was given to all the proposals received, the respondents' qualifications and their abilities to perform the required services; and

WHEREAS, the director of contracts administration has further advised that Amtek has provided a proposal guaranty and evidence of its ability to provide the required performance bond and insurance as set forth in the RFP and that the Commission may legally accept said proposal from Amtek; and

WHEREAS, the executive director has reviewed the evaluation committee's and the director of contracts administration's written recommendations and concurs with the selection of Amtek to provide desktop computer equipment maintenance services; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has determined that the proposal submitted by Amtek is the **best** of all proposals received for desktop computer equipment maintenance services in response to the advertisement of said Contract.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

RESOLVED that the proposal submitted by **Amtek Computer Services, Inc.** of Upland, California is, and is by the Commission determined to be, the **best** of all proposals received in response to the Commission's Request for Proposals for desktop computer equipment maintenance services and is accepted; and

FURTHER RESOLVED that the executive director and director of contracts administration hereby are authorized to execute a Contract with Amtek for an initial two (2) year term commencing **May 6, 2006**, with an option to extend the Contract for three (3), one (1) year periods, and further authorizes them to take any and all action necessary or proper to carry out the terms of said proposal and said Contract; and

FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission directs the return of the proposal guaranty provided by all respondents to the RFP for desktop computer equipment maintenance as soon as said Contract with Amtek is executed.

The resolution was adopted with all Members voting in the affirmative. The resolution was identified as No. 15-2006.

Mr. Pursley said the second resolution relates to the award of Contract TRM-8C for janitorial services at the Commission's Portage and Brady's Leap Service Plazas. The Commission issued RFPs for janitorial services for these service plazas in March. The RFP was posted on the Commission's website,

advertised in five (5) different newspapers and mailed to forty-five (45) known janitorial service companies. Three (3) companies presented proposals and the evaluation committee consisting of myself, the director of service plaza operations and the eastern division service plaza manager reviewed the proposals and awarded technical scores for each. The separate cost proposals were then unsealed by the Commission's purchasing manager who calculated the Cost Performance Index for each of the proposals. As a result of that process, it was determined that the best Cost Performance Index was the proposal submitted by Any Domestic Work, Inc., d/b/a A.D.W., Inc. of Parma, Ohio. The Committee is, therefore, recommending that Contract TRM-8C be awarded to **A.D.W., Inc.** for an initial term of two (2) years commencing May 14, 2006, with an option to extend the Agreement for no more than five (5), successive one (1) year periods at an annual cost of \$261,540.00 for each service plaza and an hourly rate of \$9.25 for any additional work that is required by the Commission.

Mr. Pursley said I'd like to point out that A.D.W., Inc. has been providing janitorial services to the Commission for various service plazas since 1999 and their work has been satisfactory.

Would General Counsel please read the Resolved?

General Counsel read the Resolved as follows:

"RESOLVED that the proposal submitted by **Any Domestic Work, Inc., d/b/a A.D.W., Inc.** of Parma, Ohio, which included the following price proposal:

<u>Service Plaza</u>	<u>Monthly Per Plaza Fee</u>	<u>Annual Fee</u>	<u>Hourly Rate</u>
*Portage	\$21,795.00	\$261,540.00	\$9.25
Brady's Leap	\$21,795.00	\$261,540.00	\$9.25

** for any added requested services*

is, and is by the Commission determined to be, the **best** of all proposals received for the performance of Agreement TRM-8C and is accepted; and

"FURTHER RESOLVED that the executive director and director of contracts administration hereby are authorized to execute an Agreement with **Any Domestic Work, Inc., d/b/a A.D.W., Inc.** to furnish janitorial services at the Commission's **Portage and Brady's Leap Service Plazas** under Agreement TRM-8C, for an initial term of **two (2) years commencing May 14, 2006**, with an option to extend the Agreement for no more than five (5), successive one (1) year periods, in the form heretofore prescribed by the Commission pursuant to the aforesaid RFP, and to take any and all action necessary or proper to carry out the terms of said RFP and said Agreement; and

“FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission directs the return of the proposal guaranty provided by all RFP respondents, with their proposal, as soon as said Agreement with Any Domestic Work, Inc., d/b/a A.D.W., Inc. is executed.”

The Chairman said, is there a motion?

Commissioner Dixon moved and Deputy Director Darwish seconded.

The Chairman said, are there any questions?

Commissioner Dixon said, Mr. Pursley, you said A.D.W.’s work was satisfactory. Can you describe satisfactory?

Mr. Pursley said they have done very well. They provide janitorial services at three other service plaza sets and they have done a very good job.

Commissioner Regula said I’d just like to make one comment. From the consumer’s standpoint, the most important thing whether you are on an airplane, in an airport or anywhere else it’s how clean the bathrooms are. There was just a study done recently and the #1 complaint from the consumer was the shape of the bathrooms. So, I think it’s something that people who are getting on the Turnpike, paying their toll, the cleanliness and overall look is very important. I think we need to continue to stress that at our Turnpike.

The Chairman said, if there are no further comments, please call the roll.

The “Resolution Awarding Agreement TRM-8C for Janitorial Services at the Commission’s Portage and Brady’s Leap Service Plazas” was moved for adoption.

Commissioner Dixon said, could I have a copy of the list of companies which we mailed this RFP to?

Mr. Pursley said, yes. We’ll get you a copy before you leave this morning.

Resolution No. 16-2006

WHEREAS, on March 10, 2006, the Commission issued its Request for Proposals (RFP) to furnish janitorial services at the Commission’s **Portage and Brady’s Leap Service Plazas** (*Agreement TRM-8C*) for an initial term of two (2) years, which may be extended for not more than five (5) successive one-year periods; and

WHEREAS, the Commission’s RFP was posted on the Commission’s website, was advertised in five (5) different newspapers and copies of the RFP were mailed to forty-five (45) known cleaning and janitorial service firms; and

WHEREAS, three (3) companies presented proposals to furnish janitorial services at the Commission's Portage and Brady's Leap Service Plazas, which proposals were duly opened on March 31, 2006, as provided in said published notice; and

WHEREAS, an evaluation committee comprised of the deputy executive director, the director of service plaza operations and the eastern division service plaza manager reviewed the proposals submitted and awarded technical scores to each respondent; and

WHEREAS, the Cost Proposals were then unsealed by the Commission's purchasing manager who divided the technical scores awarded by the Cost Proposals submitted in order to identify the "best" cost performance index among the three (3) respondents; and

WHEREAS, as a result of this process, the evaluation committee has recommended that an Agreement be entered into with **Any Domestic Work, Inc., d/b/a A.D.W., Inc.** of Parma, Ohio, which submitted the following price proposal:

<u>Service Plaza</u>	<u>Monthly Per Plaza Fee</u>	<u>Annual Fee</u>	<u>Hourly Rate</u>
*Portage	\$21,795.00	\$261,540.00	\$9.25
Brady's Leap	\$21,795.00	\$261,540.00	\$9.25

** for any added requested services*

WHEREAS, the director of contracts administration advises that: 1) the RFP conforms to the requirements of applicable statutes, 2) due and full consideration has been given to the proposals received, the respondents' qualifications and abilities to perform the required services, and 3) the aforesaid proposals were solicited on the basis of the same terms and conditions with respect to all RFP respondents and potential respondents; and

WHEREAS, the director of contracts administration further advises that Any Domestic Work, Inc., d/b/a A.D.W., Inc. has provided a proposal guaranty and evidence of its ability to provide the required performance bond and insurance as set forth in the RFP, and that the Commission may legally accept said proposal from Any Domestic Work, Inc., d/b/a A.D.W., Inc.; and

WHEREAS, the Commission's director of contracts administration has also reviewed and concurs with the evaluation committee's recommendation of Any Domestic Work, Inc., d/b/a A.D.W., Inc., as reflected in her written report, which report is before the Commission; and

WHEREAS, the executive director has reviewed the evaluation committee's and the director of contracts administration's written recommendations and concurs with the selection of Any Domestic Work, Inc., d/b/a A.D.W., Inc.; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has determined that the proposal submitted by Any Domestic Work, Inc., d/b/a A.D.W., Inc. of Parma, Ohio, is the **best** of all proposals received in response to the advertisement of said RFP.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

RESOLVED that the proposal submitted by **Any Domestic Work, Inc., d/b/a A.D.W., Inc.** of Parma, Ohio, which included the following price proposal:

<u>Service Plaza</u>	<u>Monthly Per Plaza Fee</u>	<u>Annual Fee</u>	<u>Hourly Rate</u>
*Portage	\$21,795.00	\$261,540.00	\$9.25
Brady's Leap	\$21,795.00	\$261,540.00	\$9.25

** for any added requested services*

is, and is by the Commission determined to be, the **best** of all proposals received for the performance of Agreement TRM-8C and is accepted; and

FURTHER RESOLVED that the executive director and director of contracts administration hereby are authorized to execute an Agreement with **Any Domestic Work, Inc., d/b/a A.D.W., Inc.** to furnish janitorial services at the Commission's **Portage and Brady's Leap Service Plazas** under Agreement TRM-8C, for an initial term of **two (2) years commencing May 14, 2006**, with an option to extend the Agreement for no more than five (5), successive one (1) year periods, in the form heretofore prescribed by the Commission pursuant to the aforesaid RFP, and to take any and all action necessary or proper to carry out the terms of said RFP and said Agreement; and

FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission directs the return of the proposal guaranty provided by all RFP respondents, with their proposal, as soon as said Agreement with Any Domestic Work, Inc., d/b/a A.D.W., Inc. is executed.

The resolution was adopted with all Members voting in the affirmative. The resolution was identified as No. 16-2006.

Mr. Pursley said, that completes my report, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman said, Dan Castrigano, our Chief Engineer, do you have some resolutions?

Mr. Castrigano said yes. I have three (3) resolutions for your consideration this morning. The first resolution is awarding Contract No. 40-06-01 for the repainting of eight (8) bridge structures located in Cuyahoga and Summit Counties. This construction project was on the Preliminary Capital Budget that the Commission approved in December. We received five (5) bids in response to the advertisement. The lowest bid was submitted by **Corcon, Inc.** of Lowellville, Ohio in the amount of \$1,771,135.00. The total amount bid is below the Engineer's Estimate, and this Bidder has performed satisfactorily in the past on similar projects. The resolution also contains provisions to assign **Greenman-Pederson** of Akron, Ohio to this contract for performing inspection and testing services.

Would General Counsel please read the Resolved?

General Counsel read the Resolved as follows:

"RESOLVED that the bid of **Corcon, Inc.** of Lowellville, Ohio, in the amount of **\$1,771,135.00**, for the performance of **Contract No. 40-06-01** 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 chairperson 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 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 the Commission hereby authorizes the executive director and the chief engineer to assign **Greenman-Pederson, Inc.** of Akron, Ohio, to Contract No. 40-06-01 for the purpose of performing inspection and testing. Such assignment shall be in accordance with the 2005-2006 General Engineering Services Agreement between the Ohio Turnpike Commission and Greenman-Pederson, Inc.; and

"FURTHER RESOLVED that Project No. 40-06-01 is designated a Fuel Tax Project under the Commission's 1994 Master Trust Agreement."

The Chairman said, is there a motion?

Deputy Director Darwish moved and Commissioner Dixon seconded.

The Chairman said, if there are no questions, please call the roll.

The "Resolution Awarding Contract No. 40-06-01" was moved for adoption.

Resolution No. 17-2006

WHEREAS, the Commission has duly advertised according to law for bids upon a contract for repainting of the following bridges, herein designated **Contract No. 40-06-01**:

<u>Bridge</u>	<u>Milepost</u>	<u>County</u>
Stearns Road	154.6	Cuyahoga
Usher Road	156.1	Cuyahoga
S.R. 252	156.9	Cuyahoga
Exit 161 Ramp Bridge	161.8	Cuyahoga
Barr Rd.	171.6	Summit
Exit 173 Ramp Bridge	173.2	Summit
Boston Mills Rd.	178.0	Summit
Metroparks Bike Path	179.0	Summit
	(end spans only)	
	(Old N.Y.C.R.R.)	

WHEREAS, the Commission received bids from five (5) bidders for the performance of said Contract; and

WHEREAS, said bids have been reviewed and analyzed by the Commission's chief engineer, and he has submitted a report concerning such analysis, which report is before the Commission; and

WHEREAS, the chief engineer reports that the lowest responsive and responsible bid for the performance of Contract No. 40-06-01 was submitted by **Corcon, Inc.** of Lowellville, Ohio in the total amount of **\$1,771,135.00**, which bid is below the engineer's estimate and which bid he recommends be accepted by the Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has also been advised by the director of contracts administration that all bids for Contract No. 40-06-01 were solicited on the basis of the same terms and conditions and the same specifications, that the bid of Corcon, Inc. for Contract No. 40-06-01 conforms to the requirements of Section 5537.07, Section 9.312 and Section 153.54, all of the Ohio Revised Code and that a performance bond with good and sufficient surety has been submitted by Corcon, Inc.; and

WHEREAS, the Commission's executive director has reviewed the reports of the chief engineer and the director of contracts administration and has made his recommendation to the Commission to award Contract No. 40-06-01 to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, Corcon, Inc. predicated upon such analyses; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has duly considered such recommendations.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

RESOLVED that the bid of **Corcon, Inc.** of Lowellville, Ohio, in the amount of **\$1,771,135.00**, for the performance of **Contract No. 40-06-01** 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 chairperson 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 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 the Commission hereby authorizes the executive director and the chief engineer to assign **Greenman-Pederson, Inc.** of Akron, Ohio, to Contract No. 40-06-01 for the purpose of performing inspection and testing. Such assignment shall be in accordance with the 2005-2006 General Engineering Services Agreement between the Ohio Turnpike Commission and Greenman-Pederson, Inc.; and

FURTHER RESOLVED that Project No. 40-06-01 is designated a Fuel Tax Project under the Commission's 1994 Master Trust Agreement.

The resolution was adopted with all Members voting in the affirmative. The resolution was identified as No. 17-2006.

Mr. Castrigano said my next resolution awards Contract No. 59-06-03 for resurfacing of the westbound and eastbound roadways from Milepost 111.2 to 111.75 in Erie County, Ohio. This project was also on the Preliminary Budget approved by the Commission in December. We received two (2) bids in response to this contract. The apparent low bid was submitted by **Gerken Paving, Inc.** of Napoleon, Ohio, in the amount of \$300,468.50. The total amount bid is below the Engineer's Estimate, and this Bidder has performed satisfactorily on similar projects.

The resolution also includes provisions to assign **DLZ Ohio, Inc.** of Cleveland, to perform construction inspection services and **TTL Associates, Inc.** of Toledo, Ohio for performing materials testing services.

Would General Counsel please read the Resolved?

General Counsel read the Resolved as follows:

"RESOLVED that the bid of **Gerken Paving, Inc.** of Napoleon, Ohio, in the amount of **\$300,468.50** for the performance of **Contract No. 59-06-03** 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 chairperson 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 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 the Commission hereby authorizes the executive director and the chief engineer to assign **DLZ Ohio, Inc.** of Cleveland, Ohio to Contract No. 59-06-03 for the purpose of performing construction inspection. Such assignment shall be in accordance with the 2005-2006 General Engineering Services Agreement between the Ohio Turnpike Commission and DLZ Ohio, Inc.; and

“FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission hereby authorizes the executive director and the chief engineer to assign **TTL Associates, Inc.** of Toledo, Ohio, to Contract No. 59-06-03 for the purpose of performing materials testing. Such assignment shall be in accordance with the 2005-2006 General Engineering Services Agreement between the Ohio Turnpike Commission and TTL Associates, Inc.; and

“FURTHER RESOLVED that Project No. 59-06-03 is designated a System Project under the Commission’s 1994 Master Trust Agreement.”

General Counsel said, I made a correction to the draft resolution in the second paragraph, i.e., inserted DLZ, Ohio instead of TTL Associates, Inc. which was incorrectly typed in the draft resolution. This correction will be incorporated in the final numbered resolution.

The Chairman said, is there a motion?

Commissioner Dixon moved and Commissioner Regula seconded.

Commissioner Regula said, Dan, this is a ½ mile stretch of the road. What happened that this work needed to be done for this ½ mile?

Mr. Castrigano said, the way the past projects fell with the third-lane construction, these are the two existing lanes prior to the third-lane which was being constructed. We had another project that was going on, and it was going to be resurfaced adjacent to this the last time, but we couldn’t fit it in. We are picking up a section that has not been resurfaced in about ten (10) years.

Chairman Balog said, thanks Dan. If there are no other questions, please call the roll.

The “Resolution Awarding Contract No. 59-06-03” was moved for adoption.

Resolution No. 18-2006

WHEREAS, the Commission has duly advertised according to law for bids upon a contract for repairs and resurfacing of the westbound and eastbound lanes of the Ohio Turnpike from Milepost 111.20 to Milepost 111.75 in Erie County, Ohio, herein designated **Contract No. 59-06-03**; and

WHEREAS, the Commission received bids from two (2) bidders for the performance of said Contract; and

WHEREAS, said bids have been reviewed and analyzed by the Commission's chief engineer, and he has submitted a report concerning such analysis, which report is before the Commission; and

WHEREAS, the chief engineer reports that the lowest responsive and responsible bid for the performance of Contract No. 59-06-03 was submitted by **Gerken Paving, Inc.** of Napoleon, Ohio in the total amount of **\$300,468.50**, which bid is below the engineer's estimate and which bid he recommends be accepted by the Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has also been advised by the director of contracts administration that all bids for Contract No. 59-06-03 were solicited on the basis of the same terms and conditions and the same specifications, that the bid of Gerken Paving, Inc. for Contract No. 59-06-03 conforms to the requirements of Section 5537.07, Section 9.312 and Section 153.54, all of the Ohio Revised Code and that a performance bond with good and sufficient surety has been submitted by Gerken Paving, Inc.; and

WHEREAS, the Commission's executive director has reviewed the reports of the chief engineer and the director of contracts administration and has made his recommendation to the Commission to award Contract No. 59-06-03 to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, Gerken Paving, Inc. predicated upon such analyses; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has duly considered such recommendations.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

RESOLVED that the bid of **Gerken Paving, Inc.** of Napoleon, Ohio, in the amount of **\$300,468.50** for the performance of **Contract No. 59-06-03** 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 chairperson 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

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 the Commission hereby authorizes the executive director and the chief engineer to assign **DLZ Ohio, Inc.** of Cleveland, Ohio to Contract No. 59-06-03 for the purpose of performing construction inspection. Such assignment shall be in accordance with the 2005-2006 General Engineering Services Agreement between the Ohio Turnpike Commission and DLZ Ohio, Inc.; and

FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission hereby authorizes the executive director and the chief engineer to assign **TTL Associates, Inc.** of Toledo, Ohio, to Contract No. 59-06-03 for the purpose of performing materials testing. Such assignment shall be in accordance with the 2005-2006 General Engineering Services Agreement between the Ohio Turnpike Commission and TTL Associates, Inc.; and

FURTHER RESOLVED that Project No. 59-06-03 is designated a System Project under the Commission's 1994 Master Trust Agreement.

The resolution was adopted with all Members voting in the affirmative. It was numbered No. 18-2006.

Mr. Castrigano said my final resolution this morning relates to the award of Contract No. 77-06-01 for third-lane construction from Milepost 64.13 to 71.05 in Wood County. This project was on the Preliminary Capital Budget that the Commission approved in December. You will recall at the March meeting we rejected this contract. We did some revisions to the specifications and re-advertised. We received two (2) bids for the performance of the work. The apparent low bid was submitted by **The Shelly Company** of Findlay, Ohio in the total amount of \$34,693,527.91. The total amount bid is within 0.3% of the Engineer's Estimate, and this Bidder has performed satisfactorily in the past on similar projects for the Commission.

This resolution also contains provisions to assign **TTL Associates, Inc.** of Toledo, Ohio for the purpose of performing materials testing services. You will note that the Commission has not included inspection services as part of this resolution. In 1995 **URS, Inc.** of Akron, Ohio was awarded a contract to provide third-lane program management services to the Commission for third-lane projects.

I recommend that the Commission award this contract to The Shelly Company.

Would the General Counsel please read the Resolved?

“RESOLVED that the bid of **The Shelly Company** of Findlay, Ohio, in the amount of **\$34,693,527.91**, for the performance of **Contract No. 77-06-01** 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 chairperson 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 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 the Commission hereby authorizes the executive director and the chief engineer to assign **TTL Associates, Inc.** of Toledo, Ohio, to Contract No. 77-06-01 for the purpose of performing materials testing. Such assignment shall be in accordance with the 2005-2006 General Engineering Services Agreement between the Ohio Turnpike Commission and TTL Associates, Inc.; and

“FURTHER RESOLVED that Project No. 77-06-01 is designated a System Project under the Commission’s 1994 Master Trust Agreement.”

The Chairman said, is there a motion?

Commissioner Dixon moved and Commissioner Regula seconded.

The Chairman said, are there any questions or comments on the motion before the Commission?

The Chairman said, I’d like to make a quick comment. I certainly appreciate the issue we’re at from an economic standpoint. This is a \$35 million project over the next two (2) years, a significant expenditure. But, when you look at the density and the mileage, and you look at that section from Milepost 64 to 71, you can see a very definitive break in the traffic to the west, but this area is very heavily used by trucks, and it compares with the third or fourth busiest section of the road – sometimes the fifth busiest section of the road in comparison to all the other sections. I know from a personal consumer standpoint when you get into an area where it’s two (2) lanes or significant trucks, it causes you significant back-up. I will be supporting this particular issue.

The Chairman said, please call the roll.

The “Resolution Awarding Contract No. 77-06-01” was moved for adoption.

Resolution No. 19-2006

WHEREAS, the Commission has duly re-advertised according to law for bids upon a contract for third-lane construction from Milepost 64.13 to 71.05

located in Wood County, Ohio, (including safety upgrading and widening of bridges within the construction zone) herein designated **Contract No. 77-06-01**; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has received bids from two (2) bidders for the performance of said Contract; and

WHEREAS, said bids have been reviewed and analyzed by the Commission's chief engineer, and he has submitted a report concerning such analysis, which report is before the Commission; and

WHEREAS, the chief engineer reports that the lowest responsive and responsible bid for the performance of Contract No. 77-06-01 was submitted by **The Shelly Company** of Findlay, Ohio in the total amount of **\$34,693,527.91**, which bid he recommends be accepted by the Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has also been advised by the director of contracts administration that all bids for Contract No. 77-06-01 were solicited on the basis of the same terms and conditions and the same specifications, that the bid of The Shelly Company for Contract No. 77-06-01 conforms to the requirements of Section 5537.07, Section 9.312 and Section 153.54, all of the Ohio Revised Code and that a performance bond with good and sufficient surety has been submitted by The Shelly Company; and

WHEREAS, the Commission's executive director has reviewed the reports of the chief engineer and the director of contracts administration and has made his recommendation to the Commission to award Contract No. 77-06-01 to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, The Shelly Company, predicated upon such analyses; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has duly considered such recommendations.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

RESOLVED that the bid of **The Shelly Company** of Findlay, Ohio, in the amount of **\$34,693,527.91**, for the performance of **Contract No. 77-06-01** 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 chairperson 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 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 the Commission hereby authorizes the executive director and the chief engineer to assign **TTL Associates, Inc.** of

Toledo, Ohio, to Contract No. 77-06-01 for the purpose of performing materials testing. Such assignment shall be in accordance with the 2005-2006 General Engineering Services Agreement between the Ohio Turnpike Commission and TTL Associates, Inc.; and

FURTHER RESOLVED that Project No. 77-06-01 is designated a System Project under the Commission's 1994 Master Trust Agreement.

The resolution was adopted with the following Members voting in the affirmative:

- Mr. Dixon, Mr. Regula and Mr. Balog.
- Deputy Director Darwish voted nay.

The resolution was identified as No. 19-2006.

Mr. Castrigano said that concludes my report, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman said, we'll continue with the staff reports. Noelle Tsevdos, General Counsel, do you have a report?

Ms. Tsevdos said, no report, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman said Mr. Steiner, CFO, do you have a report?

Mr. Steiner said I'd like to give you an update on our traffic and revenue for the first quarter. This chart shows the passenger car miles traveled on the Ohio Turnpike over the past two (2) years. Passenger car miles traveled in 2005 were 2.8% below the level reached in 2004. We did see some improvement this January and February due to the mild winter weather. However, passenger car miles traveled in the month of March were 4.4% below the level reached last year. This decline can be attributed to the fact that Easter fell in March last year and in April this year. With rising fuel prices the trend for passenger car traffic this year remains somewhat uncertain. Fortunately, the continued vitality of the national economy helped increase March commercial vehicle miles traveled 9.4% beyond the level reached last year. This bar chart shows the year-to-date miles traveled. Passenger car miles traveled during the first quarter of 2006 were 0.8% higher than last year while miles traveled by commercial vehicles were up 9.6%.

With Easter falling in April this year, the revenues from passenger cars were down 4.4% in March compared to 2005. With the continued strength in the economy and the same toll rates as in 2005, the revenues from commercial vehicles were up 9.4% in March in comparison to last year.

This chart shows year-to-date toll revenues through the month of March for each year of the decade. Toll revenues for passenger cars during the first three months of 2006 were up 0.6% from last year and revenues from commercial vehicles were up 9.9%. Total toll revenues during the first quarter of this year were up 6.3% in comparison to last year.

This chart shows our total revenues from all sources through the month of March for the last seven (7) years including ODOT's purchase of excess capacity amounting to \$1.3 million per month. Our total revenues for the first three (3) months of this year were \$3.2 million or 6.9% higher than those from last year. And without the capacity purchase from ODOT, our total revenues would have been \$700,000 or 1.5% lower than those from the first quarter of calendar year 2000.

This report shows the year-to-date revenues, expenditures and transfers for our General Fund. Due primarily to the increased commercial traffic, our revenues for the first quarter of the year were \$2.9 million or 6.3% higher than budgeted. However, we do remain concerned about the impact that rising fuel prices may have on the traffic the remainder of the year particularly during the peak travel season this summer.

As a result of the very mild winter weather our total expenditures including debt service payments were \$3.6 million or 8.4% lower than the amount budgeted. After paying our operating expenses and our debt service, the balance of the revenue is used to fund our 2006 capital expenditures. That completes my report, Mr. Chairman. I'll be happy to respond to any questions.

The Chairman said, thanks, Jim. Any report from our financial advisor, Eric Erickson?

Mr. Erickson said, no report, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman said, is there a report from HNTB, our general consultant?

Mr. Yacobucci said, we have started our annual inspections of the Turnpike facilities. We have completed 100% of the bridges across the 241-miles and approximately 40% of the culverts. We have not done any of the roadway, sign inspections or actual facility inspections. Those are planned for the near future. We are currently working on the Old State Route 8 Bridge over the Turnpike and when we finish that we will follow-up with the Cuyahoga River Bridge and do the in-depth inspection. That completes my report, Mr. Chairman. Are there any questions?

The Chairman said, Capt. Hannay from the OSHP, do you have a report?

Captain Hannay said since last month's meeting, I have to report a fatality. We had a pedestrian under the influence of alcohol killed in the area of Milepost 189, in the Hiram area. It was a very unfortunate set of circumstances. However, that is the only fatality we had over the past month.

We had three (3) significant drug seizures in the last month – actually within a one (1) week time period. Troopers seized almost 700 pounds of marijuana, 220 pounds earmarked for Hershey, Pennsylvania out east and 463 earmarked for the Cleveland area out west. Shortly after that, within the week, 49 pounds of cocaine earmarked for the Cleveland area was seized. So our troopers remain active in our criminal patrol diligence.

Over the last month we had five (5) significant overweight commercial overweight violations by significant 20,000 pounds or more that troopers have been able to apprehend and stop from using the Ohio Turnpike. Again, officers remain diligent in their efforts to stop the overweight trucks from using the Turnpike. That concludes my report, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman said, thank you, Captain. Any questions?

Deputy Director Darwish said the overweight trucks, do you haul them on the Turnpike until they unload or do you put them on another local system?

Captain Hannay said the federal mandates for us are, once we identify it as being illegal, it is not allowed to move. It has to be made legal. We have a three (3) mile radius in which to weigh that vehicle. We try to get to a service plaza or ramp at a toll plaza to get it weighed. That way the company can provide another vehicle off-load and make the load legal before it's allowed to proceed.

Commissioner Regula asked, are we at the Turnpike, continuing to pursue increasing the fines for these overweight vehicles? Or, what's the process?

Director Suhadolnik said I probably should refer this question to Senator Armbruster. We are attempting, although it would appear that there isn't a lot of support. Is that a correct statement, Senator?

Senator Armbruster said, yes. We are continuing to advocate raising the current fine, which I believe is \$100. We'd like to raise it to what the normal fee is for anybody else driving the interstate. Working with OSHP, I'm not sure where it stands now. At the present time, the fine stays at \$100.

Commissioner Regula said, what's the push back from doing that? I don't think there is enough incentive for them at a \$100 fine. That's a chance many of them are willing to take because they are getting that back in payload.

Senator Armbruster said, let's just say we are working on it. Regarding the push-back, it's just a matter of going through the process.

Commissioner Regula said what would the fine be on a state route?

Captain Hannay said the fines under Ohio Revised Code 5577 are mandated by weight. For every 100 pounds over the allowed gross weight, there is a \$1 fee up to a certain amount. Then it increases up to a 1,000 pounds over and then it increases again in increments of \$1 or \$2 per 100 pounds until it builds. For instance, recently this year we had a 163,000 pound load that was stopped and that fine would have been in the area of \$2,400 under the Ohio Revised Code.

Commissioner Regula said the fine would be \$2,400 on a state route, but only \$100 on the Turnpike, correct?

Captain Hannay said, yes. Our officers also cite them for toll evasion, too which is again a \$100 fine. We are doing everything we can to deter the use or the attempt to use the Ohio Turnpike. Unfortunately, the fine is low.

The Chairman said, thank you, Captain. He said, I skipped over Frank Lamb, our trustee. Mr. Lamb, do you have a report?

Mr. Lamb said no, report, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Balog said, if there is no further business, I'll accept a motion to adjourn. There is no meeting set for May as we have been advised by the staff that there will not be a requirement for a May meeting. Our next regularly scheduled meeting would be Monday, June 19th. I have a personal conflict on that particular date, and I checked with the other Commission Members and **June 26th** seems to work well for most of the Commission Members. Let's tentatively pencil in that date for our next Commission Meeting, Monday, June 26th at 10:00 a.m.

Deputy Director Darwish said, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to set up a meeting as we have an outstanding issue on the funding of the S. R. 8 project between ODOT and the Turnpike. We would like to talk about it later, but just for the record, I'd like to set up a meeting to discuss the finances.

The Chairman said, are you suggesting that we need to schedule a separate meeting or add it to the Agenda for our June 26th meeting.

The Chairman said, we will discuss that issue at our June 26th meeting. That's the commitment for the Turnpike's funding for the interchange section of the Route 8 upgrade.

Deputy Director Darwish said, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman said, anything further?

Senator Armbruster said, I have a question on the cars and the OSHP. What happens to the vehicle after the drug seizures? Does that go back to the local jurisdiction, too?

Captain Hannay said we do a title search on the vehicle. If the vehicle is owned by the violator, we can initiate either under state law forfeiture of asset or seizure of that asset or, under federal law, seizure of that asset. A lot of things play into that. For example, what type of vehicle is it, and what amount of lien is left on that vehicle? If the vehicle is owned out-right and it is a usable vehicle, the Ohio Dept. of Administrative Services does provide if we seize those assets, that vehicle can be used for law enforcement purposes. There are some strict rules in regard to how many vehicles we are allowed to seize like that and use like that. Because of the money that goes against our allotment of vehicles as a division, so we reduce our fleet by one that the State would buy us in use of that seized vehicle. So we just can't seize them and sell them because a lot of these vehicles have hidden compartments and they are considered contraband by Ohio law so they are either destroyed or they are not seized at all. Some go to the wrecker operators where they are allowed to sell for salvage so they get some return on their energy and effort towing the vehicles for us. A lot of these vehicles are not worth keeping. A Ford Excursion would cost 8 miles per gallon in gasoline. It's not worth us trying to seize that asset to use for law enforcement purposes. It's too costly.

Deputy Director Darwish said, so you can pick and choose which cars to keep.

Captain Hannay said we have to look at it intelligently and smartly and as the public would look at that. How would it look if troopers are driving around in cars like that? Some of the cars we seize that are compliments of a drug-enforcement arrest we'll use for public relations. We'll show them to students in schools or we'll take them to job fairs and things like that and show the communities the efforts the troopers are doing out on the highways. A lot of these vehicles are not worth taking to be honest. They are mechanically sound, but they are older cars. They have hidden compartments. Major Born would be able to provide you with a volume of information regarding assets like that.

Senator Armbruster said thank you, Captain. I'd like to add that it is my understanding now that the OSHP is now positively in favor of raising the fees for overweight vehicles on the Turnpike.

Captain Hannay said absolutely. Under the Ohio Revised Code, the punishment meets the crime – so to speak. It is no longer an incentive for a driver to try to get an extra truckload of commodities to his destination because the pay-off is not going to remedy what he would pay if he gets stopped.

Commissioner Regula said my other concern is you start adding 20,000 pounds of what should be an 80,000 pound vehicle and your stopping distance has increased dramatically. It makes a big difference, and you are putting people at risk who are traveling the Turnpike.

Captain Hannay said, absolutely.

Senator Armbruster said, Mr. Chairman, based on this discussion, we'll pursue it further.

The Chairman said, we appreciate it very much. Motion to adjourn?

Deputy Director Darwish moves to adjourn and Commissioner Regula seconds.

The Chairman said, please call the roll.

All Members voted in the affirmative to adjourn.

Time of adjournment was 11:59 a.m.

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

George F. Dixon, Secretary-Treasurer