

From: tmailhot@frontier.com
To: [Chris Eggen](#); [Jesse Salomon](#); [Doris McConnell](#); [Chris Roberts](#)
Cc: [Tom McCormick](#); [Margaret King](#); [Shari Winstead](#); [Keith McGlashan](#); [Will Hall](#); [Debbie Tarry](#)
Subject: Amendment to put tolling study in the 2016 budget
Date: Tuesday, November 17, 2015 10:53:55 PM

I wasn't able to attend the Council meeting on Monday but I watched the meeting online today and I want to thank Council Members Eggen, Salomon, McConnell, and Roberts for your support for the amendment to fund a tolling study.

During the discussion there was some confusion about whether the study should be specific to Richmond Beach Drive or a more general study for the entire city. As several of you pointed out, it actually makes more sense and will certainly cost less to make the study specifically about Richmond Beach Drive; this specific study is needed next year because it is in response to a development permit application for Point Wells that could result in more than 15,000 additional vehicle trips on our city streets and the City needs to understand the full range of options for dealing with the resulting extra wear and tear on our roads. The City's Financial Analysis of Annexation for Point Wells is very specific about what the annexation study area is. Tolling is an potential option for the City if annexation cannot be achieved, so the tolling study needs to be just as specific about what tolling locations are included in the study.

I am also concerned that the money allocated to the study will be wasted if the study is not focused on some key issues that may be unique to this situation. The study needs to answer a very specific question: can tolling be a useful tool to raise funds to pay for the additional street maintenance costs caused by development at Point Wells. The local Richmond Beach residents who are members of the neighborhood's Point Wells Study Group have spent much time thinking about how tolling might work and would welcome a chance to meet with City staff prior to the study to help make sure the focus is narrowed as much as possible.

The City staff has so far relied on negotiating an agreement with the developer to take care of the additional road maintenance costs, but there's no guarantee that the negotiation process will result in an agreement. The City would not meet the due diligence standard if it did not understand what other options were available prior to making any decision about whether to accept an offer from the developer. The last thing the City should want is to be presented an offer from the developer and feel pressured to accept it because the City did not understand if there were other options that might work better for the City.

Thanks you again for expressing your support for this amendment.

Tom Mailhot