DATE July 7, 1960

FROM: William H. Phillips

TO: William L. Dunkle

COPIES TO

OFFICE COMMUNICATION

FLORIDA STATE ROAD DEPARTMENT

SUBJECT: Proposed Extension of Turnpike

In regard to the proposed agreement covering the extension of the turnpike, my chief concern is with paragraph 4 (XV)(page 4).

Under this paragraph the State must satisfy the company that no roads would be constructed which would adversely affect revenues from the extension. I believe this language is entirely and unnecessarily too broad. You are familiar with the detailed discussions the Road Board has had with the Turnpike Authority covering the commitments necessary from the Road Board to make the extension feasible. I see no reason why these commitments could not be precisely identified in this agreement.

Paragraph 4(j), in effect, could give the company a large amount of authority over the future road development of the State. I believe this is entirely inconsistent with the Road Department's responsibilities and, as I stated, is not at all necessary to the consummation of the agreement.

WHP:jl

fyi

This is not intended to be an analysis of the agreement but simply something which might be useful if you talk to Mr. Swanson - I therefore limit comment to the effect of the agreement on the SRD but as you know, my feelings go much further.