

## Task Force Meeting #7: Draft High-Level Needs Worksheet\*

As Presented at Meeting 6	Member Comments from Meeting 6	Revised Language for Review at Meeting 7	For Future Discussion
<p>1. Support anticipated statewide and regional population and economic growth</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommends that population growth be determined by local Comprehensive Plans rather than statewide regional growth and further recommends that this need is more specific and states that there is an advanced effort for easements and conservation and impart a connection with local plans and urgency.</li> <li>• Does not believe comprehensive plans should be referenced in the Guiding Principles but specify that the M-CORES program will go through an iterative process with local governments regarding amendments or updates to Comprehensive Plans.</li> <li>• Comprehensive Plan amendment process is an iterative process because it would change development patterns to accommodate and mitigate the corridors.</li> </ul>	<p>1. Support <del>anticipated</del> <u>projected</u> statewide and regional population and economic growth, <del>consistent with local comprehensive plans</del></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistency with local government comprehensive plans discussed in guiding principles.</li> <li>• Sources for population and economic growth estimates discussed in needs evaluation text.</li> </ul>
<p>2. Improve connectivity through access to a high speed, high capacity transportation corridor for people and commercial goods</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider demand projections, capacity needs, and safety needs.</li> <li>• Incorporate autonomous and connected vehicles into modeling process.</li> <li>• Can we look at segments of I-75 and I-95 and determine trip origin and destinations?</li> <li>• Clarify this project can act as a relief valve for I-75 and include other benefits (broadband, utilities, multimodality, etc.)</li> <li>• No need for a road parallel to the Turnpike. From an environmental/land use standpoint, we do not want development like on US 19 near Port Richey (Pasco County). US 19 will slowly be developed with strip malls, and M-CORES needs to find a way to deal with a co-located corridor on US 19.</li> </ul>	<p>2. Improve <u>safety, mobility, and</u> connectivity through access to a high speed, high capacity transportation corridor for people and commercial goods</p>	<p><u>Needs evaluation text in draft report discusses how many of these considerations will be addressed moving forward.</u></p>

## Task Force Meeting #7: Draft High-Level Needs Worksheet\*

As Presented at Meeting 6	Member Comments from Meeting 6	Revised Language for Review at Meeting 7	For Future Discussion
3. Protect, restore, enhance, and connect public and private environmentally sensitive areas, natural resources, and ecosystems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggested the term “natural resources” was too vague/irrelevant as used in this High-Level Need.</li> </ul>	3. Protect, restore, enhance, and connect public and private environmentally sensitive areas, <del>natural resources,</del> and ecosystems	
4. Enhance safety for all transportation users	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It feels like we are downplaying that this project will give southbound travelers an additional option. Suggests it reads as: “enhance travel options and safety for all transportation users.”</li> </ul>	4. Enhance <u>travel options and safety</u> for all transportation users	
5. Enhance emergency management at the local, regional, and state levels		5. Enhance emergency management at the local, regional, and state levels	
6. Improve access to ecotourism and recreational assets		6. Improve access to ecotourism and recreational assets	
7. Enhance workforce development, access to education, and job creation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggested the need should read “Enhance economic and workforce development...”</li> </ul>	7. Enhance <u>economic and workforce development</u> , access to education, and job creation	

\*Numbering of High-Level Needs are for reference only and do not represent any priority order.

## Task Force Meeting #7: Draft High-Level Needs Worksheet\*

As Presented at Meeting 6	Member Comments from Meeting 6	Revised Language for Review at Meeting 7	For Future Discussion
<p>8. Improve connectivity to agricultural businesses, manufacturing, warehousing, freight terminals, and intermodal logistics centers</p>		<p>8. Improve connectivity to agricultural businesses, manufacturing, warehousing, freight terminals, and intermodal logistics centers</p>	
<p>9. Expand rural broadband infrastructure and access to broadband service</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Telework is important and if it is an accelerating trend, we need to take this and changes in technology into consideration looking forward to 2030.</li> <li>• Given COVID, demand for virtual workers may change the transportation needs of the future and to keep these trends in mind throughout discussion.</li> </ul>	<p>9. Expand rural broadband infrastructure and access to broadband service</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Needs evaluation text in draft report discusses how these considerations will be addressed moving forward</u></li> </ul>
<p>10. Preserve and improve the character and quality of communities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Co-location should be discussed and is important for inclusion but does not necessarily need to be in the High-Level Needs discussion.</li> <li>• Revised to specify “rural character” per member comment.</li> </ul>	<p>10. Preserve and improve the <u>rural</u> character and quality of communities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilitators noted this is included in Guiding Principles; and/or could be included in Instructions.</li> </ul>

\*Numbering of High-Level Needs are for reference only and do not represent any priority order.