

<b>TASK FORCE MEMBER NAME</b>	Kent Wimmer
<b>REPORT SECTION</b>	Environmental Characteristics
<b>REPORT PAGE(S)</b>	8
<b>LINE(S)</b>	9
<b>PROPOSED REVISION</b> <i>(Please include text in track changes mode or clearly indicate original text and proposed substitution)</i>	Insert the following National Wildlife Refuges that are within the study area: "...Lower Suwannee National Wildlife Refuge, Cedar Keys National Wildlife Refuge, Chassahowitzka National Wildlife Refuge, Crystal River National Wildlife Refuge..."
<b>ADDITIONAL NOTES FROM PROPOSER</b> <i>(Use this space to provide a rationale for the proposed amendments or to provide general direction to staff to work on alternative language)</i>	For this change is requested to identify all the National Wildlife Refuges within the study area by name.
<b>Section Below for Staff Use</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM STAFF</b>	<a href="#">P.8, Line 11 (9.28.20 MS Word Version)</a>

<b>TASK FORCE MEMBER NAME</b>	Bradley Arnold
<b>REPORT SECTION</b>	Economic Characteristics
<b>REPORT PAGE(S)</b>	11
<b>LINE(S)</b>	4-8
<b>PROPOSED REVISION</b> <i>(Please include text in track changes mode or clearly indicate original text and proposed substitution)</i>	<p>Sumter County has a concentration of economic development activity at the Northern Turnpike Corridor terminus with I-75. West of the interchange activity areas, the properties are rural residential, preservation, and agriculture in use.</p> <p>Citrus County has a concentration of economic development activity along SR 44 from Inverness to Crystal River at US 19. There is also an Opportunity Zone and an extensive area of industrial and commercial-zoned land located off US 41, SR 200, and CR 491 west of Holder in Citrus County.</p>
<b>ADDITIONAL NOTES FROM PROPOSER</b> <i>(Use this space to provide a rationale for the proposed amendments or to provide general direction to staff to work on alternative language)</i>	<p>The prior bullet point lumped two different counties in divergent land uses. The Villages® development is not west of the task force study area and should not be represented in this section of the report.</p>
<b>Section Below for Staff Use</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM STAFF</b>	

<b>TASK FORCE MEMBER NAME</b>	Paul Owens
<b>REPORT SECTION</b>	Introduction and Overview
<b>REPORT PAGE(S)</b>	Page 2
<b>LINE(S)</b>	Insert at line 9
<b>PROPOSED REVISION</b> <i>(Please include text in track changes mode or clearly indicate original text and proposed substitution)</i>	Due to the early stage of planning for this corridor and the limited data and analysis on potential need and impacts at this time, the Task Force was not able to fully address its charge of evaluating the need for and impacts of the Northern Turnpike Corridor. <u>The Task Force directed FDOT to establish at least a preliminary determination of transportation need and financial feasibility before proceeding with the PD&amp;E process.</u>
<b>ADDITIONAL NOTES FROM PROPOSER</b> <i>(Use this space to provide a rationale for the proposed amendments or to provide general direction to staff to work on alternative language)</i>	This comes closer to fulfilling the legislative mandate from the M-CORES statute.
<b>Section Below for Staff Use</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM STAFF</b>	Action Plan discusses evaluating needs and conducting a high-level analysis of potential costs and funding approaches as part of the planning process (pages 29-30).

<b>TASK FORCE MEMBER NAME</b>	Zach Prusak
<b>REPORT SECTION</b>	Introduction and Overview
<b>REPORT PAGE(S)</b>	2
<b>LINE(S)</b>	11-14
<b>PROPOSED REVISION</b> <i>(Please include text in track changes mode or clearly indicate original text and proposed substitution)</i>	The Task Force did not reach a conclusion based on the information available at this time that there is a specific need for a completely new greenfield corridor on land through the study area to achieve the statutory purpose-- <u>nor did the task force reach a conclusion that there is need for expansion of existing highways or facilities through the study area.</u>
<b>ADDITIONAL NOTES FROM PROPOSER</b> <i>(Use this space to provide a rationale for the proposed amendments or to provide general direction to staff to work on alternative language)</i>	As need has not been determined at the Task Force stage, the Task Force cannot make conclusions about the specific need for particular facilities whether greenfield or expansion of existing facilities.
<b>Section Below for Staff Use</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM STAFF</b>	See similar amendment proposed for page 14.

<b>TASK FORCE MEMBER NAME</b>	Kent Wimmer
<b>REPORT SECTION</b>	Introduction and Overview
<b>REPORT PAGE(S)</b>	Page 2
<b>LINE(S)</b>	Line 21
<b>PROPOSED REVISION</b> <i>(Please include text in track changes mode or clearly indicate original text and proposed substitution)</i>	In completing this report, the Task Force’s <b>charge was</b> intent is to provide consensus recommendations for how FDOT can work with local governments and other agencies and partners to carry out the M-CORES Program as specified in s. 338.2278, F.S. Consensus on the report does not constitute agreement by <b>individual</b> all Task Force members that at this phase in program delivery, project-specific needs or environmental and economic feasibility are fully developed. Rather, the report is intended to provide consensus recommendations for how needs should be evaluated and how <b>potential</b> corridor development and related activities should move forward to implement the statute and support the environment, quality of life, and prosperity of the study area and the state.
<b>ADDITIONAL NOTES FROM PROPOSER</b> <i>(Use this space to provide a rationale for the proposed amendments or to provide general direction to staff to work on alternative language)</i>	Concerning “charge was”: FDOT and facilitators charged the task forces with striving to reach consensus recommendations. As explained on p. 1, lines 24-27, the statute directed FDOT to convene a Task Force for each corridor as an inclusive, consensus-building mechanism comprised of representatives....  Concerning “individual”: This amendment is requested to eliminate the connotation that the majority of Task Force members agree that “project-specific needs or environmental and economic feasibility are fully developed.”  Concerning “potential”: this addition is necessary as other sections of the report referred to “potential corridors” and to reflect that no decisions have been made at this time regarding specific M-CORES projects.
<b>Section Below for Staff Use</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM STAFF</b>	<a href="#">P.2, Lines 21-28 (9.28.20 MS Word Version)</a>  See similar amendment proposed for page 14.

<b>TASK FORCE MEMBER NAME</b>	Kent Wimmer
<b>REPORT SECTION</b>	Task Force Overview: Meetings
<b>REPORT PAGE(S)</b>	3
<b>LINE(S)</b>	Lines 8-33
<b>PROPOSED REVISION</b> <i>(Please include text in track changes mode or clearly indicate original text and proposed substitution)</i>	The Task Force met 13 times between August 2019 and October 2020 through nine Task Force meetings and four webinars or virtual meetings. Over the course of 15 months, the Task Force reviewed data, trends, and issues; discussed key considerations for planning <b>potential</b> transportation corridors, including specific issues as identified in Florida Statute (see box); and received and reviewed public input. Subject matter experts joined the Task Force meetings to provide information related to specific aspects of the Task Force’s charge, including community planning, economic and workforce development, agriculture, environmental resources, broadband and utilities, emerging technology, and emergency management. The Task Force developed specific recommendations related to identifying and evaluating high-level needs <b>associated</b> to the statutory purpose, as well as guiding principles and instructions for <b>advancing potential</b> corridor development and related activities to help <b>accomplish</b> these needs, as documented in subsequent sections of this report. The Task Force also recommended an action plan for moving forward.
<b>ADDITIONAL NOTES FROM PROPOSER</b> <i>(Use this space to provide a rationale for the proposed amendments or to provide general direction to staff to work on alternative language)</i>	Concerning “potential”: this addition is necessary as other sections of the report referred to “potential corridors” and to reflect that no decisions have been made at this time regarding specific M-CORES projects.
<b>Section Below for Staff Use</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM STAFF</b>	The highlighted words above don’t reflect the current version of the report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “associated” should be “related”</li> <li>• “accomplish” should be “address”</li> </ul>

<b>TASK FORCE MEMBER NAME</b>	Paul Owens
<b>REPORT SECTION</b>	Recommendations/Approach and Framework
<b>REPORT PAGE(S)</b>	Page 14
<b>LINE(S)</b>	Insert at line 9
<b>PROPOSED REVISION</b> <i>(Please include text in track changes mode or clearly indicate original text and proposed substitution)</i>	<del>Since the Task Force process was designed to occur prior to the corridor planning process, The Task Force did not was not able to review data on nor to discuss every potential impact of the corridor in detail.</del>
<b>ADDITIONAL NOTES FROM PROPOSER</b> <i>(Use this space to provide a rationale for the proposed amendments or to provide general direction to staff to work on alternative language)</i>	We do not accept the excuse for this failure to fulfill the Task Force's mandate.
<b>Section Below for Staff Use</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM STAFF</b>	Recommend minor editorial changes: "The Task Force did not review data on nor discuss every potential impact of the corridor in detail."

<b>TASK FORCE MEMBER NAME</b>	Kent Wimmer
<b>REPORT SECTION</b>	Recommendations – Approach and Framework
<b>REPORT PAGE(S)</b>	14
<b>LINE(S)</b>	Lines 26 - 33
<b>PROPOSED REVISION</b> <i>(Please include text in track changes mode or clearly indicate original text and proposed substitution)</i>	In completing this report, the Task Force’s <u>charge was</u> intent is to provide consensus recommendations for how FDOT can work with <u>local governments and</u> other agencies and partners to carry out the M-CORES Program as specified in s. 338.2278, F.S. Consensus on the report does not constitute agreement by <u>individual</u> all Task Force members that at this phase in program delivery, project-specific needs or environmental and economic feasibility are fully developed. Rather, the report is intended to provide consensus recommendations for how needs should be evaluated and how <u>potential</u> corridor development and related activities should move forward to implement the statute and support the environment, quality of life, and prosperity of the study area and the state.
<b>ADDITIONAL NOTES FROM PROPOSER</b> <i>(Use this space to provide a rationale for the proposed amendments or to provide general direction to staff to work on alternative language)</i>	As this paragraph is the same as in the Introduction and Overview section, the same changes are recommended to be made in this paragraph.  Concerning “charge was”: FDOT and facilitators charged the task forces with striving to reach consensus recommendations. As explained on p. 1, lines 24-27, the statute directed FDOT to convene a Task Force for each corridor as an inclusive, consensus-building mechanism comprised of representatives....  Concerning “individual”: This amend is requested to eliminate the connotation that the majority of Task Force members agree that “project-specific needs or environmental and economic feasibility are fully developed.”  Concerning “potential”: this addition is necessary as other sections of the report referred to “potential corridors” and to reflect that no decisions have been made at this time regarding specific M-CORES projects.
<b>Section Below for Staff Use</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM STAFF</b>	See similar amendment proposed for page 2.  The highlighted words above don’t reflect the current version of the report (local governments are mentioned on P. 2 but not on P. 14)

<b>TASK FORCE MEMBER NAME</b>	Zach Prusak
<b>REPORT SECTION</b>	Approach and Framework
<b>REPORT PAGE(S)</b>	14
<b>LINE(S)</b>	28-31
<b>PROPOSED REVISION</b> <i>(Please include text in track changes mode or clearly indicate original text and proposed substitution)</i>	Consensus on the report does not constitute agreement by all Task Force members that at this phase in program delivery, project-specific needs or environmental and economic feasibility are fully developed <u>or that specific corridor projects should be constructed.</u>
<b>ADDITIONAL NOTES FROM PROPOSER</b> <i>(Use this space to provide a rationale for the proposed amendments or to provide general direction to staff to work on alternative language)</i>	Clarifies that Task Force has not agreed on any specific corridor projects.
<b>Section Below for Staff Use</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM STAFF</b>	See similar amendment proposed for page 2.

<b>TASK FORCE MEMBER NAME</b>	Zach Prusak
<b>REPORT SECTION</b>	
<b>REPORT PAGE(S)</b>	15
<b>LINE(S)</b>	Lines 25-28
<b>PROPOSED REVISION</b> <i>(Please include text in track changes mode or clearly indicate original text and proposed substitution)</i>	The Task Force recognized general needs to enhance transportation safety, mobility, and connectivity in the study area but did not identify a specific need for a completely new greenfield corridor across the entire study area <u>nor did the task force reach a conclusion that there is a specific need for expansion of existing highways or facilities through the study area</u> based on the available information at this time.
<b>ADDITIONAL NOTES FROM PROPOSER</b> <i>(Use this space to provide a rationale for the proposed amendments or to provide general direction to staff to work on alternative language)</i>	As need has not been determined at the Task Force stage, the Task Force cannot make conclusions about the specific need for particular facilities whether greenfield or expansion of existing facilities.
<b>Section Below for Staff Use</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM STAFF</b>	See similar amendment proposed for page 18.

<b>TASK FORCE MEMBER NAME</b>	James Stansbury for Mario Rubio, Department of Economic Opportunity
<b>REPORT SECTION</b>	High Level Needs
<b>REPORT PAGE(S)</b>	18
<b>LINE(S)</b>	6
<b>PROPOSED REVISION</b> <i>(Please include text in track changes mode or clearly indicate original text and proposed substitution)</i>	... to coordinate with local governments, the Department of <u>Economic Opportunity</u> , and utility and broadband service providers and include
<b>ADDITIONAL NOTES FROM PROPOSER</b> <i>(Use this space to provide a rationale for the proposed amendments or to provide general direction to staff to work on alternative language)</i>	The Department of Economic Opportunity includes the Office of Broadband and may be able to lend technical assistance or financial assistance at the time FDOT is developing and designing the corridors.
<b>Section Below for Staff Use</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM STAFF</b>	P.17, Line 35 (9.28.20 MS Word Version)

<b>TASK FORCE MEMBER NAME</b>	Zach Prusak
<b>REPORT SECTION</b>	Needs Evaluation Process
<b>REPORT PAGE(S)</b>	18
<b>LINE(S)</b>	15-19
<b>PROPOSED REVISION</b> <i>(Please include text in track changes mode or clearly indicate original text and proposed substitution)</i>	The Task Force did not reach a conclusion based on the information available at this time that there is a specific need for a completely new greenfield corridor through the study area to achieve the purposes required by s. 338.2278, F.S, <u>nor did the task force reach a conclusion that there is a specific need for expansion of existing highways or facilities through the study area. If further analysis identifies specific needs.</u> The Task Force expressed a preference for improvement or expansion of major existing highway corridors that already have disturbed right of way.
<b>ADDITIONAL NOTES FROM PROPOSER</b> <i>(Use this space to provide a rationale for the proposed amendments or to provide general direction to staff to work on alternative language)</i>	As need has not been determined at the Task Force stage, the Task Force cannot make conclusions about the specific need for particular facilities whether greenfield or expansion of existing facilities.
<b>Section Below for Staff Use</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM STAFF</b>	See similar amendment proposed for page 15.

<b>TASK FORCE MEMBER NAME</b>	Paul Owens
<b>REPORT SECTION</b>	Recommendations/Approach and Framework
<b>REPORT PAGE(S)</b>	Page 18
<b>LINE(S)</b>	Insert at line 38
<b>PROPOSED REVISION</b> <i>(Please include text in track changes mode or clearly indicate original text and proposed substitution)</i>	The Task Force believes that the formal determination of need, economic feasibility and environmental feasibility pursuant to statutory requirements and consistent with accepted statewide processes is an <u>essential prerequisite to important milestone</u> in the project development process.
<b>ADDITIONAL NOTES FROM PROPOSER</b> <i>(Use this space to provide a rationale for the proposed amendments or to provide general direction to staff to work on alternative language)</i>	This articulates our requirement for support that need and economic feasibility be established prior to the PD&E process.
<b>Section Below for Staff Use</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM STAFF</b>	<a href="#">P.18, Line 22 (9.28.20 MS Word Version)</a> Economic feasibility typically occurs later in the project development process. The Action Plan discusses evaluating needs and conducting a high-level analysis of potential costs and funding approaches as part of the planning process (pages 30-32).

<b>TASK FORCE MEMBER NAME</b>	Paul Owens
<b>REPORT SECTION</b>	Guiding Principles and Instructions
<b>REPORT PAGE(S)</b>	Page 20
<b>LINE(S)</b>	Insert at line 3
<b>PROPOSED REVISION</b> <i>(Please include text in track changes mode or clearly indicate original text and proposed substitution)</i>	Support local governments in developing interchange management plans including appropriate land use and <u>the following environmental resource protections for areas around proposed interchange locations: before construction begins, protect within 10 miles of each planned interchange by acquisition, easement or other legal instrument, all lands identified for purchase by Florida Forever, Rural and Family Lands, and other state, county and municipal conservation land acquisition programs; springs and locally designated springs protection zones and resource preservation areas; and Florida Ecological Greenways priorities 1 or 2.</u>
<b>ADDITIONAL NOTES FROM PROPOSER</b> <i>(Use this space to provide a rationale for the proposed amendments or to provide general direction to staff to work on alternative language)</i>	This meets the legislative mandate to protect the environment from impacts from construction and ensuing development.
<b>Section Below for Staff Use</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM STAFF</b>	If incorporated, it may be sufficient to include this language only in one instruction under “Community Character” or “Consistency with Statewide, Regional, and Local Plans.”

TASK FORCE MEMBER NAME	Jason Lauritsen
REPORT SECTION	Guiding Principles and Instructions; Maximizing Existing Facilities
REPORT PAGE(S)	20
LINE(S)	11-28
<p><b>PROPOSED REVISION</b> (Please include text in track changes mode or clearly indicate original text and proposed substitution)</p>	<p><i>[Starting on Guiding Principle #2(ii), separate transportation facilities and utility facilities in priority order, placing co-location priority order with existing transportation facilities first 2(ii), and existing utility facilities and right of way second 2(iii). Redundancy found in the 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet of the instructions below (lines 25-28) can be removed as shown]</i></p> <p><b>Guiding Principle #2:</b> Develop potential alternatives for addressing statewide and interregional mobility and connectivity needs in this priority order:</p> <p>i. Safety and operational improvements to existing transportation facilities; <u>ii.</u> Then additional capacity in existing major transportation <del>and utility</del> facilities <del>or right of way</del> in or near the study area including co-location of facilities within <u>or adjacent to</u> existing right of way and other approaches to transforming existing facilities and right</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">of way to accommodate additional modes, uses, and functions;</p> <p><del>ii.</del><u>iii.</u> <u>Then co-location within or adjacent to utility facilities or right of way in or near the study area and other approaches to transforming existing facilities or right of way to accommodate additional modes, uses and functions;</u></p> <p><del>iii.</del><u>iv.</u> In circumstances where purpose and need and/or guiding principles cannot be addressed by operational or existing facility/right of way improvements, then evaluation of new facilities.</p> <p><b>Instructions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify and advance safety and operational improvements to existing transportation facilities.</li> <li>Evaluate potential capacity improvements to existing transportation facilities in or near the study area, including their impact on the surrounding environment, land uses, and communities.</li> <li>Evaluate opportunities for co-location <del>within or adjacent to existing transportation or utility right of way in or near the study area, including while considering their potential impacts</del> on the surrounding environment, land uses, and communities. <del>Place a</del></li> </ul>

	<p><del>high-priority on co-location opportunities within or adjacent to existing major transportation and utility right-of-way.</del></p>
<p><b>ADDITIONAL NOTES FROM PROPOSER</b> <i>(Use this space to provide a rationale for the proposed amendments or to provide general direction to staff to work on alternative language)</i></p>	<p>From the perspective of wildlife corridors, co-location of any new transportation facility with an existing road facility is extremely advantageous, as it avoids fragmenting otherwise intact habitat. It also offers ample opportunities to restore habitat connectivity lost from the prior road construction.</p> <p>These advantages do not apply to the co-location of new transportation facilities within existing utility facilities that do not already contain a public road. Adding a transportation facility where none exists, even if it is located within or along a utility or non-road right of way is functionally the same as a greenfield alignment and is a primary cause of corridor fragmentation.</p> <p>Therefore, we are asking that the ambiguity in the existing language be addressed to recognize that the wildlife and environmental benefits of colocation of new transportation facilities only extends to existing transportation facilities.</p> <p>Co-location of utilities, including broadband, with existing utility facilities and the associated right of way is compatible, and acceptable. If the Task Force wishes to amend the report to recognize this compatible colocation approach we support that.</p>
<p><i>Section Below for Staff Use</i></p>	
<p><b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM STAFF</b></p>	<p>P.20, Lines 14-17, 25-28 (9.28.20 MS Word Version)</p>

<b>TASK FORCE MEMBER NAME</b>	Charles Lee
<b>REPORT SECTION</b>	Technology
<b>REPORT PAGE(S)</b>	Page 21 (drafted to the track changes draft)
<b>LINE(S)</b>	21-22
<b>PROPOSED REVISION</b> <i>(Please include text in track changes mode or clearly indicate original text and proposed substitution)</i>	<u>Evaluate</u> <u>Incorporate emerging and available</u> technology to limit impacts to wildlife including road kills. <u>Utilize technology such as smoke sensors that activate warning signs and alert law enforcement and DOT offices of smoke situations to better facilitate prescribed fire management of conservation lands</u> and <u>provide</u> notifications of other hazards such as smoke from <del>prescribed and wildfires</del> <del>wild fires</del> .
<b>ADDITIONAL NOTES FROM PROPOSER</b> <i>(Use this space to provide a rationale for the proposed amendments or to provide general direction to staff to work on alternative language)</i>	Current language unnecessarily deems prescribed burns to be a “hazard” in the same way as wildfires are a hazard. Technology should be used to aid in essential prescribed fire management of conservation lands. The revised language promotes prescribed fire management and focuses the reference to hazards upon wildfires.
<b>Section Below for Staff Use</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM STAFF</b>	

<b>TASK FORCE MEMBER NAME</b>	Charles Lee
<b>REPORT SECTION</b>	Technology
<b>REPORT PAGE(S)</b>	Page 21 (drafted to the track changes draft)
<b>LINE(S)</b>	Insert following line 22
<b>PROPOSED REVISION</b> <i>(Please include text in track changes mode or clearly indicate original text and proposed substitution)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Evaluate advanced electronic tolling &amp; transponder systems that differentiate between locally generated traffic and long distance thru traffic to avoid or reduce the necessity to construct duplicate toll-free lanes if an M-Cores facility is co-located with an existing highway. Implement the use of such systems if legally and technologically practical.</u></li> </ul>
<b>ADDITIONAL NOTES FROM PROPOSER</b> <i>(Use this space to provide a rationale for the proposed amendments or to provide general direction to staff to work on alternative language)</i>	We received multiple indications in presentations from subject matter experts that using transponder systems to differentiate between locally generated and thru traffic could potentially avoid the high construction cost of frontage roads or non-tolled lanes.
<b>Section Below for Staff Use</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM STAFF</b>	Previously added "(including toll collection)" to GP #3

<b>TASK FORCE MEMBER NAME</b>	Paul Owens
<b>REPORT SECTION</b>	Guiding Principles and Instructions
<b>REPORT PAGE(S)</b>	Page 21
<b>LINE(S)</b>	Insert at line 27
<b>PROPOSED REVISION</b> <i>(Please include text in track changes mode or clearly indicate original text and proposed substitution)</i>	Support local governments in developing interchange management plans including appropriate land use and <u>the following environmental resource protections for areas around proposed interchange locations: before construction begins, protect within 10 miles of each planned interchange by acquisition, easement or other legal instrument, all lands identified for purchase by Florida Forever, Rural and Family Lands, and other state, county and municipal conservation land acquisition programs; springs and locally designated springs protection zones and resource preservation areas; and Florida Ecological Greenways priorities 1 or 2.</u>
<b>ADDITIONAL NOTES FROM PROPOSER</b> <i>(Use this space to provide a rationale for the proposed amendments or to provide general direction to staff to work on alternative language)</i>	This meets the legislative mandate to protect the environment from impacts from construction and ensuing development.
<b>Section Below for Staff Use</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM STAFF</b>	Assumed that the request is to add an instruction under Community Character Guiding Principle. It may be sufficient to include this language only in one instruction under “Community Character” or “Consistency with Statewide, Regional, and Local Plans.”

<b>TASK FORCE MEMBER NAME</b>	Charles Lee
<b>REPORT SECTION</b>	Community Character
<b>REPORT PAGE(S)</b>	Page 22 (drafted to the track changes draft)
<b>LINE(S)</b>	Insert between Lines 2-3
<b>PROPOSED REVISION</b> <i>(Please include text in track changes mode or clearly indicate original text and proposed substitution)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Avoid to the greatest extent practicable any new corridor through historic African American communities or similar minority communities.</u></li> </ul>
<b>ADDITIONAL NOTES FROM PROPOSER</b> <i>(Use this space to provide a rationale for the proposed amendments or to provide general direction to staff to work on alternative language)</i>	<p>In the past, major highway construction projects have disrupted many historic African American communities, and communities populated by other minorities. Considerations of environmental justice indicate that major highway projects should not have these impacts in the future.</p>
<b>Section Below for Staff Use</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM STAFF</b>	

<b>TASK FORCE MEMBER NAME</b>	Paul Owens
<b>REPORT SECTION</b>	Economic Development
<b>REPORT PAGE(S)</b>	Page 22
<b>LINE(S)</b>	Insert at line 33
<b>PROPOSED REVISION</b> <i>(Please include text in track changes mode or clearly indicate original text and proposed substitution)</i>	<u>Protect rural communities' character, agricultural lands and existing businesses from the negative impacts of new interchanges nearby by barring the construction of any interchanges until all land not currently served by municipal water and sewer or not designated for future development as an industrial job center within a 5 mile radius of the future interchange is protected by conservation easement, agricultural easement, purchase of development rights or other similar instrument.</u>
<b>ADDITIONAL NOTES FROM PROPOSER</b> <i>(Use this space to provide a rationale for the proposed amendments or to provide general direction to staff to work on alternative language)</i>	This fulfills the legislative mandate to revitalize rural communities.
<b>Section Below for Staff Use</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM STAFF</b>	<a href="#">P. 22, Line 31 (9.28.20 MS Word Version)</a>

<b>TASK FORCE MEMBER NAME</b>	Paul Owens
<b>REPORT SECTION</b>	Economic Development
<b>REPORT PAGE(S)</b>	Page 23
<b>LINE(S)</b>	Insert at line 24
<b>PROPOSED REVISION</b> <i>(Please include text in track changes mode or clearly indicate original text and proposed substitution)</i>	The Task Force advised FDOT to use proactive right of way acquisition to acquire mitigation lands and conservation easements prior to or in parallel with corridor construction. <u>The Task Force instructed FDOT to acquire conservation easements prior to interchange construction.</u>
<b>ADDITIONAL NOTES FROM PROPOSER</b> <i>(Use this space to provide a rationale for the proposed amendments or to provide general direction to staff to work on alternative language)</i>	This is consistent with our amendments #5 and #6.
<b>Section Below for Staff Use</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM STAFF</b>	P. 23, Lines 19-20 (9.28.20 MS Word Version) – Assume this should be in “Conservation Lands”, not “Economic Development”

<b>TASK FORCE MEMBER NAME</b>	Charles Lee
<b>REPORT SECTION</b>	Conservation Lands
<b>REPORT PAGE(S)</b>	Page 24 (drafted to the track changes draft)
<b>LINE(S)</b>	1-5
<b>PROPOSED REVISION</b> <i>(Please include text in track changes mode or clearly indicate original text and proposed substitution)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prioritize alternatives that do not traverse the Cross Florida Greenway. Consider impacts to the Cross Florida Greenway only when other alternatives cannot adequately meet the purpose and need of the corridor or project, while connecting the Northern Turnpike Corridor to the Suncoast Corridor. Use special design features <u>such as elevated bridge sections</u> if traversing the Cross Florida Greenway to minimize impacts and provide enhancements.</li> </ul>
<b>ADDITIONAL NOTES FROM PROPOSER</b> <i>(Use this space to provide a rationale for the proposed amendments or to provide general direction to staff to work on alternative language)</i>	The Greenway is a state park facility that features horse riding trails, and bicycle and pedestrian paths, as well as serves as an east-west wildlife corridor. A considerable investment in bridging I-75 has been made to facilitate continuation of these uses. If the Greenway is crossed by an M-Cores facility, the most meaningful “special design feature” would be to bridge most if not all of the Greenway with a pile supported structure, similar to what is under construction in the Wekiva Parkway design.
<b>Section Below for Staff Use</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM STAFF</b>	<p><a href="#">P.23, Line 39 (9.28.20 MS Word Version)</a></p> <p>Staff recommends expanding the example to include the following language:</p> <p>“Use special design features <u>(such as elevated bridge sections or other innovative solutions)</u> if traversing the Cross Florida Greenway to minimize impacts and provide enhancements.</p>

<b>TASK FORCE MEMBER NAME</b>	Kent Wimmer
<b>REPORT SECTION</b>	Conservation Lands
<b>REPORT PAGE(S)</b>	Page 24
<b>LINE(S)</b>	Line 19
<b>PROPOSED REVISION</b> <i>(Please include text in track changes mode or clearly indicate original text and proposed substitution)</i>	<p>Add a new instruction:</p> <p>Give consideration to impacts to Florida Forever targeted lands when developing alternatives. If these lands are impacted provide enhancements to the lands and give strong consideration to potential special design features.</p>
<b>ADDITIONAL NOTES FROM PROPOSER</b> <i>(Use this space to provide a rationale for the proposed amendments or to provide general direction to staff to work on alternative language)</i>	<p>This is a new instruction to provide guidance to DOT during the PD&amp;E process for how to evaluate and address privately owned lands whose owners have given permission to have them placed on the State approved Florida Forever acquisition lists. This calls for consideration when developing routing alternatives through areas identified on officially adopted lists for the Florida Forever funded programs (Florida Forever, Rural and Family Lands and Florida Communities Trust). If these lands are impacted, DOT would enhance and give strong consideration to special design features to avoid, minimize and mitigate impacts on these lands proposed for public conservation.</p>
<b>Section Below for Staff Use</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM STAFF</b>	

<b>TASK FORCE MEMBER NAME</b>	Charles Lee
<b>REPORT SECTION</b>	Conservation Lands
<b>REPORT PAGE(S)</b>	Page 24 (drafted to the track changes draft)
<b>LINE(S)</b>	Between lines 14-15 insert a new instruction
<b>PROPOSED REVISION</b> <i>(Please include text in track changes mode or clearly indicate original text and proposed substitution)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>During the PDE phase of any project, develop a conservation land and easement acquisition plan to be advanced into the final design phase of the project. This plan should specify particular tracts to be acquired with DOT funding, in whole or part, as features of the project.</u></li> </ul>
<b>ADDITIONAL NOTES FROM PROPOSER</b> <i>(Use this space to provide a rationale for the proposed amendments or to provide general direction to staff to work on alternative language)</i>	If the coordination referenced in lines 7-14 of page 24 is to result in any conservation acquisitions, this coordination must evolve into a specific acquisition plan that is part of the project. This is necessary to fulfill 338.2278 (3)(c)6.
<b>Section Below for Staff Use</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM STAFF</b>	<p><a href="#">P.24, Line 19 (9.28.20 MS Word Version)</a></p> <p>See similar amendment proposed for Action Plan. It may be sufficient to include this language only once, either in Guiding Principles/Instructions or in Action Plan.</p>

<b>TASK FORCE MEMBER NAME</b>	Charles Lee
<b>REPORT SECTION</b>	Wildlife Connectivity
<b>REPORT PAGE(S)</b>	Page 25 (drafted to the track changes draft)
<b>LINE(S)</b>	Lines 5-8
<b>PROPOSED REVISION</b> <i>(Please include text in track changes mode or clearly indicate original text and proposed substitution)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coordinate with the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission to determine optimal wildlife crossing locations and maximize effectiveness of wildlife crossing design elements based upon the best available data concerning wildlife movement patterns and adjacent land uses. <u>In general, wildlife crossing designs developed during the PDE and final design phase of the process must assure that publicly owned conservation lands sufficient to allow the passage of wildlife exist at both ends of a proposed crossing structure. The design of wildlife crossings intended for use by large mammals, or the design of crossings that include both upland and wetland habitats, should generally incorporate trestle bridges.</u></li> </ul>
<b>ADDITIONAL NOTES FROM PROPOSER</b> <i>(Use this space to provide a rationale for the proposed amendments or to provide general direction to staff to work on alternative language)</i>	Situations must be avoided where land uses at the ends of crossings transition into development that does not allow wildlife to effectively use the crossings. Further, the general consensus regarding wildlife crossing effectiveness is that trestle bridges are far superior to culverts, particularly when the wildlife movements to be served are those of large mammals.
<b>Section Below for Staff Use</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM STAFF</b>	<p><a href="#">P.24, Line 39 (9.28.20 MS Word Version)</a></p> <p>Current FDOT wildlife crossing guidelines (2018) provides guidance related to lands on either side of a wildlife crossing, including that they should be "public conservation lands or lands under a perpetual conservation or agricultural easement."</p>

<b>TASK FORCE MEMBER NAME</b>	Paul Owens
<b>REPORT SECTION</b>	Action Plan
<b>REPORT PAGE(S)</b>	Page 29
<b>LINE(S)</b>	Insert at line 5
<b>PROPOSED REVISION</b> <i>(Please include text in track changes mode or clearly indicate original text and proposed substitution)</i>	1. <u>Determine transportation need and economic feasibility. Await at least a preliminary determination of transportation need and economic feasibility before beginning the PD&amp;E process, as called for under the state’s corridor planning process.</u> [Relocate and insert page 30, starting with line 39, and continuing through line 18 on page 31.]
<b>ADDITIONAL NOTES FROM PROPOSER</b> <i>(Use this space to provide a rationale for the proposed amendments or to provide general direction to staff to work on alternative language)</i>	This is consistent with our other amendments.
<b>Section Below for Staff Use</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM STAFF</b>	

<b>TASK FORCE MEMBER NAME</b>	Paul Owens
<b>REPORT SECTION</b>	Action Plan
<b>REPORT PAGE(S)</b>	Page 31
<b>LINE(S)</b>	Insert at line 30
<b>PROPOSED REVISION</b> <i>(Please include text in track changes mode or clearly indicate original text and proposed substitution)</i>	<u>It will commit to the acquisition of environmentally sensitive land within 10 miles of planned interchanges, and the protection of land from development through easement purchases within 5 miles, prior to construction.</u>
<b>ADDITIONAL NOTES FROM PROPOSER</b> <i>(Use this space to provide a rationale for the proposed amendments or to provide general direction to staff to work on alternative language)</i>	This is consistent with our other amendments.
<b>Section Below for Staff Use</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM STAFF</b>	<a href="#">P.30, Line 30 (9.28.20 MS Word Version)</a>

<b>TASK FORCE MEMBER NAME</b>	Charles Lee
<b>REPORT SECTION</b>	Action Plan, Advance Innovative Land Acquisition Concepts
<b>REPORT PAGE(S)</b>	Page 31 (drafted to the track changes draft)
<b>LINE(S)</b>	Insert after the period (.) on line 36:
<b>PROPOSED REVISION</b> <i>(Please include text in track changes mode or clearly indicate original text and proposed substitution)</i>	<u>During the PDE phase of any project, develop a conservation land and easement acquisition plan to be advanced into the final design phase of the project. This plan should specify particular tracts to be acquired with DOT funding, in whole or part, as features of the project.</u>
<b>ADDITIONAL NOTES FROM PROPOSER</b> <i>(Use this space to provide a rationale for the proposed amendments or to provide general direction to staff to work on alternative language)</i>	If innovative land acquisition concepts are to be implemented, this must evolve into a specific acquisition plan that is part of the project. This is necessary to fulfill 338.2278 (3)(c) 6.
<b>Section Below for Staff Use</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM STAFF</b>	<a href="#">P.31, Line 32 (9.28.20 MS Word Version)</a> See similar amendment proposed for page 24. It may be sufficient to include this language only once, either in Guiding Principles/Instructions or in Action Plan.

<b>TASK FORCE MEMBER NAME</b>	Commissioner Jeff Kinnard
<b>REPORT SECTION</b>	Action Plan
<b>REPORT PAGE(S)</b>	Page 32
<b>LINE(S)</b>	Line 9
<b>PROPOSED REVISION</b> <i>(Please include text in track changes mode or clearly indicate original text and proposed substitution)</i>	...periodic meetings to reconvene Task Force member organizations in an advisory role. <u>This advisory role will be limited to Task Force member organizations who gave consent on the final Task Force report.</u>
<b>ADDITIONAL NOTES FROM PROPOSER</b> <i>(Use this space to provide a rationale for the proposed amendments or to provide general direction to staff to work on alternative language)</i>	
<b>Section Below for Staff Use</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM STAFF</b>	P.32, Line 5 (9.28.20 MS Word Version)

<b>TASK FORCE MEMBER NAME</b>	James Stansbury for Mario Rubio, Department of Economic Opportunity
<b>REPORT SECTION</b>	Action Plan
<b>REPORT PAGE(S)</b>	32
<b>LINE(S)</b>	9-10
<b>PROPOSED REVISION</b> <i>(Please include text in track changes mode or clearly indicate original text and proposed substitution)</i>	
<b>ADDITIONAL NOTES FROM PROPOSER</b> <i>(Use this space to provide a rationale for the proposed amendments or to provide general direction to staff to work on alternative language)</i>	I don't have a change as much as a question/request. When "Task Force member organizations in an advisory role" "reconvene" are the sunshine requirements the same as Task Force Meetings, including notice and no discussion outside of meetings?
<b>Section Below for Staff Use</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM STAFF</b>	<a href="#">P. 32, Lines 4-5 (9.28.20 MS Word Version)</a>

<b>TASK FORCE MEMBER NAME</b>	Zach Prusak
<b>REPORT SECTION</b>	End of Report
<b>REPORT PAGE(S)</b>	32
<b>LINE(S)</b>	26
<b>PROPOSED REVISION</b> <i>(Please include text in track changes mode or clearly indicate original text and proposed substitution)</i>	<p><b><u>Task Force Recommendation to Florida Legislature</u></b></p> <p><u>The Task Force recommends the Florida Legislature extend or eliminate the deadlines set forth in s. 338.2278(6), F.S., to allow FDOT adequate time to thoroughly evaluate need and financial feasibility, implement environmental conservation commitments and apply the guiding principles and planning processes recommended by this report.</u></p>
<b>ADDITIONAL NOTES FROM PROPOSER</b> <i>(Use this space to provide a rationale for the proposed amendments or to provide general direction to staff to work on alternative language)</i>	<p>The purpose of this amendment is for the Task Force to communicate to the Governor and the Florida Legislature that the planning processes recommended in the report require adequate time to implement and that given the Covid-19 related budget shortfall, the timeframes in the MCORES legislation are not realistic and should be revisited.</p>
<b>Section Below for Staff Use</b>	
<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM STAFF</b>	