

Subject:	Suncoast Corridor Task Force Meeting #8	
Date:	Thursday, September 24, 2020	
Locations:	Virtual Meeting	
Public Viewing:	Location #1 Lafayette County Courthouse County Commission Room 120 W. Main Street Mayo, FL 32066	Location #2 Madison Golf & Country Club 445 Country Club Road Madison, FL 32340

Attendees (check all in attendance)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Attendees	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Greg Evans, FDOT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Jason Peters, FDOT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Chris Stahl, FDEP	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	James Stansbury (for Brian McManus), FDEO	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mary Cross, FDOE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Diana Duque (for Paul D. Myers), FDOH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jason Hight (for Chris Wynn), FWC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pegeen Hanrahan, FDACS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mark Futrell, FPSC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Eric Anderson, Enterprise Florida	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Chris Lee, FDBPR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Diane Head, CareerSource Florida	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Audrey Kidwell, Volunteer Florida	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Scott Carnahan, Citrus County	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mark Hatch, Dixie County	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Todd Gray, Gilchrist County	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Betsy Barfield, Jefferson County	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Anthony Adams, Lafayette County	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Matt Brooks, Levy County	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sherilynn Pickles, Madison County	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pam Feagle, Taylor County	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Kristin Dozier, Capital Region TPA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jeff Kinnard, Hernando/Citrus MPO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ronald E. Kitchen, Tampa Bay RPC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Chris Rietow, Apalachee RPC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Scott Koons, North Central Florida RPC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Thomas Hawkins, 1000 Friends of Florida	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Charles Lee, Audubon Florida	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Kent Wimmer, Defenders of Wildlife	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Janet Bowman, The Nature Conservancy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lyle Seigler, Northwest Florida WMD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ashley Stefanik, Suwannee River WMD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Michelle Hopkins, Southwest Florida WMD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Anna Grace Lewis (for Christopher Emmanuel), FL Chamber of Commerce	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ken Armstrong, Florida Trucking Association	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Randy Wilkerson, Florida Rural Water Association	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Chris Bailey, Florida Internet & Television Assoc	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Susan Ramsey, FEDC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Charles Shinn, Florida Farm Bureau Federation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Dr. Lawrence Barrett, FGC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	John Grosskopf, NFCC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

8:30 am	Sign in	Greg Vaughn, Facilitator
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Task Force members were welcomed and sound checked after calling in to address any technical difficulties. 	
9:00 am	Welcome	Greg Evans, Task Force Chair
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secretary Greg Evans welcomed and thanked the Task Force members, project staff, and public for their involvement. Provided an overview of M-CORES program, shared the FloridaMCORES.com website for a recording of today's meeting and other project information and announced there will be a Community Open House at the September 29th at the Gilchrist County Woman's Club in Trenton, FL. Stated September is National Workforce Development month. Statewide workforce 	

development program in M-CORES legislation, staff is working to expand partnerships and provide opportunities.

- Secretary Evans identified that there are two public viewing locations for today’s meeting in Mayo and Madison and explained the comment period.
- He discussed the intent of today’s meeting and agenda, future meetings, and steps to finalize the final report. Noted October 20th will be the next (and last) Task Force meeting.
- Afterwards, Secretary Evans introduced the meeting facilitator, Greg Vaughn.

9:05 am	Introductions, Updates, and Agenda Review	Greg Vaughn, Facilitator
---------	---	--------------------------

- Greg Vaughn provided instructions for today’s GoToWebinar and public comment period, noting the Task Force would receive comment starting at 5:00 pm, virtually first and then from two physical viewing locations. Virtual participants must sign up to provide comments by 4:00 pm. He then provided a detailed overview of today’s agenda.
- Greg Vaughn introduced the Sunshine Law video, then provided David Flynn’s contact information for any Sunshine Law related questions.

9:15 am	Roll Call	Greg Vaughn, Facilitator
---------	-----------	--------------------------

- Greg Vaughn provided a roll call of Task Force members in attendance.

9:22 am	Public Engagement Activities	Will Watts, FDOT Chief Engineer
---------	------------------------------	---------------------------------

- Will Watts provided a summary of public engagement activities.
 - Stated the ways in which public comments can and have been received (website, email, public meetings, etc.) which included 12,768 total comments, 1,875 of which were original (vs. form letter).
 - Noted all comments have been organized into major themes which include: Environmental/Land Conservation; Quality of Life/Economic Opportunity; Corridor Considerations; and Other Issues. He then discussed each in further detail including Suncoast Corridor-specific comments.
 - Corridor-specific comments included: Create new jobs in the region; construction threatens wetlands and ‘Old Florida’; consider impacts to rivers in Jefferson County; route traffic to US 19; corridor should be thoughtfully connected, etc.
 - Stated the comments would be addressed through High-Level Needs, Guiding Principles, Instructions for Project Development and Beyond, and/or the Action Plan.
 - Announced two upcoming Community Open Houses on September 29, 2020 at the Gilchrist County Woman’s Club and on October 22, 2020 at the Madison Church of God.
 - Closed by providing methods for providing public comments (email, website, mail) then deferred to Greg Vaughn for Task Force comments and questions.
- Greg Vaughn then led the discussion for Task Force comments/questions related to Will Watts’ Public Engagement Activities presentation.
 - *Charles Lee: Expressed concern that qualitative comments (as presented by Will Watts) need to be exposed and included in the final Task Force report. Stated a couple short paragraphs should be included in report language that states the nature of the comments received. Noted he provided draft language to this effect prior to September 15th for inclusion and proceeded to read his submittal: “The largest number of comments received both presented to the Task Force and submitted in writing expressed support for a no-build option or presented concern for environmental impacts.” In the section of letters received from local governments, sought to*

insert "Some of the resolutions recommended a no-build option, others supported corridors for economic development options with cautiousness for the community and the environment." Sought to include a qualitative description of the bulk of comments received and inserted on page four.

- **Will Watts stated the team will work on getting that information incorporated.**
- Greg Vaughn reiterated that the Task Force report will be discussed today.
- *Commissioner Scott Carnahan: Thanked Will Watts for his presentation. Appreciated Charles Lee's comments; however, he expressed his concern that a majority of these complaint comments (form letters) were generated from one source and may not provide any value from a local perspective.*
- *Janet Bowman: Believed Will Watts did a great job summarizing the comments so they are representative; however, she suggested characterizing or elaborating on the content of the comments would be helpful.*
- Will Watts stated he is open to suggestions in an effort to make the nearly 13,000 comments actionable to assist the Task Force.
- *Kent Wimmer: Mentioned he also suggested something similar to what Charles Lee suggested during the Northern Turnpike Corridor Task Force meeting. **Stated qualification of comments received by individuals should be represented for no-build, etc.***
- Greg Vaughn introduced next presentation.

9:40 am

Moving from Task Force Recommendations to Corridor Planning and Project Development

Will Watts, FDOT Chief Engineer

- Will Watts provided an overview of the presentation topics, then presented the following:
 - Potential Co-Location Paths/Courses: Community Focus Areas – Will look at major focus on local community input, local plans, GIS data, interchange locations and access near the communities of:
 - Location #1: Capps and Lamont. Examples for considerations: Aucilla River; Lamont Post Office; Asa May House; cemeteries; registered archaeological and cultural sites; National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) listed sites; aquatic preserves; Florida Forever acquired lands; and managed conservation lands; potential I-10 termini; Opportunity Zones; and SUN Trail Network – Unfunded Gap.
 - Location #2: Perry. Examples for considerations: Managed conservation areas; mitigation banks; airports; hospitals; springs; Florida Forest Festival; Taylor County Courthouse; Forest Capital State Museum; Perry Airport; Opportunity Zones; Industrial, Commercial and Public Land Uses.
 - Location #3: Mayo. Examples for considerations: Florida Forever Lands; managed conservation areas; springs; cemeteries; agricultural lands; Lafayette County Courthouse; Hal Adams Bridge; Mayo Water Tower; Lafayette Blue Springs State Park; Opportunity Zones; Industrial, Commercial and Public Land Uses.
 - Location #4: Cross City, Old Town, Fanning Springs, and Chiefland. Examples for considerations: Wildlife Management Areas and Refuges; Suwannee River; Florida Forever Lands; state parks; springs; Manatee Springs State Park; Lower Suwannee National Wildlife Refuge; Dixie County Courthouse; Nature Coast Trail; Opportunity Zones; Industrial, Commercial and Public Land Uses.
 - Location #5: Inglis. Examples for considerations: Springs; High Risk Coastal Areas; Lake Rousseau; storm surge zones; NRHP listed sites; managed conservation areas; state forests; state parks; Yankeetown; Crystal River Archaeological Site; Cross Florida

Greenway; Crystal River; Industrial, Commercial, and Public Land Uses; land trail opportunities.

- Stated possible early phasing opportunities may include enhancing wildlife habitat connectivity; trail connectivity; Florida Forever Targeted Property; water resources; and spring enhancement.
- Provided a further explanation that PD&E and Design phases cover: interchanges (traffic modeling), environmental feasibility (planning and PD&E; Natural, Physical, Social, and Cultural), no-build, planning and project costs, and economic feasibility.
- Greg Vaughn requested Task Force questions/comments on this presentation.
 - *Charles Lee: Stated cost feasibility topics were unclear. Suggested additional items under 338 of M-CORES legislation/objectives state that in addition to traditional project cost, the M-CORES project would include environmental features (acquisition of additional environmental lands, broadband, water and sewer). Believed in addition to the items Will Watts listed in his presentation, there are other costs that will have to be added into the cost feasibility equation.*
 - Will Watts noted his comment has been taken and **additional enhancements will be part of total project costs**. Noted the idea is some items may be accommodated earlier. Stated FDOT is working with the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity (FDEO) on a statewide plan to expand broadband and mentioned future funds have been allocated and efforts made on right-of-way, utility coordination/solutions, etc.

10:12 am

Task Force Report Revisions

Huiwei Shen, FDOT Chief Planner

- Greg Vaughn introduced Huiwei Shen who provided the Task Force report overview.
- Huiwei Shen provided an overview of Task Force report revisions.
 - Stated minor updates were made to Overview sections of the draft Task Force report based on Task Force member comments. In the Recommendations section, the Approach/Framework and High-Level Needs were significantly revised based on Task Force Meeting 7 discussion to focus on Task Force findings and guidance. Guiding Principles/Instructions and Action Plan have been included in the draft report for discussion today.
 - Provided an overview of the draft Action Plan elements: 1. Evaluate needs; 2. Identify and evaluate alternatives (including no-build); 3. Support consistency review and updates of local and regional plans; 4. Assess economic feasibility and identify potential funding sources; 5. Advance innovative land acquisition concepts; 6. Advance multi-use opportunities; 7. Continue robust partner and public engagement (ongoing throughout process); 8. Commit to transparency and process improvement (ongoing throughout process). Reminded the Task Force of today's goals related to the Task Force report prior to posting for public review. Discussed the consensus intent of the Task Force and report, importance of them to share their concerns and solutions at this meeting, and steps for document finalization including instructions for providing comments/suggested revisions.
- Greg Vaughn requested Task Force questions/comments on this presentation.
 - *Charles Lee: On page 13 of the draft report, the section that begins with "Evaluation of needs moving forward...". He mentioned that he submitted a paragraph to be inserted and proceeded to read his submittal for the Task Force related to the need for a new corridor and Task Force's lack of conclusion related to a specific need for a new freestanding or greenfield toll road to achieve the goals of the statute. Believed his statement gets them to where they are going and **requested his text be included after the words highlighted in green**. Stated the misconception is belief to build a new roadway.*

- Huiwei Shen thanked Charles Lee for his comment and **stated staff has started to incorporate his provided language in the next draft and on improving the action plan language.**
- *Thomas Hawkins: Agreed with Charles Lee's comment and stated he has language relating to environmental resources and appreciates the positive changes on conservation.*
- Huiwei Shen replied that **language will be improved.**
- *James Stansbury: Commented he has a change to the draft report on page 14 to discuss later.*
- Greg Vaughn and Greg Garrett both stated they would come back to him later today during the discussion of that portion of the report.
- *Janet Bowman: Stated her concern with focusing on the language beyond the Guiding Principles and Instructions and mentioned the steps afterwards is critical for consensus.*
- Greg Vaughn replied you will see updated language today and will discuss to refine.
- Huiwei Shen said if you do not see changes, we will discuss concept of what we need to change. Requested patience from Task Force while staff works through comments for next draft.
- Greg Vaughn solicited any final questions/comments from Task Force members on Will Watts' or Huiwei Shen's presentations.

10:38 am

Break

Greg Evans, Task Force Chair

- Secretary Greg Evans provided instructions for break until 11:00 am and dismissed the Task Force.

11:00 am

Review and Refine Draft Final Report

Ryan Asmus, FDOT Production Lead
Greg Vaughn and Greg Garrett,
Facilitators
Task Force Support Team
Task Force Members

- Greg Vaughn introduced Greg Garrett to begin to go through the draft Task Force report.
 - Greg Garrett provided an overview and instructions as to how the Task Force will go through the report today and stated project staff will be capturing notes off-screen.
 - Greg Garrett reminded the Task Force that because there is only one meeting left, editorial comments and minor language changes can be submitted separately. If the content is in line with your sentiment, please keep that for later; however, if the intentions are separate, we would like to unpack that for consensus.
 - Greg Garrett highlighted the inclusion of an introduction paragraph to show intent on how the Guiding Principles and Instructions should be read (together, as a package).
- Guiding Principle #1 / Plan Consistency:
- Greg Garrett stated there were no changes to Guiding Principle; noted minor wordsmithing changes and new instruction added to Instructions related to technical assistance and best practices as they relate to plan updates.
 - Greg Vaughn reverted to James Stanbury who had noted a couple changes.
 - *James Stanbury: Suggested edits included:*
 - *Line 4: Stated the statute does not clarify necessary plan amendments by a given date and should specify land use changes. **Suggested comparing language to statute language to address.***
 - *Line 23: **Add in 'coordinate among agencies and local governments to address.'***
 - *Line 27: **Change to 'Assist to identifying possible changes'; focus less on owners/FDOT identifying those and put more stake on the side of the local governments.***
 - ***Suggested flipping the order of the third and fourth bullets.***

- *Line 30: Add in 'FDEO' into statement 'Coordinate among local governments, regional planning councils, etc.'* and move this sentence to beginning of this bullet.
- Greg Garrett asked for Task Force member comments on James Stanbury's comments. (None were provided.)
- Greg Vaughn solicited any additional comments on this Guiding Principle #1.
- Guiding Principle #2 / Maximizing Use of Existing Facilities:
 - Greg Garrett mentioned revisions to 3rd bullet (Line 6, Page 15) to make clear. No new Instructions; existing ones were revised (wordsmithed) based on Task Force member comments. Solicited comments from Task Force.
 - *James Stanbury: On last bullet, Line 22, suggested including 'FDEO' in case they can provide technical assistance.*
 - *Charles Lee: Line 5, GP #2 includes co-location with existing disturbed right-of-way. Recommended placing a modifier where we define this as 'major right-of-way facilities.'* Concerned with county roads/greenfields. Mentioned previously submitted language and discussion about co-location with meaningfully sized right-of-way, such as those that are 200' in right-of-way and four lanes; only major/state/federal major roads for co-location is appropriate. **Stated need to include other types of linear facilities such as major electric transmission lines – using the word 'major,' at least 240 kb line with a couple hundred feet of right-of-way.**
 - Greg Garrett noted some language was included to address this concern.
 - *Charles Lee: Stated you are only talking about road right-of-way. Would put another descriptor in there such as 'major electric power lines.'*
 - Greg Garrett replied this is addressed in the 3rd bullet.
 - *Charles Lee: Requested more modifiers for state roads/federal highways as it is not to discuss small county road co-location.*
 - Greg Garrett addressed the Task Force and explained by the introduction of the word 'major' may preclude opportunities and limit flexibility. The magnitude and differential impact on smaller roads are definitely greater but could be better in terms of avoidance features.
 - **Charles Lee: Stated you should consider in greenfield mode, not co-location. County road right-of-ways are 70'. Advised to look at public right-of-way.**
 - Jason Watts stated there is a middle ground, comparing a small road is not exactly a greenfield, the other approach is that the word 'major' would be difficult. Suggested adding instruction to give a higher priority to existing locations with high existing right-of-way to minimize impact. **Charles Lee and Jason Watts agreed with Greg Garrett's suggestion to revise/expand upon the third instruction bullet to include priority for roadways that have a larger existing right-of-way.**
 - *Ken Armstrong: Asked if the intent of Suncoast is to support I-10 or divert I-75 traffic. Felt we have missed stating what we are doing with this road.*
 - Greg Garrett stated we tried to expand the first bullet to clarify. Noted there is some consideration for the 'why' in the High-Level Needs discussion. Greg Vaughn stated this will be covered later today and can discuss revisions and solicited Task Force comments on this Guiding Principle.
 - *Kent Wimmer: Supported Ken Armstrong's recommendation for identifying the need/purpose of the corridor. Believed there is need for clarification related to I-75 relief/traffic.*
- Guiding Principle #3 / Technology:
 - Reviewed new language throughout Guiding Principle and Instructions, noting the language was borrowed from the Northern Turnpike Connector.

- *Kent Wimmer: Stated the Northern Turnpike Corridor had excellent language. Stated there should be a bullet that says ‘plan for and provide electric vehicle charging stations.’ Greg Garrett replied it is included in another Guiding Principle; however, it can be moved here if needed. Kent Wimmer replied as long as it is included.*
- No additional comments on this Guiding Principle #3.
Guiding Principle #4 / Resilience:
- Greg Garrett reviewed the revisions.
- *Charles Lee: Believed another bullet should be added/existing bullets modified so that co-location will provide the opportunity to upgrade existing facilities such as below storm surge levels.* Greg Garrett stated this is provided in another Guiding Principle and can be moved here if needed. *Charles Lee then expressed concern over US 19 improvements (elevation, additional bridging/culverts to address flooding) stating M-CORES would do it all at once vs. create future budget issues.* Greg Garrett re-iterated this language can be moved here if desired or included in both locations.
- *Michelle Hopkins: Stated she has similar concerns related to inland flooding. Wanted to ensure this Resilience Guiding Principle focuses on extreme weather events and climate trends.* Greg Garrett mentioned this is also included under ‘Natural Environment’ Guiding Principle.
- No additional comments on Guiding Principle #4.
Guiding Principle #5 / Transportation Modes:
- Greg Garrett mentioned there was no change to the Guiding Principle; however, some bullets were wordsmithed and a new fourth bullet added (per Thomas Hawkins) to evaluate modal solutions.
- Greg Vaughn solicited questions/comments related to this Guiding Principle #5.
- *Kent Wimmer: Noted Northern Turnpike Connector had a good suggestion related to high prioritized gaps on Florida Greenways and trail segments (page 23, line 26) which he thought was appropriate to fit in ‘Transportation Modes’ Guiding Principle.*
- Guiding Principle #6 / Community Identify and Character:
- Greg Garrett reviewed the revisions stating there were no changes made to the Guiding Principle; however, changes were made to existing Instructions and new bullets added to include signage, native species, Big Bend Ecosystem, and recognition of community character features.
- *Charles Lee: Noted this language is very general and FDOT already has a practice of coordinating with local communities; however, he asked if there should be more of a policy directive in the instructions. Expressed concern of roads that bypass communities have killed the downtown by removing the business/commerce. Suggested a need for a memorialization in one of these bullet points that says ‘avoid creating a new route which will divert business traffic away from existing commercial areas’ or something like that. It is a big issue that has been expressed by city/county commissioners. Need to put something more definitive in there rather than say ‘coordinate,’ we should acknowledge that concern. Another concern was related to billboards and signs. If retrofitting US 19, he hoped that policy would be to try and make this section of Florida highways more scenic unlike I-75 with billboards. Suggested language that “new facilities should not have billboards on them.”*
- Secretary Evans stated signs are outside of the scope and mentioned private property rights.
- *Commissioner Todd Gray: Commented that the flexible language allows for the differing communities allows them to design it individually. Some of the communities along this route would want them coming through town, so keep guiding principle as is and let individual communities decide.*
- Greg Vaughn stated that was the intent so it could be flexible.

- Ken Armstrong: Also agreed with general language as provided.
- Commissioner Ronald Kitchen: Stated he also agreed that local officials should have final input. General language allows communities to be specific to their own needs.
- Charles Lee: Suggested connectivity issues may be on their end.
- Greg Vaughn informed Charles Lee that Task Force members had previously indicated they were in favor of the general language to allow maximum flexibility.
- Charles Lee: Mentioned other state highways are not festooned with billboards. If retrofitting US 19 for M-CORES or building a facility elsewhere, hopes Guiding Principles state we make this portion of Florida not look like I-75/festooned with billboards. **Think we should make a statement that new highways should not have billboards and is included in this process.**
- Secretary Greg Evans replied that there is not a lot we (FDOT) can do as an agency.
- Charles Lee: Responded the Legislature has given the Task Force an overarching responsibility. If property owner has adjoining property to roadway, that is their decision; but in right-of-way, you have the opportunity to extinguish that “problem” along the highway corridor. This would bypass the law to avoid this issue.
- Commissioner Pam Feagle: Asked how local communities can brand/promote their communities without billboards.
- Greg Garrett and Greg Vaughn supported her concern and referred to language in first bullet of Instructions to work with communities.
- Commissioner Pam Feagle: Believed it was important to be left to local officials. Want the opportunity to sell our communities.
- Commissioner Ronald Kitchen: Stated billboards may be helpful for communities, keep local control, personally liking a billboard or not is not for you to decide. Crystal River has a more restrictive sign ordinance than Citrus County.
- Ken Armstrong: Agreed it is hard to be specific on this as some sign situations are already decided for you on co-locations. The more general approach, the better.

Guiding Principle #7 / Historic and Cultural Resources:

- Greg Garrett stated no changes were made to this Guiding Principle #7; however, some bullet Instructions were wordsmithed.
- No questions/comments/discussion by Task Force.

Guiding Principle #8 / Natural Environment:

- Greg Garrett noted the revisions which included: capturing sentiment in Introduction section, revised to include priorities, included a clause before the No New Corridor Through resources, added additional bullets to last list of resources, and added four additional Instructions. The first new bullet includes coordination with agencies early in the process for land acquisition, coordinate with FDEP and Florida Forever program by priorities. Under Wildlife Habitats, the second bullet has been expanded to use available technologies. Under Water Resources, the third bullet includes the addition of upgrades to existing facilities as discussed in the resiliency section.
- Michelle Hopkins: Believed this was okay, as resiliency is planning for future. Stated first two bullets focus on water quality under Water Resources and wanted to make sure there was enough emphasis on historic flooding concerns, which third bullet captures. **Suggested adding coordination with local agencies to obtain their data/perspective on historic local flooding concerns to ensure these corridors do not result in flooding impacts.** Mentioned the potential for inland flooding is going to increase with sea level rise/extreme weather events. Thinks there is a lot of value in getting local agency input on their flooding.
- Charles Lee: Stated he had two comments on this section. Under the last bullet, Line 42 on page 20, it reflects one part of discussion from last meeting. Water quality is not the only problem of

US 19; problem is it was built in 1950s/1960s so it is lacking in several places of roadway to pass water from east to west. Mentioned that the Floridan aquifer has risen to the surface along much of US 19 in these areas with potential for water to flow over the road is a water quantity/flow issue. **Need an extra bullet point to deal with water quantity (improved bridge/culvert structures) and hydrological issues along the road and add flow capacity on east side of the road.** Said in regard to resiliency, you do not address elevation of the road as it relates to sea level rise/flooding and **recommend adding a bullet to Instruction to elevate road for these issues to floodproof roads as part of this project.** Greg Vaughn asked about co-locating. Charles Lee replied to first improve existing roads (not necessarily co-location); move traffic up US 19 from Suncoast/Red Level joining in Citrus County; then you deal with elevation, sea level rising, and floodproofing the road when talking about co-location or improvements to US 19.

- Janet Bowman: Wanted to make a comment on prescribed burning, stating the language has changed a bit (line 34), and wanted to maintain the ability to burn. Greg Garrett stated it was included in the Agricultural Guiding Principle. Janet Bowman replied it is applicable here as well and should be included in both Guiding Principles.
- Michelle Hopkins: **Requested to add 'stormwater management and flood control' to Water Resources.**
- Kent Wimmer: **Stated that in the spirit of consensus, in the Do Not Impact list, he suggested adding any impacts to any public and private conservation lands only with enhancement.** Second point, to the No New Corridors Through, all areas approved or targeted for acquisition for conservation will require acquisition of full project area.
- Christ Stahl: Stated it is very problematic in terms of who owns the land, so it's a really grey area and not sure how we could proceed in a functional way. By sheer nature, the roadway will not be an attraction, but also you also have to deal with why it was bought in the first place. By sheer mitigation required to impact conservation easements, it'll be higher than just a piece of land.
- Jason Watts: Explained FDOT's current process related to conservation lands/impacts. Stated that if FDOT impacts conservation land, FDOT goes through an elaborate process of determining our impacts, then figure out how to mitigate which usually ends in purchasing property or monies. He then asked Kent Wimmer for clarification on if FDOT just clips a small piece of land, if he is suggesting FDOT purchase the entire property parcel.
- Kent Wimmer: **Replied to Jason Watts by stating it is worthwhile to say that we will provide enhancements.** Secondly, regarding lands that are on acquisition lists, the concept is that if you are going to build a corridor through those lands, FDOT should make above and beyond efforts to secure that property. **Asked to consider adding in proposed conservation/Florida Forever lands to No New Corridors Through. Make sure there is an effort with FDEP to acquire those lands.**
- Jason Watts: **Replied we will look at the enhancement language.** Stated he was unsure of how this would work functionally as some tracks are very large which could be an issue.
- Thomas Hawkins: **Believed this Guiding Principle needed a simple, measurable standard to identify when we have met a measurable level of conservation.** Unsure of exact language but believed that was the missing link.

12:32 pm

Break for Lunch

Greg Evans, Task Force Chair

- Secretary Greg Evans dismissed the Task Force for lunch noting the meeting would resume at 1:30 pm.

<p>1:30 pm</p>	<p>Review and Refine Draft Final Report (continued)</p>	<p>Ryan Asmus, FDOT Production Lead Greg Vaughn & Greg Garrett, Facilitators Task Force Support Team Task Force Members</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Secretary Greg Evans welcomed everyone back from lunch and introduced Greg Vaughn. ○ Greg Vaughn reviewed the public comment instructions for today's meetings prior to returning to the draft report and those who wished to speak prior to the lunch break. <p><u>Guiding Principle #8 / Natural Environment (continued):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Commissioner Kristin Dozier: Agreed with Charles Lee's comments related to flood control and water quantity on existing roadways. In response to Janet Bowman's controlled prescribed burns, she suggested mentioning federal agencies for coordination of national forests.</i> ○ <i>Charles Lee: Stated in reference to lines 9-14, he believed the order should be avoid, minimize/mitigate, then restore, connect and enhance.</i> Greg Garrett suggested this order was placed as such based on Task Force sentiment at previous meeting. <i>Charles Lee disagreed/did not recall this being the order.</i> ○ Jason Watts: Replied to enhance is secondary, and only when we do negative impacts, then we can mitigate. ○ <i>Charles Lee: Responded that throughout the Efficient Transportation Decision Making (ETDM) process it has always been avoid, then minimize. Stated that with M-CORES you have added responsibility because environmental lands are part of the project. If building a road through the Big Bend, then the project design should include wildlife crossing. Next point is the suggestion of placing prospective Florida Forever lands into a new category, prospective conservation, avoided to the greatest extent possible, and proceed to acquire them. Third point in dealing with acquisition of lands: yes, you should coordinate with other agencies, but it misses the points of what is in the statute, as part of project design. There needs to be a component in which FDOT is funding that support the statute. Stated 'coordinate' is not sufficient. Coordination and provision of funding for these purposes. Greg Garrett directed to the last sentence. Charles Lee does not agree that this supports the statute. Fund the acquisition of lands to achieve the specific laws raised in the statute/series of bullet points as to the purposes of M-CORES. This needs to have the word 'funding' or 'fund.'</i> ○ <i>Commissioner Scott Carnahan: Suggested we keep moving forward and agreed with existing language.</i> ○ <i>Michelle Hopkins: On the Conservation Lands second bullet, Charles Lee's recommendation is missing the point, as it is about coordination not the acquisition component. Partnering on acquisitions is good but maybe another bullet on the funding point.</i> ○ <i>Pegeen Hanrahan: Stated providing support for the Rural and Family Lands is important. To make assumptions about voters of the state of Florida, she thinks Charles Lee is correct on the way the statute is read. Protecting natural environment is more important than a road.</i> ○ <i>Michelle Hopkins: Commented on page 19, under 'Avoidance/minimization' you would not avoid, then minimize impacts. Think the order is correct on this. Agency will prioritize established priorities. Might want to consider separating point number 3 so it reads as: 3. Minimize, then 4. Mitigate negative impacts (line 14, page 19).</i> ○ Greg Vaughn recalls possibly moving enhance further ahead of list of priorities, avoid, enhance, etc. ○ <i>Thomas Hawkins: Believed the current principle language is good and embraces the role of M-CORES as environmental protection as its own goal. Stated we need something that is clear and able to be captured.</i> 		

- Huiwei Shen: Replied we will try to define some reasonable metrics but will still need to keep it broad.
- *Charles Lee: One of the difficulties with putting enhancement first is that it appears attractive to invade a conservation area to enhance. Wouldn't operate well in a greenfield scenario.*
- Jason Watts: Stated if you can enter into a conservation area and enhance without negative impacts, clearly, we would not make negative impacts and enhance it. We will look for every opportunity to enhance without making negative impacts.
- *Janet Bowman: Stated the reference of the statute is an improvement. In reference to metrics, the big picture is water quality improvement above and beyond what you would provide for mitigation. One way is to look at it from a metric point of view. Cannot get into specific water quality, parcels of land, etc. more benefit beyond pure mitigation.*
- *Michelle Hopkins: **Suggested reorder wording on second bullet point and start with enhance.***
- *Kent Wimmer: First, complement staff for coordinating with Northern Turnpike Corridor, but concerning Commissioner Dozier's comment, the **Northern Turnpike Corridor has a very good Instruction "coordinate with Florida Forest Service...(prescribed burning)." Under Wildlife Habitats, Northern Turnpike Corridor also has a few good ones such as minimize impacts to transportation lighting, and consult with state and federal agencies to identify threatened and endangered species.***

Guiding Principle #9 / Economic Development:

- Greg Garrett provided a summary of revisions noting no change to Guiding Principle, and addition of last two bullets to Instructions.
- *Kent Wimmer: In last bullet related to Land and Water Conservation Fund, he noted this is a federal funding program and asked if it should reference the Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) program.*
- *Ken Armstrong: **Asked to consider adding "cross cutting" in reference to economic development and agriculture. Secondly, regarding line 34/Land and Water Conservation Fund, prefer that it just say support opportunities for recreational tourism or something more generalized.***
- *Kent Wimmer: Supported Ken Armstrong's recommendation.*

Guiding Principle #10 / Agriculture:

- Greg Garrett provided summary of changes noting no change to the Guiding Principle and two changes to Instructions per Task Force comments.
- *Charles Shinn: Noted he was fairly comfortable with wording; however, on second bullet, he suggested we include other private family lands. **Perhaps add 'other conservation lands' in addition to Florida Rural and Family Lands.***
- *Ken Armstrong: **Stated that 'coordinate any impact' is a confusing phrasing and 'ameliorate' may be a better word.***
- Greg Garrett: Replied that the reason for adding that would be the differences in community preferences on determining minimal impacts and **stated they will make another attempt to re-word.**
- *Pegeen Hanrahan: Supported Mr. Shinn's commentary on coordinating with other programs for farms and forestry lands. Stated that under the economic development section, agriculture is one of our state's biggest industries and we do not want to lose sight of that fact. Recall that in this area, farming is very important to sustaining communities.*
- *Charles Lee: Pick up the resolution that was released the day before yesterday on Agriculture section. There are two effects of new road, especially greenfield. One is dividing and fragmenting farms. The second and broader is the effect on land use patterns over time. The forces, via tax assessments, or real estate prices, ultimately is to work these agricultural*

properties out. The way to resolve that is the Rural and Family Lands Program, 100 properties on priority list. You have thousands of property owners who are wanting to apply and holding off because there is no money in the system. Asked what is FDOT obligated to do. We should not only speak to coordination but also to funding as a portion of the program costs and putting money into that program.

Guiding Principle #11 / Highway Safety:

- Greg Garrett summarized revisions and new Instructions.
- **Ken Armstrong: *Did not like ‘consider’ and requested stronger language to ‘ensure’ there is truck parking.***
- *Commissioner Kristin Dozier: Questioned a source/reference in the report narrative concerning vehicle crashes along the study area in 2018. This is one of many times in the report that has already been drafted that there are questions as to where we are drawing that data from, is it a community, corridor, etc. Have some questions as to source of data in narrative.*
- Greg Garrett noted that after we get through the Guiding Principles, we will cover the narrative portion.

Guiding Principle #12 / Emergency Management:

- Greg Garrett reviewed the minor wordsmithing revisions and three new instructions.
- *Charles Lee: Read an excerpt from Florida Division of Emergency Management’s (FDEM) website related to selecting evacuation destinations near your home/within your county to minimize the distance traveled. Noted evacuation is a complicated subject, and the last thing that should occur is an imprecise tendency and have them move to evacuate further away. On the alert billboards, may be appropriate to say if you live in a modern home, you should not be evacuating. Stated there are broad tendencies to evacuate which creates additional negative externalities. A more conservative instruction would be something similar to the recommendation stated previously. “Structured evacuation planning” follows the guidance that you evacuate to the minimum degree necessary to achieve safety. Final point, as Ken Armstrong stated, the issue of truck parking is included, to the extent evacuation is necessary, the provision for enough fuel is necessary, and the provision of emergency fueling stations. Seems like FDEM should assist us in the design process/be directly involved. One research component is the concern of people to evacuate when not necessary. One of the things may be about new signage. Or communicate instructions about emergency advice.*
- **Secretary Greg Evans suggested it would be appropriate to defer in the Instructions to FDEM on latest guidance.**
- *Commissioner Mark Hatch: Suggested leaving the language as-is because no one is going to read this or what FDEM has to say when doing what they feel is best for their family.*
- *Commissioner Todd Gray: Stated for us to let the emergency management folks do this. Noted that some areas in south Florida are hardened a little better than we are. Need to be flexible given the area and rely on the experts. Minimizing mass evacuations is a good example, but people will hit the road. Suggested leaving the language as-is.*
- *Scott Koons: Stated that the regional planning councils are working with FDEM to update regional evacuation studies having completed a behavioral analysis. In 2010, that was determined based on several thousand random samples asking people what they would do. Noted what an individual will reply to in a survey vs. what they do are two different things. Said we will now rely on cell phone data and real life experiences in Florida in the last five years. We should minimize the number of persons evacuating; however, other officials may advise on evacuation (Governor, local officials, etc.). Will rely on real world data in recent storms. Current language is appropriate given people will make their decisions based on their best interest.*

- *Commissioner Kristin Dozier: Agreed and noted the study is scheduled to be conducted within 18 months. One comment, if we do not have the money to support the aggressive schedule, this is one of the most important impacts on a transportation project. This is the main point for advocates. To move forward without the study or the funds seems like a cart before the horse scenario. Agrees with the instructions as written, this is the appropriate time to mention that we hold off.*
- *Ken Armstrong: Reiterated language for lines 37-44 to be left as-is.*
- *Charles Lee: Believed involving emergency managers in planning is desired approach.*
- Guiding Principle #13 / Broadband and Other Utilities:
- *Greg Garrett summarized revisions.*
- *Chris Bailey: Noted inclusion of the second bullet is critical regarding private internet service providers (ISPs). Mentioned ongoing efforts over next several years for rural broadband, costs, utility poles and other right-of-way areas.*
- *Greg Vaughn appreciated Chris Bailey's input on this topic.*
- *Charles Lee: Stated the discussion on utilities goes beyond what we have in the first bullet, these two bullet points are primarily related to broadband. In the statute/objectives, provision of utility functions is also water and sewer and not just broadband. Limiting to FDOT right-of-way, means that FDOT will do nothing more than providing access to right-of-way. Under shoots what is required in the statute. At the minimum, if you are reconstructing a highway or a greenfield, then FDOT should include in the Instruction, usable conduits. Some of the funding responsibility does not all fall on the shoulders of other parties. Rethink Instructions and include one on collaboration with ISPs and water and sewer utilities and conduit construction within right-of-way. That is the minimum that needs to be done to achieve statutory requirement. In the case of water and sewer, you are putting in lines, the structure of what FDOT is doing is given service areas, or would like to use the provision of M-CORES, you should work with local utility, city, or county with design. As construction goes forward, FDOT should be laying down lines in the right-of-way that supports recommendations of local utilities.*
- *Greg Vaughn referred to Chris Bailey on FDOT provisions within the right-of-way for installation of these items.*
- *Chris Bailey: What Charles Lee stated is partially correct, it is okay to lay conduit/pipelines for infrastructure. It would be detrimental for the State of Florida to lay the fiber and then require ISPs to use it. Ensure adequate space, nondiscriminatory, adequate size, etc. for multiple providers.*
- *Charles Lee: Stated local utilities should be working with you on Design who already have water/sewer/aspire to in the future, as construction goes forward.*
- *Greg Garrett solicited Task Force response related to existing language and revisions based on today's discussion.*
- *Charles Lee: Referred to the statute, stating there is no priority of utilities. If you are building a greenfield or right-of-way transformation, place sufficient water/sewer lines to handle future aspirations of local water/sewer providers.*
- *Greg Garrett solicited response from Mark Futrell.*
- *Mark Futrell: Believed concerns regarding other utilities were addressed. Noted that in line 13 parenthetical, solar is not considered a utility. In a mix with other resources, solar is not considered a utility service that is regulated.*
- **Secretary Greg Evans summarized the Task Force member comments concerning conduits, pipes, etc. within an alignment. Noted that whether it is a greenfield/co-location, it will be substantial, and to proceed with caution as to not limit/overextend but list as considerations.**

- *Commissioner Scott Carnahan: Agreed with Charles Lee, FDOT has worked with them tremendously in helping lay utility and right-of-way. Do not think it is a big concern and working with local governments. Will allow Citrus County to connect all plants together.*
- *Ken Armstrong: **Suggested it would be appropriate to add an instruction about water and sewer.** Noted that with the construction of the corridor will create opportunities.*
- *Greg Garrett: Noted the Northern Turnpike Connector has good points and read them to the Task Force.*

2:58 pm

Break

Greg Evans, Task Force Chair

- Secretary Greg Evans dismissed the Task Force for break.

3:15 pm

Review and Refine Draft Final Report (continued)

Ryan Asmus, FDOT Production Lead
Greg Vaughn & Greg Garrett,
Facilitators
Task Force Support Team
Task Force Members

- Greg Evans reconvened meeting and introduced Greg Garrett as the facilitator to continue the Task Force discussion on guiding principles.
- Greg Garrett provided an overview of the changes to the report.
High-Level Need 1: Support projected statewide and regional population and economic growth
 - *Janet Bowman: Noted on page 9, first part regarding consensus recommendations, stated she appreciates the sentence which unpacks where we are with need, but statute puts an obligation on Task Force to evaluate. **When discussing what FDOT is going to be doing in the future, she believed it needed the perspective of a Task Force member that ‘we’ as a Task Force cannot fully evaluate the charge. Stated that not many of them agree to sign on to a long corridor. Believed it should speak from a Task Force member, believes lines 10-16 could be expanded.** Looked like we are delegating our responsibility to FDOT and stated the Task Force also has statutory obligations as well as FDOT.*
 - *Charles Lee: Mentioned the language he provided project staff prior to September 15th addresses this issue. Stated we did not find a need for a greenfield corridor through the study area and believed FDOT should consider other improvements. Could put in this section or one below to open future activities. Concluding statement by Task Force should read that we did not reach a consensus; however, did believe transportation improvements could be evolved.*
 - Greg Garrett solicited additional Task Force member input.
 - *Commissioner Kristin Dozier: Focused on population, for example, we have population numbers for 2019 showing 15% increase by 2045 which may have been impacted by COVID-19. **Refining this data would be part of the Guiding Principles or Instructions and wanted clarity on where datasets should go.** Asked where funding is coming from if the funding is mainly in PD&E and Design.*
 - Greg Garrett stated language added for high-level needs and how they are evaluated are various questions of ‘why. Explained that once that data is provided, the data is then directed forward based on Guiding Principles.
 - Huiwei Shen: Replied to the data point question stating **we will comb through report and improve the statement of certainty about the datasets, especially traffic.** Noted data updates will be done going into the future (population, traffic, etc.) throughout the process. In terms of coordination in working with other agencies, it is our daily business at FDOT to work with partners/stakeholders, that is why we have the planning offices. Have some funding (\$5 million) for broadband. Will work with FDEO to obtain their objectives and make sure our

criteria align with theirs. During early phases, will seek funding for conservation goals. Some is daily work, some is mandated (broadband), as we progress, we will use a variety of funding sources. FDOT may not always take the lead, like overall broadband strategic plan led by FDEO, FDOT will support.

- Will Watts: Explained FDOT is funded one year at a time by Governor/Legislature and explained timeframes. As we finish Task Force report, we will adjust work program targets. As of now just an estimate.
- Greg Garrett suggested the addition of language to clarify.
- *James Stanbury: Stated in response to funding, there are grants available for us (FDEO) to fund in the past as local governments become aware of the need for planning within the corridor for broadband, and we can assist communities with that. We are also working on a larger scale with FDOT for funding in the future.*
- *Ken Armstrong: **Believed 'in the study area' needs to be removed on page 10, lines 21 and 26, and remove 'regional' on page 9, lines 28 and 31. Do not think it is our job to solve the legislature's problems or COVID-19 as they are larger than 'regional/in the study area' and we need to fix the scale/scope in those places.***
- *Commissioner Kristin Dozier: Asked if we were just doing planning, tell us what we need for this region to solve the problems. Said we would not have a problem with budget shortfall, but M-CORES is tied to construction dollars beginning in December 2022. Concerned that this report and the other two are the first step in moving forward quickly to construction; and asked how we are going to address these other needs. Said she is familiar with FDEO's programs and statewide initiative. Appreciated all of the information Will Watts and Huiwei Shen have provided, but it is how statute has been written. Stated we will be spending money she is not convinced we have which will directly impact MPO and other statewide projects. Wanted to clarify why she asked these questions at this point and suggested we discuss in October on report consensus. Stated if it is pure planning, that is fine, but expressed her concern because it is tied to implementation.*
- Will Watts: Said we have to follow the schedule; it is aggressive and there are things we cannot override like economic feasibility and have this report finalized. Stated we have to do prudent planning first before construction, but we have to submit this report before we start planning.
- Huiwei Shen: Stated that when we get to the draft Action Plan and evaluate alternatives, we will look at financial cost and funding sources as there is a step for economic feasibility/identify funding sources. Advised that we will look at that language today to see if that addresses your concerns.
- Will Watts: **Said there are some funding opportunities for corridor development that we can weave those into Guiding Principles to identify early phases.**
- *Charles Lee: **Agreed with Ken Armstrong with removal of word 'regional'; however, support retaining paragraph.** Commends FDOT on line 9 to include the 'whether.' Believed Ken Armstrong is missing lines below related to traffic analysis – people and freight; then 'as well as' and statewide interregional travel to from and through the study area.' Account for two types of traffic: 1) move 2) service within the study area. Suggested leaving 'in the study area.'*
- *Ken Armstrong: Replied he was referring to lines 21 and 26.*

High-Level Need 2: Improve safety, mobility, and connectivity through access to a high speed, high capacity transportation corridor for people and commercial goods

High-Level Need 3: Protect, restore, enhance, and connect public and private environmentally sensitive areas and ecosystems

- Charles Lee: ***Believed the wording should be enhanced and stated that nothing in this area is meaningful unless you fund it. Suggested including the words ‘proactive opportunities,’ ‘for FDOT to fund in whole or in part,’ and ‘as required by 338.2278.’***

High-Level Need 4: Enhance travel options and safety for all transportation users

High-Level Need 5: Enhance emergency management at the local, regional, and state levels

- ***Scott Koons: Stated emergency response is a three-tiered process and page 11, line 34, should read ‘local emergency response and regional evacuation studies.’***
- ***Charles Lee: Referred to his language submission prior to September 15th suggesting that the Task Force recommend refinement of criteria for types of structures that need to be evacuated where sheltering in place may be more effective. Referenced analysis that is underway which will be plugged into the design in these projects. (page 11, line 35)***
- Secretary Greg Evans suggested we refer to the information Scott Koons just provided.
- ***Charles Lee: Replied we could do that but would prefer to have some definitive language included related to evacuation vs. shelter in place.***
- ***Greg Garrett confirmed placement beginning with page 11, line 35.***
- Secretary Greg Evans stated FDOT is not responsible for those types of evacuations.
- ***Charles Lee: Replied that technically, the recommendation could come from emergency managers. Clearly two different modes with preparing with emergency situations. Should not be assuming capacities until those studies come out. Suggested looking at qualitative output.***
- Huiwei Shen believed Guiding Principle has that consideration for sheltering, but stated it is a local decision/personal behavior. Replied that if you want language, we can hand that off to partner agency as it is not really under the purview of FDOT.
- ***Scott Koons: Stated this could be handled on page 11, line 37, by adding ‘evacuation zones’ after ‘including.’***
- ***Ken Armstrong: Mentioned that focusing on evacuation fails to take into consideration trucks, freight shipping, and utility vehicles fighting traffic on I-75. Suggested removing emphasis from evacuation to avoid painting a smaller picture.***

High-Level Need 6: Improve access to ecotourism and recreational assets

High-Level Need 7: Enhance economic and workforce development, access to education, and job creation

High-Level Need 8: Improve connectivity to agricultural businesses, manufacturing, warehousing, freight terminals, and intermodal logistics centers

High-Level Need 9: Expand rural broadband infrastructure and access to broadband service

High-Level Need 10: Preserve and improve the rural character and quality of communities

- ***Ken Armstrong: Referred to the high-level need and traffic issue of I-10 east/westbound and relief for I-75. Stated he was not sure how we are going to deal with this problem but wanted to ensure it was included as it will have huge impacts on trail locations, communities, and FDOT’s demand/finance model.***
- Greg Garrett: ***Replied that the team will fit it somewhere and bring language back to the Task Force.***
- ***Janet Bowman: Followed Ken Armstrong’s comment, stating we need evaluation in the future to look at those issues. Concerned with discussion of using I-75 to be irrelevant, but agreed it is important, that the language in report states we are unsure how a corridor could affect congestion on I-75 (see page 7). Noted the northern portion of the study area has low traffic portions now. Important to have a clear description of where we are now, how we are going to evaluate demand, based on I-75/I-10 in the future.***
- Secretary Greg Evans replied that FDOT has and will analyze that information.

- Janet Bowman: Responded yes; however, **there are some traffic statements from today which can be included on page 7, lines 39-40.**
- Greg Garrett: Stated this has been unpacked at great length throughout the process (corridor study, etc.). **Noted both comments are right and will be expanded upon moving forward.**
- Huiwei Shen: **Added that per Janet Bowman’s comment, we need to show traffic from a statewide perspective not just from a congestion standpoint and include a more robust discussion.**
- Charles Lee: Stated he believed the I-75 issue (non-issue) is handled very well in the draft report sections. Appreciated use of ‘whether’ or ‘if’ statements indicating further analysis and further noted I-75 is terribly crowded/erratic. Stated the Suncoast and Turnpike extension projects will be driven by analysis.

4:15 pm

Review and Refine Action Plan

Greg Garrett, Facilitator

- Greg Garrett provided an overview of the components of the action plan.

Action Item 1: Evaluate needs.

- Charles Lee: **Stated the language between lines 31 and 41 (page 23) is excellent; however, it does not serve to fulfill the purpose of the statute in that the Task Force has to make a statement on need, and mentioned his suggested language provided to project staff prior to today’s meeting for insertion. Noted text should be included that we did not reach a consensus, but we believe that we should go forward with the analysis based on the Guiding Principles to determine necessity. Said if you include that statement those lines are fine.**

Action Item 2: Identify and evaluate alternatives.

- Kent Wimmer: **Recommended on line 9 of page 24 that a new sentence be added before the last sentence: ‘Alternative routes beyond the task force boundaries including the Jefferson County.’**
- Greg Garrett requested further comments/FDOT input.
- Greg Vaughn reiterated his comment. Suggested the Task Force include options outside of the study area counties.
- Kent Wimmer: **Recommended expanding upon text to include I-75/improvements outside of the study area.**
- Ken Armstrong: Noted on line 30 of page 23 that this statement is of FDOT making a commitment.
- Huiwei Shen: Stated that these actions plans are considered part of the Task Force recommendations as well as FDOT commitments.
- Charles Lee: Believed Task Force cannot extend outside of the study areas. Noted prior discussion during Northern Turnpike Corridor Task Force Meeting. Stated that one of the things we are dealing with on Suncoast, for better than 20 years, we have had a plan on the table and approved by all entities for Suncoast I, Suncoast II, and linkage to SR 44 at Red Level have already been vetted. Believed a logical starting point for corridor evaluation should be based on that at Red Level north as identified in previous work. Noted a strong indication that the US 19/98 corridor is the primary alternative for evaluation. Hoped a great effort is made by FDOT to focus primarily on ways the M-CORES objectives could be achieved by using US 19/98 corridor from Red Level north. Suggested the location of a toll road along that whole corridor/ sections of toll road would improve US 19/98 as a limited access facility in distance between towns, retrofit US 19 with environmental improvements with necessary bridging, sea level rise issue, etc. Mentioned Northern Turnpike Corridor consensus that there were probably alternatives of SR 44 co-location with powerline. Observed a similar situation here including a

strong consensus that we should use US 19/98 corridor and requested input from other members.

- Janet Bowman: **Suggested change on Introduction/Task Force charge based on statutory requirements. Noted how we addressed the goals through High-Level Needs, Guiding Principles, Instructions, etc. to better characterize, but believed it is within purview that if there is a point that needs to be required/recommended by the Task Force, it can recommend and FDOT is not required to implement.**
- Kent Wimmer: Disagreed with Charles Lee and questioned the traffic demands, consideration, and evaluation of counties outside of the study area/I-75. Asked FDOT for clarification of boundaries, etc.
- Jason Watts: Explained that the Legislature identified the boundaries of M-CORES. The Task Force has provided another level of instructions for consideration in addition to what FDOT normally does. Does not mean FDOT is not doing work in other counties.
- Will Watts: Confirmed FDOT's efforts to reduce congestion on the highway system. Noted a statewide model has been calibrated but will require further study of entire network.
- Kent Wimmer: Thanked FDOT staff for their response.
- Ken Armstrong: Disagreed with statement related to Task Force consensus of US 19/98 stating there are still other possibilities in play.

Action Item 3: Support consistency review and update of local and regional plans.

Action Item 4: Asses economic feasibility and identify potential funding sources.

Action Item 5: Advance innovative land acquisition concepts.

Action Item 6: Advance multi-use opportunities.

Action Item 7: Continue robust partner and public engagement.

Action Item 8: Commit to transparency and process improvement.

- Secretary Greg Evans introduced Huiwei Shen for next presentation.

4:40 pm	Next Steps	Huiwei Shen, FDOT Chief Planner Ryan Asmus, FDOT Production Lead Greg Evans, Task Force Chair Greg Vaughn, Facilitator
---------	------------	---

- Huiwei Shen stated report will be revised and posted on project website next Tuesday, September 29th. Advised the review window for Task Force members is September 29th - October 9th. Noted project staff will present revisions at next Task Force meeting and provided instructions and amendment form to be used for making comments. Asked the Task Force to allow project staff to work on typos, etc. and to submit substantive comments.
 - Commissioner Kristin Dozier: Agreed with the review process and asked what to expect at the next Task Force Meeting on October 20th and how consensus will be determined (vote, etc.).
 - Huiwei Shen replied that we will compile the amendments, go through each one, and try to gain consensus or at least not oppose the package. Noted the draft provided on September 29th will reflect today's edits. Stated logistics are still being determined on reaching a consensus; however, advised that in our final meeting we will have public comment at the beginning and go through each of the amendments, making changes, and checking with each member.
 - Commissioner Kristin Dozier thanked Huiwei Shen.
- Greg Vaughn provided a summary of today's discussions.
- Secretary Greg Evans reminded everyone today's meeting was being recorded and will be posted on the website.

4:53 pm	Public Comment	Greg Vaughn, Facilitator Production Staff
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greg Vaughn provided public comment instructions, followed by public comments from the following individuals. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Jim Tatum, Tampa, FL, Member of Our Santa Fe River: Asked Mr. Watts to take account of all 12,500 public comments (for, against, and category). Stated the no-build option is very important. Disagreed with Commissioner Scott Carnahan on counting of all form letters of individuals who completed the form letter request. Stated if disregarded, Commissioner Carnahan is not representing his constituents who have reached out to him. Mentioned Tax Watch and Cornell Group's M-CORES information stating it will fail, is fiscally unsound, and will cause environmental harm. Stated it is time to face the reality that very few people want this road. Requested FDOT to listen to the people of Florida and go with the no-build option.</i> ○ <i>Amy Datz, Tallahassee, FL: Stated recommendations, statewide and regional growth, and sea level rise are causing a migration of 79% of the population away from the coast is not mentioned in this report. Noted increase of working from home and movement of people to avoid tax. Regarding increase connectivity, observed there was no mention of directly connecting these corridors and avoid dumping traffic on I-4 and I-75 and stated this should be a primary consideration when relocating corridors. Regarding emergency management, observed there is no mention of staging areas of vehicles which come to repair electrical and other systems as directed by the legislature in 2020. Regarding broadband, stated it needs to be available to all citizens in the area, not just schools and libraries. Noted the counties in this area have significantly lower access to healthcare then the rest of the state making their broadband access more critical. Stated the legislation promised 700,000 residents internet access and instructed to keep this as a critical element when reviewing the final report. Regarding internet access, noted working from home is an advantage this area needs, increases their access to education and job training, used by agriculture and freight, and should be considered for economic development. Requested incorporation of emerging technologies into corridor planning with emphasis on portable solar charging stations/strips (electric cars, buses, and freight), grass from roadway for biofuel consideration. Requested to not include natural gas as it will be obsolete or Sabal Trail in utility plans. Noted abandonment of pipelines and cost for removal and environmental damage. Noted no mention of multimodal needs or mention of high speed rail connection/Amtrak as approved by voters several years ago and M-CORES being a possible opportunity. Noticed community identity discussion is centered on tolls but not discussed in report and is a necessary component. Stated no transportation system is profitable or even pays for itself and tolls are critical to future of highway maintenance.</i> ○ <i>Michael McGrath, Ft. Myers, FL, Sierra Club: Stated the Task Force has focused largely on nebulous ideas rather than specifics. Advised prior to considering any of these principles, FDOT should have evaluated if it was feasible or fiscally responsible as they normally would during their five-year planning process. Stated FDOT failed taxpayers and discussed Cornell's use of FDOT information and their findings (inputs/outputs, needs, and costs) related to toll roads. Asked why FDOT has not considered financial feasibility and for Task Force members to request no-build.</i> ○ <i>Herman Younger, Gainesville, FL, Sierra Club: Reminded Task Force their recommendations will soon go to Governor's desk and will determine future of Florida's economy, environment, and moral standards. Stated that FDOT argues that you are not tasked with recommending a no-build option as that is determined in FDOT's PD&E process which cannot be relied upon; only tasked with providing M-CORES recommendations. Stated a no-build recommendation is</i> 		

appropriate, and refusal for this expensive destruction to environment. Noted as if FDOT's failure to provide justification was not enough, Cornell's information made infeasibility clear on traffic congestion, broadband, and hurricane evacuation. Stated evidence shows there is no need for M-CORES and as Task Force members, your stamp of approval/lack of sound reason will be forever written in history. Requested to listen to everyone and do not sign on to any consensus agreement.

- *Teri Bridge, Bradenton, FL: Stated she has attended a number of M-CORES meetings and observed the Task Force's effort on their work. Observed and asked the following:*
 - 1) *Where is the data that supports the need for these corridors. Stated the data provided to-date does not support the need and the answer is critical to M-CORES project credibility.*
 - 2) *Why has the no-build option not been discussed to point it has its own Guiding Principles, Instructions, and Action Plans. Asked if the statute does not require these types of discussions and how will consensus on reports be determined without these discussions. Observed government bias and that these roads will be built despite concerns.*
 - 3) *Would not the improvement/expansion of existing roads and transportation infrastructure be more successful, environmentally friendly, and fiscally responsible solution to Florida's infrastructure needs? Believed this is best option to give existing roads priority.*
 - 4) *What is cost to build toll roads (costs, damages, impacts to environmental resources, Florida's budget, etc.)?*

Stunned when Commissioner stated he did not count form letters and explained that most of the public does not have time to write their own letters and officials should take them seriously. Believed M-CORES should clarify form letter weight to public.

- *Matthew Schwartz, Ft. Lauderdale, FL, South Florida Wildlands Association: Noted the vast majority of environmentalist are deeply opposed to this project and have joined the No Roads to Ruin Coalition. Joined not just because it is not financially feasible or will benefit a few wealthy land owners who will have greater high speed transportation to reach their properties, but because this project is a disaster to our parks, springs, aquifers, wildlife habitat, outdoor recreation, and quality of life. Stated Task Force members have no desire to protect Florida considering pollution, climate change, and sea level rise. Believed this is the most ecologically destructive project Florida has ever seen. Stated Task Force members, public, press, and state employees implementing this project should hear a full explanation of what is wrong with this project vs. the three minute statements at the end of each meeting. Observed yesterday's Task Force meeting was a great example of an expert on the Florida panther being limited to three minutes at the end after hours of unexperienced conversation to represent one of 27 of North Florida's wildlife listed as endangered/threatened. Noted concern of water resources (underground/limestone). Urged Task Force to vote no-build.*
- *Vivian Young, Tallahassee, FL, Communications Director, 1000 Friends of Florida: Submitted recommendations for use in developing Guiding Principles and Instructions. Urged to read and incorporate in order to protect lands, waters, prevent development, and protect local economy and quality of life. Highlighted these two concepts and included Task Force recommendations:*
 - 1) *Related to transportation and financial feasibility, stated that had this went through FDOT's process there would have been a transportation need identified/financial feasibility before going into the PD&E process. Concerned with costs/issues related to circumventing FDOT's normal process especially given timing/impacts of COVID-19. Recommended Task Force's first priority/phase for FDOT to be the determination of financial feasibility prior to spending millions of dollars.*
 - 2) *Related to protection of natural resources and rural character, as noted in Senate Bill, concerned with placement and planning of interchanges thus creating urban sprawl*

including development of gas stations, etc. which hurt downtowns. Second recommendation for Task Force is to include land acquisition as needed to promote conservation and limit urban sprawl prior to commencement of any road construction (model Wekiva Parkway project). Closed by stating significant acquisition is essential to protect natural resources.

- Shirley McCullough, Dunnellon, FL: Supported no-build. Stated in Citrus County form letters were the suggested way of communicating at the beginning and all comments are important. Concerned with disregard for Citrus County/public opinion because of desire for interchange. Hoped these call outs are added as comments. Requested FDOT to advise if so and she will send her concerns to address all three sections. Noted reference that FDOT will work with local governments. Observation of what has not been added is if using suggested proposed roadways (US 41, SR 44, SR 200, SR 121, etc.), they do not show what towns will be destroyed. Concerned her home, community, and county will be destroyed and noted these communities are not being revitalized. Stated this information should have a place in final report and not pretend this will not happen. Noticed wildlife was not discussed much today. Stated Georgia is having success breeding Eastern Indigo Snakes and are being released in Alabama, not Florida because they do not trust them for protection. Tampa Zoo is working to rehab and has expressed their concern how this will affect their efforts.
- Stephen Martin, Tallahassee, FL: Stated as a native Floridan, he is outraged over M-CORES and development of Florida. **Noted he has spoken at two prior Task Force meetings where much attention has been given to natural environment/protection but questioned how these grand projects (asphalt and fast cars) will be protective of the environment and wildlife.** Concerned with Florida being overdeveloped and questioned developers. Stated Florida was better without internet and mass development and expressed concern over its promotion.
- Neil Fleckenstein, Tall Timbers: Appreciated Task Force's work and provided the following recommendations:
 - 1) Related to the terminus, recommended report reflects I-10 without regard to any pre-determined county as it undermined the determination need, costs, analysis of alternatives, and impacts of this project.
 - 2) For final report to not include deadlines for construction/completion of corridors. Agreed with Janet Bowman that it is within the rights of the Task Force to approve the process. Believed aggressive timeline undermines the ability of FDOT, public, and consultants to fully evaluate impacts of one of Florida's largest transportation projects in history.
 - 3) Related to financial feasibility, recommended the Task Force adopt a Guiding Principle given the reality and fiscal restraints of Florida.
 - 4) Believed public engagement section lacks citizen feedback, concerns of public, and level of support for/against and stated it should be summarized in body of report with detailed analysis in attachments.
 - 5) In infrastructure section, expressed concern there was no mention of US 19 or its underutilization in report.
- Jenny Welch, Old Town, FL: Expressed concern that communities and wildlife areas between Old Town and Mayo were left out. Agreed with Charles Lee that it should follow US 19 and leave Old Town alone. Stated native plants should be saved and put back after it is built, and invasive species not used (bamboo and chase tree). Asked for native plants be used around retention ponds and included in Guiding Principles. Disappointed to hear Task Force members attacking one another. Thanked for including best available technology in Guiding Principles and Charles Lee for speaking for those that live in rural Florida.

- *Ted Smith, Ocala, FL, retired architect: Thanked everyone for the work they are doing and enhancing wildlife. Author of article "If done right, highway could be something special." Provided suggestions for considerations such as:*
 - 1) *Related to bottlenecks during hurricanes/bad accidents on I-75, suggested having the roadway extend north bypassing Atlanta.*
 - 2) *Noted Suncoast is the most important corridor being studied given COVID-19 impacts and suggested perhaps other efforts could be shelved or overall scope pared down.*
 - 3) *Asked if a short narrative about historic sites, environmental features along the Nature Coast be included instead of billboards.*
 - 4) *Recommended the mention of some portion (percentage) of project funding dedicated to enhancing the environment may ease public concern.*

Believed this project has potential to be a great project that hopefully we can all be proud of. Thanked for opportunity to share thoughts and wished best of luck.
- *Jimmy Carrell, Ocala, FL: Stated regarding public engagement, it would be helpful to include in the final report, a progress report with some specificity on how that would be accomplished from partners in public. In terms of co-location with US 19, stated if looking at flood and storm surge on the interactive map, you can see from Citrus County to Perry, the entirety of US 19 is subject to flooding per Charles Lee's comments. In addition, asked to look at roads to improve to get above flood/surge levels. If multi-modal is considered, asked to look at how long to get rail from Orlando to Tampa and whether multi-modal is really going to work all the way from Citrus County to I-10 vs. a short section of a multi-modal facility might be. Stated he will submit other additional/longer comments online.*
- *Tracie Seale, Lamont, FL: Thanked group for their work. Spoke as a resident/taxpayer from Lamont, FL with concerns it could be destroyed if this project goes through US 19/98. Stated they chose to live in this area, due to no noise/light pollution and pristine environment; however, expressed concern this would be lost if project goes through Lamont. Concerned economic growth might be encouraged by this project. Afraid it would be beneficial mostly to outside investors who do not share resident's values or way of life. Questioned how broadband would benefit anyone who is not beside/right along the corridor. Wanted to see it out into the rural areas if being used as an incentive. Concerned about increase of local taxes with small to no benefits for local residents. Thanked for allowing comments.*
- Greg Vaughn offered satellite public viewing locations the opportunity for public comment.
 - Mayo Location: Ron Caldi stated there were no individuals at location wishing to make a public comment.

Madison Location: David Haight stated there were no individuals at location wishing to make a public comment.

5:37 pm

Adjourn

Greg Evans, Task Force Chair

- Secretary Greg Evans thanked everyone for their public comments and stated they would become part of the public record. Provided instructions for providing written comments. Closed by thanking Task Force members.

Text Format:

Regular – Agenda outline; *Italic* – Discussion notes; **Bold** – Action items

Notes Taken By:

Kaleb McClellan and Alicia Barber, Atkins