

Subject: Southwest-Central Florida Corridor Task Force Meeting #9 (Virtual)

Date: Monday, October 19, 2020

Locations: **Public Viewing Location #1**

**AdventHealth Fieldhouse & Conference Center**  
210 Cypress Gardens Boulevard  
Winter Haven, FL 33880

**Public Viewing Location #2**

**Bonita Springs-Estero Elks Lodge #2753**  
3231 Coconut Road  
Bonita Springs, FL 34134

## Attendees

### In Attendance

L.K. Nandam, FDOT  
Tracy A. Hood, FDOT  
Jennifer Carpenter, FDEP  
Pam Johnson, FDEO  
Robert Richards, FDOE  
Stephanie Vick, FDOH  
Janet Taylor, FDACS  
Tom Graef, FWC  
Mark Futrell, FPSC  
Eric Anderson, Enterprise Florida  
Tim McGrath, FDBPR  
Donna Doubleday, CareerSource Florida  
Rechell Johnson, Volunteer Florida  
Melissa M. Roberts, South Florida WMD  
Brian Starford, Southwest Florida WMD  
Donald Scott, Lee County MPO  
Chris Constance, Charlotte County-Punta Gorda MPO  
Colon Lambert, Heartland Regional TPO (Tim Stanley substitute)  
Nat Birdsong, Polk TPO-City of Winter Haven  
Bill McDaniel, Southwest Florida RPC  
Pat Steed, Central Florida RPC  
Katie Worthington-Decker, Florida Chamber of Commerce  
Dave Rawicz, Florida Trucking Association  
Gerald Buhr, Florida Rural Water Association  
Bill Ferry, Florida Internet & Television Association  
Sherry Ambrose, Florida Economic Development Council  
Gary Ritter, Florida Farm Bureau Federation  
Dr. Jeff Allbritten, Florida SouthWestern State College (Bob Jones substitute)  
Glenn Little, South Florida State College  
Dr. Angela M. Garcia Falconetti, Polk State College  
Matt Caldwell, Maxwell, Hendry & Simmons LLC (phone only)  
Andrew Dickman, 1000 Friends of Florida  
Dr. Paul Gray, Audubon Florida  
Elizabeth Fleming, Defenders of Wildlife  
Shannon Estenoz, The Everglades Foundation  
Jason Lauritsen, Florida Wildlife Corridor  
Wendy Mathews, The Nature Conservancy  
Penny Taylor, Collier County  
Cecil Pendergrass, Lee County  
Ken Doherty, Charlotte County  
Mike Thompson, Hardee County

### Not in Attendance

Michael McCabe, Collier MPO  
Mitchell Wills, Hendry County  
Elton Langford, DeSoto County

## Attendees(cont'd)

In Attendance	Not in Attendance
John Ahern, Glades County	
Ron Handley, Highlands County	
Rick Wilson, Polk County	

Task Force Meeting		
9:00 AM	Welcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>L.K. Nandam, Task Force Chair</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Secretary L.K. Nandam introduced himself and thanked Task Force members for their participation. He expressed his appreciation for their continued contribution and commitment. He recognized October as National Community Planning Month and explained the format of the meeting with in-person and virtual options. He then mentioned the change of the agenda, with public comment occurring first and noted that FDOT Secretary Kevin Thibault is participating. He mentioned that the meeting would focus on the amendments proposed by Task Force members, with time given for discussion of each. He then turned control over to Karen Kiselewski.</li> </ul>		
9:05 AM	Introductions, Update, and Agenda Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Karen Kiselewski, Facilitator</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ms. Kiselewski went over the meeting agenda, objectives, and materials and the public comment period process. After showing the video on Florida's Sunshine Law, she reminded attendees that John Fricke with the Office of the Attorney General is available to answer any questions. She clarified a question from Meeting #8 that the Sunshine Law remains in effect through November 15, 2020 when the report is submitted. She conducted a roll call then called for public comment.</li> </ul>		
9:15 AM	Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>L.K. Nandam, Task Force Chair</li> <li>Karen Kiselewski, Facilitator</li> <li>Kevin Thibault, FDOT Secretary</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ms. Kiselewski reviewed the public comment process.</li> <li>Vivian Young is the Communications Director for 1000 Friends of Florida. 1000 Friends of Florida has submitted numerous recommendations regarding guiding principles, PD&amp;E directions, and the final report. She noted that 1000 Friends of Florida sent a letter to FDOT on October 8, 2020 reiterating their ongoing, major concerns. She said these remain the same as discussed throughout the process. The first related to transportation need and financial feasibility of the project. She said that it is really disconcerting to think that hundreds of millions of dollars are being spent before going through the Florida corridor planning process to determine if there is a preliminary determination of need and whether the project is financially feasible. She said 1000 Friends of Florida strongly urges the Task Force to slow down the process and include in the report a recommendation that a preliminary determination of need and financial feasibility be done before the PD&amp;E. Their next concern relates to the issue of sprawl - one of the major impacts of this road system. There has been a lot of discussion about the role of the state and the desire for local governments to make the final determination on what goes on around interchanges. This would not be in place if there were not taxpayer dollars from across the state being spent to build these roads and interchanges. There would be tremendous impacts funded by taxpayers across the state that would impact the State's drinking water supply and endangered species habitats. They want provisions included related to interchanges and the acquisition of lands prior to the construction of roads, including lands for conservation and lands in areas that local governments have not designated for development.</li> <li>Lindsay Cross from St. Petersburg is with the Florida Conservation Voters. She recognized that Task Force members have reviewed the Draft Task Force Report, and that they would be asked to sign on</li> </ul>		

to it today. She would like them to think of themselves as jury members, and, if there is any doubt, that they do not sign onto the report. She reiterated their legislative duty to evaluate the need for, and economic and environmental impacts of, hurricane evacuation impacts of, and land use impacts of the related corridor. The first part of the charge is to evaluate the need. FDOT has failed to provide this documentation. Outside analysis shows roads aren't needed. If you can't verify if roads are needed, do not sign onto report. FDOT has failed to provide a robust economic analysis. Independent organizations have undertaken this work and have strong concerns about cost and viability of the roads. One report suggests costs could exceed \$20 billion. If taxpayers' money could be better spent on providing infrastructure support that is needed today, especially during an extremely difficult budget period, do not sign on to the final report. She said the Task Force has heard about hurricane evacuation and how the state has not updated its evacuation plan in over 10 years. If Task Force members feel that the state should first have a defensible study about hurricane evacuation that is consistent with the state's emergency management department, then they should not sign onto the report. The Task Force has heard from panther experts and heard that roads will mean the end and possible extinction of the Florida panther. If the Task Force thinks the construction of these roads would irreversibly impact panthers and other vulnerable areas, they should not sign onto the report. The Task Force has heard from public members. An army of voluntary comment counters reviewed nearly 10,000 public comments, 93% of comments were against roads. If the desire of public should be taken into consideration, do not sign onto the final report.

- Amy Datz from Tallahassee felt as though there are more issues not emphasized in the high-level needs. First, the cost of congestion; second, design of connectivity between these three corridors; third, the emphasis on multi-modalism; fourth, co-location of fracked gas pipeline in the right-of-way. There should be a study of the cost-benefit analysis not only of freight, but also farm products, vehicles, people, bicycles, pedestrians and public transportation, reduction in medical costs by air pollution through congestion and increased internet connectivity. The legislation promised 700,000 residents would get internet access. Please keep this as a critical cost-benefit element in the report. Working from home is an important economic advantage. Study major areas with congestion and determine the best alignment that will provide the maximum reduction statewide. Connection with the Suncoast, I-4 and I-275 are some of the worst congested areas in the nation. Interregional connectivity to maximize efficiency of travel must be realized by not dumping traffic on I-4 or I-75 to connect these three corridors. Make the southwestern and central corridors contiguous with an I-4 interchange. Passenger rail is not addressed by this report, it should be given a priority when right-of-way is designed. Voters approved it decades ago. Solar power to supply energy for this new rail service should be discussed in the report and recommended in PD&E and design. Her chief concern is the co-location of Sabal Trail or other national gas pipelines in the corridor right-of-way. This is stated clearly in the northern Turnpike extension report, but not this one. The Task Force and the public are not adequately informed on this major issue. It is expensive to install and more expensive to remove gas pipeline when the industry goes bankrupt. The natural gas industry will be obsolete in 10 to 20 years leaving taxpayers to clean up the mess. This project should avoid supporting the development, inclusion, and maintenance of natural gas. Big Cypress is a site for exploratory fracking. Fracking will not only destroy panther habitat, but potentially adversely impact this roadway. Fracked gas must travel by pipeline, truck, or train. Transportation by truck has potential for explosion or spills, and is a dangerous material mingling with traffic. Fracking requires toxic explosive material that would need to be brought in and the result brought out. This is hundreds of thousands of dangerous truck trips in the corridor, and this should be discussed in the report. This may be the most contentious issue hidden in this project. She thanked staff for allowing her to speak through the webinar.
- Matthew Schwartz from Fort Lauderdale is with the South Florida Wildlands Association. All three legs of the M-CORES project have the same problems: slicing up wildlife habitat, degrading public

conservation lands, inducing sprawl, paving over of wetlands and aquifer recharge areas, decreasing water for springs, creating new sources of runoffs, destroying agricultural areas and spending massive amounts of public money on a project that has never been deemed necessary by any state or federal agency. It has not received an environmental review. The only one came from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and it referred to the project as a disaster for the panther and would open up for more development some of the best and last remaining habitat for panther, as well as other fish and wildlife resources and the environment. This leg has special problems as it would cut through habitat for Florida's state animal; an area carefully preserved through decades of preservation and management and includes well known lands such as the Big Cypress, etc. Though these lands are essential for the Florida panther, they are only part of a larger landscape that constitutes the core breeding habitat for the species. This project would roll out the red carpet for hundreds of thousands of acres of lands of private rural lands to be converted to housing and commercial uses. The transportation grid provided to these developers free of charge to degrade this part of Florida will never be mitigated if this project moves forward. The end result of this is not some grand public works project but only more people, more cars, and more shopping and less habitat, degraded waters, and increased roadkill. One of the main goals of M-CORES is revitalization of rural areas. Collier, Lee and other counties in Southwest Florida do not need this kind of revitalization. Growth has been skyrocketing in this region for decades. Southwest Florida needs a set of brakes and intelligent growth that brings protection to wildlife and habitat including wildlife crossings on existing roads and brings money for needed things like broadband for residents and shelters for hurricanes. He asked they support the no-build alternative for M-CORES and specifically the Southwest Corridor Connector.

- Eugene Kelly is with the Florida Native Plant Society. He was heartened by Task Force recommendations in the draft report, especially the one saying that there needs to be a need for an economic feasibility of the road before a PD&E. The Task Force had recommended that they finally put the cart behind the horse. He said the Task Force's inability to determine a need for a road, and the absence of any comment from the residents that they need or want it, amounts to a pretty clear determination that there isn't an urgent need for it. The Florida Native Plant Society is strongly in support of a simple no-build. He didn't believe the environmental impacts and impacts to wildlife and plant habitat can be justified by a road that is unneeded and unaffordable. He suggested that the Task Force won't just come forward with a no-build recommendation and include the additional recommendation that Legislature put the brakes on the process and the timing. He said the Task Force spent 15 months studying a need for the road and found none. It would be absurd for construction to begin in 14 months. That would be unrealistic and an irresponsible requirement. He asked that the report include a recommendation that the Legislature remove or adopt new legislation that would remove the required date for the start of construction.
- Susan Steinhauser is from Coconut Creek and said she supports everything that Mr. Schwartz said a few minutes ago. She had been in Tallahassee in 2019 and was astounded at how the legislation was passed. She was vehemently against this and stated "no-build."
- Christina Scaringe is from Miami Beach with Animal Defenders International. She recommended a no-build alternative and was concerned that there was no serious consideration for the project's need and impacts. Despite the chorus of voices expressing criticism and doubt on the project, it is still pushing forward. Critically endangered panthers struggle to survive while climate change looms and development threatens ecosystems. She said humans are their greatest threat. Thoughtless sprawl breeds habitat loss. The panthers' northern expansion is absolutely critical to survival. Other studies agree that the panther should receive the highest priority as any further loss risks extinction. A Cornell study concluded that M-CORES will fail to meet its goals across all measures and is fiscally infeasible and an environmental nightmare that will starve state coffers. The process should implement a stringent data driven analysis early and throughout. Failure to do so is a fatal flaw. She

provided the World Economic Forum's new nature economy series demonstrating the urgency of nature loss and calling on public and private sectors. The UN Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) warns that humanity is at a crossroads. The more humanity exploits nature, the more we undermine our own wellbeing, security and future. More than one million species face extinction demonstrating our lack of foresight. CBD shows the severe widespread consequences if we continue along our current path. The times demand that we reevaluate our use and abuse of the world. Development of infrastructure can no longer be blind to the natural world. Humans are part of the natural balance that has been thrown off with our thoughtlessness. Floridians agreed as 75% voted to mandate the spending of millions towards habitat corridors and the like. It doesn't take a massive roadway to fulfill this mandate. The natural and environmental challenges could not be clearer. This can be fixed, but only if we face our hubris with honest, responsible, and innovative nature-positive solutions that improve all of our lives and a world we can all share.

- Carlton Ward from Tampa is a conservation photographer and eighth generation Floridian. He spent the past 15 years photographing Florida ranch country. He has seen firsthand what is at stake with large scale development decisions like this. Ten years ago, he founded the Florida Wildlife Corridor. We have trekked 2,000 miles through the rural heartland of Florida, much of it in the study area so he is able to bear witness to the tremendous stakes of these large landscape scale development decisions. The past five years he's been working for the National Geographic Society on the path of the panther. The panther is a symbol of why large landscape conservation is needed. The stakes have never been clearer. The Florida panther, for the first time, is breeding north of the Caloosahatchee River. To reach sustainable numbers they need access to historical territory through the northern Everglades, through North Florida, and beyond. He said they must maintain robust, wide, connected wildlife corridors. He meant that there is a need to preserve land for ranching, for agriculture and for wildlife corridors because what wildlife and people need are largely one and the same. If the state is considering spending \$20 billion on new roads through the heart of wild Florida, we also need to be spending equal or more money on conservation infrastructure. Until we are willing to make that investment to ensure the future of agriculture, working lands, panther, water for the Everglades and other watersheds in the state, then this conversation makes little sense. Green infrastructure needs to have equal consideration in the public planning and funding process as built infrastructure. When we get to a point where we are willing to do that, then we can build them together in such a way that it can all work. He was optimistic during the last call because people were discussing the Florida panther.
- Adrienne Barmann has listened to the meetings for several months, and heard the words of multiple local people, and more people were against this road system than for it. A lot more. She didn't understand why this is even an issue when so many people, the people who have moved to these areas to be in rural places, do not want this corridor. She supported Matt Schwartz who spoke about the Florida panther and also the Florida bear. They don't know how to cross the street. There are so many roadways that have been built in Florida that this road is not needed. She is a Florida native and Florida is heating up. There are more days over 90 degrees, including yesterday. With more pavement, the state is going to heat up even more. Please reconsider this because this is so important to keep rural areas green so they can replenish aquifers, so we don't have to pollute our waterways with stormwater runoff as well as springs that are full of algae. The last time she jumped in a spring she broke out in hives. She's allergic to algae. She said that most of the springs she's been to have algae growing in them. More stormwater runoff means more algae. She said we don't need these problems to be enflamed in the state, please reconsider this. Think about the wildlife and trees and carbon input we are putting through our abuse in the state. We need the trees not to be cut down to build a road that's not needed. She is a member of the Sierra Club and she completely disagrees with this corridor.

- This concluded the online comments and members of the public at the physical locations were then given an opportunity to speak.
- Bonita Springs had no members of the public asking to speak.
- Winter Haven had one member of the public signed up to speak.
- Will Lorenzen decided to brave existing roads to come in and speak. He had been following this more as a commuter than as an environmental or transportation expert. From his experience as someone who gets in a car and drives from Riverview or across bridges in the Tampa Bay area or gets stuck on I-4, all these corridors are highly stressed. Looking around at fellow commuters going only a few miles an hour, he didn't get the impression that they felt there needs to be a multibillion-dollar project in several areas of rural Florida. Those sitting in traffic looking at their speedometer think there needs to be creative transportation solutions. Refocusing and reallocating resources to those areas that are not under stress and not the urban core areas that are future of state, he didn't get the impression that people are clamoring for something like this when they would like to get in their cars and go to work and do the things they need to do in their local areas. Please remember them when making these decisions that frustration and being stuck is the way they are feeling. Being stuck with billions of dollars in extra expenditures for something that is not currently needed is something they asked to have empathy for as they sit in traffic.
- Ms. Kiselewski emphasized the importance of public comments and the various ways that FDOT has collected input thus far. She reminded participants about the upcoming Community Open House and then turned the conversation to Secretary Nandam.
- Secretary Nandam thanked the members of the public for their thoughts and their time. He introduced Secretary Kevin Thibault and thanked him for being there to support the Task Force and share his thoughts.
- Secretary Thibault addressed the Task Force members and thanked the public for sharing their thoughts in this process. The last phase of the Task Force's work has occurred in a virtual/hybrid mode and he was pleased that they have not missed a beat. He applauded the Task Force's focus on planning for Florida's future. M-CORES has created extra steps in the process for engagement at all levels. He is hopeful that the development of a foundation of planning principles for an infrastructure program will be a model to follow. The goal of the Task Force has been to build consensus along the way and the development of high-level needs, guiding principles, and instructions that will be the foundation of planning and PD&E for each proposed corridor under this program. He thanked subject matter experts for their input on panels that volunteered their time. We have learned a lot from them and strengthened industry partnerships. He acknowledged individual Task Force member organizations and members' individual contributions to the M-CORES Program, acknowledging their key issues and providing assurances. Secretary Thibault then spoke of the Task Force's actions regarding balancing considerations and recommending actions and principles for decisions still to be made. The Task Force is making recommendations about how we plan and develop corridors for the 21st century, for multimodal multi-use corridors and all purposes of the statute. He committed to ensure the guiding principles, instructions, and action plan will be followed, and he will monitor adherence to the recommendations in the Task Force's report and to ensure transparency and public engagement throughout the process. He provided historical context on Florida's growth and expectations for future growth. Generations of Floridians will look back on this time as a pivotal point in history. He thanked the Task Force for their service to ensure Florida remains the greatest state for years to come.
- Secretary Nandam thanked Secretary Thibault and handed the conversation to Ms. Kiselewski to allow Task Force members to ask questions.
- Ms. Kiselewski called for questions from the Task Force.

- Elizabeth Fleming thanked Secretary Thibault. She was pleased to hear of his personal commitments that the guiding principles and instructions and follow up are adhered to. She wondered where that is required. Since this came about from a legislative process, and the Legislature can change its mind, where does that commitment come through in terms of funding the enhancements, for example the wildlife crossings, acquisitions of land, etc. She asked how the Task Force will know that the Legislature will decide not to fund those parts.
- Secretary Thibault said the goal would be to extract the Task Force recommendations and that will feed into the next phases of project development. He noted that it is rare, if it has ever happened at all, that the Legislature would make specific changes or delete specific lines of text. In case of budget and work program, they usually follow through with it as proposed. So, if a project or corridor development includes enhancements related to wildlife crossings or anything else, that gets approved as one line item. They have a rare ability to do that.
- Ms. Fleming said that answered her question and gave her a peek into understanding the legislative process and what can go on. She appreciated the answer that this would go forward as a package with the enhancements fully intact.
- Mayor Pro-Tem Nat Birdsong thanked Secretary Thibault. In light of all the shutdown and budget constraints, as it relates to FDOT he asked how corridor funding and local funding would be affected.
- Secretary Thibault said the unique aspect of this program was to put it as part of the Turnpike Enterprise. The Turnpike Enterprise is a part of FDOT, but with different funding opportunities and requirements. There have been reductions related to traditional funding sources, which is the gas tax, but the Turnpike doesn't receive those funds or get involved in allocations as it relates to MPOs. As the project and program moves forward it will continue to fall under the Turnpike Enterprise which has a unique funding capability separate from the rest of the state.
- Andrew Dickman said the board of 1000 Friends of Florida submitted a letter on October 8, 2020. He appreciated his appointment to the Task Force and has gained a lot of knowledge from the process. He worked hard to see through the eyes of the Task Force's diverse membership. He wanted to hear Secretary Thibault's thoughts on an opportunity to take a poll on who can and cannot support the final report. The concern is that there is not at least a basic part of the report that evidences the economic feasibility for the project and the need for it.
- Secretary Thibault thanked him for the comments and was glad to hear Mr. Dickman benefitted from the various perspectives. He wanted to reflect on the nature of the planning process that FDOT usually follows and the work being entertained today. There are legislative mandates that the Task Force is required to follow. One of those is that the Task Force submits the final report to the legislative leadership and to the Governor by November 15, 2020. He expects and hopes to see a lot of different perspectives captured and put into the final report. This includes areas for continued consideration that may not move forward right away because of some issues. There was quite a bit of robust discussion along the way about providing for broadband. Regardless of what happens with other elements, there is still a need to provide broadband access. As Ms. Fleming asked, how do we provide for enhancements to our environmental features in these corridors and is there an opportunity in existing corridors where we can make these enhancements. All aspects he hopes become part of the discussion and final report. He expected the need for a poll is not necessary because it has captured the input of different group members. Hopefully, that we will be able to move forward, and we can pivot from that information as the corridors continue to be developed.
- Mr. Dickman thanked the Secretary.
- Secretary Thibault thanked everyone for their work once again.

10:19 AM

Summary of Public Comments

• Beth Kigel, Task Force Support Team

- Ms. Kiselewski turned the conversation over to Beth Kigel to summarize the public comment on the draft Task Force report. She mentioned that the draft report has been posted online for two weeks seeking actionable input. She thanked the public for their review and comments.
- Ms. Kigel detailed the timeline for public comment on the draft Task Force report then summarized the public comment on the draft report. She broke the comments down by theme to capture public sentiment.
- Ms. Kiselewski asked the Task Force for comments and there were none. She then handed off to Secretary Nandam.

10:30 AM Break

- Secretary Nandam called for a 15-minute break.

10:45 AM Discuss Revisions to Final Draft Task Force Report

- Marlon Bizerra, FDOT Production Lead
- Karen Kiselewski, Facilitator
- Beth Kigel, Task Force Support Team
- Task Force Members

- Secretary Nandam welcomed the Task Force back and handed over to Ms. Kiselewski.
- Ms. Kiselewski reviewed the procedure for the discussion for all 72 amendments. The amendments were provided by ten Task Force members who would be asked to explain why they recommended the amendment.
- *Commissioner Chris Constance had a comment on public comment but will wait until the appropriate time.*
- Ms. Kiselewski asked for him to hold his question until the public engagement section. She then handed off to Ms. Kigel and asked that the report and the amendment be brought up, side by side.
- Ms. Kigel started with editorial amendments. All editorial amendments had been incorporated in some way in the final draft of the report. She did not go through them individually but scrolled through them. She noted they are marked as such in the packets.
- Ms. Kiselewski clarified that Task Force members originally received 68 amendments so there may be some they have not seen yet. All the amendments were posted on the Task Force website and available for the meeting. The Task Force generally will go in chronological order through the amendments.
- Ms. Kigel showed that the report has blue highlights to reference where amendments referred. She reminded everyone that they would be presenting their amendments to the Task Force then proceeded to the first amendment from Commissioner Penny Taylor (amendment #2).
- *Commissioner Taylor introduced her amendment concerning changing the word "and" to the word "while" on page 1, line 9. She noted that it was clear that protecting the environment is the denominator to all decisions that need to be made going forward. She wanted to emphasize how critical and important the environment is, especially in this leg of the M-CORES road. She thought this made it a stronger statement about the environment.*
- *Ms. Kigel clarified that this would be a change to the statutory language.*
- Ms. Kiselewski called for discussion.
- *Mr. Dickman agreed with Commissioner Taylor. He understood that this was lifted right from statute, but we are also expounding on statute in many other places, and this emphasizes the purpose of the statute.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski called for more discussion and noted that silence would indicate acceptance of the amendment.*

- *Commissioner Constance agreed and thought it could be made even stronger by saying “while always protecting” the environment and natural resources. He needed clarification and asked if they were specifically bringing out language from the Florida Statute and repeating it here or making it their own.*
- *Ms. Kigel noted that this is in the introduction and overview section which is just trying to set the stage for what’s in the statute and the charge for the Task Force as opposed to further into the report with the recommendations section.*
- *Commissioner Constance said he can go with it or not because later on in the document they will be as strong as they need to be on all they have been discussing, mainly protecting the existing environment and natural resources, along with financial obligations for local communities.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski called for any Task Force members that disagreed.*
- *Ms. Fleming said she doesn’t tend to disagree. She thought what Commissioner Taylor proposed put it more in line with the statute. She was looking at the language at the moment that said “it is created within the Department the multi-use corridors of regional economic significance program. The purpose of the program is to revitalize rural communities, encourage job creation and provide regional connectivity ‘while’ leveraging technology, enhancing quality of life and public safety and protecting the environment and natural resources.”*
- *Ms. Kiselewski said she didn’t hear any disagreement and took the liberty to accept the amendment as generally agreed upon. She called for any additional disagreements.*
- *Donna Doubleday said it sounded like Ms. Fleming said the way it was originally written is directly from the statute, so she wondered why not leave it as written.*
- *Commissioner Bill McDaniel said he was not in favor of or against the suggested change. He did share the concern that Commissioner Constance brought forth regarding the intent. If the language was specifically from the statute, he leaned towards leaving it alone. His main reason for commenting was that, rather than making an assumption, he suggested they just call for a vote. He felt they were leaving circumstances out that could be easily taken care of with the hand raise function.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski stated that this is a consensus-based process, so they won’t be taking votes.*
- *Gerald Buhr said he doesn’t have a problem with it but would prefer to leave it as is. He believed that the environment is very important, but he felt the economics issues were also very important. They should look to protect both at the same time. It’s a balancing act the Department has to do.*
- *Ms. Fleming said Ms. Doubleday misunderstood her point. Looking at the statute it has “while” in it. She suggested that they move on and pause on this point while the corridor support staff check it.*
- *Ms. Kigel checked it and noted the gray section at the bottom of the amendment form refers to the actual statute paragraph number. She said this will be seen in other places in the introduction and overview section.*
- *Secretary Nandam suggested that if staff has confirmed that the language came directly out of the statute, which was done, then the language should be kept the same so as not to conflict with the statute, but the Task Force members should look for opportunities further in the document to reemphasize things that they want to bring attention to.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski asked for any concerns with that approach.*
- *Jason Lauritsen weighed in of support to changing from “and” to “while.”*
- *Commissioner Taylor stated that even though the statute reads that way, and this is exactly from the statute, she wanted to emphasize the importance of the environment that she did not think was emphasized enough; and where better to emphasize than right at the beginning and back it up throughout the document.*
- *Mayor Pro- Tem Birdsong said the language as presented is what he supports, especially if it is pulled directly from legislation. Throughout the document they will voice stronger opinions.*

- *Commissioner Cecil Pendergrass wanted to clarify whether the amendment reduces or takes away ability for the Task Force to approve to build the road, which is the original purpose of the Task Force.*
- *Ms. Kigel said the Task Force report isn't a consensus on building a road, it is on recommendations for FDOT to take forward when going through the future phases of PD&E and so on. If the question is "does this change in language change the charge of the Task Force," no it does not.*
- *Commissioner Pendergrass said the original legislation had information about habitat, wetlands, and the environment. He isn't sure how it's determined what part of the environment isn't included in the original language.*
- *Ms. Kigel responded that most of this section is directly lifted from statute as it stands today, including how it addresses and talks about the environment and other areas for consideration by the Task Force.*
- *Katie Worthington-Decker said she is comfortable leaving it as "and"; words matter and choice of words. She would prefer to stay with what was in the original, similar to what Secretary Nandam said: could this create more problems if it conflicts with the way statutory language is written.*
- *Ms. Doubleday believed "while" was already there. She is in favor of leaving it as statutorily written.*
- *Commissioner Constance said the section creating M-CORES is missing. This needs to say that "the language of the legislation states that the purpose of the program," because that is what is being said. This is not coming from the Task Force; the Task Force doesn't state the purpose. He suggested they were saying that the language is that the Legislature placed this language, so that would be the clarifying statement to put in there.*
- *Ms. Kigel asked if the language would be "statutory purpose of program."*
- *Commissioner Constance responded, "the statutory purpose from the Legislature," yes. He wanted to see it referenced to the Legislature, that it was passed by the House and Senate and is what is being referenced.*
- *Dave Rawicz said he agreed with leaving it as is and supported Commissioner Constance's comment about clarifying.*
- *Janet Taylor said she would also agree to leave it as is.*
- *Commissioner Taylor wanted to move this ahead but felt the challenge for her was that they were handed a program that they are not allowed to say whether they like or not. They are coming to consensus about how to make it happen. So, the birth and growth of this program is going to be formed by what they do in the Task Force, but the actual idea is in law. That is a challenge for some of the members. She liked Commissioner Constance's idea of defining where purpose comes from. She felt they had to editorialize a bit and make sure the environment is paramount to everyone's idea. If it is FDOT and Secretary Nandam's belief that it is troubling to go away from statute, that it might cause technical and political problems for FDOT, she will withdraw.*
- *Secretary Nandam said thank you. The fundamental question was, if language is directly from statute, we should keep that language the same, but **take Commissioner Constance's clarification** and then take the opportunity to reflect enhancements in other places within the report.*
- *Commissioner Taylor said **she will withdraw the amendment** and respect FDOT's position in the importance of the state agency to adhere to the statute made by lawmakers of the state of Florida.*

**The amendment text for Introduction and Overview page 1, line 9: The following language was included by the Task Force: *The statutory purpose as defined by the Legislature is to revitalize....***

- *Ms. Kigel moved onto amendment #3 also from Commissioner Taylor.*
- *Commissioner Taylor introduced her amendment concerning changing "specific" to "critical" on page 1 line 37. She believed the proposed words were stronger. "Critical" rather than "specific" underscores the importance of the environment. Critical issues that might possibly change and damage the ecosystem of Southern Florida like what happened with US 41 from Miami to Naples.*

- Ms. Kigel said the intent was to say there are three corridor areas and each one had specific items called out by the Legislature, like this Task Force has the Florida panther. That's what "specific issues for each study area" referred to.
- Ms. Kiselewski asked for any concerns to the amendment and did not see any hands raised. She said the amendment can move forward as is.
- Commissioner McDaniel noted that he had his hand raised from before. He didn't disagree on the introductory portion, and he concurs with Commissioner Constance, but back when they were discussing the "and" or "while," the beginning of the paragraph starts off with "Florida statute XYZ." The only entity that can create statute is the Legislature. So, he didn't see the need to go through the clarification of who wrote the statute.
- Commissioner Pendergrass agreed with Commissioner McDaniel.
- Commissioner Constance asked if this showed corrected language with blue highlight in the document. Or if the edited document on the green sheet is the language that will be going in.
- Ms. Kigel clarified that the green sheet is the language that will be inserted and modified in the final draft report. At the end of the day the Task Force will see an actual track changes version where these revisions were placed into the report.
- Mr. Dickman thinks Commissioner McDaniel's voting idea has a lot of merit to it. Put an appendix in the report on who had what reaction.
- Secretary Nandam addressed the Task Force members noting that the dialogue going back and forth has been good, but he agreed they need to keep to the task and go through the amendments. He asked that moving forward they focus on the amendment put forward. The Task Force member would present their amendment, Ms. Kiselewski would ask the appropriate questions, then we will figure out if each member is okay with it. He is confident they can cover all the amendments as submitted.
- Ms. Kiselewski said they can move on to the next amendment.

**The amendment text for Introduction and Overview page 1, line 37: The following language was included by the Task Force: Addressing potential conflicts that may occur related to critical specific environmental resources and land uses identified in each study area;**

- Ms. Kigel moved to amendment #4 from Commissioner Taylor. She noted the language was directly lifted from the statute.
- Commissioner Taylor said that if it's directly from statute, **she will withdraw this amendment to page 2, line 1.**
- Ms. Kiselewski noted the next amendment was not in the original package but is on the website.
- Ms. Kigel mentioned that this subject matter related to preliminary determination is also referenced in the action plan. She also indicated that it is a similar topic to other amendments.
- Mr. Dickman introduced his added sentence to the report. He noticed in the analysis of public comment the top two things had to do with determination of a need for the project and financial feasibility. A lot of items were deferred to the PD&E, and he thought it was important to communicate to the Legislature and public some type of basic need for the project and financial feasibility before the PD&E study. He recognized staff are referencing that it is in a different part of an action plan. He also wanted to discuss the word "consensus."
- Ms. Kiselewski stopped Mr. Dickman because there were several amendments on the consensus topic, and she wanted to keep on track.
- Ms. Kigel clarified by saying they were going to have a robust discussion later about consensus because there were a few amendments regarding that.
- Mr. Dickman said to look up what consensus means; the whole document is approved by the group in general. That's why he liked Commissioner McDaniel's idea of hand raises signifying agreement.

- Secretary Nandam said the proposed amendment related to need and financial feasibility is well within the Department's current process, so they are okay with that.
- Commissioner McDaniel asked that the staff help them by sharing the Department's position on proposed amendments. He is not opposed to his colleagues making suggestions to enhance the final document. He has concerns about inserting language that would be prohibitive or make the document less effective. What Secretary Nandam just said stipulating that the Department didn't have an issue, that would give him comfort that the Department is okay with the suggestion.
- Ms. Kigel said there will be dialogue on these amendments with Secretary Nandam and other FDOT members.
- Secretary Nandam said that is correct. There are several amendments that he would ask staff to weigh in on so the Task Force can factor it in their analysis.
- Ms. Kiselewski called for any further discussion. Then said the language would be put in the gray box and transferred to the report in track changes for later.

**The amendment text for Introduction and Overview page 2, line 7: The following language was included by the Task Force: 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 Southwest Central Florida Corridor. The Task Force directed FDOT to establish at least a preliminary determination of transportation need and financial feasibility before proceeding with the PD&E process.**

- Ms. Kigel moved to the next proposed amendments where two Task Force members commented on the same highlighted section of the report. First, Commissioner Taylor (amendment #5) struck a sentence on page 2, lines 7 to 10, but split into two parts.
- Commissioner Taylor introduced her amendment to page 2, line 8, and felt the sentence is clearer in terms of what the Task Force did, and she wanted to emphasize that the Task Force built upon the purposes in law and developed high-level needs that need further evaluation. She thought it was important to be very clear to the public and those reading it, the process by which they have come to this day. The sentence that she added is a lot clearer than the one above it.
- Ms. Kiselewski called for concerns on the editorial piece of the amendment but didn't see any. She then called for thoughts on the additional change the amendment made.

**The amendment text for Introduction and Overview page 2, line 8: The following language was modified by the Task Force: ~~The Task Force identified a series of potential high-level needs for future evaluation by FDOT and developed recommendations for how FDOT should assess the need for a corridor of the scale specified in 10 statute.~~ The Task Force built upon the purposes outlined in the statute developing high-level needs that need further evaluation by FDOT.**

- Commissioner Taylor said that her amendment on page 2, line 9 comes from further down in the document. The Task Force did not fully develop the recommendations of how FDOT should assess the need for the corridor. She wanted to add it at the beginning to be consistent throughout.
- Sherry Ambrose believed this was a particularly important point. She requested they walk through the amendment again to explain how changes would impact the highlighted portion.
- Ms. Kigel reviewed how the document would change, referencing the green amendment document.
- Ms. Ambrose said she would not support the changes. She does not see that they are necessary, and it seems like a significant text change.
- Ms. Estenoz thought that Commissioner Taylor's language was truer and more accurate in describing the work done than the existing language. She didn't think the Task Force report gave FDOT complete recommendations for how it should assess need. She would support Commissioner Taylor's proposed amendment.

- *Secretary Nandam said they should look at the language on what the Task Force has delivered here. What was delivered in the report are the high-level needs, guiding principles, and instructions for the Department to go forward with their planning and PD&E process. He suggested they put “recommendations including high-level needs, guiding principles, and instructions were developed by the Task Force for further evaluation by FDOT.” This is based on and focused on what’s included in the report as recommendations of the Task Force and leaves responsibility of corridor evaluation as the Department’s responsibility.*
- *Commissioner McDaniel had a concern about the process they were going through. He said he felt like he was being pitted against his colleagues. He felt a much simpler process could be done with raising hands for or against. He’s not necessarily in favor of suggestions that were being made in this amendment, he thought the language as it stood sufficed. He is not happy with this process of determining whether amendments are agreed to or not by the entire Task Force.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski stated they will still have consensus discussion on the full report later in the day, so the discussion on the full package is still to be had. The thought was to go through amendments one by one much like in the past with guiding principles and instructions in terms of getting input from the Task Force and discussing whether to incorporate.*
- *Secretary Nandam said the first part of the amendment is pretty much rephrasing. The second part is where there is concern, that it does not go to the extent that they feel is the responsibility of the Task Force. He suggested a fact-based amendment. The second part would read “recommendations including high-level needs, guiding principles, and instructions were developed by the Task Force for further evaluation by FDOT.”*
- *Commissioner Constance disagreed with reviewing the amendments and suggested they call for discussion then ask “who is opposed” because they are probably going to find less people opposed than for.*
- *Commissioner Taylor requested that Secretary Nandam repeat his recommendation.*
- *Secretary Nandam repeated the language. He said this way it is clear and fact-based on what the Task Force has done in this report and what the Department is going to do with the report.*
- *Commissioner Taylor disagreed and kept with what she had written and asked for consensus on both.*
- *Secretary Nandam thanked Commissioner Taylor. He asked Ms. Kiselewski to ask the question in the way Commissioner Constance phrased it.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski asked if there were any concerns about the amendment as submitted by Commissioner Taylor.*
- *Commissioner Taylor thought that Commissioner Constance’s concept was: if you agreed, hands up, or if you disagree, hand is up. By asking about concerns, this meeting will last until tomorrow.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski asked again if there were any Task Force members that disagreed with the amendment as submitted. She saw Ms. Janet Taylor, Ms. Ambrose, and others. She said she would have to ask them to speak up.*
- *Commissioner McDaniel thought they needed to amend this process. He thought a raised hand was a simple way to get to consensus, and then it is possible to note the number of Task Force members who voted in favor of or not in favor of. He cannot support Commissioner Taylor’s language, especially with Secretary Nandam’s language adjustments. He said perhaps the Task Force needs to make a motion to get through this.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski appreciated the thoughts and noted that staff would consider that. She indicated they will proceed in the existing way for now.*
- *Mr. Buhr supported Secretary Nandam’s wording as opposed to Commissioner Taylor’s. He supported Commissioner McDaniel’s ideas in general.*

- Secretary Nandam said the process staff wanted to follow was the process that was used up to this stage to develop guiding principles and instructions, and that's how they wanted to continue. Just like in the previous meeting they went through the Task Force report, looked for feedback and then incorporated. The game plan should be that the Task Force member who submitted the amendment talks about their thought process. If there are any concerns/agreements from the Department they will mention them, and then Ms. Kiselewski will ask for any concerns with the language. Any hands that are raised Ms. Kiselewski will call on and they can make a comment. He wanted to make sure Task Force members get the opportunity to talk about their concerns.
- Ms. Kiselewski noted there were still several members that wished to speak and asked if the outlined process should begin now or with the next one.
- Secretary Nandam said it seemed like Task Force members liked the amendment he proposed. He wanted to see if any Task Force members had concerns with his language and if not then they would move forward.
- Ms. Kiselewski asked if any Task Force members had concerns with the proposed alternate text.
- Ms. Janet Taylor agreed with the recommendation made by Secretary Nandam
- Ms. Estenoz said she was comfortable with either amendment but what she was hearing was the process was bumping up against statutory constraints. She knew the Department had its eye on getting consensus by the end of the day, and every consensus document she'd been part of has been tedious with wordsmithing. Whatever the group decided was fine with her. She was interested in getting to the conversation about what consensus meant.
- Ms. Kiselewski said that would be at the end of the day, so they would get back to it.
- Dr. Angela Garcia Falconetti wanted to share her full support of Secretary Nandam's revised language.
- Ms. Kiselewski appreciated that. She said there did not seem to be opposition to Secretary Nandam's proposed language so they will add that language.
- Ms. Kigel clarified Commissioner Taylor's first part would be accepted, then Secretary Nandam's suggestion for the second part would be accepted and both were added to the gray box.

**The amendment text for Introduction and Overview page 2, lines 9-10: The following language was modified by the Task Force: ~~The Task Force identified a series of potential high-level needs for future evaluation by FDOT and developed recommendations for how FDOT should assess the need for a corridor of the scale specified in statute. The Task Force built upon the purposes outlined in the statute by developing high-level needs that need further evaluation by FDOT. Recommendations including high-level needs, guiding principles and instructions were developed by the Task Force for further evaluation by FDOT.~~ (Staff Note: The last sentence was removed from the final report as duplicative of the final sentence within the same paragraph.)**

- Ms. Kigel moved to the next amendment from Ms. Mathews (amendment #1) and noted that Ms. Mathews had other amendments that utilized similar or the same language.
- Ms. Mathews introduced her amendment. She felt the notes summarized it pretty well, that at the Task Force stage it is not possible to make conclusions about need and financial feasibility.
- Ms. Kiselewski asked if there were any additional comments from FDOT staff about the amendment.
- Mr. Jason Watts said that as a Department the only concern about this was they would like to see a focus more on what happened and not necessarily on what hasn't happened yet, or what will happen at a future date. Staff looked at this and came up with an alternative. The sentence in the middle of this section reads "Project-level needs will be evaluated consistent with Task Force's recommendations. If specific needs are identified, the Task Force expressed a preference..." That was a separate alternative that focuses more on what the Task Force did and how the Department is going to use the Task Force report for future phases of the project.
- Secretary Nandam asked Ms. Mathews to weigh in on Mr. Jason Watts' suggestion.

- *Ms. Mathews appreciated the offered-up language and wanted to see the recommendations on the screen.*
- *Ms. Mathews said the point they are trying to make is that the Task Force couldn't identify the need. That was what the Task Force was tasked with and that was the point of the additional language.*
- *Mr. Jason Watts said he understood the reasoning. Staff's concern is the amount of work that hasn't happened yet. Focus on the Task Force report and how it shows the Department what to do in the future and put it in a way to carry it forward instead of focusing on what has not happened or what won't happen for a while.*
- *Ms. Mathews said he'd hit on what was an important point. The Nature Conservancy had seen a lot of FDOT projects, and they fully trust the process. Their concerns were with the legislative language because the Task Force has no control over what happens once the document is presented.*
- *Dr. Paul Gray wasn't sure the Task Force determined a need and that may need to be investigated further. He recognized that the 2050 future conditions map showed where roads won't be suitable in the future. He thought they should look at those red lines and see if they can fix them and co-locate facilities. He noted that it is really important to have good roads in urban areas and have a good quality of life, so they don't move out to the country. Even if the Task Force didn't determine need, he recognized a need and doesn't have an issue with FDOT fixing them in the future.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski noted that some of the Department's concerns were that it may limit the ability to expand existing facilities or enhancements where they are needed.*
- *Ms. Estenoz supported Ms. Mathews' amendment. She thought this was going specifically to statutory direction. The Task Force did not evaluate need. She was growing concerned that the process today was trying to soften the process that they all spent a bunch of their time on. FDOT has reminded them that they are not evaluating corridors, that it wasn't their job to look at specific roads/alternatives. It was their job to look at need and establish need and they didn't. The report needed to be truthful about one of the things they were told to do. The reason Ms. Mathews gets it right is that, without the clause, there is an incomplete explanation of what was not determined. The sentence in the report says they didn't do one thing, and the silence after that statement implies that the Task Force established a need, which they didn't. That doesn't mean FDOT won't establish that need, that could happen. She strongly supported Ms. Mathews amendment.*
- *Mr. Will Watts said he thought it was a quality comment they just need to clarify "during the Task Force process." The way it was worded almost concludes there is no need for future expansion and staff wants to preserve the right to study and determine needs in the future.*
- *Ms. Kigel noted the recommended language from Mr. Jason Watts was in the gray box.*
- *Mr. Gary Ritter thought that FDOT has many areas that are already redlined and identified as a need for expansion of existing highways. He thought there was a great deal of discussion for a need for expansion of existing facilities on those that had been redlined, especially some of the east-west roads.*
- *Secretary Nandam suggested that FDOT has a charge based on Task Force recommendations and what has been provided in the content of the report that the Department is going to go forward with evaluation that will include the need for expansion of highways, and they will use the report recommendations. When that is being done, they are going to use the high-level needs, guiding principles, and instructions. What if instead of saying "the Task Force did not evaluate," say "the Task Force directs/requests FDOT to evaluate need to widen existing facilities using the guiding principles and instructions provided in this report." That would be a means to go forward with evaluation consistent with the direction given.*

- Ms. Mathews said yes, the intent was not to limit any future enhancement, just to say the Task Force did not make that determination. She clarified that the Task Force did not reach conclusions on expansion of existing highways or facilities.
- Secretary Nandam said they are not disagreeing. The point is ensuring that they have, and the Task Force acknowledges that they have been given, guiding principles and instructions for FDOT to go forward with the evaluation of these two items. The Department would be okay if language associated with that was added.
- Ms. Mathews said she thought it was important to add the sentence that the Task Force did not reach these conclusions, but she wasn't trying to limit FDOT from further evaluating these in the PD&E process. Today the Task Force did not reach these conclusions.
- Mr. Jason Watts thanked Ms. Mathews. Staff were working on language that may satisfy her concern and get Secretary Nandam to where he wanted to go. Instead of putting the entire section after "purpose," they are adding "need or completely new greenfield corridor or modifications to existing corridors (or existing facilities)." This ties the new greenfield corridor and modifications to existing corridors to the time frame so it will be clear that the Task Force had not reached a conclusion.
- Ms. Mathews thanked staff for putting it on the screen.
- Commissioner McDaniel asked who is going to make the final decision as to whether a new road is constructed anywhere. He asked if the Task Force was making that decision.
- Ms. Kiselewski said it was her understanding that the Task Force was only making recommendations on how a new road should be developed.
- Commissioner McDaniel said that answered his question. Where he was finding issue with Ms. Mathews' comments is, at one of the early Task Force meetings, Dr. Gray suggested and the Task Force came to the conclusion that they are not recommending a road or not, that will be left up to the government and FDOT working together. If a road is going to be built someday, here is a list of guiding principles that there is consensus on (do's and don'ts). He returned to the need issue saying there is an intrinsic need due to population growth in the state of Florida that, in the event that the government and FDOT determine to build a new road, that it does in fact follow an existing road and provide enhancements to the existing routes. Saying that the Task Force didn't look at that need or come to a conclusion on that need is almost counterproductive. He has specifically stated that if it is determined that a road is to be built, those enhancements need to follow an existing route.
- Ms. Kiselewski said she believed that was included throughout the rest of the report.
- Ms. Kigel noted the first guiding principle focused on maximizing use of existing facilities.
- Glenn Little said he respects Ms. Mathews' comment but liked the idea of a blended approach that was suggested. He was fine with the inclusion of the existing highways/facilities as proposed.
- Ms. Kigel read out the new recommended language.

**The amendment text for Introduction and Overview page 2, line 10-13: The following language was modified by the Task Force: 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 or modifications of existing facilities on land through the study area to achieve the statutory purpose. Project-level needs will be evaluated consistent with the Task Force's recommendations. If specific needs are identified, the Task Force expressed a preference for improvement or expansion of existing major highway corridors.**

- Ms. Mathews thanked everyone for the conversation and thought that Mr. Jason Watts was able to get at what she was trying to express.
- Ms. Kiselewski didn't see any hands and thought they could break for lunch.
- Secretary Nandam thanked the Task Force for their patience with the discussion of amendments. Their goal is to make sure their viewpoints are reflected in the report. He wanted to make sure Task

Force members who recommended amendments had a chance to speak. Hopefully, the Task Force will go through the amendments quicker after lunch.		
12:35 PM	Break for Lunch	
1:30 PM	Discuss Revisions to Final Draft Task Force Report (continued)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marlon Bizerra, FDOT Production Lead</li> <li>• Karen Kiselewski, Facilitator</li> <li>• Beth Kigel, Task Force Support Team</li> <li>• Task Force Members</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secretary Nandam welcomed attendees back from the lunch break. Secretary Nandam then stated that he would go over the process of going through the amendments, so that Task Force members and staff have a clear understanding of the process and to ensure Ms. Kiselewski can manage the conversation. Secretary Nandam stated that, when Ms. Kigel brings a Task Force member’s amendment on the screen, the member who proposed the amendment will be provided the opportunity to provide a summary and thought process. Secretary Nandam then stated that FDOT will also weigh in on the amendments and provide a Department perspective, then Ms. Kiselewski will engage the Task Force members on their thoughts related to the proposed amendment. During that process, if the Department has a friendly amendment that they wish to bring forward it will also be shown on the screen. Then Task Force members will have the opportunity to review and provide comment on the Department’s proposed amendment. Ms. Kiselewski is going to ask for any concerns or comments and then monitor changes as needed, with a final check that there are no additional concerns after possible revisions. Secretary Nandam stated that in this way there is a consistent process for every amendment and it ensures the opportunity for the Task Force members to discuss the amendments and provide input based on the feedback the Department has given. Secretary Nandam then asked for Ms. Kigel and Ms. Kiselewski to take over.</li> <li>• Ms. Kigel continued from where they left off before the break, which was discussing Ms. Mathews’ amendment #4 on report page 2, lines 15-17.</li> <li>• <i>Ms. Mathews presented an overview and summary of her amendment and stated that she believed it was important to include the phrase, “based on the limited data and analysis” in this specific section because that was utilized in a previous paragraph and helps clarify that the Task Force recommendations on guiding principles and instructions were also based on limited data and analysis.</i></li> <li>• <i>Ms. Kigel stated that the phrase is located on line 5 of the Introduction and Overview section as it relates to needs and this statement which relates to the proposed amendment is related to the Recommendations.</i></li> <li>• <i>Ms. Kiselewski asked for FDOT to weigh in on the proposed amendment.</i></li> <li>• <i>Huiwei Shen stated that when discussing potential needs, the conversation needs to stay at a high level. She believes that the Task Force did have enough high-level, sketch planning-level data and needs information to guide the guiding principles and instructions. Ms. Shen recommended revising the proposed amendment to “based on the data and analysis provided” and asked Ms. Mathews to consider that revision.</i></li> <li>• <i>Ms. Mathews was not clear on the differentiation between needs and that set of data, versus drilling down in the guiding principles and instructions and how that data differs. Ms. Mathews agreed to Ms. Shen’s revision.</i></li> <li>• <i>Commissioner McDaniel stated that in the previous proposed amendment discussion he was concerned about the “major highway routes” language due to specific definition of a major highway. The Task Force has had several discussions of where the corridor could go and does not want to lead people in one direction or another and is concerned about what is considered a major highway on an</i></li> </ul>		

existing corridor. The Commissioner stated there seemed to be consensus in the Task Force that even some of the local county roads could be considered for the proposed new corridor.

- Ms. Kiselewski asked if that comment was on the amended language or on a different part of that paragraph.
- Commissioner McDaniel stated that it was related to Mr. Jason Watts' suggestion on that regarding the Department's final version of suggested language used the term "major highway systems."
- Ms. Kigel asked staff to show the previous amendment.
- Commissioner McDaniel was concerned about defining major highway corridor.
- Mr. Jason Watts stated the term is defined in the M-CORES Glossary.
- Commissioner McDaniel stated he was good with using that term.
- Ms. Kiselewski went back to discussing the Wendy Mathews #4 amendment and asked if the Department has developed revised language.
- Ms. Kigel read the proposed language to the Task Force and Ms. Mathews stated yes, that language makes it clear and would be acceptable.
- Task Force members agreed to make the change as proposed by staff.

**The amendment text for Introduction and Overview page 2, lines 15-17: The following language was added by the Task Force: The Task Force also recommended guiding principles, instructions, and an action plan, based on the limited data and analysis, as a set of directions to FDOT and other partners for future planning, project development, and implementation activities related to the M-CORES Program.**

- Ms. Kigel moved to the next amendments from Ms. Fleming (amendment #1) and Commissioner Taylor (amendment #6). Ms. Kigel noted these next two amendments discuss the same section and issues and asked to discuss both amendments together.
- Ms. Fleming presented an overview and summary of her amendment for report page 2, lines 18-25. Ms. Fleming stated she believed that in this section there is identical language to the Approach and Framework section on page 10, so they are identical suggestions. The first is that in completing this report the Task Force "intent is to provide consensus recommendations" and is suggesting to change that to the "charge was to provide consensus recommendations," because the charge is more accurate than their own intentions. Further down there is a proposed change to one word from "all" to "individual" regarding consensus on the report does not constitute agreement by "individual Task Force members." The next change suggested is placing the word "potential" in the sentence regarding the report being intended to provide consensus recommendations for how needs should be evaluated and how "potential" corridor development and related activities should move forward to implement the statute. Regarding the word "potential" it is consistent with other sections throughout the report.
- Ms. Kigel thanked Ms. Fleming and asked Commissioner Taylor to introduce her amendment.
- Commissioner Taylor presented an overview and summary of her amendment for report page 2, line 24. Commissioner Taylor stated she recommends a series of text edits, recommending changing the word "support" to "protect" regarding the environment and to add "enhance the" regarding quality of life.
- Ms. Kigel stated that the proposed edits are consistent with the statutory language and then asked if she also had an edit to line 23.
- Commissioner Taylor said yes. She noted that it was important to add in "statutorily defined purposes" to make it clear to folks not familiar with the process. These are not purposes the Task Force agreed on. This is what was told to the Task Force and it is important to make that clear.
- Ms. Kigel stated there is some language put forward by staff that will cover edits to the entire paragraph and one issue to point out is that if the statement said "built upon the statutorily defined purposes" it would be consistent with the other language used throughout the report.

- Commissioner Taylor agreed with that language.
- Ms. Kiselewski asked for Mr. Jason Watts to provide the FDOT perspective on both amendments.
- Mr. Jason Watts stated the Department does not take issue with either amendment, and when reviewing this paragraph, the Department realized there were several clarifications needed that solidified the intent of the paragraph. FDOT staff developed a revised version.
- The proposed FDOT edits were shown on screen and Ms. Kigel read the revised paragraph.
- Commissioner Taylor agreed with the revision.
- Ms. Fleming wanted a little more time to review.
- Ms. Kiselewski opened up the floor for comments from Task Force members.
- Ms. Estenoz asked if there is going to be an option to use “consent,” “approve,” or “do not object,” and how do those options relate to consent to the report.
- Ms. Kigel noted that “consent” had four different definitions from “support” through “agree not to oppose.”
- Ms. Estenoz thanked Ms. Kigel and agreed with the term as it stood.
- Pam Johnson stated she agreed with the proposed changes.
- Mr. Jason Watts stated that FDOT’s revision inadvertently left off the term “potential” and added it to the FDOT revision.
- Ms. Fleming asked if the Task Force could table this section for now until she hears back from her colleague who is proposing the same language on another Task Force.
- **Secretary Nandam agreed to table this amendment discussion for now and come back to it.**
- Ms. Kigel introduced the next amendments from Ms. Fleming #3.
- Ms. Fleming presented an overview and summary of her amendment for report page 3, lines 9-34 and stated she **added the word “potential”** to indicate what the Task Force did during this process and noted that, at this point in time, the Task Force is discussing potential corridors, not actual corridors.
- Ms. Kiselewski asked for Mr. Jason Watts to provide FDOT’s comment.
- Mr. Jason Watts stated that FDOT had no comment on this amendment.
- Task Force members agreed to make the change as proposed in the amendment.

**The amendment text for Task Force Overview page 3, lines 9-34: The following language was modified by the Task Force: 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 potential 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 associated to the statutory purpose, as well as guiding principles and instructions for **advancing potential** corridor development and related activities to help accomplish these needs, as documented in subsequent sections of this report. The Task Force also recommended an action plan for moving forward.**

- Ms. Kigel introduced the next amendment from Ms. Mathews (#5).
- Ms. Mathews presented an overview and summary of her amendment for report page 4, lines 17-19 and stated that, after reading the staff comment about this amendment, being about the GIS tool and the data utilized in that tool, and about in future work FDOT internal tools will be used. Ms. Mathews stated she was fine leaving her comment out with the understanding that the Task Force GIS tool will not be used for the future FDOT planning phase.

- After discussions about existing GIS tools, Mr. Jason Watts stated the Department has no opposition to the amendment and noted the Department will support the Task Force GIS tool and keep the layers in the tool updated.
- Ms. Mathews thanked Mr. Jason Watts.
- Ms. Kiselewski noted the amendment was recommended for adoption and asked for any questions or concerns.
- Task Force members agreed to make the change as proposed in the amendment.

**The amendment text for Meetings page 4, lines 17-19: The following language was modified by the Task Force: The GIS tool served as a living tool and was updated based on feedback and suggestions from the Task Force members. The GIS tool remains publicly accessible at all times, and will be updated as new data becomes available, on the project website ([www.FloridaMCORES.com](http://www.FloridaMCORES.com)) including through a mobile-friendly format.**

- Ms. Kigel noted there are multiple amendments that pertain to the public engagement section and would like to address them together.
- Dr. Gray presented an overview and summary of his amendment #1 for report page 4, line 20 and stated that when talking about 1,000 people sending in a comment there should be some directionality as to what that comment was, was it in favor or not. The Legislature and Governor are not going to read every comment so this should provide more information on general tone of the comments.
- Mr. Will Watts stated the Task Force has discussed how the Department has tried to focus on actionable items from the public comment. If people did have concerns, the Department tried to categorize those concerns from FDOT Listens and written comments received, and other methods like comment cards. What FDOT tried to do is put a tool in the Task Force toolbox to allow the Task Force to use that information in crafting the guiding principles and instructions. FDOT did the same approach when it came to public comment on the report. Mr. Will Watts then stated there are two additional form letters that are populated in the folder that was sent prior to the meeting, so instead of having to read all of them, Task Force members can get a sense of them quickly on what the form letters contain. Action items have been the focus of how FDOT developed these summaries.
- Dr. Gray said if a comment received stated people were concerned about water resources but does not mention if they were in favor or opposition, then there should be clarification added.
- Mr. Will Watts stated Dr. Gray brought up a good point and that concerns on water resources could be improvements or current state of affairs, so the Department had to sift through a lot of data to categorize issues for the Task Force to act on. Some categories may offer a sentiment of opposition, but it may be opposition based on very specific concerns, and the Department brings those specific concerns to the Task Force.
- Ms. Kigel noted a reference on page 5, lines 14-15 that the majority of the comments expressed opposition or concerns.
- Ms. Kigel asked to move to the next amendment in this report section and then discuss all the amendments at the very end.
- Commissioner Taylor presented an overview and summary of her amendment #7 for report page 4, line 41 and stated that her amendment is regarding adding an additional sentence prior to the start of page 5. Commissioner Taylor asked if her understanding is that FDOT has tabulated comments according to the form letters, for example 1,000 related to a specific form letter. Commissioner Taylor stated it would be easy to gloss over without the numbers behind the form letters.
- Mr. Will Watts confirmed that is correct. FDOT has taken the form letters and put them in a separate folder for the Task Force members to review and put at the top the different types of form letters so as

to not have members read over 1,000 form letters and for members to get the sentiment/concern of the bulk of them.

- Commissioner Taylor asked if, since each form letter had its own folder, did FDOT tabulate the number of each.
- Mr. Will Watts stated that FDOT did not go into that level of detail but did create a folder for all form letters and provided information on the prevalent form letter type.
- Commissioner Taylor stated she would like to insert her amendment.
- Ms. Kigel moved to the next amendment in this report section.
- Ms. Mathews presented an overview and summary of her amendment #16 for report page 5, lines 17-22 and stated her amendment is regarding adding exact numbers or percentages for the public comments related to the provided categories.
- Ms. Kigel noted that in the presentation she gave this morning there were categories with common themes and percentages for those.
- Mr. Will Watts stated there are a couple options as FDOT does have percentages for certain categories and can provide the Task Force those category percentages.
- Ms. Mathews stated that would help show how these different comment buckets rank in terms of public comment and would like to review FDOT's data.
- Mr. Will Watts **asked the Task Force to table this discussion for now to allow the Department to develop the alternate report language to address this amendment.**
- Ms. Kigel stated there is one more comment on this report section and noted that Commissioner Taylor's County Commission recently passed a resolution and asked her to present her amendment.
- Commissioner Taylor presented an overview and summary of her amendment #8 for report page 6, line 7. The Collier County Commission passed a resolution in support of the M-CORES Program only if it doesn't supplant or delay existing FDOT Work Program projects in Collier County, noting that it would be tentative support since there have been projects that have been delayed twice.
- Ms. Kiselewski pointed out there are several other amendments related to conditional or tentative support and the Task Force would be discussing this topic again when getting to that part of the report.
- Commissioner Doherty appreciates the resolution from Collier County and suggests discussing this item in the Action Plan section of the report since he has an amendment on this topic as well.
- Ms. Kiselewski noted that Commissioner Constance's previous comment from the morning session should be discussed here and asked the Commissioner to discuss his comment.
- Commissioner Constance stated, regarding today's comments from citizens, many Task Force members agree with the concerns raised. Task Force members cannot stop growth in Southwest Florida and close borders and cannot stop climate change or sea-level rise. Task Force members will not violate the current conservation lands or wildlife corridors and he appreciated fellow Task Force members' comments about not affecting county FDOT work plans.
- Secretary Nandam said he appreciated bringing this topic up. He proposed **adding the resolution to the list of organizations who passed resolutions in support, even though it is conditional and provided a text revision to line 32.**
- Commissioner Taylor accepted the proposed revision.
- Mr. Dickman asked if this section outlining resolutions in support was just local governments/counties or if it included other agencies and organizations that could propose resolutions.
- After discussions about resolutions received, Secretary Nandam said this section will focus on local municipalities only and will remove Sebring Airport Authority from the list.
- Task Force members agreed to make the change as proposed by FDOT staff.

**The amendment text for Public Engagement page 6, line 7: The following language was added by the Task Force: The following local government organizations provided resolutions in support of the corridor with or without conditions: (add Collier County, Board of County Commissioners to bullet list and delete Sebring Airport Authority).**

- Ms. Kigel noted no other Task Force comments, and the Task Force will return to the amendments addressing public comment categorization once FDOT staff have developed draft language.
- Ms. Kigel asked Commissioner Taylor to present her amendment #9 but noted that her proposed amendment language included state level statistics as opposed to region level statistics.
- Commissioner Taylor presented an overview and summary of her amendment for report page 6, line 38. She stated water has no boundaries and that her statistics are important for the Task Force to consider and noted the data is from a public academic paper.
- Ms. Kiselewski stated that FDOT has no concerns with the proposed amendment.
- Task Force members agreed to make the change as proposed in the amendment.

**The amendment text for Study Overview page 6, line 38: The following language was added by the Task Force: More than 90% of Florida's population relies on groundwater for its drinking water supply. Of the total water withdrawn in Florida for purposes such as drinking and agricultural irrigation, 62% comes from groundwater.<sup>1</sup>**

- Ms. Kigel called on Mr. Dickman to introduce his amendment #2.
- Mr. Dickman presented his amendment for report page 10, line 10 with a purpose of precision and did not recall the Task Force reviewing data or discussing every potential impact of the corridor in detail, and the current language states the Task Force process was designed to occur prior to the corridor planning process. He was unclear if the report is referring to FDOT's PD&E process or another process.
- Mr. Jason Watts provided background information on FDOT's planning process. The Planning and Environmental Linkage (PEL) happens between a formal planning process and a PD&E phase. He suggested that, instead of stating "prior to the corridor planning process," the report could state "prior to the corridor planning and development process." The Task Force Report is a pre-planning document. The Task Force Report will be incorporated into FDOT's processes and FDOT will complete PEL, ETDM, the ACE process, and then get to PD&E.
- Mr. Dickman agreed with the text revision.
- Mr. Jason Watts' text revision was accepted by the Task Force.

**The amendment text for Recommendations/Approach and Framework page 10, line 10: The following language was modified by the Task Force: Since the Task Force process was designed to occur prior to the corridor planning and development process, the Task Force did not ~~was not able to~~ review data on nor discuss every potential impact of the corridor in detail.**

- Ms. Kigel requested Commissioner Taylor to review her amendment #10.
- Commissioner Taylor presented her amendment for report page 10, line 18 and stated it was in response to the Task Force purpose in the state statute.
- Secretary Nandam stated that FDOT agrees with the amendment.
- Task Force members agreed to make the change as proposed in the amendment.

**The amendment text for Recommendations page 11, line 18: The following language was modified by the Task Force: ~~The high-level needs, along with the purpose, answer the question "why?".~~ The high-level needs are in response to the statutory defined purposes. The statutory defined purposes answer the question 'why?'.**

- Ms. Kigel noted that Ms. Fleming's amendment #2 also refers to the prior language FDOT is working to address as part of her amendment #1 in the Introduction and Overview section regarding consensus.
- This amendment was tabled.

- Ms. Kigel called on Ms. Mathews to present her amendment #14 for report page 10, lines 29-31 and stated this amendment is seeking clarification that the Task Force has not agreed to any specific corridor projects.
- Ms. Mathews presented her amendment stating it is just a clarification statement that the Task Force has not agreed to any specific corridor projects.
- Ms. Kiselewski noted this amendment is also part of the previous discussion on consensus.
- Mr. Jason Watts stated that earlier FDOT showed the rewrite of this paragraph and will review to determine if the rewrite covers this amendment or if FDOT needs to revise the rewrite. It was significantly rewritten to cover what FDOT does now and to define the intent of the Task Force.
- Ms. Mathews agreed and thanked Mr. Jason Watts.
- Ms. Kigel asked if there were any other comments from Ms. Fleming.
- Ms. Fleming stated the language regarding project specific needs and environmental feasibility was confusing and asked FDOT to help with the wording, to clarify what the state of affairs is so that “individual Task Force members consent to the report with a qualifier that FDOT needs to undertake a needs assessment, determine environmental feasibility, determine economic feasibility,” or leave it the way the sentence was previously written.
- Mr. Jason Watts stated that FDOT agrees and is reviewing the revised language.
- Ms. Kigel asked if the Task Force should come back to this while FDOT staff work on those edits.
- Secretary Nandam **suggested the Task Force work through this language and the previous amendment that was tabled.**
- Ms. Kiselewski stated the Task Force is still discussing Ms. Fleming’s amendment #2 with Ms. Mathews’ amendment #14 and asked for any questions or comments from the Task Force.
- Mr. Dickman stated that regarding the idea of qualified consensus is referred to a few times in the report and believed FDOT stated that would be discussed later and asked if that was correct.
- Ms. Kiselewski stated that was the language FDOT is working on.
- Ms. Kigel stated there were three amendments regarding the consensus language in the report, one of the amendments was in the Introduction and Overview section and the other two were in the Approach and Framework section, where the report language is identical related to consensus. Ms. Kigel stated FDOT had presented language to address consensus in the Introduction and Overview section and Ms. Fleming asked if she could talk with her colleague. Ms. Fleming has come back and provided feedback on the language the Department put forward earlier.
- Mr. Dickman stated he thought it was Ms. Estenoz that asked the question on consensus and believed the Task Force stated it would be discussed at the end.
- Ms. Kigel stated that was a different question related to the definition of consensus and the four categories.
- Ms. Kigel read the proposed language developed by staff and stated it **would appear in the Introduction and Overview section and Approach and Framework section.**
- Mr. Jason Watts addressed two points. For Ms. Fleming’s amendment, FDOT rewrote the sentence to make very clear what the individual Task Force consent with the qualifier means. The Task Force is instructing FDOT to do the three points made in the revision for future projects. The Department intended to do this, but wants to offer very clear distinctions as to what that means. Regarding Ms. Mathews’ amendment, her concerns should be captured in the revised paragraph.
- Ms. Kigel asked if there were any comments from the Task Force members who proposed the amendments.
- Ms. Fleming stated the language satisfied her concern for clarity.
- Ms. Mathews stated the language addressed her concerns but asked why there needs to be the sentence regarding Task Force members “consent” to the report instead of “submit” this report? She

understands FDOT is trying to build consensus but does not understand the need for the word “consent” to be woven throughout the report.

- Mr. Jason Watts said FDOT would not object to change the word “consent” to “submit.”
- Ms. Mathews agreed with that revision.
- Commissioner Taylor agreed to the change to the term from “consent” to “submit” with a qualifier and believed her amendment had been addressed with this new language.
- Ms. Fleming asked if it was possible in the FDOT revised language to remove the term “individual Task Force members submit” to simply “the Task Force submits.”
- Secretary Nandam agreed to make the change.
- Ms. Mathews agreed with Ms. Fleming’s edit.
- Mr. Dickman stated the edits are satisfactory.
- Ms. Kigel reminded Task Force members that this language will be shown exactly the same on page 2 in the Introduction and Overview section.
- Mr. Dickman agreed on the context in the Approach and Framework section but on page 2 he is concerned about the term consensus and how it is defined in that context. Mr. Dickman asked to remove the word “consensus.”
- Mr. Jason Watts confirmed FDOT will remove the term “consensus” from both sections.
- Ms. Shen stated that later in the meeting FDOT will show the final report and gauge if there are any more amendments. FDOT is comfortable removing the term from those sections and confirmed there will be a block of time later to discuss the term consensus.
- Mr. Dickman thanked Ms. Shen for that clarification.
- Task Force members **agreed to make the change as proposed by FDOT (same change will be made on page 2 lines 18-25 of the Final Report).**

The amendment text for Approach and Framework page 10, lines 27-34 and page 2, lines 18-25: The following language was by the Task Force replaces the existing text: ***In completing this report, the Task Force’s charge was to provide 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. The Task Force submits the report with a qualifier that FDOT must still develop project-specific needs, environmental feasibility, and economic feasibility for future projects. These recommendations address how needs for the statutorily defined purposes and feasibility should be evaluated and how potential corridor development and related activities should move forward to implement the statute and protect the environment, and enhance quality of life and the prosperity of the study area and the state. Future activities related to project-specific needs, environmental feasibility, and economic feasibility will be fully developed by FDOT consistent with the Task Force’s recommendations.***

Note: this also references Ms. Fleming’s amendments #1 and #2, and Commissioner Taylor’s amendment #6 in other sections of the report.

- Ms. Kigel brought up the next amendment for Commissioner Taylor (amendment #11).
- Commissioner Taylor presented an overview and summary of her amendment for report page 11, line 15-16 and stated she is adding the phrase “built upon” instead of developed.
- Ms. Kigel provided a recommended edit to the amendment to make it consistent with other parts of the report, to say **“built upon the statutory purposes.”**
- Commissioner Taylor agreed with that edit.
- Commissioner Constance proposed that it should state “statutory criteria.”
- Ms. Kigel noted there are a few areas in the report using the phrase “statutory purposes” and recommends being consistent.
- Task Force members agreed to make the change as proposed in the amendment and modified by Ms. Kigel.

The amendment text for High Level Needs page 11, line 15-16: The following language was modified by the Task Force: Based on the information provided, the Task Force identified potential high-level needs for the corridor, **built upon the statutory purposes**, and developed recommendations for how FDOT should assess the needs for a corridor of the scale specified in statute as part of future planning and project development.

- Ms. Kigel introduced the next amendment from Commissioner Taylor (amendment #12).
- *Commissioner Taylor presented her amendment for report page 11, line 24 and stated it adds a new sentence regarding the environment.*
- *Secretary Nandam provided a suggestion to not remove the deleted portion, but to add in the proposed sentence directly after the existing sentence.*
- *Commissioner Taylor agreed to the edit.*
- *Task Force members agreed to make the change as proposed by Secretary Nandam.*

The amendment text for High Level Needs page 11, line 24: The following language was added by the Task Force at the end of line 24: **One critical high-level need that could be jeopardized by a new transportation corridor is the maintaining of and enhancing of the environmental sensitivity of the land the corridor traverses through. Quality of life is also a high-level need that cannot be narrowly defined. People oftentimes interpret quality of life differently.**

- Ms. Kigel went to the next amendment from Commissioner Taylor (amendment #13).
- *Commissioner Taylor presented her amendment for report page 11, line 25 and stated these comments emphasize the importance of the environment in the Task Force process.*
- *Mr. Jason Watts stated FDOT has no concerns with the amendment.*
- *Mr. Buhr had an issue with the edit proposed on line 25 and that the Task Force did find significant issues with the rural communities regarding economic development due to poverty in the area and this could revitalize those areas, especially if the Task Force is going to add the term “significant need” in the environmental section it should be used in this section.*
- *Ms. Kigel noted that this section includes human and environmental needs, and the proposed amendment would pull the environmental needs into a separate sentence.*
- *Mr. Jason Watts **provided a recommended edit to the amendment based on concerns from Mr. Buhr.***
- *Commissioner Taylor agreed with the edit from Mr. Jason Watts.*
- *Task Force members agreed to make the change as proposed by Mr. Jason Watts.*

The amendment text for High Level Needs page 11, line 25: The following language was modified by the Task Force: In general, the Task Force **identified found** significant needs in the study area related to the six statutory purposes, including revitalizing rural communities, supporting economic development, and enhancing quality of life, ~~and protecting the environment.~~ **The Task Force also recognized the significant need to protect the environment.**

- Secretary Nandam called for a break

3:15 PM	Break	
3:30 PM	Discuss Revisions to Final Draft Task Force Report (continued)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• L.K. Nandam, Task Force Chair</li> <li>• Marlon Bizerra, FDOT Production Lead</li> <li>• Karen Kiselewski, Facilitator</li> <li>• Beth Kigel, Task Force Support Team</li> <li>• Task Force Members</li> </ul>

- Secretary Nandam welcomed everyone back from the break and reminded the Task Force members that the meeting would not end until all of the amendments and final report have been addressed.

- Ms. Kigel mentioned that they would be moving on still within page 11.
- Ms. Estenoz asked if this was the language the Task Force had been looking at before the break.
- Ms. Kigel said it was the next amendment but that the Task Force could go back, which they did.
- Ms. Estenoz expressed her concern for the language stating that the “Task Force identified significant needs” and she did not feel as though they had. The Task Force considered potential needs in the study area but did not identify them.
- Ms. Kigel stated that there is language on line 16 that says, “Task Force identified potential high-level needs” and could change the language to be consistent “in general the Task Force identified potential high-level needs in the study area.”
- Ms. Estenoz thought “potential” should be put back in. FDOT’s job moving forward is to identify the actual needs.
- Mr. Jason Watts stated that the reason it was included like this is because another Task Force member identified that there were significant needs as pertained to revitalizing rural communities and they were trying to meet in the middle and still include the word “significant.”
- Ms. Estenoz was concerned about the “identified needs.” The following sentence “the Task Force also recognized the significant need to protect the environment” uses the words “needs” slightly differently. In general, it could be said that the Task Force “recognized significant needs in the study area related to six statutory purposes including revitalizing rural communities.” The word “identified” sounds as though the Task Force quantified some kind of need which they didn’t.
- Secretary Nandam liked the term used, “recognized.”
- Ms. Kiselewski asked the original proposers to weigh in.
- Ms. Mathews stated that she was satisfied.
- Mr. Buhr said he was ok with the change.
- Ms. Kigel changed “identified” to “recognized.”
- Ms. Kiselewski asked Task Force members one more time if there were any concerns with the amendment as now shown and did not see any members raise their hands.

**The amendment text for High Level Needs: page 11, line 25: The following language was modified by the Task Force: In general, the Task Force ~~recognized identified~~ significant needs in the study area related to the six statutory purposes, including revitalizing rural communities, supporting economic development, and enhancing quality of life. The Task Force also recognized the significant need to protect the environment.**

- Ms. Kigel moved to Ms. Mathews amendment #2 on page 11 lines 29-30. She suggested that the language mentioned in Ms. Mathews’ prior amendment #1 there was agreed upon language to address these concerns. Ms. Kigel then asked Ms. Mathews to present her amendment.
- Ms. Mathews stated that works.
- Ms. Kigel clarified that this was an exact replication of the language to address Ms. Mathews’ recommendation earlier in the Introduction and Overview.
- Ms. Kiselewski asked if there were any concerns from Task Force members and did not see any.

**The amendment text for High-Level Needs: page 11, lines 29-30: The following language was modified by the Task Force: ~~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 based on the available information at this time. 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 or modifications of existing facilities through the study area to achieve the statutory purpose. Project-level needs will be evaluated consistent with the Task Force’s recommendations. If specific needs are identified, the Task Force expressed a preference for improvement or expansion of existing major highway corridors.~~**

- Ms. Kigel moved to Commissioner Taylor’s amendment #15 on page 13, line 13, related to utility co-location.
- *Commissioner Taylor wanted to strike through the word “to” and add additional text to say “by encouraging the co-location of utility lines as the road is constructed. This will enhance quality...”. She wanted to describe the main issue with broadband and the important role a road can play in terms of making the co-location of all utilities less expensive by doing it at the same time.*
- *Ms. Kigel read the sentence with the recommended change.*
- *Secretary Nandam stated that FDOT was okay with that change.*
- *Bill Ferry said he did not have a concern but more of a comment. It assumes utilities are put in at the same time along with broadband. In practicality that’s not how it typically occurs. He did not oppose it, it’s pretty innocuous and it’s trying to advance the idea of co-locating and being more efficient.*
- *Jennifer Carpenter had similar concerns about the language “as the road is constructed.” She suggested taking out “as the road is constructed” and simplifying it.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski asked Commissioner Taylor if that was acceptable to her.*
- *Commissioner Taylor stated that she was comfortable with the suggested revision.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski asked for any other comments or concerns. She did not see any raised hands.*

**The amendment text for High Level Needs: page 13, line 13: The following language was modified by the Task Force: The Task Force recommended FDOT evaluate opportunities to improve infrastructure connections between communities and regional roadway networks and support the expansion of rural utility infrastructure, including broadband, water, and sewer by encouraging the co-location of utility lines. This will ~~to~~ enhance quality of life for rural and underserved areas.**

- Ms. Kigel moved to Ms. Mathews amendment #7 on page 15 pertaining to lines 13-15 under the High-Level Needs section.
- *Ms. Mathews asked to amend the report to reiterate the statutory mandate for the special consideration of impacts to the Florida panther and the fact the statute requires the identification of opportunities for land acquisition.*
- *Secretary Nandam said FDOT is okay with the change.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski asked for any comments or concerns. Seeing none, the amendment was accepted as is.*

**The amendment text for High-Level Needs: page 15, line 13-15: The following language was modified by the Task Force: Section 338.2278(3)(c)7, requires the Task Force ~~recommended that FDOT to~~ give particular attention to these resources, including addressing the impact of the corridor on the Florida Panther and the need for acquisition of lands for state conservation or as mitigation for project construction. The Task Force identified through application of the guiding principles in addition to standard project development and environmental review processes, that are intended to protect and enhance these resources.**

- Ms. Kigel stated the next amendment is from Commissioner Taylor (amendment #16) and has two parts. The first portion addressed the language for the high-level need itself.
- *Commissioner Taylor wanted to emphasize “critical” and to add a sentence “these agricultural lands may be in critical areas of environmental sensitivity.” The idea is to tie the environment to agricultural lands in terms of environmental sensitivity of agricultural lands.*
- *Ms. Kigel stated the high-level need would be split into two sentences and would now state, “Support agriculture and resource-based industries as major economic drivers. These agricultural lands may be in critical areas of environmental sensitivity.”*
- *Mr. Ritter thought they should have at least equal importance. He wondered if this was not presented in the environmental area.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski thought that it might be helpful to explain how this high-level need is different from the conservation lands, environmentally sensitive areas, and some of the other high-level needs.*

- Ms. Kigel stated that this a high-level need and the way it was originally stated, there is reference to environmental objectives. Further in the report, anything with respect to guiding principles and instructions, the environmental aspects were folded into environmental-related guiding principles with the following high-level need shown here “Protect, connect, and enhance ....”
- Ms. Kiselewski asked for any other comments and there were none.
- Ms. Kigel stated the second item is on page 15, line 28. Where statewide regional evacuation studies were included and asked Commissioner Taylor to present.
- Commissioner Taylor thought that it’s important to touch base with local emergency operations centers of different counties, not only at a statewide-level, so they know what’s happening in their county.
- Ms. Kiselewski saw no comments from FDOT nor any Task Force members and therefore that amendment could also move forward.

The amendment text for High Level Needs: page 14, line 35-36, 39: The following language was modified by the Task Force: Support agriculture and resource-based industries as major economic drivers. ***These agricultural lands may be in critical areas of environmental sensitivity.***

The amendment text for High-Level Needs: page 15, lines 26-30: The following language was modified by the Task Force: The Task Force recommended FDOT closely tie the development of the M-CORES program to the forthcoming updates of the Statewide Regional Evacuation Studies underway by the Division of Emergency Management, ***the Emergency Operations Centers (EOC) throughout the region,*** and the regional planning councils, which will include information regarding travel behavior and sheltering needs.

- Ms. Kigel moved to Ms. Mathews’ amendment #3. This was the language that was proposed in two previous amendments (Ms. Mathews’ #1 and #2). Staff inserted the agreed upon language here as well. This was under the Needs Evaluation Process on pages 15 and 16 for lines 38-39 and 1-2. She asked if Ms. Mathews was okay with inserting this language again.
- Ms. Mathews stated she was good with that.
- Ms. Kiselewski asked if any Task Force members have any comments on this and, seeing none, moved to the next amendment.

The amendment text for Needs Evaluation Process: page 16, line 38-39: The following language was modified by the Task Force: ~~***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 based on the available information at this time. 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 or modifications of existing facilities through the study area to achieve the statutory purpose. Project-level needs will be evaluated consistent with the Task Force’s recommendations. If specific needs are identified, the Task Force expressed a preference for improvement or expansion of existing major highway corridors.***~~

- Ms. Kigel stated the next amendment was Mr. Dickman’s #3 for changes to lines 3-5 in the Recommendations/Approach and Framework section.
- Mr. Dickman said this came from looking at the statute, subsection 3(c)4. It’s a key part to this where “each corridor Task Force shall evaluate the need for, etc.” It emphasized an important milestone, and he doesn’t believe it is specific enough and consistent with statute. He preferred to see something more definitive. He recommended the need for and economic feasibility, environmental feasibility be performed as a prerequisite of the project development process. This subsection of the statute specifically talks to identifying the need for transportation capital project and economic environmental impacts, includes hurricane impacts, etc.

- *Mr. Will Watts said FDOT is okay with the proposed language except for a slight modification to change the word “economic” to “financial.” Financial feasibility accommodates all project costs at each phase, even as early as planning. Economic feasibility is further down the road when talking about toll revenues.*
- *Mr. Dickman asked for clarification about the difference between financial and economic feasibility.*
- *Mr. Will Watts clarified that economic feasibility is defined by statute. That’s with 30% plans where a revenue grade audit is done to determine contributions of toll revenue and what it does to funding the project. Financial feasibility is through the life of the project. FDOT is committed to starting that in early phases to include construction costs as well as fund sourcing.*
- *Mr. Dickman wanted it to be a prerequisite*
- *Ms. Kiselewski asked if changing the word economic to financial was acceptable to Mr. Dickman, with the rest remaining as he submitted.*
- *Mr. Dickman was agreeable.*
- *Ms. Estenoz is comfortable with the amendment, but wanted Mr. Will Watts to distinguish between financial and economic feasibility again. She wanted to know the relationship between financial and environmental feasibility when each are determined and how do they differ from economic feasibility.*
- *Mr. Will Watts stated that economic feasibility and environmental feasibility are covered in statute. Environmental feasibility is essentially the PD&E study. Economic feasibility is taking the PD&E study and advancing design up to 30% plans with enough detail to develop cost estimates. Financial feasibility is done through the life of project. FDOT can also commit to conducting an environmental assessment earlier, by taking a component of the statute required feasibility studies and advancing it into early phases, more of an assessment, the best that can be done at a planning level. They can take knowns and categorize them and understand unknowns. Pieces can be advanced earlier.*
- *Ms. Kigel clarified that this allows the Department to do the analysis earlier than is statutorily defined for economic feasibility.*
- *As a hypothetical, Ms. Estenoz asked if you identify as an alternative a new corridor from Immokalee north running parallel to SR 29, what kind of financial or environmental feasibility analysis could be done at those early stages.*
- *Mr. Will Watts stated that during the ACE process, those alternatives are costed out with knowns and unknowns to the best of their ability. They weigh out the most feasible alternative for moving forward.*
- *Mr. Jason Watts had a suggested rewrite. Instead of focusing on statutorily required things that have to happen later, make it more of a commitment by the Department to perform a financial feasibility assessment and environmental assessment prior to the project development phase. This would ask the Department to do an initial financial feasibility and initial environmental assessment in planning and pre-PD&E phases.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski asked if anyone else wanted to weigh in on this area of the report.*
- *Ms. Kigel presented the proposed language.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski asked Mr. Dickman if that got to his intent and met his needs.*
- *Mr. Dickman asked if this would be a preliminary assessment prior to the PD&E process.*
- *Ms. Kigel clarified that it was getting away from the statutory language and having these assessments done prior to the PD&E process.*
- *Mr. Jason Watts suggested a live revision.*
- *Mr. Dickman appreciated the clarification.*
- *Ms. Estenoz said that she was comfortable.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski asked for any other concerns or comments and there were none.*

**The amendment text for Recommendations/Approach and Framework page 16, lines 3-5: The following language was added by the Task Force to replace lines 3-5: The Task Force believes that the**

**determination of the transportation need, an initial financial feasibility assessment, and an initial environmental assessment is an essential prerequisite to the PD&E process.**

- Ms. Kigel moved to page 16 for the next amendment from Commissioner Taylor (amendment #17) on lines 25-27, the guiding principle on consistency with statewide and local plans. As per staff notes, also an action plan item #3 there is language reflective of the statute and what it requires.
- *Commissioner Taylor said it's the sentence that underlines that affected local governments are required by statute to modify their comprehensive plans to accommodate interchanges. She asked that these words be struck out and replaced with a sentence that referred to other required plans requiring consistency. The local county LRTPs need to be fully funded before money is moved to M-CORES from that plan.*
- *Ms. Kigel clarified the changes. In line 25, that the period after the word "statute" and there would be a sentence with the statutory reference. And then a sentence with additional plans.*
- *Commissioner Taylor stated that was fine.*
- *Secretary Nandam stated that FDOT was okay with the amendment.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski stated that the amendment would be accepted as proposed and called on Mr. Little.*
- *Mr. Little had a grammatical comment that "the metropolitan long-range transportation plans" should not be capitalized.*
- *Ms. Shen suggested calling it the "Florida Transportation Plan" and deleting "statewide."*
- *Ms. Kiselewski clarified the suggestions to lowercase LRTP and delete statewide.*
- *Commissioner Taylor stated that she was comfortable with that.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski ask if any Task Force members have concerns with the revisions and there were none.*

**The amendment text for Guiding Principles and Instructions: page 16, lines 25-27: The following language was modified by the Task Force: The emphasis of the principle is on consistency with local, regional, and statewide plans specifically called out in s.338.2278(3)(c)10, F.S. requires affected ~~statute~~; these include the local governments to review their comprehensive plans, to accommodate projected corridor interchanges. Additional plans requiring consistency include the metropolitan long-range transportation plans, strategic regional policy plans, and the ~~statewide~~ Florida Transportation Plan.**

- The next amendment is on page 17 on maximizing use of existing facilities. This is one amendment with multiple parts from Mr. Lauritsen (amendment #1) for lines 12, 17, and 23-26.
- *Mr. Lauritsen stated that the aim of the amendment was to differentiate between those rights-of-way and facilities that are existing that have public roadways on them and those that don't. There are markedly different impacts on wildlife when talking about those two different types of facilities. He would like to tie transportation facilities and rights-of-way together by adding "associated" in two places. That way this will not be interpreted as "transportation and other rights-of-way that may not be associated with those facilities." Looking at instructions, to order those two types of existing facilities by priority to make sure FDOT is looking at projects prioritizing existing facilities with co-location ability first before going to look at adjacent utility facilities.*
- *Ms. Kigel stated that this was a subject of discussion at Task Force Meeting #8 and the amendment provides encapsulation of that.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski understood this language to be acceptable to FDOT and asked for any Task Force member comments or concerns. Seeing none, it was accepted as proposed.*

**The amendment text for Guiding Principles and Instructions: page 17, line 12-26: The following language was modified by the Task Force: 2) MAXIMIZING USE OF EXISTING FACILITIES. This guiding principle is a cross-cutting principle addressing all high-level needs and supporting all other guiding principles in this report. This principle reflects the Task Force's strong preference for using existing transportation facilities and associated right-of-way to address the M-CORES purposes and high-level needs. Guiding Principle: Evaluate potential alternatives for addressing statewide and interregional**

mobility and connectivity needs in this priority order: 1. Make safety, operational, and capacity improvements to existing transportation facilities and associated right-of-way. 2. Develop new transportation facilities. Instructions: · Identify and advance safety and operational improvements to existing transportation facilities. · Evaluate potential capacity improvements to existing transportation facilities, including their impact on the surrounding environmental resources, land uses, and communities. ~~· Evaluate opportunities for co-location of transportation and utility facilities within or adjacent to existing disturbed right-of-way, and other approaches to transforming existing facilities and right-of-way to accommodate additional modes, uses, and functions, including their impact on the surrounding environmental resources, land uses, and communities.~~ · Evaluate opportunities for co-location, and other approaches to transforming existing facilities and right-of-way to accommodate additional modes, uses, and functions, including their impact on the surrounding environmental resources, land uses, and communities in the following priority order: ° Within or adjacent to existing transportation facilities and associated right-of-way. ° Within or adjacent to existing utilities facilities.

- Mr. Dickman thought he had submitted an amendment related to planning which he thinks was passed. He wanted to ask a question when this discussion was concluded.
- Ms. Kiselewski responded in the affirmative and last-minute amendments would be taken once the submitted ones are complete.
- Mr. Dickman clarified that it is consistency with statewide, regional, and local plans but they can circle back.
- Ms. Kigel moved to the next amendment on page 18, Social and Community Context - Dr. Gray's amendment #3. This would add a bullet in the instructions after line 16.
- Ms. Kiselewski clarified that FDOT finds the amendment acceptable.
- Dr. Gray wanted a social justice bullet here.
- Ms. Kiselewski asked if any other Task Force Members had suggested wording.
- Commissioner Constance is fine with the language but didn't know if "inequities" was a better word than "injustices."
- Dr. Gray stated that that was fine with him.
- Ms. Kiselewski asked for other comments from Task Force members.
- Mr. Jason Watts wanted to comment on the word change and suggested going back to "injustices." There is an "environmental justice" process, and this would keep the two melded together. There is a definition from the government, and he suggests it stay "injustices" to tie it to environmental justice portion just in case. He stated that environmental justice means the Department looks at how a project will affect a community from a social or ethnic perspective or other types of disadvantaged communities, so it is already kind of laid out. He would like to see it stay "injustices" as it is easier to explain, and inequity causes more ambiguity.
- Commissioner Constance was okay to withdraw.
- Dr. Gray was happy with this.
- Ms. Kiselewski stated that the amendment was back to being accepted as proposed and asked for any other thoughts. There were none.

**The amendment text for Guiding Principles and Instructions: page 18, after line 16: The following language was added by the Task Force: Plan and design corridors that avoid social, ethnic, and/or economic injustices.**

- Ms. Kigel stayed on page 18 for Mr. Dickman's amendment #5 starting at line 33. There are two successive amendments related to interchanges and they will go through both.
- Mr. Dickman wanted to make it simple as it relates back to consistency with regional and local plans. He wanted to skip those two.

- *Ms. Kigel said there is a connectivity guiding principle with instructions later on where there is quite a bit related to instructions around interchanges. That is another area it could be discussed as well.*
- *Mr. Dickman stated that the point trying to be made is to not damage in any way small communities. An interchange might draw away from them and could hurt economic development and their prospects.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski assumed skip meant withdraw.*
- *Mr. Dickman said yes but he wanted to raise it in a different context.*
- *Ms. Kigel said there would be an opportunity to call on him in different areas. The next amendment was Commissioner Taylor #18 on page 19, line 4. This had a couple of different parts with the first being a change that was already accepted by Task Force members in the high-level needs. Commissioner Taylor had additions in the preamble before line 6 and she was asked to present.*
- *Commissioner Taylor stated that this referred back to water farming. This is researched at the University of Florida and is becoming more and more of an opportunity for agricultural lands, especially if they are deemed unproductive. She wanted to add this here as well as footnotes where information can be found in published documents.*
- *Ms. Kigel asked to clarify this. The existing bullet is the high-level need. She asked if it should be added as text afterwards.*
- *Commissioner Taylor deferred to Ms. Kigel as to where it should be inserted.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski did not see any alternate language from FDOT.*
- *Mr. Ritter wasn't sure it's really pertinent.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski called on other Task Force members for recommendations.*
- *Ms. Ambrose felt it was a little outside of their scope. Economic developers are supportive of aquaculture, water farming, and other applications and they are all sensitive to the importance of groundwater resources. This seems to be more of a land use conversation.*
- *Ms. Kigel asked if her comment was for both bullets.*
- *Ms. Ambrose stated yes. She stated the Task Force is to identify industries that folks are supposed to be considering as part of economic plans and strategic industries.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski asked Commissioner Taylor if she wanted to respond.*
- *Commissioner Taylor thinks it's important to bring the future into this document. Water farming is becoming more prevalent. It's critical that the importance of being able to keep agriculture lands as agriculture because of water recharge is discussed.*
- *The Task Force discussed whether water farming was pertinent in this location and the potential connections, such as land use. It was noted this is part of basin management action plans that are identified in the recommendations.*
- *Ms. Shen stated there is not clear direction from the Task Force, but these are valuable thoughts. She suggested converting the bullets into two sentences and placing them on page 14. She asked Commissioner Taylor if that would be sufficient.*
- *Ms. Kigel asked if the high-level needs related to agriculture would be where the language would fit.*
- *Ms. Shen stated that yes, where "supporting agriculture and major resource-based industries..." would be the place where these two sentences would fit nicely.*
- *Commissioner Taylor stated that she was comfortable with that.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski and Ms. Kigel clarified the changes before asking for any other comments or concerns.*
- *Ms. Carpenter wanted to add, under water resources, a bullet that talks about pursuing regional or landscape scale water resource management approaches, and certainly water farming or distributed water management would fit under that bullet too.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski stated that they would work at it until everyone is comfortable.*
- *Mr. Jason Watts stated the changes would occur offline so that the conversation could move forward.*

The amendment text for High-Level Needs: page 15, line 3: The following language was added by the Task Force: **Future land-use management should consider the impact of conversion of agricultural and/or natural forested areas on the extent and distribution of recharge for sustainable use of groundwater resources in the region. On- and off-site water farming could be considered as a possible economic solution for farmlands deemed economically unproductive.**

- Ms. Kigel moved to the next amendment, Commissioner Taylor #19 on page 19, line 24.
- Commissioner Taylor stated that instead of “improve” broadband, change to “support.” It is expanding on what is meant by improve broadband connectivity.
- Ms. Kigel stated the Department is okay with the language.
- Ms. Kiselewski asked for other Task Force comments.
- Mr. Ferry said he had no objections.
- Ms. Kiselewski asked for other comments. Seeing none the amendment went forward as proposed.

The amendment text for Guiding Principles and Instructions: page 19, line 24: The following language was modified by the Task Force to replace bullet text: **Support ~~improve~~ broadband connectivity by providing the opportunity of co-location of utility/broadband lines to promote and support efficiency, new and emerging technologies, and best practices.**

- Ms. Kigel moved to Mr. Ritter’s amendment #2 on page 20, lines 10-12. She said there is an instruction in water resources that includes consideration of the basin management action plan and wanted to make sure he was aware.
- Mr. Ritter said he was but there has been duplication in other areas so it would be good to have it here as well.
- Ms. Kiselewski said that FDOT finds it acceptable and is supportive of it and asked for other Task Force members to comment.
- Ms. Estenoz supported the change.
- Ms. Kiselewski asked for any concerns. Seeing none, it was accepted as proposed.

The amendment text for Guiding Principles and Instructions: page 20, lines 9-12: The following language was modified by the Task Force: The Task Force recommended that FDOT commit to working closely with other local, regional, state, and federal agencies and nongovernmental organizations to advance key priorities such as Everglades restoration, **state Basin Management Action Plans**, and high priority land conservation, habitat and water resource protection, and ecosystem connectivity initiatives developed by other partners.

- Ms. Kigel brought up the next amendment from Commissioner Taylor (amendment #20) that suggests replacing the word “them” with language in the guiding principle above on page 20, lines 19-22.
- Ms. Kigel asked if she would be okay with how it is in the guiding principle.
- Commissioner Taylor replied yes.
- Ms. Kiselewski said she didn’t think FDOT had an issue.
- Mr. Starford was going to recommend support. He thinks it will tie into his comment.
- Ms. Kiselewski asked for concerns or comments. This amendment went forward as proposed.

The amendment text for Guiding Principles and Instructions: page 20, lines 19-22: The language was modified by the Task Force: **1. Avoid negative impacts to ~~them~~ existing conservation lands, conservation easements and mitigation lands; 2. Restore, connect, and enhance these lands while continuing to avoid negative impacts to ~~them~~ existing conservation lands, conservation easements and mitigation lands; and 3. Minimize and mitigate negative impacts to ~~them~~ existing conservation lands, conservation easements and mitigation lands.**

- Ms. Kigel moved to the next amendment, Mr. Dickman’s #4 on page 20, line 24 and asked him if he wanted to postpone the discussion.

- *Mr. Dickman thought this was addressed by Mr. Jason Watts in terms of doing feasibility before/prior to the PD&E process and asked if he could confirm.*
- *Ms. Kigel clarified that this was page 20 where he wanted to add an instruction and if he wanted to have the discussion all in one place.*
- *Mr. Dickman stated that he did.*
- *Ms. Kigel stated that there were two requested amendments to the first instruction. She moved to the next amendment which was Ms. Mathews' #9 on page 20, lines 24-26.*
- *Ms. Mathews was confused why they can't settle on a succinct definition of conservation lands that is all encompassing.*
- *Mr. Jason Watts said they can go back and see how it got to where it's at in the "no new corridors through" and GIS layers or areas suggested by the Task Force. FDOT committed that there won't be new corridors through certain areas and FDOT wanted to make sure that commitment was captured in the document as was shown on the pink and purple map at Task Force meeting #5. For all of the other areas, they didn't want to roll them into the same thing. If the no new corridor areas are too large, lots of things happen. For example, there's no bypasses because you have to stay on existing corridors. This would limit the Department on how they analyze alternative corridors. This would require co-location and there are going to be scenarios where co-location isn't possible. The intent was to be clear and definitive that the Department agrees where we will not have a new corridor through.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski asked Ms. Mathews for a response and stated Mr. Starford had a similar amendment.*
- *Mr. Starford stated his amendment would go away if Ms. Mathews' amendment is accepted because it includes the water management district conservation lands.*
- *Mr. Jason Watts understands what was said and thinks FDOT has a strong feeling as it pertains to adding to the "no new corridors through" commitment. It seems like all of the layers that are discussed, if they were added to an instruction that said, "place a high priority on avoiding" and listed them. As FDOT goes through PD&E, and even ACE, they have to create a methodology memorandum. Alignments that impact areas would get lower priority and would be a last case scenario rather than iron clad "do not place a corridor through." Move to an instruction that FDOT can follow in the future without stopping bypasses or limiting the Department's ability to build a corridor.*
- *Ms. Kigel stated that, with the exception of water management district conservation lands, the others that Ms. Mathews mentioned are in the instructions as shown in the bottom of her amendment.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski encouraged any local or regional agencies who had thoughts on this to speak up.*
- *Ms. Mathews understood where Mr. Jason Watts was trying to go but in line 1 of page 20 it references conservation lands and it's not indicated which ones. She wanted to know why it can't all be called conservation lands.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski stated that a few more members wanted to weigh in.*
- *Ms. Estenoz wanted to make sure she understood that, in line 1, conservation lands are the pink and purple on the map because there's no footnote.*
- *Mr. Jason Watts said that they could walk through the guiding principle as it's laid out. FDOT will go through the process and avoid negative impacts to all lands, minimize and mitigate impacts to all lands. As it is written, FDOT is trying to avoid all conservation lands, all encompassing. The first bullet is referencing the pink and purple map as a start for the Department to not build a new corridor through. All other lands are captured by the guiding principle.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski thought the point was that all lands are important but putting in absolutes in classification does limit some options.*
- *Commissioner McDaniel was happy with staff's recommendations. The main requisite that he saw is no new corridors are going to be constructed through any of these lands which are already encapsulated in what staff has put down. He recommended accepting staff's recommendations*

- *Commissioner Pendergrass echoed Commissioner McDaniel and was happy with staff's recommendations.*
- *Mr. Starford asked multiple questions of Mr. Jason Watts to elaborate on how FDOT would follow the guiding principles and instructions.*
- *Mr. Jason Watts stated the guiding principle affects all conservation lands, and the Department will make every effort to avoid them. Then it will go to restore, then minimize and mitigate. It is a step process on all conservation lands.*
- *Mr. Starford was fine with the amendment but thought a strongly worded instruction should be added.*
- *Ms. Kigel stated that the only one not covered is water management district conservation lands.*
- *Ms. Estenoz concurred with the remarks made about the pink and purple map process. She doesn't remember the Task Force ever reviewing the map and then messing with various different iterations of pink and purple. How could FDOT build a new corridor through any lands that were purchased for conservation using public money. Ideally the first bullet would say do not place new corridors through and then Commissioner Taylor's comment. She would be more comfortable with no new corridors through conservation lands.*
- *Ms. Fleming concurred with the remarks being made. She tried to get this improved language in here at the beginning. She understood that someone said, if we put all these lands in here, we won't be able to build. Maybe roads shouldn't be built where there are very sensitive environmental lands that have been purchased over several decades through systematic methodologies with public dollars. It seems like there is a good opportunity to consolidate the information here and define conservation lands.*
- *Mr. Jason Watts stated staff will come up with language that is more satisfactory.*
- *Pat Steed recalled from the beginning; it was very intentional. The word conservation means so many things in so many different contexts. The Task Force walked through it carefully and it's a complicated issue and she was in favor of finding a simpler way to express it. She did think how we got to what was in the draft was intentional.*
- *Mr. Jason Watts stated that staff has suggested text that would be a fairly substantial change and he walked through it to see if it made sense. The proposed modifications would remove the first instruction. The guiding principle would be rewritten, instead of saying 1/2/3, it would be 1/2/3/4. The new #1 would be "do not place a new corridor through existing conservation lands including conservation easements and mitigation lands." FDOT would follow that priority order and would make absolutely every effort not to put a new corridor through existing conservation lands. Then they would avoid negative impacts. If not possible, then restore and enhance, and lastly minimize and mitigate. The priority order would stay the same, but no new corridors through would essentially move to the top of the pile.*
- *Ms. Mathews asked how the pink and purple map would change.*
- *Mr. Jason Watts stated that the pink and purple map would go away. For all conservation lands FDOT would make every effort to not put a new road through.*
- *Ms. Mathews thanked him and wanted to mull it over.*
- *Mr. Starford stated that this recommendation was satisfactory, and he appreciated it.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski asked Mr. Dickman and Tom Graef if they wanted to speak.*
- *Mr. Dickman said he wants to reserve his comment but he's not sure where it belongs. He calls it his "five/ten rule" for interchanges. He is not sure if this is the best place to put it. This refers to a ten-mile radius of interchange area as far as conservation and then five miles related to proper planning.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski said that the interchange comments are coming, and they will get to them.*

- Mr. Graef has talked with FDOT about labels and it's confusing. He appreciated Mr. Jason Watts clarifying the intent and covering everything they have talked about.
- Ms. Mathews thanked Mr. Jason Watts and said that the language was a lot better.
- Mr. Jason Watts said it would appear in the gray box.
- Ms. Kigel suggested scrolling down to Ms. Mathews' amendment #9 where it belongs. Staff would also work to accommodate Mr. Starford's amendment as well.
- Ms. Estenoz stated she was comfortable with the changes.
- Ms. Kiselewski asked for any other comments or final concerns before moving on. There were none.

The amendment text for Guiding Principles and Instructions: page 20, lines 19-26: The following language was modified by the Task Force: **1. Do not place new corridor through existing conservation lands (including conservation easements and mitigation lands);** ~~1.~~ **2. Avoid negative impacts to ~~them~~ existing conservation lands (including conservation easements and mitigation lands);** ~~2.~~ **3. Restore, connect, and enhance these lands while continuing to avoid negative impacts to ~~them~~ existing conservation lands (including conservation easements and mitigation lands);** and ~~3.~~ **4. Minimize and mitigate negative impacts to ~~them~~ existing conservation lands (including conservation easements and mitigation lands).** Instructions: ~~Do not place new corridor through Preservation 2000 Lands, National Parks, State Parks, State Forests, State-owned Mitigation Banks, National Wildlife Refuges, and Florida Forever Acquired Lands.~~

- Ms. Kigel shared one more amendment for conservation lands: Ms. Fleming's amendment #4 on page 21, line 2. This would add one more instruction under conservation lands.
- Ms. Fleming said the new instruction would give consideration to impacts to Florida Forever targeted lands. If these lands are impacted, give enhancements and strong consideration for design features. These are lands on the list to be acquired in the future and form part of the wildlife corridor and ecological greenway. They are important and are not in conservation status yet. It is a new instruction to provide guidance for FDOT during PD&E for how to evaluate privately owned lands whose owners have given permission for conservation purposes.
- Mr. Jason Watts stated that the Department supports the amendment and it correctly articulates what will happen with Florida Forever targeted lands.
- Ms. Kiselewski asked for any other comments or concerns.
- Mr. Lauritsen thought this was a terrific addition.
- With no concerns from the Task Force, Ms. Kiselewski stated the amendment was accepted as proposed.

The amendment text for Guiding Principles and Instructions: page 21, line 2: The following language was added by the Task Force: **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.**

- Secretary Nandam gave a short break to the Task Force

5:37 PM	Break	
5:45 PM	Discuss Revisions to Final Draft Task Force Report (continued)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• L.K. Nandam, Task Force Chair</li> <li>• Marlon Bizerra, FDOT Production Lead</li> <li>• Karen Kiselewski, Facilitator</li> <li>• Beth Kigel, Task Force Support Team</li> <li>• Task Force Members</li> </ul>

- After the break, Ms. Kigel went back to the Introduction and Overview on pages 4 and 5 as there were a few comments on public engagement that had been tabled earlier in the day.
- Ms. Kigel said that staff were asked to try and account for the number of comments in various categories on page 5, line 15. This would replace from “specific comments” through line 27 with alternative language. She reviewed the proposed language.
- *Ms. Mathews liked this and asked if it could be in an ascending order to see what has the highest number of comments and what the item was.*
- *Dr. Gray thought it was much more informative, and he appreciated it.*
- *Commissioner McDaniel echoed his colleagues, especially Dr. Gray. This is a public process, and the reiteration of comments is imperative. He commended them again.*
- *Commissioner Taylor responded yes, well done.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski asked if it was now acceptable with the changes. There were no disagreements.*

**The amendment text for Task Force Overview/Public Engagement: page 5, line 17-22: The following language was added by the Task Force, to be placed in ascending order based on number of comments: A detailed summary of the public comments can be found on the project website. A summary of the most written comment themes received from the public during the Task Force process are included below.**

- Concern for impacts to wildlife habitat (1484 comments)
- Concern for impacts to property and rural quality of life (1114 comments)
- Concern over project cost (714 comments)
- Need to improve and protect water resources and the aquifer (655 comments)
- Support to expand, improve, and maintain existing roads (623 comments)
- Need for protection and enhancement of conservation lands (520 comments)
- Support the need for jobs, economic development, and business enhancements; but concern over potential negative economic impacts (419 comments)
- Concern for impacts to wetlands (286 comments)
- Concern over the cost of tolls (282 comments)
- Concern for increased water, ground, and air pollution (251 comments)
- Need for hurricane evacuation (248 comments)
- Need for broadband (217 comments)
- Support for multi-modal/mass transit (186 comments)
- Concern over location/project alignment, route, or new greenfield corridor (176 comments)
- Concern over impacts to tourism (134 comments)
- Concern for impacts to native plants (124 comments)
- Need for expansion on water, sewer, and other utilities (81 comments)
- Concern over eminent domain process (6 comments)

**The draft Task Force report was posted for a 15-day public comment period from September 29-October 14, 2020. A total of # members of the public submitted a total of # comments during that period. A copy of these comments and a summary of the key themes were provided to the Task Force at its final meeting. A summary of the written comment themes received from the public on the draft Task Force report are included below.**

- Co-locate with existing facilities such as US 27 and SR 29 (228 comments)
- Funding for conservation land acquisitions to mitigate project activities and enhancements need to come from FDOT and not from other sources (114 comments)
- Co-locate a transportation facility within a utility corridor (113 comments)
- Additional analysis is needed to establish statutory need for the corridor (87 comments)
- Include preliminary determination of need and economic feasibility prior to the PD&E phase (65 comments)

- Preserve rural community character and lifestyle (65 comments)
- Consider the no-build option (65 comments)
- Concerns over cost to implement the corridor (33 comments)
- Protect against urban sprawl (32 comments)
- Protect ecotourism (30 comments)
- Concerns over the impacts of COVID-19 on funding and resource allocation (24 comments)
- Evaluate multi-modal alternatives such as freight, transit, and rail (21 comments)
- State budget is better spent on maintaining the current transportation system (14 comments)
- Preserve Florida rural lands (14 comments)
- Provide broadband and utilities for rural areas (14 comments)
- Provide for bicycle and pedestrian safety features such as multi-use trails (6 comments)
- Concerns regarding impacts of sea-level rise (5 comments)
- Land Conservation and Preservation
  - Avoid and protect environmentally sensitive areas (226 comments)
  - Protect and expand conservation lands (149 comments)
- Water Quality and Water Resources
  - Concern regarding growth impact on water resources (98 comments)
  - Protect wetlands, aquifers, and other critical water resources (25 comments)
- Wildlife and Plants
  - Protect endangered wildlife and their habitats, especially the Florida Panther (160 comments)
  - Protect and preserve habitat for native plants (36 comments)
  - Develop long distance wildlife corridors (21 comments)
  - Develop wildlife crossings that are effective in reducing wildlife and vehicle interaction (7 comments)
- Other general comments
  - Promote planning for Florida's future development (5 comments)
- Adopt Task Force recommendations (3 comments)
  - Ms. Kigel went back into the amendments starting with the Florida panther on page 21 and Ms. Fleming's amendment #7 which a simple text addition to lines 11 and 29-32.
  - Ms. Fleming said her goal is a simple clarification and read them out loud. She added "future" to the first item and "transportation" to the second. She added "transportation" to differentiate between highway corridors and wildlife corridors.
  - Ms. Kiselewski stated that FDOT supported the amendment. She asked for questions and seeing none the amendment was accepted as proposed.

The amendment text for Guiding Principles and Instructions: page 21, line 11: The following language was modified by the Task Force: The Task Force recommended that in developing future M- CORES corridors, FDOT have a goal of its infrastructure creating improvements to Panther habitat and connectivity.

The amendment text for Guiding Principles and Instructions: page 21, lines 29-32: The following language was modified by the Task Force: The Task Force recommended that to minimize negative impacts to the Florida panther and other wildlife, FDOT should evaluated existing wildlife corridors during the transportation corridor development process. These transportation corridors would be candidates for wildlife crossing features such as bridges, bridges with shelves, culverts, and fencing to protect wildlife movements.

  - Ms. Kigel moved to the next amendment, Ms. Mathews #12 which refers to page 21, line 14. This would change the word "may" to "will." She stated that the Department was fine with the language.
  - Ms. Kiselewski asked for any other comments or concerns. Seeing none this was also accepted as proposed.

**The amendment text for Guiding Principles and Instructions: page 22, line 14: The following language was modified by the Task Force: To address the impacts of corridor construction, the Task Force recognized that the acquisition of lands for state conservation or as mitigation will may be required.**

- Ms. Kigel moved to Mr. Ritter’s amendment #4 on page 21, lines 16-25. This would add “and agricultural operators” to the first item.
- *Ms. Kiselewski said that FDOT is in support of the amendment and asked if Task Force members had comments at this point. Seeing none, this amendment moved forward as proposed.*

**The amendment text for Guiding Principles and Instructions: page 22, line 16-25: The following language was modified by the Task Force: 1. FDOT would identify conservation targets in coordination with a corridor advisory group to be appointed following completion of the Task Force process, and agricultural operators. (see discussion in Action Plan)**

- Ms. Kigel stated that this is still on the panther on page 22 with Ms. Mathews’ amendment #10 for lines 2-9. She suggested Ms. Mathews explain changes to each bullet.
- *Ms. Mathews stated that her first bullet was to ensure the best available science is being used. She saw a note about the Panther Recovery Implementation Team (PRIT), and she thought U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) preferred to be communicated with directly instead of going to the PRIT and wanted to know if that was accurate.*
- *Ms. Kigel stated that was correct.*
- *Ms. Mathews said that was fine, but she was trying to be more inclusive.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski said that later bullets referenced PRIT and Mr. Jason Watts can elaborate.*
- *Mr. Jason Watts stated that Ms. Mathews said it correctly. The Department will do bullet #1 and was supportive of putting it in. They try to always use the best available science. For the other two bullets, FDOT would like PRIT to be removed, because USFWS would like it removed.*
- *Ms. Kigel stated that the third bullet is not necessary. By removing PRIT, first bullet stands as proposed.*
- *Ms. Carpenter stated that the Division of State Lands is a subset of the Department of Environmental Protection so that detail isn’t necessary.*
- *Ms. Kigel asked if the suggestion was to keep the Florida Department of Environmental Protection and removing Division of State Lands.*
- *Ms. Carpenter responded yes.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski asked for any other comments and saw none.*

**The amendment text for Guiding Principles and Instructions: page 22, lines 2-9: The following language was modified by the Task Force: · Use best available science to evaluate the potential impact of individual projects and the cumulative impact of multiple projects on the Florida panther and its habitat. · Coordinate with the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FFWCC), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection, and other Florida panther experts to place a high priority on acquiring lands that protect panther habitats and connect existing conservation lands and wildlife management areas important to improving and sustaining the Florida panther both north and south of the Caloosahatchee River.**

- Ms. Kigel moved to the next amendment which was Ms. Matthews’ #11 on page 22, line 13. Ms. Kigel clarified that there would be a comprehensive discussion about interchanges and asked if this could be tabled to do all at once.
- *Ms. Mathews agreed.*
- Ms. Kigel moved to the next amendment of Ms. Mathews #13 on page 22, line 25. This is a replication of the instruction in conservation lands. This is trying to pull all items into one area. She asked if Ms.

Mathews was okay that these lands are covered in conservation lands with the change previously discussed.

- Ms. Mathews wanted to tie to the panther principle and would think about it.
- Ms. Kigel stated that this is in the wildlife and plant habitats guiding principle section.
- Ms. Mathews stated that the previous change that was done should be fine.
- Ms. Kigel stated that everything is equal so if it's stated in one place, it's covered.
- Ms. Kiselewski noted that **this amendment was dropped, since it was covered by another amendment.**
- Ms. Kigel moved to Ms. Fleming's amendment #8 which was a minor text revision on page 22, lines 39-40 and FDOT was fine with the proposed change.
- Ms. Kiselewski asked for any other comments or concerns, and it was accepted as proposed.

**The amendment text for Guiding Principles and Instructions: page 22, line 39-40: The following language was modified by the Task Force: Coordinate with landowners and operators of agricultural lands that also serve as ~~critical~~ **important** wildlife habitat.**

- Ms. Kigel moved to Commissioner Taylor's amendment #21, page 23, lines 15-17. Ms. Kigel asked if what she meant was to replace "them" with "water resources."
- Commissioner Taylor was hoping to repeat "environmentally sensitive..." but if it is referred to as above for agricultural uses, then she is also okay with that.
- Ms. Kigel said that is consistent with how conservation lands are addressed, all others are reflected in their own guiding principle.
- Commissioner Taylor thinks it protects, connects, and enhances those areas and avoids impacts to those areas. She thought it would be better to write it out.
- Ms. Kigel said that particular high-level need only states the high-level need addressed by water resources. That high-level need is included in the preamble for conservation lands, panther, for wildlife and plant habitats, and water resources. If you place water resources here, you would include everything including the guiding principle language.
- Commissioner Taylor stated she was comfortable with that.
- Ms. Kiselewski asked for any other comments or concerns and there were none.

**The amendment text for Guiding Principles and Instructions: page 23, line 15-17: The language was modified by the Task Force: 1. Avoid negative impacts to ~~them~~ **water resources**; 2. Restore, connect, and enhance ~~them~~ **water resources** while continuing to avoid negative impacts; and 3. Minimize and mitigate negative impacts to ~~them~~ **water resources**.**

- Ms. Kigel moved to Ms. Fleming's amendment #6 on page 23, lines 27-28. Ms. Fleming asked to add in the Florida Panther National Wildlife Refuge and FDOT is okay with that language.
- Ms. Kiselewski asked for questions or comments and there were none.

**The amendment text for Guiding Principles and Instructions: page 23, line 27-28: The following language was modified by the Task Force: Leverage s.338.2278 (3)(c) 6, F.S. acquisition authority and other programs to identify opportunities to advance and fund acquisition of additional land to restore and enhance water quality, quantity, and flow, including through and to the Big Cypress National Preserve **and the Florida Panther National Wildlife Refuge**, with the intent of acquiring property near or adjacent to the corridor prior to or parallel to corridor development.**

- Ms. Kigel moved to Commissioner Taylor's amendment #22 on page 23, line 41 related to water farming and noted that this was already addressed before. She asked Commissioner Taylor if she was comfortable with that.
- Commissioner Taylor responded in the affirmative.
- Ms. Kigel stated they were at a point where the interchange discussion would be appropriate as Task Force members agreed to have the conversation in one location. The bullets here, particularly the third

*bullet under guiding principle #12 regarding “develop interchange management plans including appropriate land use and environmental resource for areas around proposed interchange locations and encourage their adoption into local government comprehensive plans.”*

- Ms. Kiselewski pointed out that this relates to Ms. Mathews’ and Mr. Dickman’s multiple amendments.
- Ms. Kigel noted that primarily Mr. Dickman had amendments and then Ms. Mathews’ amendment #11 on page 22, line 13, was more focused on panther habitat. She thought the dialogue might all be together where Task Force members can bring up their interchange concerns. Mr. Dickman’s amendments #4, #5, and #6 concerned five- and ten-mile radii around interchanges and Ms. Mathews wanted to talk about five-mile radius around interchanges within panther habitat.
- Ms. Mathews said there should be solid protections in place around interchanges to prevent any additional road kills or interactions with panthers. They are trying to protect as much habitat as they can around interchanges to protect against all the induced development that follows interchanges.
- Mr. Dickman tried to condense the amendments he provided. The essence of it, under the statute of 338.2278 paragraph 3 (c) 10 talks about the presentation of the report to local governments by December 31, 2023 for local governments’ review. This has to do with the interchanges that the local government will review whether the area in and around the interchanges has appropriate land uses and natural resource protections and if the comprehensive plan should be amended. He thinks the local governments need to have their own home rule abilities to plan. However, this is a statewide project and under the current comprehensive plan amendment process, it’s an expedited review process, not typical process. As a reviewing agency, FDOT should have a stronger role in determining two things – within ten miles protecting environmental and natural resources and within five miles protecting the rural character and economy of areas that are not served by local water and sewer. The statute clearly says that these reports will be provided to the local governments and the alignments of the roadway for evaluation of an interchange. Appropriate land uses, to him, means addressing prevention of sprawl which would essentially mean if there is no public water and sewer there, you would prevent sprawl and protect natural resources. There would have to be some type of acquisition or easements until such time as they should be developed or protected in perpetuity.
- Ms. Shen asked Mr. Dickman to email his language to her and Ms. Kiselewski so that it could be passed to the team. When reviewing comprehensive plan amendments, FDOT can only legally comment on impacts of statewide significance. In support of the M-CORES Program, they are going to work with the regional planning councils and provide some interchange management plan best practices and share these practices with the local governments. Land use decisions rest upon local governments. From a FDOT perspective, they can work with local governments and encourage them to prioritize protecting environmental resources of statewide significance, but she was not sure how strong that language can go.
- Mr. Jason Watts added that it’s important to remember that the Task Force report is written as a whole. They are trying not to impact panther habitat and are trying to pick corridors that have the least impact on the environment. By the time the interchange discussions occur with local governments, a lot of those considerations will have already been brought up and addressed.
- Ms. Shen also suggested looking at the existing language under the guiding principle and instructions to see if they addressed concerns or if anything could be strengthened.
- Mr. Buhr stated he can’t support them as proposed. He suggested keeping the third bullet.
- Ms. Kiselewski asked if there is a part of that which he couldn’t support.
- Mr. Buhr thought the arbitrary distances should be taken out and be based on an evaluation.
- Ms. Steed agreed that the distance is problematic. It is the local government’s decision about what might work best with best practices for each interchange. These corridors were put forward to also

*encourage economic development and vitality in economically depressed rural areas of Florida. This gets difficult with set distances.*

- *Ms. Estenoz doesn't think it's completely honest that FDOT doesn't make land use decisions. The very decision to build an interchange starts to circumscribe the community's ability to make their own land use decisions. FDOT is a state agency. It has decisions and responsibilities for state and regional importance that a local government has less responsibility. The first decision is to put the interchange in. If the decision is made intelligently then the process should work. If it is made irresponsibly then there are no kind of growth management laws to protect the panther. She was glad they strengthened language about no new corridors through and thinks it will be helpful. She thinks they should also consider strengthening the existing language similarly about where to put interchanges.*
- *Secretary Nandam said the first bullet on the instructions states prioritizing interchanges on the State Highway System and then the regional roadway network. They already have an instruction that limits interchange locations to those corridors. He asked if she was thinking of something more stringent.*
- *Ms. Estenoz said she didn't know because she's not a panther expert You can't look at growth management or comprehensive plans to protect resources of regional or state significance. You must appropriately condition the first decision, which is FDOT's decision, to put the interchange there or not.*
- *Mr. Dickman said the statute specifically says FDOT will provide the report to local governments and this elevates FDOT's role in examining local comprehensive plans. This is not necessarily local in its expedited comprehensive plan review process. This is a statewide project and, as Ms. Estenoz mentioned, FDOT's role is elevated. Looking at interchanges, there are lots of things to consider: urban sprawl, protecting conservation and natural resource areas by easements or purchase. This is a major statewide capital project and the idea that all these interchange and comprehensive plan decisions being left up to local governments is inappropriate and inconsistent with statute. Transportation dictates land use.*
- *Commissioner Taylor heard the comments about a five-/ten-mile radius and is sure that can be addressed by the most credible and recent science for the panther since it is changing all the time, but she would defer to Mr. Dickman. You can build a road but if you don't have interchanges then you leave communities behind.*
- *Commissioner McDaniel said there is no decision to build a road anywhere and now there are arguments about interchanges. He didn't want to put restrictions on local governments. If this is be constructed, he doesn't want the document dictating to a local government about what they can or should do. He thought the language currently here under guiding principles and instructions was good and he would prefer to stay as global as possible. Allow this document to move forward with language on the left-hand side and then work with local municipalities that are impacted where the corridors and interchanges ultimately are determined to be. Leave what's in here for now and allow for decisions to be made if the road is even built and then come back.*
- *Ms. Fleming said while the statute elevates the considerations for the Florida panther and directs the Task Force to look at those, it specifically talks about land acquisitions and wildlife crossings, things that are good to do and must do. If the road happens without threatening the recovery of panther and its survival, the Task Force has to address interchanges and how development will happen as a result of this road. It is a big state project. You can't get to something this important and say we're going to turn it over to local governments and expect it to be coordinated. All counties have comprehensive plans, but they are implemented unevenly. They have to face this as a Task Force. There has to be wording that commits FDOT and others to working together. The M-CORES Program aims to do so many things. A couple of goals are at odds with each other at certain parts of it. If we don't address it,*

*then the other goals for conserving panther and all the work over the last decades to stitch together the wildlife corridors will be undone and we will lose ground.*

- *Mr. Jason Watts said that from the local perspective, the arbitrary five-/ten-mile radius; it is a number that is hard to grasp. This becomes prohibitive to building an interchange. He had some language he'd like to read as an alternative. The statute requires the Department bring interchanges to local governments and let them look at it. The local governments must also give consideration about the appropriate land uses around the interchange and whether natural resource protections are included. It doesn't say "this is what you have to do" but tells the local governments what they should consider. He first read his suggested language.*
- *Ms. Kigel noted the new language is on the screen in the gray space and read the new language.*
- *Mr. Jason Watts was also working on another sentence about a commitment by the Department before an interchange location is finalized, a specific Florida panther impact assessment will be developed, and public outreach will take place.*
- *Don Scott thought that the overarching thing that the Task Force recommended is co-locating on an existing facility. If you go with a five-mile radius, the corridor will be built in the middle of nowhere.*
- *Commissioner Mike Thompson agreed with Commissioner McDaniel and liked the path that Mr. Jason Watts and his group are taking. He agreed with Mr. Scott*
- *Mr. Little echoed his support for the last two commissioners' comments. Home rule is important. He believed county commissions can follow the will of the people, with the understanding that FDOT would provide every effort to ensure that environmentally sensitive areas are protected, including the panther. He supported the ability for local counties to make local decisions.*
- *Ms. Kigel noted that more language was added to the gray space and read it aloud.*
- *Ms. Estenoz suggested that the primary decision is FDOT's to put in an interchange or not. "FDOT shall give a high priority..." should go first. Secondly, this isn't about somehow usurping local decisions about land use. This is entirely about where FDOT puts a state facility. When considering locations for interchanges, why can't there be language that FDOT requires a local government to submit their plan for an interchange. By incorporating the local governments' ideas and having them make commitments upfront before it gets the benefit of a state transportation facility put in its jurisdiction.*
- *Mr. Buhr supported the changes that staff put together. He doesn't think that supporting government equates to mandates. Most governments will listen to suggestions and hear public comments. He would not support any mandates, but thought the language put in is a good, even point for everybody.*
- *Commissioner McDaniel thought Mr. Jason Watts' language is a very nice compromise. It leads them to a place where they can go forth and allow for local governments to make their own decisions and puts the priority on the Department to work with local governments to preserve, protect, and avoid as much as possible. He supported the language that was brought forward.*
- *Commissioner Doherty stated the text looks reasonable and is a good compromise. It allows both levels of government to be involved and he supported it.*
- *Mr. Dickman stated that one of the phrases, the second line "statewide and regional significance", this is right out of the statute and part of the watering down of the Growth Management Act. Especially the part where it says the state will not get involved in any type of growth management decision unless it has a statewide or regional impact. He echoed Ms. Estenoz to require local government to elevate an interchange management plan before FDOT decides it's going to place an interchange in its area. He understands that five-mile/ten-mile sounds arbitrary so they should come up with something else. There has to be a management plan that will not just allow for land use to run wild because development will follow transportation. He thought "statewide and regionally significant" should be taken out.*

- *Ms. Mathews appreciates language along the lines that has some sort of accountability on FDOT's part. It's their responsibility to provide protections during the design phase. The amendment is much better but doesn't alleviate all their concerns about panther habitat.*
- *Mr. Jason Watts stated he was working with staff to try and meet both sides in the middle. He had no concerns with taking out "statewide and regional significance." He would like to rewrite the last sentence. This is a commitment that says FDOT will work with the local government about how they will satisfy the statute and the goals of the Task Force report.*
- *Ms. Mathews said that it helps, and she appreciated the work going on.*
- *Mr. Dickman thought it was getting close. The first line about the Task Force "urges" should be changed to "requires" local governments to prioritize protecting not just environmental resources but rural lands and environmental resources.*
- *There was additional Task Force discussion about the balance between local government home rule and statewide and regional interests in the M-CORES Program.*
- *Secretary Nandam feels as though the Department has offered the best they can within its control. The Department would place priority for interchanges to protect Florida panther and work with local governments providing best practices and work in conjunction with them as they prepare comprehensive plans.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski asked for those opposed.*
- *After seeing the proposed text, there was additional Task Force discussion about specific wording and clarifications.*
- *Secretary Nandam said they would include the urging for the Department through the review process and address unimproved rural lands to protect small towns.*
- *Ms. Ambrose wanted to know who pays for the reports and interchange plans.*
- *Ms. Fleming was still trying to work out the commitment implied with instruction #2. Someone expressed concern about local government having resources to do these. She wondered if it could say "FDOT will work with local governments or assist local governments to prioritize and protect natural resources."*
- *Ms. Shen stated that FDOT plans to work with regional planning councils and there's not an issue with putting that language in.*
- *Ms. Fleming stated that satisfied her concerns.*
- *Mr. Dickman thought the Task Force here is giving instructions to FDOT then FDOT should encourage or mandate local governments to protect unimproved rural lands and environmental resources.*
- *Secretary Nandam said that Mr. Jason Watts is working on that language to include "urges."*
- *Mr. Jason Watts clarified that it says urges, but it is also the Task Force urging.*
- *Ms. Ambrose appreciated the language changes but doesn't know why unimproved rural land needs to be incorporated. What if it's an interchange for Airglades and it is five/ten miles away? There can be unintended aspects of this about connections to communities. A lot of us are thinking more about developed counties than the undeveloped communities. She questioned if it's critical language to include in here and whether it supports the logistics type of growth some of these communities are focused on.*
- *Ms. Steed agreed with the point that was just raised. Looking at developing in rural versus urban areas is very different. Part of the idea of an interchange is to build in an area that has central water/sewer and certainly broadband and other services that's what makes it economically viable in these rural areas. To exclude that in some way starts to work against bringing all those things together as the potential of what this can do. It does not contradict saving environmental resources and protecting it because that is number one on the list of priorities. Avoiding rural really does work against locating them in the very areas that have the best viability for investment and economic development.*

- Secretary Nandam emphasized concern about protecting environmental resources. What if this says the “Task Force urges FDOT to work with local governments to prioritize protecting environmental resources through the interchange management process.” That ensures the network will support any development plans and achieves the goal of protecting environmental resources.
- Mr. Dickman said he liked Ms. Estenoz’s suggestion about submitting interchange management plans, but the Task Force should require that FDOT require local governments to submit plans to address appropriate land uses and natural resources. He said FDOT should oversee these decisions, so they aren’t encouraging sprawl and desecrating natural resources.
- Secretary Nandam said they would **look at local government interchange plans as defined by statute. He said staff would get a definition and incorporate it into the report.**
- There was further discussion about interchange management plans and FDOT’s role in assisting in their preparation, review, or potential acceptance. Questions about the existing facilities recommendations were raised and prioritizing interchanges at existing roads.
- Secretary Nandam thanked everyone for their conversation.
- Mr. Jason Watts added “consideration of” to the last bullet because it was in the statute.

The amendment text for Guiding Principles and Instructions: page 24, line 37: The following language was added by the Task Force: **· The Task Force urges FDOT to work with and assist local governments to prioritize protecting environmental resources through the interchange management process. FDOT will provide best practices to the local governments for interchange management plans. FDOT shall give a high priority to interchange locations that limit impact to important wildlife habitat, especially that of the Florida Panther, and commit to working with local government and other partners with a goal of maximizing conservation lands around the interchanges. · Before an interchange location is finalized, a specific Florida Panther impact assessment will be developed, public engagement will take place, and FDOT will review local government interchange management plans that includes consideration of appropriate land uses and natural resource protections.**

- Ms. Kigel moved to page 26, line 6 of the report where Commissioner Taylor’s amendment #23 was located. This was in the broadband and other utilities guiding principle.
- Commissioner Taylor said this is a definition of what broadband will do.
- Ms. Kigel said it’s similar to the language already there.
- Ms. Kiselewski said the Department supports the amendment and it is accepted as proposed.

The amendment text for Guiding Principles and Instructions: page 26, line 6: The following language was modified by the Task Force: **Support expansion of rural utility infrastructure, including broadband, water, and sewer to enhance quality of life; ~~and plan and design enhanced or new corridors by planning and designing new corridors or improving existing corridors and enabling co-location of utility and broadband infrastructure in right-of-way.~~**

- Ms. Kigel moved into the action plan. She introduced Mr. Dickman’s amendment #7 on page 26, lines 35-41. She said the Department is okay with this language. She called for comments and concerns.
- Ms. Kiselewski noted that earlier language was changed from “economic” to “financial” feasibility and that this needs to be consistent with earlier edits.
- Mr. Dickman said it addressed the financial feasibility, which is fine. That also included the “need” phrase before starting PD&E, the need and financial feasibility.
- Ms. Kiselewski said yes, whatever the language was before. She called for comments and concerns and there were none.

The amendment text for Action Plan: page 26, line 34: The following language was added by the Task Force: **The Task Force directed FDOT to establish at least a preliminary determination of transportation need and financial feasibility before proceeding with the PD&E process.**

- Ms. Kigel said they would stay in this location and moved to Commissioner Taylor's amendment #24 on page 26, line 39. The edit is ending the sentence and adding a new one. The Department is fine with this language.

- *Ms. Kiselewski saw no comments, and the language was accepted as proposed.*

**The amendment text for Action Plan page 26, line 39: The following language was modified by the Task Force: This process will evaluate and distinguish between conventional safety, mobility, and connectivity needs, and broader regional needs or co-benefits related to transportation, such as economic development, ~~or environmental stewardship benefits.~~ Environmental stewardship must be considered at every point in the process of determining the need for potential corridor improvements.**

- Ms. Kigel stated the next few amendments address impacts to the FDOT Five-Year Work Program. She noted that Commissioner Doherty had an amendment that was very comprehensive, so she suggested they address that one first then move to others.
- *Commissioner Doherty presented on his amendment #1 on pages 28-29, lines 37-43 and 1-2. In this section, specifically the line that starts with "FDOT has committed...2021-2025 will not be impacted by M-CORES funding needs." He said that begs the question of what happens after 2025. The Charlotte County MPO has approved the LRTP through 2045, and every five years shows a list of projects that will need to be funded. He presented the need to clarify that local MPO work programs after 2025 won't be adversely impacted by the M-CORES project. He also felt they needed to describe the pathway forward. He added the initial statement "M-CORES projects...beyond 2025 without consent of specific MPO." He said it is very simplistic but powerful and gets to home rule and is an adequate statement to protect LRTPs. The rest of the amendment is to clarify the pathway for M-CORES projects that have funding issues.*
- *Mr. Will Watts said the Department is in full support of the language.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski asked Commissioner Taylor if that also addressed her suggested amendments.*
- *Commissioner Taylor said yes, she liked it. It was well put and simple, but powerful.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski called for any concerns from the Task Force and there were none.*
- *Ms. Kigel said this would amend action item #4, so she confirmed with Commissioner Taylor that this lays it out comprehensively. She asked if it worked for her amendments #25 and #26.*
- *Commissioner Taylor said yes, she thinks it does.*

**The amendment text for Action Plan page 28-29, lines 37-43/1-2: The following language was modified by the Task Force: FDOT has committed that projects currently in its Five-Year Work Program for Fiscal Years 2021-2025 will not be impacted by M-CORES funding needs. M-CORES projects would not impact MPO TIPs beyond 2025 without the consent of the specific MPO. M-CORES Program costs that are not covered through the dedicated funding sources identified in statute or through toll revenues and associated Turnpike revenue bonds and other financing and partnerships could be covered by advances from the State Transportation Trust Fund. To the extent legally available, any toll revenues from the Turnpike system not required for payment of principal, interest, reserves, or other required deposits for bonds; costs of operations and maintenance; other contractual obligations; or system improvement project costs must be used to repay advances received from the State Transportation Trust Fund. Any potential advances from the State Transportation Trust Fund would need to be prioritized along with other needs for future Five Year Work Programs, working through the standard process including the applicable MPO (TIPs) and rural transportation planning processes. All M-CORES projects, regardless of funding source, will be included in the applicable MPO TIPs and long-range transportation plans, consistent with federal guidance for projects of regional significance. Specific M-CORES projects not prioritized for funding through these processes will not be able to advance until funding sources are identified. FDOT would continue to coordinate development of continuous corridor concepts identified in the planning process.**

- Ms. Kigel introduced Ms. Estenoz amendment #1 on page 28, lines 26-33. This amendment was regarding financial analysis as opposed to economic feasibility.
- *Ms. Estenoz said the intention was to follow up on the Task Force discussion on the importance of this program moving forward with the Task Force recommendations intact. The way the language reads now is that the economic feasibility of the corridor will account for the required cost to develop and implement the corridor. This will include typical corridor costs plus FDOT's contribution toward the additional corridor costs related to environmental enhancement or multi-use opportunities. She believes it is important to the public that it is not only FDOT's contribution, but the total cost. To the extent that wildlife crossings, environmental enhancement or land acquisition is required by a specific corridor, then all those costs should be incorporated in the economic feasibility. She said the language of "as envisioned in statute" was also changed to "as identified in this Task Force report" which is much more detailed.*
- *Ms. Kigel said she doesn't want to lose sight of lines 24 and 25 which lead into this section and talk about economic feasibility. She knows the Department will have something to say based on the spirit of what Ms. Estenoz had proposed.*
- *Ms. Estenoz asked, while they are waiting, she would like to make one small change. The next sentence where FDOT will find potential funding sources, she took out the word potential and just said that FDOT needs to identify those sources.*
- *Mr. Jason Watts said that the problem with economic feasibility, as defined in statute, is that it's the Department's costs associated with the project. He said that trying to include the total cost of other agencies is not allowed from the Department's standpoint.*
- *Ms. Estenoz said they should find a way to meet halfway. There is the required analysis by statute, but that doesn't mean the Department can't be transparent in the total cost of the corridor or program.*
- *Mr. Will Watts asked if Ms. Estenoz wanted to track all costs including other agencies costs and private sector costs.*
- *Ms. Estenoz used environmental enhancements as an example: The Department would identify other funding sources, such as Florida Forever dollars, that become necessary to spend in these corridors because the Department decides to build a road there. That's a cost to the public.*
- *Mr. Will Watts noted they had talked about an environmental acquisition plan during planning that will identify funding sources and partners early on. He asked if that would satisfy her request.*
- *Ms. Estenoz said the Department will do a calculation at 30 percent design that will only calculate its own obligations to determine if the corridor is feasible. She wondered what will happen if environmental enhancements are ten percent or zero percent of the Department's cost share because another funding partner was identified, and then that cost doesn't get factored in at all.*
- *Mr. Will Watts said the statute doesn't necessarily obligate other agencies at the moment, but rather allows FDOT to "flex their muscles." He said they would step through that first wave of acquisition plans and identify partners, but it won't obligate other agencies at this point.*
- *Ms. Estenoz, Mr. Will Watts, and Mr. Jason Watts discussed hypothetical situations to clarify FDOT's processes.*
- *Mr. Jason Watts suggested they add "FDOT will work with partner agencies trying to document their contributions to the conservation and environmental enhancement activities associated with the M-CORES program." The Department can't commit what other agencies are going to do but they can commit to working with those agencies to document the costs.*
- *Ms. Estenoz said she liked that but asked them to add in when in the process it would happen.*
- *Mr. Jason Watts said it would be as those costs are incurred or obligated.*
- *Ms. Estenoz and Mr. Jason Watts discussed the cost information available at different phases of a project.*

- *Mr. Jason Watts asked for a few minutes and new proposed language was shown to the Task Force.*
- *Ms. Estenoz said she will accept this language, but wants to be on the record here saying the public deserves to know how much this program is going to cost, not just a fraction of it. Her hope is that the public remains engaged after the Task Force is done with their work.*
- *Secretary Nandam stated the Task Force and everyone listening hears FDOT commit to be transparent and ensure proper public and stakeholder engagement will happen, and all the information used in the decision making will be available to anyone who wants to see it.*
- *Mr. Dickman agreed there needs to be transparency with the public for financial feasibility, or economic feasibility; however, it is phrased. This is important to the public and he said he will take FDOT's word that they are going to continue to keep the public informed about the cost.*
- *Ms. Kigel alerted everyone's attention to the report action item #8: "commitment to transparency and process improvement."*

**The amendment text for Action Plan page 28, line 30: The following language was added by the Task Force: FDOT will work with partner agencies to document their contributions to the conservation and environmental enhancement activities associated with the M-CORES Program. This process will include early identification of potential partner contributions during corridor planning; refinements of specific contributions as part of PD&E; and a process to monitor and report on these commitments over time.**

**The Task Force urges FDOT to be transparent on total program costs throughout the M-CORES Program.**

- *Ms. Kigel moved to page 29 for Mr. Dickman's amendment #8 to action plan #5 on lines 11-12. She asked him to address the strikethroughs.*
- *Mr. Dickman said he already addressed the five-mile/ten-mile item. He did think, where it says "this process will identify opportunities to advance" that it was weak, and he would like it to identify specific land acquisitions.*
- *Ms. Kigel asked if the Department was okay with that language.*
- *Mr. Jason Watts said the Department is not opposed to the idea. They took what he had and some of the other amendments and realized in action plan #5 they wanted to say they are going to develop an early acquisition plan for potential land acquisition. They are going to do it in planning and carry it into PD&E and beyond. He stated the Task Force has discussed in several meetings how the Department is going to determine if conservation was completed and what that means. This language lays out a project plan to talk about conservation and lands that are going to be acquired early in the planning process, updated during PD&E, and lay out a written plan of how that will be accomplished and what partners are going to be included, and then have some report that discusses how the Department did or did not satisfy the plan developed through process.*
- *Ms. Kigel clarified that, as it compares to existing language in action plan #5, it is clear this new language would supplant what's on line 7.*
- *Mr. Jason Watts said it's a complete rewrite starting at "This process will identify..." at line 11 to the end of the paragraph at line 18.*
- *Mr. Dickman wanted clarity and asked if this was prior to PD&E.*
- *Ms. Shen said yes. She noted that this expands on what Mr. Dickman wanted to say and lays out a complete plan as to what the Department is going to do in terms of identifying lands all the way through actual acquisition.*
- *Mr. Dickman asked if M-CORES is going to end and if it will all be into FDOTs hands then.*
- *Ms. Shen said yes, all these activities will be implemented by FDOT following recommendations outlined by the Task Force and partners.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski asked for comments or concerns and there were none, so it moved forward as revised.*

**The amendment text for Action Plan page 29, lines 11-13: The following language was modified by the Task Force: This process will ~~identify opportunities to advance specific~~ include early identification of**

potential conservation land acquisition and protection opportunities during corridor planning; development of a corridor conservation land acquisition and easement plan as part of PD&E; and a process to complete or commit to specific acquisition and easements ~~related recommendations~~ prior to or in parallel with corridor construction. FDOT will determine how to provide funding, in whole or part, for land acquisition projects consistent with its statutory authority in s. 338.2278(3)(c) 6, F.S., with the expectation that FDOT funding supplements and leverages other state, federal, local, private, and nonprofit sources. The land acquisition and easement plan will include FDOT will work with FDEP, FFWC, water management districts, and nongovernmental organizations to explore potential indicators for ~~setting and~~ tracking progress toward plan implementation and conservation goals.

- Ms. Kigel introduced Commissioner Taylor’s amendment #27 on pages 29-30, lines 26, 44, and 11. She asked the Commissioner if this was covered comprehensively in action plan item #4.
- Commissioner Taylor said yes, **her amendment has been addressed.**
- Ms. Kigel introduced Mr. Ritter’s amendment #3, page 29, lines 28-29. It is an addition of agricultural organizations and stakeholders to this coordination process. The Department accepts this language.
- Ms. Kiselewski asked if any Task Force members had concerns or comments and did not see any.

**The amendment text for Action Plan page 29, lines 28-30: The following language was modified by the Task Force: FDOT will continue robust coordination with local governments; local, regional, state, and federal agencies and environmental, community, economic development, agricultural organizations/ stakeholders, and other interest groups, with an intent of exceeding the requirements of the PD&E process.**

- Ms. Kigel introduced Commissioner Doherty’s amendment #2 and Ms. Mathews’ amendment #15 which are very similar. The amendment language would be added to the end of the report in the conclusion of the action plan.
- Commissioner Doherty had concerns over the schedule laid out in statute. It was very ambitious and difficult to achieve. He thinks it’s important they go on record to request the Governor and Legislature consider adjusting the deadlines so there is proper time to complete the work.
- Ms. Kigel asked Ms. Mathews if she was okay with the language from Commissioner Doherty.
- Ms. Mathews said she thought that was fine.
- Ms. Kigel noted the Department was good with the language.
- Mr. Dickman said this was logical and was glad it was brought up.
- Ms. Kiselewski called for other comments or concerns and seeing none called it accepted as proposed.

**The amendment text for Action Plan page 30, line 11: The following language was added by the Task Force: The Task Force recognizes that the vision of M-CORES established by the Governor and Legislature in s. 338.278, F.S. is ambitious and its implementation will require continued strong coordination among state agencies, local governments, MPOs, RPCs, water management districts, and other agencies. The Task Force also recognizes that the economic and fiscal outlook facing Florida has changed significantly since the legislation authorizing the M-CORES Program was signed in May 2019. Given the potential transformational impact of the M-CORES Program on the future of Florida, the Task Force respectfully requests the Governor and Legislature to consider adjusting the deadlines for corridor construction and other milestones in statute to permit thorough analysis and thoughtful collaboration on all key decisions.**

- Ms. Kigel told Secretary Nandam that was the last of the amendments.
- Mr. Nandam told the Task Force members to give themselves a round of applause and called for a break after which they would scroll through the final report with the amendments included.

8:28 PM

Break

8:40 PM	Final Task Force Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• L.K. Nandam, Task Force Chair</li> <li>• Karen Kiselewski, Facilitator</li> <li>• Beth Kigel, Task Force Support Team</li> <li>• Task Force Members</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secretary Nandam welcomed everyone back and introduced the section of the discussion where staff would scroll through the report with amendment revisions included for Task Force members to review the final document.</li> <li>• Ms. Kiselewski asked staff to open and scroll through the report. They worked to make sure all the day's amendments were included but there may be some formatting/grammar issues to fix.</li> <li>• <i>Mr. Dickman stated there are a couple of places that say, "the Task Force reached consensus" and he thought it was unfair to everyone. He thought it should just deal with "the Task Force or the report says this" instead of "the Task Force reached consensus" on it. He had lost track of which page. He recalled seeing it with the original text on page 2 and 10. He said maybe it was already dealt with, but he saw it on page 2, line 20 at some point.</i></li> <li>• <i>Ms. Kigel said that in the stricken language, like on line 38, consensus was removed.</i></li> <li>• <i>Mr. Dickman said he sees that now.</i></li> <li>• <i>Commissioner Constance asked why they removed local comp plans on page 20.</i></li> <li>• <i>Ms. Kigel clarified they were missing some amendment language here. There was statute language that was included here. Strikeouts are correct. She said they need to get language in there and they had additional language but just didn't put it in yet.</i></li> <li>• <i>Mr. Starford said his understanding was they were going to change the word "them" to identifying what the conservation lands were.</i></li> <li>• <i>Ms. Kiselewski said they didn't get all the "them's" fixed, but that they will fix that (page 24).</i></li> <li>• <i>Commissioner Taylor had the same comment.</i></li> <li>• <i>Ms. Fleming had a request to <b>change the word "critical" to the word "important."</b> Critical means something under the Endangered Species Act and she didn't think that was what was implied here.</i></li> <li>• <i>Ms. Kiselewski asked for any comments and not seeing any, the change was made to line 22.</i></li> <li>• <i>Mr. Dickman said he was reading the second bullet. He noted they are just going to rely on statutory language of appropriate land uses and natural resources. Whatever is meant in statute is what it is. He is going to assume that "appropriate land uses" means avoid sprawl. He asked if, when it says, "need and financial feasibility," does it mean "transportation need and financial feasibility."</i></li> <li>• <i>Mr. Jason Watts said they realized they say this phrase in two parts and they don't match, <b>so with approval from the Task Force they will make them match.</b> We'll go with the one saying, "transportation need and preliminary financial feasibility," and he thought sharing the phrase twice would be more indicative of the intent.</i></li> <li>• <i>Ms. Estenoz asked where it says "FDOT will create a corridor advisory group..." add "and independent technical experts." She felt that in the next go around the Department should make an effort to bring some independent technical expertise, meaning individuals not funded by M-CORES or FDOT. She suggested that might be universities or other agencies, but that would go a long way to ensuring there is a full range of feedback, including expert feedback.</i></li> <li>• <i>Mr. Will Watts stated <b>staff would work on some language as related to the advisory group on page 35.</b></i></li> <li>• <i>Ms. Mathews asked if it would be wise to ask to remove deadlines that are imposed on the M-CORES process that are in statute language.</i></li> <li>• <i>Ms. Kiselewski said the last sentence does mention considering deadline adjustments.</i></li> <li>• <i>Ms. Mathews said adjusting is good, she was just wondering <b>about "removing" deadlines.</b></i></li> </ul>		

- *Mr. Dickman said he was fine with removing deadlines but asked that on **line 35 they add “partners” to read “agencies and partners.”***
- *Commissioner Constance said that, when they are done, he wanted to go back to action item #4 because he had questions. He was concerned about the language that says M-CORES would not impact MPO TIPs beyond 2025 without consent from the specific MPO. His question was how come it doesn't just say that “FDOT has committed that projects currently in the 5-year work program for fiscal years 2021-2025 and future work programs from 2026-2030 will not be affected”?*
- *Ms. Kiselewski referenced the last sentence in the section that refers to the path if a project is not funded and not approved by the MPO. It said that unfunded projects will not continue until funding is identified and FDOT will coordinate on that.*
- *Commissioner Constance says he understood, it's logical, but it still doesn't protect them. If the MPO decides not to do it, that doesn't mean there wouldn't be punitive action to local governments for not advancing projects.*
- *Ms. Shen said that FDOT works with MPOs and rural partners collaboratively. There is no punitive action if MPOs don't agree with specific projects, and the MPO process is outlined in federal and state law, so this isn't a significant concern. FDOT commits to this collaborative process and are reviewed by the Federal Highway and Transit Administrations each year to check their processes and they have FDOT management here. The project won't go forward without the consent of the MPO.*
- *Commissioner Constance said he appreciated the Department being on the record, he just wanted to make sure.*
- *Secretary Nandam confirmed what Ms. Shen said. This is a collaborative process with the MPOs, and projects are prioritized based on need. If there is a particular need in a county, FDOT will take care of it as long as resources are available, so he suggested that is not a concern.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski requested to go back to page 35 for Ms. Estenoz's additions on the advisory group. She noted they will talk about the final report and consensus and everyone will have an opportunity to say closing remarks. She read the suggested language, **“FDOT will invite, as requested, a range of independent, and not part of the M-CORES program approval, subject matter experts (SME) to meet with the corridor advisory group on technical subjects. FDOT also will create multiple ongoing opportunities for partners and members of the public to be aware of and provide input to this process, with emphasis on direct engagement of the public in local communities.”***
- *Ms. Estenoz said that looks good to her.*
- *Mr. Starford asked why the word “as requested” was added. Just say “FDOT will invite a range of independent experts.”*
- *Mr. Will Watts said if it is requested, they will do their due diligence to provide.*
- *Ms. Estenoz said she agreed they should remove “as requested.”*
- *Commissioner Taylor agreed, “as requested” should be deleted.*
- *Mr. Jason Watts said they have no issues with that wording.*
- *Ms. Fleming said she understood they are in the process of editing, and she agreed with this very much, but wondered if they will get to the point of making the report flow a little more.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski asked if **Ms. Estenoz and Ms. Fleming would give the staff the authority to make editorial adjustments, keeping the intent.***
- *Ms. Estenoz said yes.*
- *Ms. Fleming said yes.*
- *Ms. Kiselewski said staff will make that flow better. She asked staff if they had another open item on page 24. She noted there were four amendments that have been incorporated.*
- *Ms. Kigel noted these were just corrections that inadvertently didn't make it into the report and wanted to ensure the Task Force saw they are incorporated now.*

- Secretary Nandam discussed the final Task Force report and thanked Ms. Kiselewski for going through the amended report. The discussion will now be on the draft as amended. He said the conversation is going to be regarding the agreed upon standard and members are able to “support, accept, live with or agree not to oppose” the package of recommendations in the final report as amended today. He reiterated FDOT’s commitment to carrying out the guiding principles, instructions, and action plan in the subsequent phases of the program. He noted that staff are going to assume members are comfortable unless they raise a hand. He asked that anyone who cannot “support, accept, live with or agree not to oppose” to raise their hand and express concern now.
- Mr. Dickman didn’t think they were taking a vote and asked for clarification about the process.
- Ms. Kiselewski said she thinks the issue is, if members cannot at a minimum agree not to oppose then we want to hear from you.
- Secretary Nandam added that if a Task Force member does not have concerns, he or she does not need to raise their hand.
- Mr. Dickman said he is concerned about the whole thing. He said he appreciated the process and respects everyone here, but it’s kind of being thrown at them.
- Secretary Nandam said they are not asking him for an up or down, they are asking if there is anything in the report that is a cause for concern.
- Mr. Dickman said yes, there are things that give him concern.
- Secretary Nandam asked him to go over his concern so they can talk about it.
- Mr. Dickman thought the vote on “consensus” was unnecessary. He didn’t want to go back through his individual concerns, of which there were many, because points of compromise were not necessarily points of consensus for him.
- Ms. Mathews wanted to express her admiration for the dedication of the Task Force members, and the staff have been incredible, and consultants have been great as the Task Force collaborated to produce this. The Nature Conservancy tried to help the Task Force and FDOT when they commissioned a scientific report of the potential impacts of the corridor on the Florida panther habitat. The Nature Conservancy has the utmost confidence and trust in FDOT and staff, but they don’t have assurance of the statutory language passed by the Legislature or that their concerns will be adequately addressed in the future. The Nature Conservancy does not support the construction of the Southwest-Central Florida Connector from Collier County to Polk County, nor can they sign-off on the final Task Force report because they don’t have assurance that construction will not have significant detrimental impacts on the Florida panther and its habitats.
- Commissioner Taylor said she represents her commission, and her commission has said they support the M-CORES Program as long as it doesn’t affect the work program. For that reason, she is in a quandary because she shares great concerns over issues of the environmental aspect of this road being handed over to the political bodies that created this statute.
- Secretary Nandam said that staff are going to reflect Ms. Mathews’ comments as not supporting the report. He asked Mr. Dickman if there was anything he wanted to add.
- Mr. Dickman said he personally doesn’t support this. He’d like to see the whole thing as a finished document before he throws his support one way or another. He said the staff did what the statute asked them to do, which was for a consensus building strategy, but he wasn’t prepared to go back through and say yes/no/maybe.
- Ms. Estenoz didn’t see the four options being equivalent to each other. The Everglades Foundation does not have plans to walk away from this process and turn around and condemn the report. There has been nothing that has happened this year that has given them any certainty or comfort in supporting the M-CORES Program moving forward. All the things she came expecting from the process, most of it has not materialized. She thought the work of the Task Force has been to do the

*best they could with what they were given in terms of a time frame and a charge. FDOT has been amazing at helping with what has been done. Her organization is not going to walk away and condemn the work of the group, but that should not be in any way construed as support for the M-CORES Program or any corridor.*

- *Ms. Kiselewski said she was hearing a theme about being unable to support the program going forward. She wondered if there was a way to document that in the report that would allow them to support the report.*
- *Commissioner Constance said there is no one sitting at the table that agrees with every single word and line, but the Task Force was charged with a task to produce a final report to allow FDOT to do their job. Their job was to try to make a document that had best safeguards and best verbiage. He had been very impressed by not just the governmental individuals but also the non-governmental organizations that have been involved. They have done an excellent job putting in exactly what should be there to protect the environment and safeguard wildlife. This will be something forward thinking for multiple decades in the state of Florida. FDOT will continue to work on this and local governments will have a hard time if they don't help mold this through the MPO process and the county government process to make sure everything done is correct. He appreciated everyone's opinions.*
- *Ms. Fleming said she had struggled the entire time with the need for roads as depicted, 330 miles along the entire western peninsula, and the fact that it was legislated. This was an unconventional way to decide how things should be built and where. She was comfortable with the recommendations and thinks that construction projects would benefit from these kinds of recommendations in implementation. She was not comfortable with endorsing moving forward with the M-CORES Program before we have established the need for roads themselves, the financial feasibility, and the environmental studies. She is steadfast in trying to make sure that if roads are built, they will be done in the best possible manner, to protect the environment, wildlife and panther, but is worried about the follow-through and what guarantees will be implemented as written. She has many concerns about this, but she is comfortable supporting these recommendations.*
- *Secretary Nandam wanted to make sure they are clear on what they are asking the Task Force to do. We are asking that you take the work you have put in, with all principles and instructions and the action items, and give us your concurrence to go forward with the report. The question was to ensure if there is anything in the report that is going to cause any concern that they bring it up so it could be talked about and then move forward to submit the report. He wanted to ensure that their comments are reflected. If they have not been resolved at this stage, if there is anything that still concerns you then we document it and then go forward. The second purpose is if you still don't have a comfort level with the report as it is then we want to document that too. The question is specific to the report and the submittal of the report, and with the blessing from the Task Force on the contents of the report. He thought the Task Force was clear they want FDOT to go forward with the evaluation, defining the needs, the financial feasibility, the environmental feasibility, and doing what FDOT has always done and be a good steward of our citizens, making sure we deliver the best product that incorporates the guiding principles, instructions, high-level needs and action items provided in the report.*
- *Dr. Gray said he works for an environmental group. Florida is growing and every time a new road is built, special stuff is lost in the state. It is a huge concern about how fast the state is growing. But it is growing, and we can't get out of that. One thing that's important in this report is the idea of no new greenfield roads. It was concluded that would be very expensive, wouldn't be traveled as much, wasn't feasible. The idea that this Task Force wants to build a brand-new road is important to us, we don't want a brand-new road. There were some instances where we recognize that level of service is bad, we don't mind looking at some of those areas being co-located and make it, so Florida has livable communities. This report does have our essential values in it. No new roads, but let's look at the*

existing infrastructure where people are having trouble. At least look at it, not necessarily follow through. In that regard this report is a pretty good report. It looks at the things that it needs to look at and says, “well what are we going to do about this growing population.”

- Mr. Dickman felt he had been conciliatory in many areas, but he wanted to see the word sprawl in the report. He came in with full understanding that he was going to try to see things through other people’s eyes and bring his experience to the table and he felt like he had done that and that he had acquiesced in areas that he wouldn’t have.
- Secretary Nandam thinks Mr. Dickman has been a very valuable partner and has given suggestions that were critical for several Task Force members that garnered support for those amendments. He wanted to re-pose the question focused on the report itself. Is there any reason that the Task Force shall not submit this report to meet the charge of the Task Force given by the Legislature?
- Ms. Estenoz would like to move away from the four boxes. She would like to say that the report is just complete. The Task Force has finished its report and consensus doesn’t need to be in there.
- Secretary Nandam wanted to repeat the question because that’s where he was going. The question is: does the Task Force see any reason for us to not submit this report? That means do you have any concern about the content of the report that will be submitted to the Legislature. He asked it in a more positive way saying, “do you concur with the contents of the report that will be submitted to the Legislature”?
- Mr. Ritter agreed with Ms. Estenoz. He believed the report is a good one in that it provides FDOT guidance and it has the best of all of the Task Force’s thoughts. In that respect, as a guidance document, for FDOT to move forward, it has enough information that FDOT will hopefully make good decisions, being optimistic, based on the information and guidance that this Task Force has provided. In that respect the Task Force supports the document. There are areas in there that our membership would not like to see done, but he thinks there’s enough guidance to lead you away from that direction. As a guidance document, we would support this.
- Commissioner Taylor asked what about wording like this: The Task Force supports this document as it was created on consensus, but it in no way implies that the Task Force as a whole endorses the road. She supported the work done and FDOT’s support and extraordinary perseverance. She said they have done an outstanding job, but she is concerned by saying that we support the report it will imply that we support the whole program, which she cannot do.
- Secretary Nandam thinks the Task Force needs to focus on if there are any concerns with submitting the report. If not, then the report can be submitted as an outcome of the Task Force effort.
- Commissioner Taylor asked if they just have to narrowly decide.
- Secretary Nandam said yes, they are going to focus on report content. If there’s not an issue with the content of the report, we will submit to the Legislature as requested.
- Ms. Estenoz asked why they as individuals have to be characterized as blessing the report or supporting the report. The report is done. It is in the possession of FDOT who will transmit it to the Legislature. She strongly advised against a transmittal letter, because what FDOT is hearing is a lot of anxiety and voices who stuck with this process despite deep seeded skepticism.
- Secretary Nandam said that based on Task Force comments he is going to say at this time **the Task Force agrees the report is done and shall be submitted to Legislature.**
- Ms. Estenoz said that speaking for herself, she can agree that the report is done.
- Ms. Kiselewski called for closing remarks, that each member could give one or two key thoughts.

10:25 PM

Closing Remarks

- L.K. Nandam, Task Force Chair
- Will Watts, FDOT Chief Engineer
- Huiwei Shen, FDOT Chief Planner

- *Dave Rawicz thanked everyone for their efforts. The most recent comments he supported, that a report was done and should be submitted in avoiding the words consensus, etc. He still felt as though, if any Task Force member or organization, there are remedies for their ability to affect change down the line throughout the planning process. He believed they should be satisfied we got the report done and appreciate the effort.*
- *Mr. Dickman asked several “yes or no” questions to Secretary Nandam to which the Secretary responded. Mr. Dickman just wanted to conclude the Task Force as “they all worked hard, and they are submitting the report as is.”*
- *Secretary Nandam thanked Mr. Dickman.*
- *Mr. Starford thanked the Department for everything, this has been challenging in many respects for a lot of people here. He appreciated the professionalism that had gone into the report. He asked if they would discuss next steps before anyone signed off.*
- *Secretary Nandam said the next steps are for the Department to finalize the report and make sure there are no errors and submit it by November 15, 2020.*
- *Commissioner Taylor thanked the Department for their support and for all the hard work Secretary Nandam and his staff have done. She would support their suggestion that the Task Force report is just handed in. She thinks that’s a good result, and one she was looking for.*
- *Mr. Ritter thanked the Department for their support with everything and agreed he would also support their final recommendation suggesting that the report is complete and submit it as is.*
- *Mr. Lauritsen said his reason for looking forward to participating in the Task Force was because he wanted to avoid what has happened in history. This has not been easy, but he wished this kind of process had been taken up 50 years ago; just imagine what could have been saved. He appreciated everyone doing their level best to pull themselves into planning and sharing and he appreciated the invitation from FDOT and the state to seek our guidance. It is not often environmental organizations get a seat at the table where they can lay out what should and should not be done. He appreciated the chance to outline that and identify opportunities to recuperate ecological functions that were lost through those past actions, and yes, we are going to get things wrong at times, but this planning effort has resulted in a lot of actions he thinks we can be proud of.*
- *Mayor Pro- Tem Birdsong said he appreciated the work of FDOT staff and members of the Task Force. He went into this process thinking he would have a part in determining and drawing the lines; he actually verbalized that in Tampa. He is very proud of the document that has been prepared that will lead and give direction to FDOT. He said it is so thoroughly done in his estimation that all the things we thought about will give direction and make a real decision as to “are the corridors going to be developed?” or whether there will be new roads. He highly supports submitting the document. Thank you all for the hard work by staff and the Task Force.*
- *Mr. Graef thanked everyone and said he appreciates the opportunity to participate. He appreciated FDOT staff and their responsiveness. He has worked with FDOT for many years and all these processes (PD&E, etc.) and he looks forward to whatever the next steps are to help protect and enhance wildlife corridors and environmentally sensitive areas.*
- *Mark Futrell, as a member of public service commission staff, appreciated the opportunity to work with everyone and the professionalism of the FDOT staff is commendable. We are working through a difficult challenging topic with multiple stakeholders.*
- *Ms. Pam Johnson echoed the comments made and the sentiments. She thought this was well done by her fellow agencies and the Department and staff and Task Force members as a whole. As a strategic planner she said this is a document where they accomplished what they set out to do. She appreciated everyone’s commitment and investments into making it as good of a document as it can be.*

- *Mr. Scott said he was happy to be involved and understood from the beginning they wouldn't get all the answers they wanted and that's why there is a PD&E process.*
- *Commissioner McDaniel thanked the Department like all the previous speakers and said it had been an educational process. He learned a lot and so had his colleagues. With this document, FDOT has the opportunity to go forward if the Legislature and Governor choose to construct the road. This is a formidable plan with guiding principles that will allow those decisions to be made. He was pleased with the document, not in its entirety, but he wanted to commend FDOT and his colleagues.*
- *Commissioner Constance thanked everyone on the Task Force for their opinions and hard work and collaborative effort. He heard comments from others, and nothing will be perfect, but they've spent enough hours that they've gotten as close as what they could to mold a document that will try to protect wildlife and the environment while looking at the future of Florida 50 years down the road to make sure we are prepared and resilient as a state.*
- *Ms. Steed thanked everyone and said she was amazed. She has been on many Task Forces over the years and she had never seen so many data assembled in such a short period of time. The level of information provided will be useful in many endeavors throughout these nine counties. This is a legacy document and is very much a testament to the Task Force members.*
- *Ms. Worthington-Decker thanked everyone on the Task Force for their hard work and said she had learned so much. Much like projects she is working on with FDOT, this is another highlight of how wonderful and responsive you all are. Having worked on a lot of government committees as a non-government person, the ability to include everyone's feedback in the report is impressive.*
- *Mr. Ferry said he had no closing thoughts, but he supports the document.*
- *Ms. Ambrose thanked everyone from the Department and staff.*
- *Ms. Estenoz said the M-CORES process could reshape the entire state. Her plan and hope are that everyone will stay very engaged. There are a lot of decision points in front of them as a state as to how to deal with this program going forward. The state is facing an economic situation we could not imagine when this started. She thanked everyone again. Her biggest regret is that she always enjoyed getting to know everyone, seeing them in person, and that hasn't been the case for the last six months.*
- *Secretary Nandam shared the same sentiments. The Department will definitely engage with each Task Force member as a stakeholder going forward.*
- *Ms. Fleming reiterated that it's been a challenge under strange circumstances, but appreciated everyone sticking with it, and FDOT and staff trying to understand concerns and address them. There has been a remarkable amount of work done in a very short period. It's the largest road project undertaken in Florida since the 1950s. It will change the state forever and she doesn't take it lightly. She appreciated feedback and effort of staff and all the other Task Force members. She thought this was a good product at the end of the day she hoped it will be read and utilized in a good way.*
- *Secretary Nandam ensured that their engagement will not stop here.*
- *Commissioner Thompson said he supports the document and supports building the road. His concern is different, he thinks there are enough "outs" that it won't get built, which is probably unlike what other folks are feeling. When there are this many opinions it's a wonder they did as well as they did. He thanked the Department for work they've done.*
- *Ms. Carpenter thanked FDOT and staff for their work. She has been impressed to see the level of effort and engagement and professionalism. All of that, especially under the circumstances.*
- *Melissa Roberts thanked FDOT staff, they have been amazing.*
- *Tim McGrath thanked everybody and FDOT for their hard work. He said this was a learning experience and he thanked everyone for their hard work.*

- *Stephanie Vick thanked FDOT and thanked staff for sending data whenever she asked. She enjoyed working with everyone and she does approve the report as it's being submitted.*
- *Tracy Hood said it's been great working with a group of people who are so knowledgeable and so passionate. They will recognize in the years to come the value of their effort, maybe beyond the M-CORES corridor and how transportation works in the Southwest Florida area. They'll find ways to use the great thoughts/concepts in years to come.*
- *Commissioner Doherty thanked all the Task Force members saying it was a job well done. They have a very good work product, and he looks forward to watching this process unfold in the future.*
- Secretary Nandam thanked the Task Force members who stayed for the lengthiest meeting he's ever attended. He appreciated their patience as they completed the Task Force report and agreeing to send it to the Legislature. He mentioned the meeting will be on the website and the team will submit the report by November 15, 2020. The final report will be on the website. If anyone has additional questions or comments, they can reach out to the production lead Marlon Bizerra.
- Ms. Shen thanked Secretary Nandam. She said throughout the process they learned what is most important to each Task Force member and about each other's perspective. What we want is what's best for the state of Florida. She'd gotten to know Task Force members, the public, industry leaders, and production team members. These relationships will serve us well for planning a multimodal transportation system for our great state. She is excited about the opportunities for collaboration and reminded the Task Force members that they are still under the Sunshine Law until November 15, 2020. She thanked them for their service to their state and for their passionate hard work.
- Mr. Will Watts thanked everyone for their hard work and guidance to FDOT and to their fellow Floridians to prepare for the future. This will serve as a blueprint for the planning phase. Their guiding principles and instructions will guide the Department's decision making every step of the way. He looked ahead to recognize the importance of the needs evaluation and taking an early look at the financial analysis at the project level, including project costs and funding sources. They will build upon recommendations of the Task Force and use the best available data to conduct a robust evaluation of potential corridor needs. Following PD&E they will evaluate the economic feasibility of the corridor at the 30% design phase accounting for FDOT contributions related to enhancements and multi-use opportunities. They talked about broadband a lot, and statutorily they will have \$5 million annually in 2022 and 2023 for broadband infrastructure projects. They will be working with the Department of Economic Opportunity to support their statewide broadband strategic plan. They will focus on rural areas and middle/last mile connectivity. Public engagement continues to be a priority and focus of the Department. He thanked everyone for providing input and encouraged everyone to stay involved.
- Secretary Nandam thanked Ms. Shen, Mr. Will Watts, and the Task Force. He said it was rewarding to see the outcome of this work. He thanked everyone for allowing him to serve as the Task Force chair. He felt they accomplished a lot in their time together and learned some new things along the way with corridor planning, broadband, emerging technologies, land use planning, conservation, and so on. He appreciated advocacy for the things everyone is passionate about and how it was documented in the Task Force report. This is only the first step, and this will set the foundation for future phases of the project. FDOT remains committed to working with local, regional and state agencies and partners. Engagement is a very high priority of the Department and they are going to live by that. He looked forward to continuing to work with everyone.

11:05 PM	Adjourn
----------	---------

Text Format:

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

