



East Central Florida Corridor Task Force

Minutes from the June 5, 2014 Meeting

Valencia College Lake Nona Campus

12350 Narcoossee Road, Orlando, Florida 32832

Bill Killingsworth, Task Force Chairman, Director of Community Planning, Florida Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO)

Task Force Members Present (in alphabetical order):

Rich Biter, Assistant Secretary for Intermodal Systems Development, Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT)

John Browne, Land Programs Administrator, Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services

Tracy Duda Chapman, Chief Executive Officer, The Viera Company

Charles Lee, Director of Advocacy, Audubon Florida for Eric Draper

Debbie Harvey, Chief Executive Officer, Ron Jon Surf Shop

The Honorable Fred Hawkins, Osceola County Commissioner

Erik Jacobsen, General Manager, Deseret Ranch

Belinda Ortiz Kirkegard, Economic Development Director, City of Kissimmee

Marcos Marchena, Citizen

Charles Pattison, President, 1000 Friends of Florida

The Honorable Jennifer Thompson, Orange County Commissioner

Facilitator

Shelley Lauten, TriSect, LLC



Task Force Staff Members Present (in alphabetical order):

Maria Cahill, FDOT

Carly Hermanson, DEO

John Kaliski, Cambridge Systematics

Caroline Knight, DEO

Bill Pable, DEO

Ashley Porter, DEO

Laura Regalado, DEO

Ana Richmond, DEO

Bob Romig, FDOT

Huiwei Shen, FDOT

Brian Ten Siethoff, Cambridge Systematics

Matthew Wilson, Cambridge Systematics

Jim Wood, FDOT

1. Welcome

Mr. Killingsworth welcomed everyone and introduced Dr. Mike Bosley, Executive Dean, Valencia College. Dr. Bosley welcomed the members to the facility. Mr. Killingsworth introduced two new members. First, Charles Lee with Audubon Florida is attending for Eric Draper. Second, John Browne will take Robert Williams' place representing the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services.

Mr. Killingsworth noted that he will stop the meeting at 3:00 p.m. for public comment. He introduced Carly Hermanson, Attorney for the Task Force, to follow up from last meeting on the maintenance of public records. Ms. Hermanson said that the members should maintain their own public records. She directed the members to copy James Stansbury with DEO when they send and/or receive emails related to the Task Force. This will expedite the response to any public records requests. Once the Task Force disbands, DEO can be responsible for maintaining the Task Force public records.



2. Approval of Minutes from Last Meeting

Mr. Killingsworth asked if the members had any corrections to the minutes from the last meeting. Ms. Duda Chapman identified corrections to page 5, related to the Cocoa Ranch and Viera Wilderness Park. The members approved the minutes with the amendments offered by Ms. Duda Chapman by an affirmative voice vote. Mr. Killingsworth directed the members to the evaluation form in the notebooks and asked them to fill them out.

3. Overview of the Study Area Counties

The overview included three presentations. First, Mel Scott, Assistant County Manager, provided an overview of Brevard County. Second, Alberto Vargas, Planning Manager, provided an overview of Orange County. Third, Jeff Jones, Director of Strategic Initiatives, provided an overview of Osceola County.

Discussion

- Mr. Killingsworth noted that the Indian River Lagoon is a \$3.5 billion annual revenue generator. Is that the total economic impact? Mr. Scott confirmed that \$3.5 billion is an annual figure. Mr. Killingsworth noted that this is a significant economic generator with a grand total impact of \$70 billion over 20 years. In that context, it makes sense to protect it. He noted that we should ask ourselves how much a community would be willing to spend to protect a \$70 billion economic asset.
- Mr. Lee commented that he appreciates how the presentation outlined various conservation achievements in Brevard County. However, he commented that it is important to note that some of the economic growth points identified present significant challenges to environmental areas. For example, proposed new launch pads at Cape Canaveral may close Playalinda Beach. Also, the potential port site on the Banana River is located in an area with a depth of two feet of water. Therefore, millions of cubic yards of dredging will be required. Mr. Lee requested that these environmental resources continue to be considered.
- Mr. Pattison asked whether there has been an analysis of potential conflicts between the noted comprehensive plans. Mr. Killingsworth replied that an analysis will occur over the summer break.
- Mr. Killingsworth noted that Osceola County had a hearing that rezoned 50,000 acres at one time. How much public comment occurred? Mr. Jones replied that there was some public comment, but not a large amount. He thinks the reason is that they have discussed this issue for the last 5 years, and it therefore was not a surprise. It was a very well vetted process.
- Mr. Killingsworth emphasized that it is important that the public remains involved. This is a significant initiative. Mr. Killingsworth requested the Task Force to think about potential



conflicts where the four Cs come together. How do we weigh the four Cs against each other? Do we weigh them or do we have a process to resolve any conflict?

- Mr. Lee offered three comments. First, there are conflicts concerning the siting of the Osceola County Southport expressway corridor near the Disney Wilderness Preserve. Controlled burns may be difficult. Second, the expressway system may pass near the Split Oak Conservation Preserve near Orange County. Third, the status of the Osceola County Conservation Element has been appealed by the Audubon Society. They are concerned that the removal of conservation policies will adversely affect the ability to protect lands, particularly outside the urban growth boundary.
- Mr. Pattison noted that Mr. Jones indicated that the Osceola County Expressway Authority was disbanded. He understands the Legislature passed a law creating a new Central Florida Expressway Authority. He inquired whether the Task Force will get a briefing. Mr. Killingsworth advised that a briefing will occur at the next meeting if the bill is signed into law by the Governor.
- Ms. Thompson inquired about a potential government in the sunshine concern. She intends to have a conversation with Mr. Lee about some geographical areas as part of a matter that will be considered by the Orange County Board of County Commissioners. Ms. Hermanson replied that she will discuss her questions with her at the break.
- Ms. Duda Chapman mentioned the proposed connection from the Pineda Causeway to the North Ranch, which as shown would pass through the Viera development. The approved plans for Viera do not contemplate a corridor.
- Mr. Marchena asked about the transit study occurring for East Orange County. Mr. Vargas indicated that transit alternatives are being studied from the Orange County Convention Center to Orlando International Airport, as well as along SR 50 from downtown Orlando to the University of Central Florida. Mr. Marchena also asked about the projected build out for the Northeast District. Mr. Jones advised that the buildout date is 2040.
- Ms. Lauten asked if the panelists could identify major connectivity gaps or issues in the study area. Mr. Jones said there is a gap in connectivity from southeastern Orlando to southern Brevard County – two areas rich in high-tech resources. Mr. Scott commented that this effort should not overlook the importance of investing in our existing network. Development of new corridors should not occur to the detriment of our existing network.
- Mr. Vargas noted that the community must also look at possible alternative modes of transportation within the corridor.
- Mr. Pattison said he agreed about the importance of maintaining the existing network and would like to understand the 50-year plans for the existing facilities.



- Ms. Lauten posed the following question to the Task Force and the panel: How do we find a balance between the new and old Florida? Agriculture is a significant factor in the old Florida. Mr. Scott noted that Brevard has rebranded its agricultural extension service. It no longer uses the word “agricultural”. The primary agriculture output in Brevard is the 1 to 9 acre hobby farm. Mr. Jones observed that Osceola County is different. Agriculture holdings are typically 1,000 to 9,000 acres. Osceola has identified agriculture as one of its targeted industries. Mr. Vargas noted that Orange County is considering “agrarian urbanism”, such as community gardens.
- Mr. Lee observed that the Audubon Society is very concerned about the future of agriculture in Florida. Some of the most important intact resources in Florida are the ones that have been successfully managed as ranching. Keeping the large ranches intact and operating is important for environmental resources.
- Mr. Killingsworth remarked that there are different types of communities within the study area—some that want to grow and others that want to maintain their rural character. How can we reconcile the conflicts of this process? Mr. Vargas observed that Orange County just worked with the Urban Land Institute to convene a technical advisory panel on agricultural subdivisions. Mr. Scott noted that Brevard County is placing its heritage at the forefront.
- Mr. Browne noted that the next major obstacle is potable water. He expressed concern regarding how the conversion of open space is going to result in less water going to the aquifer. He inquired whether the approval of new development is taking into account water availability. Mr. Jones concurred that the availability of water is a big issue both in geography and timeframe. It cannot be dealt with as it has in the past. The region cannot do project by project planning for water. Sector plans provide an opportunity to plan for water on a large scale. One of the things worth considering is combining corridor plans with sector plans, as is occurring with the current Task Force process. Mr. Scott indicated that Brevard County recognizes the need to address challenges in the Indian River Lagoon. It is a critical water supply and water quality issue.
- Mr. Pattison requested that the Task Force receive the Bureau of Economic and Business Research population projections for the three counties for 10, 20, and 50 years. Ms. Lauten indicated that those figures will be provided this afternoon.
- Mr. Jacobsen agreed that it is important that the dual processes of corridor planning and sector planning process run parallel with each other and inform each other.

4. Department of Economic Opportunity Remarks, Jesse Panuccio, Executive Director

Mr. Panuccio provided an overview of the functions of DEO and how its various programs provide holistic support for economic development. The vision of DEO is to integrate its policies and programs in support of economic development. Mr. Panuccio raised a series of questions for the consideration of the Task Force that outlined how the region may grow in the future and how the community might prepare for that future.



5. **Break**

6. **Conservation: Trends, Issues, and Opportunities**

The conservation overview included three presentations. First, Jean Scott, Strategies for Livable Communities, provided an overview of the conservation discussion paper prepared for the Task Force. Second, Hugh Harling, Executive Director of the East Central Florida Regional Planning Council provided an overview of the Seven Jewels of Central Florida and also of the Natural Resources of Regional Significance. Third, Robert Beltran, Executive Director of the Southwest Florida Water Management District, provided an overview of the Central Florida Water Initiative.

Discussion

- Mr. Killingsworth remarked that one of the speakers observed that sea level rise is not just a coastal issue. The water has to go someplace. There will be impacts to the St. Johns River.
- Mr. Lee observed that conservation lands must be identified first, which provides guidance concerning the appropriate location of growth. That is the principle that was followed for the Wekiva planning process. He encouraged the Task Force to consider how they can simultaneously think about transportation and conservation goals. Mr. Lee urged the Task Force to get to a better definition of the conservation that must be done first, put that on the map, and then use that as a guide for future development decisions.
- Ms. Kirkegard asked whether the Task Force is going to receive mapping of where key environmental resources are currently located. Mr. Killingsworth replied that a technical advisory group could put together maps of environmental resources.
- Mr. Browne suggested using the Critical Lands and Waters Identification Project (CLIP) as a starting point. These maps show both wetland and wildlife signatures. Mr. Lee agreed with using CLIP as a starting point.
- Mr. Jacobsen noted that the ongoing North Ranch sector plan process has done a very detailed environmental analysis. The corridor process and sector plan process should continue to communicate.
- Mr. Lee agrees with the need for coordination between the North Ranch Sector Plan and the Task Force's work to ensure consistent assumptions about future conservation on the Deseret Ranch property. He expressed concern that the current environmental framework for the North Ranch sector plan is not yet precise enough.
- Mr. Pattison observed that we have a 50 year timeframe. Measurability will be a big issue. He wants to find a scorecard to measure success. We need to have standards to determine whether the plan is functioning well.



- Mr. Lee indicated that it is not just the wetlands that are important, but also the edges of the wetlands that provide habitat.
- Mr. Beltran said he would like to continue to coordinate efforts of the Central Florida Water Initiative with the work of this Task Force. As the Central Florida Water Initiative develops more specific recommendations, he can help develop an overlap with regional water projects and where water connectivity is needed.
- Mr. Biter agrees that we need to identify connections between transportation and water planning including determining if they are using consistent growth projections. However, we need to look at all utilities and all the needs that support a population (electric, sewage, etc.).

7. Countryside: Trends, Issues, and Opportunities

Mr. Kaliski and Mr. James Fletcher, County Extension Director, UF IFAS Extension in Osceola County, provided an overview of the trends, issues, and opportunities related to countryside.

Discussion

- Mr. Pattison inquired whether there is such a thing as a 50 year projection for agriculture (type of crop, etc.). Mr. Fletcher replied that there is not.
- Ms. Lauten asked if the Task Force members have other issues of connectivity related to agriculture.
- Mr. Fletcher noted that we are in a region that can move a lot of product. How do we get product to the port in Brevard County? Fuel for transport is also a major factor. We need to ensure that the road network can handle trucks hauling cattle.
- Mr. Lee remarked that the potential for growth in agriculture and cattle is not static. We need to consider market adaptation as a key feature to the agriculture economy. There could be an unpredicted economic shift that causes growth in the future. Mr. Fletcher observed that these issues are market driven and cannot be predicted 50 years into the future.
- Mr. Hawkins inquired whether the speakers can foresee a day when we would not ship calves out west. How can we sustain the cattle here? Mr. Fletcher indicated that the cost of production drives the issue.
- Mr. Killingsworth noted that the issue is that we need an economical way to go from a calf to a cow. Mr. Fletcher responded that we cannot grow corn in the quantities that they can out west. Corn is required to finish the product.



- Mr. Lee suggested that we identify the lead expressway authority that will be responsible for potential new corridor construction, given the status of the Osceola County Expressway Authority. What is the leadership structure long term for how we make decisions about this?

8. Lunch

9. Working Lunch Panel – Landowner Perspectives

The working lunch panel included three presentations, as summarized below.

First, Mr. Eric Jacobsen, General Manager, provided an overview of the Deseret Ranch. The Deseret Ranch is about 295,000 acres. It includes north and south sections and was originally assembled in the 1950s. It was a collection of properties previously used for timber production that had been cut. It is now one of the premier cow and calf operations in the United States. It is comprised of 14 operational units with 6.5 acres per cow. The ranch includes 42,500 cows, and 35,000 calves are weaned yearly. Calves go to operations in Texas and Oklahoma, and then to processing sites in Kansas. The ranch includes 1,700 acres of citrus, as well as row crops, palm/timber harvesting, sod production, and shell mining. The Deseret Ranch has a multiple use philosophy. They seek sustainable management of natural resources, have a comprehensive wildlife management plan, and are engaged in water resource protection. The Deseret Ranch is currently working with Osceola County on a sector plan for 133,000 acres.

Second, Ms. Tracy Duda Chapman, Chief Executive Officer, The Viera Company provided an overview of the Cocoa Ranch and Viera. Their business components include fresh fruit and vegetables, ranching (sod, cattle, and citrus), real estate, and passive commercial properties across the United States. Celery is its major crop. Their Central Florida property includes 3,500 cattle and 1,000 acres used to grow sod.

Third, Mr. Jim Zboril, President, Lake Nona Property Holdings, provided an overview of Lake Nona's operations. Lake Nona's business components include Medical City, housing, commercial, and education. The current onsite employment at Medical City totals 4,700 persons, which in turn creates 30,000 jobs throughout the local economy.

Discussion

- Mr. Pattison asked the panelists if they have had any experience for payments for eco-services. Mr. Jacobsen replied that they have not had such experience to date but would consider this as an option. Ms. Duda Chapman confirmed that her company had experience with this strategy in Southwest Florida but not at the Cocoa Ranch.
- Mr. Lee noted that Mr. Jacobsen had mentioned that conservation easements were not in his business model. Mr. Jacobsen confirmed that easements are not in their agriculture model. However, if a portion of the ranch were to develop, they envision easements being a potential tool as development occurs.



- Mr. Lee asked Ms. Duda Chapman to be more specific about the impact of the proposed Pineda corridor on the Viera DRI. Ms. Duda Chapman said that the DRI does not currently contemplate a corridor. She would not rule out a corridor but it would be a challenge to figure out what the corridor would mean for approved development, as well as the Viera Wilderness Park and conservation area.
- Ms. Lauten observed that the panelists represent three private entities that are here for the long term. She requested that they advise the Task Force about their view of the future of the region. Mr. Jacobsen encouraged the Task Force to not be afraid to think very long term. There were previously no good tools to forecast beyond 20 to 30 years. However, the sector plan process lets them go further. Do not be afraid to think 80 or 100 years into the future. Mr. Zboril encourages the use of a regulatory carrot versus a regulatory stick. Local governments should make regulatory decisions in a uniform manner. A big developer who has many conditions of approval can be at a competitive disadvantage.
- Mr. Marchena asked for Lake Nona’s projected buildout. Mr. Zboril advised that the DRI buildout is about 2025.
- Mr. Killingworth encouraged the Task Force to consider what connectivity gaps exist in terms of moving people and products. Mr. Zboril replied that the key for Lake Nona is connectivity to Orlando International Airport. Lake Nona does not have a bus that runs to their property. That will likely change with the VA clinic. Mr. Jacobsen commented that as the area matures, multi-modal transportation will be critical. He also said that a better connection between Orlando and Melbourne is critical. Ms. Duda Chapman mentioned the importance of connectivity for trade and logistics, as well as linkages from the study area into regional and statewide transportation systems.
- Mr. Marchena requested information about the number of tractor trailers in this study area.
- Mr. Lee said there is a multi-layered issue in this study area. The highest level is the statewide and regional movement along I-4 and the potential need to better connect Orlando to southern Brevard County. The Task Force needs to see some good numbers on these needs. The second layer relates to the functionality of major developments in the study area, and whether they would benefit from greater interconnectivity. The third is planning for the 50-100 year buildout of the Deseret Ranch. He believes there is a missing piece. The Deseret Ranch and Osceola County are developing a sector plan. Half of the Deseret Ranch is in Orange County. If you have a plan that goes 50 years out for the Osceola County portion of the Deseret Ranch, and no long term plan for the Orange County side, that is not a consistent approach.
- Mr. Biter said we can’t look at any of these issues myopically. We need to understand the flows of people and freight at local, regional, statewide, national, and global levels. What happens if we grow more exports and imports from and to this study area? What are our supply chain needs? We need to be realistic, particularly about where rail can be successful for short-hauls.



- Mr. Killingsworth reminded the Task Force that we are talking about corridors, not necessarily roads. The result might include roads, but it could also include other facilities, such as multimodal transportation options (i.e. rail, bus, bike, etc.) or utilities.

10. Centers – Brian ten Siethoff, Cambridge Systematics

Mr. ten Siethoff provided an overview of trends, issues, and opportunities related to centers.

Discussion

- Mr. Hawkins encouraged the Task Force to consider what the population may look like in the future, given that different ethnicities have varied cultural housing trends, such as multi-generational households. He also suggested that the Task Force consider how the impact of major developments such as Lake Nona extend beyond the study area.
- Ms. Lauten observed that the issues under discussion go beyond the three counties. The overall economic region included in *How Shall We Grow?* was seven counties, and the “superregion” from Orlando to Tampa is generally defined as 15 counties.
- Mr. Pattison asked if the Task Force will receive demographic information on the counties. Mr. Killingsworth replied that they will.
- Mr. Killingsworth noted that the maps still show a gap in terms of assumptions for future growth and development on the North Ranch. The Task Force needs a better sense at a conceptual level of what can be shown here.
- Mr. Hawkins indicated that he prefers to focus on the Osceola County North Ranch sector plan. Orange County has not decided to go in this direction yet.
- Mr. Lee suggested that Orange County should be requested to reconfirm their intentions concerning a sector plan for the portion of the Deseret Ranch within their jurisdiction.
- Ms. Lauten inquired whether any additional information is needed from the team. Mr. Pattison requested information concerning the Orlando International Airport’s expansion plans and implications for compatible land use.

11. Break

12. Public Comment

Three members of the public spoke before the Task Force.

- Ms. Jenny Welch stated that Osceola County has no plans for businesses in its future. They are relying on Orange County. Ms. Welch disagrees that only large land owners are represented on



the Task Force. She notes that stormwater ponds should use native plants. She also stated that the Indian River Lagoon cannot be protected unless we cut back on use of fertilizers.

- Ms. Sandy Webb encouraged the Task Force to focus more on alternative energy sources. Ms. Lauten advised that the Task Force will be discussing energy at a future meeting.
- Mr. Jorge Soto expressed concerns about the Osceola Parkway extension.

13. Guiding Principles for Transportation Corridor Planning in the Study Area

Bob Romig, State Transportation Development Administrator, FDOT, reviewed the draft guiding principles for future corridors developed by FDOT with input from its partners. He noted that the principles are intended to be statewide in nature. The Task Force may wish to refine these principles. The principles are at a high level. They do not make decisions about specific corridor locations. How will these principles be used? FDOT hopes that the work of the Task Force will result in a set of principles that can be applied in any region of the state. The focus today is on the first two categories: 1.) Planning process; and 2.) Corridor location.

Discussion

- Mr. Killingsworth said he heard several thoughts today related to the planning process, including: the importance of identifying conservation areas first; the importance of the leadership structure; and the importance of measurability and how the recommendations of this Task Force carry forward. He asked whether any of these concepts rise to an independent idea. He noted that the Task Force is trying to give staff guidance on a broad framework.
- Ms. Harvey agreed with the importance of making all that we do actionable, as well as the need to coral many ideas discussed today.
- Mr. Hawkins observed that the Task Force needs to stay consistent with the structure of state and local rules and regulations that will carry these recommendations forward. Perhaps we should pick the five most important things that its members care about.
- Ms. Lauten asked whether the idea of handing responsibility off to someone is one of the key factors that the Task Force cares about.
- Mr. Pattison suggested that there should be significant benchmarks that this group identifies that can be tracked over time.
- Mr. Browne suggested elevating the importance of the environmental issues, and also clarifying that these include water, wildlife, and the other specifics discussed today.
- Ms. Thompson noted that it is important to elevate the environmental piece now instead of later. Conservation sites should be identified now.



- Mr. Lee agrees that conservation should be identified first. We should have a definitive long range vision. It cannot be ambiguous. The Task Force should specifically reference the principles in “How Should We Grow” because of the shared commitment this region has to this vision.
- Mr. Jacobsen suggested that the text should indicate that the corridor process should be done in coordination with the sector planning process.
- Ms. Duda-Chapman observed that it is important to ensure buy in to the process so this does not become an exercise that is not ever implemented.
- Mr. Biter suggested that the Task Force emphasize transparency. Do not publish a report without an explanation of why the Task Force reached conclusions. The Task Force should document the facts that led to the conclusion. Show both what is recommended and also why.
- Mr. Killingsworth noted that the Governor could be asked to periodically reconvene this Task Force to ensure enforceability and measurability of its recommendations.
- Mr. Lee stated that he would prefer greater definition and specificity rather than ambiguity.
- Mr. Kaliski observed that the principles may require commentary to help explain the meaning of the text. He also suggested that the Task Force create a sixth category of principles related to implementation.
- Mr. Lee expressed concern with the statement about consistency with the goals and objectives of the FTP and other statewide plans. He suggested the issue was more one of alignment than consistency, and also requested more specificity in terms of which plans are considered.
- Mr. Killingsworth requested input on the draft principles regarding corridor location.
- Mr. Kaliski briefly reviewed the intent behind these statements from the partners involved in creating them.
- Comments regarding the principle about protecting and restoring the natural environment:
 - Mr. Killingsworth stated that perhaps the conversation’s first concept should go here.
 - Mr. Jacobsen asked for clarification on how a transportation corridor can “restore” the environment.
 - Mr. Killingsworth said that when an existing facility is upgraded, there is an opportunity to undo some of the prior impacts from construction of the facility, such as re-establishing connectivity for wildlife crossings.



- Mr. Lee said there were opportunities to restore some environmental functions in some of the currently developed areas; in the greenfield areas, the emphasis should be more on avoiding and minimizing impacts.
- Mr. Romig gave examples of the bridging of the Tamiami Trail or the Wekiva River.
- Mr. Lee said there are two elements of concern from the environmental perspective: landscape and habitat related issues, which are covered here; and engineering and design issues, which should be covered in later principles. Both need to be included.
- Mr. Browne requested adding a reference to mitigation.
- Regarding the principle about supporting growth in appropriate areas:
 - Ms. Kirkegard suggested adding a reference to sector plans.
 - Mr. Pattison requested clarification about whether this group should be guided by How Shall We Grow? and other visions, or whether the group should come up with its own.
 - Mr. Killingsworth said How Shall We Grow? is a starting point but we also need to recognize that there are other community and neighborhood visions.
 - Mr. Pattison said he agreed with the need for a reference to sector plans but also that we should recognize the sector planning process could change. The intent is to coordinate with large, landscape-scale planning efforts.
 - Mr. Hawkins suggested a reference to large scale comprehensive plan amendments.
 - Mr. Marchena suggested deleting the reference to environmental issues in this statement since these are covered elsewhere, and focusing on location of improvements to existing corridors and new corridors in areas consistent with adopted visions and growth plans, comprehensive plans, sector plans, etc.
 - Mr. Killingsworth suggested that there may be a “cascading” effect of consistency across the various types of plans.
 - Ms. Duda Chapman requested clarification of the term “adopted” vision, and also adding reference to landowner plans and developments of regional impact.
 - Mr. Killingsworth agreed that the current language does not capture DRIs or some large master plans that are implemented through development orders.
 - Mr. Lee expressed concern that in today’s context, most of what we are talking about would be inconsistent with adopted plans and would only be consistent if the comprehensive plans change through sector plans or similar processes. It’s a question of timing. Perhaps we should structure this into a hierarchy beginning with How Shall We Grow? as implemented through appropriate amendments. The key question should be has the vision been adopted by the region, and has it been translated into local plans?
- Regarding the statement on supporting economic development:
 - Mr. Pattison suggested broadening to talk about other types of infrastructure.
 - Mr. Biter requested clarification of the term “economically productive rural lands.”
 - Ms. Kirkegard said she liked the structure of referring to both established and emerging centers, and suggested adding a reference to economically valuable lands.
 - Ms. Thompson said the term emerging is unclear and that the location of corridors could determine what becomes emerging.



14. Task Force Work Plan

- Mr. Kaliski provided an overview of future meeting dates and locations. The next meeting is June 27 at Port Canaveral. The proposed future dates are as follows: June 27 (Port Canaveral), September 12 (Orange County), October 17 (Brevard County), and November 13 (Osceola County). Staff will poll the Task Force members to determine if these dates work.
- Mr. Killingsworth proposed adding one more meeting to the schedule in August. He then discussed future meetings and whether they should continue with single long days or divide them into two ½ days. The consensus of the Task Force is for June 27 to remain as one full day. Subsequent dates will be divided into two ½ days.
- Mr. Kaliski noted that one or more Technical Advisory Groups will be set up in the near future. He also stated that a statewide webinar is scheduled for June 24, and a community workshop will occur in Kissimmee on July 8 from 9 a.m. to noon and will be repeated from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.

15. Closing Comments and Adjournment