



**East Central Florida Corridor Task Force  
Minutes from the August 22, 2014 Meeting  
University of Florida / Osceola County Extension Services Building  
Heritage Park, 1921 Kissimmee Valley Lane  
Kissimmee, Florida 34744-6107**

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

**Task Force Members Present (in alphabetical order):**

Rick Baldocchi, Commissioner, Orange County Planning & Zoning Commission, for The Honorable Jennifer Thompson, Orange County Commissioner

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

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

Tracy Duda Chapman, Chief Executive Officer, The Viera Company

Debbie Harvey, Chief Executive Officer, Ron Jon Surf Shop

Jeff Jones, Strategic Initiatives Director, Osceola County, for The Honorable Fred Hawkins, Osceola County Commissioner

Belinda Kirkegard, Economic Development Director, City of Kissimmee

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

The Honorable Mary Bolin Lewis, County Commissioner, Brevard County

Marcos Marchena, Citizen

Charles Pattison, Policy Director, 1000 Friends of Florida

David Wright, Properties Manager, Deseret Ranch, for Erik Jacobsen, General Manager, Deseret Ranch



**Facilitator**

Shelley Lauten, TriSect, LLC

**Task Force Staff Members Present (in alphabetical order):**

Maria Cahill, DOT

Chris Edmonston, DOT

Carly Hermanson, DEO

John Kaliski, Cambridge Systematics

Bill Pable, DEO

Dan Pennington, DEO

Bob Romig, Florida Transportation Commission

Jean Scott, Strategies for Livable Communities

Huiwei Shen, DOT

James Stansbury, DEO

Natalie Suner, DOT

Matthew Wilson, Cambridge Systematics

Mark Yelland, DEO

John Zielinski, DOT

**A. Welcome**

Mr. Killingsworth welcomed the Task Force members and the public. He noted that the Task Force members from Orange County, Osceola County, and the Deseret Ranch are represented by their alternates at today's meeting. Mr. Killingsworth then reviewed today's agenda, as well as the minutes from the Task Force's last meeting on June 27. Approval of the minutes was moved by Ms. Lewis and seconded by Ms. Kirkegard. The June 27 meeting minutes were unanimously approved. All Task Force members were present at the start of the meeting except Ms. Tracy Duda Chapman, who arrived at 11:00 a.m.



## **B. Staff Presentations**

Mr. Stansbury of the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity provided two presentations. First, he summarized the input received at the two Task Force community workshops that occurred on July 8, 2014 at the Kissimmee Civic Center. The community workshops allowed participants to provide feedback on a series of questions focused around the 4C's (conservation, countryside, centers, and corridors) from Central Florida's Regional Growth Vision, "*How Shall We Grow?*" Second, he provided an overview of the sector plan process established in Section 163.3245, Florida Statutes.

## **C. North Ranch Sector Plan**

Mr. Killingsworth introduced the first panel, which provided an overview and status of the North Ranch Sector Plan. This presentation provided an overview of the Deseret Ranch, the sector plan process, pertinent demographic information related to the North Ranch, the environmental plan for the North Ranch, and relevant transportation and land use issues and strategies. The speakers were as follows: 1.) Don Whyte, Vice President of Planning, Deseret Cattle and Citrus; 2.) Jeff Jones, Strategic Initiatives Director, Osceola County; 3.) Chris Sinclair, Renaissance Planning Group; and 4.) Mike Dennis, Ph.D., Breedlove, Dennis & Associates.

### Discussion

1. Mr. Lee asked for future meeting dates related to the North Ranch Sector Plan. Mr. Jones advised that the dates for the proposed amendment are September 17, 2014 (for the Development Review Committee), October 2, 2014 (for the Planning Commission), and October 20, 2014 (for the Board of County Commissioners). The public hearing for the adopted amendment is anticipated to occur in February 2015.
2. Ms. Kirkegard asked what the acronym "CLIP" stands for. Mr. Dennis advised that it means "Critical Lands and Water Identification Process."
3. Mr. Lee remarked that the presentation has done an overall good job at pinpointing conservation areas. What is more ambiguous are the areas on the map that are neither green (conservation) nor orange (development nodes), but rather remain yellow. The yellow areas are in range and pasture today. From an environmental stand point, even though they are pasture, they have significant wildlife habitat. He sees this as a flaw. It implies that the yellow lands may be available for future development. If it is not the intent to reserve the yellow lands for future development, the plan should specify that. Otherwise, these areas should be set aside for conservation. Mr. Sinclair advised that the proposed plan is not ambiguous. The yellow areas are set aside for lower density residential development. They will be governed by the mixed use principles. Mr. Lee noted that if the yellow is being reserved for low density residential, then the map should say that in the legend. Also, it appears that there is too much development that is characterized by sprawl if the yellow is low density residential. Mr. Jones noted that other uses would also be integrated into the yellow areas.



4. Mr. Pattison asked whether each of the red squares are intended to be an individual detailed specific area plan (DSAP). Mr. Sinclair confirmed that each red square is intended to be a DSAP. Mr. Pattison followed up by asking if they are anticipating 10 to 15 DSAPs? Mr. Sinclair replied that 10 to 15 DSAPs is a good range.
5. Mr. Lee noted that the presentation slide indicates 60,300 acres as the Environmental Plan subtotal, or 46% of the North Ranch land area. Will most if not all of the 60,300 acres go into some type of environmental or conservation easement? He noted that other recent large scale developments such as Envision Alachua or Farmton have preserved over 80% of their lands. He believes this proposal is low. Mr. Dennis replied that this sector plan is twice the size of Alachua County's and is significantly larger than Farmton. The time scale for this project is also longer. He also said that the DSAP environmental plans would likely add to this total. Mr. Lee acknowledged these points, but he does not think they explain the full difference. Mr. Lee noted that about 80% of the land was set aside for conservation in these past projects. He believes that the percentage set aside should be increased. Mr. Lee also noted that the best use of the Brevard County land is agriculture and that the Ranch should set it aside for that purpose as part of the proposal for the North Ranch sector plan.
6. Mr. Killingsworth asked for clarification of the terms "community centers" and "neighborhood centers." He thinks of neighborhood centers as 100,000 square feet and community centers as 300,000 square feet. Mr. Sinclair replied that neighborhood centers are ½ mile walk from a neighborhood with a small retail area or a park serving as a center. The community center would be similar to what Mr. Killingsworth described as a neighborhood center, with a two to three mile shed and 100,000 to 300,000 square feet of retail. The next tier is the small urban center, which would have a six mile shed and about 500,000 square feet of retail. Generally, four neighborhoods would support one community, and four communities would support one small urban center.
7. Mr. Marchena asked for an estimate of the total projected buildout population. Mr. Sinclair replied that it is projected to be about ½ million persons by 2080.
8. Mr. Lee remarked that he believes it is a mistake to allow the Osceola portion to proceed without a parallel sector plan process occurring with the Orange County portion of the Ranch. The regional map shows conservation lands in the Orange County portion for the Ranch – should that commitment be made now as well? Also, will the center shown in red in Osceola County truly be the largest center on the Ranch, or only the largest one in Osceola County? Mr. Sinclair responded that the context is different with this project. This project is connecting development on its eastern and western boundaries.
9. Mr. Baldocchi asked how a plan such as this can be implemented. How do you ensure the jobs/housing numbers stay on track? Mr. Jones replied that this process creates the template and the format for development, which future growth will fill in. He added that he believes this Plan better serves the county's needs than allowing future growth to move south of U.S. 192. To reap the benefits of the mixed use district form, the county needs the critical mass that is



available from a large amount of contiguous developable land. Mr. Baldocchi suggested considering the set aside for parks (15%) as part of the total conservation commitment, which would raise the total to 61%.

10. Mr. Killingsworth asked for clarification concerning the density of 12 units/acre in urban centers. Is that a gross figure? Mr. Sinclair confirmed that it is the minimum in the centers. Assuming a 1,000 acre urban center, Mr. Killingsworth then asked whether the average density is 12 units, or is the minimum 12 units? Mr. Sinclair replied that it would not be the average across, but the floor for that center.
11. Concerning the figures shown for the reservoir, Mr. Pattison asked if they pertained to the existing Taylor Creek reservoir. Mr. Dennis replied that is correct. The land for the proposed new reservoir is currently part of the total shown for agriculture. Mr. Pattison also asked if the consultant team is at the point of estimating water needs for both agriculture and urban development. Mr. Dennis noted that water is unique and would be addressed by a section in the Sector Plan.
12. Mr. Biter observed that the numbers addressed population growth but not tourism growth. The plan should address visitors given the unique role played by tourism in this area. He also suggested that the Plan address freight and logistics needs, and observed that the spacing of these centers could support an efficient supply chain.
13. Mr. Pattison inquired whether the Ranch anticipates this being a single 500,000 person community in and of itself, or is it a series of self-sufficient communities. Mr. Jones noted that the area covered by a DSAP is designed to be a complete community. By design, you should be able to do everything within a DSAP.
14. Mr. Lee asked if they had considered the form of governance for these areas (i.e. cities, neighborhood associations, or community development districts). Mr. Jones replied that the sector plan does not close the door on any type of governance but does not specifically address it either.
15. Mr. Lee noted that the area below the Northeast District and above Harmony is a 10,426 acre property owned by the Kirchman Foundation. It manages it as a conservation property. The map should indicate that ownership and purpose. The proposed development will impact that site. Also, the County should clarify when and how conservation easements will occur. There should be very direct obligations to sequentially record conservation easements by a date certain. Mr. Killingsworth observed that the Florida Statutes require conservation easements to be recorded by DSAPs. Mr. Dennis also remarked that Policy 6.7 of the draft DSAP addresses this question.
16. Mr. Killingsworth said he agreed with Mr. Lee about the opportunity to look at this entire property at a regional scale, but the Task Force's role is not to second guess local decisions. He asked the Task Force to keep in mind that the County has a defined review process for the



Sector Plan. While we do not have the level of detail available in Orange County that we do in Osceola, we do have a sense of scale in terms of the population the Ranch believes it could accommodate in Orange County, which also is about 500,000. He asked staff if they could use this information as part of the analysis of corridor needs.

**D. Revised Minutes**

Mr. Killingsworth advised the Task Force members that staff determined that the version of the June 27 meeting minutes approved this morning did not include a minor change that was made to the minutes at page 11. The change was identified at the meeting. Approval of the change was moved by Ms. Lewis and seconded by Ms. Kirkegard. Mr. Pattison stated that an additional edit should be made on page 15. Approval of the change was moved by Ms. Lewis and seconded by Ms. Kirkegard. The revised minutes for the June 27 meeting were approved unanimously.

**E. Existing and Future Transportation Corridor Needs**

Mr. Killingsworth introduced Mr. Kaliski, who provided a presentation on existing and future travel demand and potential transportation corridor needs.

Discussion:

1. Mr. Pattison asked whether the cost consideration only comes into play for the Cost Feasible Plan (CFP). Mr. Edmonston replied that DOT has a 5 year work program, a 10 year plan, and then the 2040 CFP. The CFP is based on revenue estimates. The “wish list” is the 2040 Unfunded Needs Plan. Mr. Lee remarked that he assumes that funding for future corridors in this area will be a combination of the new Central Florida Expressway Authority and Florida’s Turnpike Enterprise. Mr. Romig noted that funding depends on the timing of these projects and which funding sources are available at that time. Mr. Pattison asked whether the Task Force will need to prioritize its recommendations. Mr. Killingsworth responded that the recommendations will manifest themselves in the action plan and the priority would come from their timing. Mr. Baldocchi observed that the Task Force should determine the corridors first prior to thinking about costs in detail.
2. Mr. Lee asked to what degree is the corridor dependent on the sector plan and the growth that may be associated with the sector plan. Mr. Kaliski said that staff would prepare two scenarios for future travel demand in the area – one with existing communities and planned developments, and the second adding in the North Ranch Sector Plan as proposed.
3. Ms. Duda Chapman remarked that the Task Force’s goal is to facilitate better planning which minimally impacts the environment.
4. Mr. Pattison asked whether the unfunded needs map represents the existing level of service standards. Mr. Kaliski confirmed that in most cases this map is based on existing level of service.
5. Mr. Pattison inquired whether there is a way to segregate tourist versus freight versus local population traffic. Mr. Kaliski replied that the discussions that will occur later in today’s agenda



will address this issue, and that staff are working to bring more specific data to the next meeting.

6. Mr. Marchena asked how the population trends for the North Ranch will impact the future growth of all of the other cities and counties. Is the North Ranch's ½ million person population in addition to what is expected from counties and cities? Mr. Jones replied that it is a part of the anticipated regional total.
7. Mr. Lee asked whether an approval of a North Ranch Sector Plan might delay or remove the potential for the Osceola County urban growth boundary to expand to the south toward the greater Kissimmee Prairie. Mr. Jones agreed with that observation.
8. Mr. Lee asked staff to explain how the figure titled "Person Trips: 2014" was derived. Mr. Kaliski noted that it is based on a number of different data sources including Census data, traffic counts, the regional travel demand model, and available travel surveys. There was a consistent message from all of those sources put together. Mr. Lee asked whether "person trips" is "daily trips." Mr. Kaliski confirmed that it is.
9. Mr. Lee observed that if you were to animate these slides, it would appear that when you add the North Ranch, it suggests that the North Ranch is more connected to the Orlando metropolitan area than it is to the east coast. Mr. Kaliski said this is the result of the limited connectivity in the transportation network today between the North Ranch and Brevard County.
10. Mr. Lee noted that no new lanes are proposed for east west travel to or from northern Brevard County for either limited access highway lanes or principal arterial highway lanes. Mr. Kaliski confirmed that this is what is reflected in the existing Cost Feasible Plans. The eastern and western ends of SR 528 will be widened, but the central portion of SR 528 is not currently included in the CFP.
11. Mr. Lee noted that there is a potential competition for limited resources between the cost of a corridor from Lake Nona to Viera versus the cost of the super corridor on State Road 528. Would the corridor connecting Lake Nona and Viera take financial support away from the super corridor on State Road 528? Mr. Kaliski suggested that this question be deferred until all of the areas are examined. Mr. Killingsworth suggested that Mr. Lee's question should be kept in mind as the Task Force develops guiding principles.
12. Mr. Pattison asked staff to provide an overview of the I-4 Ultimate Plan. Mr. Zielinski summarized the parameters of the I-4 Ultimate Plan, which includes a reconstruction of I-4 through portions of Orange and Osceola counties, including adding tolled express lanes.
13. Mr. Lee questioned whether it is relevant to discuss single occupancy, gas powered cars as a relevant mode of transportation in 2040 or 2060. Ms. Lauten noted that the Task Force is planning for corridors for various modes, not necessarily roads for cars. The Task Force's focus



should be on needed connectivity. Ms. Lauten offered that relevant experts could provide future presentations to the Task Force on the issues involved in building corridors for various modes of travel. Mr. Biter suggested that DOT provide a presentation on its Automated Vehicle initiative at the next meeting.

14. Mr. Lee questioned whether a reduction in travel time of 15 minutes from Melbourne to Lake Nona would justify the expenditure of billions of dollars for a new corridor. Ms. Harvey noted that the issue is also what the saved travel time is further into the future. Ms. Duda Chapman remarked that if we need certainty for what might happen 40 years from now, we will never have it. Plans will be refined over time as factors change. Mr. Browne observed that the Task Force is seeking to identify a direction of what will be built. It is not determining what exactly will be built.
15. Ms. Lauten indicated that the Task Force should review and identify where there is consensus on Mr. Kaliski's presentation slides under the categories of "Potential Corridor Needs", "Potential Alternatives", and "Issues". The following comments from the Task Force members correspond to the slide titles in the headings:
  - a. East/West travel to and from Northern Brevard
    - (1) Ms. Harvey noted that everyone can agree that State Road 528 should be a super corridor.
    - (2) Ms. Duda Chapman observed that there is opportunity to improve the existing system.
    - (3) Mr. Marchena remarked that projected growth at Orlando International Airport and Port Canaveral will drive the need for improvements on State Road 528. Mr. Marchena requested staff to determine if the Expressway Authority has information regarding whether there is a need for the 408 expressway to be extended to the east.
    - (4) Mr. Pattison inquired whether there are studies that define travel preferences for tourism.
    - (5) Mr. Lee noted that over the next 20 to 30 years, the piece of the puzzle that will be most directly connected to economic growth is the State Road 528 corridor. He does not think development of State Road 528 is a "potential alternative"; rather, it is essential. After State Road 528 is addressed, the Task Force could consider connectivity for other areas.
    - (6) Mr. Killingsworth noted that the Task Force should be more explicit about the movement of freight.
  - b. East/West travel to and from Southern Brevard
    - (1) Ms. Lauten asked whether the more expansive statement of need in this area is acceptable to Mr. Lee's earlier concerns given that they are stated more broadly.
    - (2) Mr. Lee noted that the major population centers are in fact already connected. The difference is convenience and travel time.
    - (3) Ms. Lewis indicated that she believes the expansion of emergency evacuation routes is a valid need for enhanced east/west connections.



- (4) Ms. Kirkegard noted that the U.S. 192 corridor should be prioritized and considered as a super corridor.
  - (5) Mr. Pattison observed that hurricane evacuation should not be the primary reason for opening up rural lands for new development.
  - (6) Mr. Baldocchi remarked that both of the East/West corridors (north and south) should be kept on the table for discussion.
  - (7) Mr. Lee agreed that U.S. 192 needs to be upgraded and that it is an extremely important corridor. The Task Force should be careful to not abandon U.S. 192.
- c. North/South travel in Brevard County
- (1) Ms. Lewis remarked that the Task Force should acknowledge this connection in the study, but plans already were in place for this connection. Mr. Kaliski said staff would coordinate with Brevard County and the Space Coast TPO to document the existing plans.
  - (2) Mr. Killingsworth noted that “strategies” should be changed to “alternatives” on the slide.
  - (3) Mr. Biter observed that the “Complete I-95 Widening” is already in the work program. It should not be listed as an alternative unless analysis shows the need for future widening beyond what is in the current project.
  - (4) Mr. Marchena asked that the term “Premium Transit” be clarified. Mr. Kaliski replied that it means something more than a bus system, such as commuter rail, light rail, or bus rapid transit.
- d. North/South travel in Central Orange and Osceola Counties
- No comments.
- e. North/South travel in Eastern Orange and Osceola Counties
- (1) Mr. Lee observed that if the North Ranch Sector Plan included Orange County, the urban center that is being discussed might shift to the north, which then also has impacts on roadways.
  - (2) Mr. Wright remarked that the Task Force’s goal is to do more than just piecemeal planning of roadways.

#### **F. Demographic Changes and Community Values**

Mr. Killingsworth introduced the next panel, including Dr. Stefan Rayer, Ph. D. of the Florida Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR), Ms. Diana Bolivar of the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of Metro Orlando, and Mr. Mark Brewer of the Central Florida Foundation. The panel provided a presentation concerning various population and demographic trends that affect the Task Force’s study region.

Discussion:

Mr. Wright inquired whether the BEBR projections take into account land availability or is it strictly based on demographics? Dr. Rayer responded that it is based solely on a demographic model.



### **G. Transportation Planning and Decision Making Structure**

Mr. Killingsworth introduced Ms. Huiwei Shen of the Florida Department of Transportation (DOT), Ms. Laura Kelley of the Central Florida Expressway Authority (CFX), and Mr. Jeff Jones of the Osceola County Expressway Authority (OCX). The panel provided a presentation concerning transportation planning in the study area and identified the role of the DOT, the MPOs, the expressway authorities, and other partners in that planning process.

*Note: At 3:00 P.M., Mr. Killingsworth paused this presentation and asked the audience if there were any public comments. One comment card was submitted from Ms. Maria Diaz Urbino, but there was no one present who wished to speak. The text of the comment card is as follows:*

- “1. Please explain your rationale in planning to include existing cities such as St. Cloud. On all the maps the transportation, connectivity and planning seem to favor Orange County and bypass existing communities such as St. Cloud, which will be at the center and the main thrust of growth for the area being planned. The Medical City and UCF/Florida Advanced Manufacturing and Research Center people will live in St. Cloud and Osceola. Growth will come mainly from the west, north and east.*
- 2. Please demonstrate or explain how St. Cloud will connect to the seaport for economic development purposes.*
- 3. How does this plan take into consideration the Joint Planning Agreement (JPA) between the City of St. Cloud and Osceola County?*
- 4. What are the plans to connect existing urbanized areas like St. Cloud to this sector plan and its center, multimodal and transit?*
- 5. How is this plan address sprawl?”*

Discussion:

1. Mr. Pattison asked whether there are other states that have future corridor planning programs. Ms. Shen replied that DOT has examined various best practices and it appears that we are at the front of that effort.
2. Mr. Marchena asked if there are any plans to extend the CFX 2040 master plan out further. Ms. Kelley replied that if it is brought to their board, it could be considered.
3. Ms. Kirkegard inquired whether it is possible to identify a different alignment of the Osceola Parkway Extension so that it impacts Orange County less. Mr. Jones confirmed that it is possible.
4. Mr. Browne asked how proposals are funded from the Central Florida Expressway Authority. Ms. Kelley advised that funding occurs mostly through bonds. They do the bonding themselves.



## H. Framework for the Task Force Report

Discussion:

1. Mr. Killingsworth suggested that the goal for the next meeting should be to start a “rolling approval” of independent sections of the Task Force’s final report, which will go to the Governor. He also noted that the action plan would represent the priorities of the Task Force.
2. Mr. Lee noted that he does not think the outline has a significant enough discussion of where are we going to get the water for additional growth. Ms. Hermanson read the portion of the Executive Order addressing the protection of water resources, which is part of a list of matters the Task Force should consider when conducting its work. Mr. Lee observed that the Executive Order therefore specifically addresses it. Ms. Duda Chapman said she believed that the referenced portion of the Executive Order meant that the Task Force is expected to protect environmental resources as it considers the placement of the right-of-way, not that it examine water needs of associated future development. Ms. Hermanson indicated that she reads the Executive Order in the same manner. Mr. Pattison suggested that the water needs of future development caused by future corridors should still be highlighted in the report as a caution. Mr. Lee suggested that the Task Force’s recommendations should be cognizant of the issue of the water needs from development caused by future corridors. Mr. Biter believes the Task Force is focusing on corridors and that future sector plans should address the water demand of future development. Mr. Killingsworth suggested that while there may be disagreement concerning the details of this issue, it could be acknowledged in the report as an important issue for future evaluation, but not expect it to be solved at this stage.
3. Mr. Kaliski reported that the sections of the Task Force’s report that are in a “near final state” include the Guiding Principles, and the 4C papers, which could be an Appendix to the report. The Introduction will be drafted for the next meeting. The Overview of the Study Area is currently in bulleted form as a Synthesis of the 4Cs papers and Task Force discussions to date, and also will be drafted for the next meeting.
4. All Task Force members indicated that they had no concerns regarding the working outline.
5. Mr. Lee requested that materials be sent in digital format so that Task Force members can offer alternate language. Ms. Duda Chapman suggested that the Task Force members focus on key points and use strikethrough/underline format so that the text does not become unmanageable for staff. Mr. Kaliski requested any input by September 8 so that staff would have time to compile the comments and redistribute the draft for the September 15 meeting.
6. Mr. Lee requested that a guiding principle should be added to assure “avoidance to the maximum extent practicable of existing conservation land”. Also, conservation land should be defined as “land that is in the ownership of a county, the state, a water management district, or a non-government organization through an easement”.



7. Mr. Lee noted that construction of a corridor through environmental assets should require participation in funding of land acquisition programs in the same ecosystem. Mr. Lee will provide suggested language. Mr. Biter does not want to see an open ended commitment. Mr. Lee agrees.
8. Mr. Baldocchi asked if co-location of recreation trails can be incorporated into the guiding principles. Task force members supported the idea.
9. Mr. Lee observed that a list of “Potential Action Items” does not equal the Executive Order’s call for “Findings and Recommendations”. Findings and Recommendations should be a primary output. A list of potential actions would flow from the Findings and Recommendations. Mr. Killingsworth remarked that he does not disagree with that point, and that the “Potential Action Items” are staff’s working list of suggestions made during past discussions.
10. Mr. Kaliski provided a brief overview of the Alternative Alignment Research Tool (AART) that FDOT is developing to test potential alignments once the general location of a corridor is identified. He provided illustrations of potential alignments between the Orlando International Airport and Melbourne International Airport under different assumptions. Mr. Lee said the Task Force should have further discussion about whether and how the tool should be used. Mr. Kaliski replied that staff will report back at the next meeting concerning how this tool might be used.

**I. Next Steps**

The future Task Force meetings will occur on September 15<sup>th</sup> in Melbourne, on October 9<sup>th</sup> in Orlando, and on November 13<sup>th</sup> in Kissimmee. Community workshops are also scheduled for October 6<sup>th</sup> to the 8<sup>th</sup>. The meeting was adjourned at 4:29 P.M.