

**Summary of Comments Received on Draft Report and Proposed Staff Response  
as of 11/10/14**

Section	Comment	Staff Response
Transmittal letter; introduction; background; study area overview	Need to clarify relationship between Task Force final report and draft North Ranch Sector Plan	Included proposed paragraph in transmittal letter; text on page 9 of summary report and pages 3 and 14 of full report; technical note for Figure 6 and Figure 10 in full report
Study area overview	Clarify definition of managed lands	Added note to Figure 5 in full report
Study area overview	Correct map of North Ranch Environmental Framework	Replaced Figure 6 in full report
Study area overview	Reference Cape Canaveral National Seashore	Added text to p 4 of summary report
Study area overview	Reference coordination with Indian River Lagoon National Estuary Program	Added to text in conservation section (page 21 in full report)
Study area overview	Reference opportunity to provide enhanced access to recreation areas	Added to text in conservation section (page 5 in summary report; p 21 in full report)
Study area overview	Clarify forecasts of future highway congestion	Added text to corridors section (page 35 in full report)
Study area overview	Recognize role of emergency evacuation routes	Added text to corridors section (page 35 in full report)
Guiding principles	Ensure guiding principles are understood as inter-related, not siloed by the 4Cs	Expanded preamble to guiding principles (page 40 in full report)
Corridor needs and alternatives	Alternatives do not include managed lanes or other improvements to I-95	<p>Added text and table mentioning current and projected travel in the I-95 and I-4/SunRail corridors (p 5 in summary report; p 43 in full report)</p> <p>Added text explaining that the Task Force did not prioritize alternatives in these corridors; clarify that I-95 improvements could be part of an alternative to connect Orlando to Melbourne (p 8 in summary report; p 43 in full report)</p>

<b>Section</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
Corridor needs and alternatives	Clarify that all alternatives should consider multimodal options, consistent with the guiding principles	Added text to summary report (p 8) and executive summary (p 3 in full report) and to appropriate descriptions of corridor alternatives (see below)
Corridor needs and alternatives	Questions about number, scope and timing of evaluation studies; whether existing corridors can move forward before evaluation studies or if a comprehensive study is needed; how evaluation studies relate to completion of long-term sector plan or DSAP for North Ranch; relationship to PD&E process; etc.	Added brief description of potential evaluation study activities to corridor needs and alternatives section (p 43 in full report)
Corridor needs and alternatives	No discussion of how planning or projects will be funded	Added to text to clarify that Evaluation Studies will address potential costs and funding partnerships (p 43 in full report)
Corridor needs and alternatives	Recognize role of counties and cities in planning for some existing corridors (especially those involving county roads or state highways that are not part of the SIS)	Added text to clarify ownership of existing facilities that are part of each alternative (throughout this section; see pages 45, 47, 49, 52, 54, 57, 59 in full report)
Corridor needs and alternatives	Clarify relationship to the SIS	Clarified in text whether existing facilities that are part of each alternative are part of the SIS (throughout this section; see pages 45, 47, 57 in full report)
Corridor needs and alternatives	Retitle Alternative B as SR 50/SR 405 to clarify connection to Cape Canaveral	Change made (p 47 in full report)
Corridor needs and alternatives	Retitle Alternatives B, C, E, H to clarify these include multimodal options	Changes made (p 47, 49, 52, 59 in full report)
Corridor needs and alternatives	Clarify purpose of Alternatives D, F, H, I and relationship to other planned and proposed corridors	Text added; maps refined as needed to show connections to other corridors (p 50, 54, 59, 61 in full report)

<b>Section</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
Action plan	Identify incentives and compensation approaches as tools for helping preserve right of way for future corridors	Added to text in action plan (p 13 in summary report; p 8 and 68 in full report) and also study area overview/corridors section p 37)
Initial implementation activities	Concerns about 9/30/15 target for plan amendments	Added language indicating this date is from the EO and a target for amendments that are feasible; indicate initial amendments could be just to acknowledge conceptual studies (p 71 in full report)
Initial implementation activities	Potential need for an ongoing group to coordination implementation over the long term; could occur at staff level among various agencies	Added text recommending that DEO and FDOT provide support for an ongoing working group of regional and local agencies (p 14 in summary report; p 4 and 72 in full report)
Initial implementation activities	Clarify role of FTC and FDOT in implementation	Revised text to clarify FDOT and FTC responsibilities (p 14 in summary report; p 4 and 71-72 in full report)
Various	Minor editorial changes	Made changes
Various	Minor clarifications to map formats, labels, and legends	Made changes
Various	Missing sources for some data	Added footnotes throughout documents