

Comments Received on Draft Task Force Report

presented by

John Kaliski, Cambridge Systematics, Inc.

November 13, 2014



Sources of Comments

- ▶ **Task Force member review**
- ▶ **Stakeholder briefings**
 - » State agencies (October 24)
 - » Environmental stakeholder groups (October 24)
 - » Regional and local agencies (October 28)
- ▶ **Staff coordination**



Summary of Comments

- ▶ **Relationship of Task Force report to draft North Ranch long-term sector plan**
- ▶ **Study area overview**
- ▶ **Guiding principles**
- ▶ **Corridor needs and alternatives**
- ▶ **Proposed action plan**
- ▶ **Minor editorial and formatting changes**



Relationship to Sector Plan

Comment

Need to clarify relationship between Task Force report and Sector Plan, particularly in view of pending review of Sector Plan by DEO

Proposed Response

Add text to transmittal letter clarifying that this report does not constitute a pre-decisional outcome of coordinated state review of the sector plan

Added text to report to indicate that Task Force has not taken a position on draft sector plan



Study Area Overview

Comment	Proposed Response
Clarify definition of managed lands	Add note to map
Correct map of North Ranch environmental framework	Update map
Reference Cape Canaveral National Seashore	Add to text
Reference Indian River Lagoon National Estuary Program	Add to text
Reference potential benefits of improved access to recreational areas	Add to text



Study Area Overview

Comment	Proposed Response
Clarify future highway congestion forecasts	Add text reflecting updated FDOT analysis
Recognize major evacuation routes	Add text



Guiding Principles

Comment

Ensure principles are viewed as inter-related, not siloed by the 4Cs

Proposed Response

Add text to introduction to principles



Corridor Needs and Alternatives

Comment

No alternatives included for I-95 corridor

Proposed Response

Add text and table summarizing travel in I-95 and I-4 corridors

Add 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



Corridor Needs and Alternatives

Comment	Proposed Response
Clarify that all alternatives should consider multimodal options	Add general statement Revise titles/text for specific alternatives
Questions on Evaluation Studies: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- number, timing, scope- relationship to sector plan- relationship to PD&E	Add text on general scope/approach
No discussion of funding options	Clarify that Evaluation Studies will develop initial cost estimate and funding options



Corridor Needs and Alternatives

Comment	Proposed Response
Need to recognize role of cities and counties in planning for existing corridors	Clarify ownership of existing facilities in description of alternatives
Clarify relationship to the SIS	Clarify SIS designation of existing facilities in description of alternatives
Questions about specific alternatives	Clarify text or maps as appropriate



Proposed Action Plan

Comment	Proposed Response
Identify incentives and compensation approaches as potential tools for preserving right of way for future corridor improvements	Add to text
Include East Central Florida RPC in list of partners involved in action #7 and additional recommendations #2 and #3	Add to text



Initial Implementation Activities

Comment	Proposed Response
Concerns about 9/30/15 date for plan amendments	Clarify that this date is a target for initial amendments that might at a policy or conceptual level
Recognize need for ongoing coordination among regional and local partners	Add text suggesting an ongoing working group with DEO/DOT support
Clarify role of FDOT and FTC in progress tracking	Add text clarifying responsibilities

