THE CABINET

STATE OF FLORIDA

Representing:

STATE BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION

DIVISION OF BOND FINANCE

FSC - OFFICE OF INSURANCE REGULATION

DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

DEP POWER PLANT SITING BOARD

BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE INTERNAL IMPROVEMENT TRUST FUND

The above agencies came to be heard before THE FLORIDA CABINET, Honorable Governor Bush presiding, in the Cabinet Meeting Room, LL-03, The Capitol, Tallahassee, Florida, on the 8th day of November, 2005, commencing at approximately 9:30 a.m.

Reported by:

KRISTEN L. BENTLEY, RPR Certified Court Reporter

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.
2894 REMINGTON GREEN LANE
TALLAHASSEE, FL 32308 (850)878-2221

APPEARANCES:

Representing the Florida Cabinet:

JEB BUSH Governor

CHARLES H. BRONSON Commissioner of Agriculture

CHARLIE CRIST Attorney General

TOM GALLAGHER Chief Financial Officer

* * *

STATE BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION (Presented by Coleman Stipanovich)

| ITEM | ACTION | PAGE |
|------|----------|------|
| 1 | Approved | 6 |
| 2 | Approved | 6 |
| 3 | Approved | 6 |
| 4 | Approved | 7 |
| 5 | Approved | 7 |
| 6 | Approved | 7 |

DVISION OF BOND FINANCE (Presented by Ben Watkins)

| ITEM | ACTION | PAGE |
|------|----------|------|
| 1 | Approved | 8 |
| 2 | Approved | 8 |
| 3 | Approved | 8 |
| 4 | Approved | 9 |
| 5 | Approved | 9 |

FINANCIAL SERVICES COMMISSION (Presented by David Foy)

| ITEM | ACTION | PAGE |
|------|----------|------|
| 1 | Approved | 10 |
| 2 | Approved | 11 |
| 3 | Approved | 11 |

DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE

(Presented by Dr. Jim Zingale)

| ITEM | ACTION | PAGE |
|------|----------|------|
| 1 | Approved | 12 |
| 2 | Approved | 19 |
| 3 | Approved | 21 |
| 4 | Approved | 21 |
| 5 | Approved | 23 |

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS (Presented by Rocky McPherson)

| ACTION | PAGE |
|----------|-------------------------------------|
| Approved | 24 |
| Approved | 24 |
| Approved | 26 |
| Approved | 29 |
| Approved | 30 |
| | Approved Approved Approved Approved |

DEP POWER PLANT SITING BOARD (Presented by COLLEEN CASTILLE)

| ITEM | ACTION | PAGE |
|------|----------|------|
| 1 | Approved | 31 |
| 2 | Approved | 31 |

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

(Presented by Colleen Castille)

| ITEM | ACTION | PAGE |
|------|------------------------|-------|
| 1 | 7 | 2.0 |
| T | Approved | 32 |
| 2 | Approved | 33 |
| 3 | Approved | 34 |
| 4 | Approved | 41 |
| 5 | Preliminarily Approved | l 175 |

| 1 | PROCEEDINGS |
|----|---|
| 2 | THE GOVERNOR: The next cabinet meeting will be |
| 3 | November 22nd, 2005. We have in front of us the 2006 |
| 4 | cabinet calendar. Treasurer Gallagher mentioned to me, |
| 5 | correctly so, I forgot the update on the United Way but |
| 6 | we'll get right back to that. We also want to we are |
| 7 | going to add additional clemency dates to deal with the |
| 8 | backlog that exists for the restoration of civil rights. |
| 9 | We will come back to you in two weeks with an amended |
| 10 | schedule that would include which dates we could use. |
| 11 | Perhaps the idea would be to do it during cabinet, a day |
| 12 | that we have cabinet just to extend the day. Not every |
| 13 | time of course, but enough times to deal with the backlog |
| 14 | So is there a motion to |
| 15 | CFO GALLAGHER: I'll move the schedule. |
| 16 | COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Second. |
| 17 | THE GOVERNOR: There's a motion and a second to |
| 18 | approve the 2006 cabinet schedule. Without objection, it |
| 19 | is approved and we'll get back with you in two weeks. |
| 20 | (Off-the-record discussion.) |
| 21 | THE GOVERNOR: All right. As I said, the next |
| 22 | cabinet meeting will be Tuesday, November 22nd. The State |
| 23 | Board of Administration. Mr. Stipanovich. |
| 24 | MR. STIPANOVICH: Thank you, Governor, members. |
| 25 | Minutes. |

| 1 | THE GOVERNOR: Is there a motion? |
|----|---|
| 2 | CFO GALLAGHER: Motion on the minutes. |
| 3 | ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: Second. |
| 4 | THE GOVERNOR: There's a motion and a second. |
| 5 | Without objection, Item 1 passes. |
| 6 | MR. STIPANOVICH: Item No. 2 is a request for |
| 7 | approval of fiscal determination of an amount not |
| 8 | exceeding 12,090,000 tax exempt Florida Housing Finance |
| 9 | Corporation multifamily mortgage revenue refunding bonds. |
| 10 | CFO GALLAGHER: Motion. |
| 11 | ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: Second. |
| 12 | THE GOVERNOR: There's a motion and a second. |
| 13 | Without objection, the item passes. |
| 14 | MR. STIPANOVICH: Item No. 3 is a request for |
| 15 | approval of fiscal determination of an amount not |
| 16 | exceeding 7,500,000 tax exempt Florida Housing Finance |
| 17 | Corporation multifamily mortgage revenue bonds. |
| 18 | ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: Motion. |
| 19 | CFO GALLAGHER: Second. |
| 20 | THE GOVERNOR: There's a motion and a second. |
| 21 | Without objection, the motion passes. |
| 22 | MR. STIPANOVICH: Item No. 4 is a request for |
| 23 | approval of fiscal sufficiency of an amount not exceeding |
| 24 | 273,500,000, state of Florida full faith and credit |
| 25 | CFO GALLAGHER: Motion. |

| 1 | ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: Second. |
|----|--|
| 2 | THE GOVERNOR: There's a motion and a second. |
| 3 | Without objection, the item passes. |
| 4 | MR. STIPANOVICH: Item No. 5 is a request for |
| 5 | approval of fiscal sufficiency of an amount not exceeding |
| 6 | 116,300,000 State of Florida full faith and credit State |
| 7 | Board of Education public education capital outlay bonds. |
| 8 | ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: Motion. |
| 9 | CFO GALLAGHER: Second. |
| 10 | THE GOVERNOR: There's a motion and a second. |
| 11 | Without objection, the item passes. |
| 12 | MR. STIPANOVICH: The last item on the agenda is a |
| 13 | request for approval for the filing of notice for |
| 14 | rulemaking having to do with one DB rule that is being |
| 15 | amended, eight DC rules that are being amended, one new DC |
| 16 | rule and this will allow us, if you approve us, to file |
| 17 | for notice to implement the procedures for the DC program |
| 18 | that's consistent with the legislation that was enacted in |
| 19 | the 2005 legislation session. The summary of their |
| 20 | proposed rules are Attachment 6, Governor, members, and |
| 21 | it's really pretty much a technical cleanup. |
| 22 | CFO GALLAGHER: Motion. |
| 23 | ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: Second. |
| 24 | THE GOVERNOR: There's a motion and a second. |
| 25 | Without objection, the item passes. Thank you, Coleman. |

| 1 | THE GOVERNOR: Division of Bond Finance. |
|----|---|
| 2 | CFO GALLAGHER: Motion on the minutes. |
| 3 | ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: Second. |
| 4 | THE GOVERNOR: There's a motion and a second on |
| 5 | Item 1. Without objection, the motion passes. |
| 6 | Good morning, Ben, how you doing? |
| 7 | MR. WATKINS: Good morning, Governor, how are you? |
| 8 | THE GOVERNOR: Excellent. |
| 9 | MR. WATKINS: Item No. 2 is a resolution authorizing |
| 10 | the competitive sale of up to \$116.3 million in PECO |
| 11 | bonds. |
| 12 | THE GOVERNOR: Is there a motion? |
| 13 | CFO GALLAGHER: Motion. |
| 14 | ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: Second. |
| 15 | THE GOVERNOR: Motion and a second. Without |
| 16 | objection, the item passes. |
| 17 | MR. WATKINS: Item No. 3 is a resolution authorizing |
| 18 | the competitive sale of up to \$273.5 million in PECO |
| 19 | bonds. |
| 20 | CFO GALLAGHER: Motion. |
| 21 | ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: Second. |
| 22 | THE GOVERNOR: There's a motion and a second on |
| 23 | three. Without objection, the item passes. |
| 24 | MR. WATKINS: Item No. 4 is a report of award on the |
| 25 | competitive sale of \$28,290,000 in university system |

| 1 | refunding |
|----|---|
| 2 | CFO GALLAGHER: Motion. |
| 3 | ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: Second. |
| 4 | THE GOVERNOR: There's a motion and a second. |
| 5 | Without objection, the item passes. |
| 6 | MR. WATKINS: And Item No. 5 is a report of award on |
| 7 | the competitive sale of \$37,610,000 of University of |
| 8 | Florida housing refunding bonds. |
| 9 | CFO GALLAGHER: Motion. |
| 10 | ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: Second. |
| 11 | THE GOVERNOR: There's a motion and a second. |
| 12 | Without objection, the item passes. |
| 13 | Thank you, Ben. |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |

| 1 | THE GOVERNOR: Financial Services Commission. Office |
|----|---|
| 2 | of Insurance Regulation. |
| 3 | CFO GALLAGHER: Motion on the minutes. |
| 4 | ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: Second. |
| 5 | THE GOVERNOR: There's a motion and a second on |
| 6 | Item 1. Without objection, the motion passes. |
| 7 | Good morning. You're not Butterbean. |
| 8 | MR. FOY: No, sir. Commissioner is in Washington |
| 9 | actually speaking before the House, Insurance and Banking |
| 10 | Committee on national catastrophe plan this morning. |
| 11 | THE GOVERNOR: Excellent. How was the convention out |
| 12 | west as it relates to that? |
| 13 | MR. FOY: That's next week, November 15th and 16th. |
| 14 | THE GOVERNOR: Okay. We're looking for some |
| 15 | specifics to be able to advocate. I think, as the |
| 16 | treasurer said, there's some momentum now in Washington |
| 17 | for something like this. It will be important for our |
| 18 | state. |
| 19 | MR. FOY: We hope to bring that back to you, |
| 20 | Governor, cabinet members and the Legislature. |
| 21 | THE GOVERNOR: Okay. We already have a motion on |
| 22 | item one? |
| 23 | CFO GALLAGHER: It's done. We're on two. |
| 24 | THE GOVERNOR: Item 2. |
| 25 | MR. FOY: Item No. 2 is adoption of proposed new rule |

| 1 | changing the structure of the Office of Insurance |
|----|--|
| 2 | Regulation. |
| 3 | CFO GALLAGHER: Motion on 2. |
| 4 | ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: Second. |
| 5 | THE GOVERNOR: There's a motion and a second. |
| 6 | Without objection, the item passes. |
| 7 | MR. FOY: Item No. 3 is adoption of amendments |
| 8 | regarding definitions and rate filing procedures, is a |
| 9 | technical amendment changing the definition of a stop loss |
| 10 | amendment. |
| 11 | CFO GALLAGHER: Motion on 3. |
| 12 | ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: Second. |
| 13 | THE GOVERNOR: There's a motion and a second. |
| 14 | Without objection, the item passes. That's it. |
| 15 | MR. FOY: Thank you, Governor, members. |
| 16 | THE GOVERNOR: Get back to work. |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| | |

| 1 | THE GOVERNOR: Department of Revenue. |
|----|--|
| 2 | CFO GALLAGHER: Motion on the minutes. |
| 3 | ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: Second. |
| 4 | THE GOVERNOR: There's a motion and a second. |
| 5 | Without objection, Item 1 passes. Good morning, Doctor, |
| 6 | how are you? |
| 7 | DR. ZINGALE: Great. |
| 8 | THE GOVERNOR: How's the tax collecting business? |
| 9 | DR. ZINGALE: Great. |
| 10 | THE GOVERNOR: Overly great. Item 2. |
| 11 | DR. ZINGALE: This has been going quick and I will |
| 12 | try to make it quick. We have four tough items on here. |
| 13 | THE GOVERNOR: Please present as thoroughly as you'd |
| 14 | like. |
| 15 | DR. ZINGALE: The four items are the budget, the |
| 16 | capital improvement plan, the long-range plan and the |
| 17 | performance contract for myself and the Agency. I think |
| 18 | it might move smoothest if I give, by program, a quick |
| 19 | history of where we've been and link into performance and |
| 20 | then where we're going and then that might make the budget |
| 21 | issues and contract go quicker. With your permission. Is |
| 22 | that okay? |
| 23 | THE GOVERNOR: Fine with me. |
| 24 | DR. ZINGALE: Okay. Let's start with general tax |
| | |

administration. In terms of the history and where we are

| 1 | headed, let me get a few pages here laid out and off we |
|---|---|
| 2 | will go. Okay. General tax administration. Thirty-six |
| 3 | taxes. Historically has been going through a |
| 4 | technological transformation. Over my tenure, 25 percent |
| 5 | fewer FTE. Last three years, which is what I'm going to |
| 6 | focus on, 10 percent fewer FTE. During that time |
| 7 | framework, we've brought in \$5 billion with less people. |
| 8 | Primarily do two things and we try to do it consistently. |
| 9 | We try to help taxpayers be successful. |

We do that with a fairly aggressive taxpayer education and assistance program. Things that have happened in the past, a very modern web site. Seminars that are free, 1-800 number call number system that is also free. Tremendous success in developing a working relationship with the business community who really wants to get their taxes paid correctly. On the other side, we deal with leveling the playing field. Need to get out there particularly in the sales tax and corporate income tax area and ensure that every taxpayer is paying their legal obligation.

There are some fairly dramatic changes in the history and the performance. If you would look at the last three years and then the previous nine years, over that nine-year period, we had averaged \$553 million in enforced compliance. A little more than a half a billion dollars

coming from our audit program, coming from our collection program. Three years ago with the aid of integrated tax administration and our Suntax computer system, we broke the first \$600 million level and went from an average of 553 to \$665 million.

Last year -- two years ago, \$770 million. Last year, \$701 million. That's a \$479 million increase in enforced compliance in three years. Our budget is only 200. Okay? So you can get some sense that the return that we were getting on the Suntax system is paying dividends, not in terms of not only helping the taxpayer be successful, but also leveling the playing field. \$479 million increase on a 500 base is a dramatic increase.

With that coming up, we have, this year, UT coming on board, unemployment -- excuse me, insurance premium tax coming on board. Out year, UT. Two years, we'll be fully compliant with an integrated tax administration system, first one in the country. Things are going good on the tax side.

If you shift over to child support, we're kind of at a stage where major progress in the past since the Governor took office of 500 -- a 50 percent increase in collections, 400 children with paternity established. But we're certainly not anywhere where we want to be. With your help last year and the legislative help and the

Governor's recommendations, we passed landmark

| 2 | legislation. We've got 26 teams in place trying to get to |
|----|--|
| 3 | the top five. To compliment those 26 teams we are rolling |
| 4 | out cams one over the next three months. Cams one will |
| 5 | dramatically change our back end computer system. We have |
| 6 | laid out both to you individually and collectively to the |
| 7 | Legislature, a very aggressive three-year plan to continue |
| 8 | the progress of getting in the top five in the country. |
| 9 | We're happy with the success we made. We're very proud |
| 10 | with what's going in the current year. |
| 11 | THE GOVERNOR: General. |
| 12 | ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: Thank you, Governor. I want |
| 13 | to thank Dr. Zingale for his great work in this area. |
| 14 | Child support is one of the most important things we do to |
| 15 | help our people. And the Department has done a tremendous |
| 16 | job and thank you for your leadership very much. |
| 17 | DR. ZINGALE: Thank you for your all leadership. We |
| 18 | hope we can get better. On the property tax side, again, |
| 19 | some fairly dramatic numbers here. We all know we have a |
| | |

some fairly dramatic numbers here. We all know we have a
white hot economy going on in the state of Florida. It
certainly translated itself into rising property tax
rolls. If you would go back and look at the last 15 years
in three-year -- in five-year blocks, from '90 to '94, the
tax rolls grew in the property tax area by 4.6 percent.

The next five years, 5.3 percent, not counting '05. The

prior five years, 11 percent. And the January 1, '05 tax roll, 20 percent. A traumatic increase over the last six years.

Our goal is too forward in terms of how we look at that. One, we regulate the trim process to ensure that every city, county, elected official that raises milages goes to the rollback rate and has to advertise legally any increase above that rollback rate. This year we only had four local taxing jurisdictions not in compliance with that that we had to go back and get them to come back into compliance.

In addition, our job is to make sure fortunately and unfortunately that the value that went up in property makes its way to the roll. We do that with a variety, as the Governor reminds me, of mind-numbing statistics. We have tried to do those mind-numbing statistics better every year. We have tripled the number of types of analysis that we're performing on those rolls. Where are we going in the future in this area? More consistency of our staff, better measures to ensure what we're doing.

So that's kind of a quick history of our three programs and where we're headed. And with that, the second item which is in Tab 2 is our budget request. It continues to follow the transformation that we've been doing in the last few years. Time is short. I'm going to

only highlight quickly some of the top ten issues that we have requested. Certainly our number one priority is to continue to fund the child support enforcement computer system cams one and cams two. We've got a \$22.2 million request in technology. The majority of that money is for next year's cam two, 15.6. There's another 5.1 million to finish off the rollout of cams one. That money is primarily coming from federal incentive dollars and federal matching dollars. There's no recurring general revenue in there.

On the property tax area, this will be a difficult one. But we surveyed our tools that we have and if you would look at the Department of Revenue as basically only having three tools to bring a property appraiser into compliance, we can turn down a tax roll. That's kind of like the nuclear weapon. We don't like to use that one. We can send very directed letters of improvement that require a property appraiser to respond within a time framework. That's kind of slow. A third tool is we have a very modest performance contract, a procedural audit that we can come in and perform. If a property appraiser is having difficulty in a stratum, we would like to go in and be able to do a performance audit against standards and we'd like to outsource that. That is our first recuring GR issue, 447,000.

On the Suntax side, we have been gradually weaning ourselves from recurring general revenue as the project winds down and replacing it with nonrecurring revenue. We are also proposing that again this year. We probably have two-and-a-half years more of Suntax funding where each of those dollars is generating about a 5 to 6 rate of return on investment.

Quickly going on, annualization of hearing officers, you provided them last year. They didn't get funded for the full year. Those are annualized. A request we had last year for reconciliation contract nonrecurring, the Dade County demonstration project for their call centers so that their call center can link into cams one, and a few small other ones.

We complete our top ten with a \$2.3 million reduction in incentive trust funds with a new contract that has been negotiated with DeLoitte to replace Unisys. So, in general, you will see a budget that except for the big trust funded areas, primarily in the tax side that's in balance, we've been working with the Governor's budget staff and the house and senate to identify further cuts so that what we do need will be paid for out of cuts in the program. We are cognizant that there are down-the-road budget issues and we'll be working with everybody to make sure that the prudent and fiscally conservative cabinet

| 1 | and Legislature has our support in balancing those |
|----|---|
| 2 | activities. So with your permission, I'd like, if there |
| 3 | aren't any questions, the budget |
| 4 | THE GOVERNOR: Any questions? Is there a motion on |
| 5 | Item 2? |
| 6 | ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: Motion. |
| 7 | CFO GALLAGHER: Second. |
| 8 | THE GOVERNOR: There's a motion and a second. All in |
| 9 | favor say aye. |
| 10 | (Aye.) |
| 11 | THE GOVERNOR: I'm abstaining so I can submit my own |
| 12 | darn budget to the Florida Legislature. |
| 13 | DR. ZINGALE: The third item |
| 14 | THE GOVERNOR: Good presentation, Jim. You do |
| 15 | fantastic work, by the way. Hard for me to say the tax |
| 16 | collector does great work but you really do. You're a |
| 17 | model for a lot of the agency heads and they respect you |
| 18 | enormously for your incredible skills. |
| 19 | DR. ZINGALE: We do regulate business in a lot of |
| 20 | places and we're kind of proud that with that increase in |
| 21 | enforced compliance the business community still views us |
| 22 | as a partner. |
| 23 | THE GOVERNOR: Not all of them. An occasional E-mail |
| 24 | comes in that would say it any other way. But it's a lot |

better.

| 1 | (Laughter.) |
|----|--|
| 2 | DR. ZINGALE: We have to do better than 51 percent. |
| 3 | Capital improvement plan is the next item. Big document. |
| 4 | Only two significant changes. One, we've being working |
| 5 | with DMS on an accelerated basis. It won't affect next |
| 6 | fiscal year but the out fiscal year, '07/'08, we expect to |
| 7 | consolidate all of our facilities here in Tallahassee, |
| 8 | primarily Tax World, which is in an 85-mile-an-hour |
| 9 | facility. If a hurricane hit it, we'd be in one of those |
| 10 | mobile homes out there. And we would like to move to |
| 11 | Southwood. |
| 12 | THE GOVERNOR: There are no mobile homes. Wish I |
| 13 | could find a few. |
| 14 | DR. ZINGALE: Move to Southwood and that's going on |
| 15 | an accelerated schedule. DMS has been very helpful. |
| 16 | The other one is a multi agency project. AWE, DMS, |
| 17 | Children and Family, looking to consolidate all of our |
| 18 | data centers and move them to the shared resource |
| 19 | facility. This may happen in '06/'07 so there won't be |
| 20 | any budget implications for it. But we're trying very |
| 21 | much to do this multi agency move and move all our |
| 22 | facilities out to the shared resource center and we hope |
| 23 | that that helps them with any funding issues that they |
| 24 | have. So with your permission, I'd like to have that |

item, the capital improvement plan, adopted.

| 1 | CFO GALLAGHER: Motion on three. |
|----|---|
| 2 | ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: Second. |
| 3 | THE GOVERNOR: There's a motion and a second. |
| 4 | Without objection, the motion passes. |
| 5 | DR. ZINGALE: The next item is our long-range program |
| 6 | plan. It just kind of puts in place what I described on |
| 7 | the front end so I would, with your permission, like that |
| 8 | approved. |
| 9 | ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: Motion. |
| 10 | CFO GALLAGHER: Second. |
| 11 | THE GOVERNOR: Motion and a second. Without |
| 12 | objection, the item passes. |
| 13 | DR. ZINGALE: The last is my performance contract. |
| 14 | These are legislatively created measures. And as I |
| 15 | mentioned last year, when the Legislature gives them to |
| 16 | you, you just say thank you and take them. We've exceeded |
| 17 | all of those measures except one which we were just |
| 18 | slightly below. If you'd like an individual briefing on |
| 19 | the plan, we have, back at the shop, we'd be glad to go |
| 20 | over that with you individually. It's a lot more |
| 21 | aggressive than what's here. |
| 22 | CFO GALLAGHER: I would like to do this. |
| 23 | DR. ZINGALE: Absolutely. |
| 24 | CFO GALLAGHER: You-all so far exceed what the |

Legislature set. I congratulate you on that. But I'd

| 1 | like to give you a little challenge. |
|----|---|
| 2 | DR. ZINGALE: Okay. |
| 3 | CFO GALLAGHER: Instead of taking these little |
| 4 | legislative ones, let's make your goal what you did this |
| 5 | year. |
| 6 | DR. ZINGALE: (Laughter.) I see that too. Okay. We |
| 7 | do have |
| 8 | THE GOVERNOR: What's so funny about that, Jim? |
| 9 | (Laughter.) |
| 10 | DR. ZINGALE: We do have internal goals way beyond |
| 11 | what you see there. And I'd love, if you do have time, |
| 12 | you're very busy, to sit down and show you what we are |
| 13 | striving for internally. |
| 14 | THE GOVERNOR: So the Legislature the |
| 15 | Legislature's goals in stature are lower than what |
| 16 | CFO GALLAGHER: Here's the thing. I mean, they ask |
| 17 | for 80, they do 95. They ask for 70, they do 82. The |
| 18 | only one where he's a half point down is in child support |
| 19 | which they're working on a whole new program which will |
| 20 | probably take care of that. And so just to give you a |
| 21 | challenge, there is no challenge set here in the |
| 22 | legislative goals. Let's get a challenge out here and |
| 23 | take what you performed this year and that's your |
| 24 | challenge for next year. |
| 25 | DR. ZINGALE: We will shoot on that for next year. |

| 1 | CFO GALLAGHER: Great. |
|----|---|
| 2 | DR. ZINGALE: Thank you very much. |
| 3 | THE GOVERNOR: He needs it approved. Is there a |
| 4 | motion? |
| 5 | ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: Motion. |
| 6 | CFO GALLAGHER: I'll motion it. |
| 7 | THE GOVERNOR: There's a motion and a second. And |
| 8 | guess we're amending the performance contract to make the |
| 9 | indicators be |
| 10 | DR. ZINGALE: Anything you want. |
| 11 | THE GOVERNOR: There you have it the indicators |
| 12 | the actual results for this fiscal year. Any objections |
| 13 | (No response.) The motion passes. Thank you. |
| 14 | DR. ZINGALE: Thank you very much. |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |

| | 24 |
|----|--|
| 1 | THE GOVERNOR: Department of Veterans' Affairs. |
| 2 | CFO GALLAGHER: Motion. |
| 3 | ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: Second. |
| 4 | THE GOVERNOR: There's a motion and a second. |
| 5 | Without objection, Item 1 passes. |
| 6 | MR. McPHEARSON: Good morning, sir. Item 2 is our |
| 7 | quarterly reports for the third and fourth quarter of the |
| 8 | '04/'05 fiscal year. They're Attachment 2. Recommend |
| 9 | acceptance. |
| 10 | CFO GALLAGHER: Motion. |
| 11 | ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: Second. |
| 12 | THE GOVERNOR: There is a motion and a second. The |
| 13 | item is accepted. |
| 14 | MR. McPHEARSON: Item 3, sir, is the Florida |
| 15 | Department of Veterans' Affairs legislative budget |
| 16 | request, a little bit shorter than Dr. Zingale's. But |
| 17 | just a few slides for you, sir. To note primarily in your |
| 18 | presentation are requested for a continuation budget of |
| 19 | approximately \$51.5 million. We have asked for some |
| 20 | slight growth in several areas, primarily in our homes |
| 21 | program, very small additive amounts and some IT recurring |
| 22 | fund increases. And I'd note that our operations in the |
| 23 | Department are 81 percent trust fund operated. |
| 24 | Second item, second portion of that is just a little |
| 25 | detail of the issues. Primarily what we'd ask for is some |

| 1 | inflation in operational increases in our nursing homes |
|----|--|
| 2 | along with health care cost increases, two new vehicles in |
| 3 | our homes, and IT budget increases. Minor, all totaling |
| 4 | about a half a million dollars. We do have one |
| 5 | contingency item, Senate Bill 1202 is legislation that has |
| 6 | been several years in the making and it involved nursing |
| 7 | home staffing. And if the final increment of that is |
| 8 | enacted, it will be a requirement for about an additional |
| 9 | million dollars in staffing that we would have to have to |
| 10 | continue to operate the state minimums were that to pass |
| 11 | in this next session. |
| 12 | And then our final note is in our capital improvement |
| 13 | plan, with the Governor's support, we are proposing a |
| 14 | renovation of our domiciliary home in Lake City. It's our |
| 15 | oldest facility and I would note there that with the money |
| 16 | that we asked for, both general revenue and what we have |
| 17 | in our license plate trust fund, and a \$2 million, which |
| 18 | is a two-thirds federal match, we can accomplish those |
| 19 | renovations and we thank you for that support. |
| 20 | THE GOVERNOR: Is there a motion? |
| 21 | ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: Motion. |
| 22 | CFO GALLAGHER: Second. |
| 23 | THE GOVERNOR: There's a motion and a second. All in |
| 24 | favor say aye. |
| 25 | (Aye.) |

| | 26 |
|----|--|
| 1 | 26 I abstain so that I can submit my budget to the |
| 2 | Florida Legislature in January. |
| 3 | MR. McPHEARSON: Thank you, sir. Item 4 is a short |
| 4 | information briefing report on our state veterans' nursing |
| 5 | home project. There are probably several slides in the |
| 6 | presentation that I'd like to call your attention to. The |
| 7 | first one is a lot of concern over the years about census |
| 8 | in our nursing homes. The goal, state goal, in |
| 9 | performance measures from the Legislature is 90 percent. |
| 10 | I'd like to note that in '04 we finally did reach that in |
| 11 | all of our homes and that our projections for '05 are that |
| 12 | we should operate all of our nursing homes at |
| 13 | approximately 95 percent. So we're going to |
| 14 | THE GOVERNOR: Why has it been slow to ramp up to get |
| 15 | to that level given the number of veterans that I would |
| 16 | think are qualified? |
| 17 | MR. McPHEARSON: We do have waiting lists in some of |
| 18 | our homes, sir. But we have a couple of issues. One is |
| 19 | the renovations in Lake City have about 35 beds out of |
| 20 | service. |
| 21 | THE GOVERNOR: Put aside Lake City because that makes |
| 22 | sense. |
| 23 | MR. McPHEARSON: And then Port Charlotte, we also |
| 24 | have 20 beds there that are a VA outpatient clinic. The |
| 25 | VA clinic in Port Charlotte was destroyed in Hurricane |

| 1 | Charlie and we gave them a 20-bed wing of our home to |
|---|--|
| 2 | operate a nursing excuse me, an outpatient medical |
| 3 | clinic in. So until that comes off, that's an additional |
| 4 | 20 beds available. And we have a waiting list to fill |
| 5 | those. |

6 THE GOVERNOR: So if you take those two extenuating 7 circumstances, your --

8 MR. McPHEARSON: Yes, sir, we will exceed 90 percent. 9 And this year, we'll approach 95.

THE GOVERNOR: Thank you.

MR. McPHEARSON: And the other issue that we get an awful lot of questions on is cost of care. I've noted in the slides that our average daily cost of care and monthly cost of care is the same as the industry wide. But in Florida, the requirement from the Legislature is to pay, for veterans to pay, based on their income. So essentially while we -- I have one slide that talks to how our homes revenue is generated. And I would note that VA per diem is a good portion of our cost of care and that state general revenue is 18 percent. And that's high this year due to getting those two new homes operating. That will come down to about 11 percent. And the VA per diem will go up to about 30 percent next year.

And then, finally, we've added some new slides that talk to the branches of military service that are in our

| facilities, new data that we've collected and the major |
|---|
| conflicts that the various veterans who are residents in |
| our facilities served in. And I note that World War II is |
| over half of our residence population, World War II |
| veterans are currently in our homes. And we're beginning |
| to see Vietnam War veterans in our homes as well, more |
| than 14 percent. |

With that report, sir, the only other item that's significant is to talk a little bit about the next state veterans' nursing home slated for northeast Florida.

There was legislative money to start that process last year. We have started the site selection process. Two counties have indicated that they will compete for that.

They are Duval and St. Johns. The applications, the full applications in accordance with the criteria that the cabinet approved in February, are due to us November the 14th. We will thereafter form a site selection committee. And then based on analysis and comparison of the submissions from the two counties, bring a recommendation to the Governor and the cabinet in late January for siting of that facility.

THE GOVERNOR: Clay County didn't --

MR. McPHEARSON: No, sir, they did not indicate that they intend to participate. And then, sir, that concludes that information session. And our final item, Item 5, is

- another information session where we'd like to present --
- THE GOVERNOR: Let's get an acceptance for Item 4
- 3 before we move to Item 5.
- 4 MR. McPHEARSON: It was just an information brief,
- 5 sir.
- 6 THE GOVERNOR: Let's just accept it anyway to be
- 7 sure.
- 8 There's a motion and a second to accept. Without
- 9 objection, it's accepted.
- 10 MR. McPHEARSON: Thank you, sir.
- 11 THE GOVERNOR: I'm a real, you know, stickler for
- 12 details.
- MR. McPHEARSON: I understand.
- 14 Another information for acceptance is our proposal of
- our new Veterans and Benefits Guide. This particular
- 16 guide has been reorganized, updated, simplified, and it's
- a much better layout. We're going to produce about 40,000
- of these and we're trying to open up distribution much
- 19 wider than we have in the past. Certainly we always use
- them with the veterans' organizations but now we'll also
- 21 be going to county veterans service organizations, AWI
- one-stops, Department of Elder Affairs, DCF locations, and
- 23 DOC facilities. We can produce this publication for about
- 24 15 cents a copy through Pride. And it's an improvement
- over where we were and we'd propose acceptance of that

| 1 | item. |
|----|--|
| 2 | ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: Motion. |
| 3 | CFO GALLAGHER: Second. |
| 4 | THE GOVERNOR: There's a motion and a second. The |
| 5 | item is accepted. Thank you, Rocky. |
| 6 | MR. McPHEARSON: Thank you, sir. |
| 7 | |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |

| 1 | THE GOVERNOR: Siting Board. |
|----|--|
| 2 | Bringing out the water. |
| | |
| 3 | MS. CASTILLE: Yes, sir. Good morning, Governor, |
| 4 | members of the cabinet. |
| 5 | ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: Motion. |
| 6 | CFO GALLAGHER: Second. |
| 7 | THE GOVERNOR: There's a motion and a second. |
| 8 | Without objection, Item 1 passes. |
| 9 | MS. CASTILLE: Item 2 is Florida Power & Light |
| 10 | Company land use order for the West County Energy Center. |
| 11 | This is the certification application for a three combined |
| 12 | cycle 1100 megawatt powered, of natural gas fired, |
| 13 | combined cycle generating unit. |
| 14 | ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: Motion. |
| 15 | CFO GALLAGHER: Second. |
| 16 | THE GOVERNOR: There's a motion and a second. |
| 17 | Without objection, the item passes. |
| 18 | MS. CASTILLE: That concludes the Siting agenda. |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |

| 1 | THE GOVERNOR: Board of Trustees. Here we go. |
|----|---|
| 2 | MS. CASTILLE: Item 1 is the annual land management |
| 3 | review team findings. The law requires the Board of |
| 4 | Trustees, through the Department of Environmental |
| 5 | Protection staff, to conduct land management reviews of |
| 6 | conservation, preservation and recreation lands to ensure |
| 7 | that the lands are being managed for the purposes for |
| 8 | which they were purchased. And the managers have a joint |
| 9 | team that they go around and evaluate the sites. |
| 10 | Twenty-three sites were reviewed this year and 15 sites |
| 11 | were excellent on management practices. Fifteen sites |
| 12 | were excellent on law enforcement. And we're working on |
| 13 | the others who were only adequate to get up to that |
| 14 | excellent opportunity. |
| 15 | THE GOVERNOR: Is there a motion? |
| 16 | ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: Motion. |
| 17 | THE GOVERNOR: Is there a second, Commissioner? |
| 18 | COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Second. |
| 19 | THE GOVERNOR: Motion and a second. Without |
| 20 | objection, the report is accepted. |
| 21 | MS. CASTILLE: Thank you. |
| 22 | THE GOVERNOR: Item 2. |
| 23 | MS. CASTILLE: Item 2, this is an Anita Vargas |
| 24 | purchase agreement for the Florida Keys ecosystem. This |
| 25 | purchase agreement will allow us to acquire 1.5 acres for |

| 1 | \$468,000.00 which is 100 percent of appraised value within |
|----|---|
| 2 | the Florida Keys ecosystem. The property has 13 ROGO |
| 3 | allocations at \$36,000 per unit associated with it. This |
| 4 | would bring us to a total of \$27 million in acquisitions |
| 5 | in the Keys for 681.85 acres at a cost, including closing |
| 6 | costs, of approximately \$39,000 an acre in Florida Keys. |
| 7 | CFO GALLAGHER: Motion. |
| 8 | ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: Second. |
| 9 | THE GOVERNOR: There's a motion and a second. |
| 10 | Without objection, the item passes. |
| 11 | MS. CASTILLE: Item 3. Hamilton Harbor Marina |
| 12 | recommended consolidated intent. This is a consideration |
| 13 | of an application in Collier County for a 20-year |
| 14 | sovereignty submerged lands private easement containing |
| 15 | 67,330 square feet or 1.55 acres for a navigation channel |
| 16 | within Naples Bay. This particular issue has been in |
| 17 | court for approximately 17 years. From the time that the |
| 18 | Department first approved an easement in 1986 it has been |
| 19 | challenged. |
| 20 | Now it was a much larger project and had a much |
| 21 | greater impact to the sovereign submerged lands and to the |
| 22 | mangrove forest along the area here. But what we're doing |
| 23 | in this consolidation is providing 116 acres of |
| 24 | conservation easement which will protect 9 miles of |

mangrove shoreline along Naples Bay.

| 1 | Would you like any further detail? |
|----|--|
| 2 | THE GOVERNOR: I don't think so. |
| 3 | CFO GALLAGHER: Motion. |
| 4 | ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: Second. |
| 5 | THE GOVERNOR: There's a motion and a second. |
| 6 | Without objection, the item passes. |
| 7 | MS. CASTILLE: Item 4, this is a request for a |
| 8 | private easement by Mr. Bruce Kendeigh. This is the |
| 9 | consideration across State owned private uplands State |
| 10 | owned uplands, not private for the construction of a |
| 11 | single family dock to reach a tidal tributary of the |
| 12 | Tolomato River within the Guana Matanzas Tolomato National |
| 13 | Estuarine Research Reserve. |
| 14 | CFO GALLAGHER: I move we approve the easement to |
| 15 | allow Mr. Kendeigh to reconstruct his dock recognizing his |
| 16 | hardship and unique circumstances of his request. |
| 17 | COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Second. |
| 18 | THE GOVERNOR: There's a motion and a second. Do we |
| 19 | have the applicant here? |
| 20 | MS. CASTILLE: We do. I think Mr. Kendeigh is here. |
| 21 | THE GOVERNOR: Would you like to make a presentation |
| 22 | first, Colleen, or would you like the applicant to speak? |
| 23 | MS. CASTILLE: I just want to suggest that what we |
| 24 | probably need to do in this area, because it's an area of |
| 25 | significant growth, there are already numerous homes in |

| 1 | the area who find themselves in the same in a similar |
|----|---|
| 2 | situation as Mr. Kendeigh, save for the fact Mr. Kendeigh |
| 3 | had a previous structure. But I know that people here |
| 4 | have bought very expensive homes that they would like to |
| 5 | have access to, but what we find in this, Governor, these |
| 6 | are one of these patent lands where the State has |
| 7 | ownership of the uplands. And so what we're doing is |
| 8 | allowing people to cross the State owned uplands. And |
| 9 | ownership is our most effective type of protection. |
| 10 | THE GOVERNOR: Well, let's hear from the applicant |
| 11 | and then just want to make sure if this motion passes |
| 12 | that this does not create a precedent which I assume is |
| 13 | the point of your |
| 14 | MS. KENDEIGH: We have just gotten to this point |
| 15 | THE GOVERNOR: Good morning first of all. |
| 16 | MS. KENDEIGH: Good morning, Governor and cabinet. |
| 17 | THE GOVERNOR: Who are you? |
| 18 | MS. KENDEIGH: I'm Marilyn Kendeigh. |
| 19 | MR. KENDEIGH: And Bruce Kendeigh. |
| 20 | THE GOVERNOR: How are you-all doing? |
| 21 | MS. KENDEIGH: We apologize we're fine for |
| 22 | having brought this to this point. |
| 23 | CFO GALLAGHER: That's what we're here for. |
| 24 | THE GOVERNOR: Don't apologize. Look at all the |
| 25 | other people in the room doing the same thing. |

| 1 | (Laughter.) |
|----|---|
| 2 | MS. KENDEIGH: We would like to rebuild a dock |
| 3 | THE GOVERNOR: In fact, you ought to stick around |
| 4 | after yours is finished and see a real show. |
| 5 | (Laughter.) |
| 6 | MS. KENDEIGH: We're looking forward to that. We |
| 7 | would like to build rebuild an existing dock that was |
| 8 | there when we bought this property. We bought it thinking |
| 9 | we could reach that tidal creek. Our intent was to be |
| 10 | able to take our children, grandchildren, cane pole |
| 11 | fishing. We can see the water but we can't get to it. |
| 12 | We'd just like a small easement, 4 feet wide, to reach |
| 13 | that tidal. |
| 14 | THE GOVERNOR: So you have a dock that you thought |
| 15 | you owned. |
| 16 | MS. KENDEIGH: We'd like to rebuild what was there. |
| 17 | The storm came and tore up a lot of what was there so we |
| 18 | have to rebuild. |
| 19 | THE GOVERNOR: Did you know that you owned it? Did |
| 20 | you think you owed it when you bought the property? |
| 21 | MS. KENDEIGH: We thought we could get access to it. |
| 22 | No, we didn't think we owned the marsh but we thought we |
| 23 | could cross it. |
| 24 | THE GOVERNOR: What I'm saying is, you thought you |
| 25 | had an easement already with the dock. |

| MS. KENDEIGH: Right. Yes. |
|--|
| MR. KENDEIGH: The dock was already there before we |
| ever cleared the property. |
| THE GOVERNOR: How did someone did someone get a |
| dock approved? |
| MS. KENDEIGH: I don't know whether it was approved |
| or not, it was already there. |
| (Off-the-record comment.) |
| THE GOVERNOR: I know. I'm using the Socratic |
| method, Treasurer. |
| MS. KENDEIGH: I know there are a lot of them |
| everywhere that are not approved. |
| THE GOVERNOR: So you had your dock damaged? |
| MS. KENDEIGH: Had the dock damaged, yes, sir. |
| THE GOVERNOR: And how long have you been trying to |
| get this done? |
| MS. KENDEIGH: Over two years. |
| THE GOVERNOR: How has it been? |
| MS. KENDEIGH: Not pleasant. |
| MR. KENDEIGH: Today is the 25th month anniversary. |
| Today, the 8th. |
| THE GOVERNOR: And so why is this different than |
| why would your neighbors you can see how we might be |
| concerned about taking what is a beautiful these are |
| beautiful properties for people to say, Well, if my |
| |

| | 38 |
|----|---|
| 1 | neighbor gets a dock, I want one too. |
| 2 | MS. KENDEIGH: Well, we have a neighbor who already |
| 3 | has an illegal dock. |
| 4 | MR. KENDEIGH: We requested a permit 25 months ago |
| 5 | for legal permission to cross the creek. |
| 6 | THE GOVERNOR: Your neighbor the other dock is |
| 7 | illegal that's on this picture? |
| 8 | MS. KENDEIGH: Yes, sir. |
| 9 | THE GOVERNOR: Yeah, General. |
| 10 | ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: Just curious. How many |
| 11 | others are in a similar situation to you? |
| 12 | MS. KENDEIGH: I don't know of anybody else that's |
| 13 | requested a dock other than us. There are only like eight |
| 14 | sites behind us that could have a dock. We're the end of |
| 15 | where a dock would be feasible. There is no water beyond |
| 16 | us. We're the end of the creek. |
| 17 | ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: The Treasurer has expressed |
| 18 | concern about setting a precedent which gave me the |
| 19 | impression that maybe there might be others. |
| 20 | THE GOVERNOR: Around the rest other places in the |
| 21 | state, I assume. |
| 22 | CFO GALLAGHER: The only precedence this would do is |

24

25

if someone was in a similar situation that had a dock, it

got blown away, they could say, well, you know, this

precedent was set by this particular item. Although I

- look at this as a hardship and I also think that getting
 yanked around for two years isn't a good idea.
- 3 ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: Motion.

THE GOVERNOR: All right. Why don't we ask Colleen

if she's sensing where we are in the cabinet here. Would

you like to make an appeal or would you surrender

peacefully?

MS. CASTILLE: Surrender peacefully. But I would like to ask you to direct the Department to establish a policy for the aquatic preserves in situations like this. We have Nocatee that is being developed in this very same area that has a lot of shoreline and will bring in hundreds of houses in this similar situation. And I know people want access to these waterways. So we think the best way to do this is to provide -- is to provide a situation for multi-family docks in limited locations that are less impactful to the environment because it ends up that people who bound our national estuarine research reserves end up as our biggest fans and we want to continue that. And hopefully we can work things out with Mr. Kendeigh and Ms. Kendeigh to have them become one of biggest fans as well.

- THE GOVERNOR: All right. It'll take a little time for that.
- MS. CASTILLE: I think so.

| 1 | MS. KENDEIGH: Some healing time. |
|----|--|
| 2 | CFO GALLAGHER: Not on this issue, but when you're |
| 3 | coming up with these great ideas of having a community |
| 4 | dock, you ought to talk to the person whose land is going |
| 5 | to be the one that accesses it. And, two, you need you |
| 6 | can't like have somebody's private property and make your |
| 7 | mind up that that's the person that's going to have a |
| 8 | community dock. Because now everybody traipsing across |
| 9 | their land, they have a liability problem on it. |
| 10 | MS. CASTILLE: They do. |
| 11 | CFO GALLAGHER: And so these things have to be |
| 12 | thought out a little bit more. |
| 13 | MS. CASTILLE: And Nocatee has not been built yet so |
| 14 | we're hoping to actually get to them before they sell all |
| 15 | of their lots. |
| 16 | CFO GALLAGHER: So the owner can work it out for |
| 17 | everybody and own the land and let it be a community deal. |
| 18 | THE GOVERNOR: And as far as I'm concerned, I'm going |
| 19 | to vote yes for this. But I'm voting yes because of the |
| 20 | hardship and the fact that I don't believe this creates a |
| 21 | precedent. So we're throwing all your neighbors under the |
| 22 | bus, but |
| 23 | (Laughter.) |
| 24 | MS. KENDEIGH: Thank you. Let them work 25 months to |
| 25 | do it. |

| 1 | THE GOVERNOR: Invite them over to use your dock. So |
|----|--|
| 2 | there is a motion. Is there a second? |
| 3 | ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: Second. |
| 4 | THE GOVERNOR: There's a motion and a second. Any |
| 5 | other discussion? Without objection, the item passes. |
| 6 | Thank you very much. I'm sorry for the frustrating |
| 7 | moments but |
| 8 | MS. CASTILLE: Item 5. |
| 9 | THE GOVERNOR: Okay. Babcock Ranch. So how many |
| 10 | speakers do we have? |
| 11 | MS. CASTILLE: We have a lot. |
| 12 | THE GOVERNOR: Just to pace ourselves here. |
| 13 | CFO GALLAGHER: Is everybody in here here for |
| 14 | Babcock? Everybody doesn't want to speak, I hope. We'll |
| 15 | be here a long time. |
| 16 | THE GOVERNOR: Do we know how many speakers we have? |
| 17 | MS. CASTILLE: We have about 20. |
| 18 | THE GOVERNOR: Okay. I would ask everybody to be as |
| 19 | brief as possible after the secretary makes her |
| 20 | presentation so that we can get to the question and answer |
| 21 | portion of this. |
| 22 | Secretary Castille. |
| 23 | MS. CASTILLE: Yes, sir. Governor, members of the |
| 24 | cabinet, I want to take a moment to talk a little bit |
| 25 | about Florida and our culture and our history which, |

Commissioner Bronson, chime in any time you'd like to help. According to Carl Sharp who is Florida's official cowboy poet, he talks of stories much like Patrick Smith in A Land Remembered of acres and acres and miles of miles of prairie and wetlands and open pasture where our historic ancestors have brought cattle across the center of the state into our ports to be able to take them around to different parts of the country, to Cuba, to other countries.

Florida was actually the last state in the union to have a fence law that began to fence off these parcels of property. What we're trying to do in this historic area is to recreate a pathway from Estero Bay, Gulf of Mexico to Lake Okeechobee. And in this parcel, we have the Babcock Ranch parcel which actually provides about -- closes a gap of 65 miles in the landscape connection from Lake Okeechobee to Estero Bay. The natural habitat of this particular piece of property is -- includes Florida panther, black bear, red cockaded woodpeckers, wood stork, scrub jay and at least 16 other threatened and endangered species.

There are opportunities that we have never seen on a piece -- on one parcel of property that is so expansive.

This is the largest acquisition in the State's history that we have brought to the Board of Trustees. There are

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

opportunities for public recreational uses including camping, picnicking, birding, nature appreciation, hiking, horseback riding, hunting, biking, just generally getting back into the history of what Florida used to look like. The Babcock Ranch is such a farm, it is such a ranch. It has -- it has been this way since Mr. EV Babcock purchased it in the early 1900s.

There is a growing demand for land in southwest Florida. There's a growing demand for recreational opportunities. Southwest Florida, for both permitting on the Water Management District basis and for DEP, is the highest growth area of our state. There are almost half again as many permits are applied for in this region as any other region in the state. There is a purchase and sale agreement -- well, let me step back a moment and talk a little bit more about the environmental protection that we would be including here and I'd like to call up Ken Haddad and Jim Beever who can give us a little bit more detail on the property. Ken.

MR. HADDAD: Governor, cabinet members. Pleasure to be here today. I want to quickly -- I'm going to introduce Jim Beever who is going to give you an overview of the region and the property. I wanted to quickly give you an FWC perspective on our thinking on this property. We know it's a complex and very out-of-the-box type of

25

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

deal. I think everybody has seen that. We also believe it has both positive and negative aspects for virtually everyone concerned about the purchase. But from our perspective, we see it as an unbelievable opportunity that we must really try to capitalize on and it would be very unlikely that we'd either have the same type of chance against from either a seller or buyer's perspective.

You're going to hear about how the land is blessed with about every aspect of Florida's natural environment that exists in Florida. I guess a point I just want to make from our perspective, as we look critically at the purchase, which we should, but we're trying to not lose sight of the future in the unique opportunity that is in front of us. And if I look or we as an Agency look 30 years out instead of focusing right on the present, we can only conclude we've got to try to find a way to close this deal and that's our perspective on it. I want to introduce and we're here to help this process in any way as I think most everyone knows. I'd like to introduce Jim Beever from our division of habitat and species conservation. He's from southwest Florida, knows the ranch, and he's going to give a perspective of how this fits into the environment of Florida.

24 THE GOVERNOR: All right. Good morning, sir.

MR. BEEVER: Good morning. The Babcock Ranch sits in

| a unique biogeographic position in southwest Florida. It |
|--|
| can provide a link between the Charlotte Harbor ecosystems |
| and the lands that the State have already acquired there. |
| The Charlotte Harbor buffer preserve, the Cowpen |
| flatwoods, the Cecil Webb Management area, over to the |
| Fisheating Creek and then down southward through the |
| panther ecoscape to the Big Cypress. So a black bear |
| could literally walk from the shore of the Charlotte |
| Harbor to Lake Okeechobee down into the Big Cypress and |
| even over into the Everglades. |

Through a series of planning efforts over in this landscape scale, which we've done with the coastal conservation corridor plan, you see the lower map here was done in coordination with the Nature Conservancy, we've been able to identify these type of landscape scale connections. Looking at geographic information system maps from the Department of Environmental Protection, South Florida Water Management District, the Babcock Ranch outlined in black here shows the greenways corridor system formed by Telegraph Creek Swamp and the landscape scale connections from east to west of the upland systems across the property.

There is a high level of biodiversity on this property. More than 20 types of habitats, 23 confirmed listed species and three other potential listed species

| 1 | 46 which would take extra surveys to do. On the ground here, |
|----|--|
| 2 | this is one of the truly unique places where uplands and |
| 3 | wetlands intersect each other providing a high level of |
| 4 | ecotones which is one of the areas of highest species |
| 5 | occurrence. And what's unique about this is they occur in |
| 6 | juxtaposition to each other over an elevational gradiant. |
| 7 | This is just a table of the former map. In terms of land |
| 8 | use, it's been principally ranching and some other |
| 9 | forestry activities. And I was asked to analyze the |
| 10 | property by the Commission and others to look at those |
| 11 | portions which were the most critical to be acquired. And |
| 12 | they basically fall in these series of categories. In the |
| 13 | center, there is the Telegraph Creek Swamp. To the west |
| 14 | is the West Stream connection to the wildlife management |
| 15 | area. |
| 16 | THE GOVERNOR: Can you describe that? It's hard for |
| 17 | us to see this on our little screen here. |
| 18 | MR. BEEVER: And I'm not sure how I can do a pointer |
| 19 | for you. |
| 20 | THE GOVERNOR: First thing you described, is that to |
| 21 | the left of that light green? |
| 22 | MR. BEEVER: It is the large thank you very much. |
| 23 | This central region here is the Telegraph Creek Swamp |
| 24 | system which moves from the northwest to the south. And |
| 25 | this is one of the largest remaining cypress swamps in |

southwest Florida. To the east are the eastern flatwoods

Jack Creek system which is a wonderful pine flatwood

system with many red cockaded woodpeckers and listed

species which connects over to Fisheating Creek.

On the west is the western connection to the Babcock web wildlife management area, also a high diversity of upland plant habitats and wetland communities. The southeastern flatwoods located in the southeastern portion of the site also provide important wildlife habitat.

These lighter green areas are areas suitable for ecotourism opportunities or associated park activities.

The yellow location is the southern scrub. This is where principally you will find the scrub jays, gopher tortoises and other species which like the dry habitat.

There are two remaining zones. This northeastern zone which is principally an area of sod activity and the area most suitable for development on the property, the one that was least needed to be acquired, the southwestern zone which has existing rock mining activities and high intensities of extractive land uses. And so that was my analysis that I put together for the Commission in terms of what the critical areas were to be acquired in the green colors along with the yellow color.

THE GOVERNOR: So the properties that would be developed for residential uses are the properties best

| 4 | | _ | . 1 |
|---|--------|-----|-------|
| | suited | tor | ナカコナツ |
| | | | |

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- MR. BEEVER: Yes. And so concluding my presentation,

 I'd like to thank the Charlotte Harbor National Estuary

 program and Carol Newcomb Jones who has been the

 coordinator with the preservation partnership who assisted

 me in putting together this partnership.
- 7 THE GOVERNOR: Thank you, sir.
- 8 All right, Secretary. Onward.
 - MS. CASTILLE: Okay. The purchase price for the property is \$350 million for 73,476.5 acres and the funding is split as follows. Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission will pay \$10 million. Lee County will contribute \$40 million based on a vote for -- on November 15th we're anticipating. The Board of Trustees will pay the balance, \$300 million. That balance will be -- we're recommending a payment of \$100 million that we're requesting in our budget for general revenue to be appropriated to us July 1st, 2006. And then we propose to take \$62.5 million for four years from Florida Forever which are the four final years of Florida Forever. Keep in mind that for the next four years there is a total of \$1.2 billion in funding for Florida Forever for land acquisition across all state agencies in addition to \$100 million a year from -- for Everglades acquisition as well.

| 1 | Let me give you a little bit of an aerial overview. |
|----|--|
| 2 | THE GOVERNOR: Not taking Everglades funding, are we |
| 3 | MS. CASTILLE: No, sir, not at all. We're holding |
| 4 | that sacrosanct. |
| 5 | THE GOVERNOR: The South Florida Water Management |
| 6 | (inaudible) |
| 7 | MS. CASTILLE: No, they are fine. So before you is |
| 8 | the Babcock acquisition. It has been cut into several |
| 9 | different parcels. Parcel No. 6 on the lower left-hand |
| 10 | side in the parcel that Mr. Kitson and partners will |
| 11 | retain for future development. I'm going to take you on |
| 12 | an aerial tour of the Babcock Ranch. |
| 13 | This is from a northern a northern viewpoint. So |
| 14 | think about it. I think all of you have at least at one |
| 15 | time been in a Water Management District helicopter. So |
| 16 | think of Mike flying you across the area here. You'll be |
| 17 | very safe. Mike is the best pilot. So we're coming into |
| 18 | Telegraph Swamp from the northern end, that northwestern |
| 19 | corner that Mr. Beever showed you. |
| 20 | CFO GALLAGHER: Colleen? |
| 21 | MS. CASTILLE: Yes. |
| 22 | CFO GALLAGHER: If you'll use the mouse instead of |
| 23 | your pen on the screen, we'll get to see it too. |
| 24 | MS. CASTILLE: Sorry. That will work much better. |
| 25 | (Laughter) So we're coming in over the swamp here and |

| 1 | you can see that there are a lot of hardwoods. There's a |
|---|--|
| 2 | little bit of pasture here. But for the most part, it's |
| 3 | still in its natural pristine state. |

You keep flying south, a little bit towards the center of the property, you'll see the ranch headquarters where most of the intense activity of the ranch management is taking place. Keep going a little more into the center and this is where the lodge exists, sleeping quarters and full kitchen for the ecotourism activities that currently exist within the ranch.

CFO GALLAGHER: Is this still Telegraph one or Babcock.

MS. CASTILLE: It's still in Telegraphs one. This is the northern boundary of the ranch, County Road 34 -- 74, with Division of Forestry facility is in the foreground. Again, this is the eastern boundary of the ranch area where most of the hunting occurs. You'll see on the eastern boundary where a lot of the uplands exist, Mr. Beever pointed out. And this is coming in from the southern boundary about, a little bit further south, where you see on the big sign it says, "transition acreage". So this is coming in on the west side of the ranch and it's northwest of the Lee County part.

This is the proposed location of the Lee County purchase within the boundary of Lee County for their

| \$40 million. It's not the whole section, but we haven't |
|--|
| mapped that out yet and we'll map that out when the vote |
| comes with the County. And this is the conservation |
| easement to the west. If you'll look on the large map, |
| you'll see a red boundary area, it's called Curry Lake and |
| that will be part of our acquisition. But you'll notice |
| there is some sod activity here. And so what we'll do is |
| we'll keep this natural area as an ecosystem link between |
| the Curry Lake which connects to the Babcock web area on |
| the to the west of the current Babcock property and |
| then we'll connect into Telegraph Swamp and then we'll |
| have that complete connection across the way. This is a |
| conservation easement that's donated to us by Kitson and |
| Partners. |

This is the water control structure. There are two water control structures on the property. This is the north one near the headquarters that we showed you down in this area. And then this is the southern one which is called the Water Bird Road structure. There's an existing road that has openings throughout so that the swamp can continue to flow on a southerly basis. So let's talk a little bit about the purpose for this acquisition.

In the CARL acquisition, the Acquisition and Recreation Council, we have -- the purpose for purchasing the property is to support and protect the old growth

forest and the mesic pine flat woods that include the

Babcock ranch. Additionally what we're asking you to do

is approve an amendment to the purpose for the acquisition

to have it eventually be managed by a non-profit

consisting of an appointed board of directors with a range

of multi recreational uses as outlined in the purpose for

the State acquisition.

The closing date we're proposing for the contract will be on or before July 31st. What will have to happen between now and then, assuming that the Board of Trustees approves it, it will have to go to the Board of Lee County Commission and the Board of the Charlotte County Commission as well as with the Department of Community Affairs. And Kitson Partners. There is an interlocal agreement that is to be entered into. That interlocal agreement will approve an overlay for -- well, no, the overlay is not until February. But it recommends an overlay that will allow densities to be increased on this southwest portion of -- up to 19,500 units.

The overlay itself, which is to be approved in February, will link to a rural land stewardship area agreement that will be -- that will then extinguish the former overlay that had been voted on. But it will take some time to do rural stewardship which under the law creates additional credits for densities. Credits can

otherwise be known as densities. And then the densities will then be transferred from this property to the Kitson property. And I'll deal with that in a little bit more detail in a moment.

We would propose to close this property in a phased approach, 100 million on or before July 31st, 2006 and then each year thereafter we would pay 62.5 million until the very last section where we would true up all of the values after the rural land stewardship amendments are made to the property. What rural land stewardship will do is it will create credits and we just don't know how many credits. The concept in the law is the credits -- more credits are assigned to more environmentally sensitive properties. So the properties will be -- the credits will be transferred to a receiving area which would be this southwest area that Mr. Kitson is proposing to develop.

And then we'll true up the price. And the contract is structured that we will pay -- that either we will pay the lesser of the value if the value is affected, i.e., lowered. Or Mr. Kitson can offer us additional properties to meet the 6250 -- or the final 6250 -- 62 million that is slated for the fourth year.

This agreement is contingent on the following conditions. The seller and Babcock Corporation have merged. The purchaser, number two, that the purchaser

| 1 | shall have obtained funding from the Florida Legislature |
|----|--|
| 2 | for both Florida Forever and the \$100 million in general |
| 3 | revenue. So if either of those two things don't happen, |
| 4 | then the deal cannot close. The third item, the seller, |
| 5 | Charlotte and Lee Counties, and the Florida DCA will have |
| 6 | addressed various development issues for the retained |
| 7 | property. And that's those overlays I've talked to you |
| 8 | about. And then fourthly Charlotte County will have |
| 9 | adopted certain overlay amendment to its comprehensive |
| 10 | plan. |
| 11 | THE GOVERNOR: Treasurer? |
| 12 | CFO GALLAGHER: What does address development issues |
| 13 | mean? |
| 14 | MS. CASTILLE: Well, there is a number of development |
| 15 | issues and that's the densities that are associated with |
| 16 | it; making sure that all of the commitments for utilities, |
| 17 | all of the concurrency issues that have to be addressed, |
| 18 | all of the approvals that have to be adopted on the local |
| 19 | level. |
| 20 | CFO GALLAGHER: And so if anything doesn't go the way |
| 21 | one of the three parties wants it to go, or four parties |
| 22 | here, I guess you got DCA in there too, the deal doesn't |
| 23 | work? |
| 24 | MS. CASTILLE: Then the deal doesn't work. On these |
| 25 | issues, I'd like to ask Mr. Kitson to come up and talk |

| 1 | about | what | are | issues | for | him | that | will | move | us | away | from |
|---|-------|--------|-------|--------|-----|-----|------|------|------|----|------|------|
| 2 | the c | losing | g tak | ole. | | | | | | | | |

3 CFO GALLAGHER: See, that, to me, is very subjective 4 and maybe it's not meant to be. But, you know, I think 5 there needs to be --

6 MS. CASTILLE: Well, there are details that are laid 7 out in the contract that are in more detail.

CFO GALLAGHER: That are very objective details?

MS. CASTILLE: Yes, sir.

CFO GALLAGHER: Okay.

MS. CASTILLE: What we have -- the deal that we have before us today is considerably different than what we had last year. When we proposed -- when even myself and a number of folks on our team were negotiating last year directly with the Babcock family, we came to the table with our own investment partners. We came to the table with someone who would continue to manage the property and to keep the corporation intact for a minimum of ten years which is the requirement under corporate acquisitions.

And so for us, we were in the driver's seat at that point in time. We approached the family and said we'd pay \$455 million which was generally just what we've been able to get under the appraisal. So we were just paying for the land and we would get all of the assets of the corporation as well. We are not in the driver's seat in

| 1 | this one. We are bringing a significant amount of money |
|----|--|
| 2 | to the table but for the deal to work, it's got to work |
| 3 | for Mr. Kitson as well. So we are taking into account |
| 4 | some of those issues that Mr. Kitson is reliant upon in |
| 5 | the contract because if he can't close, then we can't |
| 6 | close either and that puts the Babcocks back in the |
| 7 | ownership role and the future of what they would like to |
| 8 | do with the project. |
| 9 | But what I'm proposing to you is an acquisition that |
| 10 | will preserve 80 percent of the property in perpetuity, |
| 11 | 80 percent of the property. It's a significant amount of |
| 12 | money. But on average, the price that we're paying in |
| 13 | this deal is \$4750 per acre which is significantly less |
| 14 | than the appraised value for the property, 390 and |
| 15 | 394 million. 89 percent of appraised value. |
| 16 | THE GOVERNOR: Let's make sure that the appraiser is |
| 17 | warming up in the bullpen. |
| 18 | MS. CASTILLE: He is. Mr. Holden is here. |
| 19 | THE GOVERNOR: Where is he? |
| 20 | MR. HOLDEN: In the bullpen. |
| 21 | THE GOVERNOR: I'm keeping my eye on you. |
| 22 | (Laughter.) |
| 23 | MS. CASTILLE: The Lee County Commission will vote on |
| 24 | the 15th on both the purchase and sale agreement and the |

management agreement and the Florida Wildlife Commission

25

is scheduled to vote on the purchase agreement on November 30th. The seller reserves the right to utilize the rural stewardship program, as I talked about, and the reduction, if the rural land stewardship program causes a reduction in value, then the seller has those two options, that he may accept the reduced price or provide the Board of Trustees with acreage to bring the acquisition price back in line with the updated appraised value.

But nowhere do we pay more money for any additional value even four years into the future. The purchase agreement provides for the establishment of an easement area for a nonmotorized recreational trail between what will eventually be the state property and the private development along a corridor that's been mutually agreed upon in that southwest area.

The seller is donating a conservation easement from Curry Lake to Telegraph Swamp and there is an agreement to allow mitigation on this property. It allows the purchaser to use the lands that are destined for State ownership to restore those lands and to receive mitigation credits for the restoration. But the work is to be done -- completed prior to the State taking ownership of any of that property.

Water facilities. There is a -- there is an existing

Town and Country Utility that has a Public Service

| Commission certificate. Town and Country Utilities |
|--|
| Company currently has the exclusive water service for |
| Babcock Ranch property and there are currently 31 potable |
| wells and about 420 agricultural wells which are scattered |
| around the entire 91,000 acres. Under the purchase |
| agreement, Town and Country will be providing the current |
| water needs for Babcock Ranch and the future needs when |
| the public facilities are added, including cabins, |
| campgrounds, showers, public bathrooms, et cetera, at no |
| cost to the State. |

The State can also choose to seek its own consumptive use permit and add additional wells for its own use if it chooses. The seller is acknowledging in the contract, in expanded language that we included and sent to you yesterday, that there is no guarantee that it will receive any consumptive use permits. The purchase agreement provides that the utility will use its best efforts to use the existing wells and roads for locating commercial wells and pipes. And the owner will retain fee ownership of the proposed commercial well sites which are 10 by 100 square feet along the access easements and the locations will be established before the takedown of each parcel.

As each parcel is taken down and the new well sites are designated, the existing lease will be lifted from that piece of property for all wells not reserved by Town

and Country. And so it will come to the State in fee simple.

There will be a maximum of 75 wells on the State owned property reserved for Town and Country and no wells within Telegraph Swamp wetland or any other significant natural areas. The only pipes across Telegraph Swamp will be located immediately adjacent to the two water control structures which I showed you earlier. For all new locations, Kitson and Partners will exchange land on an acre-for-acre basis at closing. If and when the wells are permitted, permanently abandoned, the seller will cap, remove equipment, fences, et cetera and donate the land to the Board of Trustees.

There is an exclusive right in the contract which the Board of Trustees agrees not to compete with Town and Country in the sale of water or to lease any of its property to an entity that would then sink a well and do the same. Kitson and Partners will be assessed a water facility easement fee of 20 cents per thousand gallons. Some folks have suggested that there may be -- have a concern with that and so we have an additional proposal for you on a per easement basis if -- based on the testimony that some people will bring to the podium on that, on charging for those easements.

THE GOVERNOR: What is it?

MS. CASTILLE: It is \$24,000 per easement on an

| 2 | annual basis. |
|----|--|
| 3 | THE GOVERNOR: Instead of? |
| 4 | MS. CASTILLE: Instead of the 20 cents per thousand |
| 5 | gallons which is currently a price that Babcock charges or |
| 6 | has the right to charge Town and Country Realty for water |
| 7 | off of the property. The water facility easement fee is |
| 8 | similar to a commercial easement fee that the Board |
| 9 | charges for use of any of your land. In this case, since |
| 10 | the water is owned by the public and there's not a |
| 11 | commercial market for it, which is the way staff usually |
| 12 | evaluates an amount to charge a commercial entity, the |
| 13 | staff is recommending that you use the fee currently paid |
| 14 | by Babcock or the alternative that I have just expressed |
| 15 | to you. |
| 16 | There are a number of items on flood and water |
| 17 | control structures, on drainage on the property owners' |
| 18 | association as well. But if you have any questions on |

association as well. But if you have any questions on that, I'd be happy to answer any questions. Additionally, there is an automatic increase for the water facility easement fee on an annual -- each time the utility receives an increase in rates, in what they can charge in rates, the Board of Trustees' fee will go up by the same percentage.

THE GOVERNOR: All right.

| | 61 |
|----|--|
| 1 | MS. CASTILLE: And that's the contract. |
| 2 | THE GOVERNOR: Okay. So should we ask Mr. Kitson to |
| 3 | speak? |
| 4 | MS. CASTILLE: Okay. |
| 5 | CFO GALLAGHER: If we could, I know there is water |
| 6 | issues involved and I'm wondering if we should have the |
| 7 | Water Management District talk about that either right |
| 8 | before him or right after so we can have those issues |
| 9 | brought forth. He may want to talk about them too. |
| 10 | THE GOVERNOR: Syd, you may want to raise the |
| 11 | microphone up, you're a tall guy. Good morning. |
| 12 | MR. KITSON: Good morning, Governor and cabinet. A |
| 13 | pleasure to be here. We have a unique opportunity for |
| 14 | both preservation and creating a new community and I'm |
| 15 | equally excited about doing both of these. Preserving |
| 16 | over 74,000 acres, that's 115 square miles, and creating a |
| 17 | self-sustaining community that will provide a variety of |
| 18 | housing, jobs, and education in a unique environment. Our |
| 19 | vision for Babcock Ranch is founded on our belief that |
| 20 | preservation and responsible growth can go hand in hand. |
| 21 | I'd just like to spend two seconds on how we got here. |
| 22 | As you know, the State purchase of the ranch really |
| 23 | was never possible. And the reason is, during the |
| 24 | negotiation with the family, they discovered that they had |

a significant tax problem that the company was in a C corp

25

| and was subject to corporate taxes of almost 40 percent. |
|--|
| The IRS notified the family during that process when they |
| were negotiating with the State and learned they would |
| have a significant, really huge tax liability. So the 43 |
| shareholders were very upset and concerned about that |
| outcome. It was at this point that they decided to go in |
| a different direction. And, of course, as you can |
| imagine, when the deal didn't happen in April, they were |
| inundated with offers from developers, investors really |
| from all over the world. The thing that's interesting is |
| that we were not the highest bidder. Kitson and Partners |
| was not the highest bidder but we had a shared vision with |
| the family and that was to preserve as much of the ranch |
| as possible. And I think the family deserves a lot of |
| credit for doing that. |

We agreed to pay a price that is higher than what the State offered. And we also agreed to pay the corporate taxes. And in addition to that, we agreed to certain guarantees and negative covenants to make this all work. It was a rather detailed and expensive contract to put together. But it is important to understand that the ranch at this point is going to be sold. The family has stated that it's not going to sell to the public sector and it will be sold to the private sector. I think the path that we have chosen is not the easy path and

certainly not the most profitable but we think that it's the right path. You know, the Babcock family has done an absolutely tremendous job in operating the various businesses. That includes the eco tours, the cattle ranching, hunting, a lodge, sod farm, a mining operation, timber operations. They do a great job of keeping the exotics off the land.

The employees live on the ranch and it's much more than a job to them. They are just deeply committed to what goes on there. Arnie Sarlo and his group are just doing an absolutely phenomenal job. And we have committed to continue that great stewardship and continue to use the employees for that purpose. So along with the State, we have created what we think is a very unique private/public partnership to manage the ranch. Kitson and Partners will manage the ranch for up to ten years, then turn it over to the State, to the nonprofit.

Also, the new community that we are proposing for the ranch, we will charge the homeowners a monthly fee that will be used for the benefit of the ranch to ensure that the ranch will be financially self-sustaining for now and into the future.

So what are the resources that make the Babcock deal work? Well, first is the purchase of the 74,000 acres by the State. And next are the mining operations and the

| water rights. When we buy the stock from the Babcock |
|---|
| family, the Town and Country Utility will be part of that |
| purchase price. Not only are we paying for the utility |
| but the utility is important for several other reasons. |

First, it is needed for the financial viability of the project and it is part of the reason that we're able to sell the 74,000 acres to the State below appraised value and significantly below what we paid for it.

Second, we need to control our ability to provide water to our new community and to control the permitting process and the construction of the facility. And then, finally, to fulfill our commitment to the County to provide them with potable water and to eventually sell them the utility.

Now at the cabinet meeting, cabinet aides meeting, I was asked about the value of Town and Country Utility and I wish I could change that response. But you can't pull words out once they are recorded. My response was that it was worth anywhere from 50 to \$200 million. However, I should have continued to explain how that value is achieved.

First, the value that I stated includes both the water utility and the sewer utility. Second, we will have to apply and receive a consumptive use permit for potable water, which we do not have. And, finally, we have to

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

spend up to \$200 million to build the facilities. So,

currently, without the consumptive use permit and without

the facilities, the utility has very little value.

The final piece is to allow Kitson and Partners to create a self-sustaining community of 19,500 homes, up to 6 million square feet of office and retail space on 17,800 acres. And I want to just spend two minutes on this. We want to create a place where people can live, learn, work and play. And what makes this so unique and really a once in a many lifetime opportunity is we truly have a clean sheet of paper. We can do it right from the beginning. We'd start right from scratch and do the right things for this community from the beginning. We can develop it in an environmentally responsible way. We plan on putting greenways through the property where you can literally walk out your front door and walk ten miles right up to the Caloosahatchee River or into the ranch itself. And I would ask if anybody knows of any place where you can actually do that -- my wife and I love to hike but it's always crossing roads and going through streets and having cars go by your ears and, here, we have a chance to do it differently.

Education. I've already met with the Board of
Education and the superintendent of schools and we
focussed on the placement of the schools, where they're

going to go. Most developers when they come in look for the property that is probably the least valuable on the land to place their schools. What we propose to do is to put the high school and the middle school right in the middle of the community so it becomes a focal point. And then to have the downtown right next door to it. So, as everybody knows in the high schools and middle schools, that's where all the events are, the football games, where you can literally go from the football game over to your downtown and you really have a sense of place for not only for the students but for the families. And Florida Gulf Coast University is working with us on an education and research center.

Also, we want to include green development. Right now, the commercial buildings are economically profitable to make them green buildings. That's something that we're going to incorporate into the community and we're working on that on our residential side also because we believe strongly that that's something that can work. We have the technology. There's fiber right outside our door which is amazing. Right on 31 we can wire the entire community and we plan on making it wireless. Also, housing. Workforce housing. There is very little workforce housing in southwest Florida and it's getting worse because the property values are going up.

| 1 | Right now, it's very difficult to get teachers and |
|---|---|
| 2 | other service-oriented jobs a place to live because there |
| 3 | is no workforce housing and we're committing to providing |
| 4 | that housing on Babcock Ranch along with all other price |
| 5 | ranges. There will be high-end homes and everything in |
| 6 | between. |

7 CFO GALLAGHER: Two questions.

8 MR. KITSON: Yes.

CFO GALLAGHER: How many units and how much are they going to cost?

MR. KITSON: Right now, as far as number of units, we're working that out in the interlocal agreement with the counties. I don't want to say too few and I don't want to say too many. I want them to help us in determining that number of units and we're very flexible on what that number will be. And as far as the pricing is concerned, again, working with them because what we want to do is actually offer the teachers the opportunity, with the schools, to give them housing based upon what their salaries could be. So if they're 125, 150,000, whatever that price range needs to be, is what we're going to work out with the counties. So we're really working in a collaborative effort which I'll explain in just a moment.

And also, jobs. We have an opportunity to provide jobs. We have 6 million square feet of office and retail

| space. And right now, the unemployment rate in that area |
|--|
| is 3.8 percent which you would think is terrific. But I |
| think if you asked anybody in southwest Florida, they'll |
| tell you that those jobs are not necessarily high-paying |
| jobs. What we're going to do is we've already started |
| working with the workforce group. In trying to attract |
| businesses, they need two things. One is housing and two |
| is an educated workforce. So we're working with their |
| educators, Florida Gulf Coast University and Edison |
| College and the high schools to educate and coordinate |
| with them in how they educate our students so that when we |
| attract these companies, there is an educated workforce |
| for them to be a part of. |

And then finally and something that I think I've been talking about for the last several months, that is to design the community so that it is resilient in the event of a hurricane. I think there is something we can do.

This is 20 to 30 -- actually, 35 feet above sea level.

We've already talked to Florida Gulf Coast University to look at the type of technologies that we can put in place to make this a reality. We'd like to make it so homeowners can actually buy insurance. And I think there are a lot of initiatives and things that we can do to really create a safe community.

Why did everybody laugh at that one? Oh, welcome to

| Florida. We have been building a consensus with the local |
|--|
| leaders and environmental groups and we have widespread |
| support for this vision. And one of the things that we've |
| done is we've agreed to have the community involved in the |
| planning process through a series of shrets (sic) that |
| we're going to put into place over the next couple of |
| months and that will include the educators, |
| environmentalists, planners, architects, builders and |
| others. |

One of the questions I got asked is: Let me see your plan. What is it that you're proposing here. Kind of do a Donald Trump and lay out the grand scheme. What I said is I'd rather bring all the community leaders, get them involved, really do something, as I said before, because we have a clean sheet of paper here, is to do it right, get their expertise involved and really to design a community that we all can be proud of. And that's something that will be done over the next two to three months.

To make this work, all the pieces must fit together.

The State purchase of the 74,000 acres, the mining operation and the water utility and the development rights for a sustainable community. All three must work together for this all to happen.

THE GOVERNOR: Syd, I'm sorry, I didn't think the

| 1 | consumptive use permit was part of |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. KITSON: That's correct. |
| 3 | THE GOVERNOR: It's not a contingency in the |
| 4 | contract, right? |
| 5 | MR. KITSON: That's correct, Governor. |
| 6 | THE GOVERNOR: You're buying the land |
| 7 | MR. KITSON: We are taking the risk on the |
| 8 | consumptive use permit. |
| 9 | THE GOVERNOR: And when is your closing? |
| 10 | MR. KITSON: July 31st. |
| 11 | THE GOVERNOR: Same as so we will have a simul |
| 12 | MR. KITSON: No, it will not be simultaneous. Our |
| 13 | closing will be earlier than that with the family. |
| 14 | THE GOVERNOR: You have a date? |
| 15 | MR. KITSON: Not set. Depends on a few things that |
| 16 | are going to happen over the next few weeks. |
| 17 | THE GOVERNOR: So you don't have, you have a do |
| 18 | you have a binding contract? |
| 19 | MR. KITSON: It will be yes, we have a binding |
| 20 | contract. We're talking about mid spring will be the |
| 21 | closing date. |
| 22 | THE GOVERNOR: And you have money at risk right now? |
| 23 | MR. KITSON: Yes. |
| 24 | THE GOVERNOR: You have a binding contract? |
| 25 | MR. KITSON: Yes. |

| 1 7 | THE GOVE | RNOR: And | l you | have | money | at | risk? |
|-----|----------|-----------|-------|------|-------|----|-------|
|-----|----------|-----------|-------|------|-------|----|-------|

- 2 MR. KITSON: Yes.
- 3 THE GOVERNOR: And the consumptive use permit has
- 4 nothing to do with it?
- 5 MR. KITSON: That's correct.
- 6 ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: If I might. What did you
- 7 say about Mr. Trump?
- 8 MR. KITSON: I have more hair than him.
- 9 (Laughter.)
- 10 ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: I just didn't hear what you
- 11 said.
- 12 MR. KITSON: Yeah, I know. I was just saying
- 13 generally what he likes to do is roll out a plan that is
- 14 already in place and what I'm proposing to do is to have
- that plan designed with the community.
- 16 ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: And you want the taxpayers
- to help you do it?
- 18 MR. KITSON: Not the tax -- well, the community
- 19 leaders to help me do it.
- 20 ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: They do.
- MR. KITSON: Well, yeah, absolutely.
- 22 ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: He does a lot of good
- things.
- 24 MR. KITSON: No, he does a lot of great things, a lot
- of great things. Am I in trouble with him? I meant that

| 1 | in a really, really good way, just so you know. |
|----|--|
| 2 | (Laughter.) |
| 3 | Just to finish up, the property values continue to |
| 4 | rise at an alarming rate and it's really making it |
| 5 | difficult for public acquisition. Higher land prices are |
| 6 | shutting the door on workforce housing and even mid-priced |
| 7 | homes and making it difficult to create sustainable |
| 8 | communities. Babcock Ranch offers a rare opportunity to |
| 9 | create a true private/public partnership where |
| 10 | preservation and sustainable growth will provide a win/wir |
| 11 | for all stakeholders. The result will be a proud legacy |
| 12 | for state leaders, local leaders, Kitson and Partners, |
| 13 | residents and future generations. I believe this is the |
| 14 | last opportunity to preserve Babcock Ranch and I believe |
| 15 | without a question from the bottom of my heart that this |
| 16 | is the right thing to do and I'm very, very proud to be a |
| 17 | part of it. Thanks. |
| 18 | THE GOVERNOR: Thank you, Syd. |
| 19 | Secretary? |
| 20 | MS. CASTILLE: Yes, sir. |
| 21 | THE GOVERNOR: You want to go through the order? |
| 22 | MS. CASTILLE: I do, sir. I would like to ask |
| 23 | Mr. Brian Prestley if he will come up and speak first |
| 24 | because he's got a flight to catch. |
| 25 | THE GOVERNOR: I would ask everybody to be as brief |

| as possible so that we can get to the que | uestions. |
|---|-----------|
|---|-----------|

MR. PRESTLEY: Governor, cabinet. My name is Brian Prestley. I'm the chairman of the Enterprise Charlotte Foundation. I'm an investment advisor by trade and I own a ranch about 7 miles away. So before the appraiser even gets here, I will tell you that's an incredible price that the State is getting. There is nothing selling for one-third of that. I mean three times that.

THE GOVERNOR: You got 72,000 acres?

MR. PRESTLEY: No, but I'm saying it is an awesome deal and I don't feel it could happen again. From our point of view, it's a total win/win, first of all environmentally. You're getting 74,000 acres but that's actually not the environmental part. The environmental part will be in excess of 80,000 acres because the State is going to own 74. But Syd will also be doing green belts and paths and things like that. It is very difficult for us to understand the environmental objections when this is a win beyond anything they could ever afford to achieve on a tax point of view, National Association of Home Builders did some independent work.

We're looking at a net tax contribution, net tax contribution of over \$300 million. That would do every deferred comp infrastructure project in Charlotte County. In education, the self-sustaining aspect of it, talking

- about the building of the schools, are awesome. 1 Otherwise, who's paying for it, Syd is paying for this in 3 this deal. The FGCU facility will further the 4 environmental programs and environmental engineering 5 programs at the university. You'll hear Dr. Burns talk 6 about that. Job growth, you're talking probably 20,000 jobs in an 8 area that was hit with four and a half hurricanes, you know. It's a major deal there. And it also creates an 9 enlightened model for development. As he said, there is a 10 huge fiberoptic bundle down 31, just amazingly large. And 11 12 an 8-inch gas line. So there is infrastructure right 13 there. It's very close to downtown Fort Myers and it will be a net win/win deal. It's Florida's Louisiana purchase. 14 15 You have the opportunity to change the character of 16 Florida forever because you're never going to put this big a piece back together again. Thank you. 17 18 THE GOVERNOR: Thank you. 19 MS. CASTILLE: Thank you, Brian. 20 THE GOVERNOR: I'll take the purchase price of the
- MS. CASTILLE: And Senator Bennett.
- THE GOVERNOR: Welcome, Senator.

it's more, who knows.

21

22

25 SENATOR BENNETT: Governor, members of the cabinet,

Louisiana purchase then. Maybe on a present value basis

appreciate it. You know, this opportunity, as everybody has told you before, it just doesn't come down the road anymore and this is going to be the last chance that we've got to really protect a true piece of Florida that we all want to do. When we did the growth management bill last year, we were very concerned about sustainable communities. We were concerned about affordable housing. We were also concerned about how we were going to leave a legacy for your children, your grandchildren and their grandchildren and for everybody down the line. And I often talked about preserving pieces of Florida that forever and ever would be off the scope and off the radar screen for any kind of development.

But a creative deal is going to take some creative financing. And as I know you-all are working through the water problem, I know it's been very, very contentious. I'm hoping that through the legislative process this year we can also look for a creative way to help offset the cost. I know a lot of environmentalists are concerned that we're going to be taking money from Florida Forever. We're going to be taking money from other projects. But, you know, we might have a chance to look at something creative during the Legislative process this year. For example, a State owned mitigation bank where a developer from Sarasota County, instead of trying to mitigate and

save a quarter acre pond behind my development over there, may be able to buy into this. Where a developer from Lee County -- I know of a developer down in Lee County right now who's looking for land for panther mitigation. And if we could turn right back around and where we're buying it for \$4700 an acre, we may be able to sell it to the developer for three or four times that money.

But I think to do that, we're going to have to look at some creative financing terms this year in order to sell it. Because as we try to go through the environmental groups that are arguing about that money and as we try to go through the groups that are arguing to try to save more money for education and more money for Medicaid, we've got to figure out how we're going to replace that \$100 million out of GR and address it. I believe if we would look at some creative methods and really take our hats off, we would find there is a way to preserve this.

And I do have to say that when you look at all the job benefits and the affordable housing and the entire package that is going to come, even if we couldn't come up with that, I would ask this cabinet and our Legislature to really give this a hard look because this is something we've got to preserve for everybody. You-all have got a tough job ahead of you and I really appreciate the time.

| | 77 |
|----|---|
| 1 | THE GOVERNOR: Thank you, Senator. While you're here |
| 2 | because I know you may have to go back. I wanted to ask |
| 3 | Secretary Castille a question regarding the Legislature, |
| 4 | if I could. The contract has a specific I think we |
| 5 | have a couple of other members from the House as well that |
| 6 | want to speak, but the contract calls for \$100 million out |
| 7 | of I don't know if it specifies general revenue, |
| 8 | probably doesn't have to do that, cash. And then a phased |
| 9 | purchase of 62 and a half million for four years. What |
| 10 | would happen if the Legislature decided because they |
| 11 | wanted to, they have the right to do whatever they please |
| 12 | in this regard, what would happen if they wanted to put |
| 13 | more money up or if they wanted to bond or if they wanted |
| 14 | to do this or that? Does that change the contract itself? |
| 15 | Is there some flexibility in the contract or does that |
| 16 | open up other clauses in the contract for renegotiation? |
| 17 | MS. CASTILLE: We can if the Legislature |
| 18 | appropriates the entire amount, in any fashion whatsoever, |
| 19 | Mr. Kitson is willing to close with the whole deal all at |
| 20 | once. |
| 21 | THE GOVERNOR: I mean, the contract calls for that. |
| 22 | It's not a question of whether he wants to. |
| 23 | MS. CASTILLE: Yes. |
| 24 | THE GOVERNOR: The point being that this a real |
| 25 | estate contract is a real estate contract. If not it's |

| 1 | just kind of work in progress and there's a lot of moving |
|----|--|
| 2 | parts here. I'm asking: Does this keep a binding |
| 3 | contract going if we make changes because you know, |
| 4 | revenue estimating conference comes next week or week |
| 5 | after, we may get a big slug of nonrecurring money. There |
| 6 | could be many things could happen between now and the |
| 7 | end of the session. So any change in the structure of the |
| 8 | payment of this contract does not change the underlying |
| 9 | contract itself. |
| 10 | MS. CASTILLE: It does not. The language of the |
| 11 | contract states that the closing on the phases shall be on |
| 12 | or before the specific dates that |
| 13 | THE GOVERNOR: So we would take down if we wanted |
| 14 | to put more money up, we would take based on the |
| 15 | appraised the amount in the contract, we would just |
| 16 | take more of it. And who determines which part is taken? |
| 17 | MS. CASTILLE: Oh, we decide that together. |
| 18 | THE GOVERNOR: We? How do we do it together? So |
| 19 | then it is open-ended. |
| 20 | CFO GALLAGHER: We have sessions that are set per |
| 21 | year and we have to do the first one first. |
| 22 | MS. CASTILLE: Right. |
| 23 | THE GOVERNOR: This is an unusual contract. When |
| 24 | you're not buying a this is not a if we can |
| 25 | accelerate it and it's still open to suggestion on who |

| 1 | gets t | o pick, | it's not | iron clad. | That's | all | I'm | asking. |
|---|--------|---------|----------|------------|--------|-----|-----|---------|
| | | | | | | | | |

2 There's a lot of uncertainties.

the ultimate facts.

- Syd, has this been thought through? Because, you

 know, we're going to make our recommendation but the

 Legislature will have the ultimate say and they'll have
- SENATOR BENNETT: Well, I don't necessarily always

 agree with that, Governor. If I remember correctly, last

 year you vetoed a couple of things I had the ultimate say

 on.
- 11 THE GOVERNOR: And I'm going to do it again next 12 year. Put you on notice, I'll do it again.
- 13 (Laughter.)

6

- MR. KITSON: The takedowns are on the map and if we wanted to accelerate that, we could. So if there was first or second or third or fourth take down, we can accelerate those in any fashion.
- 18 CFO GALLAGHER: "We" is who?
- MR. KITSON: Between the two parties.
- 20 CFO GALLAGHER: But how about if the State wanted to 21 accelerate it. Do you have to go along with that?
- MR. KITSON: Yeah, we do. I believe we do under --
- 23 CFO GALLAGHER: Doesn't say.
- MR. KITSON: Ernie?
- THE GOVERNOR: Mr. Cox, good morning.

| MR. COX: Governor, members of the cabinet. Ernie |
|--|
| Cox. I represent Kitson and Partners. Happy to be with |
| you. The contract provides, chief financial officer, that |
| there is a certain number of acres purchased in each take |
| down. And that number of acres is set and it has an on or |
| before date. So, for instance, on or before the first |
| take down, July 31, \$100 million at \$5,000 an acre, it's |
| 20,000 acres. The second take down is 12,500 acres. The |
| third take down is 12,500 acres. And the contract |
| specifically provides that 90 days prior to the first take |
| down we have to specifically identify on the map, once |
| we've got the survey completed, and this is just like any |
| contract contingent upon survey, the survey is due to be |
| completed by December 31 of 2005. We will then use the |
| survey to specifically identify which sections are in take |
| down one and take down two. But the way we worked it, |
| Governor, is there is an absolute binding contract to buy |
| 20,000 acres in take down one. To buy 12,500 acres in |
| take down number two. |

THE GOVERNOR: What happens if we get one and a half takedowns? In other words, if the Legislature, instead of putting up 100, decides that 150 or -- I mean, I could see if the Legislature decides and the Governor agrees that there is \$300 million of bonding, I should probably add that too (laughter) then it's all taken down, it's not a

| 1 | problem |
|---|---------|
| | |

But if it's not all the same take down, not the same phase-in, the question is who picks the, what property is taken down and if there is not an agreement, how is it resolved? One of the problems with the structure, in my opinion, relates to our -- the inability for us to write a \$350 million check or whatever it is. So instead of taking purchase money mortgage back, we are taking down pieces of property. The last thing we want is to get halfway into this and not be able to fulfill the ultimate vision which is the purchase of 72,000 acres. And so any contingencies along the way I'm worried about.

MR. COX: Understood. And, Governor, what I could say is we've worked it so there are on or before dates and that was based upon DEP's estimate of what funding might be available absent the Legislature deciding to do something special.

THE GOVERNOR: Well, again, that was our best estimate but it certainly has a very good chance of changing, maybe for the better.

MR. COX: Governor, from our perspective, there's no interest in this contract for the takedowns. And so the amount of money for the last take down is the same as the amount of money for the first take down. I can commit to you, and I believe Syd will as well, that if there is

money available, we'll sell the land. And as much money

| 2 | is available of the 74,000 acres, we'll sell it as soon as |
|----|--|
| 3 | that money is available. |
| 4 | THE GOVERNOR: I guess my worry is, since you get |
| 5 | your part first, you know, once we get past the first |
| 6 | phase of this, are we going to be in a position where all |
| 7 | of a sudden it gets more difficult? I don't know. |
| 8 | CFO GALLAGHER: Here's the way I've seen this is the |
| 9 | phases sort of work that they will release to us acreage |
| 10 | that is least environmentally sensitive, then a little |
| 11 | more environmentally sensitive, and then the most |
| 12 | environmentally sensitive to keep our, you know, our |
| | |

THE GOVERNOR: I know. That was smartly negotiated.

That's exactly right. So I'm not getting a definitive.

I'm getting a kind of a "we'll work with you".

appetite going.

MS. CASTILLE: Well, Governor, there are four contingencies in the contract which I outlined earlier. All of those contingencies will actually be completed before we go to the very first closing. Once we go to the first closing, then the contract compels the seller to sell the property. And whether it's one and a half phases or two phases, Mr. Kitson wants to sell the property. I mean, he cannot afford to do the deal without our money.

25 THE GOVERNOR: Stuff happens. Things change. The

| 1 | more binding the contract is, the more you think about |
|----|---|
| 2 | these all of the contingencies that would happen. The |
| 3 | better it is, the easier it's going to be to convince the |
| 4 | Legislature to go forward. The easier it is for our |
| 5 | partners locally to understand what the rules of |
| 6 | engagement are. |
| 7 | MR. KITSON: I'll commit on the record that we would |
| 8 | do that. And if there is an adjustment that needs to be |
| 9 | made, we'll do that. |
| 10 | THE GOVERNOR: Okay. Representatives? I see two at |
| 11 | least. Represent Kreegle, welcome. |
| 12 | SENATOR BENNETT: Governor, I can assure you we will |
| 13 | do everything we need to do to work with the Governor's |
| 14 | office to make this thing happen. |
| 15 | THE GOVERNOR: Thank you, Senator. Thanks for your |
| 16 | support. |
| 17 | REPRESENTATIVE KREEGLE: Let me adjust these. |
| 18 | They're vertically challenged. Good morning, Governor and |
| 19 | cabinet members. You've had a lot of details this morning |
| 20 | so I'll be brief and I won't give you details. I'll give |

22

23

24

25

you some overview because I believe I have a unique

perspective on this ranch. I've hunted it and hiked it

and walked every square inch of it over the last 25 years.

I actually had the opportunity to meet many family members

and I was Fred Babcock's medical doctor for several years

prior to his death. I don't think that was the cause of his death.

3 (Laughter.)

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And now I find myself in the unique position that the entire ranch is in my district. You know, in a lot of the press debate we hear a lot about the pristine wilderness of the Babcock Ranch. And it is true, there are pristine wilderness areas there. But as any of you who've flown over have noted, it's not completely pristine. It contains a lot of wilderness areas but it contains many other areas which have been used because it was, for almost 100 years, a working ranch. And the area which Mr. Kitson wants to develop has been logged out, bedded, swaled, it's been extensively used for sod farming, vegetable farming, and in recent years, has been extensively mined for gravel and shell. And I think this deal really does the ideal thing, it preserves for the State and the people the environmentally sensitive areas and parts which really are wilderness and gives up for development that area which is certainly not environmentally sensitive at all.

I notice a sticking point here is apparently going to be the \$100 million in general revenue funds. And I'd just like to make a brief comment on that. It's a lot of money, granted. It is -- but in perspective, last year in

| | 85 |
|----|--|
| 1 | the House of Representatives we voted, with the addition |
| 2 | of a floor amendment, to give more than \$100 million to |
| 3 | the Miami Marlins to build a new stadium. Now, the Senate |
| 4 | didn't agree but had that gone through as a bill, we would |
| 5 | have put \$112 million into about 25 acres which when it's |
| 6 | all said and done, people still would not have owned. |
| 7 | Still would have been in private hands essentially. For |
| 8 | this \$100 million in general revenue funds, we're getting |
| 9 | an area almost as big as Rhode Island and the people are |
| 10 | going to own it forever. So with that being said, thank |
| 11 | you very much. |
| 12 | THE GOVERNOR: Thank you. Rhode Island without the |
| 13 | two senators. |
| 14 | (Laughter.) |
| 15 | Representative, good morning. |
| 16 | REPRESENTATIVE DAVIS: Thank you. Representative |
| 17 | Mike Davis. I have eastern Collier County. And, |
| 18 | Governor, you and I flew over it just recently looking at |
| 19 | some hurricane damage and we appreciate all of your |
| 20 | attention in southwest Florida. |
| 21 | I'm known in southwest Florida as the guy that keeps |
| 22 | pushing and coercing everyone into this regional thinking |
| 23 | of our five-county area. And that's why I come to speak |
| 24 | to you today. Because if Babcock Ranch is not important |

to the region, then I'm not really sure what is. My

25

district, which is a lot of eastern Collier County, which is the Big Cypress, the Everglades, directly benefits what happens to this land. So I certainly have a very deep concern that it be preserved. I think from a regional perspective while I haven't polled each of the individual senators and House members, I think you'll find that there is general support in our area for this purchase as is there from local government.

My two colleagues that preceded me, my two good friends, I think have touched on most of the issues so I don't want to be repetitive. But I would just say to you-all today because you've got the power to make this go forward, that I've looked at this hard, I've had concerns. I'm very familiar with the rural land stewardship program having put a lot of it in statute the last two years. But I just say to you today that the orange is worth the squeeze in this case and encourage you to go forward with a positive vote. Thank you.

THE GOVERNOR: Thank you, Representative.

MS. CASTILLE: In continuing with the elected officials, we have two more elected officials on the local level. We have Commissioner Matt DeBoer from Charlotte County and we have Commissioner Bob Janes from Lee County.

THE GOVERNOR: Commissioner DeBoer, welcome. Raise the mike up.

| 1 | COMMISSIONER DeBOER: Good morning. I was going to |
|----|--|
| 2 | say how many years have you been here and you haven't |
| 3 | raised the podiums up for us normal size people. |
| 4 | THE GOVERNOR: You still have to raise it up. |
| 5 | COMMISSIONER DeBOER: I want to thank you for the |
| 6 | opportunity to be here this morning and talk to you about |
| 7 | this. And for the record, my name is Matt DeBoer, |
| 8 | Charlotte County Board of County Commissioners. I'd like |
| 9 | to commend your staff. The effort they have put into this |
| 10 | has been nothing short of herculean. Most people don't |
| 11 | realize that we've had three this is our third bite at |
| 12 | this apple and we were not successful the first two times. |
| 13 | So the effort they've put into this and to be here to |
| 14 | bring this forward today, they deserve a lot of applause |
| 15 | for that. |
| 16 | Like anybody else, we wish that there was enough |
| 17 | money to do 100 percent of this purchase. But what we did |
| 18 | is we got together with some private people and we |
| 19 | understood the financial limitations and also the |
| 20 | implications of buying corporations and buying corporate |
| 21 | stocks and the tax liabilities. I'm sure Mr. Kitson would |
| 22 | lose some more hair if I say this in public, but what |
| 23 | you've already learned about me is I say things in public |
| 24 | just for the heck of it sometimes but this time not. |
| 25 | I believe that the outright purchase of this ranch is |

| somewhere between 730 million and \$780 million. And I |
|--|
| don't think there's any way that we can do that based on |
| our limitations financially and also our inability to buy |
| corporate stock and pay tax liabilities. And for that |
| reason, I have moved from that idea of doing a 100 percent |
| purchase to where we are today. I think the partnerships |
| that are brought to the table are extremely unique and |
| something that we should model in the future. Bringing |
| Florida Gulf Coast University into this process to be part |
| of the management to also have their bio pharmaceutical |
| programs, their environmental engineering programs, hotel |
| management programs, to have those on site is extremely |
| unique and a phenomenal opportunity. I think that |
| creating a not-for-profit organization that's going to |
| oversee this and become basically a self-sustaining, |
| self-funding long-term management structure for the ranch |
| is something that also is very unique and hopefully a |
| model for the future. |

For Charlotte County, I believe a long-term economic impact is a very positive one for Charlotte County. I believe at the rate of -- the amount of revenue, Charlotte County tax revenue, that we're going to receive are going to far exceed the demand that we're going to have as far as services.

25 THE GOVERNOR: Commissioner, you brought up a little

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

| bit of a sore subject and I thought about this because I |
|--|
| do appreciate Charlotte County a whole lot, having gotten |
| to know you-all up close and personal, more than I ever |
| did before last year. But given the fact that there is |
| going to be a significant economic benefit of this very |
| unique development, why isn't Charlotte County stepping up |
| in some fashion to be a partner financially in this? |
| THE WITNESS: The biggest reason that we have is that |
| we are still recovering from the devastation of Hurricane |

Charley.

THE GOVERNOR: What about a forward commitment? COMMISSIONER DeBOER: We would be willing to make some kind of commitment like that. One of the things that we had to do because of the hurricane last year, we did have an initiative we were going to put on the ballot to try to have a least a half a mill put aside of taxes for environmental purchases. I would like to see that back once we get past the hurricane. It wasn't a time to ask people to vote for --

THE GOVERNOR: No, and I'm not suggesting that. We have the -- Lee County has a land purchasing program and they've made a commitment as I understand or we'll hear about it perhaps. And the economic benefits of this will, in terms of tax revenues for local government, will go more towards Charlotte than Lee because Lee is buying the

| L | land, | right? |
|---|-------|--------|
| | | |

COMMISSIONER DeBOER: And I would be happy to sponsor that referendum coming forward. But, also, in the four-party agreement Charlotte County is going to be asked to fund the transportation impacts that are going to occur in Lee County. We are asked to share 100 percent of our impact fee revenues. Also to share some of the ad valorem revenues that we are going to receive off this.

THE GOVERNOR: Okay. I didn't know that.

COMMISSIONER DeBOER: Yes, sir. Well, this is so complicated and we have all these different agreements that are threaded together and I wish I could keep up with all of them right now, but I can't. They seem to change hour by hour.

THE GOVERNOR: That helps me a little bit.

COMMISSIONER DeBOER: Yes, sir. One of the things that comes up quite often is the utility. I know that I talked to Commissioner Bronson about this and a number of our legislators too. Mr. Kitson has agreed that the utility will be sold to the public. I think that solves some of the problems that, in fact, having a public utility would be a lot better than skirting all of the problems we had with western water laws where we actually had turned our water resources into a private market commodity. So I think that would be very appropriate to

| 1 | start. |
|----|---|
| 2 | THE GOVERNOR: Is that a binding commitment? Is that |
| 3 | part of our contract? Is that |
| 4 | COMMISSIONER DeBOER: Right now, that language is in |
| 5 | the four-party agreement, right, Mr. Kitson? |
| 6 | MR. KITSON: Yes, it is. |
| 7 | THE GOVERNOR: How about our contract? |
| 8 | MR. KITSON: They are |
| 9 | (Inaudible.) |
| 10 | (Off-the-record comment.) |
| 11 | THE GOVERNOR: I'm sorry, Syd. I didn't hear the |
| 12 | Secretary mention that as part of the deal. It's a fairly |
| 13 | significant fact. |
| 14 | MR. KITSON: Yeah, it is. It's going to be part of |
| 15 | the interlocal agreement and these agreements are |
| 16 | basically contingent upon each other happening. One can't |
| 17 | happen without the other. |
| 18 | THE GOVERNOR: What else is in the interlocal |
| 19 | agreement that would have an impact on our purchase? |
| 20 | MR. KITSON: I think probably the most important |
| 21 | thing is the fact that both deals are contingent on each |
| 22 | other. In other words, if, in fact, Charlotte County |
| 23 | approved the interim overlay comp plan and the State does |
| 24 | not go forward with the purchase, then that interim |

overlay goes away and vice versa. So what happens is all

25

| 1 | the parties are tied together which I think is the right |
|----|--|
| 2 | thing to do. Because for Charlotte County, one of the |
| 3 | motivating factors for them to do this is the fact that |
| 4 | they're going to preserve all this land. So if that land |
| 5 | is not going to be preserved, they're not going to want to |
| 6 | go forward with the interim overlay. So I think that's |
| 7 | probably one of the big features of it. And as the |
| 8 | commissioner was talking about, the water and how that |
| 9 | water not only how we're going to be allocating it but |
| 10 | that we're going to sell it to them. |
| 11 | THE GOVERNOR: When? |
| 12 | MR. KITSON: 15 years. |
| 13 | THE GOVERNOR: You're selling the utility? |
| 14 | MR. KITSON: And the sewer, correct. |
| 15 | COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Governor, and I'm going to |
| 16 | wait until I think we kind of half agreed to hear all |
| 17 | aspects and ask questions. |
| 18 | THE GOVERNOR: My bad. |
| 19 | COMMISSIONER BRONSON: No, but there still are some |
| 20 | issues involving a couple of things that I have not asked |
| 21 | that I definitely want to get some answers to as you might |
| 22 | imagine and that is one of them, how this contractual |
| 23 | agreement is going to be and who gets a chance to bid on |

25

the water utility and so forth. And I still got a lot of

questions of the Water Management District to tie some

| 1 | loose e | ends | here | to | make | sure | all | this | is | going | to | come |
|---|---------|------|------|----|------|------|-----|------|----|-------|----|------|
| 2 | togethe | er. | | | | | | | | | | |

THE GOVERNOR: We're going to stay here until we get all our questions answered.

COMMISSIONER DeBOER: I'll go ahead and wrap up because I understand the probability of success is inversely proportionate to how long I speak.

8 (Laughter.)

THE GOVERNOR: No, the inverse relationship is heightened intelligence, Matt.

COMMISSIONER DeBOER: Thank you. There a lot of development questions that were asked here. And the County understands that we have some heavy lifting that we have to do on our side of this to make sure that all the assurances are met in providing that the goals, objectives, and policies of the State and County government in the rural land stewardship program and in our DRI processes, that those things are all met. And at the same time, we have to make sure in the four-party agreement there are some assurances in here, that we create that value of the 19,500 units of development in order to offset some of the costs in this thing to make the deal work. And this four-party agreement is going to tie us into those approvals. I would ask your support of this. I understand it's a big step. Hopefully it will be

- 1 a successful one and I'll stand by for any questions.
- 2 Thank you.
- 3 THE GOVERNOR: Thank you, Commissioner.
- 4 MS. CASTILLE: Commissioner Bob Janes from Lee
- 5 County.
- 6 THE GOVERNOR: Good morning, Commissioner.
- 7 COMMISSIONER JANES: Good morning, Governor. Good
- 8 morning, Governor and members of the cabinet. It's a
- 9 pleasure for me to be here. I just wanted to indicate to
- 10 you first off that I am county commissioner from Lee
- 11 County. I am also -- my county board is appointed
- designated liaison, appointed designated liaison, on the
- Babcock situation. So I'm part and parcel of the whole
- 14 discussion that's been going on.
- I want to tell you first off that what I'm intending
- to do today is to just identify a few of the concerns that
- 17 Lee County has with the Babcock acquisition at the present
- 18 time. It does not mean that they can't be corrected or
- 19 that they can't be improved. It's just that there are
- 20 concerns. Now they are also not all of the concerns. If
- I were going to list and identify all of our concerns, my
- 22 two-hour presentation would extend to four hours and I
- don't think you want to hear that. I thought I heard a
- 24 ripple of laughter but I could be wrong.
- THE GOVERNOR: That was a groan, I think.

COMMISSIONER JANES: I just also want to tell you too that what I'm speaking about to you today is something our board has not formally acted upon. We are waiting until the meeting of November 15th to begin to look at this problem to have their staff make its presentation of what some of the issues are.

What I'm going to present to you today are six or seven issues that our staff has already identified. Now these are issues that should not be a surprise to

Mr. Kitson or to DEP or to anybody because I understand that our designee which is staff designee, Wayne Daltry, has communicated this several times. So they're not formal at the present time but they will be because the staff will be asking us to support them. Let me just indicate what they are.

Point one. Lee County supports the acquisition, preservation, conservation and management of as much land as is possible in one of southwest Florida's most outstanding areas of natural resources and wildlife habitat which we know is Babcock Ranch. Number two, Lee County supports the purchase of a 5000 acreage within Lee County's boundaries for \$40 million. We also reserve the right to negotiate with the seller on any property not sold to the State. We preserve -- we want to preserve that right.

| 1 | Thirdly, Lee County does not support using the |
|----|--|
| 2 | four-party interlocal agreement. However, we have no |
| 3 | problems allowing the buyer to consent to an application |
| 4 | for a comp plan amendment as long as it does not commit |
| 5 | Lee County to make the sale go through if it does not |
| 6 | fail. |
| 7 | THE GOVERNOR: Can you explain that? |
| 8 | COMMISSIONER JANES: Yes, I can. In other words, |
| 9 | what we're saying is if the deal doesn't go through, the |
| 10 | comp plan amendments are not approved, that ends it as far |
| 11 | as we're concerned, that's it. We're not pledged to |
| 12 | commit us to go through with a project if they can't get |
| 13 | the comp plan amendments through the normal process, the |
| 14 | regional planning council and things like that. Should be |
| 15 | nothing |
| 16 | THE GOVERNOR: And the four-party agreement does |
| 17 | allow them to |
| 18 | COMMISSIONER JANES: Well, they won't allow it. It |
| 19 | goes beyond that, Governor. It also talks about |
| 20 | developing the rural landship steward program which are |
| 21 | also not in favor of. As a matter of fact, that's the |
| 22 | fifth point, is that no rural land stewardship program is |
| 23 | going to take place on Lee County properties. |
| 24 | THE GOVERNOR: Will I'm sorry? |
| 25 | COMMISSIONER JANES: We do not support the use of the |

| 1 | rural land stewardship program in Lee County, the purchase |
|---|--|
| 2 | of land, the Babcock Ranch that's in Lee County. |

THE GOVERNOR: Is the agreement have that in it?

COMMISSIONER JANES: I believe it does. I don't know. We've not seen the agreement. We're going to be looking at it as it comes up. But anyway, we do not support it. I know that's what they want to encourage it. I understand, it looks like an attorney is coming up here to speak. Looks like what they want to talk about is if they're willing to go through the DRI process and not use a rural land stewardship program. And also No. 6, no wells on properties that the Lee County Board buys. No wells.

MR. KITSON: We agreed to those.

COMMISSIONER JANES: I know. I said, these are no surprises to you and shouldn't be to anybody here. And Lee County is not consenting to the agreement overturning the results of our county's challenge of the original Town and Country franchise. And the result of this is then, because we don't agree, that we may provide utility service to the ranch if we are better positioned to do so. Those are just some of the points that we feel are important that ought to bear consideration and careful and detailed thought.

Frankly, we're concerned that a critical piece of

Florida is hanging in the balance but the acquisition deal being proposed by Kitson and Partners in the state needs to be done right for the citizens of Florida, Lee County and Charlotte County. And what happens to the Babcock Ranch will have a tremendous effect on southwest Florida and the state itself and for future generations but we are gravely concerned that we must do this right. It's a complex, exceedingly complex, problem and we feel that we're being rushed through to a decision and there's really no need to be rushed through for a decision. It's complex, we need to get the answers to the questions, and hopefully we will. We have to have them before we'll be able to take any action on it. Thank you.

THE GOVERNOR: Thank you, Commissioner.

MS. CASTILLE: I'd like to get Ernie Cox up here to address the interlocal agreement. The interlocal agreement drafts have been available for more than a month and a number of people have them and have read them and gone over them. So, Ernie.

MR. COX: Governor, just briefly. Each of the points that Commissioner Janes has mentioned have been ably negotiated by the county attorney David Owen and, in fact, as late as yesterday, there was a revision being made to the interlocal agreement draft that incorporate those issues based upon David's negotiation. There is a meeting

| scheduled for tomorrow with the Lee County attorneys, the |
|---|
| Lee County staff, the Charlotte County attorneys, the |
| Charlotte County staff to finalize a draft. Be meeting |
| with Heidi Hughes later today, Department of Community |
| Affairs, and it will be presented for discussion and |
| hopefully a vote by the Lee County Commission at a public |
| hearing next Tuesday, the 15th. It will then be presented |
| to the Charlotte County Board for a vote on the 22nd. |
| |

THE GOVERNOR: Mr. Cox, could you explain to me one more time, I'm a little slow on this, the relationship between the four-party interlocal agreement and the purchase contract and how they interrelate?

MR. COX: Yes, Governor, I can. We have two different issues. The first is the purchase of the property and the retained rights and that is a Board of Trustees Internal Improvement Trust Fund role. On the other side, we have local planning decisions that would need to be made in a timetable. No local planning decisions have been made. But in order to have a format and a schedule, we've created an interparty local agreement that talks about how the governments will consider the applications that have been presented. Understand, the government cannot contract to agree to conference plan amendments.

So what we've done, Governor, is we have two

different -- actually, three different governmental

| 2 | entities that have to vote on this at public meetings. |
|----|--|
| 3 | And so what we have done is we have made each of the |
| 4 | agreements contingent upon the other, meaning if the |
| 5 | Governor and cabinet approve today, we'll go forward. And |
| 6 | if the local governments approve the interlocal agreement, |
| 7 | we'll go forward. If the local governments don't approve |
| 8 | the interlocal agreement, then the whole thing falls part. |
| 9 | THE GOVERNOR: Well, let's take it to the next step |
| 10 | after that which is that Lee County and Charlotte County |
| 11 | land use decisions have to be made. So there is a DRI in |
| 12 | Lee County as I understand it. And this overlay process |
| 13 | which would be in Charlotte County. So when does let's |
| 14 | say that Lee County says we're not going to give you the |
| 15 | density that you need to justify the price that you're |
| 16 | paying to the Babcock folks. Does Kitson and Company say, |
| 17 | Sorry, deal is off? |
| | |

MR. COX: That's the final step and the final contingency, Governor. The final contingency, and based upon this, we have two local governments with boards.

What we have done is in the context, and this is part of the negotiation between what Lee County might provide and what Charlotte County. Lee County is willing to provide \$40 million for the purchase. Charlotte County said, We don't have money, but we would be willing to have an

| 1 | expedited process to look at interim overlay amendments in |
|----|--|
| 2 | the comprehensive plan and zoning code. We're not going |
| 3 | to give you DRI approval because there's just not enough |
| 4 | time. But they have expedited the review of a |
| 5 | comprehensive plan amendment, Governor, which is scheduled |
| 6 | for transmittal hearing on December the 14th. We have |
| 7 | worked through a schedule with them and the Department of |
| 8 | Community Affairs such that by March of 2006 that |
| 9 | contingency would either be satisfied if they approve it |
| 10 | at public hearings or that contingency would not be |
| 11 | satisfied, in which case it would not go forward. It is |
| 12 | not contingent on Lee County at all from a governmental |
| 13 | approval perspective. |
| 14 | THE GOVERNOR: So their DRI process you'll close |
| 15 | on the property even if you don't get what you need. And |
| 16 | as it relates to Charlotte County, you've gotten a |
| 17 | commitment that you can get entitled, 18,000 units, |
| 18 | whatever it is, by March? I want to hire you. Maybe you |
| 19 | could work for Scripps. |
| 20 | (Laughter.) |
| 21 | Sore subject. Take it back. I recall that remark. |
| 22 | Is that really |
| 23 | MR. COX: Basically what we've done, Governor, it's |
| 24 | not to get a DRI approved in Charlotte County because that |
| 25 | will take more time. But the comprehensive plan and |

| 1 | zoning, there's a timetable that we believe can be met. |
|----|---|
| 2 | The commitment is to consider it within that timetable. |
| 3 | But obviously the decision will not be made until they've |
| 4 | had the full public hearing. But the timetable commitmen |
| 5 | has been made. And so we're kind of, as I explained to |
| 6 | Syd earlier, we're in the first playoff game of a |
| 7 | four-month single elimination playoff system and we have |
| 8 | to win all of our games. |
| 9 | THE GOVERNOR: That's a good analogy. Commissioner, |
| 10 | you wanted to add something? |
| 11 | COMMISSIONER DeBOER: Yes, I just want to again |
| 12 | reinforce that we have not agreed to anything at the |
| 13 | present time, nothing. |
| 14 | THE GOVERNOR: I understand. Just wanted to make |
| 15 | sure that everybody else understands. You need a formal |
| 16 | approval through your county commission. |
| 17 | COMMISSIONER DeBOER: Yes, sir. |
| 18 | THE GOVERNOR: We understand. Thank you for that |
| 19 | explanation. |
| 20 | MS. CASTILLE: We have two more, a senator and |
| 21 | representative who have joined us as well. Senator Burt |
| 22 | Saunders and Representative Machek. |
| 23 | THE GOVERNOR: Senator, welcome. |
| 24 | SENATOR SAUNDERS: Thank you very much, Governor and |
| 25 | cabinet members. I really appreciate the opportunity to |

| be here. I'm just going to say a couple of quick things. |
|--|
| First of all, this obviously is a very, very complex |
| transaction. I've been kind of involved in this from a |
| legislative standpoint for a little over a year. I filed |
| a bill last year that would have helped generate money for |
| the Babcock acquisition and I've got a bill this year to |
| do the same thing. So there is a vehicle there, assuming |
| that this moves forward. But what I really wanted to do |
| today is congratulate the Governor and cabinet for your |
| foresight in protecting areas in the state of Florida that |
| are critical for the future generations of Floridians and |
| this is one of those pieces of property. So I |
| congratulate you for your foresight and vision. |

I also want to congratulate and commend our staff.

When I say "our staff", I'm talking about the staff of the

Department of Environmental Protection and the other

agencies that have been involved in this because this

really has been a very difficult and very complex issue

and I'm proud to say that they've been able to bring it to

this point. And so I think they need to be publicly

commended for everything that they've done in that regard

and I'm looking for proceeding with this. Hopefully this

will be a successful acquisition and hopefully we'll be

able to preserve a very significant piece of property for

future generations of Floridians. Governor and cabinet, I

1 thank you for that.

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE GOVERNOR: Thank you, Senator. Thank you for being here.

Representative, would you like to speak?

REPRESENTATIVE MACHEK: Thank you, Governor and cabinet. You know, they quit making land a long time ago and it's an opportunity to preserve some of that which is still in its natural state. So I'm totally in favor of this purchase if we can get it worked out. My problem with the whole thing is the management. I notice that every operation on that ranch is cattle, timber, sod, nursery, apiary and others but yet the Department of Agriculture who oversees all those functions in the state of Florida are not at the table to be in charge of a lot of this. And it's kind of hard to believe that Fish and Wildlife and others, which they're good, they're great people and they do a great job but I didn't know they were in the cattle business or in the sod business or things like that and I'm just concerned that we may let a function of the Department of Agriculture get away from us on a project of this size and I didn't know if somewhere along the line DEP would be considering giving the Department of Agriculture the role that they deserve in the purchase of this property and that's my main concern and I'd like to have that aired out a little bit if we

- THE GOVERNOR: Representative, Commissioner Bronson

 has been holding back and that's one of his questions. So
- 4 it will be discussed.
- 5 REPRESENTATIVE MACHEK: Good. I was hoping I'd bring 6 him out.
- 7 COMMISSIONER BRONSON: You didn't have to bring me 8 out. I've been sitting on the fence --
- 9 MS. CASTILLE: Do you want to talk about that now?

 10 THE GOVERNOR: No, let's get some speakers going.
- Whenever the commissioner wants to speak about it, he has every right to just take the microphone.
- MS. CASTILLE: Okay. I want to let people know that

 Mr. Jack Peoples is here to answer any questions. He's

 representing the Babcock family. And if you remember,

 Governor, he and Wade Hopping were the ones who came to

 visit you approximately five years ago to start working on

 a very similar project.
- 19 THE GOVERNOR: Welcome, Mr. Peoples.
- 20 MS. CASTILLE: And we have a couple of our water
 21 management district board members here, the chairman,
 22 Mr. Kevin McCarty is here. And I'd like -- is Kevin in
 23 the room? And I'd like him to come up and say a few words
 24 and also Mike Collins.
- THE GOVERNOR: They don't have to speak if they don't

| 1 | | |
|---|------|------|
| I | want | 1 () |
| | | |

2 MS. CASTILLE: Okay. They don't have to speak if they don't want to.

THE GOVERNOR: Carol, would you like to speak? I
mean, you've been nodding your head once in awhile and
shaking it a few times. I'm just curious to know,
anything here that relates to your responsibilities that
you'd like to, on the record, state?

MS. WHELE: Yes. For the record, my name is Carol Whele, the executive director of the South Florida Water Management District and I do have two of my board members here today. And I especially want to make sure that I accurately reflect the dialog and the concerns of the governing board as expressed at the South Florida Water Management District governing board meeting last Wednesday.

THE GOVERNOR: Okay.

MS. WHELE: And Colleen did come down. Secretary

Castille gave a very thorough presentation on this

acquisition and we really appreciated her coming down and
sharing all of that information with the governing board.

I think there are a lot of misperceptions that she had the
opportunity to correct but there were still some issues
outstanding that the governing board wanted me to express
to you-all in terms of water.

First, I'd like to say we are very excited about the opportunity to put this land in the public trust. The South Florida Water Management District spends 100 percent of its money these days on buying land for projects for Everglades restoration and Kissimmee restoration and haven't, for awhile, been in a position to do these wonderful preservation acquisitions such as the other water management districts and what a great opportunity this is.

I wanted to share with you what the actual permits were on this property and what some of the concerns are of the South Florida governing board. First, in 1979, and renewed in 1988, there is a permit that was issued to the Babcock Florida Corporation. There is 66.58 MGD, that's million gallons per day that's been issued for the purposes of pasture on a little over 14,000 acres, 7.19 million gallons a day that was issued on 4,615 acres for the purposes of small vegetables.

This permit is a total of 73.7 million gallons a day. All of the permits in the South Florida Water Management District are in the process of being renewed. The new rules of the South Florida Water Management District have the renewal based on actual usage, not previous permitted usage. As of today, the actual usage that has been demonstrated to us, but we're still in the process of

| negotiating on this permit, is somewhere between 20 and |
|---|
| 30 million gallons a day, all for the purposes of |
| agricultural usage. As of today, there is no permit that |
| has been issued specifically to the utility. So the |
| utility has no permit. And if you remember, the permit is |
| for agricultural uses. |

There are three different scenarios that are being contemplated here today in terms of future water use. A consumptive use permit is very different than the actual water use permit for agriculture. We calculate the withdrawal on a very different basis because we do assume that some of that water goes back into the aquifer. It's not a usage that is removed from the property. The three scenarios that we have will be a consumptive use permit that will be required for the purposes of providing water to the actual residents on this property. That will be a straightforward consumptive use permit and we will consider all normal considerations in the process of issuing that consumptive use permit to the utility. And I'll talk about some of the resource issues that we have to consider after I do this.

The second scenario will be a consumptive use permit that will be looked at very differently than the consumptive use permit for the residences on the site of this property. If water is contemplated being brought

from the Babcock Ranch, be it a public or private utility, that water, if it goes from the Babcock Ranch to be used in other areas of Charlotte County, what we have are two different water management districts. Now this is not an interdistrict transfer because in the interdistrict transfer language in the state statute there is an exemption when you're transferring within two water management districts in the same county. But there is a higher public interest test that the applicant will have to meet for the purposes of bringing water from the South Florida Water Management District into the Southwest test will be a policy consideration of the governing board of the South Florida Water Management District.

The third scenario is if there is any kind of an arrangement that is made to bring water to Lee County.

Now, Lee County and Charlotte County, the Babcock area, are both in the same water management district. But transferring from one county to the other will be a consideration of local sources first. And before that transfer would be allowed, there would have to be due diligence made on the part of Lee County to show that Lee County did not have the wherewithal to provide water resources within its own county before it was able to bring water from Charlotte County.

| The resource issues are going to be probably |
|--|
| intuitive for the very reason that we're buying the |
| Babcock Ranch or contemplating buying the Babcock Ranch, |
| those same resources that we want to protect are resources |
| that we want to protect during the consumptive use |
| permitting process. And what we're going to ask the |
| applicant to do is due diligence in making sure that any |
| withdrawal, both the quantity and the pumpage rate of the |
| withdrawal allowed from this property will do no harm to |
| users outside this property. And we do have a lot of |
| agricultural uses outside of this property that rely on |
| consumptive use as well as making sure that we don't have |
| any negative impact to the wetlands that are on site and |
| we also have to make sure that we take into consideration |
| the flows coming off this property. |

For those of you that aren't aware, a minimum flow and level has been established for the Caloosahatchee River. The Caloosahatchee River during the summer months, as Lee County knows very well, we have some very serious issues in not having enough flow into the Caloosahatchee River. So we'd also have to make sure that the consumptive use permit does no harm to the minimum flow and level of the Caloosahatchee River.

I'm not going to comment on the withdraw that we think will come off this property. It's extremely

inappropriate to do so because we are the permitting
agency and it will definitely be done on a fact basis.

But these are issues that will have to be addressed in the permitting.

The other thing I wanted you to know is that the governing board of the South Florida Water Management District definitely prefers the \$24,000 or the land lease as opposed to the fee per thousand. We just feel that that is a precedent that we would rather not establish and would encourage you to look at the lease as opposed to the fee for water.

The other is a public policy issue that I wanted to share with you. When details of the Babcock negotiations became public over the last two weeks, the South Florida Water Management District has received several phone calls from large property owners. The question they have asked that we have not answered specifically to them is, If I go to the Public Service Commission and get a certificate for a utility and I get a consumptive use permit, can I sell my water too. And that is, I believe, a public policy issue that transcends the South Florida Water Management District. I believe it's an issue that we are in a position today that if a large agricultural landowner did want to go to the Public Service Commission and get a utility certificate and had a consumptive use permit, is

| 1 | that the way that we want to be providing water to the |
|----|--|
| 2 | cities and to the counties in this state. Above my pay |
| 3 | grade, but I do think it is a public policy question that |
| 4 | needs to be discussed and debated and deliberated on |
| 5 | because this is a trend, I think, that will continue in |
| 6 | the future. And with that, I'm available for any |
| 7 | questions you may have. |
| 8 | THE GOVERNOR: Carol, the property first of all, |
| 9 | your consumptive use process, and you're absolutely |
| 10 | correct not to prejudge how that process goes, has nothing |
| 11 | to do with this contract. It is not contingent |
| 12 | MS. WHELE: Well, what we have |
| 13 | THE GOVERNOR: You don't have to favorably, in the |
| 14 | minds of the seller of this property to us, you don't have |
| 15 | to favorably |
| 16 | MS. WHELE: It is our understanding from |
| 17 | conversations that we've had with Charlotte County, that |
| 18 | there may be some kind of an arrangement that is being |
| 19 | negotiated in exchange for a certain quantity of water |
| 20 | that is tied up with the comp plan amendment changes and |
| 21 | the density increases. And I just so if those two |
| 22 | agreements are linked, then the answer is |
| 23 | THE GOVERNOR: That's a separate link. I'm talking |
| 24 | about the link between your process and the purchase of |
| | |

25 this property.

| | 113 |
|----|--|
| 1 | MS. WHELE: Absolutely. Those are independent. |
| 2 | THE GOVERNOR: And, secondly, there is water |
| 3 | irrespective of what happens in that interlocal four-party |
| 4 | agreement. The structure, as you see it, of this deal |
| 5 | protects the water on the 72,000 acres. |
| 6 | MS. WHELE: The new language as proposed by the |
| 7 | Department of Environmental Protection, we feel, is very |
| 8 | protective of the consumptive use permitting process and |
| 9 | we feel that there would be more protection afforded to |
| 10 | the resource if you entered into the fee in terms of a |
| 11 | lease as opposed to the 20 cents per thousand gallons. |
| 12 | THE GOVERNOR: Okay. That doesn't quite answer my |
| 13 | question. Maybe Colleen can answer it. |
| 14 | MS. CASTILLE: There's absolutely no link between the |
| 15 | consumptive use permit process and the contract |
| 16 | THE GOVERNOR: No, I got that. That part, I got |
| 17 | clear. It's the second part which relates to the fact |
| 18 | that assume for a moment that the utility does get a |
| 19 | consumptive use permit for a lot of water and there is a |
| 20 | minimum is there adequate protections to make sure that |
| 21 | the water resource for the 72,000 acres stays on the |
| 22 | property so as to protect it? I mean, we're buying |
| 23 | something because it's got a lot of water on it. We're |

24 not buying it to mine it to sell it to water-hungry

coastal southwest Florida.

| | 114 |
|----|--|
| 1 | MS. WHELE: The consumptive use permitting process of |
| 2 | the South Florida Water Management District allows no harm |
| 3 | to the resource in the process of allowing withdrawals. |
| 4 | So, yes, the resource will take precedent and it will be |
| 5 | protected. |
| 6 | THE GOVERNOR: Thank you. Treasurer. |
| 7 | CFO GALLAGHER: Here's if we had some land that's |
| 8 | State-owned, which we have a lot of, and somebody wanted |
| 9 | to get water from it and for some reason we, as the State |
| 10 | trustee, said okay, what would be the process? They'd |
| 11 | have to come let's say it's in your district. |
| 12 | MS. WHELE: They would have to do due diligence in |
| 13 | providing the technical information and they would have to |
| 14 | submit a request for a consumptive use permit from the |
| 15 | Water Management District regardless of which district it |
| 16 | was in. |
| 17 | MS. CASTILLE: And they'd have to come to the Board |
| 18 | of Trustees to seek a change in the management plan for |
| 19 | the property. |
| 20 | CFO GALLAGHER: Right. And would we charge them for |
| 21 | that? Would we charge them for a well site? Would we |
| 22 | charge them for so much water? What would we do? |
| 23 | MS. WHELE: That's the public policy question that |
| 24 | you're deliberating on today. |
| | |

MS. CASTILLE: I'd like everybody to bring their

| 1 | concerns to the table and then at the end, I'd like to |
|----|---|
| 2 | deal with everybody's concerns all at once on water, on |
| 3 | management, on the future of the consumptive use |
| 4 | permitting and on the interdistrict transfers |
| 5 | CFO GALLAGHER: That isn't going to work because I'm |
| 6 | going to forget what I asked you by then. |
| 7 | MS. CASTILLE: Okay. |
| 8 | CFO GALLAGHER: What would we do? |
| 9 | MS. CASTILLE: I have to agree with Carol. That's |
| 10 | the process that we're here today. What I'm bringing you |
| 11 | today is the only option that we have for buying the |
| 12 | Babcock Ranch. I don't want this to be a precedent. It |
| 13 | is not the first time that we have water being taken off |
| 14 | of State property. We have two State parks that have |
| 15 | existing wells in them. One, Jonathan Dickinson State |
| 16 | Park. And, two, Bald Point State Park. Bald Point |
| 17 | provides water to the Alligator Point water resources and |
| 18 | the Jonathan Dickinson provides to the city of Jupiter |
| 19 | Tequesta. |
| 20 | CFO GALLAGHER: All right. And what is the deal on |
| 21 | those? |
| 22 | MS. CASTILLE: And we charge nothing for that. |
| 23 | CFO GALLAGHER: Okay. So they can come in and get i |
| 24 | for nothing. |

MS. CASTILLE: It was existing when we purchased the

| 1 | property. |
|----|---|
| 2 | CFO GALLAGHER: And the end users, City of Tequesta, |
| 3 | charges their users what it costs them to get it to them, |
| 4 | I would gather. |
| 5 | MS. CASTILLE: All the appropriate costs that are |
| 6 | allowed to be charged and |
| 7 | CFO GALLAGHER: Is it a private water company or is |
| 8 | it a city water company? |
| 9 | MS. CASTILLE: City for Tequesta and private for |
| 10 | Alligator Point. |
| 11 | CFO GALLAGHER: Let's look at Alligator Point then. |
| 12 | It's a private company that takes water from the Bald |
| 13 | Point State Park, pumps it over to the users and charges |
| 14 | them and makes a profit out of it. |
| 15 | MS. CASTILLE: Yes. |
| 16 | CFO GALLAGHER: And pays the State |
| 17 | MS. CASTILLE: Nothing. |
| 18 | CFO GALLAGHER: Zip. How long weren't those |
| 19 | already there when the State bought them? |
| 20 | MS. CASTILLE: Yes. |
| 21 | CFO GALLAGHER: Okay. So that's why we made that |
| 22 | agreement, to let them continue pumping? |
| 23 | MS. CASTILLE: Correct. But what we're doing is |
| 24 | Mr. Kitson has every intention of deciding where these |

wells are and holding back the property for -- on

| 1 | ownership where the wells are going to be. So he's buying |
|---|---|
| 2 | the property between the time we purchase between now |
| 3 | and the time that we purchase the property. So even |
| 4 | though the time frame is shortened, he is still going to |
| 5 | be the owner of record for a period of time and will only |
| 6 | sell to us that land with an exception for those well |
| 7 | areas. |

THE GOVERNOR: Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER BRONSON: I think the idea of just waiting until the end is starting to fade here. There's too many questions coming up. My big point on water was I do not want to get into a prolonged battle over water rights issues, western water law, all the things that everybody fears on water rights issues and especially since we have a system set up in the state of Florida. The one concern I had is if you're going to keep an agricultural and other use application which is already -- and I don't know how far into the -- you give a 20-year permit for that use, how far into the 20-year permitting they are.

MS. WHELE: We're in renewal.

COMMISSIONER BRONSON: You're in renewal now.

MS. WHELE: So it will be at the beginning. But remember, it's for agricultural use.

25 COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Right. And there is competing

| use. I don't care how anybody wants to cut this thing. |
|---|
| And when you've got a deeper well next to your neighbor |
| |
| and you pump a lot more than your neighbor does, your |
| neighbor, sooner or later, is going to be shooting sand |
| out of those because that happens all over the state and |
| has happened before, especially in dry times. So I know |
| the water issues have to be worked out to be able and |
| especially for the kind of commitment that Mr. Kitson has |
| on this developable property that he has and what's going |
| to happen to the rest of the state-owned property in the |
| process. But I don't want us to get off into a water |
| situation where we're going to spend years in court |
| fighting over water law and that concerns me that we've |
| got this worked out from that situation. And I happen to |
| believe that how you cut up all this chopped liver before |
| you get to the end result which everybody would love to |
| save 74,000 acres of Florida. I want to make sure we have |
| a fiduciary responsibility to do it the right way and ${\tt I'm}$ |
| very concerned about it, that we do it the right way. And |
| the water policy issues with the water management district |
| crossing lines, local sources first which I fought for in |
| the Senate, all those things are going to be met. And |
| that's the only way to make sure that there is some type |
| of protection here and selling water at 20 cents a gallon |
| anywhere is not the way, in my opinion, to do this simply |

| 1 | because now we get closer to western water law to some |
|----|--|
| 2 | degree. And, I think, as I remember, and I'm not an |
| 3 | attorney, there's probably about 50 sitting out there. |
| 4 | But the point is, I think under Florida law, as I |
| 5 | remember, the water is free. It's the delivery of the |
| 6 | water that you pay for. So we don't want to get into a |
| 7 | per gallon anywhere situation and then you have bidders. |
| 8 | And, of course, Miami and certain areas can outbid other |
| 9 | areas because they have more people. And we just don't |
| 10 | want to do that. So I want to make sure that we're |
| 11 | correct here on our water policy issues and the way the |
| 12 | law is written that we're not going to transcend any |
| 13 | potential problems for water. |

THE GOVERNOR: I think the change to the easement idea is a reflection of that, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER BRONSON: And I haven't seen anything written down on paper. I mean, I hope we're going to see something that says all of this is written down and ready to be signed in agreement simply because as much as I believe that everybody here means well, it's how it's worded in the end as we all know and whether it's signed off on. And we're being asked to, up front, for the good of nature and wildlife and so forth to put a lot of money out there to buy 74,000 acres for the State, that we're not caught holding the bag. And I don't think anybody

| really intends for us to do that, but Mr. Kitson is a very |
|--|
| good negotiator and from what I can see, he negotiated a |
| pretty good deal from his standpoint. I'm not too sure |
| yet that it's a real good deal for us but that's what I'm |
| trying to get at. |

MS. WHELE: Commissioner Bronson, the reason I went through the three scenarios is because I believe in the contract it does say that the utility has the right in its order to sell water to Charlotte County, Lee County, and there's a list of five. And I just wanted to share with you that other than providing water to the actual development, that there were policy considerations selling to Charlotte County. Local sources first was the policy consideration, selling to Lee, because it was in the contract and I just --

COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Well, that was my point,

Governor, is I saw things in there that says all this is

going to take place and I don't think there's any kind of

permitting that I can see from the water management

district that says that's allowable yet.

MS. CASTILLE: It's all based on water management district decisions. Can I make a short presentation on water and bring all the issues out on the table about water?

25 CFO GALLAGHER: Yeah, but I want to also just make

| 1 | public, it's something that's bothering me, because I |
|----|---|
| 2 | think you-all ought to at least hear it. If we're willing |
| 3 | to buy the 74,000 acres and there is a value in the water |
| 4 | there, I understand the part Mr. Kitson keeps and he keeps |
| 5 | the wells he has and has a water company and all, that's |
| 6 | fine. But now we have a huge area and we have possibly |
| 7 | some municipalities or others that need the water. I just |
| 8 | think that the delivery of that water that's coming from |
| 9 | the land that we're spending \$300 million for, ought to be |
| 10 | some kind of a public nonprofit delivery system. Instead |
| 11 | of all of a sudden building up in a huge worth of |
| 12 | something that we're basically, in my opinion, paying for. |
| 13 | MS. CASTILLE: Well, water delivery in the state of |
| 14 | Florida is done by two entities. It's done by public |
| 15 | water facilities and it's done very limitedly by |
| 16 | private generally not-for-profit companies. But as we |
| 17 | all know, there is some profit involved in a |
| 18 | not-for-profit company. Mr. Kitson has said that after he |
| 19 | goes through, he's got all the funding lined up to |
| 20 | support, depending on if he gets a consumptive use permit, |
| 21 | to support the development of a water and sewer facility. |
| 22 | So he's got it all lined up. All ready to go. All ready |
| 23 | to construct. And typically what happens with a private |
| 24 | industry is they do that very same thing and then they |
| 25 | sell it to a local government. You know, makes it they |

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

put the capital cost up front and then the cost of the -
and then the sale of the facility is done on a public

basis.

CFO GALLAGHER: And I understand that. But I feel like we're given the resource and obviously he's putting capital in, I don't have any problem with that, obviously. And then using the resource that we have just, in my opinion bought, that's what's making this -- there's two things in it, one, the amount of capital put in to make the resource available by pumping it and the other is the resource itself. And what I'm trying to do here is if we're going to put all this money up and he's going to put the money up for the capital obviously, they need a return on their capital, I understand that. What I'm concerned about is the cost of water down the road goes way, way up, which because of the value of the water, the price of the entity that we sort of funded goes above and beyond the cost and a reasonable profit there in setting up the facility.

MS. CASTILLE: That's not how the Public Service

Commission approves its rates. And I have John Williams

here from the Public Service Commission who can tell you

about the rate structure, the rate structure that's

approved already for the utility, \$2.47 per 1,000 gallons

and 50 cents per 1,000 gallons for raw water. The other

| 1 | one is to potable water and raw water. And then very |
|---|--|
| 2 | similar to the utilities, to the electric utilities, there |
| 3 | is an allowable profit that's built in there. And, John, |
| 4 | if you want to come up and explain that. |

MR. WILLIAMS: Hello, I'm John Williams on the staff of the Florida Public Service Commission. The applicant, Babcock Ranch, came to the PSC in 1999 and applied for a certificate of authorization to provide water service in Charlotte and Lee County. A part of the application process is they noticed both Charlotte and Lee Counties, the DEP, the water management districts. Initially Charlotte and Lee County both objected to the application and it was scheduled to go to hearing. Eventually, a settlement agreement was reached with both Lee County and Charlotte where they withdrew their objections to this entity getting the certificate to operate.

Basically what it is is it is a license to provide water for compensation. They still have to go to the water management district for consumptive use permits.

They have to go to DEP to get the health and safety factors considered on potable water issues. But the piece we do at the PSC is basically approving the charges because it's a private entity. Therefore, state law has that it should be regulated since it's a monopoly provision of service.

| Their service area was their entire property. What |
|--|
| they said in 1999 was they were currently providing |
| service both to agricultural entities as well as to |
| certain facilities on their property and that they plan to |
| develop property in the future. So in this application |
| were approved both agricultural rates for wells to provide |
| agriculture and potable water rates for treated water |
| served to communities that were to be built on the |
| properties in the future. And they got a bulk rate |
| approved for sale at their boundaries that they a part |
| of the settlement agreements with Lee and Charlotte |
| Counties was at some point in the future they may sell |
| water, bulk water, nontreated water at their boundaries. |
| And the rate, we did approve 20 cents per thousand |
| gallons as a royalty fee because the parent company, |
| Babcock Ranch, was going to own the land where the wells |
| were. And we came up with that rate was based on what was |
| the value of the property that was going to be used for |
| well facilities and what was a fair return on that |
| property. And we did approve a calculation in the rates. |
| Built into the rates we approved was to provide a normal |
| return as if the utility bought the land in 1999 and got |
| to earn a return, a fair return on that investment through |
| the life of the utility. |
| |

CFO GALLAGHER: And so we're all sitting around

| 1 | worried about somebody charging 20 cents per 1,000 gallons |
|----|--|
| 2 | when they already got a deal to charge 20 cents per |
| 3 | 1,000 gallons. So what's the water management district |
| 4 | have to say about that? |
| 5 | MS. WHELE: We understand the Public Service |
| 6 | Commission, in negotiating these rates with private |
| 7 | utilities, allow for a royalty fee to be charged. The |
| 8 | issue that the water management district has is the use of |
| 9 | public dollars to buy public land for a public purpose and |
| 10 | then charging for the value of water. They are charging a |
| 11 | royalty based on investment. In the state of Florida, |
| 12 | water belongs to the citizens of the state of Florida. |
| 13 | And I think that even the Legislature and the cabinet for |
| 14 | years have defended the right that water isn't to be |
| 15 | charged for. What you charge for is the treatment, the |
| 16 | distribution, the delivery of water. You don't charge for |
| 17 | the water itself. |
| 18 | CFO GALLAGHER: What are they doing? |
| 19 | MS. WHELE: They are charging a royalty based on |
| 20 | MR. WILLIAMS: The value of the land where the well |
| 21 | is. |
| 22 | MS. WHELE: And they do it per thousand. But they're |
| 23 | not charging for the water. It's a rate for the value of |
| 24 | the land that they calculated and maybe it was unfortunate |
| 25 | that they attached the 20 cents per 1,000 gallon but it |

1 was not for the water, it was for the land.

CFO GALLAGHER: So the bottom line is the land is worth what you at the water management district say it's worth. Because if you let them put 200,000 gallons out a minute, boy, that's worth a lot. You only tell them they can put out 500 gallons a week, then it's not worth very much. So how are you doing what the land is worth?

MS. WHELE: You're absolutely right and I think we're talking about two different issues. The value of the land is the value of the land. And the ability to take water off of that land is a separate water supply water use issue that usually does not attach to the value of the land.

up here are having a problem with in regards to -- I mean, I like the idea he's going to develop it nicely. I think it's great that we're going to take some of this land and preserve it. It's just, you know, this isn't the beginning of water wars. We've had them since the -- well, before I was around. Yeah, that long. And it's going to get worse, not better. So this is a really, to me, a very, very important issue to get solidified before we move ahead and maybe in a different way than you-all are you solidifying it.

25 THE GOVERNOR: Can I make a suggestion? May I

| 1 | suggest that we take a five-minute break for the court |
|----|--|
| 2 | reporter and the Governor? |
| 3 | (Brief recess.) |
| 4 | THE GOVERNOR: Could I have everybody's attention, |
| 5 | please? Thank you. Colleen? |
| 6 | MS. CASTILLE: Yes, sir. |
| 7 | THE GOVERNOR: You want to continue? |
| 8 | MS. CASTILLE: I do. I imagine that we do we want |
| 9 | to keep talking about water where we took the break or do |
| 10 | we want to take speakers? |
| 11 | CFO GALLAGHER: Well, I had a chance to have a little |
| 12 | discussion about some of the things that I think were |
| 13 | causing all the water discussion. And I think |
| 14 | Mr. Kitson's or his utility expert might want to present |
| 15 | to us what they think might take care of people sitting up |
| 16 | here is the water problem. |
| 17 | MR. SUNDSTROM: Governor and cabinet, my name is Bill |
| 18 | Sundstrom. I'm representing Mr. Kitson for water utility |
| 19 | issues. We've reached an understanding which we'll be |
| 20 | glad to build into the contract to address |
| 21 | THE GOVERNOR: Well, you haven't reached tell us |
| 22 | what you're proposing. There's no understanding here. |
| 23 | MR. SUNDSTROM: Governor, I'm sorry. We've reached |
| 24 | an understanding among ourselves how we would address |
| 25 | THE GOVERNOR: Okay. That's fine. |

| 1 | MR. SUNDSTROM: Excuse me very much. How we'd |
|----|---|
| 2 | address Mr. Gallagher's concern. And that is as we would |
| 3 | bifurcate the valuation of the utility, that's the value |
| 4 | of the assets that are on or crossing state land that |
| 5 | would be sold at the time the utility is sold at cost. |
| 6 | MR. KITSON: So let me be more specific. So for the |
| 7 | water utility and the utilities on our retained |
| 8 | properties, they will be our responsibility to build and |
| 9 | when we sell them, we'll sell them to the public but at |
| 10 | whatever price that can be agreed to. For that on the |
| 11 | State land and then water that is delivered to the |
| 12 | counties or for any other public use, it would be then |
| 13 | sold to the public at cost. |
| 14 | THE GOVERNOR: Sold at cost. |
| 15 | MR. KITSON: So we would take the responsibility |
| 16 | still of putting in the infrastructure but it would be at |
| 17 | cost. |
| 18 | COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Governor, could I make a |
| 19 | comment on this? |
| 20 | THE GOVERNOR: Yes. |
| 21 | COMMISSIONER BRONSON: This is one of my sticking |
| 22 | points, I guess. I was confused on which of the wells |
| 23 | that are on the property that you're going to be able to |
| 24 | keep and build on and the infrastructure of the facility |
| 25 | would be on, is the way I understood it. But I was under |

the understanding that the majority of the water and the piped water would come off of the State land that the State would purchase fee simple, which in all other purchases the water under it and everything else, all the resources that are there, belong to the State at the time of that fee simple purchase and that's where I was having a problem.

If you were going to pump water out of a well, that's kind of like saying, Well, you know, we'll put up an oil well in Alaska and pump it about 30 miles across the line into Russia and pump all their oil out from under them.

I'm a little concerned about how that water is going to transfer from state land through this process and then the whole aspect of selling the water that's actually coming off of state land through that system. And that's what had me concerned.

MR. KITSON: Yeah, I think that solves that problem because we're literally, for our development, we don't need to use State land for our development. We put the wells right on our own property. And the 75 wells that we've been proposing on the State land essentially will be used for sources outside, the commitments we've made to the counties.

THE GOVERNOR: But if it's at your cost, what's the advantage of investing 100 million bucks to build all this

| 1 | infrastructure then you're transferring it to Charlotte |
|---|---|
| 2 | and Lee, I guess. |

MR. KITSON: That's a great question. And the reason is is because it was an important part of the deal for the counties, particularly Charlotte County.

THE GOVERNOR: Why don't we look at doing this. This is a horrible way to negotiate an incredibly complex real estate deal, by the way. Four guys, you know, in a public gathering. The public part is good but this is complex and we need to be very careful we don't make commitments that haven't been thought through completely.

But if you have -- why not if you have enough water on the 18,000 acres or whatever the amount is that you want to keep to build your beautiful development, why not be done with it? Allow us to deal with the water issues on the rest of the property?

MR. KITSON: Well, I think that would be a problem for Charlotte County. I think part of the deal with Charlotte County has been, and they stated from day one how important this water was to them. And not so much Lee County, I can't really -- that's been a little less clear. But on the Charlotte County side, they said from day one that this has been an important part of what they've done. We have this utility that we've paid for as part of our purchase price and therefore we've committed from the

| 1 | beginning to supply them with that water. Now separating |
|---|--|
| 2 | this out now and eventually selling them that utility I |
| 3 | think could probably flow pretty well because they would |
| 4 | ultimately, whether it be Charlotte County, Lee County, or |
| 5 | them together, however that would work, they would have |
| 6 | those rights. |

THE GOVERNOR: Well, it seems like, you know, there is -- the big elephant in the room here is the water deal that you've struck has value that you're using to make this whole thing work and everybody --

MR. KITSON: Right.

THE GOVERNOR: And when you said you made a mistake when you said what the value was, I think you were honest. I think you were being accurate. Whether it's the transmission of water that has value or the water itself, I'll leave that for the legal people and all that. Water has value, come on. Call it -- even the transmission for a gallon of it, there is value. And you're using that value to make this deal work.

MR. KITSON: And I only get 60 percent of it too.

And remember that. So a part of everything we do, we have to look at what we actually get. Because of the C corp, we only get 60 percent of the revenues.

CFO GALLAGHER: Well, let me try to look at this in a different way. I don't think any of us up here have a

problem with the land that you retain, that you have a water company on and that you pump for the use that you get a consumptive use from the water management district and that's all well and good. I don't think any of us have a problem with it, that's how you do a development.

Now we talk about the water that other counties think they may need down the road and they're holding you up for it maybe. I won't say they're doing it for sure but it sounds like it. I'll speak for this member of the cabinet. If there was a need for water by a county or a city and they could not get it somewhere else, I believe that they could come to us and we would probably allow them to take the water because that's -- I mean, it's public land and it's just going to flow somewhere else if they didn't get to use something. So I wouldn't have a problem with doing that. They'd have the responsibility, obviously, of paying for it, getting it there, and all the other stuff. We wouldn't pay anything. Might not even charge them anything. I don't know, we may.

But that was a small land lease for if they ran across it or something probably. So those being said, if you were the one that was going to facilitate that for them, you know, that would be okay too because somebody is going to have to do it. I think the issue we're having here is that nobody has shown us the necessity of taking

| 1 | water off of there for those counties at this point. |
|---|--|
| 2 | There may be a point where it's needed but pretty much |
| 3 | today, nobody really thinks it is. So and I don't mind |
| 4 | you making the deal when they need it that you'll put it |
| 5 | in for them, that's okay too. But I think we're |
| 6 | uncomfortable with basically giving away the water that we |
| 7 | sort of are buying, especially when you don't need it for |
| 8 | what you're doing. |

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So what I would suggest at this point is I think you're getting close to what makes some sense. The Governor is right. This is not easy. It is complicated. We have counties that are involved in it too. And I would like the rest of the deal, you know, you're getting real specific in some of the stuff. We're not as wishy washy as when we started. There's more specifics to get done. And I would suggest that we get these specifics done along with the water and with the counties recognizing you're going to get water from us if you show you have a need. And I don't even mind that being in there. But we're certainly not going to just pump water off there when there is no need.

MR. KITSON: I think -- and I can't speak for the counties, obviously. But I think if they knew that commitment was there, that same commitment that I was giving to them was there, that that would solve their

| _ | |
|---|-------------|
| 1 | problem. |
| _ | DI ODICIII. |

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 2 THE GOVERNOR: Well, let's try to work on that in the 3 next couple of weeks in this infamous four-party 4 interlocal agreement.
- 5 MR. KITSON: Okay.
- 6 THE GOVERNOR: I mean, because that would --
- 7 CFO GALLAGHER: I move that we hold this up until the 8 November 22nd meeting, get all these details worked out, 9 bring it back to us.
- 10 THE GOVERNOR: General?

MR. KITSON: Rather than do that because I truly do have an issue internally on a delay. If we could specifically talk about what it is we're agreeing to do and then have that four-party agreement -- I think that's a great idea because that is a place where it could be -- from here, I could take it right to the four-party agreement which is going to be voted on a week from today and then -- in Lee County. And then two weeks from today in Charlotte County. I'm going to know in two weeks whether this all works.

But I think it can be fairly simple, if we're agreeing that through that agreement if they want water, if they're going to be coming through the state to make that happen and they're willing to agree to that, I think that's something that we could, on the record, state and

1 amend a contract to reflect that.

CFO GALLAGHER: Well, I know it might not fit you internally. But I think for me, I can only speak for myself, go get those four-party agreements done, bring them back and then we'll agree to buy the property. I mean, I'm real uncomfortable doing it the other way around.

THE GOVERNOR: Yes, General.

ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: I think where we are is, you know, the conservationist in all of us wants to do this in order to preserve Florida Forever. But I think the competing strong interest as well is we have a trustee obligation to make sure that when we go forward and make one of these acquisitions we do it in the best interest of the people and that's the difficulty, I think, that you're sensing with the cabinet today is we want to make sure we do what's right while we conserve Florida for future generations and we're just not sure we're there, I think, is the sense of it.

COMMISSIONER BRONSON: About the water issue, which is very important to me, as you know, but there are some other issues here that I was concerned about in this management plan issue and I think you heard the representative, he hit it on the head. All he did was look at the list and saw what was there. And we haven't

| even heard from the ranch manager that's here about the |
|--|
| cattle and the acreage and so forth. But you've got |
| thousands and thousands of acres of agricultural property |
| where timber and cattle, nursery, sod, all these things |
| that fall under the Department of Agriculture oversight |
| and I don't think I remember anybody from my office being |
| at the table to discuss all this stuff. And while I think |
| the Fish and Wildlife Commission does an exemplary job of |
| protecting Florida's wildlife and natural resources from |
| that standpoint, I think there needs to be some discussion |
| here about those management issues, we manage timber, we |
| manage, we look oversight of cattle and all these other |
| issues out there and especially since people are using the |
| Department of Agriculture's best management practices all |
| over the state for the production of cattle and other |
| commodities, I think we need to talk about this management |
| component on the rest of this as we go into this |
| discussion about the water. |
| |

CFO GALLAGHER: Every ten years?

COMMISSIONER BRONSON: For ten years, that's my understanding. They've got it the first ten years and then it's turned over to this -- and I saw this board and I'm not sure who this board is going to be.

24 THE GOVERNOR: Let's let Colleen explain it to you.

MS. CASTILLE: The management -- hold on, let me get

| 1 | my paper. The management of the ranch will continue with |
|----|--|
| 2 | a management agreement that's an interim management |
| 3 | agreement with the Babcock Ranch and Kitson as Kitson |
| 4 | owns it. We are it's a 5-year period, two 5-year |
| 5 | periods of time. And in the interim, we have about an |
| 6 | 18-month process where all of us all of the agencies |
| 7 | will get together with the public, with it's a public |
| 8 | process on deciding how the land should be managed. But |
| 9 | the contract will and then the contract will be amended |
| 10 | with Kitson and Partners to reflect the management plan |
| 11 | that's been decided upon and that we would bring back to |
| 12 | this board. |
| 13 | CFO GALLAGHER: Aren't we going to decide as the |
| 14 | trustees of the Internal Improvement Trust Fund who's |
| 15 | going to manage it? |
| 16 | MS. CASTILLE: Yes. We have a group of agencies that |
| 17 | are getting together to decide what the management plan |
| 18 | shall be and will be a recommendation to you. |
| 19 | CFO GALLAGHER: They're getting together not to |
| 20 | decide but to recommend. |
| 21 | MS. CASTILLE: To recommend, yes. |
| 22 | CFO GALLAGHER: And is agriculture included in that? |
| 23 | THE GOVERNOR: Absolutely. |
| 24 | MS. CASTILLE: Yes, they are. And they have been |
| 25 | involved in our discussions in the past six months. |

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

| 1 | COMMISSIONER BRONSON: That's not what this says. |
|---|---|
| 2 | MS. CASTILLE: Chuck Aller and Mike Long have been |
| 3 | involved in discussions with us. |

COMMISSIONER BRONSON: But the paper I've got here says Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission is the lead managing agency.

7 MS. ARMSTRONG: Yes, sir, they are the lead agency.
8 COMMISSIONER BRONSON: On agricultural land and
9 including the wildlife lands?

MS. ARMSTRONG: Yes, and let me give you a little background. Because when the Babcock family first appeared at DEP when Secretary Struhs was still here, the original plan was that we were going to convert -- the ranch wasn't going to be kept. At that point, we were going to turn it into a wildlife management area and do those kind of activities. And it's only been in the last three years since we've been down there a lot and the support has grown to maintain it as an active ranch. And so since that has occurred, we've come to you with a change in the management philosophy which is in the agenda item today and we started working with a lot of people at the local level and the state level to put together a plan to maintain it as an active ranch. And that's why you see the recommendation before you today to make use of not just your agency, but there are three state universities

| | 139 |
|----|--|
| 1 | that see this as an opportunity to use the ranch as a lab |
| 2 | and go beyond normal ranching activities and public use |
| 3 | activities out there on the ranch and so that's why we |
| 4 | have this design and we've talked with Chuck Aller several |
| 5 | times. We tried to get other cattle people involved in |
| 6 | your division but we were told Chuck was the one to deal |
| 7 | with so that's who we've talked to about it. |
| 8 | MS. CASTILLE: But Division of Forestry is the |
| 9 | secondary manager in the plan. |
| 10 | MS. ARMSTRONG: Cooperating manager. |
| 11 | THE GOVERNOR: And there will be ten years to figure |
| 12 | it out. |
| 13 | MS. ARMSTRONG: And, remember, this is not locked in. |
| 14 | This is just at the beginning. This is a very complex |
| 15 | piece of land to manage. |
| 16 | CFO GALLAGHER: Just so we understand one thing. The |
| 17 | final decision on who manages this land and who runs this |
| 18 | land is not part of this contract. It's done by this |
| 19 | board. |
| 20 | MS. ARMSTRONG: Right. This is just the purchasing. |
| 21 | MS. CASTILLE: No, let me clarify that, Treasurer. |
| 22 | CFO GALLAGHER: Which we can change any time we want. |
| 23 | MS. CASTILLE: Let me clarify that, Treasurer. The |
| 24 | contract says that Kitson and Partners, under the new |
| | |

ownership of the ranch, will be the manager of the land

| 1 | for | the | next | ten | years. |
|---|-----|-----|------|-----|--------|
|---|-----|-----|------|-----|--------|

2 CFO GALLAGHER: Find.

MS. CASTILLE: And that they will work with us to develop a management plan but there will be an interim management plan that they're going to continue to operate the ranch as they operate it today with additional hunting, I think that goes on it, public hunting. Then we will jointly, among all the agencies, develop a management plan that we will bring to the Board here for your approval.

MS. ARMSTRONG: And Fish and Wildlife is the designated managing agency. Because, remember, they're managing Fisheating Creek to the east, Babcock Cecil Webb to the west and it's being managed as a landscape piece of property that also connects to the panther ecoscape to the southeast. So they're managing all this property together. That is the key reason we're buying it. The ranch adds value to this acquisition.

CFO GALLAGHER: What's the part of the non-profit that gets established ten years from now?

MS. CASTILLE: That is the non-profit that we are proposing that gets set up at the end of the 10-year period to take ownership of the ranch. Because in the agreement, Mr. Kitson agrees to turn the ranch over, lock, stock and barrel and cattle over to the non-profit that we

| 1 | would create. |
|----|--|
| 2 | CFO GALLAGHER: Well, let me ask you this. |
| 3 | MS. CASTILLE: Actually, it's to the State of Florida |
| 4 | because |
| 5 | CFO GALLAGHER: Comes out of the State of Florida is |
| 6 | what it ought to come over to, the trustees. And if we |
| 7 | want to put it out to lease to somebody or whatever, I |
| 8 | think it ought to come to the trustees. And 10 years from |
| 9 | now, whatever the trustees think they ought to do with it, |
| 10 | they do. |
| 11 | MS. CASTILLE: And we can do that. We have not |
| 12 | established what will be done in the 10-year |
| 13 | CFO GALLAGHER: So instead of nonprofit, it ought to |
| 14 | be turned over to the State of Florida and then we do what |
| 15 | the next cabinet does. |
| 16 | MS. CASTILLE: The contract says State of Florida. |
| 17 | CFO GALLAGHER: Okay. |
| 18 | THE GOVERNOR: The Florida Legislature may have |
| 19 | something to say about this too. |
| 20 | CFO GALLAGHER: Of course. I have that in my motion |
| 21 | to bring it up, get the details worked out for the |
| 22 | four-party agreement. Get some of these other things |
| 23 | worked out and bring it back on the 22nd. |

ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: Second.

24

25

MS. ARMSTRONG: Do you want to say anything?

| 1 THE GOVERNOR: | Is there any discussion? | |
|-----------------|--------------------------|--|
|-----------------|--------------------------|--|

2 MS. CASTILLE: Mr. Kitson would like to speak. And 3 there is also about another 15 speakers.

MR. KITSON: You know, I do believe that we can, right here, we can solve the water issue. I think we all agree that the management issues are going to be ongoing as far as how the -- some of the issues that we're just talking about now. And we'd like at least the chance to see if we can't come to an agreement on how this is going to work and one of the ideas is, to keep it very simple on the water side, is -- and this is why a vote would be very helpful today because then on the next two meetings I have with the counties, at least they're going to understand where we are and the position in this. And that is if we agree, Kitson and Partners agrees, that we will be responsible for the water on our property and leave it at that.

And then the counties can work with South Florida

Water Management over the next several weeks to work out
whatever concerns they have on their water issues. If we
can agree to that and you can vote on that and I have a

vote, then I know that over the next two weeks that we
have a deal in place and it will make that a meaningful
discussion with them.

25 THE GOVERNOR: My personal opinion is that I think

you have a general consensus that our hearts are in this, our minds are moving towards it. I'm more than happy to talk to the members of the County Commission, the chairman of the County Commission, to express what I think is the general feeling about the importance of doing this. But this is too complex to approve. I think we need to have an agreement that's ironed out. And, Mr. Kitson, I pledge to you that we will do what we can to be a catalyst for this four-party agreement to be done as quickly as possible.

If, in fact, Charlotte County says, Look, the only reason why we're interested in this is because we need lots of water, and that becomes apparent, then, first of all, Charlotte County has got some issues beyond this purchase that they need to work on with us. But we'll find that out in two weeks. I mean, you've spent a lot of time and a lot of money in chasing this deal. And I think it's important to get it right. There have been three or four additions to the contract that none of us saw this morning. I mean, everybody is working around the clock to get this done. I think a thoughtful way, given the size and scope of this transaction, is to know what we're buying when we commit to it.

CFO GALLAGHER: Let me try something that might work, Governor. I'd like to change my motion that says that I

| 1 | move preliminary approval and hold final approval until |
|----|--|
| 2 | the 22nd when we receive a contract to clarify. |
| 3 | THE GOVERNOR: It's not a binding commitment. |
| 4 | CFO GALLAGHER: But we preliminary approved it and we |
| 5 | want to see details |
| 6 | MR. KITSON: Well, certainly it's better than at |
| 7 | least it shows the intent and that would certainly be |
| 8 | acceptable till the 22nd. |
| 9 | COMMISSIONER BRONSON: I can second that motion |
| 10 | because we still have to come back to this later on if it |
| 11 | doesn't look like we feel comfortable with it. |
| 12 | ATTORNEY GENERAL CRIST: Certainly because it's not |
| 13 | approval. |
| 14 | THE GOVERNOR: All right. There is a motion to |
| 15 | what did you call it? |
| 16 | CFO GALLAGHER: I'm saying preliminary approve it and |
| 17 | final approval is going to be based on the issues being |
| 18 | clarified in the contract for us for the 22nd of November. |
| 19 | THE GOVERNOR: And the four-party interlocal |
| 20 | agreement. |
| 21 | CFO GALLAGHER: That's all part of the issues that |
| 22 | have to be clarified. |
| 23 | THE GOVERNOR: All right. There is a motion. |
| 24 | COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Second. |

THE GOVERNOR: And a second. Yes, Colleen?

| 1 | MS. CASTILLE: We still have 11 speakers who would |
|----|---|
| 2 | like to speak. |
| 3 | THE GOVERNOR: All right. We will hold this motion |
| 4 | up to |
| 5 | CFO GALLAGHER: Do they want to speak now? Give them |
| 6 | a choice now or |
| 7 | MS. CASTILLE: I think they would want to because if |
| 8 | we're going to make amendments to the contract, you may |
| 9 | want to consider what they have to say. |
| 10 | THE GOVERNOR: All right. If everybody could be |
| 11 | brief, that's fair. You've all been very, very patient. |
| 12 | So we have a motion that's pending and a second but |
| 13 | we're going to allow for 11 speakers. Whoever else wants |
| 14 | to speak, at least I'll be here. |
| 15 | MS. CASTILLE: Betsy Roberts representing the Sierra |
| 16 | Club. |
| 17 | THE GOVERNOR: Good afternoon. |
| 18 | MS. ROBERTS: Good afternoon. I guess it is on. You |
| 19 | can hear me? I tend to have a quiet voice. Governor and |
| 20 | cabinet, I thank you for the opportunity to speak to you |
| 21 | today. Excuse me, I'm all choked up. I'm Betsy Roberts. |
| 22 | I'm Florida chapter conservation chair and am speaking to |
| 23 | you for our chapter and also for the public lands |
| 24 | committee. |

I'm a volunteer for this organization so I get no

| money but I do work as a nurse and have worked you |
|---|
| mentioned hurricanes, I worked very hard in the last few. |
| Just got back from Louisiana where I was working with |
| evacuees. On November 3rd, you should have received a |
| letter provided with our position on this issue. My |
| concern today is the 17,500 acres of real Florida that |
| will be lost or altered with the sale of the Babcock |
| Ranch. And although 7400 thousand acres, sorry, trying |
| to decrease it, have the potential to be saved, this will |
| still have an enormous impact on Charlotte County |
| primarily but also on Lee County and on the surrounding |
| region. Six million square feet of commercial along with |
| 50,000 new residents driving, going to school and work, |
| playing golf and using water, will most definitely affect |
| the area. |
| |

Other impacts will be on the endangered species in the vicinity, Florida panthers, bears, Sherman fox squirrels, scrub jays and gopher tortoises as all have been mentioned earlier, are just a few of the state list of species that will be affected.

From the previous discussion we've all heard and I know your major concerns is also the water and this has been our major concern too. Water is always a big issue in Florida and is a major concern with the sale. In its ***apparition to current water law, the State is agreeing

to give up public water by allowing Mr. Kitson to withdraw from approximately 75 parcels he would continue to own surrounded by State purchase of public lands. The well heads would be approximately 100 by 100 feet in size. The State would also allow Mr. Kitson to retain easements throughout the publicly purchased land for installation of pipelines to deliver the water from wells off site. Under the proposed agreement, Mr. Kitson can sell the public's water back to the public and operate his water business only because of the publicly owned water resources beneath land purchased with public funds. The fact that he would retain ownership of those 75 parcels is a distinction without a difference.

Acquiring Babcock Ranch with the water utilities spread out over public lands creates a very bad precedent. What environmental impacts will the loss of this 30 to 50 million gallons per day of water cause to the environment and how much harm to the ecosystem will the loss of this water from Babcock wetlands cause? And most importantly, do we really need this city to save this land? If the rural stewardship land program is used as described in the contract and other communications, it would violate the intent and spirit of the state. We urge you to vote no on the sale of the Babcock Ranch and I appreciate your concern for the water as we obviously

| 1 | have. |
|----|---|
| 2 | THE GOVERNOR: Thank you. Thank you very much. |
| 3 | MS. CASTILLE: Tom Reese. |
| 4 | THE GOVERNOR: Good afternoon. |
| 5 | MR. REESE: Good afternoon. I'm Thomas W. Reese. |
| 6 | I'm representing the Responsible Growth Management |
| 7 | Coalition and the Greater Pine Island Civic Association. |
| 8 | They're two organizations from Lee County which have been |
| 9 | working for the last 17 years trying to get the Growth |
| 10 | Management Act to work in Lee County. They had asked me |
| 11 | to prepare an analysis of this particular sale and |
| 12 | purchase agreement as well as the interlocal planning |
| 13 | agreement. That I did and provided to your cabinet aides. |
| 14 | In that analysis, I came up with a figure that the value |
| 15 | to Kitson and his corporation is approximately \$1.1 |
| 16 | billion and in return we are getting land which is |
| 17 | essentially we're paying full value for but getting |
| 18 | with restrictions on water use which you've discussed as |
| 19 | well as transfer of the development rights. And I came to |

21

22

23

24

25

that figure because I've been working in Collier County

with their rural stewardship program which resulted from

the administration commission back on June 22nd, 1999

found the Collier plan not in compliance and ordered a

came up with a rural fringe amendment and a rural

three-year analysis and assessment. And out of that, they

| 1 | stewardship. And in that program, they determined what |
|----|---|
| 2 | transferred development rights for dwelling units is |
| 3 | really worth. It came out and it is currently operating |
| 4 | at roughly \$25,000 a unit. So when you figure that the |
| 5 | applicant here with the permit application is asking for |
| 6 | 19,500 units for a new town with 6 million square feet of |
| 7 | commercial, I came up with a figure that the dwelling |
| 8 | units at \$25,000 a piece is worth \$487,000,000. |
| 9 | THE GOVERNOR: Did you discount it back given the |
| 10 | fact it may take 20 years, 30 years? |
| 11 | MR. REESE: No, this is present day value. Same |
| 12 | as that's how much is being purchased right now in |
| 13 | Collier County. Developers are paying that for |

as -- that's how much is being purchased right now in Collier County. Developers are paying that for development rights. They are purchasing those. Those transactions are occurring. That sum was actually -- the Transfer Development Rights Program was prepared by Dr. James Nicholas, University of Florida. It was challenged and the challengers hired Dr. Fishkind to examine it and they came up and said that's basically the way it works. They pretty much agreed. Administrative law judge, Lawrence Johnston heard the testimony and entered a recommended order and DCA entered a final order saying that's the way it works in Collier County. So that's a pretty good figure at \$25,000 a unit. Now you get 6 million square feet of commercial. How much that's

worth, I put a figure of roughly \$50 a square foot, that's a ballpark figure. I'm not saying it's absolute but we're talking a couple hundred million dollars in commercial.

Now, put all that together, there was value for the water rights, that's being discussed here. But that's how I came up with the 1.1. I came up with the figure on what is the value actually of the ranch, 74,000 acres that you're proposing to buy. You're essentially getting a conservation easement because they are peeling off the development rights, they're transferring the development rights off those 74,000 acres and putting them over on the 17,890 acres where they want their new town. They also had the water rights.

So I think roughly when you buy, as trustees, when you buy a conservation easement, you're paying roughly 65 -- or those rights are worth about 65 percent. So really, the residency there is 35 percent. So I think it's only worth maybe \$132 million after you peel off the development rights and the water rights and they're asking you for \$350 million. That is a fee simple full-price appraisal. That's what I heard at the cabinet aides meeting, it was a fee simple, full-price assessment.

CFO GALLAGHER: Got a question, real quick. We're paying about 89 percent, wasn't it, of the full appraisal and we just took the water rights off of it. So now it

1 sounds like a better deal.

MR. REESE: It is a better deal. The development rights are still there and we haven't worked the water rights out but it looks like they're going to leave the water rights and not peel those off. So that would help.

CFO GALLAGHER: So at this point -- well, let me tell you the down side to this. You're not wanting us do this but at the same time, if not Mr. Kitson, somebody else can come along with us not involved and buy this from Babcock and develop it or they can do it themselves, they can go to Mr. Kitson, we're going to keep it in our family and we're going to contract you to build it, just give us a profit on it as we build it out so then we don't have anything.

MR. REESE: My clients and I are not suggesting that you just totally turn the deal down. The summary of the analysis is Mr. Kitson needs to sharpen his pencil. You need to cut a better deal. And that hopefully will happen in the next two weeks. I don't know whether two weeks is enough time to actually cut a better deal. But the rural stewardship program is based upon development rights having a value and if that's not entered into this calculation, I have a concern and my clients have a concern that that's going to affect other rural stewardship programs in other counties.

| It's being proposed in Hendry County. It's being |
|--|
| proposed in Glades County. If landowners see that |
| Mr. Kitson can come in and not have to do an analysis for |
| the development rights and can build a new town, it's |
| going to discourage other landowners from doing what's |
| currently occurred in Collier County. There, a large |
| property owner came in and peeled off development rights |
| and all sorts of rights off of 17,000 acres and gave it to |
| Collier County, gave a conservation easement to Collier |
| County and gave the same conservation easement jointly |
| held by Department of Agriculture. There was no exchange |
| of money for that. What they got was the right to build |
| Ava Maria. |

Now would somebody do that again if they thought they could get that town without peeling off conservation easements free of charge? I think that's an important policy decision. I'm not suggesting you vote this down.

I'm just considering -- asking you to consider all the factors on what is the true value here and development rights are very important and putting value on development rights and getting conservation easements in return for transfer of development rights is really the foundation of the rural stewardship program.

CFO GALLAGHER: Well, as you may have heard, there's going to be quite a bit of conservation land in his

| 1 | d l | 7 | | la -i | 77 | | 1 | ! | 10 |
|---|-------------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|----------|
| | development | Dian | ()[[| 1118 | land. | TIOL. | wilat. | we re | DIIVING. |
| | | | | | | | | | |

- MR. REESE: Correct. Just to repeat, I'm not
- 3 suggesting -- you're making progress here today, very good
- 4 progress. And I appreciate your time and effort.
- 5 THE GOVERNOR: Thank you, sir.
- 6 MR. REESE: One other item I wanted to stress. The
- 7 contract does say the entire contract. It's very
- 8 important you read Paragraph 23 because if it's not
- 9 written in the contract, it doesn't exist. The contract
- 10 supersedes anything else. You need it in writing in the
- 11 contract.
- 12 THE GOVERNOR: Thank you. Thank you, sir. If I
- 13 could ask the next nine speakers to be brief -- I can ask.
- 14 I'm not sure anybody would listen.
- 15 MS. CASTILLE: If you could keep your comments to two
- to three minutes, it would be great. Is Janet Bowman
- 17 here?
- 18 THE GOVERNOR: Senator Dockery, would you like to
- 19 speak since you've been here? Welcome. Glad to have you
- here.
- MS. CASTILLE: Dr. Burns.
- THE GOVERNOR: Excuse me?
- 23 MS. CASTILLE: I'm sorry, Senator Dockery -- no?
- Janet Bowman.
- MS. BOWMAN: I'm Janet Bowman. I'm the legal

| 1 | director of 1000 Friends of Florida. We've been |
|---|--|
| 2 | supportive of the State acquisition and protection of |
| 3 | Babcock and we think it's a great opportunity. |
| 4 | Personally, I'm a second generation southwest Floridian so |
| 5 | it's something I get excited about. And I remember as a |
| 6 | kid driving down to Ft. Myers to visit my grandmother and |
| 7 | going by it. |

During the public discussion and debate, there are a number of issues that we've raised with Mr. Kitson personally and he's been very receptive to listening to them. In the last day, there were four specific changes to the contract that we have sought. And I think three out of the four, which they're amenable to, but kind of the reception we got was, Well, we can't do that. We can't change the contract up or down today.

Well, obviously, it's not up or down today. So I wanted to briefly mention what those are. The first is with respect funding. The way the contract is drafted, it talks about having -- the Legislature appropriating adequate money for the various takedowns. It doesn't specifically require as a condition precedent that \$100 million dollars is general revenue, okay? Obviously that would be nice but it doesn't specifically say that. So we have some concerns about Florida Forever money being drained and the idea of the possibility which the Governor

| 1 | discussed. You know, if the Legislature came up with the |
|----|--|
| 2 | full purchase price or bonded the full purchase price, I |
| 3 | think it would be very desirable in the contract to have a |
| 4 | specific requirement that the takedown is in a shorter |
| 5 | period of time. Because the way it's structured now, if |
| 6 | the parties agree, sure, that can happen but otherwise |
| 7 | THE GOVERNOR: I think based on the conversation we |
| 8 | had, there is a way to structure it so that it recognizes |
| 9 | that the Legislature you know, there are 50 different |
| 10 | options that they will have and so, therefore, the |
| 11 | contract needs to reflect the takedown being symmetrical |
| 12 | and we're committed to this. The only other issue I think |
| 13 | maybe Syd outdid Eva on this was that the properties we're |
| 14 | buying for our perspective are the least we're buying |
| 15 | the least valuable first but that's to keep us in the |
| 16 | game, I guess. |
| 17 | CFO GALLAGHER: And by the way, we did him the |
| 18 | biggest favor in the world by closing on the 1st with all |
| 19 | the cash. |
| 20 | MS. BOWMAN: Oh, sure, that that would be the best |
| 21 | outcome for everyone involved but I do think there are |
| 22 | reasons that it would be a good idea to specifically |
| 23 | address in the contract. |
| 24 | THE GOVERNOR: I think we're going to do that. |

MS. BOWMAN: The second is on the Rural Land

Stewardship Program. We've been supportive of the program in general. We gave Collier County an award for their use of the program. But we believe that there are some specific issues in the contract that just need to be nailed down. If it's used, there are some things we think should be in the contract.

First, that the Rural Land Stewardship Program can't be used to generate more credits than are necessary to authorize the number of units that Mr. Kitson is asking for from Charlotte County or Charlotte and/or Lee. That the credits can only be used in area six. That the credits can only be used in area six which is the area he's retaining for his development. And that if the credits are removed prior to the takedown, that the contract should provide for -- specifically provide for reappraisal. And that's just protection so that you-all know you're paying the appropriate amount for the piece.

On the water, obviously, you-all have had a great discussion about that and I appreciate your insight and your questions. One thing that we've pointed out as problematic is there is a provision in the contract, a noncompete clause. The State cannot compete with Town and Country Utilities or Mr. Kitson and specifically says, The purchaser shall not have the right to use or grant any third parties the right to use, remove, and/or pump water

| 1 | from the surface or subsurface of the property for |
|----|--|
| 2 | commercial use or otherwise. |
| 3 | Well, the commercial use, obviously that's an issue |
| 4 | and that's been discussed. But the "or otherwise", I've |
| 5 | had the concern of what if the State, for whatever reason, |
| 6 | needed to use the water for some sort of public health or |
| 7 | safety reason, they would be precluded by this paragraph |
| 8 | from pumping the water off site from the Babcock Ranch. |
| 9 | THE GOVERNOR: Well, I think that's probably going to |
| 10 | change now too. |
| 11 | MS. BOWMAN: Yeah, and it's going to change. But I |
| 12 | wanted to specifically raise that because a discussion had |
| 13 | been over valuing utility, where the pumping occurs, et |
| 14 | cetera. |
| 15 | CFO GALLAGHER: That was in there because he was |
| 16 | going to control the water. Now, once it's ours, that's |
| 17 | going to come out of there because he's not going to |
| 18 | have |
| 19 | MS. BOWMAN: It certainly should come out of there. |
| 20 | But I guess the point I would make is, you know, there are |
| 21 | other potential uses other than commercial and that the |
| 22 | State, in buying the resource, should be getting that. |
| 23 | CFO GALLAGHER: We're going to get it. |
| 24 | THE GOVERNOR: I think you got a better deal than |
| 25 | even what you're proposing in your letter. |

| 1 | MS. BOWMAN: Anyway, so I appreciate your-all's |
|----|---|
| 2 | questions and I appreciate all the time that your staff, |
| 3 | both the cabinet aides and the DEP have given and I know |
| 4 | everyone has put a lot of thought into this. Thanks. |
| 5 | THE GOVERNOR: Thank you. |
| 6 | MS. CASTILLE: Mr. Lane Stephens representing Nestle. |
| 7 | CFO GALLAGHER: And if it has anything to do with the |
| 8 | word commercial, it's coming out of there so you don't |
| 9 | have to talk about that. |
| 10 | MR. STEPHENS: I was not even going to speak to that. |
| 11 | I didn't know it was on the list. But I was going to |
| 12 | speak on behalf of another client. And so if you would |
| 13 | indulge me just for about two minutes. Many of you know |
| 14 | me as the lobbyist for Nestle but I also am executive |
| 15 | director of Allied Sportsman's Association of Florida. |
| 16 | This is an organization that represents probably 25 to |
| 17 | 35,000 sportsmen in the state and obviously we are very |
| 18 | interested in this property and very interested in seeing |
| 19 | hunters continue to have access to this in the future. |
| 20 | Commissioner Bronson, I look forward to working with |
| 21 | you on the management plan issues with regards to your |
| 22 | concerns or the concerns raised by Representative Machek. |
| 23 | We have concerns about access issues, some things that |
| 24 | were in the contract, there were some confusions about |
| 25 | whether or not hunters will continue to be able to use |

| 1 | some of the swamp buggies and other types of things that |
|----|--|
| 2 | they use currently on the property. It's our |
| 3 | understanding they will continue to be able to use those |
| 4 | in the future. So I wear several hats and I thank you for |
| 5 | the opportunity to talk to you about hunters. Thanks. |
| 6 | THE GOVERNOR: Did you know that it takes 1.3 gallons |
| 7 | of water to create one gallon of bottled water? |
| 8 | MR. STEPHENS: For Nestle it does. I do. |
| 9 | CFO GALLAGHER: Yet to make one gallon of soda it |
| 10 | takes three gallons of water. |
| 11 | MR. STEPHENS: That's correct. |
| 12 | CFO GALLAGHER: And the most important is beer. It |
| 13 | takes 42 gallons of water to make one gallon of beer. |
| 14 | MR. STEPHENS: We won't tell anybody else I represent |
| 15 | Miller Brewing Company. |
| 16 | THE GOVERNOR: Just to prove we actually read the |
| 17 | information people send in. |
| 18 | MS. CASTILLE: Vicky Tschinkel from the Nature |
| 19 | Conservancy. |
| 20 | MS. TSCHINKEL: Hello. You know what? I just really |
| 21 | hate it when everybody takes care of everything and then I |
| 22 | don't get to say much so I thought I'd say something |
| 23 | anyway. |
| 24 | MS. CASTILLE: She's transitioning into the |

25 supportive role.

| | 160 |
|----|--|
| 1 | MS. TSCHINKEL: Yes, I am. I'm rapidly transitioning |
| 2 | into the supportive role. This has been a very |
| 3 | difficult you cannot imagine what you haven't seen |
| 4 | going on. I don't what you two said, but it probably |
| 5 | wasn't very nice. (Laughter.) But I did want to point |
| 6 | out one thing which is one of the things you're doing |
| 7 | really, really right. It's something to underline. It's |
| 8 | that you-all are not parties to the interlocal agreement. |
| 9 | There's probably a reason for that that I don't |
| 10 | understand. DCA is obviously. So a lot of things that |
| 11 | you want to see happen in the interlocal agreement, you |
| 12 | have no review no authority over. So by this delay and |
| 13 | continuing to work on the interlocal agreement, a draft of |
| 14 | which came out at 6:30 a.m., I think this morning, still, |
| 15 | that really makes the timing a lot more sensible because |
| 16 | you need to know what's going on in that agreement. And |
| 17 | the only other thing, Governor, is the excitement that you |
| 18 | have generated in this room about the potential for |
| 19 | bonding for this program is incredible. I know you |
| 20 | haven't said that, but you have mentioned it and that |
| 21 | would be really great. So that's all I have to say. |
| 22 | Thank you. |
| 23 | MS. CASTILLE: We have about eight more speakers. |
| 24 | And let me call up Don Ross and Manley Fuller. If you can |
| 25 | come up together, we can move people a little bit more |

1 quickly.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ROSS: I'm Don Ross. I'm a former commissioner of Charlotte County and in my life as a recovering politician, I run the company Earth Balance which is a restoration firm that serves the Southeast and it gives me the opportunity to see a lot of different kind of land. We work for the National Park Service, your park service, a lot of county parks. And I just want to tell you that this piece of property is an excellent piece of property not just because of its critical location but because of the way it's been managed for the last century. And so I just wanted to convey that to you and to give you one little vignette to back it up. Today, we're collecting seed on that property to restore land that is in less good condition. So we use the Babcock Ranch to collect seed and that's one of the revenue streams to the Babcock Ranch, is our seed collection for the restoration of other properties, either State owned or privately owned.

The second point I want to make that I don't think
I've heard today is that this contract, even though it's
complicated and involves a management plan and management
partner, provides for the management and restoration of
this property which is something you normally don't get
when you buy property. You usually buy it and you run the
previous owner off and you inherit the contingent

- And in this management agreement, in this contract, you're not inheriting the contingent liability, you're basically running revenues back in from the operation of the ranch for its continued management and restoration.

 I'll be brief because I'm hungry as you are. Thank you.
- 7 THE GOVERNOR: Thanks.
- 8 MR. FULLER: Manley Fuller, Florida --
- 9 THE GOVERNOR: What are you reading, Manley?
- 10 MR. FULLER: Field Guide to Panama. I'm going there
 11 next week.
- 12 THE GOVERNOR: All right. Just curious. I always
 13 like to find a new good book. I noticed you were reading
 14 while we were deliberating.

MR. FULLER: The Florida Wildlife Federation, as do the people in this room, recognize the great quality of this property and the tremendous resource values that speaker after speaker have addressed. We have enjoyed the many discussions with Mr. Kitson and his representatives throughout the process. We appreciate the scrutiny that you-all have exhibited this morning in your role as trustees.

We think that another two weeks to work on this and refine this is a good thing to do. We are -- one of the things, Governor, that you alluded to as a possibility,

| 1 | the bonding, the potential bonding or funding by the |
|----|--|
| 2 | Legislature of this entire project. And I know how you |
| 3 | said it. But that's really, from our perspective, would |
| 4 | be a very significant thing if the Legislature could put |
| 5 | that could put that package together because we have so |
| 6 | many other very important projects around the state under |
| 7 | the Forever Florida program that we've been concerned that |
| 8 | that funding allocation in the current contract takes so |
| 9 | much money away from Florida Forever that it would |
| 10 | jeopardize other very important projects across our state. |
| 11 | So we hope that the idea that was broached by you, |
| 12 | Governor, are considered by the Legislature. |
| 13 | THE GOVERNOR: I'll let the treasurer speak first. |
| 14 | Then I have a little shot at you. |
| 15 | CFO GALLAGHER: Listen, everybody wants to issue |
| 16 | bonds because a great big bunch of money comes in when you |
| 17 | issue the bonds. There's another little problem and maybe |
| 18 | you could tell us. Where does the cash flow come to pay |
| 19 | for the bonds? |
| 20 | MR. FULLER: Well, I think I'm certainly not an |
| 21 | expert in that and I defer to your greater expertise in |
| 22 | that. But I think it would be real estate, probably doc |
| 23 | stamps. |
| 24 | THE GOVERNOR: And your point and it's a legitimate |

point, of the environment groups' concerns isn't

1 whether -- you know, you're not starting to attempt to dictate fiscal management of the budget so much as your 3 concern of crowding out other worthy programs, correct? MR. FULLER: Yes, sir. 5 THE GOVERNOR: For example, last couple years we've 6 proposed, and I think the Legislature has gone along with, cash for Florida Forever. You're not opposed to using 8 cash for the same amount that was bonded? MR. FULLER: No, sir. 9 THE GOVERNOR: So, you know, lighten up a little bit. 10 Give us a break because maybe we can do all cash. This 11 12 economy is red hot right now and there is a lot of 13 nonrecurring revenues. Just recognize that there is -you know, what you want to have is make sure Florida 14 15 Forever exists so we can buy in these important 16 ecosystems. 17 MR. FULLER: Yes, sir. 18 THE GOVERNOR: I think there's a general agreement on 19 that. Don't give me hard time for being fiscally sound. 20 You're for that, aren't you? You're not for being 21 fiscally unsound? MR. FULLER: No, sir, absolutely not. 22 23 THE GOVERNOR: Just checking.

MR. FULLER: My board of directors -- I have to meet

24

25

(Laughter.)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

a budget and a CPA does my books. But your books are a

| 2 | lot bigger |
|----|--|
| 3 | THE GOVERNOR: You mean, you can't borrow and use the |
| 4 | taxpayers' debt service to pay for your ongoing |
| 5 | MR. FULLER: No, we don't utilize taxpayer funds in |
| 6 | our organization. But we're glad to work with you-all on |
| 7 | this and look forward to coming back in a couple of weeks |
| 8 | as these important issues are brought closer to conclusion |
| 9 | or hopefully to a conclusion. Thank you. |
| 10 | THE GOVERNOR: Thank you, sir. |
| 11 | MS. CASTILLE: Andy McLeod from Trust for Public |
| 12 | Lands. |
| 13 | MR. McLEOD: Governor and members of the cabinet, I |
| 14 | heard your plea, Governor. Watch me be rapid. I am here |
| 15 | solely to assert the interest of Florida Forever and its |
| 16 | integrity. The Trust for Public Land has worked with a |
| 17 | number of its statewide and national nonprofit |

As we stated in a letter to you-all a month ago approximately, long before Babcock was announced, the Florida Forever program was already creaking under the weight of substantial need and substantially insufficient

environmental and conservation colleagues, some of whom

a few moments, on Florida Forever and its long-term

viability and its sufficient funding.

you've heard from previously, some of whom you'll hear in

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

| funds to meet that need, a list of the ***Carl program at |
|--|
| the Division of State Lands that amounts conservatively to |
| \$3 billion. This is \$200 million of a remaining program |
| amount over four years of \$420 million. And so it's just |
| less than half of the remaining pot for four years. |
| That's a substantial hit, we would argue, on the program. |
| And we have tried to assert the interest of 67 counties in |
| the context of a project being proposed in two counties. |

That having been said, most recently we joined with the Audubon Society and the Florida Recreation and Parks Association in a letter to you-all just prior to this meeting today and I would read four short sentence fragments from that, it is to urge you, the cabinet, to consider the benefits of, one, funding the State's share of the Babcock Ranch purchase on a schedule earlier than that provided under the current contract. And, two, funding the State's share through special one-time or two-time funding. This could be achieved either by utilizing existing bond authority separate from the annual appropriations for Florida Forever or through the utilization of general revenue. Such an approach to the acquisition would provide greater simplicity to the transaction, increase its certainty to all parties and a potential reduced cost to the State.

Lastly, given the time and value of money to the

- seller, Mr. Kitson, earlier payments may entice the

 seller, Mr. Kitson, to reduce the purchase price to the

 State. To answer your question, Commissioner Gallagher -
 (Laughter.)
- 5 THE GOVERNOR: I was just checking.

MR. McLEOD: I'll be leaving this room very quickly shortly after. To answer your question, Commissioner Gallagher, where does the money come from, where's the revenue stream. Well, arguably, doc stamps. There are two years of authorized but unused bonds for Florida Forever in the past that arguably could be used for this purpose. I'm not arguing prospectively that we take that money but rather looking at what might exist in the past. Eva, Colleen, and the Ben Watkins of the world can speak to those issues better than I can.

In conclusion, yes, perhaps your legacy will be the preservation of Babcock Ranch. We would urge you also to see that part of your proper legacy be as it is now, a healthy and robust well-funded Florida Forever program, and that you seek all of these creative and innovative ways to makes the deal happen. Appreciate your time very much.

- THE GOVERNOR: Thank you.
- MS. CASTILLE: Carol Newcomb Jones representing herself.

| 1 THE GOVERNOR: Good afternoon. |
|---------------------------------|
|---------------------------------|

MS. NEWCOMB JONES: Hello. Well, I'm really disappointed you couldn't come up with a decision today but I understand it. But you blew my whole talk because I started off to say, We stand today. But I'll change it to, We stand in two weeks. And I'll make it brief. I'll just do my opening paragraph and my closing paragraph. So I'll cut out the middle section.

Well, we stand in two weeks at a historical moment for the State of Florida, its wilderness places, its heritage, and its citizenry. The challenge we face in two weeks in making an important decision about a large plank of earth, that being the Babcock Ranch, is not in what we know but in what we do. Much depends on our wisdom, foresight and maybe now it will be hindsight, rational dialog, cooperation, and the quality of our thinking to make good on this opportunity to preserved a significant piece of what is left of wild and old Florida.

And I'll skip this page. I'll skip this page. So I end with, In the next two weeks, every citizen of Florida should celebrate the successful public/private partnership that is taking hold in securing this ranch for its wildlife to carry on with the inherent right to live within and travel through intact, untouched ecosystems, securing the heritage of old Florida with its working

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

| cracker cattle ranch, and securing the ranches means to |
|--|
| provide an opportunity for its citizens and visitors to |
| recreate in and have a piece of mind of that which is |
| still breathing space, that there is still breathing space |
| with large blocks of land still untouched. |

And I'll just end, I decided I'll throw this in for what it's worth. I'll close with my favorite writer, Barbara Kingsolver, that's a good book you could read. By Barbary Kingsolver, People need wild places. Whether or not we think we do, we do. We need to be able to taste grace and know again that we desire it. We need to experience a landscape that is timeless, whose agenda moves at the pace of speciation and glaciers. To be surrounded by a singing mating howling commotion of other species and all of which love their lives as much as we do ours and none of which could possibly care less about us in our place. It reminds us that our plans are small and somewhat absurd. It reminds us why in those cases in which our plans might influence many future generations we ought to choose carefully, looking out on a clean plank of planet earth we can get shaken right down to the bone by the bronze-eyed possibility of lives that are not our own. Thank you.

THE GOVERNOR: Well done. Thank you. I hope no one else wants to speak after that.

| | 170 |
|----|--|
| 1 | (Laughter.) |
| 2 | MS. CASTILLE: I do have three other speakers, |
| 3 | Governor. I have Eric Draper, Jim Handley from the |
| 4 | Florida Cattleman's Association and I hope Arnie Sarlo who |
| 5 | will be as eloquent as Carol who is the current ranch |
| 6 | manager. |
| 7 | MR. DRAPER: Eric Draper. I will be quick. I will |
| 8 | waive my time but I won't be here for your next meeting so |
| 9 | I wanted to get on the record in support of this very good |
| 10 | proposal. |
| 11 | I just want to say I think your staff has done a |
| 12 | terrific job of putting this together. I've monitored it |
| 13 | as it's gone along and it's been a very, very complicated |
| 14 | proposal and I know they worked very hard, Eva and Colleer |
| 15 | have. Governor, when you announced the Lake Okeechobee |
| 16 | Estuary Recovery Program a few weeks ago, you talked |
| 17 | about well, actually you may not have said this, but I |
| 18 | know it was in the talking points. |
| 19 | (Laughter.) |
| 20 | THE GOVERNOR: In the script but not out of the |
| 21 | mouth. |
| 22 | MR. DRAPER: You talked about using transferred |
| 23 | development rights as a way to leverage conservation in |
| | |

Lake Okeechobee Basin and that is a really smart way to do

this. And I think that's essentially what you're doing

24

| 171 |
|--|
| here with the Rural Land Stewardship Program, is you've |
| come up with a new tool and which came out of your growth |
| management study commission a new way to leverage |
| conservation at a discount to the State. I think you're |
| getting a really good deal on this land at \$4700 an acre. |
| We, Audubon, are very strongly supportive of continued |
| ranching on this property. It produces about 5,000 cows a |
| year. You're going to hear from Arnie, the ranch manager. |
| He took me on a tour, great guy. Great place. You need |
| to keep that ranching going. That's a good way to manage |
| state land. I think myself that Kitson deserved a final |
| vote today. I wished you had given that to him. There |
| are pending deals that are behind his. I've been told by |
| representatives of the family that they've got other cash |
| offers just waiting for this one to fall apart. So I |
| really hope that all the parties involved will continue to |
| work to make sure that this definitely comes through and |
| allow us, the environmental lobbying community, to get |
| over to the Legislature and work hard to get them to |
| appropriate the funds to finally do it because your |
| decision won't be the final one, the Legislature still has |
| to appropriate the money. Thank you very much. |
| THE GOVERNOR: Thank you. |
| MS. CASTILLE: Commissioner Janes wanted to say |
| |

something before he left.

| - | THE GOVERNOR: | Very briefly, | Commissioner. |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | | | _ |

- 2 COMMISSIONER JANES: Thank you very much.
- THE GOVERNOR: Want to make sure you get your flight back home.

5 COMMISSIONER JANES: Indeed. I've got a meeting 6 later on. I wanted to thank you for the interest and the attention that you've spent on this problem. Enormously 8 complex. And I have to tell you as the only partner who is a partner with you in this project to the tune of 9 10 \$40 million, we have great interest that it be done right. We want to spend our 40 million correctly and rightly. 11 12 That's why I have absolutely no problem if instead of a 13 preliminary approval you just wanted to delay the whole thing two weeks, it makes no difference to us. But we 14 15 wanted to thank you for your interest and appreciate it. 16 Thank you.

17 THE GOVERNOR: Thank you for coming up.

20

21

22

23

24

25

18 MS. CASTILLE: Mr. Jim Handley, Florida Cattleman's
19 Association.

MR. HANDLEY: Thank you, Governor and cabinet. I appreciate the opportunity to speak. I'll be real brief. It's a beautiful piece of country. It's a tremendously well-managed ranch. The past management and current management are doing an outstanding job. They've been recognized for that. They've won awards for their

- environmental stewardship and we applaud your efforts. I
 know there is a tremendous amount of detail that needs to
 go into it. We stand ready to support it. We think it's
 the right thing to do and we look forward to seeing it
 come together. Thank you.
- 6 THE GOVERNOR: Thank you, Mr. Handley.
- 7 MS. CASTILLE: And lastly, Mr. Arnie Sarlo who's the 8 current ranch foreman at the Babcock Ranch.
- 9 THE GOVERNOR: Good afternoon.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SARLO: Thank you, Governor and cabinet. Good afternoon. It's a pleasure to be here and I've had the pleasure of managing the Babcock Ranch and brought two fellow managers up here today, our cattle manager and our wildlife biologist. They're here with me. Came up out of the woods and left that paradise to come here. And just wanted to say, you know, this plan, we support it and we think it fits everybody. It's a win/win. It's got a lot of details to work out but a key thing that Kitson and Partners did that's never been done before and Mr. Don Ross stated it before be so I'll be brief and not be repetitive, but you think about it, there is a lot of time and effort that went into that management plan and it needs tweaking. I understood that came about today and it will be tweaked. But when you've got a piece of land that big, been compared to bigger than cities in New York,

| | 174 |
|----|--|
| 1 | there's a lot of time and a lot of effort that goes into |
| 2 | that. And we have to hustle to get that done, well, that |
| 3 | provision has been put in there and I think they should |
| 4 | commend Kitson and Partners for that. That's one of the |
| 5 | most wonderful things we've seen but it's not free, |
| 6 | nothing is free. So you've got that money already set and |
| 7 | there is a plan there. So a good plan set aside to keep |
| 8 | what you know, I've watched every agency come through |
| 9 | there, every state agency, commissioners, anybody, |
| 10 | environmental groups, and they all have one consensus, |
| 11 | it's a beautiful place. That means more to us that live |
| 12 | there than anybody. It's a beautiful place but it's going |
| 13 | to take time and money and there's a plan put in place by |
| 14 | these people and we support it. I mean, people think |
| 15 | that's easy? It's not. It takes our employees a year to |
| 16 | learn their way around so they don't get lost and people |
| 17 | don't take that into consideration. And not everybody is |
| 18 | as lucky as us. We got to stand out there and David has |
| 19 | got to patch fences at 3:00 in the morning in waist-deep |
| 20 | water and we're out there in alligator-infested swamps |
| 21 | killing Melaleucas and exotics. That money comes from |
| 22 | somewhere and that plan is put in place and we really |
| 23 | support this deal and we wish everybody else would because |
| 24 | it's a win/win for everybody. Thank you. |
| | |

THE GOVERNOR: Hope we will. Thank you very much.

| 1 | MS. CASTILLE: Thank you, Governor, members of the |
|----|---|
| 2 | cabinet. |
| 3 | THE GOVERNOR: We have a motion and a second. Is |
| 4 | there any other discussion? All in favor. |
| 5 | CFO GALLAGHER: Colleen. One other thing. In the |
| 6 | contract, you have spelled out who is going to manage it |
| 7 | from the State. Why does that have to be in the contract, |
| 8 | just that the State will manage it, that's really up to |
| 9 | the trustees. Can we just leave it that way? |
| 10 | MS. CASTILLE: It's in the agenda item, it's not in |
| 11 | the contract. |
| 12 | CFO GALLAGHER: Okay. |
| 13 | THE GOVERNOR: There's a motion and a second. Any |
| 14 | other discussion? Without objection, the motion passes. |
| 15 | We look forward to seeing you in a couple of weeks. Thank |
| 16 | you everybody for coming. |
| 17 | (Thereupon, the proceedings concluded at 1:40 p.m.) |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |

| 1 | |
|----|--|
| 2 | CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER |
| 3 | |
| 4 | STATE OF FLORIDA) |
| 5 | COUNTY OF LEON) |
| 6 | I, KRISTEN L. BENTLEY, Court Reporter, |
| 7 | certify that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me at |
| 8 | the time and place therein designated; that my shorthand notes |
| 9 | were thereafter translated under my supervision; and the |
| 10 | foregoing pages numbered 1 through 175 are a true and correct |
| 11 | record of the aforesaid proceedings. |
| 12 | |
| 13 | I further certify that I am not a relative, employee |
| 14 | attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative |
| 15 | or employee of any of the parties' attorney or counsel |
| 16 | connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in |
| 17 | the action. |
| 18 | |
| 19 | DATED this 23rd day of November, 2005. |
| 20 | |
| 21 | KRISTEN L. BENTLEY, Court Reporter |
| 22 | Notary Public 850-878-2221 |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |