THE CABINET

STATE OF FLORIDA

Representing:

STATE BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION

DIVISION OF BOND FINANCE

FINANCIAL SERVICES COMMISSION, OFFICE OF INSURANCE REGULATION

ADMINISTRATION COMMISSION

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND CONSUMER SERVICES

BOARD OF TRUSTEES, INTERNAL IMPROVEMENT TRUST FUND

The above agencies came to be heard before THE FLORIDA CABINET, Honorable Governor Crist presiding, in the Cabinet Meeting Room, LL-03, The Capitol, Tallahassee, Florida, on Tuesday, September 15, 2009, commencing at 9:10 a.m.

> Reported by: JO LANGSTON Registered Professional Reporter

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC. 2894 REMINGTON GREEN LANE TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32308

(850) 878-2221

APPEARANCES:

Representing the Florida Cabinet:

CHARLIE CRIST Governor

CHARLES H. BRONSON Commissioner of Agriculture

BILL McCOLLUM Attorney General

ALEX SINK Chief Financial Officer

* * *

1		INDEX	
2	STATE BOARD OF ADMINIST (Presented by ASH WILLI		
3	ITEM	ACTION	PAGE
	1	Approved	5
4	2	Approved	5
	3	Approved	6
5	4	Approved	б
	5	Approved	7
б	6	Approved	20
	7	Approved	7
7	8	Discussion	7
8	DIVISION OF BOND FINANC		
9	(Presented by BEN WATKI	INS)	
-	ITEM	ACTION	PAGE
10	1	Approved	21
-	2	Approved	21
11	3	Approved	22
	4	Approved	22
12	5	Approved	23
	6	Approved	23
13	7	Approved	24
14			
15	FINANCIAL SERVICES COMM	IISSION, OFFICE	
	OF INSURANCE REGULATION	1	
16	(Presented by KEVIN McC	CARTY)	
17	ITEM	ACTION	PAGE
	1	Approved	26
18	2	For Information	26
19			
20	ADMINISTRATION COMMISSI (Presented by LISA SALI		
20			
21	ITEM	ACTION	PAGE
22	1 2	Approved	44
22	2	Approved	87
23			
24			
25			

1	INDEX (conti	.nued)	
2	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND CON (Presented by SHERMAN WILHELM)	ISUMER SERVICES	
3		5.07	
4	ITEM ACTION 1 Approved	PAGE 88	
4	2 Approved	88	
5	3 Approved	89	
	4 Approved	89	
б			
7			
8	BOARD OF TRUSTEES, INTERNAL IMPRO (Presented by MICHAEL SOLE)	VEMENT TRUST FUND	
9	ITEM ACTION	PAGE	
	1 Approved	90	
10	2 Accepted	96	
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER	97	
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	* * *
3	(Agenda Items Commenced at 9:30 a.m.)
4	GOVERNOR CRIST: Our first agenda item this
5	morning, State Board of Administration, Ash
б	Williams. Good morning, Ash.
7	MR. WILLIAMS: Good morning, Governor,
8	Trustees, members of the Cabinet. Item 1 is a
9	request for approval of the minutes of the September
10	1 meeting.
11	ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: I so move.
12	COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Second.
13	GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show the
14	minutes approved without objection.
15	MR. WILLIAMS: Item 2 is a fiscal sufficiency
16	for the State Board of Education Public Education
17	Capital Outlay Refunding Bonds.
18	GOVERNOR CRIST: Is there a motion on Item 2?
19	CFO SINK: Move it.
20	ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: Second.
21	GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show Item
22	2 approved without objection.
23	MR. WILLIAMS: Item 3 is a fiscal sufficiency
24	for State of Florida, Full Faith and Credit, State
25	Board of Education Public Education Capital Outlay

1 Bonds.

2	ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: I move Item 3.
3	CFO SINK: Second.
4	GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show it
5	approved without objection.
6	MR. WILLIAMS: Item 4, another fiscal
7	sufficiency for the State of Florida, Board of
8	Governors, Florida International University Parking
9	Facility Revenue Bonds.
10	CFO SINK: Move it.
11	ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: Second.
12	GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show Item
13	4 approved without objection.
14	MR. WILLIAMS: Item 4 (sic), we request
15	approval to file for notice Rule 19-7.002,
16	Investment Policy Guidelines. This is for the Local
17	Government Surplus Funds Trust Fund, and will adopt
18	the investment policy guidelines approved previously
19	by the trustees 28 July 2009.
20	ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: I move it.
21	CFO SINK: Second.
22	GOVERNOR CRIST: I think this was Item 5,
23	right, Ash?
24	MR. WILLIAMS: Correct.
25	GOVERNOR CRIST: Okay. Moved and seconded.

б

1	Show it approved without objection.
2	MR. WILLIAMS: Item 6, request approval of the
3	appointment of David J. Grain to the Investment
4	Advisory Council.
5	CFO SINK: Move it.
6	COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Second.
7	GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show it
8	approved without objection.
9	MR. WILLIAMS: Item 7 is the appointment of Mr.
10	Floyd M. Yager as the actuarial representative to
11	the Advisory Council of the Florida Hurricane
12	Catastrophe Fund.
13	CFO SINK: Move it.
14	ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: Second.
15	GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show it
16	approved without objection.
17	MR. WILLIAMS: Item 8 is the SBA Governance
18	Report. I believe Mr. Cassady is going to handle
19	that item.
20	GOVERNOR CRIST: Morning, Jim. How are you?
21	MR. CASSADY: Good morning, Governor, CFO Sink,
22	General McCollum. And, Commissioner Bronson, happy
23	birthday.
24	COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Thank you. I appreciate
25	it.

1 MR. CASSADY: Having crossed that milestone 2 myself, I can tell you 60 is the new 30. A lot to look forward to. In May the trustees voted 3 4 unanimously to name a working group to study 5 industry best practices and governance structures in б the pension fund and other public pension funds. 7 The working group was comprised of staff from each of the three trustee offices and staff from the SBA. 8

9 I do want to take a minute to recognize the 10 staff members for the hard work that they've completed over the last few months. From the 11 Governor's Office, Kathy Mears and Pat Gleason, from 12 the Attorney General Office, Rob Johnson, from the 13 14 CFO's office, Amber Hughes, Dan Sumner, Meredith Berger and Robert Tornillo. And the SBA staff 15 16 assisted greatly in the project, with Ash Williams, Director Williams, and Mike McCauley. And I 17 especially want to thank Amber, Meredith and Mike 18 for their hard work in putting this document 19 20 together.

21 ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: I'm going to 22 interrupt you by saying all of us want to thank 23 them. I think it's very important, all the work 24 that you've done and all the work they've done. It 25 really shows up in this report. Thank you.

1 MR. CASSADY: Thank you, General. So today we 2 present to the Board the SBA Fund Governance Report, 3 with the information compiled by the working group. 4 This report is really a study of best practices and structures and does not include recommendations at 5 б this point. The report was delivered to the 7 trustees via electronic format on Thursday. 8 And for those who are interested in reading the 9 report, it will be posted on the website both at 10 Myfloridacfo.com and the SBA website at the conclusion of the Cabinet meeting. 11 The working group focused on three key 12 13 categories for gathering information in order to 14 outline best governance practices in the industry. We gathered empirical information comparing general 15 pension fund characteristics for 15 other public 16 17 pension funds. These 15 funds were identified based on assets under management, their location, their 18 structure and other characteristics of the funds. 19 20 That's the first point. 21 Secondly, Director Williams conducted personal 22 interviews with private sector investment

professionals. And, thirdly, the group members
conducted interviews with selected trustees of the
15 public pension funds that were noted in the

matrix.

1

2 The governance reform -- or working group studied ten different characteristics in the 15 3 4 different pension funds selected. This included 5 board composition, pension investment versus other б mandates, selection of investment managers, budget 7 approval process and meeting frequency. And the 8 study of these characteristics is actually in a matrix form and it does allow for easy comparison 9 10 between funds.

We found that Florida's primary board is smaller than most other pension systems' governing bodies, with three members. We also found that the size of the boards vary greatly across funds, from a 16-member board in Colorado to a sole trustee in North Carolina. However, the majority of the plans studied have more than ten members of their boards.

We also found that Florida is similar to other 18 19 states in that many of them also have other 20 investment mandates than just the pension fund. And 21 the frequency of the meetings for the pension plans 22 vary tremendously across the United States. The report includes a summary and a comparison table of 23 all the governance characteristics that were 24 25 studied.

1 Regarding the personal interviews with the 2 private sector, at the direction of the working 3 group, SBA Executive Director Ash Williams conducted 4 personal interviews with a variety of professionals, 5 ranging from best practices in pension funds and 6 endowments and in foundations in the institutional 7 investor market.

These individuals included chief investment 8 officers, investment committee members of major 9 10 endowments and foundations and principals of leading 11 investment and consulting firms, also fiduciary partners of major law firms and the CEOs of 12 investment advisory firms. Both a summary and the 13 full notes of Director Williams' conversations can 14 15 be found in the report.

Let me add that as we were conducting these interviews, we informed on the front end all the interviewees that, of course, Florida is a public records state, and so they were well aware that the notes and their comments would be a public record.

21 Some things that Director Williams found 22 included governance structure in itself is not 23 necessarily the primary determinant of success, 24 depending on how you define success of a fund. It's 25 people and execution that matter the most, which I

1 think we felt that going in.

2 Training is highly beneficial for trustees and 3 advisory board members, including fiduciary and 4 investment training. And outside commercial audits 5 are certainly preferable and provide a better 6 perception of soundness and transparency; for 7 example, in the areas of compliance and internal 8 controls.

9 We also conducted personal interviews with 10 other pension fund board members. Members of the 11 SBA governance working group interviewed trustees 12 who serve on state pension fund boards across the 13 country. Group members asked questions about best 14 practices, governance and governance success.

15 Again, a summary and full notes of these interviews can be found in the report. But some of 16 17 the themes that we found were that strong 18 consideration should be given to having more than 19 three trustees on a board, for diversity and for 20 effective governance. It's helpful to have some 21 board members who have diverse experience, for 22 example, investment experience. Having elected representatives of pension fund participants as 23 24 members of the board informs membership and gives 25 investors a say in the management of the fund.

1 So in conclusion, I again want to thank the 2 staff from each of the trustee's offices. I want to thank all of you, the trustees, for giving us an 3 4 opportunity to do this. And I'll be glad to answer 5 any questions. GOVERNOR CRIST: Thank you very much, Jim. б Any 7 questions? 8 CFO SINK: I have some comments, Governor. 9 GOVERNOR CRIST: CFO, please, of course. 10 CFO SINK: Again, excellent report. And just 11 all the offices were so cooperative. And I think I would say to Ash and all the people who did the 12 interviews that what I heard was that the people 13 14 that they reached out to, both in the public and the private sector, were more than willing to talk to 15 us, our team, and give some opinions and some 16 17 thoughts about best practices at their pension funds and comment on ours. 18 19 So there's a lot of really good, interesting 20 information in here. And I think that all of us 21 should really dig into the report. We've only had

it a couple of days now. But my thinking is that after we've had a chance to really get into some more details on our own in the report, that we would come back at maybe perhaps the next Cabinet meeting

in two weeks and have a conversation among the three
 of us about what we might, if anything, want to do
 with the results.

4 And the things that I just picked out, just over my brief review, was this issue of the 5 б composition of the board. We have, because the 7 three of us have so many other duties and 8 responsibilities, we do have limited time to spend on the details of managing, from a strategic point 9 10 and a fiduciary point, a 110-billion-dollar pension 11 fund. And it is the largest financial asset that we have in the State of Florida, and hundreds of 12 13 thousands of people are depending upon this pension 14 fund, of course, for their retirement.

So I'm going to do some thinking myself about a proposal perhaps for a constitutional amendment to expand the membership of the board to include and require that an expanded membership have people with investment and accounting and auditing backgrounds, as we've seen most of the other firms around the country have.

The second thing that I picked up on was over and over again this issue about training in fiduciary duties. And it's -- I think it doesn't hurt us as board members to be reminded on an annual

basis of what our fiduciary responsibilities and
 duties are in a very public -- in a public way.

Thirdly, I was struck by, you know, our fund is 3 4 not really audited by an outside audit firm like a corporation would be or like many other pension 5 funds would be. We have kind of a mishmash of б OPPAGA looks at some things, the auditor general 7 8 looks at some other things. We've had an outside firm, Clifton Gunderson, looking at compliance 9 10 issues. And I think we ought to discuss whether or 11 not we engage an outside independent auditing firm to give us, on an annual basis, an opinion about the 12 state of the fund. 13

14 And the fourth thing that I picked up on, because it came up at our quarterly board meeting, 15 was the use of the Investment Advisory Committee and 16 17 the fact that each of us appoint these experts in investments. They should be reporting directly to 18 us, and I think we made a good start at our first 19 20 quarterly board meeting, to hear directly, 21 unfiltered from any staff, from these six people who 22 are in fact pretty expert in investment matters, and just encourage continuing to find a way for us as 23 board members to get that unfiltered and independent 24 25 information separate and apart from what the staff

1 gives us.

2 And I don't know about you all, but after we had our last quarterly board meeting the other day, 3 4 I went back into my office and actually was around and about the state, and I had many people comment 5 б about how informative they found it and they 7 appreciated us taking a longer period of time to get 8 more in depth in some of these really important 9 issues about the management of our fund. 10 So that's kind of what my initial early 11 thinking is about what we might talk about going forward. 12 13 ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: Governor, I'd just 14 like to, first of all, say I agree with the CFO that we need to look seriously at an outside auditor. I 15 think that's one of the things it looks like there's 16 17 consensus in the report to do. But I'd look forward to discussion of this report next week or the next 18 19 Cabinet meeting or whenever. 20 But it seems to me that the report itself, in the very beginning of it, sets forth what I think is 21 22 the key issue here, and that is what is our role. We are a policy board, as opposed to a management 23 board. And many of these boards around the country, 24

25 I think the report indicates, are management boards.

1 They do involve professionals, where we don't have 2 one. We use our independent Advisory Council to provide that function. And I looked at the summary 3 4 of the themes displayed in the interviews that says 5 right at the top, "Governance structure in itself is б not a primary determinant of success. It's the 7 people and execution that matter most. Board focus 8 should be on high level policy, with operations delegated to professional staff. Board appoints and 9 10 sets compensation for an executive who hires staff, 11 staff is responsible," and so on.

I would like, myself, to hear from our Advisory 12 13 Council members on their thoughts about the 14 structure and how they feel it works, because I do think that integral to this system that we have in 15 Florida, which is in our constitution -- and I'm 16 17 personally reluctant to go tamper with it unless it's absolutely necessary. I'm interested in 18 19 knowing what the Advisory Council members themselves 20 think.

They are, it seems to me, our eyes and ears. They perform a function in Florida that is different than other states, apparently, and other boards like ours where we oversee pension funds. And they have a very important role to play and should be

1 consulted on the governance structure itself and the 2 uniqueness of our system, which I kind of like myself right now. But I'm interested in improving 3 4 it and interested in hearing what people say and 5 certainly interested in this report. You did a б great job with this report. I want to reiterate 7 that. Y'all just did a great job with it. COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Governor? 8 9 GOVERNOR CRIST: Commissioner. 10 COMMISSIONER BRONSON: While I am not a member 11 of the Board to vote on these issues, there's a lot of people in the state who think I am, because I 12 13 hear from a lot of them. When they see the word 14 "Cabinet," they're looking to get their issues in. And as a matter of just information to those of 15 you who sit and vote on these issues, there is a lot 16 17 of angst out there by a lot of people in law enforcement, firefighters, teachers, others whose 18 19 lifetime pension is tied up in these funds. 20 And to the person that I talk to, all of them 21 are saying, whatever happens, please make sure that 22 there is going to be the highest regard for the 23 pension plan and that it be above board as far as 24 the critical aspects of those investments. And I 25 think what's happened is enough of their private

investments have taken a hit, along with everybody
 else's state investment program, because if you were
 in the market, you took a pretty good hit generally.

4 And I think the fact that they have been hit 5 privately in their own investments and now they've turned to their retirement fund as their only б 7 failsafe, they want to be super conservative on and 8 want that message to be delivered to the Board, to 9 be super conservative on how that money is going to 10 be invested, because some of these -- we're living 11 to the ages of up in the seventies, eighties and even longer now. And a lot of them are going to 12 13 have to rely on those retirements for the rest of their life. 14

And quite frankly, I hear from even some of my 15 former teachers when I was in grade school who are 16 17 retired on very low income. Those people made very 18 little money back in those days. Even when I was 19 teaching, I was at a 6,900-dollar-a-year salary. So 20 a lot of them, even though they may have had 30, 35 21 years, are living on very short incomes in a very 22 high-priced world today. And I think there's a lot 23 of fear out there.

24So all I'm doing is relaying to you what has25been relayed to me by different groups and

1	organizations, that they are very concerned about
2	that they have the money to live on throughout their
3	years so they're not a burden on their children.
4	GOVERNOR CRIST: Very good. Good words,
5	Charlie. Thank you. Thank you, Jim. Anything
6	else?
7	MR. CASSADY: No, sir. Thank you, Governor.
8	GOVERNOR CRIST: I need to do a little
9	housekeeping. On Item 6, I think we got a second
10	from the commish. So we is there a motion again
11	on Item 6?
12	CFO SINK: I'll move Item 6.
13	ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: Second.
14	GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show it
15	approved without objection. Broadening your
16	jurisdiction.
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	GOVERNOR CRIST: Division of Bond Finance, Ben
2	Watkins. Good morning, Ben.
3	MR. WATKINS: Good morning, Governor, Cabinet
4	members. Item Number 1 are minutes from the August
5	11th meeting.
б	GOVERNOR CRIST: Is there a motion on the
7	minutes?
8	CFO SINK: Move it.
9	ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: Second.
10	GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show the
11	minutes approved without objection.
12	MR. WATKINS: Item Number 2 authorizes the
13	issuance and competitive or negotiated sale of up to
14	\$32 million in Parking Facility Revenue Bonds for a
15	parking facility at Florida International
16	University.
17	ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: Move Item 2.
18	COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Second.
19	GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show it
20	approved without objection.
21	MR. WATKINS: Item Number 3 authorizes the
22	issuance and competitive or negotiated sale of up to
23	155.1 million in Public Education Capital Outlay
24	Bonds for school construction.
25	COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Motion on Item 2.

1 GOVERNOR CRIST: 3. 2 COMMISSIONER BRONSON: 3. GOVERNOR CRIST: Gee whiz, Charlie, it's 3 4 slipping fast. 5 COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Just so you know my eyes are working, mine has two 2s on it. б 7 GOVERNOR CRIST: There you go. You are excused. Motion on Item 3. Is there a second? 8 9 ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: Second. GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. 10 Show it 11 approved without objection. MR. WATKINS: Item Number 4 authorizes the 12 13 issuance and the competitive or negotiated sale of 14 up to \$540 million in refunding bonds for Public Education Capital Outlay Program. 15 ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: Move Item 4. 16 17 CFO SINK: Second. GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show it 18 19 approved without objection. 20 MR. WATKINS: Item Number 5 is the report of 21 award on the competitive sale of \$146.8 million in 22 Public Education Capital Outlay Refunding Bonds. 23 The bonds were sold at competitive sale. They were awarded to the low bidder at a true interest cost of 24 approximately 3.17 percent. And the refunding 25

1 resulted in debt service savings to the State of 2 approximately \$18.8 million or, on a present value basis, \$15.4 million. 3 4 GOVERNOR CRIST: Is there a motion on Item 5? CFO SINK: Move it. 5 COMMISSIONER BRONSON: б Second. GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. 7 Show it 8 approved without objection. 9 MR. WATKINS: Item Number 6 is a report of 10 award on the competitive sale of \$52.9 million of 11 Capital Outlay Bonds for school construction. These bonds were also sold at competitive sale. They were 12 awarded to the low bidder at a true interest cost of 13 14 approximately 3.29 percent. It was actually a mixed issue of new money as well as a refunding, combined 15 16 together, and the refunding was approximately 17 39.4 million and resulted in debt service savings to the State of approximately 3.6 million, or on a 18 present value basis, 3.2 million. 19 20 CFO SINK: Move it. 21 ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: Second. GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. 22 Show it 23 approved without objection. MR. WATKINS: And lastly, Item 7 is a report of 24 award on the competitive sale of \$165.8 million in 25

1	Public Education Capital Outlay Refunding Bonds.
2	These bonds were awarded to sold at competitive
3	sale, awarded to the low bidder at a true interest
4	cost of approximately 3.48 percent. And it
5	generated gross debt service savings of
6	approximately \$18.2 million, or \$14.2 million on a
7	present value basis.
8	CFO SINK: Move it.
9	COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Second.
10	GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show it
11	approved without objection. Thank you, Ben.
12	CFO SINK: Governor.
13	GOVERNOR CRIST: CFO.
14	CFO SINK: Is that the last item?
15	MR. WATKINS: Yes, ma'am.
16	CFO SINK: I just want to make a comment
17	here we just kind of ran through here pretty
18	quickly that these are very attractive interest
19	rate refundings, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 percent. We wouldn't
20	get those without our AAA rating.
21	GOVERNOR CRIST: That's a great point.
22	CFO SINK: And I know that Ben and, I believe,
23	Jerry McDaniel went up to New York and worked
24	really, really hard to communicate to the rating
25	agencies the State of Florida's finances and the

fact that we have to have a balanced budget and some of the moves that were made by the Legislature. And they deserve a lot of credit and thanks. I think all these refinancings this year alone has saved almost \$58 million in our taxpayers' money.

6 So my compliments to Ben and his staff and 7 Jerry McDaniel for going up and helping with the 8 rating agency presentation.

9 GOVERNOR CRIST: That's an excellent point. 10 And I want to add my gratitude. You know, since 11 I've been Governor, we've cut this budget by almost \$8 billion. We are in balance. We have the largest 12 13 tax cut in the history of the state, and we have a 14 AAA bond rating. Now, not many other mega states can say that. And without your work, Ben, and Jerry 15 16 in our office and the great Legislature that approves all of that, Florida wouldn't be in the 17 good shape that she is. So thank you very, very 18 much from all of us. 19 20 MR. WATKINS: Thank you, Governor.

21 GOVERNOR CRIST: We're not the IOU state, and 22 that's a good thing.

23

24

1 GOVERNOR CRIST: Insurance Regulation. Kevin 2 McCarty, Commissioner. MR. McCARTY: Good morning, Governor --3 4 GOVERNOR CRIST: Good morning. MR. McCARTY: -- members of the Commission. 5 б Our first agenda item is the minutes of the 7 Financial Services Commission on July 28, 2009. 8 CFO SINK: Move it. 9 COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Second. 10 GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show the 11 minutes approved without objection. MR. McCARTY: The second agenda item is an 12 13 update on the property market, particularly as it 14 relates to the 29 newly admitted companies as of 2006. Those companies currently are reporting 15 747,000 policies in force in Florida as of the 16 reporting date June 30, 2009. In addition, those 17 same companies reported policyholder surplus 18 increase from initial capitalization of \$607 million 19 20 to about \$625 million. 21 However, 21 of the companies that have shown 22 that they're writing policies during the reporting 23 period, only six of them have experienced an 24 underwriting gain during the first six months of the

25 year, while 15 have reported underwriting losses.

1 It's important to note that it is generally 2 consistent with the other companies that are writing 3 business in Florida and other companies that are 4 writing around the nation.

5 I'll give you an example. Of the 210 writers in Florida that have a significant presence in our б residential marketplace, 150 have shown increases in 7 their policyholder surplus, while 60 companies have 8 9 reported declines during the first six months of 10 this year. Of that same 210 companies, 84 have 11 posted underwriting gains, while 102 of those companies have posted underwriting losses based on 12 13 the second quarter financial reports to the National Association of Insurance Commissioners. 14 That doesn't total 210. Twenty-four of those companies 15 are in intercompany pooling arrangements and they 16 17 don't report.

18 Although the analysis features our 210 writers, 19 these are national results, which are indications on 20 their consolidated financial statements, and I 21 provided those 210 company reports to your staff 22 yesterday.

It should be noted that new companies of any
kind, including insurance companies, in general
experience losses in their first few years of

business, which is certainly evident by the financial statements of our 27 -- 29 newly admitted companies. This is due in large part just to the start-up expenses, the organization of an agent force, the cost of overhead and general expenses of starting up a business.

7 We have met and corresponded directly or 8 indirectly with any of our companies that have reported significant surplus loss, because that's of 9 10 course a deep concern of ours. And these companies 11 are experiencing problems that are endemic across the nation. But we've met with companies that are 12 13 making money and not making money and just asked 14 them to give us a general overview of some of their cost concerns that are in the marketplace. 15

16 We've identified the five following areas. 17 Number one is the premium reductions as the result of mitigation credits. Many companies did not 18 19 anticipate that the mitigation credits would 20 generate as much savings to the policyholders. 21 Savings to the policyholders mean less premiums to 22 the company, so they don't have the necessary 23 premiums to pay expected losses and administrative 24 costs and agent commissions.

Number two, and it was somewhat related with

25

1 the first, is an uptick in the number of fraud cases 2 and the concern about the expansion of fraud. Fraud 3 as it relates to the mitigation discounts is that 4 the mitigation discounts in some cases are so 5 significant, particularly in parts of Florida that are coastal, where much of the premium is for б 7 hurricane, there's an incentive to generate a 8 fraudulent discount for those areas. This, again, 9 is what the companies are reporting to us.

10 Number three, and interesting, even though we 11 haven't had any hurricane losses in the last few 12 years, thank the Lord, reinsurance costs are still 13 going up in the area of about 15 percent. So that 14 also is contributing to the cost of the system.

Fourth is replacement cost methodology. After 15 hurricane season 2004 the Legislature enacted 16 17 changes due to consumer complaints that they were not getting enough money for them to effectuate 18 repairs on their homes. And so the Legislature 19 20 enacted legislation for replacement cost on 21 structure and contents. And in many cases the 22 companies believe that this is a cost driving the 23 system and may need to be addressed.

And lastly is reported sinkhole claims.Although the Legislature has worked on this very

hard to address this issue, as they have on a number 1 2 of the issues that are cost drivers in our systems, companies assert that the -- just the allegation 3 4 that there may be a sinkhole, cracks in the 5 foundation, cracks in the walls, et cetera, it's not б only the cost of fixing the claims, but it's the 7 cost of investigating those claims, and they're very 8 substantial and a concern and financial burden to the insurance companies and their administrative 9 10 costs.

11 All of the companies also indicated that in addition to these problems, they're exacerbated by 12 13 our current economic conditions. The Office has 14 taken action with regard to those companies that have declined in their policyholder surplus. 15 That includes working with them on a corrective action 16 17 plan. Some of them are in confidential supervision, and if necessary, they'll be referred to the 18 19 Division of Rehab and Liquidation if necessary.

The obstacles we face in our marketplace today is very different than the reinsurance -- spiraling reinsurance costs we saw in 2006. That was largely addressed by House Bill 1A by lowering the reinsurance cost. An underlying factor in the current economic environment is the decline in our

1 housing market. If current trends and conditions 2 continue and we have increased foreclosures and vacant homes, I think we can expect to continue to 3 4 have some challenges in our property market 5 irrespective of any hurricane losses. We will continue to be vigilant to monitor the б 7 financial conditions of our companies, including our 8 colleagues around the country who have domiciled companies in their states doing business in ours, so 9 10 that we maintain a marketplace. Thank you. 11 CFO SINK: Governor, can I --GOVERNOR CRIST: Yes, of course. 12 13 CFO SINK: Thank you, Kevin. This is a really 14 good report, and thank you for getting it to us so we could look at it. I was really interested in 15 your response about -- the companies have named 16 17 these five factors that you described. What do you as the insurance commissioner think about what 18 19 they've told you the reasons for some of their 20 losses are? 21 We need to keep a competitive and healthy and 22 sound financial environment for the insurance companies writing here, so I'm really more 23 24 interested in what you as the insurance commissioner 25 are thinking about with regard to these underwriting

1 losses.

2 MR. McCARTY: Well, that's a very good question 3 because with the underwriting losses, there are only 4 two alternatives, increasing rates, which is really 5 just addressing the symptom, or looking back at the 6 core problems and what can be done.

7 And I want to commend the Legislature because 8 all of these have been issues that have been there before. We certainly have concern about the 9 10 mitigation discounts. There is currently a loss 11 methodology commission. The Hurricane Loss Methodology Commission is conducting an evaluation 12 to ensure that those relativities that have been 13 14 developed in the past are appropriate in terms of the credits and discounts that are available for 15 mitigation. 16

Having said that, I think a number of companies have identified their own internal problems in terms of applying those discounts and may be applying those discounts on top of discounts that are similar. For instance, a new home discount in addition to a mitigation discount actually is giving duplication.

24 So we're working with the companies to ensure 25 that the implementation of their discounts is

appropriate and also doing an evaluation, the state
 evaluation of the discounts themselves.

Fraud of course is -- continues to be a vexing 3 4 problem in our state. And we certainly, I think, 5 continually look for ways that we can augment our fraud investigation, as well as looking at б 7 potentially ways of addressing particularly the 8 fraud as it relates to the mitigation discounts and 9 probably strengthening the requirements with regard 10 to doing that, perhaps requiring an affidavit, to 11 say there's a penalty of a felony conviction for fraud. 12

13 In our interest of getting consumers to 14 mitigate their homes, we perhaps have made an 15 opening for those few fraudsters and hucksters that 16 are out there that want to take advantage of our 17 system. So we're going to work to identify areas to 18 ratchet down that fraud as well.

19 The increased reinsurance cost unfortunately is 20 outside my jurisdiction. I wish that there were 21 ways for us to do that. As we've seen in the past, 22 it's a volatile marketplace. We have had no storms 23 in Florida, but they've had catastrophic events 24 globally, and that's going to affect the cost of 25 reinsurance.

1 And I think the fact that we have a Florida 2 catastrophe fund that provides a sizable amount of 3 catastrophe coverage in our state is one of the more 4 stabilizing things that we could have done in 5 providing stability for our domestic as well as 6 foreign market.

7 With regard to replacement cost methodology, I 8 think there's a number of things that can be done. 9 I think we need to be concerned about the consumer 10 who is not able to fix their roof. On the other 11 hand, we've got to make sure, if you get replacement 12 cost on something, that that money is used to 13 replace that.

So we're going to work with the insurance industry to ensure that we strike some kind of appropriate balance to ensure that in a catastrophe, that the policyholder gets the money to effectuate the repair of the roof. But in other areas, we may look at returning to actual cash value, where it seems more prudent in terms of cost containment.

21 And, lastly with the report, in regard to 22 sinkhole coverage, again, the Legislature has made 23 herculean efforts to try to provide consumers with 24 options, whether to take the coverage or not take 25 the coverage. We're seeing a considerable number of

policyholders, and this is asserted by the industry,
 that are having very expensive inspections and
 evaluations that need to be done for cracks in the
 walls, et cetera.

We're looking at some alternative to --5 б companies are certainly willing to pay for 7 catastrophic losses, ground collapse, you know. But 8 many of the cases that they're seeing is really a 9 matter of settlement, ground settlement and 10 something that you see fairly consistently around 11 the state that is not directly related to sinkhole activity. And that is not so much the claims paying 12 13 as it is the frictional costs, the cost of 14 investigating those claims, which can be tens of thousands of dollars, even with no claim. 15

16 And, again, what we're seeing in Florida is 17 again exacerbated by the economy. And obviously, with a recovering economy, we're cautiously 18 optimistic that we'll benefit. But the things that 19 20 we're looking at here are really Florida-specific 21 and I think will require not only our administrative 22 attention but legislative attention as well. 23 ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: Governor?

24 GOVERNOR CRIST: Yes, General.

25 ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: Of all those items

you've listed to us as reasons for the price or cost of insurance going up, the rates and whatever, the pressures on it, I had the impression before you presented, and I want to know if it's correct, that the single biggest item remains the question about the reinsurance in a catastrophe.

7 In other words, we have a catastrophe fund, but 8 these private insurers who insure homes and do 9 windstorm still have to go out and seek some, if not 10 in some cases all of their reinsurance from outside 11 that fund, and it costs them a lot, and they want to 12 pass that on, obviously. Is that not true?

13 MR. McCARTY: Without question, without 14 question. You know, we talked about it. The overriding concern always in Florida is the risk of 15 ruin. Companies go into business every hurricane 16 17 season with the fact that they could have all of their assets wiped out by a catastrophic event in 18 19 Florida. And we rely very heavily in our state on 20 global reinsurance, particularly Bermuda and 21 Lloyd's. There's a lot of volatility in that 22 marketplace.

23 Some companies that I've individually spoken 24 to, even just the remove of the temporary tickle 25 layer that was dialed down a little bit this year,

that wasn't their biggest cost. Their biggest cost was their underlying coverage for their attachment point to the Cat Fund, which was substantially higher than it was last year.

5 So we are continuing to be pressed by the б increasing cost in the reinsurance industry. And 7 it's important to note that this is happening without a storm. And so if we have a storm of 8 9 anything like we've seen in 2004 or '5, on top of 10 it, you're going to see increased pressure on reinsurance. That's the variable that we're not 11 able to address. 12

ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: So the absence of real competition or as much competition as we'd like in the reinsurance market, the threat of the big super storms, et cetera, still loom as the single biggest driver in pressure on homeowners' insurance.

Let me ask you, Kevin, about something 18 19 unrelated but something that you and I discussed, I 20 think, that ought to at least be laid on the table. I heard for the first time in the last few days 21 22 something I wasn't very familiar with, and that is 23 that there is a problem with the liability insurance 24 for above-ground and below-ground storage tanks for 25 petroleum in our state.

1 Historically, I understand that there has been 2 insurance for this. The market, however, appears to 3 be either drying up or the insurers that are here, the few are indicating they're going to drop these 4 5 coverages. Can you tell us about this? Is this a problem for the mom and pop convenience stores and б 7 for others who have these storage tanks, and can you 8 describe that for us?

MR. McCARTY: Yeah, absolutely, and I think 9 10 you've really set the background for that. Prior to 11 1999 Florida had a trust fund that was set up to deal with seepage or pollution liability or 12 13 pollution exposure for underground and above-ground 14 storage tanks. We transitioned to an insurance model in 1999. There was only a handful of carriers 15 that had been in this business, which is not unusual 16 17 because it's a very specialized business and it's a 18 very specialized coverage.

As we get closer to the time when we need to move from the single layer to the double layer and all of those tanks need to be removed, we're talking about a number of mom and pops. These are not generally the big chains. These are mom and pop, and they are transitioning to that. They are having difficulty having their policies renewed, and there

1 is a real shortage in that marketplace.

2 And we are working with Secretary Sole because 3 this is an issue, obviously, important to his 4 agency, to provide coverage and alternatives in this 5 market.

6 ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: My understanding is 7 there are only like two companies in the whole state 8 right now, and both of them indicated they're going 9 to drop these policies, or a good portion of them 10 that are doing business; is that right?

MR. McCARTY: One of them is dropping and one
is not taking any new policies and only renewing.
So, yeah, that is a big problem.

14ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: And you don't have15many buyers, or many new companies that want to come16in here, but you do have one or two under17consideration?

18 MR. McCARTY: Yes, we do. We have one company 19 that has made application that has done this 20 business very successfully, it appears, in Iowa. 21 And we're in the process of working with them on a 22 consent order for us to provide coverage. There's 23 like 3,000 companies out there that still have a 24 potential for exposure due to the changing of the 25 tanks, and they're looking at doing about a thousand

1 of those, so --

2	ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: And there are a
3	thousand or more mom and pop shops in Florida,
4	stores or people who own these storage tanks that
5	need the coverage and don't right now have it; is
6	that right?
7	MR. McCARTY: That's correct.
8	ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: Thank you. It's a
9	tough issue, too. May not be as broadly affecting
10	everyone, but it certainly affects small business in
11	our state, and I thought we should at least be aware
12	of it as a group. Thank you.
13	MR. McCARTY: Thank you, General.
14	CFO SINK: Governor, could I just
15	GOVERNOR CRIST: CFO.
16	CFO SINK: bring up one more thing? In
17	terms of the new companies that have come, Kevin, to
18	bring capital and write insurance and, again, I
19	appreciate your providing the additional detail.
20	But, you know, we have this looming State Farm
21	departure that we're looking at over the course of
22	the next, well, 18 months or so. What's your
23	feeling now about the ability of this of these
24	new companies to absorb numbers of these policies
25	that State Farm is going to be leaving? Because

1 it's almost a million policies, I gather.

2 And as you provided the details on the 29 new companies, some of the prospects don't seem too 3 4 bright for some of the companies in terms of capabilities of writing a lot of more new policies. 5 MR. McCARTY: Yes. State Farm in their б 7 withdrawal plan is looking at 770,000 policies that 8 are subject to their nonrenewal. They're attempting 9 to withdraw, as you know. The Florida law provides 10 that we can accept the withdrawal plan, providing it 11 is not hazardous to its policyholders or hazardous to the people of the state of Florida. 12 13 We have set conditions on that withdrawal, 14 which we think are prudent, to provide for an avenue for those agents to place them with the voluntary 15

17 orderly withdrawal.

16

18 Right now we are -- we have not agreed. They 19 have contested our conditional withdrawal provision. 20 And they will not be nonrenewing during the course 21 of this. So at the current moment, those policies 22 will be staying with State Farm until we have a 23 resolution of how they will exit from the 24 marketplace.

market and not house them in Citizens and to have an

25 I think it's important to -- most of the

companies that have expressed an interest in taking 1 2 blocks of State Farm business, and there have been a 3 number of companies that have, are not in the 29 new 4 companies. They were companies that had been doing 5 business, organically-grown companies, Florida б companies that had been doing business in Florida, 7 many of them since the late 1990s. They are 8 companies that have probably superior ability to 9 negotiate reinsurance contracts due to their track record and their business record and their success 10 11 in terms of making money in Florida.

There have been over 30 -- about 30 companies 12 13 that have contacted our office and State Farm about 14 taking those policies on. It would appear that there would be sufficient capital in those 15 companies, but we would certainly be better served 16 17 if State Farm, even if they didn't stay with the full complement of their 770,000 policies, if they 18 stayed with some policies in the state of Florida, 19 20 recognizing that they're overexposed and they have 21 to do some strategy of increasing revenue, which 22 they have taken steps to do so by eliminating some 23 of their discounts and credits, their voluntary 24 discounts and credits, which is helping their bottom 25 line.

1	So hopefully with our continued negotiations
2	will become a settlement that is agreeable to the
3	policyholders of State Farm and a benefit to the
4	people of Florida.
5	CFO SINK: Okay. Thank you.
б	MR. McCARTY: Thank you.
7	GOVERNOR CRIST: Thank you. Great report,
8	Commissioner. Thank you very much.
9	MR. McCARTY: Thank you very much, Governor.
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

```
1
               GOVERNOR CRIST: Administration Commission,
 2
          Lisa Saliba.
               MS. SALIBA: Good morning, Governor and
 3
 4
          Commission members.
 5
               GOVERNOR CRIST: Good morning.
 б
               MS. SALIBA: We have two items today.
                                                      The
 7
          first item is the approval of the minutes from the
 8
          July 28, 2009 meeting.
 9
               ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: I move the approval
10
          of Item 1.
               COMMISSIONER BRONSON:
11
                                      Second.
               GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded.
12
                                                     Show the
13
          minutes approved without objection.
               MS. SALIBA: Item Number 2 relates to a land
14
          use -- future land use amendment. The item comes to
15
          the Commission for final action. At issue is
16
17
          whether an amendment to the Marion County Future
          Land Use Map is in compliance. The Department of
18
          Community Affairs issued a determination of
19
20
          noncompliance based upon the lack of demonstrated
21
          need.
22
               Let me very quickly on this issue go through
23
          the procedure. I will give a short overview of the
24
          case. It will be followed by presentations from the
25
          parties. Those parties are Mr. Ralf Brookes,
```

representing the petitioner; Susan Woods, who is a 1 2 petitioner; Secretary Pelham with the Department of Community Affairs; Commissioner Barbara Fitos with 3 4 Marion County; Linda Shelley representing Austin 5 International, Castro Realty Holdings and Halcyon Hills; Terri Keogh, representing Castro Realty б 7 Holdings. And then from the public is Charles 8 Pattison with 1000 Friends of Florida, and Manley Fuller, Florida Wildlife Federation. 9

10 If I may, I wanted to give you a short overview 11 of the case. Again, the issue pertains to a future land use amendment adopted by Marion County 12 Ordinance 07-31. The amendment changed the FLUM 13 14 designation on 378 acres of urban reserve and 17.83 acres of rural land to medium density residential. 15 The effect is that the density would increase from 16 17 one dwelling per ten acres to two dwellings per unit -- two dwelling units per acre. 18

DCA initially published a notice of intent to find the amendment in compliance. Citizen Petitioner Susan Woods and Karen Lynn Recio challenged DCA's decision and filed for an administrative hearing. Their challenge focuses mainly on the lack of demonstrated need as required by the Marion County comprehensive plan, state law

1 and rule.

2 During the course of discovery and preparation 3 for the hearing, DCA determined they had made an 4 error in their finding of in compliance. DCA 5 informed all parties prior to the hearing and 6 subsequently supported the petitioner's contention 7 that the County had not demonstrated need for the 8 FLUM amendment.

The administrative law judge entered a 9 10 recommended order finding the petitioners had proved 11 beyond fair debate that the FLUM amendment was not based on professionally acceptable demonstration of 12 13 need. He found that the County based its decision 14 on an analysis that allocated enough land for residential use for approximately 45 years. DCA 15 issued its determination that the amendment is not 16 17 in compliance, consistent with the administrative 18 law judge's recommended order.

Before you today will be the decision. Right now we will go into the speakers. The first speaker that we invite to speak is Ralf Brookes representing the petitioner.

23 GOVERNOR CRIST: Good morning.

24 MR. BROOKES: Thank you for taking the time to 25 read and understand the administrative law judge's

1 ruling in this case and thank you for your service 2 as Governor and Cabinet in fulfilling the awesome 3 responsibility you have in providing a sustainable 4 future for this generation and future generations of 5 Floridians and also for your service as part of the 6 process, ensuring that there's a full and fair 7 hearing for all citizens of the state of Florida.

8 This case shows that the system is working. 9 The system was designed to give Florida's citizens 10 input into the agency decision-making process. It's 11 a long and arduous administrative hearing process 12 that involves discovery and depositions and many 13 weeks, if not years in this case, of preparation.

We support the amended draft final order prepared by your staff. We object to the applicant's request that the plan amendment be shelved and put on a shelf based on an approach that was deemed to be not credible and did not pass even the most generous fairly debatable standard.

The County is examining and considering appropriate professional acceptable methodologies for need, and placing this plan amendment would only hinder that process. It's important to remember that this is an applicant-generated plan amendment, dealing with only 378 acres within the entirety of

1 Marion County.

The administrative law judge found, quote, the result of the approach was to allocate enough land for residential use to meet the countywide projected incremental need for additional residential land use for approximately 45 years, which is five times the calculated incremental need for 2015.

8 The administrative law judge, after hearing all the evidence and testimony, also found that Marion 9 10 County has an available supply of 7,572 medium 11 density residential dwelling units in this Planning District Number 5. So the question is do they need 12 13 another 800 units in this Planning District Number 14 5, the way the comprehensive plan of Marion County 15 is currently set up.

To shelve this plan amendment on this 378 acres would put the cart before the horse. I'd suggest to you that it even puts the horse upon the rider. Marion County is undertaking an extremely complex process now of determining what their population projections are, what their need is going to be, how much has already been allocated.

And once they determine the amount of how much growth they're going to have, then they'll sit down and they'll plan where to put this growth in

appropriate areas. And to put this plan above all
 other property owners and all other property in the
 county simply wouldn't be fair.

We thank you for your service at this final step in a long process representing two years of sacrifice by two incredible citizens, Lynn Recio and Susan Woods. And I'd like to introduce you to Susan Woods, who will say a few words. Thank you.

9 MS. SALIBA: Susan Woods, the petitioner.10 GOVERNOR CRIST: Good morning.

11 MS. WOODS: Good morning, Governor Crist, Agriculture Commissioner Bronson, CFO Sink and 12 13 Attorney General McCollum. It is with great 14 appreciation that I stand here today after our two-and-a-half-year-long hearing process. What I 15 have learned is that it really is true that a group 16 17 of concerned citizens can be heard, thanks in no small part to each of you and to a state government 18 19 that is committed to citizen participation in that 20 state's future.

I'm sorry that I could not be joined today by my co-petitioner, Lynn Recio. She and her husband Bill are in Kentucky at the fall sale of young thoroughbred horses because their lives and profession revolve around one of Marion County's

oldest treasures, what we refer to as the horse
 business.

Luckily for all of us horse people, we are 3 4 fortunate to live in one of only three areas in the world, Marion County, Lexington, Kentucky, and 5 Chantilly, France, that can claim the finest soil б 7 and environmental conditions possible for raising strong, healthy horses. It is the work of many 8 9 small horse farm neighbors, not just me, that has 10 brought this case to this point today.

11 We thank you for being part of the open 12 governmental process that honors the rights of all 13 Florida citizens to be heard. Today, on behalf of 14 all my neighbors, I thank you for your fair, honest 15 and appropriate decision.

16 MS. SALIBA: Next is Secretary Pelham17 representing the Department of Community Affairs.

18 MR. PELHAM: Governor and members of the 19 Cabinet, good morning. The Department is here to 20 support the staff recommendation and to call your 21 attention to several issues of statewide importance 22 that are presented in this case. But first let me 23 say just a word about the Department's role in this 24 matter.

25

The Department staff received this amendment,

1 as they do many, many, many others, reviewed it and 2 found it in compliance. Subsequently, as you have heard, two Marion County citizens challenged the 3 Department's decision, as they have the statutory 4 5 right to do under our Growth Management Act. Indeed б the enforcement of our Growth Management Act depends 7 primarily upon citizen participation and enforcement 8 through exercising their standing to challenge decisions which they think are inappropriate. 9

10 At some point my staff came to me and said, we 11 need to brief you on a Marion County plan amendment. They explained the background. They explained that 12 13 two citizens had challenged the amendment and that 14 after careful evaluation of the citizens' complaint, they had determined that the citizens were correct 15 and that the Department erred in overlooking this 16 17 very important issue. It wasn't that the Department analyzed it in a certain way. It's simply that the 18 Department overlooked it altogether in this 19 20 situation.

21 And their question to me was, "If we're asked 22 to go down and testify in this hearing, what are we 23 to do?" And I said, "Well, the answer to that is 24 very simple. You are to tell the truth. You have a 25 legal and an ethical obligation as professional

1 planners to tell the truth."

2 Subsequently, they were subpoenaed by the 3 petitioners to the hearing before a DOAH 4 administrative law judge. And I'm confident that 5 under oath and subject to cross-examination they 6 told the truth.

Now, the Department has been criticized for
this, much to my astonishment. I hope that we have
not reached the point where it is considered
inappropriate for a governmental agency to tell the
truth and admit that it made a mistake.

Now, out of this case, there are three issues 12 13 that I would like to bring to your attention and 14 discuss. And the first is the role of citizen participation and citizen standing. As I've pointed 15 out, our system depends upon that. It provides, 16 17 pursuant to the instruction of the Legislature, that we shall have broad public participation in these 18 19 processes, so that citizens can protect their own 20 property and make sure that their local government 21 is following the plan that they have adopted.

In this case, these two citizens did challenge our decision. They challenged it to protect their livelihood, to protect their horse farms and, more broadly speaking, to protect the equestrian industry

1 in Marion County, which is important to the County's 2 economy and the economy of Florida. They have been 3 engaged in this effort for numerous years in trying 4 to protect horse country from the continuing 5 encroachment of urban development into these areas.

In this case these two citizens, without a б 7 lawyer and faced with the extremely difficult "fairly debatable rule" standard of proof, which 8 9 makes it virtually impossible to ever win, they won. 10 Now some development interests, some of whom did not 11 even participate in the case below, are urging you to reject the administrative law judge's decision 12 13 and take away from these two great ladies their 14 hard-earned victory.

I respectfully suggest that to do that would 15 send a terrible message to the citizens of this 16 17 state. The message would be, don't bother. You can 18 participate all you want at the local level, but up 19 the line, the system is not going to protect your 20 rights. And in sending such a message, I suggest to 21 you that we would simply pour more fuel on the fires 22 of hometown democracy.

The second issue that I would like to point out is the requirement that a local government must comply with its own adopted plan. Much has been

1 made about the Department's role and state laws, but 2 at bottom this case involves local law and Marion County's adoption of its own comprehensive plan. 3 4 And that comprehensive plan contains Marion County's 5 own special requirements regarding a demonstration б of need for new plan amendments which add still more 7 residential development to a county that is already 8 hugely allocated with residential development 9 rights.

10 The local comprehensive plan is for the 11 protection of all citizens and their property, 12 including these two petitioners and their horse 13 farms. The administrative law judge correctly 14 determined that the County violated its own plan 15 when it adopted this plan amendment.

And I note that the County's own planning staff recommended to its commission that it deny the plan amendment and that there was a demonstration of need. And at the administrative hearing in this case, the County presented no evidence to support its plan amendment decision.

If you should now reject the administrative law judge's decision or to allow this amendment to survive, as is being suggested now, it will send another message, this one to local governments. You

```
    need not follow your own plan because the system
    will not do anything about it if you don't.
```

And then finally, a third issue, a critically 3 important issue under our Growth Management Act, the 4 5 issue of need. The issue that says that if you are б going to substantially increase amounts of 7 development over what you've already done in your 8 plan, you need to demonstrate that there's a need for it, because after all, what the Legislature is 9 10 asking you to do under the Growth Management Act is 11 to plan for your projected needs.

What do you project for your jurisdiction and how are you going to accommodate that growth? How are you going to provide for it? How are you going to provide the infrastructure, the water and the schools? To plan without regard for your projected needs is to not plan at all.

These requirements have been in the Growth 18 19 Management Act from the very beginning, for more 20 than 20 years. They're in Chapter 163. They're in Chapter 9J-5, the administrative law rule that 21 22 applies here. It is not a new policy. It has been 23 here from the beginning. Those statutes and rules have been applied in numerous cases involving 24 25 individual plan amendments. There are numerous

precedents in the decisions of this own commission
 in the past that apply those rules in the same way
 that they have been applied in this case.

Despite what has been contended by some people, some who are not even parties to this case, the Department is not doing anything differently in this case. The administrative law judge is not doing anything differently in this case that has not been done in numerous other cases.

10 The need criterion is more important now than 11 it has ever been, for this reason. The hometown democracy movement is prompting landowners all over 12 13 the state to submit plan amendments to the 14 Department, greatly increasing development rights on property so that they can beat hometown democracy 15 should the voters of this state adopt a 16 17 constitutional amendment in November of 2010 that requires a public referendum. In fact, this case 18 19 has become a stalking horse for much bigger projects 20 waiting in the wings that are in the pipeline.

21 We have at the Department now plan amendments 22 proposing enormous amounts of new development. We 23 have received proposals for amendments that want 24 30,000 residential units, 60,000, even 100,000 25 residential units in the case of one county. If you

should yield to the urgings of those who would now like to remove or weaken the demonstration of needs requirement, we will be sending the worst message of all to the people of this state. That is, the system will not enforce even the most fundamental growth management requirements in our statutes and rules.

8 I would urge you to support your staff's 9 recommended order. I think it is appropriate. We 10 have gone through an administrative hearing before 11 an administrative law judge, where people testify under oath and subject to cross-examination. 12 There 13 is absolutely nothing unusual about this 14 administrative law judge's decision.

And I think in most circumstances it would be 15 very easy to deal with it. But because of other 16 17 issues that are being injected into this case, including the effort to undermine the most 18 19 fundamental requirement of our growth management 20 laws, it gives special significance and importance to this case, and I would urge you to follow your 21 22 usual practice and uphold the administrative law 23 judge's decision and the recommended remedial 24 action.

25

I'll reserve a few minutes for any rebuttal

should it be necessary and will be happy to answer 1 2 any questions, but thank you for your time and attention. 3 4 GOVERNOR CRIST: Thank you, Secretary. 5 MS. SALIBA: Commissioner Barbara Fitos, Marion б County. 7 GOVERNOR CRIST: Morning, Commissioner. 8 MS. FITOS: Good morning, Governor Crist, 9 Commissioner Bronson, CFO Sink and Attorney General 10 McCollum. My thanks for your consideration of this 11 crucial growth management issue for Marion County. My own stated goal in seeking this office of county 12 13 commissioner was sustainability, both economically, 14 environmentally and in terms of quality of life. Nothing, both from my personal perspective and 15 in my official capacity, will have a greater impact 16 17 on sustainability than appropriate comprehensive growth management, crafting policies in partnership 18 19 with our community stakeholders in envisioning how 20 we grow. 21 In the past three years since my election, 22 tremendous strides have been made, not only in 23 advancing and formalizing our own strategic vision 24 in Marion County, but in seeking new levels of

cooperation and collaboration with all of our

25

partners, including DCA, toward this goal of
 sustainable community.

As a retired banking executive in human resources, I have had a tremendous learning curve in dealing with the complex issues relating to sustainable growth, both at the local level and on a statewide basis, as we deal with land use, public works, infrastructure and most especially our precious water resources.

10 I am not an attorney nor an urban planner. But 11 as a 30-year resident of Marion County whose love of this community is why I do what I do, it just makes 12 13 sense to me that we have adopted a proprietary 14 economic model designed by WilsonMiller to measure the economic impact of growth. We are updating our 15 EAR and comprehensive plan to include a defined 16 17 urban service boundary in lieu of an untenable urban reserve designation that incorporates all of the 18 individual corridor studies completed over the last 19 20 several years in Marion County.

21 We are rebalancing the equation between 22 commercial and residential growth that is crucial to 23 job creation, which is an imperative in these 24 perilous economic times, especially in Marion 25 County, with a current unemployment rate approaching

1 14 percent.

2 From my perspective, we have also forged a new, more open communication and dialogue with DCA. And 3 4 again from my perspective, this 07 amendment in 5 question encouraged clustered, contiguous development, and not only included a key transfer of б 7 development rights option, but by its very proposed 8 design and densities, which were included in a 9 comprehensive developer's agreement, would allow for 10 significant green spaces, would mitigate key 11 drainage issues, would allow for central water and sewer connections, was largely compatible with a 12 13 defined corridor study and created an appropriate 14 buffer for preservation of rural, agricultural and equine lands beyond. In short, it was that kind of 15 exemplary planned growth that would position the 16 17 County well as we moved forward.

Any true planning with respect to need must 18 19 also incorporate those platted vested lots that 20 exist not only in Marion County but statewide. I look forward to that conversation to address what in 21 22 many cases are unsustainable plats in a way that 23 preserves property rights but offers a vehicle to 24 effectively incorporate these platted lots into our 25 plans for sustainable growth.

1 I fully appreciate and respect the position of 2 DCA regarding need and also have tremendous respect for the legitimacy of the pro se filed by Ms. Woods 3 4 and Ms. Recio. I am not asking for an exception to 5 be made with respect to this 07 amendment. Rather, as we move forward cooperatively in partnership with б 7 DCA in formulating a revised planning horizon well 8 beyond 2010 and incorporate a DCA-accepted needs methodology, that this amendment be required to meet 9 10 those revised standards.

11 Treating this amendment comprehensively rather 12 than isolating it in this piecemeal fashion or tying 13 it to a nonviable planning horizon will foster these 14 goals of sustainable growth management.

I respectfully request that no sanctions be imposed against Marion County if this amendment should be found to be consistent with these updated planning provisions that are in process now and which will be adopted according to DCA's prescribed time lines. Thank you again for your time and consideration.

GOVERNOR CRIST: Thank you.
MS. SALIBA: Next is Linda Shelley,
representing Austin International, Castro Realty
Holdings and Halcyon Hills.

- MS. SHELLEY: Good morning, Governor and
 members of the Commission.
- 3 GOVERNOR CRIST: Good morning.

4 MS. SHELLEY: Linda Shelley from Fowler, White, 5 Boggs here in Tallahassee and very pleased to 6 represent the intervenors, applicants, property 7 owners in this amendment process.

8 As much as the editorials and the press would 9 like to make it so, this is not a case of good 10 versus evil, saints versus sinners, greed. It is not a result of a David and Goliath fight. What it 11 is is a case of a family that has owned property in 12 13 Marion County for decades and that wishes to build a 14 high quality community because they intend to be involved in this community for many years to come. 15

16 It is also not a case in which this property 17 owner applicant is asking you to overturn the findings of fact and conclusions of law and the 18 recommended order. As your staff, as the 19 20 petitioners, as the Department of Community Affairs have urged you to do so, this applicant has no 21 22 objection to a final order that adopts the 23 recommended order and upholds and validates the 24 issues that the petitioners and the Department have 25 brought to bear in this matter.

1 We are asking instead to be judged on the 2 revised methodology that is in the process of being 3 adopted by the County and that Commissioner Fitos 4 referred to. That has a fairly long time line. I believe that won't be completed until the end of 5 б next year. But there is no harm done in leaving 7 this amendment pending. It will not go into effect. 8 It will not get an advantage over other amendments.

This litigation was about a variety of issues, 9 10 none of which were sustained by the administrative 11 law judge, except for the issue of need. And need is not about this amendment. It doesn't change any 12 13 of the stormwater protections or the density. It 14 doesn't change the water, sewer, transportation mitigation. So a remedial measure that you would 15 normally see that says change the comp plan 16 17 amendment in a certain way or add new data and analysis in a certain way is not applicable here. 18 Your staff has said just rescind this amendment. 19

20 And we're asking you to not do that because we 21 believe that a more equitable result and one that 22 provides the result that the secretary has so 23 eloquently argued in favor of, sustaining and 24 validating the Department's position and the 25 petitioner's position on the need issue but still

lets this amendment survive to be judged against the
 new methodology that will be approved by the County,
 with the help of their consultant, and will be
 judged by the Department of Community Affairs.

And then we have said also, once the County has 5 that new methodology and they make a judgment, make б 7 sure the Department agrees that they are correct. 8 And even further we have asked that if all of that 9 happens, then ask the Department of Community 10 Affairs to issue a new notice of intent so that if 11 anybody disagrees with the outcome, such as occurred in this case, that they would have a challenge 12 13 opportunity.

14 Some people have said, well, what's the difference? Maybe -- why wouldn't it turn out the 15 same? One of the key issues in this case was the 16 17 planning horizon. It's a 2007 amendment with a 2010 plan. The issue was whether or not one needed to 18 19 prove need during that limited planning horizon. 20 The analysis prepared by the applicant's consultant 21 went out to 2015. That was determined by the ALJ to 22 be unprofessional and unacceptable.

23 The new plan will have a longer planning
24 horizon. I don't know how long it will be. Will it
25 be 2020, 2030? The needs methodology is a

mathematical equation. And when you change the 1 2 projections, you change the time line, you change the population projections, you may change the 3 4 districts, you may change the density of different 5 properties. So we do not know whether or not we б will comply with the new needs methodology being determined by the County. But we want to be judged 7 8 against it, and we believe that it is fair.

9 For that reason, we have requested, instead of 10 staff recommendation, that you impose a remedial 11 measure of testing what we refer to as the Castro amendment against the new adopted needs methodology, 12 13 the new plan that will come forward next year and 14 that you make sure the Department agrees with it and that, if possible, this amendment will be able to 15 deliver the high quality community that it was 16 17 intended to all the time.

18 It is my pleasure to introduce Terri Keogh, a 19 member of the family that has owned this property 20 for so long, to make a few remarks.

21 GOVERNOR CRIST: Good morning.

22 MS. KEOGH: Good morning. Thank you, Governor 23 and members of the Cabinet. My family has owned 24 this property, as was mentioned, since the 1950s, 25 and we have been community-minded ever since. We

have roots there. I grew up less than a mile from
 the property, went to school there. And my mother
 spends a large part of her years still there next to
 the property in Golden Hills Community.

5 We intend to stay there and to care about the б future of the community, and we also want to be 7 proud of what we helped create there. So it's with 8 this reason that we began the process by speaking with our neighbors, you know, several years ago. 9 10 And we heard their concerns then, and there were 11 many. And actually that dialogue helped us get the better community planned that we had come forward 12 with. 13

14 They had issues of density, and we mitigated from four units to two units per acre, being in the 15 urban reserve and contiguous to medium density 16 17 residential. They had issues with flooding, so we agreed to hold all of our water on site, thereby 18 19 alleviating some of the local flooding problems. 20 They had issues with the road not having the 21 capacity for additional traffic, so we obligated 22 ourselves to improve Northwest 90th Avenue. They 23 didn't want to see the development from the road, 24 and we respected that and agreed to put conservation easement natural buffers, maintaining what was there 25

around the perimeter of the property, so that the
 viewshed from Northwest 90th Avenue would not
 change.

4 We also agreed to put additional land in 5 conservation easement both on the site and off the б site on Highway 27, more community-minded, again, 7 for everybody that passes on Highway 27, an 80-acre 8 parcel. We also agreed to bring transfer 9 development rights from another 375 acres, 10 preserving that onto the property. We committed to 11 all the best management practices for water conservation. 12

13 So as you can see, we've gone to a great deal 14 of effort and expense to make this development a standard setter for Marion County and for the future 15 developments that go on there. We went to DCA 16 17 during the process and heard their concerns after the ORC report was filed and worked through their 18 19 concerns. We tried hard to comply with their 20 comments regarding need by hiring a consultant to do 21 a study on the needs issue.

22 Our amendment was then adopted and we were 23 found in compliance. As it turns out, DCA 24 discovered they had issues with the way the study 25 was done. And make no mistake, we are in agreement

1 that there should be an obligation to demonstrate 2 need as an applicant. So we are not looking to get 3 around that requirement. We're simply asking you now to give us a chance to comply with whatever 4 5 needs methodology is developed by Marion County and б approved by the DCA. And if we can't make the 7 grade, we'll live with the consequences, whatever 8 they may be.

Back in 2007 there were two other cases that 9 10 added residential density in our planning district, 11 and they were found in compliance. And we're asking not to be singled out, to have to start the plan 12 13 amendment process all over again, as it is 14 time-consuming, expensive. And since the only issue we have left remaining is need, we feel it is 15 unnecessary. Thank you very much for your time. 16

MS. SALIBA: Before the representatives from
the public, Secretary Pelham has asked for a few
more minutes.

20 MR. PELHAM: It is absolutely true that Marion 21 County has sought to develop a better, more positive 22 relationship with the Department. Recently the 23 chairman of the Marion County Commission and some of 24 the county staff came up to meet with me and our 25 staff, and their message was very clear. We know we

have problems in Marion County. We know that we haven't been doing everything the right way. We'd like to work with you to come up with a better planning system. We'd like to work with you to improve our planning.

б For the past four years what has been happening 7 with the County is that on a regular basis every 8 year they've been sending up dozens of new plan amendments covering thousands and thousands of acres 9 10 and authorizing more and more residential 11 development, into the thousands. They recognize that they could not continue to operate in that 12 13 year -- in that manner.

14 And for that reason, we have been working closely with them to update their plan, something 15 that will take a considerable amount of time, but 16 17 both the County and our staff are working very closely together. I do not think that in any way 18 justifies an action that would let this amendment 19 20 that has been found by the administrative law judge not to be in compliance to stand. 21

Let's focus for a moment on what they're asking here. Rather than to take the normal course of action, which would be to say to the County, either rescind the amendment or we retain jurisdiction for

1 60 days to consider whether or not, in the event you 2 don't rescind, any sanctions will be imposed, and in 3 almost every case where that's ever happened, the 4 local government does rescind and that's the end of 5 the matter.

6 They now want this commission to depart from 7 your well established practice. They want something 8 that's contrary to the statute. Our Growth 9 Management Act does not provide for what they are 10 now asking for.

11 But there's something else here that I have to point out seems just a little bit cynical. If you 12 13 had lost the ball game, would you not like to stave 14 off the ultimate defeat and go back and change the rules that would be more favorable to you so that 15 you could meet them and then snatch victory from the 16 17 jaws of defeat? That's what they're asking for here. We know we don't comply with the existing 18 19 law, but let's give us time to go back to Marion 20 County and change the rules after the fact and then measure us by the new rules, not by the existing 21 22 rules. There's no assurance whatsoever that that will ever happen. I would urge you that there 23 simply is no reason here to depart from your 24 25 well-established precedence.

1 If the County, in fact, is going to engage in 2 an updated comprehensive reevaluation of its plan, 3 this landowner can participate in it just like the 4 petitioners can. They can all participate in it together. And who knows, they may work out 5 б something that everybody can live with. But that 7 belongs down in Marion County. It should take place 8 because that's what Marion County and its citizens want to do, not because this commission imposes this 9 10 new unprecedented action that they are requesting for it. 11

So in conclusion, once again, we would urge you to support your staff's well-considered recommended order. Thank you very much.

ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: Could I ask the 15 secretary a question, if I could? Is there -- you 16 17 said there's no precedent for this, for us to take that action. What's happening in Marion County now 18 with all these other -- there are other matters like 19 20 this, I guess, that have been up here. You just 21 described some. Are there any that are on the 22 shelf, the word that somebody used a while ago, 23 waiting for the change to occur down the road, or is 24 this the only one? They sound like they're being --25 they're saying they're being singled out. That's

why I'm trying to understand if there is some other
 numbers of properties that are being handled
 differently.

4 MR. PELHAM: I appreciate your giving me the 5 opportunity to clarify that. There is no other case 6 in Marion County that's in the posture of this case. 7 This case has gone through an administrative law 8 hearing. It was challenged by citizens who took it 9 through an administrative law hearing.

10 That has not happened in any other Marion 11 County amendments that we're dealing with. None of them have been challenged by citizens. None of them 12 13 have gone to hearings before administrative law 14 judges. Rather, after finding them not in compliance, we have delayed holding the 15 16 administrative hearing to give the county staff and 17 our staffs time to assess the situation and see where we're going. But there's been no decision 18 19 made that those cases will not go to an 20 administrative hearing. So they're not being 21 singled out at all.

I'd like to point out, too, that the argument they're making, which I think they called the fairness argument, if accepted, would defeat in every case, virtually, a citizen's right to

1 challenge, because every time a citizen challenges 2 one of these amendments, it's usually part of a much bigger package. And the one who is challenged by a 3 4 citizen will claim, well, this is not fair. Those 5 other amendments are getting to go forward. They б weren't challenged by citizens and ours was. But we 7 should be -- we shouldn't be treated differently.

There are two sets of cases. And if a 8 citizen's right to challenge is going to mean 9 10 anything, that citizen has to be able to get relief regarding that amendment. And saying that it would 11 be unfair to handle it that way, if that were 12 accepted as the defense, would simply deprive every 13 14 citizen of an opportunity to get the relief which the law affords them. 15

ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: I agree with you, 16 17 Secretary. I have one other question, though. Are there other situations in Marion County where 18 there's no relief, if you will, being given but 19 20 where because of the land use plan change that's anticipated, there are, if you will, amendments just 21 22 sort of sitting and waiting for that to happen, waiting for the land use plan change to occur in 23 24 2010 or whenever?

MR. PELHAM: I do not think that's an accurate

25

1 description. I know that rumor has been floated 2 around. There has been no decision made by the Department to leave amendments hanging indefinitely 3 4 while the County goes through some prolonged update 5 process. ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: That's what I was б 7 asking. 8 MR. PELHAM: That's the situation. 9 ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: Thank you. 10 GOVERNOR CRIST: Commissioner. 11 COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Thank you, Governor. I've got a question, and then I've got a statement I 12 13 need to make to this board. First of all, assuming 14 that we vote the way the law judge has recommended and so forth, which we generally do when these 15 16 issues come before a full scrutiny, but in the 17 future, with the future designation or the future of 18 Marion County according to the planners and the County Commission, does this negate the landowner 19 20 from coming back under the new overview of the 21 planning council for the County and the County 22 Commission to re-petition down the road at some 23 point should -- and I'll tell you why I'm getting to 24 this question. Because I saw what happened in Osceola County. I mean, we were a rural county. 25

Everybody there either grew citrus trees or had cattle. But eventually Disney moved in and things really began to change. And downtown Kissimmee was almost no more downtown Kissimmee. Everything moved out to 192. And those types of things are going to happen as development and time takes place.

7 I just want to know, should those things move 8 in Marion County that way, does this not give the 9 landowner a chance to come back and have their 10 request reviewed?

11 MS. SALIBA: The short answer, Commissioner 12 Bronson, is this would not preclude them from filing 13 a future land use amendment. Secretary Pelham has 14 asked to respond, and then following Secretary 15 Pelham, Ms. Shelley is asking to speak.

16 MR. PELHAM: Commissioner Bronson, there's 17 absolutely nothing to prevent this landowner or any other landowner from coming back into the future, 18 19 reapplying again for the same amendment, some 20 different amendment. There's nothing to keep this 21 landowner from participating. In fact, they would 22 be encouraged to participate in Marion County's 23 initiative to do a comprehensive reevaluation of 24 their plan. So this is not set in stone. It simply 25 says at this point in time this amendment, as

presented, based on the evidence that was given,
 this plan amendment is not in compliance with
 existing law.

MS. SHELLEY: Commissioner, that's the same answer I was going to give, and that is actually the result that I think we can avoid, if you would follow my reasoning on that. This does not interfere -- leaving this amendment pending does not interfere with the County's revision of its plan.

10 There were ten other residential amendments in 11 2007. All of them have been approved without regard to the need issue. There are eight or nine other 12 13 residential amendments pending in the 2008 cycle. 14 And the secretary has indicated that he has made no decision about whether they will be pushed through a 15 trial or whether they will be allowed to be pending 16 17 while this revision is done.

18 The issue for us is why should this applicant -- if it doesn't have anything to do with 19 20 the substance of the amendment, not the stormwater, 21 the drainage, the transportation, et cetera, why 22 should this applicant have to reapply at great expense and time, hearings, et cetera, instead of 23 just remaining pending. That's our argument. 24 25 ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: Ms. Shelley --

- 1 GOVERNOR CRIST: General. 2 ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: -- would you tell us what kind of costs are involved in reapplying. I 3 4 mean, are we talking about --5 MS. SHELLEY: In addition to just regular б filing fees, which are the minimal issue, 7 consultants, presentations, time for attorneys and 8 the professional reviewers, time for the County, of 9 course, to go through the amendment cycle again. 10 The County, I understand, has agreed with the 11 Department not to process any more residential amendments until this revision is undertaken. So we 12 13 wouldn't be -- we wouldn't be accepted until the 14 following year. I'm sorry. It's not a minor fee. The filing fee is \$50,000. 15 16 ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: Thank you. MS. SALIBA: Mr. Ralf Brookes wanted to offer 17 some brief comments. 18 19 MR. BROOKES: I just wanted to say on this 20 particular issue, some of you are lawyers, this plan amendment should be considered under the law that 21 exists at this time, not some future law. And it is 22 23 simple to apply for a plan amendment in the future. 24 It happens all the time. And at that time you could
- 25 look again at need and see if there is a

demonstrated need for a plan amendment that would
 increase density on this property from agriculture
 to medium or low density residential.

4 And it probably would affect the density in 5 this plan amendment. You probably wouldn't be able to demonstrate a need for this many units on this б 7 particular parcel in this particular part of Marion 8 County, at least at this moment in time. If the economy gets better, the market improves, the need 9 10 may be there in ten years. Maybe it's there in 15 11 years. Maybe it's there in 20 years.

Just like Kissimmee grew, I'm sure Ocala and Marion will grow in the future again, and there will be a need and a projected demonstrated professionally accepted methodology for allocating

16 that need. Thanks.

17 COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Governor.

18 GOVERNOR CRIST: Commissioner.

19 COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Well, I think we see the 20 future of Florida before us today. There's no doubt 21 in my mind. The petitioners -- you know, for the 22 landowner who is trying to get some future plan in 23 place, I understand that. For those who have 24 petitioned not to have this go through, I understand 25 their position, too. If I woke up in the morning

and saw my horses out in the pasture and the next morning woke up and there's 790 houses sitting out there, that's a different view. And we're going to have these clashes from now on. This is just the first shot across the bow of these clashes.

But I think what should be talked about here is б 7 something that I've brought up many times before. 8 You've got counties, Marion being a bigger county, but you've got a lot of small counties who are 9 10 really in trouble, really in trouble right now. 11 They're trying to come up with plans to grow the county so that monies coming in to pay for all their 12 13 county issues, unless the State is going to be 14 willing to pay for those, which in the last couple of years, as we've seen, the State hasn't had the 15 money to help the counties out too much. 16

17 So counties all over this state are in trouble. You have almost 50 percent of this state off the tax 18 19 rolls. Fifty percent almost of this state is off 20 the tax rolls. No gross domestic product being 21 produced, no jobs being produced. And these 22 counties are hurting, and they're going to hurt from now and into the future because of it. 23 How this growth management plan is going to 24 go -- and I believe you have to have a plan. 25

1 There's no doubt about it. You have to have some 2 common sense growth patterns. And it could be that 3 the area that this property is in at some point in 4 time may be the big growth area for the county, who 5 knows what's going to happen, which is going to put б pressure on land owners in those areas and I'm sure 7 are not going to be happy about it. But sometimes 8 that's the way it's going to -- it's going to work 9 out.

10 But this is what's going to happen from now on. 11 I won't be on this Cabinet while some of that discussion is going on, but I can tell you factually 12 13 it's happened. It's here now. And the only reason 14 why this probably has fallen through in the past two years, I think I heard that this has been going on, 15 is because the economy has taken a hit. There are 16 17 many houses up now that weren't available two years 18 ago when this plan was being looked at.

But I don't think we need to kid ourselves here. With that many -- that much land off the tax rolls, with no gross domestic product being produced, they've got to somehow -- business has to come into these counties to keep the counties going and the jobs that would be brought with it, and that's not happening right now.

1 So while this started while things were still 2 good in the county, you're going to see more 3 counties wanting to move to do more development to 4 bring in business. And this is the type of thing 5 that's going to happen. So I think we need to be 6 honest with ourselves.

I can't say that I could vote to totally turn
down what the law judge has indicated, now that I
know it can be brought back up. The other thing,
Governor and Cabinet members, I don't believe
penalizing the County Commission, who was making a
decision that they thought was the right thing to
do, is the right thing for us to do, number one.

14 And number two, those cases will come before this board as they pop up and are challenged. 15 And I'm sure we're going to have to make those 16 17 determinations. But I don't think the County Commission should be penalized in any way, because 18 19 they're trying to improve the potential economic 20 condition of the county, over this issue, even 21 though the DCA and others may disagree with them 22 under the current terms. I just don't believe 23 that's something that this board should do. 24 MS. SALIBA: One point of clarification. 25 Secretary Pelham has asked to talk about the timing

1 and reentry of amendments, very briefly.

2 MR. PELHAM: First I want to make it clear that 3 the Department certainly is not here seeking imposition of sanctions against the County. 4 5 Secondly, if the County itself believes in this amendment or in some form of it, as it goes through б 7 its ongoing comprehensive plan update, which it says 8 it thinks will take a couple of years, if it truly supports this amendment, it can include it in its 9 10 comprehensive plan update.

11 Nothing is required of the applicant. They 12 don't have to charge this applicant a new 13 application fee. The County on its own can include 14 this in its plan for consideration. That's what you 15 do in a comprehensive update of the plan. They're 16 not going to be penalized in any way.

MS. SALIBA: Now, very briefly, we will invite
Charles Pattison with 1000 Friends to make some
remarks.

20 MR. PATTISON: Morning Governor, General 21 McCollum, CFO Sink and Commissioner Bronson. I will 22 be very brief. We are here today in support of this 23 draft recommended final order that's before you and 24 just want to make two points. The first is to 25 recognize, as Secretary Pelham said, this is about

implementing the Marion County plan and state law as
 it relates to demonstrating need for a project
 before it gets approved. That's nothing new.
 That's not being reinterpreted. That's the same
 before I worked at DCA and has been ever since.

6 The other piece of this is that each amendment 7 does need to be evaluated for need. If you don't do 8 that, you subvert and undermine the very reason that 9 you had a needs assessment when the original plan 10 came before the local government.

11 The second point is to recognize again how critically important it is for our citizens to be 12 13 involved in this process. The two ladies that 14 brought this challenge overcame major obstacles. They followed every rule. They even convinced DCA 15 and an administrative law judge that they were 16 17 correct in suggesting that this amendment was not in compliance. Theirs is a success story. It 18 demonstrates how the public involvement with our 19 20 growth management process can and should work.

We urge you then to support DCA, Judge
Johnston, Ms. Woods and Ms. Recio in upholding the
draft recommended order before you. Thank you.
MS. SALIBA: The final speaker is Manley Fuller
with the Florida Wildlife Federation.

1 MR. FULLER: Good morning, Governor and Cabinet 2 members. Florida Wildlife Federation supports the position of the administrative law judge, the 3 4 Department of Community Affairs and the citizens who petitioned, and we urge adoption of the staff's 5 final recommended order. Thank you. б 7 GOVERNOR CRIST: Thank you, Manley. Any other 8 speakers, Lisa? 9 MS. SALIBA: No, sir. That concludes our 10 speakers. Just to recap for you the staff 11 recommendation, we recommend entering the amended final draft order, which adopts the administrative 12 13 law judge's findings of fact and conclusions of law, 14 with one exception. We adopt the recommended rulings on exceptions as set forth in the DCA 15 determination of noncompliance, and as a remedial 16 17 action, we direct Marion County to rescind the amendment that they previously approved. 18 And in terms of sanctions, we retain 19 20 jurisdiction for 60 days to ensure that the ordinance is rescinded. And that is the extent of 21 our staff recommendation. 22 23 GOVERNOR CRIST: Thank you. Commissioner. 24 COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Question on that. Let's say the County decides -- I think they probably 25

will, but what if they decided they didn't want to rescind their agreement? What is then the position, since it's a duly appointed constitutional county commission, what would be their recourse should they decide to do that and DCA or the State decides to fine them or put them under some punitive program? What do we do then?

8 MS. SALIBA: The recourse would be by the Commission. In the event that they do not rescind, 9 10 the Commission can then decide if they would like to 11 impose sanctions. The statute provides that they may, the Commission may impose sanctions, which 12 13 could include some amount of the revenue sharing and 14 other items as identified in the sanctions statute. It can be monetary, nonmonetary. It is up to the 15 discretion of the Commission. 16

17 GOVERNOR CRIST: Thank you. In order to put us 18 in a good posture, I'm going to go ahead and make a 19 motion that does follow the staff recommendation, 20 the administrative law judge's findings and the 21 recommendation of Secretary Pelham.

And I want to commend the citizen involvement in this case and thank you for your tenacity and your hard work and your candor. And I'll ask for a second.

1 CFO SINK: Second.

2 GOVERNOR CRIST: Any discussion? 3 ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: I would only 4 discuss it to say that it sounds to me, from what 5 Secretary Pelham has described, that there's no 6 precedent for us to do what has been requested in 7 this case, and it would set a precedent, which 8 probably would not be good, Governor.

9 But I think there is some sympathy for the 10 applicant who -- the petitioner, however we're 11 putting this, I'm probably putting it the wrong way -- the property holder, who may be positioned 12 13 differently because this case has come along the way 14 it has from others who are apparently being given the opportunity in Marion County to hold their 15 amendment for a period of time. 16

17 Now, I don't know how that's going to get resolved. But there is that sort of sense of 18 unfairness in that. But I don't think we have any 19 20 choice, nor do I think we should set the wrong 21 precedent here because it sends the wrong message. 22 It's just an unfortunate situation for the property 23 holder in this position and Marion County who has 24 got to go back and correct this problem.

25 So I will support the amendment, or the motion

1	you've made.
2	GOVERNOR CRIST: Thank you. All in favor
3	signify by saying aye. Aye.
4	COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Aye.
5	CFO SINK: Aye.
б	ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: Aye.
7	GOVERNOR CRIST: Opposed, like sign. Show it
8	passing unanimously. Thank you.
9	MS. SALIBA: Thank you.
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	GOVERNOR CRIST: Next agenda, Board of
2	Trustees, Department of Agriculture and Consumer
3	Services, Sherman Wilhelm. Good morning, Sherman.
4	MR. WILHELM: Good morning, Governor and
5	Cabinet members.
6	GOVERNOR CRIST: Sherman.
7	MR. WILHELM: Thank you, sir. Item Number 1 is
8	approval of the minutes from the July 28th, 2009,
9	Cabinet meeting.
10	GOVERNOR CRIST: Is there a motion to approve
11	the minutes?
12	CFO SINK: Move it.
13	COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Second.
14	GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show the
15	minutes approved without objection.
16	MR. WILHELM: Item Number 2, staff is
17	requesting authorization to issue to Mr. Gary Lavine
18	a one-acre, ten-year sovereignty submerged
19	aquaculture land lease in Monroe County for the
20	purpose of culturing live rock.
21	CFO SINK: Move it.
22	COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Second.
23	GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show it
24	approved without objection. This is one of your
25	favorite issues, Commissioner. Good one. Thank

1 you.

2	MR. WILHELM: Item Number 3, staff is
3	requesting authorization to issue to the University
4	of Florida a one-acre, ten-year sovereignty
5	submerged land management agreement in Monroe County
6	for the purpose of culturing live rock and corals
7	for experimental, research and demonstration
8	purposes, and permission to waive the associated
9	fees.
10	ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: I move Item 3.
11	COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Second.
12	GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show it
13	approved without objection.
14	MR. WILHELM: And Item Number 4 is staff is
15	requesting authorization to issue to Mr. Curtis
16	Hemmel and Mr. Kyle Brinkley each a four-acre,
17	ten-year sovereignty submerged land lease for the
18	purpose in Manatee County for the purpose of
19	producing shellfish.
20	CFO SINK: Move it.
21	COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Second.
22	GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show it
23	approved without objection. Thank you.
24	MR. WILHELM: Thank you very much.
25	

1	GOVERNOR CRIST: Board of Trustees, Secretary
2	Sole.
3	MR. SOLE: Good morning, Governor, Cabinet
4	members.
5	GOVERNOR CRIST: Good morning.
6	MR. SOLE: Item Number 1, submittal of the
7	minutes for the July 28, 2009, Cabinet meeting.
8	ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: Is there a motion?
9	CFO SINK: Move it.
10	COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Second.
11	ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: Show it approved
12	without objection.
13	MR. SOLE: Thank you. Item Number 2 is request
14	consideration of the Department of Environmental
15	Protection's performance report for 2008-2009, as
16	well as our performance measures for 2009-2010. I
17	can tell you that without question I'm very proud of
18	the performance of the Department in implementing
19	direction of the Board of Trustees as well as trying
20	to strive for excellence on behalf of the people of
21	the state of Florida.
22	We had some 21 measures that we reported on. I
23	just want to highlight a few very briefly. Number
24	one, I think it's worth noting that the Florida Park
25	Service has set yet another record for visitation in

the state of Florida. We had 21 million people come and visit one of our 160 state parks. This is a phenomenal record and it's helped contribute some, just under a billion dollars to, I think, Florida's economy. So this is tremendous. Without question, our state parks are a phenomenal recreational value for the people and visitors.

8 Also note that in addition to the 9 record-setting attendance, we also had more 10 volunteer hours that were donated basically to our 11 state park system than ever before. 1.2 million 12 hours of volunteer service were provided to our 13 State Park Service. And this is equivalent to some 14 581 full-time-equivalent employees.

And I will tell you, General, CFO and Commissioner, without these volunteer hours, we couldn't do what we do for the people of Florida. So if you do go to a state park and you see a nametag with the word "volunteer" on it, please take a moment and thank them. It's tremendous assistance they provide us.

In addition to visitor and recreational services, we did also report on some of our management and performance issues. As you're aware, we are responsible for leases on behalf of the Board

1 of Trustees. We inspected some 66 commercial 2 leases. That's 100 percent of the commercial leases that are out there. Compliance was, on this issue, 3 4 94 percent, which was good. We still had four noncompliance issues that we need to solve. 5 Actually, most of them relating to hunt camps and б 7 making sure that we get our lease fees in 8 relationship to those.

9 For our sovereign submerged land leases, again, 10 we have some 2,700 sovereign submerged land leases 11 throughout the state of Florida. We are on an 12 inspection interval of basically once every five 13 years we go out and inspect.

14 Unfortunately, our compliance rate is not as high as I'd like it to be. We did roughly 399 15 inspections. We had an 85 percent compliance rate. 16 17 So 15 percent of those inspected were deemed out of compliance. Most of those are in relationship to 18 boats moored outside of the lease area or some 19 20 additional infrastructure that was built not in 21 conformance with the lease.

22 Without question -- CFO, you've raised this, 23 and we need to do a better job at trying to ensure 24 compliance of these leases. We're out there 25 aggressively moving forward. We're actually

updating our databases so that we can track it better and also try and be very aggressive with respect to ensuring we get our lease fees and lease fees in arrears. So I'm grateful for that direction.

I'm going to move to Florida Forever. б Florida 7 Forever, we had hoped to be able to acquire some 8 46,000 acres. I think the Governor and Cabinet are very familiar with our funding challenges that we 9 10 had last year and current year. We were only able 11 to acquire 37 percent of that goal. But the good news is we are still on track, moving forward with 12 the additional bonding of \$250 million that Ben and 13 14 I have been working on. We hope to have that initiated by the end of this fall to move forward 15 and get some critical acquisitions that have already 16 17 been approved by the Board of Trustees.

Finally, I want to talk a little bit about 18 19 managing our resources. We also report on how many 20 acres of property that we've burned for fire ecology 21 as well as our invasive management, invasive plant 22 management work. We've amended these goals to be a 23 little bit more reflective of a true performance 24 versus just an outcome. In prior years we would 25 just report how many acres we burned. Well, that

1 was nice, but what I asked staff, and they were 2 great to work on this, is what's our ecological burn 3 goals, how many acres should we be burning each year 4 to attain our ecological benefit for good fire 5 ecology.

So we've identified that in these measures, and б 7 it identifies roughly 77,000 acres per year should 8 be burned on average for our DEP-managed facilities. 9 Roughly we're burning about 41-, 40,000 acres. So 10 this is an area that, with resources, we can improve 11 on. But it is a resource-driven issue. And without the resources, we're able to get roughly 40,000, 12 13 which is a little over 60 percent, burned.

14 Same thing holds true for invasive plant management. We would tell you how many acres we 15 treated. Well, the true reflection of how we're 16 17 doing in Florida is how much of Florida, of our lands are under a maintenance control program. 18 And we've identified that -- and this is a good story, I 19 20 think. Eighty-one percent of the lands that we 21 manage are under a maintenance control program, 22 meaning they don't have invasives or we're managing 23 them effectively so that they are not actually 24 spreading. But without question, we need to do more 25 because we still have 19 percent that we need to get

at. And, again, this is also a resource issue.

1

2 With that, I'd be glad to answer any questions3 if there are any.

4 GOVERNOR CRIST: Any questions? Commissioner? 5 COMMISSIONER BRONSON: One. Mike, how many of the invasive species have y'all identified? I mean, б 7 I'm sure you've got a record of them. Do you know 8 or remember how many that are here in the state and 9 how many acres? I know at one time Brazilian pepper 10 was estimated at over 800,000 acres of Brazilian 11 pepper in this state.

So I -- and the only reason why I'm bringing this up, as we've seen with the boas and the pythons and all that, this is becoming a real huge issue for Florida, not only for state roads, state lands, but private landowners are spending a fortune trying to fight these invasive species as well.

MR. SOLE: The number of species I don't know 18 19 off the top of my head. We use the invasive plant 20 management's listing of invasive exotics which they 21 report on. We always had the top three of 22 Australian pine, Brazilian pepper, Melaleuca from 23 the plant side of the house. But obviously old 24 world climbing fern has just been devastating to South Florida. 25

1 You know, one of the things that's relevant to 2 your point, Commissioner, is we calculated roughly 3 how much it costs per acre to control invasives. 4 And it's not inexpensive. It was roughly -- and, 5 again, it depends on the area and the infestation -б about \$350 per acre to really get your arms around 7 some of these invasives and get them under control. 8 So it is something that I'm proud that we're able to kind of hold the line on our state lands 9 10 right now, and we are. I think we're doing a good 11 job on the state-managed lands. But without question, roadways, private lands is an area that we 12 13 continue to see more and more infestation. And 14 unfortunately it makes it even harder for us to manage our lands because of that seed source. 15 GOVERNOR CRIST: Didn't we have a record 16 17 turnout at state parks this past year? MR. SOLE: Yes, sir. Twenty-one million 18 visitors came to our state, one of our 160 state 19 20 parks. Tremendous result. What a great 21 recreational value that we provide for the people of 22 Florida and the visitors to this state, Governor. 23 GOVERNOR CRIST: That's great. Thank you very 24 much, Secretary. Anything else? Thank you. 25 (Whereupon, the meeting was concluded at 11:22 a.m.)

1 2 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 3 4 STATE OF FLORIDA) 5 COUNTY OF LEON) б 7 I, Jo Langston, Registered Professional Reporter, 8 do hereby certify that the foregoing pages 5 through 96, 9 both inclusive, comprise a true and correct transcript of 10 the proceeding; that said proceeding was taken by me 11 stenographically and transcribed by me as it now appears; 12 that I am not a relative or employee or attorney or counsel of the parties, or a relative or employee of such attorney 13 14 or counsel, nor am I interested in this proceeding or its 15 outcome. 16 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand 17 this 30th day of September 2009. 18 19 20 21 22 JO LANGSTON Registered Professional Reporter 23 24