# THE CABINET STATE OF FLORIDA

### Representing:

FINANCIAL SERVICES COMMISSION, FINANCIAL REGULATION
FINANCIAL SERVICES COMMISSION, INSURANCE REGULATION
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS
ADMINISTRATION COMMISSION
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND CONSUMER SERVICES
BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE INTERNAL IMPROVEMENT TRUST FUND
STATE BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION

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, July 28, 2009, commencing at approximately 9:05 a.m.

Reported by:

MARY ALLEN NEEL
Registered Professional Reporter
Florida Professional Reporter
Notary Public

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

\* \* \*

### INDEX

# FINANCIAL SERVICES COMMISSION, FINANCIAL REGULATION (Presented by LINDA CHARITY)

ITEM	ACTION	PAGE
1 2 3	Approved Approved Withdrawn	5 6 7
FINANCIAL SERVICES (Presented by KEVII	COMMISSION, INSURANCE N McCARTY)	REGULATION
ITEM	ACTION	PAGE
1 2 3 4	Approved Approved Approved Approved	8 8 9 10
DEPARTMENT OF REVER (Presented by LISA		
ITEM	ACTION	PAGE
1 2 3	Approved Approved Approved	16 16 17
DEPARTMENT OF VETER (Presented by ADMII		
ITEM	ACTION	PAGE
1 2	Approved Approved	18 19
ADMINISTRATION COMM (Presented by LISA		
ITEM	ACTION	PAGE
1 2 3 4	Approved Approved Approved Continued	20 20 48 49

### INDEX CONTINUED

# DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND CONSUMER SERVICES (Presented by JIM KARELS)

ITEM	ACTION	PAGE
1 2	Approved Approved	50 62
BOARD OF TRUSTEES (Presented by MIKE		ROVEMENT TRUST FUND
ITEM	ACTION	PAGE
1 2 3 STATE BOARD OF ADM (Presented by ASH		64 67 67
ITEM	ACTION	PAGE
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Approved Approved Approved Approved Approved Approved Approved Approved	88 91 91 92 93 94 95
CERTIFICATE OF REP	ORTER	96

#### PROCEEDINGS

2 (The agenda items commenced at 9:16 a.m.)

GOVERNOR CRIST: At this time, we have the Financial Services Commission, Office of Financial Regulation, Linda Charity. Good morning, Linda.

MS. CHARITY: Good morning, Governor, CFO, and Commission members. We have a fairly short agenda today.

The first item, the Office requests the approval of the Financial Services Commission minutes of the May 27, 2009 meeting.

COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Motion for approval of Item 1.

ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: Second.

GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show the minutes approved without objection.

MS. CHARITY: Thank you. Item Number 2, the Office requests approval to file for final adoption Rules 69V-85.006 and 69V-160.036 relating to the electronic filing of forms and fees.

This rule is a new rule that -- what it does is, it requires electronic filing into our new licensing system, our regulatory enforcement and licensing system, REAL, for licensees under Chapter 520, which are retail installment sales, and 516,

1 consumer finance companies. Based on some comments from the Small Business 2 Regulatory Council, we have made some adjustments 3 4 to the rule to allow certain individuals to request 5 an exemption from the mandatory electronic filing. 6 So we request that you approve for final 7 adoption --8 COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Motion for approval of 9 Item 2. 10 ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: Second. 11 GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show it 12 approved without objection. 13 MS. CHARITY: Thank you. Item Number 3, the 14 Office would like to request withdrawal for 15 approval to file the notice identified, Rule 16 69V-40.0311, 69V-40.0511, 69V-40.201, and 69V-560.1021. We would like to take this up at a 17 later time, please. 18 19 GOVERNOR CRIST: Is there a motion to 20 withdraw? 21 ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: I move to allow 22 the withdrawal. 23 COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Second. 24 GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show it

withdrawn without objection. Thank you.

1	GOVERNOR CRIST: Office of Insurance
2	Regulation, Commissioner McCarty. Good morning,
3	Commissioner.
4	MR. McCARTY: Good morning, Governor and
5	members of the Commission.
6	Agenda Item 1 is a request for approval for
7	adoption of the minutes of the Financial Services
8	Commission for May 13, 2009.
9	ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: I move Item 1.
10	COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Second.
11	GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show the
12	minutes approved without objection.
13	MR. McCARTY: Agenda Item Number 2 is a
14	request for approval for publication of proposed
15	Rule 690-138.001. This is the financial condition
16	handbook. Section 624 of the Florida Insurance
17	Code requires the Office to examine the books and
18	records of licensed insurance companies. This
19	merely adopts the 2009 edition of the examination
20	handbook.
21	GOVERNOR CRIST: Is there a motion on Item 2?
22	CFO SINK: Move it.
23	COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Second.
24	GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show it
25	approved without objection.

1 MR. McCARTY: Agenda Item Number 3 is a 2 request for approval of proposed Rule 690.137.001. 3 The requires the Office of Insurance Regulation to 4 provide annual -- quarterly and annual financial 5 statements. This adopts the 2009 edition over the 6 2008. 7 COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Motion on Item 3. 8 CFO SINK: Second. 9 GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show it approved without objection. 10 11 MR. McCARTY: The next agenda item is a 12 request for approval for Citizens Property 13 Insurance Plan of Operation changes. As you are 14 aware, there have been legislative changes, and the 15 Financial Services Commission is tasked by Florida 16 law to adopt changes to the Plan of Operation. 17 have Mark Castil here today from Citizens Property 18 Insurance to review changes, proposed changes to 19 Citizens' Plan of Operation. GOVERNOR CRIST: I think that was your cue, 20 21 Mark. Good morning. 22 MR. CASTIL: 23 24

1	changed the Legislature changed our assessment
2	stages. We changed staggered our term on the
3	board. That was from the 2009 session. We had a
4	board that was coming off all at once. Many of
5	these changes were just to make the operation
6	really run easier and clearer for the operation,
7	and we would request your approval.
8	GOVERNOR CRIST: Is there a motion on Item 4?
9	COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Motion for approval of
10	Item Number 4.
11	ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: Second.
12	GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show it
13	approved without objection. Thank you, gentlemen.
14	Department of Revenue.
15	CFO SINK: Governor?
16	GOVERNOR CRIST: Yes, CFO. Forgive me.
17	CFO SINK: Excuse me. Commissioner McCarty is
18	aware that I wanted to bring up something that just
19	came to my attention yesterday.
20	Let me pass out to the Commission members what
21	I'm going to be referring to.
22	COMMISSIONER BRONSON: I've got to get
23	somebody to hold this out.
24	CFO SINK: Yes, it's just I know. You need
25	magnifying glasses, but it's for you to take back

1 to your offices.

GOVERNOR CRIST: Thank you.

CFO SINK: At any rate, the reason I bring this up is that yesterday when I got back in the office, I had a letter from one of the members of the Legislature making a request of me as a member of the Financial Services Commission to get a clarification on comments that have been reported in the press attributed to Commissioner McCarty that Florida had been the beneficiary of approximately 40 new insurance companies bringing about \$4 billion in capital into the Florida property market. And he referenced this particular spreadsheet and has asked for some clarification as to whether or not in fact these are the companies with this amount of capital that Commissioner McCarty has been referring to.

And as we've looked in more detail, what you have is, basically 1 through 17 look to be the new Florida domestic admitted market insurers with about \$328 million in capital. And then you'll see dropping down to lines 29 through 40 are companies that are writing surplus lines insurance, which is not in the admitted market, and these are companies that can charge whatever rate their market will

bear, and they've committed over \$3 billion in capital.

And certainly it's a great thing to have any form of new capital coming into Florida, but some of these companies are writing residential, some are writing what's called commercial residential, which is the condo market, and others are writing more commercial insurance.

And since we're going to need to respond back to the legislator, Commissioner McCarty, I was just going to ask you if before the next Cabinet meeting, could you come back and kind of reorder the list and show us the divisions between the commercial, the commercial residential, and the residential, and also delineate, as you really have already here, the surplus lines company versus the ones who are subject to the rate filings at the Office of Insurance Regulation so we can get this clarified, because there has been a lot of noise around this whole \$4 billion issue over the last four to six weeks.

MR. McCARTY: There has indeed. I'll be happy to. Is this the list that we provided to your office? I don't have the list before me that you're referring to.

1	CFO SINK: Oh, I'm sorry. You need to see it
2	too.
3	MR. McCARTY: Yes.
4	CFO SINK: If somebody wants to
5	GOVERNOR CRIST: We'll make sure you get one.
6	CFO SINK: Yes. Sorry.
7	GOVERNOR CRIST: Worry not.
8	CFO SINK: Maybe the Commissioner ought to
9	look at the list too. This was the one that was
10	attached to the letter, the first one that I
11	received asking for further clarification.
12	MR. McCARTY: We'll be more than happy to
13	provide that information, Madam CFO.
14	CFO SINK: Great. Thank you.
15	MR. McCARTY: Thank you.
16	GOVERNOR CRIST: Thank you, Commissioner.
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	GOVERNOR CRIST: Department of Revenue, Lisa
2	Echeverri. Good morning.
3	MS. ECHEVERRI: Good morning.
4	GOVERNOR CRIST: How's revenue?
5	MS. ECHEVERRI: It's doing well. I think you
6	know
7	GOVERNOR CRIST: Glad to hear it.
8	MS. ECHEVERRI: that we are hoping to make
9	an estimate this month. It's looking a little
10	close on sales tax, maybe slightly below, but we're
11	not quite finished out for the month. But the
12	other taxes seem to be coming in strong. Corporate
13	and doc stamp are over estimate, the communications
14	services tax just right there at estimate. So, you
15	know, we're crossing our fingers. It's been
16	looking good for the last three months.
17	GOVERNOR CRIST: Really? Can you tell us
18	about that?
19	MS. ECHEVERRI: Well, I mean, since November
20	of 2006
21	GOVERNOR CRIST: People might like to hear
22	that.
23	MS. ECHEVERRI: Since November of 2006, the
24	State has not been making estimate on the revenues.
25	So a couple of months ago when we finally made

1 estimate, after the Revenue Estimating Committee 2 had gone back and adjusted those revenues, those 3 estimated revenues, I think they've finally 4 adjusted the estimates to be a little more 5 realistic for Florida's picture. And the revenues 6 have been coming in consistent with the estimate, 7 which is really good news, because that's what we all budget off of. So as long as we make those 8 9 estimates, you know, we should be in good shape. 10 GOVERNOR CRIST: Consistent with estimate or 11 over estimate? 12 MS. ECHEVERRI: We've been slightly, slightly 13 This month it looks like we may be just at 14 estimate. 15 GOVERNOR CRIST: So how many months have we 16 been over estimate now? 17 MS. ECHEVERRI: I think the last two months 18 we've just been just slightly -- I mean, I wouldn't 19 even call it over, but just at estimate. GOVERNOR CRIST: Would you call it under? 20 MS. ECHEVERRI: No, I would not call it under. 21 22 GOVERNOR CRIST: Okay. Good. Halleluiah. 23 MS. ECHEVERRI: I have to be pretty 24 conservative since I'm the one that counts the 25 money. But I think the big issue was, you know,

1	really getting those estimates on track, because I
2	think no one could quite predict the economic
3	future. And so when we weren't making estimate and
4	the State had budgeted off of those numbers, you
5	know, it required the State to come back and do a
6	lot of adjustment. But right now we look to be
7	meeting estimate, so we've budgeted appropriately.
8	GOVERNOR CRIST: Great. Thank you, Lisa.
9	MS. ECHEVERRI: Okay. Item Number 1, request
10	approval of the minutes from the April 28, 2009
11	meeting.
12	CFO SINK: Move it.
13	COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Second.
14	GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show the
15	minutes approved without objection.
16	MS. ECHEVERRI: Item Number 2, request
17	approval and authority to publish notice to begin
18	rulemaking to establish procedures for the
19	adjustment of distribution of communications
20	services taxes.
21	ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: Move it.
22	COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Second.
23	GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show it
24	approved without objection.

1	approval to adopt and file with the Secretary of
2	State rule amendments to simplify and clarify sales
3	tax revisions, implement law changes and
4	clarifications for the insurance premium tax, and
5	conform the corporate income tax code to federal
6	and Florida law.
7	GOVERNOR CRIST: Is there a motion?
8	CFO SINK: Move it.
9	ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: Second.
10	GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show it
11	approved without objection.
12	Thank you, Lisa.
13	MS. ECHEVERRI: Thank you very much.
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1 GOVERNOR CRIST: Department of Veterans' Affairs, Admiral Collins. 2 3 ADMIRAL COLLINS: Good morning, Governor and 4 members of the Cabinet. The Florida Department of 5 Veterans' Affairs has two items on the agenda. 6 Item 1, the minutes of the May 27th Cabinet 7 meeting. Recommend acceptance. COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Motion on Item 1 for 8 9 approval. 10 ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: Second. 11 GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show it 12 approved without objection. 13 ADMIRAL COLLINS: Item 2, we respectfully request approval of the notice of proposed rule 14 development for three rules related to veteran 15 16 service officers and continued GI bill eligibility for educational institutions. 17 18 Rule 55A-3.006 relates to continuing 19 20

21

22

23

24

25

Rule 55A-3.006 relates to continuing certification of city and county veteran service officers. Rule 55A-3.007 also relates to veteran service officers, specifically the consequences of failure to attend training and refresher courses provided by the Department of Veterans' Affairs. Rule 55A-5.008, Supervisory Inspection Review, relates to programmatic and institutional

1 eligibility to offer courses of study under the federal GI bill. 2 Currently, these rules provide discretion to 3 4 the Florida Department of Veterans' Affairs regarding training requirements for veteran service 5 6 officers and suspension of educational institutions 7 from participating in GI bill programs. At the 8 request of the Joint Administrative Procedures 9 Committee, the JAPC, we are proposing to remove 10 this discretion, making the rule requirements mandatory by amending the rules from "may" to 11 "shall" in each instance. 12 13 Should there be any questions, our general 14 counsel is here with me today and can speak to the 15 details. 16 GOVERNOR CRIST: I move Item 2. 17 Second. CFO SINK: GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. 18 Show it 19 approved without objection. Thank you, Admiral. 20 ADMIRAL COLLINS: Thank you, sir. 21 22 23 24 25

1	GOVERNOR CRIST: Administration Commission,
2	Lisa Saliba. Hi, Lisa.
3	MS. SALIBA: Good morning, Governor and
4	Commission members. We have four items today.
5	Item 1 is the approval of minutes from the May
6	13th meeting.
7	GOVERNOR CRIST: Is there a motion on the
8	minutes?
9	COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Motion for approval of
10	Item 1.
11	ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: Second.
12	GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show the
13	minutes approved without objection.
14	MS. SALIBA: The second item is recommend
15	approval of the minutes from the June 9th meeting.
16	COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Motion for approval of
17	Item 2.
18	CFO SINK: Second.
19	GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show
20	them approved without objection.
21	MS. SALIBA: The third item relates to two
22	future land use amendments adopted by the City of
23	Miami-Dade County, and at issue are whether
24	these amendments are in compliance.
25	We have with us today to answer questions

for any technical or expert questions you may have, we have Jerry Curington, who is in our general counsel's office, as well as Dave Jordan, who assisted us in writing the order.

To differentiate for you, we have two amendments that are being reviewed. The first one we refer to as the Lowe's amendment that encompasses two parcels totaling 52 acres. The ALJ found this amendment as not in compliance for several reasons, some of which include that there is insufficient proof of need for the amendment, they lack consistency between the amendment and the State Comprehensive Plan and the Strategic Regional Policy Plan, and a failure to demonstrate that the amendment would discourage urban sprawl.

The second amendment for your consideration we refer to as the Brown amendment. The Brown amendment was found in compliance by the ALJ. It encompasses a 42-acre parcel. The ALJ found it in compliance because the petitioner failed to refute the need for the amendment and failed to prove that the amendment is inconsistent with the State Comprehensive Plan and the Strategic Regional Policy Plan and failed to show that the amendment did not discourage urban sprawl.

So today for you we will have -- we have staff recommendations in the form of a Third Amended Draft Final Order. There are some revisions to the

amendment.

The Commission, however, is limited in the actions that it can take on a final order and are bound by the findings of fact of the administrative law judge that sits as the trier of fact on the case. And unless there is competent — unless we find that there is a more reasonable or as reasonable reason or conclusion than the ALJ, we do not substitute the ALJ's findings of fact or conclusions of law.

Accordingly, the staff recommends the order with slight modifications on the findings and conclusions, but the final result is the same as that recommended by the ALJ.

If you have any questions, again, we have legal staff here.

We do have presenters today. They have made extensive presentations before the Cabinet aides and meetings with the Cabinet aides, so therefore, they have agreed to keep their comments limited today.

The presenters include the petitioner, Shaw

Stiller, representing the Department of Community

Affairs. The Department supports the staff
recommendation.

The respondent, Dennis Kerbel with Miami-Dade County. Miami-Dade adopted the amendments, and he supports the conclusion on the Brown amendment, however, not the Lowe's amendment.

We have a list of intervenors that would like to present as well. They are Mr. Richard Grosso representing 1000 Friends of Florida. They do support the staff recommendation. Mr. Charles Pattison, also representing 1000 Friends, supports the staff recommendation.

Martha Harrell Chumbler, representing Lowe's Home Center, does not agree with the conclusion on the Lowe's amendment.

Linda Shelley, representing David Brown, supports the staff recommendation, and Patricia Davis, representing the West Kendall Community Council, is in support of the staff recommendation.

At this time, Governor, I would like to start with our list of speakers. All right. First up we have Mr. Shaw Stiller with the Department of Community Affairs.

GOVERNOR CRIST: Good morning.

MR. STILLER: Good morning, Governor and members of the Cabinet. Again, I'm Shaw Stiller, general counsel for the Department of Community Affairs.

And first off, I want to commend your staff and your aides for all their hard work in this matter. This is a very important case. It's a very complex case. It's important because we're talking about the expansion of Miami-Dade's urban development boundary by approximately 100 acres westward towards the Everglades.

The consideration of this order not only involves the factually specific findings with respect to these two amendments, but it does establish precedent, as recognized in the Third Amended Draft Final Order, and sets policy directive for what will happen with the next amendments that come to expand the urban development boundary.

The primary issue, of course, is the importance of the Everglades. And with the Lowe's amendment, that amendment was found not in compliance because it's inconsistent with the local plan, the regional plan, and the state plan on this issue, very important.

With the Brown amendment, we recognize that
this is an extremely limited exception to an
otherwise steadfast rule. The Miami-Dade plan does
allow for expansions of the urban development
boundary in limited circumstances. And on the
record before the administrative law judge and the
Commission, the applicant for the Brown amendment
proved that they met that limited exception.

Again, we've briefed your aides, and I'll be here for any questions, but I just want to be clear that the Department fully supports the Third Amended Draft Final Order.

ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: I have a question.

GOVERNOR CRIST: General, sure.

ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: What is that very limited exception for that amendment?

MR. STILLER: There are two policies in the Miami-Dade plan that guide how to expand the boundary. The first policy says, first off, we want to know is there a need, do we need to bump out, because Miami-Dade, throughout their plan, they encourage intense urban infill and redevelopment. So first off, they want to be sure that there's a need to bump out and get more vacant land for development.

And then the policy that follows is, okay, if there's a need, here's where you go. You avoid wetlands, and that's why the Lowe's amendment was found not in compliance. You avoid coastal high hazard areas. You avoid areas that are subject to Everglades restoration plans.

The Lowe's -- I'm sorry. The Brown amendment met all of those exceptions. And in fact, at the end of that policy, there's locational criteria about where you should encourage or allow or prefer expansions, and the Brown amendment is consistent with that portion of the policy also.

GOVERNOR CRIST: Thank you.

MR. STILLER: You're very welcome. Thank you.

MS. SALIBA: Mr. Dennis Kerbel with Miami-Dade County representing the respondent.

MR. KERBEL: Good morning, Governor Crist and members of the Commission. Again, my name is Dennis Kerbel. I'm an assistant county attorney.

I also want to thank yourselves and your staff for all the consideration that they have given these amendments. We appreciate all the time and effort that it took to wend their way through a complex issue.

Some of our local officials wanted to be here,

but they were unable to make the trip because of budget considerations. I do, however, have a letter from Commissioner Joe Martinez, who is the district commissioner for the Brown amendment, that I would like to introduce into the record, and I have copies if anybody would be like to see it.

Commissioner Martinez's letter addresses in particular the Brown amendment, but goes generally to the local considerations that the County Commission took, took up with these amendments. And particularly, with the Brown amendment, Commissioner Martinez talks about the need for an additional roadway, which this amendment will provide. It talks about addressing the needs of the population that's already in the area, and it stresses the fact that the residents of the local community, the ones that immediately surround the Brown parcel, spoke in favor of it. And you will also briefly hear from the chairman of the Community Council for the area, who was one of the local elected officials.

What I really want to stress to you is that ultimately, these are issues of local concern, and the Board of County Commissioners reviewed a complete record. They had the recommendations of

their staff, but they also heard from the community councils in both the areas, which take testimony from the residents in the immediate area and hold public hearings. They heard the recommendations of their local planning agency, the Planning Advisory Board, which also took considerable public testimony about both amendments. And they themselves had two public hearings, a transmittal and an adoption.

And so it was after hours of citizen testimony and considering a complete record and the entirety of their Comprehensive Plan, which includes not only the policies for expansion that Mr. Stiller referenced, but also the recognition that there's a designated urban expansion area where urban expansion has been contemplated and where both of these amendments are located.

After taking all of that into consideration, they concluded that it was appropriate to move the urban development boundary to serve the commercial needs of the populations in these immediate areas. Nevertheless, we understand the ruling of the administrative law judge, and we understand the Draft Final Order that is before this Commission, and we will take up the proposed remedial actions

1 for consideration with all deliberate speed. 2 I'm here if you have any questions. 3 you. 4 MS. SALIBA: Next on the list of intervenors, 5 Mr. Richard Grosso representing 1000 Friends. 6 GOVERNOR CRIST: Good morning. 7 MR. GROSSO: Good morning, Governor and members of the Commission. Richard Grosso with the 8 9 Everglades Law Center. These cases are about where growth goes, not 10 11 about whether we're going to have growth. Counties 12 like Dade and Palm Beach County, because of 13 existing problems with how they grew, have adopted 14 these urban boundary strategies so those problems 15 aren't repeated. And, of course, those are 16 counties that are front and center in the effort to 17 restore the Everglades in terms of whether they're 18 going to leave us enough land available to restore. 19 So maintaining those boundaries is absolutely 20 crucial. 21 This law doesn't say you can't grow. 22 about where. And this law doesn't say you can 23 never develop in farmlands or Everglades lands or

those sorts of things, but it's about not

unnecessarily doing so.

24

that you hear so much about. Where need comes in -- and what happens at the planning level is, you hire someone to kind of show that there's a need for your project, whatever it is. What happens is, that analysis gets gerrymandered; well, if I look at it this way, there may be a need, if I make these assumptions, there may be a need, and that kind of thing.

And that's where this need analysis comes in

The law judge on the Lowe's project said some of their assumptions were unreasonable and biased the results towards finding a need. That can't be the way we plan. We either have to have the facts straight up and objective, or it's just you hire a consultant, and they gerrymander a needs analysis. That cannot be the way we do planning. You're rightfully finding that amendment doesn't comply with the law for those reasons.

The burden of proof is on DCA and on us when we challenge one of these. It's hard to win those. When an administrative law judge says a plan amendment is not in compliance and you've met the burden of proof, that means there's a lot wrong with it. There was a lot wrong with the Lowe's amendment, where, the lack of need, just about

everything that's involved here. We appreciate the staff recommendation.

On the Brown amendment, this is a unique piece of earth. Where the boundary was written the law judge found really didn't make a lot of sense.

This would make sense now for the urban boundary, sandwiched between an urban development and a major road, not real appropriate for farming. He said this isn't going to be a precedent for others.

This is a rare, unique piece of land. I think that's a huge, important aspect of your ruling here. There are lots of projects waiting in the wings, and they'll be reading this final order and wanting to match themselves up to it.

What the staff has done in a very thoughtful way, I think, is make it clear that these should be rare expansions of an urban boundary, and the Brown parcel is different than most of the parcels that are going to be at play in the next few years in Dade County. That's why we support the staff recommendation and we really appreciate all the work that has gone into it.

This is a crucial time in South Florida for Everglades restoration. The role of this Commission and the Department of Community Affairs

1 in making sure that urban redevelopment is a 2 reality and we don't continue to do what we did in 3 the last 50 years that have caused the need to 4 restore the Everglades is going to be very crucial. 5 I thank you very much for your support of the 6 staff recommendation. I'm happy to answer any

questions that you might have. Thank you.

GOVERNOR CRIST: Thank you, sir.

MS. SALIBA: Mr. Charles Pattison representing 1000 Friends of Florida.

GOVERNOR CRIST: Good morning.

MR. PATTISON: Good morning, Governor and members of the Commission.

I'll be very brief. We want to echo the good comments that you've heard from Mr. Stiller and Mr. Grosso. And we too want to underscore the importance of this needs analysis that's the crux of this case that's before you today. That's a key for how this plan is to be implemented. that professional planners have looked at this and how they measure it and how they decide when and where it's appropriate to make changes to a comprehensive plan.

This has key significance for agricultural protection and Everglades restoration as well, and

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the important urban development boundary policies
that are here as well as in other plans throughout
Florida. There will be other cases in front of you
very shortly in Palm Beach County and Marion County
that look at urban development boundaries and needs
analysis. We think those are crucial.

We applaud the good work of your staff. We think they did an excellent job with a complicated case.

And I'll just end by saying our members and the public expect to see these comprehensive plans and their policies implemented the way they're written on a piece of paper. These were legally adopted. They do not believe they should be subject to interpretations. And we again support the third draft of this good recommended order. Thank you.

MS. SALIBA: Martha Chumbler representing Lowe's Home Center.

MS. CHUMBLER: Good morning. I'm Martha
Harrell Chumbler with the Carlton Fields law firm
here representing Lowe's Home Centers.

I think it's interesting that you've heard them talk about the Brown amendment being different and that expansion should only occur on rare

occasions. There was evidence admitted in this case indicating that over the approximate 20-year period since Miami-Dade County has created the urban development boundary, there have been few expansions. The county government has been very conservative in granting these expansions.

And in this instance, not only did they find that the Brown amendment was an exception to the rule against advancing the boundary, they found that the Lowe's amendment was an exception, and it is.

Let me give you an example or tell you a little bit about where the Lowe's amendment actually is. It is not in a rural area. It's at the intersection of two six-lane highways. 137th Avenue is a northwest major arterial. Tamiami Trail is a major east-west arterial, both six-lane highways. Immediately to the east across 137th is a very dense residential development. Immediately to the south across Tamiami Trail is strict commercial that extends several miles further to the west from our property. Immediately behind that residential strip is dense residential development. It's not rural. It's not conservation.

It's an area in which mining is permitted.

They talk about it should be denied because of protection of wetlands. Mining doesn't protect the wetlands, and that's permitted on that property today.

Also, as the record will show, as the judge found, this is highly degraded wetlands. It's also in an area of the county that the Comprehensive Plan specifically says is highly degraded wetlands, and therefore, more appropriate for development. A very small exception, and the Lowe's amendment fits within it.

Now, there has been some talk about the analysis that was done. I think it's important for you to know that the judge only talked about one of the analyses that Lowe's submitted. He talked about the analysis showing the need for a home improvement store. And Lowe's did that analysis because this Comprehensive Plan Amendment limits the use of that property not just to commercial, but to a home improvement store, so we felt the need to show that there is a need for that specific use.

But that's not all we did. We also did an analysis showing there was a need for general

community commercial, and we did it as general community commercial because the Comprehensive Plan divides commercial into three types, neighborhood, community, and regional. The ALJ doesn't mention that. He completely ignored that evidence, and therefore, his finding that only rules on one of the analyses submitted is contrary to the evidence and not supported.

Now, let me just mention one other thing.

We're not waiving any of the exceptions that we filed, but I don't want to go through all the details of that. But I think there's one very important flaw that carries throughout the Recommended Order here and throughout the draft Third Final Order, and that's that the wrong standard of review has been applied. Much of the Recommended Order, much of the Final Order depends on an interpretation of the Comprehensive Plan, whether this amendment is internally consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

The standard of review there is "fairly debatable." If the interpretation put on its own Comprehensive Plan by the County is within the range of reasonable interpretation, you must accept it. The judge must accept it. That's the standard

the Legislature has adopted. The administrative law judge did not do that. He picked the interpretation that he preferred. And the Draft Final Order does not do that.

That's a major flaw. It's directly contrary to the statute, and therefore, the Final Order should not be adopted, and instead a Final Order should be adopted finding the Lowe's amendment in compliance, as was determined after careful consideration by the county government.

Thank you. And if there's any questions, I'll be glad to answer them.

GOVERNOR CRIST: Thank you.

MS. SALIBA: We have Linda Shelley representing David Brown.

MS. SHELLEY: Governor and members of the Commission, David Brown is also fully in support of the staff-recommended Third Revised Proposed Final Order.

The findings of fact in the Brown amendment are fully supported by competent and substantial evidence in the record. And the Brown parcel is indeed different, as Mr. Grosso pointed out, both physically in its shape -- it's an odd-shaped triangular piece -- and locationally. It is

between a very intense part of the urban development boundary, a residential development to the south and Kendall Drive, and it fills in that triangular area.

And so from that standpoint, we believe that you should not be concerned about the precedent of the Brown amendment. Your staff in the Proposed Final Order has been very careful to enunciate several times that the Brown amendment will not serve as precedent for additional expansions of the urban development boundary, because each of these cases has to stand on its own merits. In fact, the most resent expansion of the urban development boundary in the area of the Brown amendment was in 1993, and that's the area right below us, the residential area.

We support the staff recommendation and the Proposed Final Order and are available to answer any questions regarding the Brown amendment. Thank you.

GOVERNOR CRIST: Thank you.

MS. SALIBA: The final presenter is Patricia Davis representing West Kendall Community Council.

MS. DAVIS: Good morning. I'm Patricia
Shannon Davis. I'm the current chairwoman of the

West Kendall Community Council 11. I want to thank Governor Crist and the Cabinet for allowing me to appear on behalf of the Brown amendment.

I'm a longtime resident of West Kendall and have lived near the subject property since 1997.

My family and I have been in the area west of the turnpike since the early '70s. I've been supporting this application since it first came up, first as a private citizen. And it was indeed this application that got me more actively and directly involved in local politics.

The Miami-Dade Home Charter, in an effort to fulfill its tenets, created the community councils in an effort to help the communities preserve the right to self-determination. The councils are structured to have six elected members and one appointed by the Board of County Commissioners. Due to resignations and pending the next election, we have three elected and three appointed members.

Each community council is focused on the needs of its own neighborhoods and is very familiar with the county Comp Plan and zoning code and how to apply those within the district and the availability of public services and facilities.

I can report that my council voted

unanimously, 7-0, in its recommendation for approval of this application. The former and current board have approved this application both times it was presented. This strong support is due to the community's recognition of how badly we need the infrastructure and the services that only approval of this application can provide.

This is the second time there has been an application for a UDB expansion for this site. In the prior amendment cycle, over 6,000 local residents signed a petition in support of this amendment because we desperately need the connection from Kendall Drive -- to Kendall Drive through this property.

During the Community Council hearing for the current application, many local residents showed up. No one from our area directly was opposed to this application. And I think that that's what's really important for us. We want to shop, we want to work, we want to receive services in our own neighborhood, in our own area.

The Council's unanimous vote was to recommend approval of the Brown amendment, and the Board of County Commissioners agreed. The administrative law judge agreed later that there is a need for the

amendment and recommended the approval, and we really appreciate your support of the Brown amendment.

Thank you.

GOVERNOR CRIST: Thank you.

MS. SALIBA: Governor, at this time, staff is prepared to take questions of the Commission members.

ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: If I could, we had quite a few presenters who talked about the Brown amendment, and it appears to be in order. We had one presenter talk about the Lowe's amendment. And I would like for staff to address the questions raised, if you could, by the presenter on the Lowe's amendment with regard to the fact that -the allegation is that the administrative law judge exceeded his authority, that he didn't consider certain things he should have, that, I gather, the city -- the county government, I guess, in this case had the authority to do this and didn't exceed it, and the judge has no right to differ from that in interpreting it, or whatever. But I would like to hear some argument or rebuttal to the arguments that were made.

MS. SALIBA: Yes, sir. I would like to ask

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Mr. Dave Jordan, who served as counsel writing the order.

GOVERNOR CRIST: Thank you.

MR. JORDAN: Good morning.

GOVERNOR CRIST: Good morning.

MR. JORDAN: The standard in the statute is that for interpretation of the county plan, the standard of proof is "fairly debatable," that is, it must be proven beyond fair debate that the County's interpretation of its plan is incorrect.

The ALJ looked at the words of the plan and reached that conclusion. When I read the plan again in preparing this Proposed Final Order, I felt he was correct.

The plan clearly states in Policy LU-8F, which is described in the Recommended Order and in the Final Order here, that the first thing you do when you address the need -- an application to expand the urban development boundary is to look at the need for the plan, for the plan amendment. It describes that for non-residential uses like the Lowe's property, you look at (a) is there a need county-wide; and is there a need in a tier, that is, there are six tiers in the county; and is there a need in the immediate MSA, which is something

like a municipal statistical area. It's a collection of census tracts.

The ALJ found that the county staff report analyzed the need for the Lowe's amendment on that basis and concluded there is no need on a county-wide basis, no need on a tier basis, and no need in the municipal -- in the MSA in which the Lowe's amendment is located. That wording in the plan is clear, and I felt that -- I think the ALJ found that the County's interpretation just was beyond fair debate.

ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: In other words, the staff of the County had not found need, but the County nonetheless went forward with this. Is that basically what --

MR. JORDAN: That's correct. In contrast, in the Brown case, the county staff report found, at least in the part that the ALJ accepted, that there was a need in the immediate MSA for the Brown amendment.

ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: Thank you.

GOVERNOR CRIST: Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER BRONSON: I do have a question.

I happen to know that area fairly well, since I worked down there for seven years.

these.

Is there -- by the statements that were just made, is that to indicate -- the one resident we heard from talking about wanting to shop in their own area without having to -- and I know how traffic is down there, and you can get run over pretty quick if you're not paying attention in that part of Dade County. But she had stated that, you know, the residents want to shop in their own area. Of course, she was supporting the Brown amendment the way that the administrative law judge gave it, which I tend to generally do myself when we hear

But in deference to Lowe's, is there another shopping area with the potential for those people in that area to go to a center such as Lowe's Center to be able to shop to pick up those items? I notice that it's right next to a developed area. It's not like it's totally separated. It's right up next to the area. And the County approved it. I'm trying to get a grasp of why one fits the bill and the other one doesn't at this time.

MR. JORDAN: The finding of fact in the Recommended Order that described the analysis I just mentioned, which is by the MSA, the tier, and the county-wide analysis, and said the county staff

report found no need for the Lowe's amendment, that finding of fact was not challenged by any exception to this Recommended Order, so it's the established law of the case.

More importantly, I believe that a second answer is that the analysis the County did was not for whether there's another home improvement store already nearby. It was whether there's a general amount of commercial development in the area. And their analysis showed that there was, and it was sufficient to carry it well beyond 2015 in terms of the needs of the immediate community.

And I did read the total record. It's three cardboard boxes. I don't remember it all, but I believe there's analysis in there that shows that there are some home improvement stores nearby already.

MS. SALIBA: Governor, to complete the question, Mr. Kerbel has asked to respond.

GOVERNOR CRIST: Sure.

MR. KERBEL: Thank you.

GOVERNOR CRIST: Of course.

MR. KERBEL: I would like to correct one thing that Mr. Jordan and the administrative law judge I do believe got wrong. The Policy LU-8F that has

been referred to that talks about need specifically refers to the need to review business and commercial uses at a neighborhood and community level. There are actually two different analyses. There's one for regional commercial uses, which would be like a giant mall -- if you know the area, like Dolphin Mall would be a regional use -- and then there's for neighborhood and commercial serving uses.

And what the ALJ we believe got wrong is, he simply ignored the statement in our plan that community-oriented and neighborhood-serving commercial uses do not require consideration of the county-wide supply of land. They talk about the local -- the localized sub-area geography, such as census tracts, minor statistical areas, and combinations thereof. The analyses for both the Brown and the Lowe's amendment were done at the level of joint minor statistical areas, because both of them were on something of a border.

And when you look at that local geography,
there was testimony in the record at the final
hearing that there was in fact a need for
additional commercial land in both areas. There
were different experts that testified for Brown and

for Lowe's, and so they gave slightly different testimony, but the end result was that if you were going to build a shopping center that was sufficient to serve the local area, you needed something on the order of 10 up to 24 acres of land for something that would have as an anchor, say, a home improvement store, or a Publix, even, and then a few other shops, and that there weren't sufficient parcels in either area of that size to build such a commercial development.

And I do want to add that what we're talking about here is commercial development to serve an existing population. You may have heard about the Parkland amendment that has been discussed in reference to this case and in some editorials. Parkland is a residential development and subject to completely different standards, and I just wanted to make that clear for the record.

Commissioner Bronson, I'm not sure if that completely addressed your question, but I appreciate the opportunity. Thank you.

MS. SALIBA: Any final questions? If the debate is complete, we do recommend your approval of the staff recommendation.

GOVERNOR CRIST: Any final questions?

1	Comments? Motion?
2	CFO.
3	CFO SINK: I'll move approval of the staff
4	recommendation, Governor.
5	GOVERNOR CRIST: Is there a second?
6	I'll second it.
7	All in favor, please signify by saying "aye."
8	CFO SINK: Aye.
9	GOVERNOR CRIST: Aye.
10	All opposed, please say "no."
11	COMMISSIONER BRONSON: No.
12	GOVERNOR CRIST: General, did I not hear you?
13	ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: I didn't say
14	anything.
15	GOVERNOR CRIST: Okay. Great. The motion
16	carries.
17	MS. SALIBA: Thank you, Governor.
18	GOVERNOR CRIST: Thank you, Lisa. Well done.
19	MS. SALIBA: We have one last item, Item
20	Number 4. Sorry. It's a little bit anticlimactic.
21	We are recommending
22	GOVERNOR CRIST: We're not worried about
23	drama, just doing the business.
24	MS. SALIBA: Absolutely. We recommend we
25	have a case before us where one of the parties is

1	ill and under extended rehabilitation and asked us
2	to grant an order moving the hearing of that
3	particular case to September 15th, and we ask your
4	approval of that motion.
5	GOVERNOR CRIST: Is there a motion to
6	accommodate that? To what did you say? September
7	15th?
8	MS. SALIBA: September 15.
9	CFO SINK: Governor, I'm sorry. I didn't
10	really even hear what she said because there was so
11	much noise in the room.
12	GOVERNOR CRIST: Could you repeat it?
13	MS. SALIBA: Absolutely. I will. Thank you.
14	We are recommending the motion to continue this
15	case until September 15th. One of the parties is
16	ill and under extended rehabilitation, but would
17	like to attend the hearing, and all parties have
18	agreed to September 15th as the date.
19	CFO SINK: Okay. I'll move it.
20	COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Second.
21	GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show it
22	approved without objection.
23	MS. SALIBA: Thank you.
24	GOVERNOR CRIST: Thank you, Lisa.
25	

GOVERNOR CRIST: Department of Agriculture and 1 2 Consumer Services, Jim Karels. I hope I pronounced 3 that right. I almost don't recognize you outside 4 your uniform. 5 MR. KARELS: Good morning, Governor, 6 Commissioner, and members of the Cabinet. And you 7 did pronounce it right. 8 GOVERNOR CRIST: Thank you. 9 MR. KARELS: I have two short items today. The first one is for approval of submittal of the 10 11 minutes from the April 28th and June 9th Cabinet 12 meeting. 13 COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Motion for approval of Item 1. 14 15 CFO SINK: Second. 16 GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show the 17 minutes approved without objection. 18 MR. KARELS: Item Number 2 is the acquisition 19 of the Evans Ranch, Rural and Family Lands 20 Protection Easement. The Evans Ranch is listed in the top tier of the approved projects for the Rural 21 22 and Family Lands program as approved by the Board 23 of Trustees on April 28th of this year. This is a 24 690-acre easement in Flagler County that is a

cooperative effort between the St. Johns River

Water Management District and the Division of Forestry, Department of Agriculture.

The total purchase price of the easement is \$2,749,650. The Trustees' purchase price is \$1,374,825, a 50-50 split with the Water Management District.

Recommendations by the Cabinet aides from the meeting of July 22nd are being incorporated into this document.

The Evans Ranch was chosen as the initial Rural and Family Lands project because of its varied agricultural operations, the connectivity of the ranch with public lands in Flagler County, the commitment of the landowners to seek new and innovative agricultural uses for conserving -- and conserving the landscape, and the opportunity to partner with the St. Johns River Water Management District, to help in furthering their objectives as well as sharing in the acquisition cost.

The property supports agriculture, cattle, and aquaculture. And the aquaculture is kind of that innovative end of it. They grow Caspian Sea sturgeon and harvest Caspian Sea caviar. And from our understanding, it is the only one in Florida and I think the only one in this country growing

1 that sturgeon.

This easement prohibits conversion of existing natural areas, cutting of cypress, and construction of commercial water wells.

I would like to give special thanks to the

Evans family, to the St. Johns River Water

Management District, to the Division of State Lands

and to DEP, and to the many people that helped

bring this initial Rural and Family Lands easement

to this stage and hopefully to approval.

Right now I would like to introduce Ray

Bunton, assistant director of real estate with the

St. Johns Water Management District, for brief

comments and to introduce the Evans family.

GOVERNOR CRIST: Good morning.

MR. BUNTON: Good morning, Governor and Cabinet. It's a pleasure to be here today. We're very excited about this acquisition. Several years ago we met with Mr. and Mrs. Evans for the first time on their ranch, and Mr. and Mrs. Evans are sitting right here on the front row.

GOVERNOR CRIST: Good morning.

MR. BUNTON: Hopefully, you all can meet them today. And we were very impressed with what we saw. They are excellent stewards of the land in

everything they do, whether it's game management for hunting, for cattle, for hay, for row crops.

And then they introduced us to their aquaculture operation. I mean, they're on the cutting edge of science. They're developing that science daily, and people from the universities here in Florida and from around the world come to see what they're doing to figure out what's going on in the world. It's just very impressive.

And they are hands-on people. Rarely will you see Mr. and Mrs. Evans in this setting. Normally it's going to be with jeans and boots on and their shirt sleeves rolled up, and they're working on this property every day.

So we're, like I said, very excited to be here. We do think this proposal meets all of the criteria for the Rural and Family Lands Protection program. There are four major criteria. We think it meets every one of them. The program requirements are that it meet one of them, so I think this is a great first proposal for this great program, great new program.

And again, we're very proud to work with the Department of Agriculture in this process, and again, for the perseverance of the Evans in working

through this program. It's a new program, and it
takes a little while to get it up and running, and
they have stayed with us through this process.

If you have any questions, I'll be glad to try
and answer them. Otherwise, we would sure

encourage your support.

GOVERNOR CRIST: I think General McCollum might have a question.

ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: I don't have a question. I just want to comment that I think this is a terrific program, and I think the acquisition is appropriate, and since it's appropriate, I would move it. I move Item 2.

COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Second.

CFO SINK: Governor, I do have a question.

GOVERNOR CRIST: CFO.

CFO SINK: I want to echo the feeling, and I want to thank the Evans family, because this is a big commitment on the part of any family to agree to put a perpetual easement on their land. It's beautiful.

But one of the things that I think we as a state as we begin to engage in the awarding of more of these easement opportunities is the assurance that the property will be maintained as the owners

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

have agreed. And so I would just like whoever is appropriate to describe what are the provisions and who -- what authorities will be visiting the property, what will the frequency be, to just assure the taxpayers who are investing and purchasing this easement that the requirements are being met on into the future, with even future generations understanding what the requirements are of the activities that cannot be performed on the -- on any property.

MR. KARELS: CFO Sink, I'm going to introduce our administrator of the Rural and Family Lands program, John Brown, and he'll kind of go over that, what we will do after and if the easement is approved.

CFO SINK: Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Good morning, Governor and Cabinet.

The basis of our easement document requires that lands be managed in agriculture in perpetuity. That will be part of the conservation deed. Prior to closing this, we'll do an easement documentation report, in which we'll actually go on the property and document the uses there. Annually we will go back and update that report and look to ensure that

the agricultural operations are going on.

Secondarily, the easement precludes any selling of rights that would undermine those agricultural uses. You can't come back at a later date and maybe overlay another easement that would preclude agriculture or preclude some agriculture uses, so it's pretty tight in that regard.

The gist of Rural and Family Lands was to keep lands in agriculture, not that they would lay fallow or go to some other use. So we do have some built-in checks that they would stay in agriculture, their rights would be preserved, and there is an encouragement to continue it in agriculture.

CFO SINK: And, Governor, what will be the reporting back to the Cabinet, for example, who is the keeper or the ultimate overseer of the easements? The reporting back, are you proposing -- this is the first one we've done, so --

MR. BROWN: It's the first one. There's nothing structured, but we would be more than happy to come back on an annual basis and give the Cabinet an update on what we have in our inventory. As I said, we will go out and evaluate these

annually to ensure compliance with the easements.

The Division of Forestry is going to manage all of
these easements, so we can bring those back.

There's nothing in rule or statute that would
compel us to do that, but we would be more than
happy to do that.

CFO SINK: Could I just defer to Commissioner

CFO SINK: Could I just defer to Commissioner Bronson, because these easements are going to be managed by the Division of Forestry --

COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Yes

CFO SINK: -- going forward? What do you think?

COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Well, I -- of course,
I'm sure the Department, even long after I'm gone,
are going to be willing to make those suggestions
on those issues that you might deem necessary to be
brought back to the Cabinet. However, I would also
like to have that same thing done by all easements,
not just the Rural and Family Lands easements, as
to what we're doing with state lands that the State
is paying a lot of money to maintain those
easements.

The good thing about this type of easement is, it will be perpetually in agriculture. It will be paying taxes. It will be creating jobs and all the

things we need to help the economy of the Volusia

County area, especially since that's where a good

bit of this is. It's on that border line. And so

you've got jobs. You've got taxes being paid. You

have an agricultural/aguaculture production area.

And we would be more -- I'm sure the

Department would be more than happy to come back

and tell you some of the world-breaking, exciting

things that are going on on the Evans property,

because I happened to be there. I was invited to

be there the day that the first artificial

insemination of Russian sturgeon took place ever in

the history of the world. They did it on this

farm. That's how far ahead they are in their

production activities.

And I can tell you the commitment I know that Gene and Marilyn have given me directly as I've visited their properties. They are fully committed to this easement. I'm glad to see -- this is the very first one. I didn't know at the time that I was talking to the Evanses at the time they would be the first one, but this is the very first Rural and Family Lands easement that has been done. And especially after we vote on this, I would certainly like to have a picture for the historical aspects

1	of this easement process.
2	GOVERNOR CRIST: I assume that's if we pass
3	it.
4	COMMISSIONER BRONSON: That's if we pass it.
5	GOVERNOR CRIST: I'm being funny.
6	COMMISSIONER BRONSON: And I'm going to
7	recommend highly that we pass it. But this is a
8	great start to keeping lands in agriculture
9	perpetually and making sure that the economy is
10	going to benefit and the people in the State of
11	Florida are going to benefit.
12	MR. BROWN: Well, we would be more than happy
13	to develop something in the form of an annual
14	report to the board or actually come and make a
15	presentation. We can certainly do that.
16	CFO SINK: Thank you. I think that should
17	just be standard procedure to have an annual report
18	of compliance on behalf of all the owners of these
19	rural lands. Thank you.
20	MR. BROWN: Thank you. Any other questions?
21	ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: I do have another
22	comment, if I might, Governor.
23	GOVERNOR CRIST: Of course, General.
24	ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: I just wanted to
25	say that I concur with the Commissioner that this

is very, very precedent-setting and important. It seems to me that we've been talking about this a long time, you have, Commissioner Bronson, our needing to do these kind of programs and these easements, and the Evanses' property and their program is ideally suited for this. And I certainly want to see reports, and I think the CFO is right to ask for some accountability here. But it's just a great program, and we ought to adopt it, hopefully unanimously.

MR. KARELS: One last comment -GOVERNOR CRIST: Certainly.

MR. KARELS: -- on the hidden value that I wanted to add to it. You know, one of the things we're doing is preserving it in agriculture and keeping it from being developed. And this area, from my standpoint, is one of the worst, or the worst wildfire condition areas in the state. The more homes we put in that not real dense setting in those type conditions, the much tougher it is to fight those fires, and the more money it is to the State in cost. So it is a hidden benefit from the wildfire end as well. We're keeping this in agriculture, and when I keep it in agriculture, I have a great opportunity to stop that fire, because

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

he gives me a great firebreak when it's coming through that area.

What I would like to do is give the Nature Conservancy a very quick comment. Andy?

GOVERNOR CRIST: Certainly.

MR. McCLOUD: Thank you very much, Director Karels. Andy McCloud with the Nature Conservancy.

We very much support the project. The resource value is protected. We applaud Commissioner Bronson for your long efforts to fund Rural and Family Lands. It's very, very important. It's a good project, a Tier 1 ranked project.

We would also observe -- and this is preaching to the converted in many respects -- that this represents the first month that Florida Forever is not funded anew, given the Legislature's failure to fund Florida Forever for the current fiscal year. This program benefits from funds from last year, and we're cognizant that this is an unfortunate precedent and that this program and others like it under Florida Forever will be increasingly rare because of the lack of new funding this year.

We're heartened to hear that revenues, doc stamp revenues are on target, slightly increased. We're heartened by the Fitch ratings taking Florida

1	Forever and P 2000 bonds off of the unstable
2	ranking. We're watching doc stamp revenue
3	continually. We search, as does the State, for new
4	revenue sources, federal revenue sources, carbon
5	sequestration potential, which you'll hear about
6	shortly from the Department.
7	So we're encouraging it in all directions, but
8	for the record, we wish to note for the people of
9	Florida and for members of the Legislature that
10	this good project unfortunately may not be
11	replicated in the near future because of the lack
12	of funds in this fiscal year.
13	Thank you very much.
14	GOVERNOR CRIST: Thank you. We're ready for a
15	motion.
16	CFO SINK: We did that.
17	GOVERNOR CRIST: We did that?
18	ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: I moved it.
19	COMMISSIONER BRONSON: I seconded.
20	CFO SINK: Second.
21	GOVERNOR CRIST: Does anybody object? It's
22	unanimous. Congratulations.
23	(Applause.)
24	(Photographs taken.)
25	

GOVERNOR CRIST: Yes. I would like to give the General an opportunity to express his vote on the Administration Commission Item Number 3.

attorney General McCollum: Thank you very much, Governor. I had intended to vote age or yes, and I think I just said I didn't vote no, and that isn't good enough for the record. And I want to explain it as well just so the record is clear.

I have grave doubts about which way that ruling ought to ultimately go, and that's why I was hesitant a bit. Commissioner Bronson had voted the way he did on it, and I didn't choose to vote no. I intended to vote yes, which I did, and I'm now clarifying that.

But I think there's some legal questions
there, and I don't know that we're going to resolve
them today. I resolved them in my mind for the
purpose of today's vote on the basis of the staff
recommendation, and that's what I took, and that's
why I voted with the majority. And it wasn't
clear, I'm told, on the record, so I want to make
it clear it was a yes vote.

GOVERNOR CRIST: Thank you, General, very much.

GOVERNOR CRIST: Board of Trustees, Secretary 1 2 Sole. Good morning, sir. MR. SOLE: Good morning, Governor and Cabinet 3 4 members. Item Number 1 is submittal of the minutes from 5 6 the April 28th, May 13th, and May 27th, 2009 7 Cabinet meetings. 8 CFO SINK: Move approval. 9 ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: Second. GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show the 10 11 minutes approved without objection. 12 MR. SOLE: Thank you. Item Number 2, this is a request by co-applicants Marco Island Yacht Club 13 and Marco Island Marina Association. This is for a 14 15 five-year sovereignty submerged lands lease for a 16 31-slip private yacht club. It's located on the 17 Marco River in Collier County. 18 The preempted area is a little over 99,000 19 square feet. There is some proposed dredging for 20 the marina area, but there are no resources within 21 the dredge footprint. The consideration is 22 \$21,916. This facility is located next to or 23 adjacent to the Rookery Bay Aquatic Preserve and 24 Rookery Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve.

We sent out some 71 notices to private

1	individuals. There were no objections, and the
2	Department recommends approval.
3	GOVERNOR CRIST: Is there a motion?
4	ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: I move Item 2.
5	GOVERNOR CRIST: Is there a second?
6	COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Second.
7	CFO SINK: Governor, I have
8	GOVERNOR CRIST: CFO, of course.
9	CFO SINK: I think my question is for
10	Mr. Gardner. Is he here representing
11	MR. SOLE: He was here.
12	CFO SINK: You want to introduce yourself and
13	clarify who you're representing?
14	MR. GARDNER: My name is Tom Gardner, and I
15	represent Marco Island Yacht Club.
16	CFO SINK: I do have a question, Mr. Gardner.
17	Some of the recent requesters have agreed, since
18	we're all aware that the DEP is working on new
19	lease rules. If your client would be willing to
20	commit to the payment of the new lease amounts when
21	the new rules in the future if and when the new
22	rules are approved.
23	MR. GARDNER: I believe the lease instrument
24	that the Yacht Club would have to sign provides for
25	the acceptance of all rule changes implemented by

the Department, which would include that fee adjustment, fee rule change whenever it takes place. And the applicant is aware of that provision and is willing to abide by whatever rule the Department does implement whenever it's implemented. Is that the question?

CFO SINK: Yes, yes. Is that correct, Secretary Sole?

MR. SOLE: Let me try to -- without question, we have a standard lease condition in leases that we issue that basically say if lease fees change, annual lease fees change, you will be subject to those. So without question, in this case, the Marco Island Yacht Club would be subject to the new lease fees, the annual lease fees.

What would not -- and I want to be clear.

What they would not be subject to, and it's something that we're contemplating in the rule, is whether or not a one-time impact fee would apply.

And in this case, it would not apply because they have already built it. But the new lease fees, if and when they went into effect, would apply in this case.

CFO SINK: And would you -- and what's the term of this lease?

1	MR. SOLE: This is a five-year lease.
2	CFO SINK: So it will come back?
3	MR. SOLE: Yes, ma'am.
4	CFO SINK: In five years. Mr. Gardner, would
5	you I heard, I think, from our staff. Would you
6	just clarify what the amount of the investment
7	would be to construct this?
8	MR. GARDNER: It's estimated right at
9	3 million.
10	CFO SINK: \$3 million?
11	MR. GARDNER: Yes, ma'am.
12	CFO SINK: Okay. Thank you.
13	GOVERNOR CRIST: Thank you. All in favor,
14	please say "aye."
15	(Affirmative responses.)
16	GOVERNOR CRIST: All opposed, like sign. Show
17	it carried. Thank you.
18	MR. SOLE: Thank you. Item Number 3, this is
19	a presentation and hopefully a discussion on the
20	carbon capture and sequestration study that we
21	prepared for Board of Trustees lands. This study
22	was accomplished in light of legislation last year
23	in 2008 to move forward and do an inventory of all
24	of our Board of Trustees conservation lands to
25	identify both the sequestration potential as well

1

as even some of the emissions on these lands.

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It's fairly technical information. And with that, we had to clearly go out and seek some expertise, so we went out and did an invitation to negotiate and selected, I think, a fantastic team consisting of EcoAsset Solutions, Land and Timber Services Group, and the University of South Florida to prepare the study.

Without question, I think they've done a fantastic job, and I want to introduce briefly the Of EcoAsset Solutions, we have Sandra Kling and Emily Zupo. With Land and Timber Services, we have Jeff Main and Kevin Pope. And finally, with the University of South Florida, with us today is Dr. Robert Brinkmann. And also, Dr. Steve Reader was part of that team, but was unable to participate today.

With that brief introduction, I look forward to turning this over to the chief environmental scientist and project manager, Sandra Kling with EcoAsset Solutions, to give you a brief 10-minute PowerPoint presentation on the study. Sandra?

MS. KLING: Thank you. Good morning, Governor -- he left the room -- and members of the Cabinet.

We are so pleased and excited to be here today

to present the results of our study. Again, my name is Sandra Kling. I'm with EcoAsset Solutions, and I was the project manager and lead scientist on the study. In the next 10 minutes, I'll be presenting to you what we did, why we did it, what we found, and what it might mean for the State of Florida.

As Secretary Sole indicated, the study was authorized in response to Senate Bill 542, and the objectives of the study were to conduct a carbon sequestration study and greenhouse gas inventory of all Board of Trustees lands acquired under Preservation 2000 and Florida Forever. In addition to this scope, the project team expanded the study to include all owned and co-owned lands of the Board of Trustees, which currently encompasses about 4.7 million acres and is comprised of about 472 land units.

Secondly, we were tasked to identify and determine the value, potential value of these state lands in terms of carbon offset projects. We also provided the FDEP with a geographic information system database that ties carbon sequestration and greenhouse gas emissions to each land unit. The study was completed over a two-month period, and we

used readily available data that was provided by multiple state agencies.

Using the best available scientific methodology, we estimated both carbon sinks and carbon stocks in addition to estimating the greenhouse gas emissions on all state lands.

First we'll look at the carbon sinks and stocks side of things. First some quick definitions. By carbon sink, I mean the amount of carbon removed from the atmosphere and stored on an annual basis. The stock represents the total carbon currently stored in forests and soils. Please note that these are our best estimates based on the information that was provided to us. We did no additional field work.

Since almost half of the Board of Trustees lands are forested, it is no surprise that forests represent a significant carbon pool, with a total carbon stock of about 120 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents. Our best estimate indicates that Board of Trustees forest sequesters about 3.4 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents a year, and this represents about 12 percent of the total state's annual carbon sequestration in the forests. It's important to

note that state forests are managed for conservation purposes and that the annual carbon sequestration on state lands would be anticipated to be much less than in commercial plantations.

Other significant carbon pools include urban forests, grassland soil carbon, wetlands, seagrass, and mangroves, as well as salt marshes. However, mostly due to data gaps and a lack of methodologies, annual carbon sequestration estimates in some of these pools were just not possible.

On the emissions side, prescribed fire and wildfire represents the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions. However, ongoing research suggests that specific prescribed fire cycles may actually enhance the carbon sequestration in these forests. And it is well known that prescribed fire prevents forest fires, which could result in a significant release of greenhouse gas emissions. The other greenhouse gases that we measured were relatively small in comparison.

In addition to estimating the carbon sinks and greenhouse gas emissions on state lands, we also identified potential carbon offset projects. A

carbon offset project is defined as a stand-alone project that's used to compensate for greenhouse gas releases in another location.

The projects we focused on were, first and foremost, in line with the State's conservation and restoration goals and those that are clearly additional. Now, by additionality, I mean that these projects go above and beyond current land practices. The largest opportunity for the State is in its forests, and there are three general categories for forest carbon offset projects.

First, the State could plant trees where no trees have been before, a practice called afforestation, or the State could replant where there was once a forest that has been converted to some other land use. This is known as reforestation. We've identified about 200,000 acres of state lands on which these projects could possibly be developed.

Secondly, improved forest management practices could be implemented to enhance carbon. Forest restoration projects are one such project in this category. For example, in certain soil types, replacing offsite pine planation forests with native longleaf has the potential to yield

additional carbon storage over the long term. In one scenario, we found about a 400 percent increase in carbon sequestration when comparing offsite slash pine with native longleaf over a 100-year period, for example.

The last project type, avoided deforestation, are projects that prevent deforestation and are found in areas that have a high risk of land conversion. There may be potential for avoided deforestation credits in some of the State's land acquisitions, since conservation is a primary goal of the Florida Forever programs.

Other offset projects that we identified include urban forests, grassland soil carbon, and energy efficiency, and are further elaborated in the report.

We also identified the valve of carbon offset projects in terms of their environmental, social, and economic factors. For the environment, these benefits include reduced greenhouse gas emissions.

And that can happen under two scenarios, one by removing additional carbon from the atmosphere through carbon sequestration, or by reducing the greenhouse gas emissions from occurring. Other environmental values include improved air and water

1 quality and, of course, improved wildlife habitat.

Social values might include a better quality of life for residents of the state and improved health, as well as an increased state pride and leadership on issues related to climate change.

In terms of economic value, the obvious benefit includes potential new revenue streams for the state. This benefit depends on many factors, including supply and demand of carbon credits, project types, and project quality.

This chart shows a range of carbon credit prices for 2008, which ranged from \$1.20 to over \$50 for a carbon credit. As the chart indicates, there is a wide range of pricing depending on these project types. The project types are listed along the bottom. The chart also shows that there's a large range of pricing within each project type, and those are the blue bars, the top and bottom bars.

For example, in forest projects, the range of forest management projects is much less in improved forest management projects than it is for afforestation projects. National, and to some extent, international climate policy has influenced and will continue to influence the price of a

1 carbon credit.

Other economic benefits include increasing the number of highly technical green jobs and could potentially attract business to the state.

And lastly, the development of carbon offset projects will require partnerships through our academic and research institutions, and there's an opportunity to bolster research and other related jobs related to carbon credits.

From this study, we concluded that conservation lands are a net sink. If we subtract the greenhouse gas emissions from the carbon sinks -- remember from a few slides ago -- the estimated annual net reduction is on the order of about 2 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents.

Secondly, there is a potential for the State to participate in carbon offset markets, particularly those that are in line with conservation and restoration goals. Future opportunities will likely expand with national policy. However, the specifics of this opportunity are uncertain at this point with Waxman-Markey.

We concluded that there are significant data gaps which would need to be filled in order to

fully develop carbon offset projects on state lands. We also concluded that we need more scientific research to fully understand the carbon sinks and sources that are important to Florida, particularly those related to soil carbon, fire, and aquatic ecosystems like wetlands, seagrass, mangroves, and salt marshes.

This study really represents baseline conditions which the State can use to consider potential projects in the future and identify some next steps. And we also identified some next steps in our report, and they're included there.

In closing, there's a great opportunity for Florida to lead the nation and potentially the world as we begin to transition toward a carbon-constrained economy. This study provides additional information that betters our understanding of greenhouse gas emissions as well as carbon sequestration on state lands.

Finally, our team would like to thank the

Board of Trustees, the Florida Department of

Environmental Protection, the Division of State

Lands, and all the state agencies that participated

and provided us data. We truly appreciate their

help, and we also appreciate the opportunity to be

of service to the State of Florida. Thank you.

GOVERNOR CRIST: Thank you very much.

General, please.

ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: I have a question. In the carbon release area that you had, the very early slides, you showed that the forest fires I guess caused a release of about 1.3 million, whatever, parts a year, and electricity was about 19,000 plus. Is that in a defined area that's rural, or is that overall?

In other words, it looked to me like electricity, or I presume the consumption of carbons in the process of producing electricity, might be in your data about 1 1/2 percent of the amount that's released by forest fires. Forest fires release a lot of carbon into the air, carbon dioxide, I assume. Is that correct?

MS. KLING: Yes, that's correct. And actually, that number does not include the carbon. That number includes the methane and nitrous oxide. Carbon is not included in that calculation because it's assumed to be recaptured in the following year, and thus it would be double-counted. So that's really only for the methane and for the nitrous oxide. And you're right -- well,

electricity usage is --

MR. SOLE: Let me just clarify, because I think I understand where the question is coming from. The electricity usage that was identified is just the electricity usage in association with managing those plots of land, not the state's electricity usage. I mean, we emit some almost -- a little over 300 million metric tons of carbon here in the State of Florida, and probably -- I think some 40 percent of that is associated with electricity usage. It really is the place-based electricity use on those lands just to manage them.

ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: Okay. That helped clarify that, because I was wondering --

MS. KLING: I'm sorry. I was actually coming to that.

ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: -- if forest fires were producing so much more, but that's not correct. All right. That's a misleading figure, and I thought it might be. Thank you.

GOVERNOR CRIST: Good question, General.

Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER BRONSON: Could I make a comment?

GOVERNOR CRIST: Yes, sir, of course.

COMMISSIONER BRONSON: We have -- our Division

of Forestry along with the forest resource, the private landowners in the state, which is about 14 million acres, have been looking at carbon sequestration, cap-and-trade, and a number of those issues for probably about five years now and trying to coordinate how that's going to work with the production of ethanol and methanol and biodiesel, and all the things that we're doing in the production side of green fuels.

There are some pitfalls we need to be careful about as we begin to look at checks and balances. Number one, yes, when we have a forest fire, it does release quite a bit during that forest fire. We also know now that a wildfire, where we're not doing prescribed burns to keep that fuel loading down, actually releases more, much more than our controlled burns do, because you have so much more fuel loading down in those wildfire areas. So there is somewhat of an offset there.

Which is better or which is worse? I can tell you our state firefighters will tell you it's much better to have controlled and prescribed burns to keep the state from catching on fire in a wildfire state that could have all kinds of implications.

The other issue that I would like for the

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

Cabinet to think about is, a lot of this carbon sequestration and some of those issues have been talked about in Europe quite a bit longer than in the U.S., and right now they control more or less some of these actions on carbon sequestration, what is it worth, who can qualify.

I will tell you I was concerned after I found out -- I thought it had great application for Florida, and I was very concerned when I found out that if you, such as in a timber operation, maintain your timber operation the way you always have, you may not qualify under that condition.

In other words, right now, since the State of Florida has quite a few million acres of land and a lot of it's in forest and so forth, unless there's some major changes, we may not qualify in this carbon sequestration. Even though our forests are doing quite a bit to take the carbon out of the air and releasing oxygen, we may not qualify under those plans.

And that's why I was very skeptical about the cap-and-trade issue, because if you're going to use American farmers and American foresters and all of the states and federal government that has kept land in a natural resource state and not be able to

allow them to compete in that market, then what you're doing is artificially setting up a cap-and-trade where we wouldn't qualify, and our people would not be able to compete in that market. And we actually would allow our competitors around the world to create a lot more, while they're forcing us to do a lot less, and therefore basically affecting our economy, along with some of these other issues.

So it's a very complicated set of formulas right now, and I'm not sure I agree with how these formulas are going to be adopted, simply because I think it shuts -- all the good work we've done in natural resource protection, it kind of shuts us out of that picture right now unless they change some of the definitions and how they're going to consider this. And I just want to make sure that the Cabinet is aware of that. I believe that the Secretary is very much aware of it, and it is a very delicate set of issues right now.

But at the federal level, we've still got some work to do. And I think Jim Karels is going to have to do some more work going up there talking to the federal people on these issues, because I will tell you, to my dying day, I'm going to fight to

1	keep prescribed burning as part of Florida's
2	protection of forests and natural resources and
3	schools, businesses, and homes, because if we don't
4	have it, if we jump too far to the other side here,
5	we're going to really jeopardize the State of
6	Florida.
7	So I hope y'all will this Cabinet, as long
8	as I'm on it, will help us manage this discussion
9	to Florida's benefit as best we can. I just wanted
10	to make you aware of some of those offsets. They
11	may not be true positive offsets. There could be
12	some negative offsets here.
13	MR. SOLE: Governor, could I respond to the
14	Commissioner, because he raises some good points,
15	and I did just want to make sure the Cabinet was
16	aware as well.
17	GOVERNOR CRIST: No.
18	(Laughter.)
19	MR. SOLE: Thank you.
20	GOVERNOR CRIST: I'm kidding. Of course you
21	can.
22	MR. SOLE: I have nothing else, sir.
23	GOVERNOR CRIST: Of course you can.
24	MR. SOLE: One of the things the
25	Commissioner is right. This is complex, and what's

exciting -- and when we started this -- and this is not new to the Trustees either. We've had the Action Team, Governor, your Action Team look at these issues and clearly identify the benefit of our conservation lands. The same thing with the Board of Trustees conversations on climate. We identified this as something that needs to be looked at.

What we're seeing, though, is that there are some unanswered questions, both from a policy standpoint as well as from a science standpoint.

Sandra and her team did a great job in identifying especially some of those scientific challenges, for example, the sequestration value of our wetlands or our seagrasses, because currently we don't have the science to do a good job of quantifying it. They did a fantastic job on our forests.

And it's good to know -- and I want to make sure the Cabinet at least walks away with this number -- that including the burning that we do, which is, I 100 percent agree with the Commissioner, something that's essential, not only to sustain our forests, but also our ecology, we do have a net sequestration of some 2.1 million metric tons of carbon on an annual basis. And that's a

positive number with our current business-as-usual management.

The policy questions that get a little complex are from an economic standpoint. Sandra pointed out, you know, "Hey, we may be able to get some credits out of this deal." When you look at Waxman-Markey and what has been passed out of the U.S. House of Representatives, the answer is, "Probably not." You will probably not get a credit for that 2.1 million metric tons of sequestration because they are not an additive sequestration value, as the Commissioner pointed out.

So we need to keep a very close eye, and hopefully, as the Commissioner pointed out, Jim Karels -- and, Governor, your Washington office is engaged in tracking this legislation now in the Senate. Keep a strong eye on how they shape that U.S. policy, because without question, that's what we are going to have to play by, that U.S. policy, in my mind.

Fortunately, in Waxman-Markey, it was in the later weeks of that legislation that this whole issue really at least got elevated to a need for determination. The south U.S., southeast U.S., we have a great biomass potential, and this is

something that I think is very important to

Florida, that we ensure we keep a very strong point
on.

I also from a policy standpoint think that we as your staff also need to bring up the purpose of the conservation lands that we've acquired them for, whether they were acquired for recreation, forestry management, wildlife. We need to be cautious in ensuring that, yes, we recognize our carbon sequestration potential, but we don't let the tail wag the dog, because believe it or not, in some cases you can improve your carbon sequestration, but actually reduce the conservation value of that land.

So I think we need to be very cautious as we approach this to make sure that the original purpose of these lands are sustained, and at the same time we maximize our carbon sequestration value, you know, in compliance with those original conservation values that we acquired the land.

So this is something that I think we need to continue to track. We need to continue to track the federal policy on this before we pull any strong triggers and move ahead, because the one last thing I wanted to raise to the Board of

Trustees is, one of the unfortunate scenarios is that the cost that it would take to actually certify these credits is about equal to the cost of the credit itself.

So if we ran out today and tried to certify this 2.1 million metric tons so that we can go to -- whether it's a voluntary market or potentially a future federal market, we would probably get about the same amount of money it cost us just to certify it back. So it's something that we need to really stay very focused on, where the policies are and also where the economics are, before we pull any triggers.

And with that, I'll answer any questions.

CFO SINK: Governor, I do have one thing that came up in my staff briefing. There is a possibility that seagrasses and mangroves can absorb carbon. Would you speak to that? We have a lot of mangroves in Florida.

MS. KLING: Yes. There is research that indicates that these aquatic ecosystems are hot spots for carbon sequestration. And there are some preliminary estimates on what the potential is, but we lack the methodologies and specific data to fully develop carbon offset projects from that.

But there certainly is a potential, and there is research ongoing, but it's an area that needs more research and more data to be collected to fully understand those carbon sinks and the potential for Florida. CFO SINK: Maybe we can inspire some of our university professors and researchers to take this on as a project. MS. KLING: Absolutely. CFO SINK: Thank you. GOVERNOR CRIST: Thank you very much. MR. SOLE: Thank you, Governor and Cabinet members. MS. KLING: Thank you. 

1	GOVERNOR CRIST: State Board of
2	Administration, Ash Williams. Good morning, Ash.
3	MR. WILLIAMS: Good morning, Governor,
4	Trustees.
5	GOVERNOR CRIST: How are you?
6	MR. WILLIAMS: Fine, thank you. How are you?
7	GOVERNOR CRIST: Good, wonderful.
8	MR. WILLIAMS: Item 1 today is approval of the
9	minutes from the June 9 meeting.
10	GOVERNOR CRIST: Is there a motion on the
11	minutes?
12	ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: So move.
13	CFO SINK: Second.
14	GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show the
15	minutes approved without objection.
16	MR. WILLIAMS: Item 2, request approval of the
17	Quarterly Report from the Protecting Florida's
18	Investments Act. I would note on this report that
19	we added several companies to the list of those
20	being monitored, and we have no exposure to any of
21	them.
22	ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: Could I
23	GOVERNOR CRIST: General, please, of course.
24	ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: I just want to
25	commend you for proceeding. I think this has been

1 a very effective program. We now see in Iran a lot 2 of reasons why we did this in the first place, Iran 3 acting less friendly and continuing to develop its 4 nuclear programs, and we saw what happened with the 5 recent elections over there. And I think the 6 concern that we expressed to you and the concern 7 the Legislature expressed when it passed the law 8 encouraging companies to divest -- or encouraging 9 us to divest from companies that were doing business with Iran and Sudan is more than justified 10 11 So I'm very pleased that you've added some 12 companies. And I assume it's progressing very 13 well, so I would move Item 2. GOVERNOR CRIST: I would second that and echo 14 15 the General's comments. We were -- correct me if 16

GOVERNOR CRIST: I would second that and echo the General's comments. We were -- correct me if I'm wrong, Ash, but I think the first state in the nation to pass legislation along these lines, and I think that's a point of pride for Florida in doing what's right to protect freedom.

CFO SINK: Governor, could I just -GOVERNOR CRIST: CFO.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CFO SINK: I was told, and would you confirm this, that the -- obviously, when you're divesting yourselves of any assets, there are potential costs. But the returns on this new portfolio are

1 around six basis points less than what another model portfolio would be. Could you expand on 2 3 that? 4 MR. WILLIAMS: That's exactly correct. 5 total fund basis, the impact of the Protecting 6 Florida's Investments Act has been a bit under six 7 basis points. And there's some --CFO SINK: Well, let me just interrupt. 8 9 .06 percent. MR. WILLIAMS: It's 6/100 of 1 percent, to be 10 11 clear. 12 CFO SINK: Yes, .06, 6/100 of 1 percent. MR. WILLIAMS: It's very small, is the short 13 14 answer. 15 CFO SINK: Everybody --16 MR. WILLIAMS: And the other point to note is, 17 depending on when you measure that, it can go the 18 other way. When I first reported to you on the 19 progress on this act, it actually was positive to 20 performance, which is counterintuitive. But the reason was that it led to an underweight in energy 21 22 companies at a time when energy companies' 23 valuations were going down. So it can go either 24 way, but overall, the effect is quite small. GOVERNOR CRIST: Okay. Moved and seconded.

1 Show it approved without objection. Item 3.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you. Item 3, we request approval of a draft letter to the Joint Legislative Auditing Committee for the annual certification of legal compliance and best investment practices for the Local Government Investment Pool.

By way of background on this, this item was taken up with the Local Government Participant

Advisory Council in a public meeting on 18 June at the State Board and reviewed in some depth, and they were quite pleased with our progress. We are in fact in full legal compliance, and all of our practices are either at or approximate to best industry practice in the Local Government Pool.

CFO SINK: Move it.

ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: Second.

GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show Item 3 approved without objection.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you. Item 4, request approval of updated investment policy guidelines for the Local Government Surplus Funds Trust Fund. This relates to Item 3, in that to the extent we had any practices that were not in keeping with the investment policy guidelines of the Investment Company Institute, we are moving to adopt these.

These were done, again, consistent with working with Ennis, Knupp & Associates and Federated

Investment Counseling, the outside asset manager that manages the pool assets. We also took these up with the Local Government Advisory Committee in their June 18 meeting.

And again, these are very consistent guidelines with the priority for the Local Pool, priorities to the Local Pool, which are, in order, safety, liquidity, and yield.

CFO SINK: Move it.

ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: Second.

GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show Item 4 approved without objection.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you. Before we leave the Local Government Pool, let me add that we distributed \$7.1 million in additional liquidity from Pool B on the 8th of July.

We've also extended the hours of our operation for daily transactions clearing. We previously closed at 11:00 a.m. That has been extended out to 1:00 to be a little more consumer-friendly.

We have continued building, I think, confidence in the local investor community. We've added several significant new mandates recently,

1 and we look forward to continuing to grow the pool. ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: What's left in 2 3 that investment pool? 4 MR. WILLIAMS: In Pool B, the current balance 5 is -- I want to say right around \$300 million. 6 I'll tell you exactly. \$273 million. And to put 7 that in perspective, I believe when I first reported to you on that, it was between 5 and 600 8 9 million. 10 GOVERNOR CRIST: Thank you. Item 5. 11 MR. WILLIAMS: Item 5, request a draft letter 12 to the Joint Legislative Auditing Committee affirming that the Trustees have reviewed and 13 14 approved the monthly Local Government Investment 15 Pool summary reports and taken action to identify 16 any material impacts. This covers Q2. There were 17 no material impacts, and therefore, there are no 18 associated actions required. 19 GOVERNOR CRIST: Is there a motion? 20 CFO SINK: Move it. 21 ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: Second. 22 GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. 23 approved without objection. 24 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you. Item 6, request 25 approval for appointment of the chair for the

Florida Commission on Hurricane Loss Projection

Methodology. This would be Associate Professor

Randy Dumm.

ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: I move Item 5 -
or Item 6, excuse me.

CFO SINK: Second.

GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show it approved without objection.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you. A little update on the Hurricane Catastrophe Fund. We recently had subscriptions for the temporary increase in coverage layer for the current hurricane season. These came in at roughly \$4.4 billion below the maximum they could have been at. In addition to that, we had a \$2 billion reduction in TICL exposure because of the passage of the legislation, Committee Substitute for House Bill 1495.

And those two changes, together with the \$5 billion increase in issuance capacity for debt that we reported to you on back in May, collectively put the CAT fund in a position that's \$11.4 billion stronger than it was when we first reported at the beginning of 2009. So I think we're moving in the right direction there.

Item --

1 GOVERNOR CRIST: Thank you, Ash. I'm sorry. 2 MR. WILLIAMS: Item 7, we request authority to 3 amend the approved fiscal 2009-2010 budget. 4 will recall at our last meeting, we brought forward 5 a budget and requested that you adopt a 6 continuation budget, which you did. We then went 7 back and sharpened our pencils, cut costs wherever we could, went through our budget line by line, 8 9 held public hearings with our Investment Advisory Council, our Local Participant Government Advisory 10 11 Council, and our Audit Committee. We trimmed 12 things quite significantly, reduced the budget request by more than half. And of the increase we 13 14 are requesting, roughly 76 percent of it is 15 directly related to audit and compliance 16 activities. 17 ATTORNEY GENERAL McCOLLUM: I move Item 7. 18 CFO SINK: Second. 19 GOVERNOR CRIST: Moved and seconded. Show it 20 approved without objection. 21 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you. 22 GOVERNOR CRIST: Thank you, Ash. We're done. 23 (Proceedings concluded at 11:01 a.m.) 24 25

## CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF FLORIDA:

COUNTY OF LEON:

I, MARY ALLEN NEEL, Registered Professional Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me at the time and place therein designated; that my shorthand notes were thereafter translated under my supervision; and the foregoing pages numbered 1 through 95 are a true and correct record of the aforesaid proceedings.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor relative or employee of such attorney or counsel, or financially interested in the foregoing action.

DATED THIS 14th day of August, 2009.

MARY ALLEN NEEL, RPR, FPR
2894-A Remington Green Lane
Tallahassee, Florida 32308
(850) 878-2221