# THE CABINET STATE OF FLORIDA

#### Representing:

DIVISION OF BOND FINANCE
FINANCIAL SERVICES COMMISSION, FINANCIAL REGULATION
FINANCIAL SERVICES COMMISSION, INSURANCE REGULATION
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE
DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAY SAFETY AND MOTOR VEHICLES
FLORIDA LAND AND WATER ADJUDICATORY COMMISSION
BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE INTERNAL IMPROVEMENT TRUST FUND

The above agencies came to be heard before THE FLORIDA CABINET, the Honorable Governor Scott presiding, in the Cabinet Meeting Room, LL-03, The Capitol, Tallahassee, Florida, on Thursday, June 16, 2011, commencing at approximately 9:08 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:

RICK SCOTT Governor

PAM BONDI Attorney General

JEFF ATWATER Chief Financial Officer

ADAM PUTNAM Commissioner of Agriculture

\* \* \*

### I N D E X

VOTES		PAGE
DEPARTMENT OF VE		4 8, 9
DIVISION OF BOND FINAL (Presented by BEN WAT)		
ITEM	ACTION	PAGE
1 2	Approved Approved	10 11
FINANCIAL SERVICES COI (Presented by ANDREA I	MMISSION, FINANCIAL REGULATIO MORELAND)	N
ITEM	ACTION	PAGE
1 2	Approved Approved	15 16

## INDEX CONTINUED

FINANCIAL	SERV	VICES	COI	MMISSION,	INS	SURANCE	REGUL	ATION
(Presented	d by	BELIN	NDA	MILLER)				

(TIESCHEED DY DELINDA	MIDDER)	
ITEM	ACTION	PAGE
1 2 3 4	Approved Approved Deferred Discussed	17 19 20 20
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE (Presented by LISA VI		
ITEM	ACTION	PAGE
1 2 3 4	Approved Approved Approved Approved	46 47 47 48
(Presented by JULIE J	SAFETY AND MOTOR VEHICLES ONES)	
ITEM	ACTION	PAGE
1 2 3 4	Approved Approved Approved Approved	64 67 71 72
FLORIDA LAND AND WATE (Presented by PHILLIP	R ADJUDICATORY COMMISSION MILLER)	
ITEM	ACTION	PAGE
1 2 3	Approved Approved Approved	74 77 79
BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF (Presented by BOB BAL	THE INTERNAL IMPROVEMENT TRUST	r fund
ITEM	ACTION	PAGE
1 2	Approved Approved	80 83
CERTIFICATE OF REPORT	ER	84

1 PROCEEDINGS (The agenda items commenced at 9:40 a.m.) 2 3 GOVERNOR SCOTT: This morning I would like to 4 ask the Cabinet to approve the appointment of Earl Danielle as the Interim Executive Director of the 5 Department of Veterans' Affairs. Colonel Danielle 6 7 retired from the United States Marine Corps after 8 30 years of honorable service. All I remember 9 about the Marine Corps is that every time the boat 10 went into port and the Marine Corps was there, we 11 would get into a fight, and they always won. I 12 don't think we never won. 13 He currently serves as the Department's Chief 14 of Staff and has held a leadership position at the 15 Department since joining the team in 2004. 16 Is there a motion to approve Earl Danielle as 17 the interim director of the Department of Veterans' 18 Affairs? All in favor say aye. 19 COMMISSIONER PUTNAM: So move and aye. 20 CFO ATWATER: Second. Aye. 21 ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: Aye. 22 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Any opposed? The motion is 23 approved. 24 All right. Colonel, would you like to come up

and say a few words?

Good morning.

COLONEL DANIELLE: Good morning, Governor and members of the Cabinet. I'm very grateful for the opportunity to continue serving Florida's

1.6 million veterans.

I would like to thank the three prior executive directors who have done so much for Florida's veterans, beginning with Rocky McPherson when I joined Veterans' Affairs in 2004, Rear Admiral Leroy Collins, who succeeded Rocky, and of course, General Milligan, who is the current executive director. Thank you very much for your time.

GOVERNOR SCOTT: Thank you very much. I also want to take a moment to thank General Milligan for his -- if you would like to -- can you stand up for a second? I would like to recognize you for the exceptional leadership as the interim director this past year and for his dedication to public service. As some of you know, General Milligan began his public service career as our state's comptroller in 1994 after 39-year career -- another Marine guy -- in the United States Marine Corps. After retiring in 2003 as comptroller, he graciously served in two leadership roles on an interim basis. He filled in

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

as the interim director of the State Board of
Administration and then as interim director of
Veterans' Affairs.

General Milligan, we would like to thank you for your years of public service and wish you a happy and healthy retirement. I can't imagine you retiring. You like to work too hard. Hopefully, you can actually retire this time. I'm not sure I would ever.

Would you like to say a few words?

GENERAL MILLIGAN: Well, thank you, Governor and Cabinet. You know, it has been my privilege to serve, and it has been particularly rewarding the past 10 months working with the veterans here in Florida. There is no question that we need to reach out and make sure that they know what benefits are available to them and see that they are effectively served by the U.S. Department of Veterans' Affairs.

So it has been my privilege, really, all these years. And I enjoyed certainly serving on the Cabinet when I was on the Cabinet, and wish you all the very best of luck. God bless.

(Applause.)

(Off the record for pictures.)

GOVERNOR SCOTT: You know what, we all don't probably realize this, but the individuals coming back now, the veterans are having a very difficult time getting jobs.

ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: That's right.

GOVERNOR SCOTT: The unemployment rate is extremely high for people coming back from the --getting out of the service from whatever their service has been. So it's very important that we keep them in mind, especially as we're talking about job growth.

1 GOVERNOR SCOTT: All right. Next we're going 2 to go to Parole Commission appointments. 3 the previous Governor and Cabinet appointed two commissioners to fill vacancies on the Parole 4 Commission. However, the Senate did not confirm 5 6 the appointments during the 2011 legislative 7 session, resulting in two vacancies that must be filed by us today, as required by statute. 8 9 vacancies are temporarily filled by the incumbents until June 20th. The Parole Qualifications 10 11 Committee has submitted a list of six eligible 12 applicants to fill vacancies. The committee submitted the following names for our 13 14 consideration: Cassandra Jenkins, Tena Pate, Mario 15 Theodore, Vincent McNally, Clovis Watson, Jr., and 16 Felix McCuen. 17 Is there a motion? 18 CFO ATWATER: Governor, I would move that we 19 reappoint Tena Pate to the Parole Commission and 20 also redesignate her as Chairman of the Commission. 21 ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: Second. 22 GOVERNOR SCOTT: All right. All in favor say 23 aye. 24 (Affirmative responses.) 25 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Any opposed? All right. The

1	motion passes.
2	ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: May I make a
3	statement, Governor?
4	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Yes.
5	ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: I have as a
6	prosecutor appeared in front of the Parole
7	Commission for many, many years, and Commissioner
8	Pate, Chairman Pate, thank you for your service and
9	your hard work, and thank you for wanting to
10	continue this position.
11	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Thank you very much.
12	Is there a motion for the second vacancy?
13	ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: Governor, if there
14	are no motions on the floor, I would ask that the
15	Parole Commission Qualifications Commission
16	reinitiate the interview process and bring us back
17	more eligible applicants to consider for the Parole
18	Commission as soon as possible.
19	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Any other comments? All
20	right. Is there a second for that motion?
21	COMMISSIONER PUTNAM: Second.
22	GOVERNOR SCOTT: All in favor I guess say aye.
23	(Affirmative responses.)
24	GOVERNOR SCOTT: All right. The motion
25	passes. Thank you very much.

1	GOVERNOR SCOTT: All right. Now we're going
2	to go to the next Cabinet meeting is Tuesday,
3	August 2, 2011.
4	Now we're going to go to the Division of Bond
5	Finance. Good morning.
6	MR. WATKINS: Good morning, Governor.
7	GOVERNOR SCOTT: The first agenda is to be
8	presented by Ben Watkins.
9	MR. WATKINS: Thank you, Governor and Cabinet
10	members.
11	Item Number 1 is approval of the minutes of
12	the May 17th meeting.
13	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is there a motion on the
14	minutes?
15	ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: Move to approve.
16	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is there a second?
17	CFO ATWATER: Second.
18	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Moved and seconded. Show
19	Item 1 approved without objection.
20	MR. WATKINS: Item 2 are resolutions
21	authorizing the issuance and competitive sale of up
22	to \$330 million in PECO refunding bonds to take
23	advantage of lower interest rates.
24	GOVERNOR SCOTT: And all this is is the
25	refunding of the bonds? It's not new debt?

1	MR. WATKINS: That's correct. It's a
2	refunding for debt service savings, to lower the
3	interest rate on outstanding debt.
4	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Are there any questions? Is
5	there a motion on Item 2?
6	COMMISSIONER PUTNAM: So moved.
7	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is there a second?
8	ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: Second.
9	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Moved and seconded. Show
10	Item 2 approved without objection.
11	MR. WATKINS: Thank you, sir.
12	CFO ATWATER: Governor?
13	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Thank you. Go ahead.
14	CFO ATWATER: I wonder, if we have just a
15	minute, if we could hear from Ben as to the value
16	of the savings that we've been receiving on what
17	you've been refunding for us. Governor, I don't
18	know if we have the time. I would be
19	GOVERNOR SCOTT: I think it's a good idea.
20	Are you willing to do that at this time?
21	MR. WATKINS: Sure, happy to.
22	Well, over the course of the last fiscal year,
23	we've executed approximately ten refunding
24	transactions totaling approximately \$1.5 billion in
25	order to lower the interest rate and take advantage

of lower rates in the municipal market, and that generated debt service savings, gross debt service savings of \$190 million on the transactions that we have executed this year.

You know, that's part of what we do, is constantly monitor all of the different series of bonds that are outstanding at the state level, what the interest rates are on those bonds, and what interest rates we may be able to obtain in the market at any given time. And what we try to do is stay ahead of the game and stay prepared and have authorizations in place and move aggressively to take advantage of lower interest rates. So that's what we've been doing, and that's what we've accomplished over the course of the last fiscal year.

GOVERNOR SCOTT: That's great. It's savings now, but it's also savings for a long time.

MR. WATKINS: It's savings over the term of the refunding. One of our policies is not to extend our debt. We've never done any restructuring of debt, is what it would be referred to as, but we do term-to-term refundings. In other words, if there's 10 years outstanding on the loan, then the refunding bonds go for 10 years, and those

savings accrue levelly over the period of time that the bonds are currently outstanding. So we're just, in effect, lowering our debt service requirements on the bonds that are being issued in order to take advantage of lower interest rates.

CFO ATWATER: I just think that that's what -Ben, all of us on the Cabinet would like to express
our gratitude. We just had a presentation that the
Commissioner did on the Davis Productivity Awards
and all of our fellow employees looking for ways to
be more efficient. And the thoughtfulness, the
care, and the analysis that you've been doing to
save us \$200 million in the course -- you know,
18 million taxpayers are grateful for that. We get
nothing for that. But when you save that kind of
money, that can be reinvested. Or frankly, I think
all of us here would prefer that it stays in the
people's pockets in Florida and doesn't come here.
But you did that by knocking down that debt
service, so thank you very much.

MR. WATKINS: Thank you. You know, it's all attributable to the hard work and dedication of my staff, of course. I'm just the mouthpiece. It's part of the job, but I appreciate the acknowledgment.

1	CFO ATWATER: Please pass along our gratitude
2	to the whole team, then.
3	MR. WATKINS: Absolutely.
4	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Thank you, Ben.
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	GOVERNOR SCOTT: All right. The next agenda
2	is the Financial Services Commission, Office of
3	Financial Regulation, presented by Andrea Moreland.
4	Good morning.
5	MS. MORELAND: Good morning, Governor and
6	members of the Cabinet.
7	The Office has two items for your
8	consideration this morning. Item Number 1 is a
9	request for approval of the meeting minutes for the
10	February 1, 2011 meeting.
11	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is there a motion on Item 1?
12	CFO ATWATER: So moved.
13	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Second?
14	ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: Second.
15	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Moved and seconded. Show
16	Item 1 approved without objection.
17	MS. MORELAND: Item Number 2, the Office
18	requests approval to publish a notice of proposed
19	rule for Rule Chapter 69V-180 relating to consumer
20	debt collection. The proposed rules revise the
21	consumer complaint form to conform to statutory
22	requirements, sets forth books and records
23	requirements, and establishes guidelines for
24	imposing administrative penalties.
25	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is there a motion on Item 2?

1	CFO ATWATER: So moved.
2	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is there a second?
3	ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: Second.
4	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Moved and seconded. Show
5	Item 2 approved without objection.
6	MS. MORELAND: Thank you.
7	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Thank you very much.
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	GOVERNOR SCOTT: All right. The next agenda
2	is the Financial Services Commission, Office of
3	Insurance Regulation, presented by Belinda Miller.
4	Good morning.
5	MS. MILLER: Good morning. Thank you,
6	Governor and members of the Commission.
7	Item 1 is to approve the minutes of the
8	Financial Services Commission from March the 9th,
9	2011.
10	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is there a motion on Item 1?
11	CFO ATWATER: So moved.
12	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is there a second?
13	COMMISSIONER PUTNAM: Second.
14	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Moved and seconded. Show
15	Item 1 approved without objection.
16	MS. MILLER: Item 2 is a request for approval
17	for publication of amendments to proposed rules.
18	All of these deal with life insurance actuarial
19	memoranda and the setting of reserves.
20	690-138.047, titled Description of Actuarial
21	Memorandum Including an Asset Adequacy Analysis and
22	Regulatory Asset Adequacy Issues Summary;
23	690-162.203, Adoption of 2001 Commissioners
24	Standard Ordinary Preferred Mortality Tables for
25	Determining Reserve Liabilities for Ordinary Life

1 Insurance.

These rules are consistent with changes to move away from the rule-based reserve requirements and toward principle-based reserve requirements.

Rule-based reserves specify mortality tables, interest rates, and method as a "one size fits all" approach. Principle-based reserving permits greater judgment on the part of the company actuaries to use assumptions based, to the extent statistically credible, on the company's own experience. Changing to principle-based reserving is occurring at both the national and the international levels.

Until recent technology made expanded underwriting criteria practical, mortality tables were based on standard and substandard risks, age, gender, and smoker and nonsmoker status. Newly developed tables permit super-preferred, preferred, standard, and substandard risk classifications. These tables were first available for policies issued in 2007.

The companies were doing underwriting in 2005 and 2006 that was essentially the same as in 2007, so the industry requested that these reserves be calculated using the preferred mortality tables for

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

1 those two years. This provides a little bit of 2 surplus relief for companies during the economic 3 downturn. 4 An initial step toward the use of these 5 reserves was the adoption by the NAIC, the National 6 Association of Insurance Commissioners, of two 7 model regulations which are a national standard for life insurance reserve calculations. So companies 8 9 write across the country, and these would be 10 consistent across the country and would be national in use for their one financial statement that's 11 12 filed for every state. 13 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Thank you. Any comments? All right. Is there a motion on Item 2? 14 15 CFO ATWATER: So moved. 16 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is there a second? 17 ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: Second. 18 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Moved and seconded. 19 Item 2 approved without objection. 20 Thank you. Item 3, if the MS. MILLER: 21 Commission would approve this, we would like to 22 defer this item until the next meeting. This is 23 appointment of the workers' comp JUA board. 24 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Okay. Is there a motion to

defer Item 3?

1 CFO ATWATER: So moved.

2 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is there a second?

3 ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: Second.

GOVERNOR SCOTT: Moved and seconded. Show

Item 3 deferred approved without objection.

MS. MILLER: And in place of that item, with your indulgence, I would like to introduce Susanne Murphy. She is the chief administration officer for Citizens Property Insurance Corporation, which writes our property coverage in the state of Florida for the people who can't find coverage in the admitted market. And Susanne is here to give you an update on Citizens and its potential assessments and liabilities.

GOVERNOR SCOTT: Thank you. Good morning.

MS. MURPHY: Good morning, Governor Scott,

General Bondi, CFO Atwater, and Commissioner

Putnam. Thank you for the opportunity to appear

before you today. I regret that our CFO, Sharon

Bennett, is unable to be here. She's actually

traveling with our financial team meeting with

potential investors on a current bond issue that we

have pending. So in her absence, I'm happy to

appear before you and hope that I can do her proud.

We were asked to come before you to talk about

Citizens and its potential assessments and how
those assessments affect Citizens policyholders and
what effect they have on non-Citizens
policyholders. So we have a very targeted
presentation to try to address that particular
issue.

If I might, let me start by just reminding you all of what financial resources Citizens has at its disposal and how those resources are different than those available to a licensed property and casualty insurance company. We have the typical resources that are available to insurance companies, such as we collect insurance premiums, we earn investment income, we have surplus from prior year operations, we're eligible for Florida Hurricane CAT Fund reimbursements, and if we purchase reinsurance, private reinsurance, as we did this year for our coastal account, we also have access to those reinsurance recoveries.

But in addition to those typical financial resources that companies have available, Citizens has some unique and special assessment powers that have been granted to us by the Legislature, and they are the following:

We have a Citizens policyholder surcharge that

I'll describe in a little more detail in a minute.

We also have the power to levy regular assessments on non-Citizens policyholders, the power to levy emergency assessments on a wide range of policyholders, and we also have access to pre-event liquidity resources, such as debt instruments, which I just talked about, and lines of credit.

And all of these resources together are combined to help us meet our obligation to our policyholders.

The next slide shows you in a graphic form those resources. We have three accounts at Citizens. That's the way that our policies are allocated in the statute that created us. We have a personal lines account, which is basically homeowners coverage throughout Florida. We have a commercial lines account, which are large condominium associations and apartment complexes. And then we have a coastal account, which is the property along the coastline of Florida, where we offer wind-only coverage.

If you look at the three accounts, you see that the accumulated surplus available from those accounts, taking into consideration surplus and budgeted net income, the total accumulated surplus that we have available for this fiscal -- I mean

for this hurricane season is about \$5.7 billion.

If you add to that the pre-event liquidity at 2.9 billion that comes from previous bond sales, our projected CAT Fund cover and projected reinsurance recoveries, for the coastal account, you see we have a little over 10 billion in resources, and for the personal lines account and the commercial lines account, about 5.6 billion, for a total of \$15.8 billion.

Now, certainly the surplus is cash that's available, but things like the pre-event liquidity available, if we draw down on those funds, we're required to repay those funds, and the repayment would come either from -- we could use those funds as a liquidity mechanism to pay claims while we wait for recoveries from the CAT Fund, or we could use those moneys to pay claims and wait for recoveries from our private reinsurance, or we could use assessments to pay those funds that are drawn down back. So although we have access to those funds, if we tap into our pre-event liquidity, we've got to repay it, and the three sources that I just described are the way that we would repay those funds.

The next chart is a chart that we posted on

21

22

23

24

25

our website and provided to all of our agents, and use it with policyholders as well to try to explain how assessments for Citizens work. The assessments have changed over time, and the Legislature has reconsidered the appropriate percentage of assessments that should be paid by a Citizens policyholder and a non-Citizens policyholder and have passed legislation a couple of years ago that created a Citizens policyholder surcharge that says if you're a policyholder of Citizens and we have a deficit in one account, you are liable for up to 15 percent of your premium if there's a deficit in that account. If we have a deficit in all of the three accounts that I referenced a moment ago, the ultimate Citizens policyholder surcharge could be 45 percent of total premium for their Citizens policy. And we have a slide later on that tries to put that in terms that are easy to understand and give you an example of what that liability could be for a Citizens policyholder.

If the Citizens policyholder surcharge is not enough to cure the deficit, then the law prescribes that we levy a regular assessment of up to 6 percent on property insurers in Florida, who then pass that assessment on to their policyholders. If

that 6 percent assessment on the voluntary market is not enough to cure the deficit, the statute provides for an emergency assessment of up to 10 percent per year per account.

I didn't mention that on the regular assessment, there is a potential liability for a non-Citizens policyholder of 6 percent for each account. Remember that for a Citizens policyholder, it's 15 percent for each account, but for a non-Citizens policyholder, it's up to 6 percent for each account. And then both Citizens policyholders and non-Citizens policyholders are liable for any emergency assessment that's levied by Citizens to cure a deficit.

All right. Next slide. The next two slides take four different scenarios and project what our losses could be for four different storms and try to show you graphically how those storms would be paid for and which resources would need to be triggered to pay the claims. We've tried to put this in a pie chart because it seems to be easier to read than the traditional layer charts that you might have seen before, so I hope this is useful and easy to understand.

In a one-in-five-year event, which is

basically a Frances event, relatively small,
Citizens could pay for that event, the probable
maximum loss of which is a little over a billion
dollars. We could pay that with our existing
surplus. So you see the circle is all green,
because that is the color of the accumulated
surplus that's right below the pie chart.

For a one-in-25-year event, Citizens would use accumulated surplus and CAT fund reimbursements to cover those losses of 8.4 billion and would not need to levy any surcharges or private reinsurance, but would use CAT Fund and surplus to pay for those losses.

All right. The next slide is a one-in-50-year event, which approximates a Hurricane Andrew event. And you see in that eventuality, we would use surplus and CAT Fund reimbursements. In the coastal account, we would trigger private reinsurance, a Citizens policyholder surcharge, a regular assessment, and an emergency assessment. So we would use all of the resources at our disposal to pay an Andrew event. The total probable maximum loss would be about 15.2 billion. For the coastal account, which is the only account that you'll see triggers surcharges and

assessments, there would be a 15 percent policyholder surcharge for that account, the maximum 6 percent regular assessment, and a 2 percent emergency assessment.

Now, the regular assessment, let me clarify, is an assessment that's intended to be levied for one year. The emergency assessment does not have a -- it's intended to be multiple years, doesn't have a prescribed term. And the last time that we implemented an emergency assessment, the Legislature prescribed that it should be for a 10-year period. And we have an emergency assessment right now that's, I think, 1 percent that is to be collected until 2017.

Okay. The last event is the one-in-100-year.

Yes. Thank you. It's on that same slide. This is an event that we have not had in Florida up to this point. But in that event, we would use surplus,

CAT Fund reimbursements, private reinsurance for the coastal account, and then policyholder surcharges and regular assessments for the personal lines and commercial lines account, and policyholder assessments, regular assessments, and emergency assessments for the coastal account, to cover an expected probable maximum loss of

1 \$24.5 billion.

And because of the significance of that event and the concern with our ability to cover a one-in-100-year event and the impact that that event would have on our policyholders and on non-Citizens policyholders, we also prepared a sheet like this that shows you how that amount of money would be paid and what the liability would be on a Citizens policyholder versus a private market policyholder. And I'll just summarize what this says.

Essentially, it says that for a Citizens policyholder, because of the difference in the policyholder surcharge amount and their liability to pay a larger share of the losses than a non-Citizens policyholder, a Citizens policyholder in a one-in-100-year event could expect to pay -- and these are based on average policyholder premiums, so let me caveat that. This is very average -- the only way I could give you a comparison is to average all the policyholder and homeowner premiums in Florida and all the auto premiums in Florida. But a Citizens policyholder would pay an additional \$1,000 on their automobile and homeowners policies in year one following a

one-in-100-year storm.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is that on each policy?

MS. MURPHY: No, it's combined, \$1,000

combined for auto and homeowner.

GOVERNOR SCOTT: So for homeowners, would that be like a \$130,000 house? Do you know?

MS. MURPHY: I think that the standard we usually use is a \$150,000 coverage A amount. I'll be honest with you. I don't know how this -- what the premium was for this particular comparison. But basically, you would show that the Citizens policyholder with an average premium of \$1,900 for a homeowners policy would pay a 45 percent policyholder surcharge on that premium plus a surcharge on their auto, and combined, they would pay about \$1,000 more. And combined, a non-Citizens policyholder would pay about \$300 So the Citizens policyholder has three times as much liability as a non-Citizens policyholder, following the State's direction that the Citizens policyholder should have more of the burden of the operations of Citizens as a beneficiary of it than a non-Citizens policyholder.

Both Citizens and non-Citizens policyholders would be liable for emergency assessments. And

again, using these very homogenized, combined 1 2 numbers, we project that the Citizens policyholder 3 would pay an additional combined of about \$47 on 4 their auto and homeowners policies versus \$39 for a 5 non-Citizens policyholder over a 30-year period of 6 And again, that's because the emergency 7 assessment can be over whatever period of time is projected and selected, and for this example, we 8 9 used 30 years. So if we shortened that emergency 10 assessment period, that number could be much 11 different. 12 GOVERNOR SCOTT: A couple of questions. 13 we go back to slide 2? So right now, the surplus of 5.7 billion --14 15 you see at the top? 16 MS. MURPHY: Yes. 17 GOVERNOR SCOTT: How much -- if nothing -- if 18 we didn't have a hurricane this year, how much 19 would that surplus increase this next year? 20 That is the projected year-end MS. MURPHY: That is the projected with our budgeted 21 22 net income projected through the end of the year, 23 so that is a number that is projected through 24 calendar year 2011. 25 I will say that I think our first quarter

financials already have us at 5.4 billion, so it
looks as though we might make that -- we'll make
that target of 5.7 by year-end.

GOVERNOR SCOTT: And so what do we -- how does

GOVERNOR SCOTT: And so what do we -- how does the surplus increase every year? If you don't have a hurricane, how much does it increase every year?

MS. MURPHY: It depends on what our claims are, because --

GOVERNOR SCOTT: So is there a projection of how much it has been increasing every year?

MS. MURPHY: I don't have that. I can certainly get that for you. I can show you over time how our net income has either increased or decreased over time. I'll be happy to get that for you. I don't have it with me.

GOVERNOR SCOTT: The other one is, on the -- I guess the risk is one this 100 -- I guess it would a smaller number for the one-in-50 or whatever, but the 1,003, that's assuming people are going to right the check; right? That's assuming people will pay it, policyholders will pay it. If they don't pay it, we don't have the money to pay out the claims.

MS. MURPHY: Well, I guess I would say if they don't pay it, they don't have coverage for either

1	their auto policy or their homeowners policy,
2	because the law prescribes that that's considered
3	premium, and if you don't pay it, then you don't
4	have coverage. And I think we and the two
5	predecessor organizations have levied assessments
6	in the past and have been successful in collecting
7	those assessments and paying our obligations.
8	GOVERNOR SCOTT: And right now we already have
9	assessments on policies; right?
10	MS. MURPHY: Yes, we have the emergency
11	assessment, the 1 percent emergency assessment from
12	Citizens.
13	GOVERNOR SCOTT: From Citizens. And based on
14	what year? Was that for 2004, 2005?
15	MS. MURPHY: It was 2005.
16	GOVERNOR SCOTT: 2005? Okay. And has that
17	been going up every year still?
18	MS. MURPHY: It has actually been going down.
19	The emergency assessment originally was
20	1.4 percent, and then this year, because
21	collections are higher than we projected, it's now
22	at 1 percent. It has been reduced from 1.4 to
23	1 percent.
24	GOVERNOR SCOTT: And if you go to let's
25	see. Go to the I guess we don't get into the

1 assessments until the one-in-50; right? 2 everything below that, the money is available now. 3 We've got the pre-event liquidity available. That's available, the 2.9 billion. 4 5 MS. MURPHY: Right. 6 GOVERNOR SCOTT: The CAT Fund, that money is 7 available. We're not relying on in the future 8 borrowing that money; right? I mean, that money is 9 available now? We already have commitments? 10 MS. MURPHY: Yes. GOVERNOR SCOTT: So on all these below in the 11 12 surplus, all that money is available now. We don't 13 have to worry about relying on the markets, if 14 they'll lend us the money at the time. 15 MS. MURPHY: No, sir. We don't need to rely 16 on anything other than surplus and CAT Fund until 17 we reach a one-in-50-year event. 18 COMMISSIONER PUTNAM: May I follow up on that, 19 please? 20 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Sure. 21 COMMISSIONER PUTNAM: How is it that your 22 projection doesn't require an assessment until the 23 one-in-50-year event if we're operating in a world 24 where you have an emergency assessment after the

'05 year, which was not a 50-year event?

1 MS. MURPHY: I'm sorry. You lost me.

GOVERNOR SCOTT: Basically, in 2005, it wasn't a one-in-50, and under yours, it shows that we don't need to do assessments until we have a one-in-50.

COMMISSIONER PUTNAM: But yet you have an assessment after a season that was not a one-in-50-year event.

MS. MURPHY: What was? (Conferring sotto voce with staff.)

Christine is just bringing me another chart that if you run a one-in-34-year event, which of course, is not in this series of slides that we provided, there would be an assessment in the coastal account.

But I think to go back to your point, I think my answer would be that the deficit that was calculated in '05 was based on the surplus, the losses, and everything at that time. So we had a deficit at that point for whatever that storm was based on the surplus that we had in that place at that time. Does that make sense?

COMMISSIONER PUTNAM: Well, it does, but I guess my question is really more -- forget about the Andrews and the Katrinas. We've got in this

decade a proven track record of multiple small to medium-sized the storms. I don't know -- you now, from an actuarial standpoint, I don't know what you would characterize Charley, Frances, Ivan, Jeanne, Wilma, and maybe Katrina as, but --

MS. MURPHY: Horrible.

COMMISSIONER PUTNAM: But how do multiple small storms throw off your model? Because your model is based on a single event.

MS. MURPHY: Sure.

COMMISSIONER PUTNAM: But you've got a proven track record of multiple -- you know, when it rains, it pours. If you have an active season, you're going to get multiple strikes that may not individually, but collectively would have an enormous impact. So how does your model factor that?

MS. MURPHY: Well, I think we have run scenarios with multiple storms to just try to figure out where we would get the resources to pay it. But it would be -- you would sort of reallocate the buckets of money that are shown on these pages. And you may in fact have -- in a series of three storms in a single year, you might trigger a regular assessment or a Citizens

1 policyholder surcharge, and it's just not shown on here. But we would still use the same discrete 2 3 buckets of money to allocate to those claims. 4 I mean, we can certainly give you multiple 5 scenarios that show what would happen if we had 6 five storms in one year, assuming these losses. 7 mean, we could do that. But I guess my point would 8 be that it will show a different use of resources 9 to respond to those claims. There are infinite 10 variations. 11 ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: A question, Governor? 12 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Sure. 13 ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: How many policies 14 does Citizens currently write? 15 MS. MURPHY: We have 1.358 million policies as 16 of the end of May. 17 GOVERNOR SCOTT: What market share is that? 18 MS. MURPHY: I think based on premium, it's 19 probably 24, 25 percent. 20 GOVERNOR SCOTT: But in the coastal areas, 21 it's 40; right? 22 CFO ATWATER: It's way out there. 23 GOVERNOR SCOTT: It's way out there in the 24 coastal areas; right. 25 MS. MURPHY: We only have about -- about

400,000 of those are coastal. The rest of them are 1 not. So of that 1.358, only about 400,000 are 2 3 coastal policies. The rest are low value, older 4 homes, mobile homes. 5 GOVERNOR SCOTT: I think going back to what 6 Commissioner Putnam was talking about, I guess it's 7 really if you have two one-in-25-year events, then we're going to have assessments, right, if we have 8 9 two in one year? MS. MURPHY: You know, I would say that's 10 11 certainly possible. 12 GOVERNOR SCOTT: And then how much has the sinkhole issue cost you all, cost Citizens? 13 14 MS. MURPHY: We have seen a huge increase in 15 the frequency of sinkhole claims and the severity 16 of sinkhole claims. 17 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Do you know off the top of 18 your head how much that's costing us a year, that 19 issue? 20 CFO ATWATER: I'll give it to you, Governor. Last year we had -- we took in about \$19 million in 21 22 sinkhole premium, if that was accurate from your 23 numbers. 24 MS. MURPHY: I think that was 2009. 25 me.

1 CFO ATWATER: Yes, the last year we had a wrap-up. And we took in 19 million in premiums and 2 paid out 85 million in claims.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

GOVERNOR SCOTT: 85 million? Okay. That's significant. And it's growing; right?

CFO ATWATER: That's the real problem. think if we had the trend line of accounts, 10 years ago we had about 450,000 accounts in what was then called -- what's now called the coastal account. Today we have about 450,000 households in the coastal account.

Our greatest concern is how we have chased away capital by the fact that we have lost capital that was insuring homes that now are in sinkhole areas, or often referred to as older housing stock homes. And so when you think of the growth that has occurred in the last three years, it has not been in the coastal areas. It has been in the interior of Florida, and because of the loss of capital and people choosing not to write in Florida. So the importance is, of course, getting that capital back here and taking that housing stock back.

MS. MURPHY: Governor, I do have current numbers through 2010. From our creation in 2002 until 2010, we collected for sinkhole 272 million in premium, and we've paid out 878 million in claims.

GOVERNOR SCOTT: A lot of money.

CFO ATWATER: And as I say, you can't make that up on volume. It's a real issue. And hopefully the changes you signed, Governor, will make a difference.

GOVERNOR SCOTT: So are you seeing any change in how many people are trying get Citizens now after the bill was signed?

MS. MURPHY: I don't think we've had enough time to see any impact of Senate Bill 408. I will say that we have seen a pretty steady increase in new applications coming in to Citizens since the first of the year. We're up to -- I think April was like 40,000 new applications for coverage in a single month. That's certainly not the highest we've ever been. I remember months in which we got 60,000 applications. But that is just an unbelievable amount of new applications for coverage.

You know, we grew by about 250,000 policies last year in 2010, and a lot of that has to do with, in my opinion, the health of the voluntary

market and the willingness of the voluntary market to write coverage in Florida, the insolvency of a couple of companies, and just plans by your household insurers, you know, not to actively write in Florida.

So, you know, our role is to provide coverage when coverage is not available, and so if coverage is restricted in the voluntary market, our applications increase.

ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: And you discuss that statutorily Citizens, of course, has moved away from being the insurer of last resort and openly competes in the market. What would Citizens look like financially if you were able to charge actuarially sound rates? What would it look like?

MS. MURPHY: I think that there are certain segments of our business that may not be able to find a home in the voluntary market that we can assume will likely remain insured by Citizens, and those would be wind-only policies, the 400,000 I mentioned earlier, mobile home policies -- we have like 185,000 mobile homes, and a huge portion of those mobile homes are more than 25 years old. No company is going to have an underwriting rule that would permit them to insure a mobile home that's

1 more than 25 years old.

So we have coastal properties that will likely remain covered. We have mobile homes that will likely remain covered by Citizens, and older homes that again most private insurers will not write a home that's more than 20 or 25 years old, and low value homes.

So I would estimate that that combined is probably 800,000 policies. If you take the 400,000 coastal policies and add mobile home, low value, and older homes, we have a significant population that would likely still need to get coverage from Citizens unless a market can be created for mobile home insurers, for low value home insurers, and for older home insurers, that that would become their niche market. And we had some of those companies prior to Andrew, but just have not seen them return to Florida.

So absent some kind of significant initiative to attract those companies to Florida, I'm not sure our numbers would get much below -- certainly not below half a million. I can't project that in my mind.

GOVERNOR SCOTT: Any other questions?

CFO ATWATER: Thank you, Governor. I think

that the Commissioner really lays out the more likely scenario. I appreciate that you were trying to figure out a way to give us the best possible, maybe the easiest to comprehend assessment strategy that may kick in, but I think it's far more likely that we're going to see multiple year events that will probably regrettably bring us to the need to assess.

And maybe also to that point, it would be my recollection that our reserves -- to the point about the assessment kicked in with less severe storms, but multiple storms, we did not go into the '04-05 season with the kinds of reserves we have now that we could have absorbed at least the first couple.

MS. MURPHY: Right.

CFO ATWATER: So that's also to the question the Commissioner was asking. We didn't have the kind of reserves we have today when we started that in '04, '05.

MS. MURPHY: That's correct.

CFO ATWATER: I think it's a very important exercise, that it can be very well understood by the public that there is someone who pays the piper here, and it's going to be the individual that

1 believes at the moment they're receiving, by the conversation anyway, a discounted rate from the 2 3 private market at the moment, if the private market 4 were offering that same price. And so there may be 5 some comfort in believing that I'm receiving a 6 lower cost at the moment. But if you don't go out 7 30 years on these other assessments, it would be a 8 significant burden to be carrying on a shorter 9 assessment period, and someone is going to pay the 10 I think that's the important exercise to 11 for people to get the word out, that someone is 12 going to pay the piper. 13 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Yes. the odds of the assessment. 14

They're not calculating

CFO ATWATER: That's correct.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

GOVERNOR SCOTT: I mean, that's basically what I'm saying.

It's Vegas, yes. I got by for CFO ATWATER: the year.

Governor and CFO Atwater, there MS. MURPHY: was a provision in 408, Senate Bill 408 that requires Citizens to provide to a new applicant for coverage, effective January 1, I believe, basically a disclosure document in which they sign an acknowledgment of what their liability may be for

assessments and distinguishes what they would pay as a Citizens policyholder versus a non-Citizens policyholder. So that is an attempt, I think, by the Legislature to make certain that we supplement our efforts to notify policyholders about the potential assessment by having them sign this disclosure document that has to accompany their application for coverage. So that's an attempt to make certain that people are aware of what their liability could be.

CFO ATWATER: Do we provide a scenario in that

CFO ATWATER: Do we provide a scenario in that document?

MS. MURPHY: We haven't created it yet. We could. That's not a bad idea at all to think about, here's an example of what could happen.

narrative that you may be held responsible or that you will be held responsible, here is scenario 1, 2, and 3, or something in which your assumptions are there. And I think it would also be important that in that assumption, someone is laying out what is the likelihood of a 30-year assessment versus a 10-year assessment, because that math makes all the difference to somebody.

MS. MURPHY: Thank you.

1 GOVERNOR SCOTT: I think as much as we can let everyone know if they're going to buy Citizens what 2 the additional potential risk is. 3 Let me add, I think we have to also look at --4 and I don't know the numbers, but I assume after 5 6 Katrina, a lot of people just walked way from their 7 homes and their policies. And so the belief that 8 everybody is going to pay an assessment might be --9 that might not happen. 10 MS. MURPHY: Again, I think our history has 11 shown that we have been successful in being able to 12 collect assessments and service our debt, so we 13 would hopefully be able to do that in the future. 14 GOVERNOR SCOTT: All right. Any other 15 questions? 16 Thank you very much. 17 MS. MURPHY: Thank you. 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Okay. The next agenda is the
2	Department of Revenue presented by Lisa Vickers.
3	Good morning.
4	MS. VICKERS: Good morning. Item 1, we
5	request approval of the minutes from the April 19th
6	and May 3rd meetings.
7	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is there a motion on Item 1?
8	ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: Move to approve.
9	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is there a second?
10	CFO ATWATER: Second.
11	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Moved and seconded. Show
12	Item 1 approved without objection.
13	MS. VICKERS: Item 2, we request approval and
14	authority to publish Rule 12E-1.0051. This rule
15	relates to undistributable collections for child
16	support and provides the method by which the
17	Department will determine when funds cannot be
18	distributed and are required to become program
19	income.
20	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Are there any questions?
21	All right. Is there a motion on Item 2?
22	ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: Move to approve.
23	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is there a second?
24	CFO ATWATER: Second.
25	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Moved and seconded. Show

1 Item 2 approved without objection. 2 MS. VICKERS: Item 3, we request approval of 3 the following rules for final adoption: Rule 12B-5.130 and 12B-5.150 related to refunds of tax 4 5 paid on fuel used for pumping off cargo; Rule 6 12A-1.018 and Rule 12A-1.074 related to trade-ins 7 when price is reduced as a result of trade-in of 8 used property; and Rule 12C-1.013 related to 9 corporate income tax, removing an obsolete example 10 referencing the Michigan single business tax that 11 has been repealed. 12 GOVERNOR SCOTT: All right. Is there a motion 13 on Item 3? 14 ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: Move to approve. 15 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is there a second? 16 CFO ATWATER: Second. 17 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Moved and seconded. Show 18 Item 3 approved without objection. 19 MS. VICKERS: Finally, Item 4, we request 20 approval for final adoption and approval of Rule 21 12A-1.061. This rule is related to timeshares and 22 provides for the tax treatment of timeshare 23 programs in the industry. 24 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is there a motion on Item 4? 25 CFO ATWATER: So moved.

1	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is there a second?
2	ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: Second.
3	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Moved and seconded. Show
4	item 4 approved without objection.
5	MS. VICKERS: Thank you.
6	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Thanks, Lisa.
7	ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: Governor, may I bring
8	up an issue?
9	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Sure.
10	ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: Thank you. I know
11	we've heard a lot lately about the issue of how to
12	impose taxes on the markup of hotel rooms sold by
13	Internet intermediaries. We know that some
14	legislative action did not pass last session.
15	Can you take a couple of moments as our
16	executive director to give us some history on this,
17	a very brief history?
18	MS. VICKERS: Certainly. The issue of tax on
19	what is known as travel intermediary sales of hotel
20	rooms has been around for a very long time. In
21	fact, I'm sure even Commissioner Putnam probably
22	recalls efforts at the federal level in Congress
23	with respect to taxation of those transactions.
24	The issue first arose back in about 2003, sort
25	of a burgeoning industry where hotel rooms were now

being offered through Internet sites. And the issue is really whether tax is due on the markup of the price of the hotel room when they're sold by an online company.

Tax has been paid and collected since the beginning of this industry on the sale of the hotel room from the hotel to the online company. To give you an example, a hotel room might be sold by a local hotel to an online company for \$100. That hotel room is resold to an ultimate customer for \$130 by the online company. Tax has been paid to the hotel and remitted to the State and the local government on the \$100, but not on the \$30 markup. In a county that might have a 12 percent tax between the state transit rental tax and local taxes, you're talking about \$3.60 on that transaction that's not being remitted.

The Department, when we originally looked at the issue, one of the things we recognized right away is that the sales tax statute was written in 1949, and it really hasn't been updated to reflect some of new ways of doing business and even some of the new products.

I always tell the story about my daughters in the back seat of the car arguing with each other,

and I turn to them and tell them they sound like a broken record, and they ask me, "What's a record?" You know, my kids have never bought music in a tangible form, digital downloads. We tax CDs, cassettes, you know, tapes. We don't tax digital downloads.

The sales tax statute has not kept up with some of the new forms of transactions, and this is an area where that is an issue. The statutes were written at a time when -- for example, references in the statute refer to things like rooming houses. You know, it hasn't been updated.

So the question is, is this new way of doing business subject to tax under our existing statute? And that has been debated a lot. Local governments have been pretty strong coming out and taking the position that they believe it is taxable under the current statute.

And there's a little difference in the language between the statute that the State administers, Chapter 212, and local government taxes under Chapter 125 on these same transactions, under the tourist development tax and the convention development tax. And there have been a lot of lawsuits filed between local governments and

the online intermediaries trying to resolve those issues that really have not made much progress.

The Legislature has had multiple opportunities to look at this issue. I think there has been a bill filed every year, with the exception of 2007, on this issue, some years to clarify that it's taxable, some years to clarify that it's not taxable, but it has never been resolved. There has never been legislation passed.

So the issue continues to hang out there. It is not a Florida-specific issue. This is being litigated all over the United States. And every state's laws are a little different, so the outcomes have been different in places where it has been resolved, and those are very few. In most places, it's still a pending issue like it is here in Florida.

ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: And for my fellow

Cabinet members, back in '09, my predecessor filed
a lawsuit that was never served. It was filed, but
not served, under the Unfair and Deceptive Trade

Practices Act. And that's what I wanted to ask

you. In your opinion, are there other avenues that
would settle this quicker? Do you have an opinion
as to a quicker resolution and how we can handle

1 this?

MS. VICKERS: Well, as I mentioned, there are about ten lawsuits that have been filed. You know, I hear from time to time that the parties are pushing those further.

As you mentioned, the previous administration had filed a lawsuit under unfair trade practices. That has been an issue that has been talked about at some length. Originally the online companies, the way they portray how much you book the room for on the websites, they'll put the price, \$130, and then they put taxes and fees, and they'll put a dollar amount. And if you click on that, it gives you an explanation that what that represents is reimbursement for the taxes that they pay to the hotels and additional charges, service charges that they make. And so I think Attorney General McCollum was very concerned about the visibility of that and whether consumers knew what they were paying.

But at the heart of all of this is the issue of whether the transaction is taxable or not. The Department has not taken a position on it, hopeful that the Legislature would, you know, bring clarity to the issue, because that's certainly the

quickest, fastest way to bring certainty to an issue, is to make sure that the statute is very

clear for taxpayers, but that hasn't happened.

One of the options that we could pursue that we haven't is for the Department to begin rulemaking on the issue and try and, you know, finally determine what we think the statute means in terms of the transit rental tax for the state. You know, I think people have gone back and forth. I think people have spent a lot of time debating on whether it should be taxable or not, and we really haven't looked at the statute and said, "Okay. This is the statute we've got. Does it apply or not?" There of rules of statutory construction when things are unclear. There's certainly the fact that the later-written statutes, the local government statutes, use language that's a little stronger than the state statute uses in terms of So that is definitely an option that's taxing it. available. You know, we could go down the rulemaking route.

ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: Would you prepare a recommendation to us about rulemaking and provide it to us next Cabinet meeting?

MS. VICKERS: I would be happy to.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: Thank you.

GOVERNOR SCOTT: Lisa, would you -- what we would do if we did a rule, you're not going to impact what the local counties are doing; is that right?

MS. VICKERS: We would. If we --

GOVERNOR SCOTT: How would you interpret -- how would you deal with their statute then?

MS. VICKERS: The way the two chapters work is, they basically use the same transaction as a tax base, the sale of a transient accommodation, and they impose taxes at two levels, the state tax under Chapter 212, the transient rental tax, tourist development tax, convention development tax, and the local taxes under Chapter 125.

When the State has not taken a position on an issue, the local governments are free to take a position on their statutes. But once the State has taken a position with respect to Chapter 212, the transient rental tax, that position becomes binding on the local government. So if we had a rule, whether it said it's taxable or not taxable, that rule would be binding with respect to those local transactions.

GOVERNOR SCOTT: Even if their statute is

written differently than ours?

MS. VICKERS: Right. I mean, specifically, our statute talks about the rental charged, and theirs talks about the consideration charged. So ours seems to focus on the rental of the room, where theirs focuses on the total consideration for the rental of that room. So it's just very slight wording differences, but it's one of the things that the local governments have really focused in on in terms of enforcing their statute.

ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: And given that our statute was written in 1949 and nothing has been able to go before the Legislature, would you agree that rulemaking -- is that what you said, rulemaking would be an appropriate venue for us to discuss a solution to this matter?

MS. VICKERS: Rulemaking will give us the opportunity to hold workshops, let everybody come forward and make their best arguments under the various statutes, you know, apply the rules of statutory construction, and bring back to you a recommendation in terms of what we believe the correct application of the statute is, you know, given all of these various debates.

The rule would definitely, I think, under the

new provisions cause the economic impact that would 1 2 require them to go to the Legislature to be 3 ratified. So the rule would end up back in front 4 of the Legislature for ratification, so they would 5 get a final say. 6 GOVERNOR SCOTT: So, Attorney General Bondi, 7 you're asking for her to come back, Lisa to come with a proposal as far as the process, or a 8 9 recommendation as far as the rule? ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: A recommendation, 10 11 just a recommendation. 12 GOVERNOR SCOTT: You're asking for a recommendation as far as the rule? 13 14 ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: The rulemaking, yes. 15 MS. VICKERS: I would recommend, you know, 16 coming back with a proposal on what that process 17 would look like and not on a particular position. 18 I mean, I think it's really important to listen to 19 all sides and get that public input and have the 20 workshops before we decide, you know, what we think the statute means. 21 ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: Governor, just the 22 23 process. 24 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Has the Legislature -- has

the Legislature been holding hearings every year?

CFO ATWATER: There have been -- in the last few years that I have been a part of the Legislature, as was mentioned, there have been bills that have been proposed on either side of this that have been debated. And I think what you can take from the fact that they haven't passed one way or the other in ten years is that the majority of legislators believe that the present statute, though maybe aged, is still being applied correctly. That would be my interpretation.

Someone would say there's been inaction. I would say that they've seen the case that has been made, and they see the statute, and they believe it's being applied correctly.

ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: As a tax lawyer, would you agree with that?

MS. VICKERS: Well, the current application is that tax is not being collected on those transactions today. It is being collected on the room rate. There certainly is a lot of debate on both sides, on multiple sides. You even see this year hotels, our local hotels lining up in a different position from the online intermediaries, and others that represent sort of the bigger resort areas that use some of these online forums and also

operate under other statutes related to the sale of travel lining up with the online companies, and the counties lining up against the online companies.

So you see multiple parties all disagreeing over what this statute means.

And it sort of gets back to that earlier point I made. I think it kind of gets back to how should we tax this, or should we tax it? You know, should we tax it at all? Is it, you know, an industry that we want to encourage this new form of transaction in, or is it so much like the old way of doing business that we think we're putting our hotels at a competitive disadvantage?

You hear the same arguments with the respect to streamlined sales tax, you know, the online companies versus the bricks and mortar stores. You know, I think it is really us reaching a point where, you know, we have statutes that were written before all of these new technologies were around and us debating about how we want to tax those or not as a policy position.

So, you know, I think even -- I want to make sure that you understand that even if we do a rule, which will definitely at least have us looking at the statutes and saying this is how we think it

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

1 applies or not, that rule will be challenged. Ιt 2 will end up in court also, because the parties are 3 very, you know, opposed --4 GOVERNOR SCOTT: There's a lot of money there. 5 MS. VICKERS: They're lined up on either side 6 of the issue. 7 GOVERNOR SCOTT: So is everybody all right if we ask Lisa to come back with a proposal on the 8 9 process of rulemaking? 10 ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: This is the process. 11 CFO ATWATER: Sure. 12 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Are you all right, Commissioner? 13 COMMISSIONER PUTNAM: I'm still not sure what 14 15 she's going to walk out of here -- do you know what 16 we're asking you to do? Because I'm not totally 17 sure what we're asking you to do. 18 I think you're asking me to put MS. VICKERS: 19 this on as a future agenda item at the next Cabinet 20 meeting. And what I would be proposing is that the Department -- or getting your permission that the 21 22 Department begin rulemaking on this issue and do that with a plan, you know, to hold a series of 23 24 workshops to gather public input.

GOVERNOR SCOTT: What I think we're asking is,

you're going to come back and say, "If we were going to do this, if we decided we wanted to go forward, this is what we would do."

Step 1 is, we decide we wanted to do it. Step 2 is, you would propose something. Step 3, I assume you're going to go through this number of workshops and how you would do it. And then understanding that, the next step is, it's still has to be approved by the Legislature, and it's going to get challenged?

MS. VICKERS: Right.

GOVERNOR SCOTT: Okay. So based on that?

COMMISSIONER PUTNAM: Based on that, we ought to just let the Legislature keep doing their thing, whether their thing is to do something or to do nothing. But if it's going to end up either in court or back in the Legislature, what role are we playing in that process? I mean, this is not a technical clarification of a statute. This is a significant policy matter that one way or the other the Legislature is going to have to speak to.

So I think we're probably putting your agency in an unfair position. This isn't splitting hairs about the collection of delinquent child support.

This is essentially a larger question about the

modernization of the state tax code, just like the streamlined sales tax. And it is, in my view, an inherently legislative responsibility, because it is such a significant policy question. That's just my view.

ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: And I'm not trying to put the Cabinet nor you in a compromising position, but as you said, this has gone before the Legislature multiple years with no action. We have to have a resolution. What would be your recommendation that we do? If it's not rulemaking, it's not rulemaking, but we've got to get this resolved sooner than later.

GOVERNOR SCOTT: So if it's okay -- we won't make a decision today about whether we're going forward with anything. You're going to come back and just say, "Look, if we had interest in trying to move this discussion along, how would we do it?" That's basically what you're going to do.

MS. VICKERS: Right. I think if you had it on a future agenda, that would give an opportunity for -- anybody who wants to have some input into your decision process could come forward and testify.

But I think the issue that you've got is, do you want the Department of Revenue to take a

position on the statute. We have not done that.

We have been very careful to just sort of sit on
the sidelines and say, "We think the statute is
unclear. We think the Legislature should clarify
it." You know, we have opposing parties who take
very strong views, and the Department has not taken
a position on the statute.

COMMISSIONER PUTNAM: But by failing to collect revenue on the delta between the two prices, you've taken a position, haven't you?

MS. VICKERS: The transactions are still open to audit. You know, we could go in and audit a taxpayer. If you're not registered, you have an open statute of limitations. So it hangs out there as an uncertainty because we have not taken a position.

And in my personal view, because I've also -over the course of all of these years, it's been
suggested, "Well, why doesn't the Department just
go out and audit the taxpayers and make an
assessment, and then you can fight about that?"
And I am very -- it is important to me that the
taxing power never be used in a way to try and, you
know, resolve unclear issues. You know, something
is either taxable or not. And if it is taxable, we

go in and we make assessments, and that's what we do.

If we're not sure if something is taxable or not, it doesn't seem fair to me that we put taxpayers through that burden of issuing an assessment and telling them to come challenge it in court if they don't agree with it so that we can get that resolved. And so we decided not to go that route, and we really thought we would go the legislative route in terms of trying to get it resolved, given that there are some very diverse views on this. But we have not taken a position on the statute.

GOVERNOR SCOTT: So if it's okay with everyone, all we're going to ask you to do is, you're going to come back and tell us the process. We're not going to make a decision today that we want you to do anything different than what you're doing. Is that all right?

Thank you very much.

1 GOVERNOR SCOTT: All right. The next agenda 2 is the Department of Highway Safety and Motor 3 Vehicles presented by Julie Jones. 4 Good morning, Julie. 5 MS. JONES: Governor and Cabinet members, good 6 morning. Item Number 1 -- I have four items to 7 present today. Item Number 1, we respectfully request approval of the minutes from the March 9, 8 9 2011 Cabinet meeting. 10 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is there a motion on Item 1? 11 ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: Move to approve. 12 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is there a second? 13 CFO ATWATER: Second. 14 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Moved and seconded. 15 Item 1 approved without objection. 16 MS. JONES: Item Number 2, we respectfully 17 request approval for the Department's Third Quarter 18 performance report. I'll highlight a few measures 19 that we did well in and I'm proud of and a few that 20 present an opportunity for improvement. 21 Driver's license wait times continue to be a 22 focus for the Department. We're experiencing a 23 very high turnover rate for driver's license 24 examiners in offices that have been legislatively

25

targeted to be closed, and we're moving employees

over to the receiving tax collector. In doing so, we create vacancies, and we can only guarantee reemployment for short periods of time. So we're reallocating existing staff across the state in order to lower the wait times.

On a positive note, we recently opened a super center in Miami-Dade County's Mall of the Americas. This is a first for us. It's one-stop shopping.

It's a huge facility in a mall, and we're offering restaurant-style pagers. When you go in, if there's anything more than a 15-minute wait, we'll give you a pager, and it gives you an opportunity to shop the mall. And when the pager goes off and you come back to the driver's license office, you're first in line. You actually step back into the beginning of the process.

We have been shifting vacancies as we close driver's license offices to Dade and Broward Counties again to increase the numbers of employees that we have there to reduce wait times.

Another measure that we're focusing on is our customer call center. Staff typically looks at problem-solving from a very simple aspect: More money, more people. And this year we've taken a different tack with our call center to use

technology and to really delve into what the exact questions are, why are they being asked, and fix the process and not throw more money and people. We've got several significant initiatives that are going to bring those call times down, and I'll, I think, be bringing some very good news in the future to the Cabinet.

On a positive note, we saw a slight increase in motor vehicle titling and registrations. This is good news for the overall look for the economy from our perspective because this means more consumers have purchased new and used cars in the third quarter.

Relative to public safety, we assisted nearly 70,000 motorists in the third quarter, and the Patrol exceeded its goal of responding to calls for roadside service in 30 minutes or less.

Next year, next fiscal year, the Department is going to be taking on the law enforcement duties of the Office of Motor Carrier Compliance. It's my intention to use this as an opportunity to completely reorganize the Florida Highway Patrol. In doing so, we believe in the next three years, through attrition and reorganization, we'll be able to put 150 to 200 more troopers on the road. And

this means expanding supervisory rates. Specialty positions, we've got a lot of speciality positions that we don't need anymore, technology, shifting sworn positions to non-sworn positions. So up to 200 positions in the next couple of years back on the road as troopers, and that will be -- create a higher level of service to our residents and to our visitors.

So with that, that is my third quarter performance.

GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is there a motion on Item 2?

COMMISSIONER PUTNAM: So moved.

GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is there a second?

ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: Second.

GOVERNOR SCOTT: Moved and seconded. Show Item 2 approved without objection.

MS. JONES: Item 3, we respectfully request approval for the Department's annual performance contract. And if you've looked at this, I'm sure you've seen we've taken a completely different tack on how we're going to measure our performance in the future. This provides for more outcome measures as opposed to output measures. And we have four pillars that tie to our strategic plan.

The first one is public safety. Outcomes

for -- positive outcomes for public safety are based on moving the needle on highway fatalities, crashes, and injuries, percent of time our enforcement section spends on enforcement and education, and then the timely investigation of crimes and intelligence gathering.

The second pillar is reliable service delivery. We're going to measure our positive outcomes as successful motor services transactions, timely completion of customer services, and customer service surveys.

Number 3 is leveraging technology. This pillar is defined by the number of customers served via the Internet, research and development projects, and computer services uptime to our business partners.

The last pillar is talent creation and development. This priority is measured by job satisfaction surveys, leadership training and development, and succession planning and implementation.

Thirty-four measures will feed into these four pillars, which are tied to the agency's strategic plan. We will update these four pillars in the form of gauges on our Internet site monthly so our

customers can click on a gauge and drill down into
the data that rolls up to show a status for how

we're doing in these four particular areas.

New to the performance contract this year are specific measures for the motor carrier function.

Motor carrier, like I said, was transferred from DOT to Highway Safety during this last legislative session. New measures include numbers of commercial motor vehicle crashes and vehicle inspections and the tracking of temporary operating heavy truck permits. We include these specific measures because we want to insure that the applicable data is collected and the service that is currently provided by DOT is maintained or increased to draw down federal DOT dollars.

We're excited about the new format and the opportunity in the future to give you empirical data as opposed to just counting widgets and bringing you numbers.

GOVERNOR SCOTT: Julie, this is impressive.

Are there national studies -- I assume every state
is managed a little bit differently, so is there a
way to measure yourself against any other states on
some of these thing?

MS. JONES: Yes, sir. As a matter of fact, I

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

just returned from a meeting of my counterparts in the southeastern United States this week, and we met. Driver's license wait times is a chronic

problem in every state.

And if you'll look at -- I have a rather aggressive number that I'm shooting for in the future. I will tell you right up front that I'm not going to meet it in the next couple of quarters. But if I don't set the bar high for our staff, then -- the 95 percent that's in the new measures is something we were very close in '07 and '08, and because of Real ID and some other things, we've fallen back.

So, yes, we do meet with our sister states. I met recently with the Department of Motor Vehicles in Texas, because they are newly constituted. They were just created, pulled out of DOT this past year in Texas. They asked me to come and speak to them, because as dismal as some of our numbers are, we're better than a lot of other states. And we try to cross-pollinate. I believe in not inventing the wheel. If somebody else is doing it better, I'll steal their stuff. And so, yes, we do a lot of conversation between the states.

Item Number 4 is my last item.

1 COMMISSIONER PUTNAM: I'm not sure we --2 GOVERNOR SCOTT: I think we need to approve Item 3. 3 4 MS. JONES: Oh, I'm sorry. 5 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is there a motion on Item 3? 6 ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: Move to approve. 7 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is there a second? 8 CFO ATWATER: Second. 9 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Moved and seconded. Show Item 3 approved without objection. 10 11 MS. JONES: Governor, if I could, something 12 that I'm excited about but I cannot tell you when I'm going to implement, the last piece of this 13 14 performance plan, I'm going to try to connect a 15 per-transaction amount in this when I build my data 16 cubes, so I will be able to tell you how much I'm 17 spending on transaction and correlate that cost to 18 the customer service piece. And that's something I 19 picked up this past week at this conference, and I 20 think that will go a long way to tying budget with 21 performance. Item Number 4 is our last item. 22 23 respectfully request approval for a four-year term 24 for two Medical Advisory Board members.

board members generously volunteer their time and

1 expertise to review the status of at-risk drivers 2 on behalf of the Department. We appreciate their 3 willingness to serve and the contribution that they 4 make to keeping our roadways safe. 5 Dr. Baxter Byerly and Dr. Viet Bui are both 6 ophthalmologists. Both doctors are properly 7 licensed and in good standing with the medical 8 community. 9 GOVERNOR SCOTT: All right. Is there a motion 10 on Item 4? ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: Move to approve. 11 12 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is there a second? 13 CFO ATWATER: Second. GOVERNOR SCOTT: Moved and seconded. 14 15 Item 4 approved without objection. 16 MS. JONES: Thank you. 17 COMMISSIONER PUTNAM: Governor? 18 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Excuse me, Julie. I think 19 Commissioner Putnam --20 COMMISSIONER PUTNAM: I would love to follow 21 up with you on the commercial carrier piece, 22 because some of these measures are outputs, not 23 outcomes. Number of inspections, that's an output, 24 not an outcome. Rate of compliance would be an 25 outcome. And it's just a huge issue, obviously,

for a lot of the commodities. We hear an awful lot 1 2 about motor carrier compliance, and I know there's 3 a lot of conversations out there about the weigh 4 stations versus inspection stations and all that. 5 And I just appreciate the conversations you and I 6 have had in the past and would like to continue 7 those as you complete that merger. 8

MS. JONES: We will do that, sir.

And you're absolutely correct. They are -some of these are outputs. I had to rely on DOT and the motor carrier folks to tell me what is required in order to meet the federal standards to draw down big DOT's money. And there are some things that they wanted to see highlighted. it's a trust issue right now transferring this to a new department. And as with anything, I'm flexible, and I would love to speak with you. Thank you.

GOVERNOR SCOTT: Thank you.

20

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

1 GOVERNOR SCOTT: All right. The next agenda is the Florida Land and Water Adjudicatory 2 3 Commission presented by Phillip Miller. Good morning. 4 5 MR. MILLER: Good morning, Governor and 6 members of the Commission. I apologize if my voice 7 is a little gravely. I've got a bit of a cold 8 today. 9 We have three items on the Florida Land and Water Adjudicatory Commission agenda. Item 1 is 10 the minutes of the May 3, 2011 meeting. 11 12 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is there a motion on Item 1? 13 ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: Move to --14 CFO ATWATER: So moved. 15 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is there a second? 16 ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: Second. 17 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Moved and seconded. Show 18 Item 1 approved without objection. MR. MILLER: 19 Thank you. Item 2 relates to a 20 petition to dissolve the Circle Square Woods 21 Community Development District. The petition 22 requests that the Commission repeal Rule Chapter 23 42S-1 that sets out the name, boundary, and initial 24 board of supervisions of the Circle Square Wood 25 CDD.

The District consists of approximately 718 acres in Marion County and was create in 1994 to provide water and wastewater services to a portion of a community known as "On Top of the World."

There are 3,326 residential accounts and 105 commercial accounts within the boundaries of the District.

Florida Statutes authorizes the dissolution of community development districts by the Commission if a district does not have any outstanding financial obligations and no operating or maintenance responsibilities.

In this case, the District has no debt. No bonds were issued by the District. No services are currently being provided by the District. Water, sewer, and reclaimed water services have been transferred to a neighboring entity, and there are no future services to be performed. No negative or adverse impacts are expected on any properties presently within the District as a result of the dissolution.

The petition was forwarded to the Division of Administrative Hearings for an administrative hearing and report. The administrative law judge conducted a hearing and issued a report indicating

1	that the hearing record supports the petition.
2	We have the District's legal representative,
3	Gerald Colen, in attendance. Mr. Colen would like
4	to briefly address the Commission on this item.
5	Mr. Colen.
6	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Good morning.
7	MR. COLEN: Well, everything has been said
8	that I was going to say. I am willing to answer
9	any questions that anybody may have.
10	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Thank you. Any questions?
11	ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: No questions.
12	GOVERNOR SCOTT: All right. Thank you.
13	MR. MILLER: Staff requests authorization to
14	begin the process to repeal Commission Rule Chapter
15	42S-1 to reflect the dissolution of the District.
16	This item will be brought back to the Commission at
17	the conclusion of the process to request
18	authorization to file for final rule repeal.
19	GOVERNOR SCOTT: All right. Is there a motion
20	to approve Item 2?
21	COMMISSIONER PUTNAM: So moved.
22	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is there a second?
23	ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: Second.
24	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Moved and seconded. Show
25	Item 2 approved without objection.

MR. MILLER: Thank you. Item 3 relates to a petition to dissolve the Coastal Lake Community Development District. The petition requests that the Commission repeal Rule Chapter 42WW-1 that sets out the name, boundary, and initial board of supervisors of the Coastal Lakes CDD.

The District consists of approximately 1,402 acres in Walton County and was created in 2004 to provide planned community development district services to the area. A private developer owns most of the property located within the District with the exception of approximately 31 lots that have been sold. Of the 31 lots, there are 14 completed homes and four under construction.

As stated earlier, Florida Statutes authorizes the dissolution of a community development district if the district does not have any outstanding financial obligations and no operating or maintenance responsibilities.

In this case, the District does not presently have any outstanding financial obligations and does not have any operating or maintenance responsibilities. The District does not own any real property or infrastructure improvements. The District does not presently have any outstanding

bonds, notes, or other debt instruments. No services are being provided by the District. Water and sewer utilities are provided by Regional Utilities in Walton County. All remaining services are provided by a homeowners association. The District does not have any debt service special assessments levied against real property in the District. The CDD does not anticipate providing or financing any future community development district services or improvements. And again, no negative or adverse impacts are expected on any properties presently within the District as a result of the dissolution.

We have the District's legal representatives,

Jere Earlywine and Cheryl Stewart, available for

questions if there are any.

GOVERNOR SCOTT: Are there any questions?

COMMISSIONER PUTNAM: Is this the beginning of a trend? Are we going to see a bunch of these as these partially built developments that had big plans and big visions respond to the conditions of the economy? Can we expect to see a lot of dissolutions of community development districts?

MR. MILLER: I think we will see some. I do not know if we have any currently -- we do not have

1	any currently pending, but I suspect economic
2	conditions will cause that.
3	GOVERNOR SCOTT: All right. Is there a motion
4	to approve Item 3?
5	ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: Move to approve.
6	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is there a second?
7	COMMISSIONER PUTNAM: Second.
8	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Moved and seconded. Show
9	Item 3 approved without objection. Thank you very
10	much.
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

GOVERNOR SCOTT: The last agenda is the Board 1 2 of Trustees presented by Bob Ballard. Good 3 morning. 4 MR. BALLARD: Good morning, Governor. 5 morning, members of the Cabinet. We have two items 6 before you today. Item 1 is the submittal of the 7 minutes from the March 9th, April 5th, and April 19th, 2011 Cabinet meetings. 8 9 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is there a motion on Item 1? 10 ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: Move to approve. 11 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is there a second? 12 COMMISSIONER PUTNAM: Second. GOVERNOR SCOTT: Moved and seconded. 13 Show 14 Item 1 approved without objection. 15 MR. BALLARD: Item 2 is a request for 16 consideration of an option agreement to acquire a 17 perpetual conservation easement over approximately 18 1,100 acres within the Seven Runs Creek Florida 19 Forever project. The purchase price is \$1 million, 20 which is 91 percent of appraised value. Located in Walton County, the properties lie 21 22 within the Seven Runs Creek Florida Forever 23 project, which is adjacent to the Eglin Air Force 24 Base, also within the military's -- this is also

within the military's existing low-level flight

25

path, and it provides an excellent and important buffer to potential encroachment.

Because of its value to the military, the federal government plans to contribute 65 percent of the purchase price, making the State's contribution 35 percent, or in dollar amounts, \$657,000 for the conservation easement from the federal government and \$343,000 by the State of Florida.

With 10 percent of Florida's economy coming from the military, partnerships such as this are very important to the State.

And with us today we have Colonel Tony Higdon with the United States Air Force here to speak on this issue. And if I may add, he was just installed as base commander at Eglin last week.

Colonel?

GOVERNOR SCOTT: Congratulations.

COLONEL HIGDON: Good morning, Governor and Cabinet members. I'm Colonel Anthony Higdon. I'm the 96th Civil Engineer Group Commander at Eglin Air Force Base, not the base commander. I work with the base commander, though, and I'm here to represent the base this morning.

I would like to say that the State of Florida

1 and Eglin have a long partnership in protecting our flying mission from potential encroachment while 2 3 preserving sensitive lands. This particular 4 conservation easement on the Seven Runs Creek 5 Florida Forever project will continue that 6 partnership. 7 As stated earlier, we have received \$657,000 that we are prepared to commit to this easement. 8 9 And the property lies under flight tracks that we use almost daily flying into our ranges for testing 10 11 and training missions. The project will protect 12 our flying mission and thereby help protect the economies of Okaloosa, Walton, and Santa Rosa 13 Counties. 14 15 I'll be happy to answer any questions if there 16 are any. 17 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Are there any questions? 18 ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: Thank you for your 19 service. 20 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Thank you. Thank you for 21 your money too. 22 MR. BALLARD: Governor, if there are no 23 questions of me, the staff recommends approval. 24 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is there a motion on Item 2? 25 COMMISSIONER PUTNAM: So moved.

1	ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: Second.
2	GOVERNOR SCOTT: Moved and seconded. Show
3	Item 2 approved without objection.
4	Thank everybody for thank you very much.
5	This concludes our Cabinet meeting. We will begin
6	the meeting of the State Board of Administration at
7	1:00 p.m. We are adjourned.
8	(Proceedings concluded at 11:07 a.m.)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	
3	STATE OF FLORIDA:
4	COUNTY OF LEON:
5	I, MARY ALLEN NEEL, Registered Professional
6	Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing
7	proceedings were taken before me at the time and place
8	therein designated; that my shorthand notes were
9	thereafter translated under my supervision; and the
10	foregoing pages numbered 1 through 83 are a true and
11	correct record of the aforesaid proceedings.
12	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative,
13	employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor
14	relative or employee of such attorney or counsel, or
15	financially interested in the foregoing action.
16	DATED THIS 12th day of July, 2011.
17	
18	
19	MARY ALLEN NEEL, RPR, FPR 2894-A Remington Green Lane
20	Tallahassee, Florida 32308 850.878.2221
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	