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GOVERNOR DESANTIS: All right. Good morning and welcome to the February 2, 2021, meeting of Governor and Cabinet.

First, I'd like to welcome Derrick McGee to lead us in Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. (Thereupon, Convocation was given, Pledge of Allegiance was said, and National Anthem was sung.)

## BOARD OF TRUSTEES INTERNAL IMPROVEMENT TRUST FUND

GOVERNOR DESANTIS: Our next item is discussion on the application process for the Inspector General position in Citizens Property Insurance Corporation. The Inspector General is appointed by the Financial Services Commission.

I would like to ask Chief Inspector General Melinda McGill to help facilitate the application process by coordinating with Citizens' human resources, advertising the position through the Association of Inspector General, conducting preliminary interviews based upon the statutorily-required qualifications and recommending three applicants for final interviews at a future meeting of the Governor and Cabinet. As we normally do, we will forward all applications received to the Cabinet Aides and conduct background checks prior to public interviews.

Are there any questions or comments about this process?

CFO PATRONIS: No, sir.
GOVERNOR DESANTIS: Okay. With that, I move that we open applications for 30 days and ask the

Chief Inspector General to facilitate the application and interview process.

Is there a second?
COMMISSIONER FRIED: Second.
GOVERNOR DESANTIS: All in favor, hearing all favor; any opposed, hearing none. The motion carries.

Next, I would like to welcome Secretary Noah Valenstein to present the BOT agenda.

MR. VALENSTEIN: Thank you and good morning.
Governor DeSantis, General Moody, CFO Patronis and Commissioner Fried, we have got a brief agenda this morning with five items.

The first is consideration of a release of restriction and right to revocation from the Board of Trustees, Deed No. 23287 with the City of Daytona Beach for approximately . 41 acres.

Based on an appraisal, the City will pay a hundred thousand dollars for this release, which will be deposited into the Internal Improvement Trust Fund.

This is really similar to, in 2018, the Cabinet approved a much larger release that the City didn't want to move forward with. They decided they would like to move forward with a
smaller subset, so this item is now trueing that up to this smaller subset. And we would recommend approval.

GOVERNOR DESANTIS: Okay. I move to approve. Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER FRIED: Second.
GOVERNOR DESANTIS: Are there any objections?
Hearing none, the motion carries.
Item 2.
MR. VALENSTEIN: Thank you. The next two items are land acquisitions. Item 2 is consideration of an option agreement to acquire approximately 729 acres within the upper St. Marks River Corridor, Florida Forever Project from Woodvest, LLC, for one million dollars.

The subject property will be managed by the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, Florida Forest Services. It butts right up against the Plank Road State Forest, and they have written a letter of support from management, which we appreciate. There's also letters from the Sierra Club. And the Department recommends approval.

GOVERNOR DESANTIS: Okay. I move to approve. Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER FRIED: Second.

CFO PATRONIS: I got one question. GOVERNOR DESANTIS: Certainly.

CFO PATRONIS: Good morning, Noah. And I'm sorry I missed your phone call this morning; otherwise, I would have asked you then.

Again, I'm just looking at the doughnut. You know, this piece of property, I know there's lots of support on it, but it's all wrapped around state land. Nothing is ever going to happen to it. You know, I get anxiety about spending money on property that's going to be, you know, protected by the watershed anyway because there's no way to do anything to it.

Again, it's just me to continue to make it loud and clear: I want conservation easements. I want other people taking care of this land; more of a point than a question, Governor.

Thank you.
MR. VALENSTEIN: And CFO Patronis, and actually, that was my comment was would love to.

Your point is well-taken. I know we have two fee simple acquisitions before us and I don't want to look as though we're tone deaf to your conservation easements. Because again, what we're looking to do, in large part, most acquisitions, I
think you'll see come forward, with an exception that we get a rare jewel of, for instance, a cultural historical resource. We actually just had after the signing of House Bill 1213 regarding the (inaudible) Memorial, there may be an
acquisition -- and I apologize for any feedback on our end. There may be acquisitions where you have a small parcel that has to do with a historic significance.

Outside of that, I think most of the acquisitions that you're seeing are trying to better the value we already have. So when you're thinking about our green infrastructure a hundred years down the road, 200 years down the road, for a future generations, we're trying to add on to what we already have to build the resilience of the corridors. And so that's why you see us filling in these corridor linkages knowing that will make them stronger down the road. Because if we were to have in-holdings or much narrower linkages for wildlife corridors, again, 50 years or 100 years down the road; the point is to make its infrastructure resilient. The fact that the land was developed or changes to lane patterns down the road, this will make us the our investment all the stronger.

What we don't want to see is invest in a corridor and then down the road see the value that deteriorates because we didn't do enough job buffering.

The last thing I'll mention is, we are, the two acquisitions today, are fee simple. They were not willing to move forward with conservation easement. But I think sort of in hindsight of looking for ways to improve the process to always make sure we have an option of conservation easement; the thing that staff and I have focused on is let's do a better job about asking on a regular basis. Because so often, what we have is, we're actually acquiring as a percentage more conservation easements on an annual basis than the percent that's on our approved list. However, I think we can go book on a regular basis and ask our approved list, "Okay. When you asked to be part of this, because it's a willing seller program, you say you wanted a fee simple." But there's no harm to check in on a regular basis to say, "Are you sure? Are you still there?" Because I think we can then increase the number of folks that are willing to do less than a fee and then that gives us a greater opportunity to bring in some of these
linkages.
So we're looking at making that change so that we're asking on a regular basis.

CFO PATRONIS: And that's great. I just think everything we can do to strengthen the corridor can be achieved with the conservation easement business model. Because in a lot of these cases -- and I don't know if you agree -- I think the only customer for a lot of these is the state.

So, you know, my point is: I look at these, and it's not about us as much as spending the state resources; it's the perpetual maintenance we're going to incur for 50 , 100,200 years, where if someone wants to do silviculture on it or whatever they want to do. At least we're putting people to work, we're letting someone else maintain it, and we're not burdening you or our future secretaries or future ag commissioners with the overhead expense of maintaining land that somebody else owns.

But we're on the same page.
MR. VALENSTEIN: Yes.
CFO PATRONIS: You know where I want to be. Thank you, Governor.

COMMISSIONER FRIED: Governor, I agree that
for sure, as far as financially, it would be more prudent to do an easement as opposed to Florida Forever. But this particular property, I do believe that we're properly managing it, and it's a great addition and one $I$ know of is top priority on the Florida Forever list.

But I concur, in the future, looking for more opportunities to do easements, one to save the money. And to CFO's point, no one else can could anything with the land anyhow.

GOVERNOR DESANTIS: Great. Okay. So is there a second to approve this item?

CFO PATRONIS: I'll second it.
GOVERNOR DESANTIS: And no objections? Okay, the motion carries.

Three.
MR. VALENSTEIN: Thank you. Item 3 is consideration of an option agreement to acquire approximately 1,786 acres within the Wolf Creek Florida Forever Project from the Trust for Public Lands for $\$ 4,325,692$. The subject property will also be managed by the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services as part of the Florida Forest Service, as part of the Blackwater River State Forest.

This is a project that's part of buffering Whiting Field Naval Air Station and comes along with other lands that our federal governments -especially the Department of Navy -- has been working with us to acquire. And in fact, the same party, Trust of Public Lands, is negotiating an option agreement on an adjoining property that's coming in without state dollars going to it. When you consider those two together, we're actually at less than 50 percent of the cost, and this is an important cost of buffering that Naval Air Station.

Letters of support were provided by the US Department of Navy, Defenders of the Wildlife, and Sierra Club.

And the Department recommends approval.
GOVERNOR DESANTIS: Okay. Item moved to approve. Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER FRIED: Second.
Governor, if I may. But one comment?
CFO, if you're in court, typically the courts take away your phone if they ring.

But, also, this is an excellent purchase. I know for water quality. With 35 miles of streams that feed into the Blackwater River, this site also features 12 archeological sites including ten
prehistoric sites. It will also expand our wildlife corridor and conservation lands that will stretch to the Whiting Field Naval Station. So again, thank you for bringing this forward and I move to approve.

CFO PATRONIS: One question?
GOVERNOR DESANTIS: Sure.
CFO PATRONIS: (Inaudible.)
MR. VALENSTEIN: Thank you. CFO Patronis, there are, and those are actually going towards the adjacent property. So when I mentioned the Trust For Public Lands was working to secure an option agreements, and has the parcel is what we're acquiring through this action or would acquire through this action. Just south of that is the parcel they're working with the Navy with secured funds. So these are the exact types of parcels where you would have funds. In this instance, the partnership was that federal funds are going to the adjacent parcel, and state funds are going to this parcel; when combined, that's where you get at the State's investment being about 43 percent.

So similar to when we would bring a parcel in directing funds or other federal base bustering funds, we're going to our parcel and end up being
about 50 percent. In this instance, it's just two separate parcels, together contiguous, making up that larger buffering area just north of the airfield.

GOVERNOR DESANTIS: Okay. Is there a second? CFO PATRONIS: Second.

GOVERNOR DESANTIS: No objections. The motion carries.

Next item.
MR. VALENSTEIN: Thank you.
Next, Director Portia Sapp, with DAC's Division of Aquaculture will present the last item.

Thank you.
MS. SAPP: Good morning, Trustees.
Item 4 for your consideration today is a new three-acre lease requested by William Conner Clark in Indian Lagoon in Gulf County. This will be the fourth lease in Gulf County.

The Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission and Department of Environmental Protection have reviewed the item and had no comments.

Additionally, the National Fishery Service and Army Corp. have reviewed the item and determined it's in compliance with our programatic general permit.

The proposed site is located within Gulf Sturgeon critical habitat; however, the applicant is using floating gear, which is authorized within the permit.

Staff recommends approval of this item. GOVERNOR DESANTIS: Okay. I move to approve. Is there a second?

CFO PATRONIS: Second.
GOVERNOR DESANTIS: And we have three affirmative votes and no objections, so the motion carries.

Item 5.
MS. SAPP: Item 5 for your consideration is a request for the Board of Trustees to approve notice of proposed rule and final adoption, if no member of the public timely requests a rule hearing or if a rule hearing is requested and no notice of change is needed for the following rules: 18-21.003.020 and . 021.

So again, this is the same language that you voted on last meeting for the Notice of Rule Development. This is for allowing restoration aquaculture within a management agreement.

GOVERNOR DESANTIS: Okay. I move to approve.
Is there a second?
CFO PATRONIS: Second.
GOVERNOR DESANTIS: Okay, no objections; the motion carries.
Thank you.

## OFFICE OF INSURANCE REGULATION

GOVERNOR DESANTIS: So I would like to welcome Commissioner David Altmaier from the Office of Insurance Regulation.

MR. ALTMAIER: Thank you, Governor.
Good morning Cabinet.
Our first agenda item is approval of the minutes from our September 22nd's FSC Meeting.

We respectfully request your approval of those minutes, please.

GOVERNOR DESANTIS: And I move to approve.
Is there a second?
COMMISSIONER FRIED: Second.
GOVERNOR DESANTIS: No objections? The motion carries.

Item 2.
MR. ALTMAIER: Thank you.
With respect to our rules this morning, the Office of Insurance Regulation has been undertaking a project that streamlined the rules related to the application process that entities go through to become licensed to offer their products in our state.

So agenda items 2, 3, 4 and 5 are related to
that project, and so we would respectfully request your approval to publish these and final adoption if no member of the public timely requests a rule hearing or if no notice of change is necessary.

GOVERNOR DESANTIS: All right. So I move -so that's 2 through 5?

MR. ALTMAIER: Yes, sir.
GOVERNOR DESANTIS: Okay. I move to approve. Anyone second?

CFO PATRONIS: Second.
GOVERNOR DESANTIS: Okay. No objections. Motion carries.

Item 6.
MR. ALTMAIER: Thank you.
Finally, Item Number 6 is to request approval for final adoption of a rule that we have previously brought. This is related to conforming our electronic process for companies to submit catastrophe claims data to the office. We brought this previously. There was no workshop, no request for workshop and no public comment, but we have some minor editorial changes from ^JPSE, so we've made those changes and brought them back for consideration. So we would respectfully request your final adoption of that.

GOVERNOR DESANTIS: Okay. I move to approve. Is there a second?

CFO PATRONIS: Second.
GOVERNOR DESANTIS: Okay. Any objections?
Hearing none, the motion carries.
I think CFO has a question.
CFO PATRONIS: Good morning, Commissioner.
MR. ALTMAIER: Good morning.
CFO PATRONIS: I had several things, and some of those I will just follow-up with you on after the meeting. But what $I$ am curious about is we saw a spike. We gave some flexibility working through COVID-19 and I know people get very concerned about their long-term benefits.

What changes are you seeing? What has happened in the life insurance market in light of COVID-19? I know you dealt with some of this at NAIC. What are people pivoting to have to deal with that rates go up? What's happened?

MR. ALTMAIER: Sure. Thanks for the question, CFO. I would say in Florida at the moment, over the summer, we asked all life insurance carriers to not make any change to their forms and their policies or underwriting criteria based on COVID-19. So at some point when we get to the end
of this, we're going to go back and evaluate some of those items that they've requested. We'll do it in at a national level of NAIC, and we'll do it at the state level here in Florida as well.

There's been some activity and some chatter about some things that are happening in the European jurisdictions and some of the things that life insurance carriers are doing there, with respect to underwriting on COVID-19, so we'll use that as a lesson, either good or bad, and see how that plays out as well. So I anticipate we will have a lot of discussions moving forward that are based on that.

CFO PATRONIS: And one follow-up: We were cranking up our relationships with the state sheriffs last week and rolling out our concern of the insurance fraud. Our team is doing their job and we're going to start leveraging other agencies. What are your concerns regarding what we've seen in insurance rates as it is to insurance fraud in the State of Florida?

MR. ALTMAIER: Thank you for that. Well, the concern with insurance rates at the moment particularly on the property insurance market is that they are on pretty steep upwards trajectory.

A lot of that is because we're seeing behavior in some claims practices that we thing is inappropriate.

Now, some of it crosses the line. It's become fraudulent, but a lot of it doesn't. We had a rate hearing with a carrier back in November and we asked them specifically this question, and one of the challenges that the insurance carriers have is flagging it specifically as fraud. But there is some of it out. There was a pretty fair presentation yesterday by OPAGA, the judiciary committee, so I'm very encouraged to the conversations taking place. And I think we can all use the progress in the session for our consumers.

CFO PATRONIS: Thank you, sir.
GOVERNOR DESANTIS: All right, thanks.
I appreciate it.

## OFFICE OF FINANCIAL REGULATION

GOVERNOR DESANTIS: I would like to welcome Ash Williams to present the items for SBA. Is he here? Is he in an ante room somewhere?

I'll tell you what, why don't we go OFR and then when Ash comes, we'll tee him up.

MR. WEIGEL: Good morning, Governor, CFO Patronis, General Moody and Commissioner Fried.

On behalf of the Office of Financial Regulation, we have one item on the calendar today. This is for the individual rule numbers are located in our rule materials for your reference.

Agenda Item Number 1, the OFR respectfully requests approval to file for final adoption to adopt two rules relating to securities that require dealer, issuer and investment advisor/registrants submit their financial statements by electronic means. This is part of our office's paperless initiative. OFR requests approval.

GOVERNOR DESANTIS: Okay. I move to approve.
Is there a second?
CFO PATRONIS: Second.
GOVERNOR DESANTIS: Okay. Any objection?
Hearing none, the motion carries.
Thank you, sir.

## ADMINISTRATION COMMISSION

GOVERNOR DESANTIS: All right. I guess we'll move to Ad-Com and welcome Andrew King to present the agenda for Administrative Commission.

MR. KING: Thank you. Good morning. We have two items on the agenda for the Administration Commission.

Number one is to request approval of the meetings of or the minutes of the meeting held on September 22, 2020.

GOVERNOR DESANTIS: Move to approve.
Is there a second?
CFO PATRONIS: Second.
GOVERNOR DESANTIS: No objections; the motion carries.

Item 2.
MR. KING: Item 2 is the consideration of a recommended order issued by the Division of Administrative Hearings in the proceeding of Jacqueline Rogers, Cynthia Cole, Ann Bennett and Theresa Blackwell versus Escambia County.

This agenda item is a challenge to the Escambia County Comprehensive Plan, Amendment CPA 2018-02, which was adopted by ordinance 2019-09.

The ALJ recommends that the Administration

Commission enters a final order finding that Escambia County Comprehensive Plan Amendment CPA 2018-02 is not in compliance with Florida law.

Joshua Pratt, the commission's counsel, will present legal analysis of the recommended order. MR. PRATT: Good morning, Governor and Cabinet.

Today I'll be presented the recommend order in this case. This agenda item is challenged to Escambia County Comprehensive Plan Amendment CPA 2018-02. The plan amendment in the Escambia County Comprehensive Lands Plan by deleting the county's policy of opposing the establishment of new rural communities within the county.

On January 9, 2020, following a hearing, an ALJ entered a recommended order determining that the plan amendment was not in compliance, which Chapter 163 of the Florida Statutes.

The purpose of today's agenda item is for the Commission to consider the ALJ's recommended order, the arguments of the parties and the relevant law and to vote on final action. It should be noted that the Commission is not being asked to pass its judgment on the policy merits of the plan amendment, which Escambia County clearly had the
ability to consider, weigh and enact.
The limited role of the Commission in this case is to simply determine whether the ALJ made the correct legal recommendation under Florida law. In preparing for this agenda item, I have met individually with each of your offices. While I've counseled each office regarding my opinion of the correct legal course of action, I have not advanced any particular outcome or discussed the contents of my conversations with the other offices.

The petitioners in this case, four property owners from Escambia County, are represented by Ms. Jacqueline Rogers.

The Respondent, Escambia County is represented by Assistant County Attorney Kia Johnson.

I will now provide a brief background of the case.

In 2019, Escambia County adopted the plan amendment at issue. The plan amendment deletes a policy expressing the county's intent not to support the establishment at new rural communities. The record reflects that the northern portion of the county is overwhelmingly agricultural whereas the southern portion is more urban.

The county's future land use map depicts
roughly 20 rural communities in the county, almost all of which are located in the northern portion.

Several uses are allowed in rural communities, including residential and compact traditional neighborhoods.

Now, the county's policy in establishing and maintaining rural communities is contained within its future land use goal, objective and policies. In particular, policy 3.1.5 provides that in order to protect silviculture, agriculture and agriculture-related activities, Escambia County will not support the establishment of new rural communities.

The plan amendment at issue deletes this policy in its entirety. Now, also in 2019, Petitioners filed a petition with DOAH challenging the plan amendment and raising three claims. Two of those claims were rejected by ALJ and only one claim is at issue today: Mainly, whether the ALJ directly determined that the County failed to base the plan amendment on relevant and appropriate data and analysis thereof, as required by Florida law.

I will now turn to the standard of review for findings of fact and conclusions of law. They are fairly differential.

Florida law provides that the Commission may not reject or modify ALJ's findings of fact unless it determines that they are: One, not based on competent, substantial evidence; or two, that the proceedings did not comply with the essential requirements of law.

The Commission may knot also not or modify ALJ's conclusions of law unless it states with particularity its reasons for doing so; and second, makes a finding that subsequent conclusions are as or more reasonable than the ALJ's.

Now, the county's determination that the plan amendment is in compliance with Florida law is presumed to be correct and is to be sustained if there is a determination that the -- if their determination of compliance is fairly debatable. However, it should be noted that the county did not file any exceptions to the ALJ's findings of fact or conclusions of law. Any exceptions were due within 15 days of the proposed order.

I will now provide a brief overview of the ALJ's findings of fact and relevant conclusions of law. In its findings of fact, the ALJ found that although the agenda items for the hearings held on the county's plan included a generalized, the
changing needs within the county, that the County offered no data for analysis.

The ALJ further found that, in effect, the County offered no data or analysis to support the plan amendment.

In its conclusions of law, the ALJ concluded that under Florida law, all planned amendments must be supported by relevant and appropriate data and an analysis thereof by the local government, and that therefore, the plan amendment here had to have at least some data or analysis. However, the ALJ concluded that one was given.

Based on the above, its ultimate conclusion was that petitioners proved that the plan amendment was not in compliance with Florida law.

Now, before the parties come and present their arguments, I would like to inform the Commission of three options for final action and of my recommendation.

I have reviewed the record in its entirety, including the ALJ's recommended order, the DOAH transcript and the DOAH exhibits.

From my review, it does not appear that the ALJ's factual or legal conclusions are contrary to Florida law. It is therefore the staff recommendation that the Commission approves what I would like to under option number one. Under Option Number 1, the Commission may move to issue a final order that adopts ALJ's recommended order by simple majority; that this option will find that the county's plan amendment is not in compliance with Florida law because the plan amendment was not based on relevant and appropriate data and analysis thereof. This option would also specify remedial action to bring the plan amendment in compliance with Florida law by directing the County to rescind it.

It should be noted that this option will not prohibit the County from reenacting this plan amendment based on relevant and appropriate data and analysis.

In option number one, it does not any sanctions against the County as they do not appear to be necessary in this case.

The parties will now have a chance to present their arguments. Respondent and petitioner should limit their presentation to five minutes each. Following their presentations, I will return to the podium to facilitate the Commission's vote.

Thank you.

GOVERNOR DESANTIS: All right. First attorney, who do we have?

MS. JOHNSON: Good morning. My name is Kia Johnson, and I'm here on behalf of the Escambia County Board of County Commissioners.

As you heard from the introduction, we're here on Escambia County's decision to eliminate 3.1.5 which is the prohibition against the establishment of new rural communities.

The elimination of 3.1 .5 was an aspirational plan amendment for the purpose of implementing community goals and visions of the Escambia County Board of County Commissioners.

Of the three allegations presented by the petitioners, the administrative law judge found only the comp plan amendment was not supported by data and analysis.

The administrative law judge reached this conclusion by rejecting the testimony of Escambia County's chief planning official. It is Escambia County's position that the testimony of a chief planning official established that the county lawfully enacted this plan amendment and that our planning official's testimony should not have been rejected from consideration.

The plan amendment merely represents a policy change for Escambia County to begin considering new rural communities within the county. The plan amendment does not change the land use of any particular parcel of land in the county and it does not change the uses allowed or the density or intensity of development on any parcel.

The plan amendment does not require the expenditure of public funds, nor does it immediately impact the provision of public services in the rural areas of the county. Whether or not the county will actually establish any new rural communities will depend upon whether a property owners proposes one in the future and whether the county approves that approval based on consideration of all elements of our comprehensive plan.

The Escambia County Board of County Commissioners enacted this comprehensive plan amendment because they simply wanted the latitude to be able to consider this type of future land use change, though 3.1 .5 currently precludes them from doing so.

This aspirational plan amendment simply sets into place Escambia County's community goals and
vision. For these reasons, Escambia County respectfully requests that this honorable Cabinet set aside the administrative law judge's decision to reject the testimony of Escambia County chief planning official. The county requests that this Cabinet give deference to the community goals and vision to Escambia County and its Board of County Commissioners by finding that this plan amendment is in compliance with state law.

Thank you.
GOVERNOR DESANTIS: Thank you.
Next.
MS. ROGERS: Good morning. I'm Jacqueline Rogers. I'm not an attorney. I'm a pro se petitioner and all of the petitioners were pro se.

I am a resident of Escambia County and my other co-petitioners could not be here today so I'll try and represent their views as well. But as he said, this ordinance change itself tells you why it's important that it stays in there, because it prohibited establishing new rural communities in order to protect silviculture, agriculture and agriculture-related activities. And these are located in the northern end of the county.

I know I don't have to remind this commission
about the importance of agriculture and silviculture in our state. But in addition to having that, the important place in the economy, these open lands also provide an important eco services for our community, including stormwater treatment, filtration of run-off pollution, support of recreational opportunities; as you discussed before, with your preservation, greenways, wildlife corridors and habitats.

While the county maintains that this policy was duplicative, I say it was an actual implementation of the previous goals in the rural strategies and the objectives in the rural development. So if you take this out, you have no real policy to implement your goal and your objective there.

While the administrative law judge did find that removing this policy did not establish a new rural community and so did not find it inconsistent with the rest, she did note that establishing a new rural community would be inconsistent with those goals and objectives that $I$ just mentioned.

So here's the problem with that: We are citizens, and the burden for every application now, if you remove this policy, is on the citizens to go
to a DOAH hearing, because the county is intent on converting agricultural lands, even though their development service director and senior urban planner previously testified that Escambia County is not at the point where we need to convert agricultural lands. We have an established midwest sector plan in Escambia County and both these gentleman from the county have testified that this is where growth is supposed to go.

So after the changes to the growth management act in 2011, DEO was no longer able to review these comp plans for consistency; that's what they told me. So unless a citizen like myself or another organization brings the challenge, these inconsistent amendments can go through. And I can't tell you what a burden this was to my family, the amount of time and hours and that all of us have to put in just to do this.

State agencies are limited now by statutes, since 2011, to only comment on things that affect state facilities or state resources. So the burden is on us, and I'm just asking this commission that DOE needs to be empowered again to review planned amendments for consistency and help counties adopt ordinances that are consistent with rest of the
comprehensive plan.
So we know that the county commission considered that the removal of this policy to be the only impediment to opening up agricultural land to residential development. There was a subdivision that wanted to change their future land use, and one commissioner couldn't approve it in his district. He remanded it back to the planning board and instructed the staff to remove this provision from the comprehensive plan.

The planning board voted unanimously to deny that. There was no data analysis presented no presentation by the staff to defend this, move this amendment, but the county commission still passed this 4 to 1 with no data and analysis. It went to DEO with only a cover letter and the draft ordinance itself, striking out this word. No data analysis. And then it was approved again, finally, in a county commission meeting; that's when we challenged it.

We spoke at these hearings. We told them, "You need a reason to do this. Why are you doing this?" Is this a favor to one developer? We don't know. There was no data and analysis.

At the final hearing, as the judge found, not
one stick of paper. Yes, to try and recover this, the county tried to have some testimony. But as you'll read in the record, the administrative law judge found that to be unconvincing and it was contradictory. In fact, both the development director and the urban services person confirmed that the sector plan is where the growth should go.

I just want to say this is about land decisions are very important, and consistency in a comprehensive plan are extremely important. And this is not a partisan issue. I'm a conservative business owner, home-school mom, and I believe in property rights. But I also believe in the necessity of planned growth before off-zoning properties and converting large tracts of agricultural land, because once that land is developed, you can never piece those back together.

So I would just ask that you'd affirm this ruling, and so in the future they would be on notice that they do have to have a reason for doing it and it can't be subject to a political whim. Thank you.

GOVERNOR DESANTIS: Thank you.
MR. PRATT: At this time, I would like to ask if there's any additional public comment.

Seeing none, does the Commission have any questions before it proceeds to a final vote on this action?

GOVERNOR DESANTIS: I don't think so. I think I'll make the motion to make the recommended order final; basically, they just follow the law. I have no problem with what they did.

CFO PATRONIS: Second.
COMMISSIONER FRIED: And I would agree and second, Governor.

MR. PRATT: And lastly, I would like to ask the Commission to motion draft and circulate a final order consistent with your vote.

GOVERNOR DESANTIS: Sure.
MR. PRATT: Thank you.
GOVERNOR DESANTIS: Okay.

## STATE BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION

GOVERNOR DESANTIS: All right. I think we have SBA. I think Ash is here.

MR. WILLIAMS: Good morning, Governor and Trustees. Apologies for being late, but I want to congratulate all of us on having excellent security in this building. I found out the hard way this morning that my building pass had expired, and FDLE is very thorough. Even if you say you're Executive Director on your way to a Cabinet meeting, they don't just listen to you; they do a full background, just so you know.

A couple of things. Let's open with performance as usual. As of last night's close, the Florida Retirement System Trust Fund fiscal year to date is up 17.69 percent; that's one basis point ahead of target.

The balance stands at 184.3 billion dollars; that's a gain of $\$ 23.6$ billion; net of $\$ 600$ million a month in cash straight out in distributions for the fiscal year thus far.

GOVERNOR DESANTIS: Were we short on Game Stop or long on Game Stop or neither?

MR. WILLIAMS: Let me just say, without getting into details on individual positions, we're
globally diversified. We're involved in alternative investments, which can include short plays. We're also involved in venture capital market making and distressed debt.

The activity, the size of Game Stop, as a percentage of the market is so small, as not to make much a difference. To give you an idea, our global equity portfolio is \$103 billion in size, and Game Stop is about, like, so.

But on the subject, that is, I think, the most fascinating thing $I$ have seen in markets in years: This whole intersection between social media and capital markets. And the difference between normal social media and herd activity and capital market activity is that at the end of the day, someone's money is affected in capital markets. And as the CFO knows only too well, Florida is a state with more retirees than anyone in the country -- and I don't mean Florida Retirement System retirees; I mean retirees from all over the world -- whose lives depend on the safety and soundness of their savings and investment activity.

Literally financial markets are the hallmark of American capitalism and power leadership and free enterprise globally, and it's important we
preserve that. And what's odd in my mind about this whole Game Stop thing, which has also spread into Blackberry, American Airlines, and more recently as of yesterday, silver as a commodity, so who knows what's next; stick around. And I think the difference is, it's like a social thing that wants to be disruptive but it doesn't have a clear end stake that it wants to reach or a plan for how to get there; it's just disruption in and of itself.

And to give you an idea on Game Stop, itself, as a business, I don't want to be dismissive but it's irrelevant. Game Stop, for calendar 2020, lost a little more than $\$ 4$ a share. The value of any stock is the net present value of its current and future earnings. If you're losing \$4 a share, there's no multiple that you can put on that that creates a positive value; yet, its share price on a trailing 52-week basis varied between \$2.57 and $\$ 483$.

You might ask what fundamental analysis supports that move, and the answer is there is none; that's all in somebody's head who thought it was a good idea. And if you read the detail on this Reddit chat board that seems to be taking
credit for being behind this and you read the nicknames or handles that these various characters, use names are profane, most of them are odd at best, and I think industry Andrew Sorken described this particularly well: It's a surreal moment in financial history.

GOVERNOR DESANTIS: Do you think when they stopped when Robinhood stopped ability to execute buy orders for things like Game Stop, was that a clearinghouse margin requirement? Or was it because they were trying to protect hedge funds? There's been a lot of different theories. I think what they've said is that the DTCC increased the capital requirements and they just were running out of money for it.

But what is your read on that?
MR. WILLIAMS: You're correct, Governor, and it's happened twice. It happened again yesterday. And Robinhood has shown an extraordinary ability to simply say to their investor base, "We need some money. We would like to raise a billion or two dollars," and within a business day, they have a billion or two dollars in additional capital. It's not unlike -- I don't want to get into calling out individual names here, but there are other
companies that have these cult-like followings.
But let me explain why the margin requirement was there, because there was a lot of discussion in a very negative way about Game Stop having these trading or purchases stopped on the Robinhood platform. The way stocks trade, anybody can initiate a buy or a sell order. Any one of us can pick up the phone, call a broker, go to an online service, go to an app like Robinhood or Slice or one of these things that have access to securities trading and initiate a buy or sell order.

But Robinhood does not in and of itself have the ability to accept a share from you, accept cash from General Moody, and award General Moody a share and give you your money. That's what a clearinghouse does and that's what the Depository Trust Corporation does, DTC, that you just referred to.

Now, these transactions do not happen instantaneously. It's commonly what's called a T. 2 settlement date, which is trade day plus two business days to actually close the transaction. The reason they're what are called margin requirements, which means somebody has got to have cash on deposit to back up their requests of DTC to
initiate and close trades is the following:
As the example we're talking about shows, prices can be volatile. And if a trade is put on a given price and the value of that security changes dramatically, one or both of the parties of that trade may get cold feet and say, "Nevermind. I don't want to close it anymore. If $I$ close it now, I'll lose a ton of money," and they'll start making excuses to avoid closing it.

Well, the DTC keeps our and having capital requirements orderly by pulling that risk and having capital requirements, so if there's ever a problem in any single stock name or security name, there's a pool of capital that everybody pays into to push in that to keep the markets orderly. That's why margin requirements exist.

So when a stock is being traded and its volatility goes up dramatically, the DTC correctly says the risk of somebody breaking the trade here has just gone up geometrically; we need to pick a margin requirement. It's just like a person with poor credit has to make a bigger deposit if they want to get a mortgage; same concept.

So yes, that has happened. And then a little color on that. The biggest, the increase and
volatility in GME, which is the symbol for Game Stop, went up 60 percent as reflected by its volatility in pricing. That's one of the biggest increases in, I want to say, 20 years; one of the top three or five in 20 years. This is very, very, very unusual. It's just, like a lot of the things you're seeing, it's out of the norm. Sorry to give you a catalogue on that.

Any other questions or decision on that subject?

CFO PATRONIS: One question. When we spoke earlier this week, you talked about was it -- I thought we talked about where you were pointing out that companies were seeking huge amounts of capital here lately and you're questioning the companies' fundamentals to be able to justify to be able to get that type of access to capital. Does that bring you any concerns?

Sorry. I know there's concerns. Walk me through what could be the end result. What type of affect could we have because of these companies that have shaky financials, but they're getting access to this type of capital?

MR. WILLIAMS: Let's generalize the concept of borrowing and excess borrowing and suitability for
borrowing and the implications for credit worthiness and orderliness of markets.

We all know we're in a zero interest place market, which means for everybody; whether it's a homeowner wanting to refinance and take cash out of their house and go buy whatever with it or whether it's a company borrowing money for future use, or whether it's a sovereign issue -- a state, a county, a city a country -- borrowing money because it's cheap and doing things over a long period of time, taking advantage of the low interest rate environment in the view of at some point in our lifetimes, we're going to have policy greats again and we might even see something called inflation that the younger people in the room don't know anything about. I can remember when the prime rate was 20 percent. And so you have sort of a moral hazard in the form of low rates.

You've also got a situation where, because of the low rates, qualifications for borrowing money are probably a bit lower than they've been, particularly in the capital market side. I think in housing and personal credit is a little tighter because of bad experiences of the great financial crisis caused a lot of lenders to tighten their
underwriting standards. So you can't get a mortgage today with no documentation. The no documentation loan that was known in the financial markets back in the pre-financial crisis days is a liar loan, because you could literally borrow money by lying about your income and your assets and value and everything else. Those don't exist anymore.

On the corporate side, sometimes you see companies -- and a great example is Hertz Rental Car. Hertz went bankrupt in 2020. And while they were in bankruptcy, they came to market with a multi-million dollar bond issue.

And you might say to yourself, the whole concept of a bond is I'm going to buy the bond. They're commonly denominator at an interest of a thousand dollars per security, and for some period of time -- 10 years, 15 years, 30 or whatever it may be; bonds are issued up to a hundred years these days, a hundred years. Think had about that -- you're going to give me my principal back at the end of the hundred years, and in the interim, you're going to pay me interest.

So if you have a company that's in bankruptcy, their earnings are negative, their balance sheet is
devastated, and they are literally shedding claims from creditors. Who in their right mind wants to buy that bond? Yet, in this environment, Hertz went to the public markets and sold a massive amount of debt. And you have to look at that and say, these are some strange times we're in. The normal rules don't seem to apply. And it's definitely a "buyer beware" market.

And will there be opportunities when all of this stuff blows up and falls apart? Sure, there will. Will we take advantage of them? Yes. Will we make some money cleaning that mess up? Yes. That's how capital markets work. So again, apology for such a long answer. Trying to be thorough. GOVERNOR DESANTIS: All right. Are we ready to do Item 1?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes. Item 1, the resolution of the state board administration, making fiscal determination in connection with the issuance of amount not exceeding $\$ 27,250,000$ Florida Finance Corporation multi-family mortgage bonds. This is for the acquisition and construction of a 230-unit affordable housing community in Hilsborough County. Request approval.

GOVERNOR DESANTIS: I move to approve.

Is there a second?
COMMISSIONER FRIED: Second.
GOVERNOR DESANTIS: No objections. The motion carries.

Item 2.
MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you. Item 2 requests approval for draft letters for the joint legislative warranting committee affirming that the SBA trustees have reviewed and approved monthly Florida prime summary reports and actions taken, if any, to address the impacts for the fourth quarter of 2020. There were no material impacts or associated actions or escalations. Request approval.

GOVERNOR DESANTIS: I move for approval.
Is there a second?
CFO PATRONIS: Second.
GOVERNOR DESANTIS: All right. There's no objections. The motion carries.

Thank you, Ash. We appreciate it.
And I think that's all of the official business. But before we conclude, I would like to recognize the CFO .

CFO PATRONIS: Thank you, Governor.
So I want to take a moment to recognize Robert

Tornillo. Robert will be leaving the end of this month and he's a legacy when it comes to the State of Florida Cabinet Affairs. Talk about continuity, he's the gold standard when it come to Cabinet and Clemency affairs.

No other state in the United States has a Cabinet that operates the way we do. It's a unique structure.

Robert, I would say, he became his job at Cabinet Affairs in 1988, but he actually began in an agency -called Florida Marine Patrol, which doesn't even exist anymore. That was consolidated at the same time we consolidated this cabinet. So whether he was here when he was a comptroller or insurance commissioner, he has now been here since, you know, in his capacity for with the last four CFOs. Mind you, two different political parties. So as someone who understands loyalty to their principal, but fiercely committed to their role as being unbiased and doing their job to assist the State of Florida he epitomizes that.

Over the last 35 years he has served assistance for the State of Florida and we're honored by his service to the state. I know personally it's not the end of Robert. I know we
will see him around through his next adventure, but I wanted to acknowledge him today and thank him on behalf of not only the CFO office but for the assistance for the State of Florida. GOVERNOR DESANTIS: All right. (Cabinet concluded at 9:53 a.m.)
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