



Agenda Item #1
CRC May 18, 2009

TAMPA BAY REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council
St. Petersburg, FL 33702

9:30 a.m.
April 27, 2009

REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT:

Commissioner Jack Mariano, Pasco County
Vice Mayor Nina Bandoni, City of Safety Harbor
Commissioner Larry Bustle, Manatee County
Councilman Bob Consalvo, City of New Port Richey
Mr. Robert Kersteen, Pinellas County
Ms. Angeleah Kinsler, Hillsborough County
Mr. Andy Nunez, Pinellas County
Councilman Karl Nurse, City of St. Petersburg
Councilman Patrick Roff, City of Bradenton
Ms. Kim Vance, Hillsborough County

REPRESENTATIVES ABSENT:

Councilwoman Mary Mulhern, City of Tampa

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mr. Manny Pumariega, Executive Director, TBRPC
Don Conn, Esq., Counsel, TBRPC
Mr. Avera Wynne, Director of Planning, TBRPC
Ms. Suzanne Cooper, Principal Planner, TBRPC
Mr. John M. Meyer, Principal Planner, DRI Coordinator, TBRPC
Mr. Greg Miller, Senior Planner, TBRPC
Ms. Jessica Lunsford, Senior Planner, TBRPC
Ms. Sue Young, Recording Secretary, TBRPC
Ms. Dee Allen, Mosaic
Mr. Prony Bonnaire, Manatee County
Mr. Rob Brown, Manatee County
Mr. Bryant Grant, Mosaic
Mr. Nick Lepp, Manatee County
Mr. Jay Matteson, Mosaic
Mr. Neal Parker, Manatee County Government

Ms. Patricia Petruff, Dye Dietrich et al (for Mosaic)
Mr. Warren Pies, Mosaic
Mr. Ryan Stoeger, Mosaic

Commissioner Mariano, Chair, called the meeting of the Clearinghouse Review Committee of the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council to order on April 27, 2009 at 9:31 a.m.

Agenda Item #1 - Minutes

Councilman Consalvo made a motion to approve the minutes from the April 28, 2008 CRC meeting. Mr. Nunez seconded the motion and the motion passed.

Agenda Item #2 - Consent Agenda

Mr. Kersteen made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda. Councilman Consalvo seconded the motion and the motion passed.

Agenda Item #3 - Items Removed from Consent Agenda - Discussion

None.

Agenda Item #4 - Developments of Regional Impact

Mr. John Meyer stated that Mosaic Fertilizer, LLC, is seeking Substantial Deviation Development of Regional Impact (DRI) approval to expand mining operations by an additional 271.8 acres and to modify existing Development Order conditions pertaining to scrub jay habitat. The mining expansion currently proposed is exclusive of prior 305- and 299-acre expansions previously granted by Manatee County since a Substantial Deviation review was last conducted for the project in 2002. Including the current proposal, the cumulative expansions are greater than those allowed under Subsection 380.06(19)(b)4, F.S. (a net increase in size by 10% or 825 acres, whichever is less), requiring this level of review. Existing approvals have been granted for the mining of nearly 11,000 acres in association with this project which abuts Hillsborough, Hardee and Polk counties.

The three expansions are all subsets of the Northeast Tract. In the report you will find Council staff's position of the appropriateness of responses regarding all regional issues. Council staff is in agreement with the applicant's initial exemption requests other than partial responses will be required for Wastewater Management (Question #18), Air Quality (Question #22) and Energy (Question #29) and the applicant shall provide responses to the product shipment questions contained in Mining Operations (Question #35). The applicant is in agreement with the Council's revised/proposed list of issues.

Mr. Ryan Stoeger from Mosaic made a presentation regarding the G & D Farms addition which is a new 272-acre addition to the Four Corners Mine DRI and constitutes a substantial deviation. Most of the site is agricultural lands.

The other component of the substantial deviation is a proposed change to the scrub jay management conditions for the Development Order. To clarify, there are no scrub jays or scrub jay habitat located on G & D Farms, but it is an important component of this substantial deviation. The goal is to update the scrub jay management conditions found in the DRI development order for Four Corners Mine to correspond with the Florida scrub jay habitat management plan which was approved by the US Fish and Wildlife Service. Mosaic started work in 1999 to develop a habitat management plan with the help of Dr. Reed Bowman of Archbold Biological Research Station. The plan has been amended and today we simply seek to update the development order conditions to match currently approved habitat management plan.

As a result of the G & D Farms parcel addition, there will be no change to water use, no change to plant capacity, shipping or trucking and no change to the development completion date, which is currently December 31, 2021. There will be no disturbances within either the 25- or 100-year flood plains as a result of this addition.

Questions and comments followed.

Mr. Kersteen made a motion to approve the pre-application for discussion purposes. Mr. Nunez seconded the motion.

Councilman Roff asked about whether the flood plains are part of the proposed mine area. Mr. Stoeger noted that the floodplain does not come into this section. Mosaic will be constructing best management practices berms all the way around the mining facilities. There will also be a recharge ditch. The surface water would not be affected.

Councilman Roff also asked about the runoff. Mr. Stoeger said this region is very flat; the drainage across the site goes northward into the Little Manatee River. The site is not in any other watersheds.

Mr. Kersteen asked if the scrub jay population would be adversely affected by the mining. Mr. Stoeger said there has been a lot of success with the scrub jay population. Mosaic wants the Development Order conditions to match the approved habitat management plan. In order to do that they are going to have the development order conditions reference the habitat management plan better so there is more consistency.

Chair Mariano asked for a vote on the pre-application. The motion passed.

Agenda Item #5 - Program Reports

A. Developments of Regional Impact

Chair Mariano noted that the Clearinghouse Review Committee is a committee established by the Council with authority to conduct pre-application meetings, site visits, concern for post developments of regional impact and provide advice as necessary leading to the Strategic Regional Policy Plan for the Tampa Bay region and/or for government coordination and review. We want to review the process to bring everyone up to speed.

Mr. Meyer discussed the DRI process.

The typical DRI proposal which comes forward is a mixed-use community where the transportation impacts. The first step is a transportation methodology meeting which will be an agreement between the review agencies and the applicant as to how the project will be analyzed from a transportation standpoint. Following the methodology meeting, there is a Pre-application Conference, similar to the one just conducted, whereby an agreement is reached between the review agencies and the applicant as to what regional issues will be assessed during the course of the DRI review. On a typical mixed-use project when we have the transportation methodology, the applicant has one year to submit the Application for Development Approval (ADA). Because there was not a transportation component of the Mosaic proposal, Mosaic will have one year from this meeting to submit the ADA. The ADA is the applicant's initial intent to respond to all regional issues which were agreed upon at the pre-application conference.

The various review entities will raise a series of questions while reviewing the ADA. These questions/issues are then forwarded to the applicant for responses. The applicant's response document is referred to as the Sufficiency Response. The applicant is obligated to provide two Sufficiency Responses if requested by the review agencies. An additional Sufficiency Response(s), if applicable, would need to be agreed to by the applicant. Upon completion of the review process, the application is declared "sufficient" by the Regional Planning Council (RPC) or by the applicant. The RPC would make this declaration once all regional issues have been assessed, appropriate mitigation has been determined and/or any remaining issues can be bridged through recommended Development Order condition(s). If the applicant were to declare their proposal sufficient, this would indicate their intentions not to provide any additional information concerning the proposal and to prepare a report based on information that was already provided.

Following the declaration, Council staff proceeds to notify the local government to schedule the public hearing. Upon receipt of the public hearing date notification, the Council has a maximum of 50 days to prepare and adopt a Final Report concerning the proposal. The Final Reports are broken down into four sections: the Introduction, Regional Impacts, Developer Commitments and Recommended Development Order Conditions. As intended, the local government would use the Final Report as a base in which to build the

Development Order. Following the rendering of an adopted Development Order by a local government, Council staff will prepare a Development Order Report to document the extent of consistency with the Council's Final Report.

There is no finite length of time for the DRI process. The review agencies are obligated to provide responses within 30 days. The applicant has up to 120 days to respond to each request for additional information.

Other DRI processes include a Preliminary Development Agreement (PDA) which would allow a Developer to proceed with a limited amount of development while the entire project is proceeding under DRI review. A PDA cannot be issued for development in excess of the DRI thresholds. A PDA is entered into between the applicant, the local government and the Department of Community Affairs.

A Notice of Proposed Change (NOPC) is the process whereby the developer proposes to amend the Development Order. It could be for a variety of reasons including change in project ownership, modification of a project land use or quantity thereof, or for approval of seeking an extension in timing.

An Essentially Built Out Agreement (EBOA) may be authorized by the FDCA when a project exceeds 90% completion and all mitigation measures have been undertaken. One of the benefits of an EBOA is that the applicant is no longer liable to provide Annual/Biennial Reports.

Vested Rights determinations are granted by FDCA. A Vested Rights determination would only apply to older projects which would have potentially garnered their approvals prior to the inception of the DRI process in 1974.

The DRI Information Matrix is available on the Council website. It is updated at least monthly by Council staff. It identifies every DRI, which land uses are approved (both specifically and conceptually), the project acreages, what has been built during the current reporting year as well as cumulatively, any inconsistencies found while reviewing the Annual/Biennial Reports, and any/all approved amendments.

Questions and comments followed:

Councilman Nurse asked when was the last time the Council turned down a DRI. Ms. Cooper stated that the Council does not approve or deny Developments of Regional Impact. By law, the Council only recommends approval or denial of a proposal, with conditions.

Mr. Pumariega noted the last time a project was denied was in the early 1990s; nothing since. The Council recommended appeal of three or four DRIs. In most of the cases we had in the 1980s and 1990s (TBRPC was the first council to have an appeal in the DRI process in the late 1970s.) we were able to reconcile our differences through the administrative

hearing process and, in some cases, just prior to the hearing. The closest one we have had to a recommended denial was in 2004 with Cypress Creek Town Centre (CCTC).

Mr. Meyer added that, in the instance of CCTC, the applicant had declared their application sufficient even though there were unresolved issues. Council staff proceeded to write an “unfavorable” Final Report based on the lack of information. Then, on the day of the Council meeting to consider the Final Report, the applicant requested that the Final Report be pulled from consideration while they prepare and provide additionally requested information. All issues were subsequently resolved and a revised Final Report adopted.

Commissioner Mariano noted this is a long process to go through; a lot of issues come up. There is so much investment into it.

Commissioner Bustle asked what would happen if Mosaic comes forward with another addition. Would that once again trigger the substantial deviation? Mr. Meyer said we are going to review the current proposal as well as the former Lambe and Lipman expansions. Once a Substantial Deviation Development Order is adopted by Manatee County, that would be comparable to resetting the expansion clock.

B. Local Government Comprehensive Plan Review

Ms. Lunsford gave a brief overview of the comprehensive plan amendment process for regional planning councils.

The general requirements involved with the comprehensive plan amendment process require that future land use map amendments and text amendments are submitted to the various state and regional agencies for review. There is a twice a year limit. Exceptions are amendments related to DRIs, annual updates of the capital improvements programs, or emergencies. Also small scale map amendments are not limited to the twice a year rule as well as public school facilities elements and regional water supply plan elements.

When the regional planning council reviews comprehensive plan amendments we are looking for consistency with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan. The primary finding would be consistent or inconsistent. We are looking for impacts to regionally significant resources, in addition to extra-jurisdictional impacts, inter-governmental coordination and the state comprehensive plan to analyze issues.

The SRPP has five subject areas when we are reviewing comprehensive plan amendments: affordable housing, economic development, emergency preparedness including hazard mitigation and hurricane evacuation, natural resources, which includes natural resources of regional significance map, and transportation.

There are the same seven issues we must address as part of the review. These include: compatibility with local plans and military bases, significant regional resources and facilities, affordable housing issues, natural resources of regional significance, enhancement of

economic development, compatibility with regional transportation corridors and compatibility with emergency preparedness plans.

In 2007 the Florida Legislature established the alternative review process pilot program. Pinellas County and its municipalities were included in this pilot program as well as Broward County and its municipalities, Jacksonville, Miami, Tampa and Hialeah. The process is intended to provide an expedited process for all comprehensive plan amendments. Exceptions include amendments that propose a rural land stewardship area, an optional sector plan, updates to a comprehensive plan based on an evaluation and appraisal report, implementing new statutory requirements. or plans from newly incorporated municipalities.

The TBRPC can comment on amendments that are in the alternative review process, however, we are limited to the effects of regional resources or facilities identified in the SRPP and extrajurisdictional impacts.

There were no questions or comments.

C. Agency on Bay Management

Ms. Cooper provided some history on Tampa Bay and then discussed the Council's Agency on Bay Management.

The rich waters of Tampa Bay supported thriving fisheries in the early part of the last century which, together with Tampa's shipping access helped drive the region's economy in those early years. With the arrival of air conditioning in the 1950s the population of Tampa began to blossom and so did the mats and clouds of tiny algae that sucked the oxygen out of Tampa Bay waters and the life out of the fish and the other critters in the estuary.

The escalating rate of development in Bay filling and the advent of the environmental movement in the 1960s spawned Save Our Bay, the region's first citizen-based environmental group which urged local, state, regional and federal officials to rescue the Bay from its critical condition. Concerns about the health of the Bay were swirling in academic circles, too. A conference held at the University of South Florida in 1968 recommended establishing a baywide management committee.

Several years later the legislature passed the Wilson-Grizzle Bill, which mandated advanced treatment of sewage before it was discharged to the Bay. Before that time there was just primary treatment of sewage going into Tampa Bay. While removing excess nitrogen and other pollutants from the sewage was a critical first step in the Bay's recovery, we knew that complete recovery of the Bay would depend on understanding the physics, chemistry and biology of the Tampa Bay ecosystem. At the first Bay Area Scientific Information Symposium, (BASIS), held in 1982, participants concluded that Tampa Bay should be comprehended and managed as a single ecological system. That was a monumental step.

Using the BASIS recommendations as a springboard, the regional planning council created a Tampa Bay Management Study Committee in 1982 and charged that committee with identifying the major issues related to the health and use of the Bay and developing potential solutions. The committee identified 40 issues of concerns. With the support of the Council and its member governments the Florida Legislature established the Tampa Bay Management Study Commission in 1984 and mandated the commission to recommend a management plan and a work program for the 40 priority issues.

One year later the Commission's report to the legislature entitled, "The Future of Tampa Bay" was the very first comprehensive management plan for the Bay. The Commission, which represented a broad group of stakeholders from government and industry recommended the creation of an entity to serve as an advocate for the Bay and to coordinate implementation of this document. And so it was in 1985 that the Agency on Bay Management was created as an arm of the Council.

At the very top of the list of priorities, of course, was securing funding to address most of those priority issues. Under the leadership of its first chair, Commissioner Jan Platt of Hillsborough County, ABM wasted no time urging the legislature to back Governor Martinez' plan for a Surface Water Improvement and Management program. The legislature listened and passed the SWIM Act in 1987, naming Tampa Bay as a priority water body. Almost 22 years later the significance of that act is still being felt. The Southwest Florida Water Management District, the agency responsible for implementing the SWIM Act in our region, has devoted millions of dollars to address some of the highest priority issues in the future of Tampa Bay. Most of those funds and many partnerships with local governments with local governments have gone to restoring wetland habitat and to cleaning out polluted stormwater runoff.

In 1987 the Agency on Bay Management worked with State Representative Mary Figg to strengthen the Wilson-Grizzle Bill mandating advanced wastewater treatment to discharges to Tampa Bay. This measure was vital to further recovery to seagrasses which is the second highest priority in the future of Tampa Bay document. We are still the envy of many coastal communities around the United States with progress that has been made in that regard.

The year 1987 also marked the creation by Congress of the National Estuary Program and the following year ABM led the effort to persuade Governor Martinez to nominate Tampa Bay for that program and urge our congressional delegation to support that nomination. In 1988 ABM published goals and strategies for Tampa Bay and that work laid the foundation for the National Estuary Program. President Bush named Tampa Bay to the National Estuary Program in 1990. That designation has lead to millions of dollars in research funds and restoration projects in the Tampa Bay Estuary and increased collaboration among myriad agencies. Also in 1990 we lead the effort to ban destructive shrimping practices in upper Tampa Bay.

From 1986 through 1996 ABM co-sponsored Tampa Bay Days in Tallahassee to inform lawmakers about the challenges facing Tampa Bay and to advocate for legislative changes.

What better way to get their attention than to take them seafood from Tampa Bay.

In 1996 ABM established the Manatee Strategies Task Force to look at options for protecting manatees in the Bay. The work culminated in 1998 with a guidance document for manatee protection which ultimately lead to the establishment of slow speed zones around Tampa Bay and some other measures to protect manatees.

A determined effort by the Council staff garnered the 30,000 signatures necessary for proposal of a specialty license plate for Tampa Bay and in 1999 the Tampa Bay Estuary specialty license plate was approved by the legislature. To date over a million dollars has been raised for community based restoration projects and education efforts of the Agency on Bay Management and the Estuary Program.

Over the first 14 years of ABM we published *The State of Tampa Bay* report each year. It was geared mainly to inform the legislature about the challenges and successes in research and other efforts to protect Tampa Bay. Regional planning council staff envisioned the publication of a broader based effort to reach citizens, legislators, elected officials and others about environmental issues and activities in the Bay and its watershed. The result was *Bay Soundings*, which was first published in 2002. It is available online at www.BaySoundings.com. It is funded by the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council, the Estuary Program, SWFWMD, FDOT and others. Our effort is to get it out as broadly as possible within our four counties. We have about 9,000 free subscriptions going out around the region and beyond; we also distribute a total of approximately 30,000 copies. Approximately 4,000 go to schools throughout the region as well.

As a respected voice on bay-related issues, the ABM has frequently been called upon to investigate specific environmental issues facing the bay. In 2000 it was the proposed desalination facility.

In 2002 ABM formed the Piney Point Task Force to help the Florida Department of Environmental Protection in handling the abandoned phosphogypsum stacks on Lower Tampa Bay.

Responding to the need for improved boater access to the lower bay, the ABM formed the Recreational Boat Launch Task Force in 2003.

In 2004, at the request of Tampa Bay Water, the ABM held workshops on the proposed Downstream Augmentation Project, resulting in the adopted recommendation to revise withdrawal plans for the Hillsborough River rather than implement downstream augmentation.

We investigated the proposed Alafia River water withdrawal project; Clam Bayou water quality concerns, proposed new port facilities in East Bay, and much more.

ABM's membership has remained consistently balanced among the stakeholders of Tampa Bay. Governments, researchers, energy suppliers, shippers, recreational interests, environmental organizations, regulators and the public at large have a seat on ABM, and it

results in an excellent forum for addressing the challenges and opportunities before us. Our chairman is currently Council member Bob Kersteen.

The Agency also serves as the natural resources committee of the Council. It recommends policies for the regional policy plan, provides recommendations on projects that require Council review, and frequently brings issues to the Council for its support.

There are several committees of the Agency: Natural Resources/Environmental Impact Review; Habitat Restoration; Public Information; and Legislative Review. The Recreational Boat Launch Task Force, which I mentioned earlier, has recently been revived. The Agency meets every month, on the second Thursday, usually alternating between full agency meetings and committee meetings. You are always welcome to attend.

We've come a long way toward restoring Tampa Bay, and we'll need to continue working on issues. The next BASIS, which is BASIS 5, will be held in October. It will be a 3-day symposium of linking and considering what we originally knew, what we know now and what we are going to do in the future to improve our research and to tackle issue we haven't yet fully addressed to move forward into the future.

Questions and comments followed.

Commissioner Mariano noted that the downstream augmentation project had been presented to the Pasco County Commission in 2002 and we are trying to revive it. We are dealing with the fertilizer ordinance and we are looking at the Curren plant. In that period of time I have been able to talk with Mayor Iorio, who is very ambitious to try to get that program. I talked to Dave Moore the other day and he is very optimistic. Gerry Seibert from Tampa Bay Water came before the Board of County Commissioners in Pasco last week proposing changes. Both of them seem optimistic about making something happen, albeit cautiously so. Mr. Moore, the Executive Director of SWFWMD, mentioned that he didn't know if the public quite understood how clean the water that is going into the bay actually is. To me the benefit is to save that vital resource and actually use it. There are reclaimed water programs in Pasco County all the way up to that area. Commissioner Mariano asked what could be done to make this a more viable program.

Ms. Cooper said the Agency had discussed the downstream augmentation and reclaimed reuse, but it focused on downstream augmentation. The idea with downstream augmentation was that they would put this reclaimed water into the Hillsborough River at the base of the dam and basically take out, on a one to one basis, that amount of water above the dam for potable use. The concern was that, because the river is a very small system, very closed unlike Tampa Bay, that highly nutrient water would be concentrated in the river and replace natural fresh water. Although it is very clean, it is high in nitrogen so putting that in the river is a real concern. The downstream augmentation part had its challenges. The reclaimed water part is something that she thinks the Agency strongly supports. Historically, what Tampa Bay has had is the Hillsborough River, the Alafia River, the Little Manatee River, the Manatee River, lots of creeks providing fresh water to the estuary. That is what makes an estuary so rich – having fresh water inflow into this basin to mix with the saltwater.

We now have many projects taking fresh water out of Tampa Bay. Tampa Bay Water takes from the Alafia River, the Hillsborough, the Tampa Bypass Canal, Florida Power and Light makes withdrawals from the Little Manatee. The desalination plant, which actually removes fresh water because it takes water from the Bay, takes out the fresh water component, and puts back in the saltwater. So a lot of the fresh water inflow to the estuary has been reduced. Tampa Bay Water has studied that quite extensively as have the permitting agencies which continue to monitor to see if there any effects on the estuary. The 55 to 65 MGD that comes from the Howard F. Curren plant is fresh water; it has been used, but is still fresh water. So, withdrawing it from the Bay has its upsides and its downsides. There have been studies about what the effect is on that discharge because the Bay is so large that it is very difficult to see the footprint of that water more than a few hundred from the outfall. So, maybe there is no serious problem with reducing that inflow to the Bay. I think we are all interested in reducing potable water use wherever we can. We are going to discuss this at the May Agency on Bay Management meeting. I think it is a plus for the region.

Commissioner Mariano said it is exciting to see this project come back up. Pasco County has made some major investments in reclaimed water structure facilities, reservoirs, and we are planning to do more. If we can even take away from the demand that Tampa Bay Water has as far as drawing out of the rivers, if we replenished our own groundwater supplies in the county, let mother nature do the filtering and if we have to change the amount of pumping we do, if we are replenishing to those higher levels, that may be an alternate way to go.

Councilman Roff noted he was in Tallahassee earlier this year with the League of Cities and there was discussion about the reuse of water. The fear at that time was there was legislation to bring reuse water under DEP, which would give them control. Bradenton and Manatee County have a very active water reuse program. The fear is that if DEP steps in and takes control of reuse water and times of the year when you have a lot of water flow and people aren't using the irrigation because the rains are coming, the fear is that DEP will require the City of Bradenton to build reservoirs. They don't have the land or capital to do so. That is a big issue. DEP has backed off for now, but this is something that probably will come up in the future.

Councilman Nurse asked if any other cities in the area adopted fertilizer ordinances. Ms. Cooper said Hillsborough County is having workshops; she isn't certain if any other cities have adopted an ordinance yet.

Commissioner Mariano asked about another idea for the upcoming meeting. With the nitrogen load so high, with the amount of water that is right there in that locale that would go into the Bay -- a few years ago the cost was \$100 million to actually create a pipeline. If they looked at the money that would actually take that water and filter it through an extra process to make it even purer and take the nitrogen load out, is that something that was discussed years ago?

Ms. Cooper said many years ago there was the TWRRP project. That was an idea for the City of Tampa, SWFWMD, and Tampa Bay Water to take some of that water and put it in the Tampa Bypass canal and then to withdraw from ground wells alongside the Bypass

Canal as a potable supply. That did not fly. The water is quite clean. Now the real concern about that water is the pharmaceuticals and personal care products that are in that water. We seem to refuse to look at projects like the Mississippi River and many other places where reclaimed water is put back into the rivers and taken out downstream for potable uses, etc. We need to get a grip on our water supply issues for many reasons. We are going to be forced to do it if we want to continue to grow.

Commissioner Mariano said the meeting coming up is a very important meeting. The ramifications will be huge.

Mr. Pumariega added to the historical notes from Ms. Cooper regarding SWIM. The Council staff and the late Roger Tucker worked on the draft legislation and basically drafted the bill for the legislature to pass. It would have landed here at the Council but even back then they passed a \$4 million appropriations to start the SWIM program, which eventually went statewide. So, by default, it ended up with SWFWMD since it required a \$4 million match. We worked very closely with them and we have participated in that process all along.

Also, regarding the Estuary license plate, the staff got all the 30,000 signatures that were needed in order for us to qualify along with other requirements. We secured the sponsors of the bill, Senator Jim Sebesta and Representative Bob Henriquez.

Agenda Item #6 - Other Business - Chair

Commissioner Mariano asked if the committee is comfortable with the 9:30 am meeting time or if they would rather meet at 10:00 am. The committee preferred the 9:30 am time.

Agenda Item #7 - Announcement of Next Meeting Date

The next CRC meeting will be announced as needed.

Agenda Item #8 - Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 10:37 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Young, Recording Secretary

Commissioner Jack Mariano, Chair