CITY OF JACKSONVILLE

DOWNTOWN INVESTMENT AUTHORITY

MEETING

Proceedings held on Wednesday, February 19, 2014, commencing at 5:00 p.m., City Hall, 117 West Duval Street, Lynwood Roberts Room, 1st Floor, Jacksonville, Florida, before Diane M. Tropia, a Notary Public in and for the State of Florida at Large.

PRESENT:

OLIVER BARAKAT, Chair.

JAMES BAILEY, Vice Chair.

KAY HARPER-WILLIAMS, Secretary.

TONY ALLEGRETTI, Board Member.

MELODY S. BISHOP, Board Member.

ROBERT CLEMENTS, Board Member.

MICHAEL SAYLOR, Board Member.

JACK MEEKS, Board Member.

CRAIG GIBBS, Board Member.

ALSO PRESENT:

AUNDRA WALLACE, DIA, Chief Executive Officer. LAWSIKIA HODGES, Office of General Counsel. JIM KLEMENT, OED, Redevelopment Coordinator. KAREN UNDERWOOD, DIA, Executive Assistant.

_ _ _

1 PROCEEDINGS February 19, 2014 5:00 p.m. 2 3 THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Good evening. 4 My name is Oliver Barakat. Welcome to the 5 February 19th meeting of the Downtown 6 Investment Authority. 7 If everyone could please join me and stand for the Pledge of Allegiance. 8 9 (Recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.) 10 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. 11 I wanted to make a couple of quick 12 introductions before we get into the agenda. First we have a new board member this 13 14 evening, Mr. Jack Meeks. For those of you who 15 don't know Jack, he is a CPA and runs his own 16 accounting firm in Springfield. 17 resident of Springfield and developed his 18 office building where he and other companies 19 are located, so he's truly a connoisseur of 2.0 urban core investment and development. 21 Jack, in other civic duties, has been the 22 chairman of the Victim Assistance Advisory 23 Council. He was the treasurer for the board of directors of Pine Castle, was a former member 2.4

of the Jacksonville Ethics Committee, and was

25

1	also I guess was a colleague of Mr. Gibbs,
2	and he Jacksonville Economic Development
3	Commission several years ago, before it was
4	disbanded.
5	So, Jack, welcome to our board and we
6	look forward to working with you.
7	B/M MEEKS: Thank you.
8	THE CHAIRMAN: Also, I want to make an
9	introduction to Lawsikia Hodges, who
10	Did I do that correctly?
11	MS. HODGES: It was close. Lawsikia.
12	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
13	She's going to be replacing Jason Gabriel
14	as our Office of General Counsel
15	representative, so she will be joining us at
16	our meetings from here on out.
17	So welcome.
18	Okay. First item on the agenda is an
19	action item which will require a vote from the
20	board members. It's the only action item this
21	evening. And this is the third amendment to
22	the development agreement between the City and
23	Interline Brands.
24	I believe, Mr. Wallace, you're going to
25	take us through that description before we

discuss it and vote.

2.0

MR. WALLACE: Yes, sir.

With regards to this particular project, this is an agreement that's already existing in place. It was a second amendment that was enacted on December 9th of 2008 by the then JEDC, moved to the City Council itself, basically giving Interline Brands until about 2015 to construct an actual building on the North Bank. They are currently leasing space on the South Bank and have an existing facility on the North Bank as well, but they want to actually talk about consolidating all of their operations into one particular location.

Due to recession issues that occurred, due to current growth opportunities that they need to explore, Interline Brands is currently leasing and their lease is going to -- give me one second. I know it expires -- February 28th, 2019 is when the current lease on the South Bank actually expires.

Well, they actually need time to determine their future growth opportunities right now and basically made a business decision about, once that lease is actually up, do they actually

still need that particular space. They don't need that space and they actually want to construct an actual facility on that North Bank property, so -- and they will make that decision here in the next three years and then still be able to move into the situation of being able to actually construct a new facility on the North Bank and house all of their operations there.

2.0

Interline Brands has been in Jacksonville for quite sometime. They are a good corporate citizen and we want to make sure that we actually keep them here in downtown itself.

Number one, what is before you. Yes, a portion of the actual property where they actually park on right now is a City-Owned lot. What this would actually do is -- again, it does keep basically -- from a land banking situation, keep the property available to Interline to basically span on that particular site.

So, yes, this particular property would be off the tax rolls for a little while longer, but if they actually can go through their due diligence and decide to construct that

particular property, we have a very good corporate tax-paying citizen on that particular property that's currently not producing any tax (inaudible) for the City at this present point in time.

I think it's a prudent investment for us to work with them, to help them -- give them the due diligence, allow them the time to make a business decision about fully locating all their businesses in one location. And I don't want to cannibalize, but I would certainly like to see them in the true urban core still on the North Bank.

We do have the CEO for Florida here with us in the audience as well, as well as the vice president and general counsel, Mike -- and I can't pronounce your last name -- is here as well if you have any particular questions of them, but I think that it's just a continuation, it's an extension, they are a good corporate citizen, and I think that we need to support them on this particular matter.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you,

Mr. Wallace.

2.0

So, to confirm, nothing in the agreement

1 would change. It's simply an extension of 2 five -- for five years? 3 That is absolutely correct. MR. WALLACE: 4 THE CHAIRMAN: Any questions from the 5 board members? Anybody know where that 6 property is located? 7 B/M MEEKS: (Inaudible.) THE CHAIRMAN: So Interline has a lease on 8 9 the South Bank, as Mr. Wallace mentioned, and 10 they own an approximately 30,000-square-foot 11 building on the North Bank, near the convention 12 center and adjacent to the Skyway station, the Water Street -- not the Water Street station. 13 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Jefferson Street. 14 15 THE CHAIRMAN: Jefferson Street, thank 16 you. 17 So there's a long block that is similar to the (inaudible) of the Federal Reserve Bank 18 19 building in Atlanta. Do you know where that 2.0 building is? And two blocks north of that is 21 where Interline owns its 30,000-square-foot 22 building. So adjacent or to the west of that 23 building is the subject property that is 24 currently owned by the City that is under 25 option by Interline. It is simply an extension of that option by another five years.

2.0

B/M MEEKS: Is there some sort of a payment that's been made in terms of an option payment to keep that option refreshed each year?

MR. WALLACE: It's a -- no actual cost at all.

B/M MEEKS: My normal expectation is that there is -- and, Oliver, you know more about this probably than I would. I'm certainly not an attorney, but generally options have payments from year to year to keep a property off the market like that. That's generally what I've experienced at least.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think in terms of real estate transactions, that is true. I think this was an agreement done for economic development in an area that had been -- does not see a whole lot of economic development.

I've been trying to sell land in the block in between the Federal Reserve Bank building and this site for over a year and it's been very, very difficult to get -- garner any interest. So, you know, the value of an option on a piece of land for development, you know,

it's very tough to put a value on it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

MR. WALLACE: The challenge to it -- if the project doesn't move to fruition, then the property reverts back to the City itself. we will be stuck in the position of having a property -- and if they actually would have really wanted to expand that business -- here we have a piece of property that we've taken I'm not going to say we don't have -- we back. couldn't have some ideas for the actual property in some point in time, but asking us today, do we have a viable tenant that wants to build on that particular property, the answer to that question is no. And do we want to hinder the future growth pattern for a very good company that's been in Jacksonville for some time right now? Professionally, I would say we don't want to send that particular message.

B/M GIBBS: Mr. Chair, I voted in favor of Interline Brands when I was on the JEDC in 2008. I'd like to extend a motion to move approval a second time. They are a great corporate citizen.

B/M SAYLOR: Second.

MS. HODGES: Mr. Chair, I'm sorry, before you vote on this action, can you open it up for public comments, due to the law that requires that before the board takes action, that the public actually have an opportunity to speak on the action prior to a vote.

2.0

THE CHAIRMAN: So should he rescind the motion or can we do it during this --

MS. HODGES: Yes. You can just do it -THE CHAIRMAN: All right. So if anybody
wants to make a comment, please go ahead and
fill out this gray/white colored speaker form.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes. I had already filled out a form, Mr. Barakat. Is it all right if I speak from here?

THE CHAIRMAN: You can.

Yes, Mr. Fouracker.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: All right. I just wanted to say that I very much favor this. I think that the land is going unused. I think that the chances of the land being sold otherwise in five years are not great to the extent that it would cause an economic loss to us, to have that extension. Okay? So I think that it's a good thing to move forward with the

1	option.
2	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Fouracker.
3	Okay. So seeing no other comments from
4	the public, I will close it at this time.
5	So there is a motion by Mr. Gibbs,
6	seconded by Mr. Saylor.
7	Any further discussion from board members?
8	BOARD MEMBERS: (No response.)
9	THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of the motion,
10	say aye.
11	BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
12	THE CHAIRMAN: Any opposed?
13	BOARD MEMBERS: (No response.)
14	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Motion passes.
15	Thank you all.
16	AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you.
17	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for coming.
18	Appreciate your corporate support in
19	Jacksonville.
20	AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you.
21	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. A couple several
22	information items for discussion.
23	Let's go into the enforcement parking code
24	update. And before I introduce Mr. Shad, just
25	a little background on why I asked him to come

before us today and give us an update.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

About three or four years ago, maybe longer, there was an ordinance that was passed to help beautification with surface parking lots that -- most of which surround downtown, and the issue has been that these parking lots, a lot of them have -- are simply blighted, have foundations that are so exposed from former buildings that were demolished and were not kept up very well. And so the concern by the downtown (inaudible) has been that this sends a negative perception and message as people drive into downtown. So an ordinance was drafted and accepted by City Council to enforce a design standard and beautification standard, and they gave property owners up to three years to provide a design plan to the City if they wanted to continue to be used as a parking property and a parking lot. If they didn't, the repercussion, I believe, was they could no longer use the property as a parking lot and derive parking income.

The third option was to be an accessory lot where they could avoid having to make design improvements if they had an agreement

with an office building. The example is the EverBank center parking lot on the corner of Forsyth and Julia, which has an agreement with that building owner and therefore does not need to make beautification improvements.

So we asked Jack Shad about a year ago to give us an update. The deadline for those designs had not yet passed, I believe. So that deadline now has passed, and so I asked him to give us an update and see if there's a way we can help the parking department enforce this important piece of legislation just to see how it's doing.

So, Mr. Shad, if you could come before -we don't have a place for you to sit. Come to
the podium. That would be fine.

Thank you.

2.0

2.4

(Mr. Shad approaches the podium.)

MR. SHAD: Just to clarify, since this ordinance falls under the zoning code, it does fall to the Office of Economic Development staff to enforce it. They act as the Planning Department staff for the downtown (inaudible), so Jim Klement with OED is going to give an update on --

MR. KLEMENT: I'll try and give you a quick overview, Mr. Chairman and members of the board.

2.0

2.4

As summarized, the ordinance was actually -- references in the reference [sic] as ordinance 2010-901-E, and the intent was to capture initially a lot of the beautification issues that were faced with parking lot scenarios.

As the ordinance moved through and as it moved through its legislative and -- enactment, we ended up with primarily addressing commercial surface parking lots. We actually got three definitions out of the ordinance.

One of them was commercial surface parking lot, one was an accessory parking lot, and then the third definition came to a vacant lot.

With that aspect and prior to the ordinance itself, we went out and did a in-the-weeds-type study and came up with a hundred-plus different lots that fell into all different types of various categories. In some cases, they were property owners -- they might be -- each of these definitions might be side by side. So it -- it presented to us a whole

number of issues and we felt, as phase one, we were going to go out and impact the legislative actions that gave us power to enforce against the commercial surface parking lots, and the commercial surface parking lots mandated primarily that they include and develop a perimeter landscaping on their street frontage. So if they had an interior lot, the only aspect of that improvement would be the perimeter or the -- or the facing of the street frontage.

2.0

Having said that, we ended up -- and the ordinance provided a -- as the chairman indicated, a series of opportunities for the applicant to come in and kind of step through the process. The first step was actually having them come in and certify. And that was kind of our signal to note who was going to claim and become of record a commercial surface parking lot, and a commercial surface parking lot was defined as 50 percent of those spaces, plus one was open to the public on a 24/7-type basis.

So the intent was to really address some of the issues of where can the public park, is the public able to park in these different

types of parking lots. And the idea, at this point in time, was to go out and capture those and make public, so to speak, those parking lots and bring them to a higher standard.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

As has been the challenge, of those seventeen, four indicated and claimed accessory parking lot status. That was kind of their get-out-of-jail-free card is how I referenced And we could come back and it, so to speak. address that. Four closed. Three are in partial compliance, and we're looking for some interpretations and -- to get that -- those items squared away, and basically they have included landscaping and/or fencing and we're looking to see how they can bring them into complete compliance. Two are in review permit right now. They are trying to come out. they are in noncompliance. Three have complied and have met all the guidelines. Two more have been issued citations at the first of the year and are now trying to submit their drawings for compliance.

So we're in a role right now of where we thought we would be much further along and would have a better completed program that

we're at right here. We're aggressively trying to pull them across the finish line.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

The intent was to come back -- once we got these phase one aspects of the commercial surface parking lots addressed, we would come back now having learned some of the issues, some of the dialogue, some of the definitions that we're running into with the new ordinance, come back and start to attack what we call the accessory lots, which do not require any beautification. But if they are not meeting the definition of the accessory lot, then we have the option to put a little more Code Enforcement on them and bring them either into making a decision of if they are going to be a commercial surface parking lot -- at which time they can pursue the upgrades or they will have to close their operations.

Now, the citation process is what we're working with Code Enforcement -- we are not Code Enforcement. So we get a lot of dialogue with Code Enforcement, and part of that dialogue has been, how do we know which ones are which, and the only way we know to do that is going to be to issue citations.

We involve -- in the past, we have worked with both Jason Gabriel and Jason Teal to make sure that as our Code Enforcement people go out that they're moving in an authoritative manner and a proper position.

And, I guess, Lawsikia, you will get a chance maybe to help us on that aspect of it as we move forward.

Did I pronounce that correct?

2.0

2.4

B/M BAILEY: Close. Ms. Hodges.

MR. KLEMENT: And, with that, phase two -one of our challenges as we looked at it
internally -- and also our DDRB, your agency
that helps to hopefully try to implement some
of the zoning code and legislative actions, is
bringing back to their table are there
alternatives to pursue beautification and to
strengthen beautification, so that's on their
agenda also.

The reason we are kind of inviting or would like to invite participation as we move through our phase two is we're seeing the needle move all the way from we may need new legislative issues to, in some cases, just good legal interpretations. There appear to be so

many different routes that are certainly challenges on a day-to-day basis and it's giving us a little bit harder path to follow than we thought we would have been able to accomplish, but we are making progress, slow progress, and I would hope by the -- if our permit people are in order with their reviews and critique and the truthfulness of the applicants -- they have all been cited, so they're under the gun to complete their compliance issues. We should see -- continue to see some improvements. I think we were blessed to see one out there at the -- across from the courthouse, which was probably one of the biggest ones that was an eyesore. applicant did come in and just complied with -and just met today with the two lots that were adjacent to them. They had to come in and get relief from some of the requirements due to site constraints, due to traffic circulation constraints as they move in and out of the site. There is a lot of subissues that were kind of renewed and needed to be addressed administratively and/or legislatively to get them to be in compliance.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

We ran into utility issues, fire hydrant issues. Some of these things get to be a real burden in cost. We're seeing the cost of the -- just for what was intended to be kind of an interim upgrade. It is interesting to note that the costs we're seeing are in the hundreds of thousands of dollars sometimes just to dig through these asphalt -- the subbases, put in the irrigation systems, put in the plant material and whatnot.

2.0

2.4

We think we've been able to get a much better product by working with the applicant.

We're getting trees planted and additional planting areas and mitigated areas, so we are getting a better product, it's just taking us a longer bit to get there.

With that, I'll close the door and let -in summary, would invite -- we talked about
this internally, maybe some type of a standing
group or someone from your team here that might
have an interest in working with us as we go
through the process to help us bring it to
fruition, the product we have.

We are looking at now -- really the vacant lots is one of our issues, to start our final

sweep on that. All of these applicants have received letters probably in the (inaudible) where we put them on notice of a compliance issue, so we're now aggressively moving into the more Code Enforcement aspect of it.

2.0

We're seeing just a number of questions being asked as we move through the -- the Code Enforcement aspect, as they move through. That process in itself is taking anywhere from a 30-to 90-day process, just to move them through the Code Enforcement process. We have out-of-town property owners, we have partnerships, we have things that are -- I won't say foreign to me, but outside our ability to either -- to either interpret as such.

We're traveling in a much finer line. I think we're aggressively on it and we're hitting it every day, and that's where we are.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Klement.

I have a question, and then the board members can chime in if they have any.

You mentioned there were 17 properties -- well, let me take a step back.

I think when we were looking at this --

drafting this ordinance, the impression was there was probably a hundred parcels throughout downtown where people parked, legitimately or not. So that -- you know, this ordinance was to help beautify most of those parcels.

You mentioned -- when you went through the list of -- you know, three are partially in compliance, two are in permitting, three were completed, there was a total of seventeen?

MR. KLEMENT: Correct.

2.0

THE CHAIRMAN: So where do the other 50, 80, whatever the number is, where do all those other lots --

MR. KLEMENT: They are going to fall into vacant property, they're going to fall into accessory lots, they are going to fall into wild cat lots. It seems like the minute we throw one flag up with respect to a citation issue or enter into a communication issue with the property owner, he may close his light off, his lot off. Those parkers are looking for other venues to park on or locate legally or illegally. So we then jump back to the citation issue and go back and try to issue citations accordingly. So we're -- it's a

1 moving target at times for us. 2 THE CHAIRMAN: You said they're either considered vacant or wild cat; is that --3 4 MR. KLEMENT: I'm using the term "wild 5 I hope it doesn't have some kind of a --6 THE CHAIRMAN: So what --7 MR. KLEMENT: -- politically incorrect They are not legal lots. 8 connotation. I'11 9 clarify that for the record. 10 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. And how do you --11 what is your definition of "vacant?" 12 MR. KLEMENT: Vacant means it's just an 13 undeveloped piece of property. In fact, we had this discussion just earlier today, as we go 14 15 through the interpretation, the more it's 16 developed -- what is vacant, and if it has 17 improvements on it; i.e., a paved surface, is 18 that an improved parcel or a vacant parcel? 19 we're seeing some nuances as we move through 2.0 our citation issue on those other aspects. But 21 for the most part, those other lots are what 22 we're going to refer to as -- presumably 23 accessory lots or undeveloped properties. 2.4 THE CHAIRMAN: So if it's vacant, no one 25 should be parking on it?

MR. KLEMENT: Correct.

2.0

THE CHAIRMAN: And if someone is parking on it, it either needs to be in compliance or on the road to compliance?

MR. KLEMENT: Correct, and/or it should be an accessory lot, which means that they will need to produce their rent rules (phonetic).

That's our next flag, is that clarification, is what is a rent rule. We over -- we heard the -- what I'm going to caution is -- is we're seeing some gray areas in that, what if I'm -- work for a business downtown and I have three -- that business is -- is the -- does the contract have to be with the business or is it with the individual?

In many cases we're seeing now where the business does not want to make the contract with the parking lot, and rethinking the code, we're thinking that we may need to clarify that aspect of the code to have it say -- be clear on that aspect because we were initially starting with a contractual relationship that was what we call long-term. "Long-term" was not defined, so we're using an interpretive process of saying six months or longer. So we

have some gray areas in the code that need to be clarified for us to move forward.

2.0

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other questions?
Mr. Saylor.

B/M SAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Jim, help me understand how -- in downtown, the -- this parking lot enhancement program, is -- are you-all doing basically cursory beautification improvements or are we reaching back into the code and requiring all the things that the code requires, such as all surfaces and VUA buffers and landscaping and irrigation, all those things? And are we reaching back into the code and requiring all that or something short of that?

MR. KLEMENT: The question is -- the answer is yes for commercial surface parking lots. And we only had -- from what we could determine in communication with property owners, we only had in that window of approximately 17 commercial surface parking lots, if you could believe that, which means that all those other lots, as per your chairman was questioning what were they, well, they were just random, partially used, partially parked

on, partially improved, just a whole variety of -- in some cases day to day, some cases illegal, parking on their own property. They were not well-managed parcels of property by the property owner in our observation.

2.0

Now, just to add a nuance to the -- to the discussion of your question, is the downtown core area now prohibits commercial surface parking lots, so we will no longer see or allow for upgrading to any commercial surface parking lots in the downtown area -- in the core area.

Now, outside the initial core, you can come in with a new request for either a commercial and/or an accessory lot, but that will be through either the downtown development review guidelines, which will then -- anything new is going to be captured by -- by this ordinance here. You will have to put in the landscaping. Even accessory lots will come in and put in the improvements, which was part of our discussion and part of the history of this ordinance.

Originally, this ordinance was intended to capture both accessory lots and commercial surface parking lots, and it did not make it

that far on the gamut there. It got as far as to capture the commercial surface parking lots, which goes full circle to, again -- this might be an area that our -- the DDRB is looking at, maybe something that we may -- would certainly invite you-all to understand with us and see if it makes sense to pursue some of those compliance issues.

2.0

2.4

Part of the whole beautification scenario was an interim use, so we're now being challenged with how do we pursue a good beautification with a cost effective manner in it being interim -- an interim use. Again, what's the best way to get that beautification and have it be an interim use, hopefully in a five-year window. These properties do become more usable or used for development. So, again, that's part of the discussion that we're including as we move through.

Foremost is the beautification. Some of these lots have been in disrepair and have not been taken care of, have not been maintained, and we do need that. And I think we're getting those with the 17 we addressed and I think our second sweep is going to bring us some new

1	dialogue for the improvements that we speak to
2	with the vacant lands and whatnot. So
3	hopefully we will see real improvement of that
4	aspect and intend to and will be glad to and
5	plan on reporting back to this board with maybe
6	some more positive improvement scenarios.
7	B/M SAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, my first
8	question was actually a segue to my second
9	question. Are we requiring ADA improvements in
10	response to
11	MR. KLEMENT: Yes. ADA is almost the only
12	requirement that we're
13	B/M SAYLOR: It's not being waived
14	anywhere?
15	MR. KLEMENT: It's not waived.
16	B/M SAYLOR: Thank you.
17	MR. KLEMENT: That's one of the things
18	that we felt that we could push off at the
19	federal level. Obviously, a mandate.
20	THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Ms. Williams.
21	B/M HARPER WILLIAMS: Through the Chair.
22	Mr. Klement, a couple of questions.
23	One, how, if at all, do the universal
24	parking signage or signs that we have
25	discussed months ago, how do they interact with

1 these lots or is there, you know, discussion 2 about if you become compliant, then we will offer the signage or if you're not -- you know, 3 4 then is that not available to you or how does 5 that work? 6 MR. KLEMENT: One primary basis that we 7 were looking for with respect to the signage 8 was to carry the universal P on it --9 B/M HARPER WILLIAMS: Right. 10 MR. KLEMENT: -- so that indicated the 11 parking. The signage also needs to carry 12 identification of the management, so that if 13 you are parking there as a parking lot user and 14 you have an issue, you can contact that 15 management team. So those are probably the two 16 big things that are required as part of their 17 compliance aspect. 18 B/M HARPER-WILLIAMS: So the property 19 owner had -- that falls on them? 2.0 MR. KLEMENT: Correct. 21 B/M HARPER-WILLIAMS: The City is not --22 MR. KLEMENT: Correct. We have indicated

that those applicants that are certifying, are

compliant -- and as part of their package, they

need to include their sign package.

23

24

25

B/M HARPER-WILLIAMS: Okay. Does the City have any obligation or any partnership or any agreement to assist with the funding of these improvements or is it solely on the property owners?

2.0

2.4

MR. KLEMENT: All these improvements are on the burden of the property owner.

We have internally talked about and there have been discussions with DVI, are there ways to maybe -- and now we're skipping gears and going to another portion of it, and I'll let the chairman cut me off, but I want to answer your questions first, and that would be are there venues that are available to the -- to the property owner, and that's something this board may look at and consider.

We talked about maybe small signage that
we're just able to put on the fencing to carry
the message of the public parking facility, and
this -- we went into that dialogue of we
historically have heard that there's no parking
downtown. And any of you that have had a
chance to review those studies, even in our
peak usage we're still at maybe 85 percent
usage of parking spaces. So there are parking

1 They're just not immediately available spaces. 2 in the desirable maybe walking distance of a So it's interesting to see that. 3 4 B/M HARPER-WILLIAMS: One last question. 5 So a parking lot that is noncompliant is 6 not able to put up the universal P; is that 7 correct? MR. KLEMENT: 8 I would not say that. 9 I would say that the requirement of a 10 commercial surface parking lot, by definition, 11 they are open to the public and they would put 12 the public P up almost as a marketing advantage 13 to their lot. B/M HARPER-WILLIAMS: 14 Thank you. 15 THE CHAIRMAN: Ms. Bishop. 16 B/M BISHOP: Just real quick, you 17 mentioned that -- I thought that their, you 18 know, just interpretation of the code -- and in 19 your enforcement of it, is there -- the 2.0 legislation, is there anyone working on how do 21 you, you know, kind of remedy some of that, 22 maybe, you know, some changes to the 23 legislation in the first place? And, you know, 2.4 maybe --25 MR. KLEMENT: Not aggressively, but we're

making our -- continuing our list of gray areas. We have regular communication with Office of General Counsel, so they are available to us and many times we're able to get an answer that we can rebut an applicant. In some cases we aren't able to rebut and kind of pull back, so -- hopefully that answers your question.

We do have legal, and our intentions are to move forward with the appropriate legislative amendments to tighten them up.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Meeks.

2.0

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{B/M}}$ MEEKS: Just a couple of comments and questions.

This did come before the JEDC when I was on there. At the time I really thought, and still would, that it was a big deal. We had several meetings about it. And just a couple of things I remember -- and see if these still strike you from memory.

There was something in the order of magnitude of over 50 percent of our space downtown -- if you -- non-right-of-way space was made up of surface parking lots. So -- maybe 60 percent, so it was a big impact.

And the other thing that I remember finding interesting, that a lot of these -- I'm now using the term now comprehensively for parking lots -- operating a lot of wild cats or -- or whatever else. A lot of those, I recall -- and see if this squares with what you're finding. A lot of those lots came about from buildings that had deteriorated and the owners weren't willing to spend the money to repair or fix the building so they tore the building down and left some portion of the slab there and then it turned into some kind of a parking lot. So that's the type of circumstances that led to us having the issues that we have now, that --

2.0

2.4

About the third thing I remember -- and see if any of this is inconsistent with your present understanding -- is that a lot of these folks were not our Jacksonville folks. They lived out of town, out of state or wherever, and so their interest in our downtown and how it looked and -- and the sort of things we're interested in, there was a big divergence there. So that -- those are some of the things I remember, and are those basically your

present understanding?

2.0

MR. KLEMENT: Yes.

Quick summary, and maybe internally as we look at the property and the ownership and the maps, how much of the property was vacant or undeveloped, and -- and in concert with your remembrance was how many of them were the result of demolition issues. And now what we do -- that aspect of it, we do tag all demolitions with you cannot use this space for additional parking. We have been able to salvage actually two or three lots out of some concern the City had.

I was concerned to see the (inaudible) use as a staging area as we just built the lot across the street, but -- you're correct, a lot of those and a lot of the property owners are out of state and/or out of city, so that's the whole -- that's the wagon that we're circling right now is going to be the second sweep, which is to come in and address the vacant lots and the compliance.

January 1, 2014 was the deadline for compliance, so we're a month out of getting our citations sent out and doing those field

sweeps, which we think were -- we're having enough success with bringing those that are commercial lots that were bringing in -- we're not as comfortable as we would like to be, but we think we're headed in the right direction and can make up any lost time with the citation aspect of it pretty quick.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bailey.

2.0

2.4

B/M BAILEY: I don't know if anybody caught it. When you said I don't want to get down into the weeds, that's the reason we have a problem with these lots is they're weeds out there. We're getting ready to adopt a CRA plan that slaps in the face of what we're trying to do downtown.

The January '14 deadline that you mentioned, what -- how many extension was that?

MR. KLEMENT: There really were no extensions. That is the date. There were communications and hopefully incremental steps for those individuals and communication on a mass mail-out type scenario. If you have been identified as a property owner that appeared to be in noncompliance, these are your compliance requirements. Please contact us or please make

a --

2.0

B/M BAILEY: What was the date of the original ordinance?

MR. KLEMENT: The ordinance was (inaudible) early on in January or February of '11.

B/M BAILEY: So we still, after this much time, we -- we can't enforce. We have all these lots. We're trying to -- we actually created another lot at SunTrust, but we still are not enforcing all these other lots. So what -- I don't understand, because we had this conversation, Jack, a year -- October of '12 we had this conversation and we still haven't been able to enforce. We gave them plenty of time and we told them what we were going to do, we told them we were going to try to enforce, and continue to do this. So I'm a little uncomfortable.

And, on top of that, parking is not in our purview. We don't have anything to do with it. We're supposed to create a CRA for downtown and encourage people to come down here, but we don't have anything to do with parking. This is information only, right?

MR. SHAD: I don't think this is information only. I think the City Council and Office of Economic Development looked to the DIA to help recommend policy.

2.0

B/M BAILEY: Well, I think that we ought to enforce this. They are torn-down buildings that people just left. They're concrete block walls. And it seems that we're forcing -- through DDRB, we're forcing people to have setbacks, screen walls and everything else. I think it's going to be tough for parking lot developers and anyone that wants to come down here and try to build -- they'll look at it and say, we can't, because there's no enforcement.

And when you say that it -- you can build an accessory lot outside of the urban core.

Why? Who would build one outside the urban core? There's no need to, so that doesn't matter. It's what we have down here.

I mean, what would it take? Because you just mentioned that we did this in JEDC and now we're doing it again. We're doing it again.

We had this conversation many times. So before we adopt this CRA, I sure hope we can accomplish this.

MR. KLEMENT: I would like to share with you the frustrations of Commissioner Bailey and commit to the Chair and to this board that we were held in abeyance pretty much by the January 2014 aspect and to bring it forward.

2.0

2.4

And I will commit, under Jack's direction, to -- to move aggressively forward to get our citations out as quick as we can on these other loose ends, and I think that we can have something more positive to report. Hopefully that report will not only include that we will move aggressively in the citation aspect and that we're also seeing some benefits from -- in terms of the --

THE CHAIRMAN: So I'd like to take up your recommendation and have somebody on this board be a apart of your process, stay attuned to it as you try to improve the enforcement and maybe tweak the legislation. Mr. Wallace and I can talk about who would be most appropriate.

I think Mr. Bailey references a more -more deeper issues as far as ongoing
enforcement of -- and this is not a glamorous
issue. It's a very important one for downtown.
It is a barrier to economic development

downtown. Since we are in charge of that development downtown -- I think the frustration is that we don't have a direct connection to the enforcement and promulgation of all these laws.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

So that's another conversation for another meeting, but that's part of the frustration I'm sensing. But I also -- given the amount of comments and questions you've had, I think you can tell that this is very important to all the board members, so we will want to stay connected to this process. And it's really important that this be enforced on a consistent basis, particularly for those who are investing their money and are abiding by the legislation. It would be unfair to them if others aren't, for whatever reason, for some bizarre loophole or weakness in the legislation. So we need to reward those who are doing their best, and we do that by consistency in the regulation.

That's how the historic districts in Riverside are successful. Why would an owner have to comply with the minutiae of the historic district legislation -- I'm okay with that as long as that guy across the street has

to do it and my neighbor two blocks down has to do it. It sets a benchmark, and you know going into that neighborhood that that benchmark will be preserved with transparency and consistency. So this legislation should be enforced with the same -- in the regard, and I think it will be hopefully successful.

2.0

2.4

So we'll be in touch, Jim, in the days and weeks to come and we'll enjoy teaming up with you to make that legislation better.

Are there any other final comments? I know we spent some time on this.

B/M HARPER-WILLIAMS: I just have one question. What -- how hefty are these citations? Are the fines significant such that anybody is motivated by them or are they --

MR. SHAD: The Code Enforcement process starts with single fines and then eventually -- it sort of takes a while to ramp up.

Eventually it becomes a rolling fine applied every day.

This is the situation that the Bostwick building has been in for the last -- many years, but it does -- I believe it starts with a warning and then it goes to a single \$250

1	citation, and then after that it goes to a
2	special magistrate and the special magistrate
3	can start to
4	B/M HARPER-WILLIAMS: And the rolling fine
5	is an additional
6	MR. SHAD: They can vary, but I believe
7	they are often up to a hundred dollars per day.
8	B/M HARPER-WILLIAMS: Thank you.
9	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Seeing no further
10	questions, we'll move on.
11	Thank you, gentlemen, for the update.
12	Appreciate it.
13	Okay. We have a series of updates to be
14	provided by Mr. Wallace, and the first is the
15	CRA plan update.
16	MR. WALLACE: Yes.
17	For many of us who have gone through
18	masters' degrees or a CPA exam, studied for the
19	bar, you can't wait for it to be over with.
20	That's kind of how we're feeling about the
21	redevelopment planning process itself.
22	What I've got before you is an actual memo
23	itself. I want to walk through our agenda
24	is kind of light tonight. I'm going to go
25	through the document. I'm going to occupy a

little bit more of your time in the coming weeks.

2.0

As I said at our last January 15th board meeting, we had, like, a 75-day movement trying to get to April, so I want to lay out the things that we need to get done, and I'm probably going to ask for an ad hoc committee to help us with some of the things. We'll talk about that as we move forward.

What I call the redevelopment plan itself is comprised of our CRA update and our business investment development strategy. It is one document. Okay? It's got -- right now it's being developed as you write your thesis in certain sections, so on and so forth. It's going to come together as one particular document. Karen may have provided to you an actual draft right now that we will get to as I go through my conversations.

The month of February, revised draft CRA document, I want to incorporate some of my comments, as well as our committee chair,

Ms. Bishop, and our board chair. We have already accomplished that. I provided you with an actual draft of this updated CRA plan. You

have that here. We're going to get it to

Jim Klement so we have some DDRB consistency.

2.0

2.4

And I also want to provide a draft BID, business investment development plan, so you can understand exactly where we're going. To the board chair and our committee chair, I want to get that out by February 28th.

The market analysis has already been initiated and it's underway. I want to schedule a special board meeting for DIA to discuss that first draft of the CRA update, and any proposed downtown incentives, I'd like to schedule that, if you're willing, February 28th at 10 o'clock. We can check our calendars as we are going on through this particular discussion. So when I say I want to start occupying a little bit more of your time, I want to start February 28th, on that particular day.

For the schedule of March, I want to provide an initial draft, as I indicated, about the business investment development strategy to the full board. I want to make sure that goes out the week of March 3rd.

Following our February special board

meeting, I want to update whatever comes out of that for the actual CRA plan portion itself. I want to get that updated, get that back out to the board by the week of March 10th.

2.0

2.4

I need to schedule a special board meeting for DIA to discuss that business investment development strategy that is going to come out to you the week of March 3rd. It won't have the market analysis in it. And if we need to bring back the CRA plan update for any additional discussions, I want to bring it at that particular meeting, at that time. Look on your calendars for March 21st. We'll talk about that as we go.

B/M MEEKS: March 21st?

MR. WALLACE: March 21st, sir.

The planning team will discuss the preliminary findings of the market study with me. We'll try, hopefully on schedule, for them to discuss that with me the week of March 24th, at the very end of March itself.

Also in March, I want to be working with the Office of General Counsel, again legislation preparation for the redevelopment plan introduction to City Council. We need to

start ahead of time. I want to make sure that we have that legislation ready so that when we do what we need to do, we can move that to council.

2.0

2.4

So that's what we're going to be doing in the month of March.

The month of April, critical month.

Subsequent to the special board meeting that we will have in March, I want to provide an updated business -- business investment development strategy that will include the market analysis to the full board. I want to try to get that to you the week of April 7th.

I want to make the full redevelopment plan document, CRA updated portion that we beat up and pull it together, as well as the business investment development strategy, I want to make that available on the Web shortly after I get it to the actual board itself. So it will probably come in on the tail end of April 7th.

We need to schedule a special -- we need to schedule a public forum where we talk about the redevelopment plan for downtown. We've got to have that.

Then once all that takes place, we've got

to have a meeting ourselves where we put it to rest and we adopt the redevelopment plan for downtown. And hopefully by April 30th we will have done that and can get that on to

Ms. Hodges and we can get some legislation again and get started and get introduced into City Council and have this process into them the month of May.

2.0

Aggressive, yes. Why do I need an actual ad hoc committee? I've been listening to some of the questions on the code, et cetera, and we need to have some different perspective in helping us on the staff, planning team, to make sure that our redevelopment plan is going to line up with City policies. I know the team is doing that, but we need to have the practitioners' perspective from the private sector looking in.

Even though we will cover that in our actual meetings, we need more work going on in between that time because we want to ensure that our City's current policies are, in fact, still applicable for downtown. Some may be, some may not be. I don't want to be the lone person saying that they are not. I want to

make sure some of the practitioners are saying that equally as well because there's a great deal of ambiguity from the private sector standpoint about contemplating development in downtown, and we need to make sure that we remove all barriers through this plan as much as we possibly can.

2.0

2.4

If our goal is to be the one-stop-shop for development for downtown, that's something that we've got to tackle because if we -- if we listen and agree with the private sector, there's already some considerable inconsistencies between the comp plan and the downtown overlay documents, so we need to vet them and make some recommendations and make sure that they are consistent at a technical level so that when you get -- as a developer, as an investor, you actually know exactly what they said and they're going to do exactly what they said.

If there's anything that people investing money have a difficult time with it's not getting a confident response and answer. And as much as our document provides that timely response, that's less questions that they have

for myself and my staff.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

We don't want our redevelopment plan hampered by confusion and inconsistency. That's that last thing that we're going to need because that's going to deter private investment. So we need to create a matrix that basically talks about the comprehensive plan, zoning, what's the DIA process, what's the DRI, downtown overlay, DDRB reviews, et cetera, and give them a particular timeline. So if you're the developer you know that once you initiate your particular project, you know when to start, you know when it ends. So you know how you're going to -- you have your capital running and your costs going. Everybody is able to factor in all of that.

So, Mr. Chairman, on this ad hoc committee, I'd ask if you would allow Mr. Saylor to work with me, chair this, and I'm going to need the Office of General Counsel, Mr. Gabriel, Ms. Hodges. We need a council liaison, Councilwoman Boyer. I'm going to need the Planning Department; I'm going to speak directly to Mr. Burney. DIA staff, myself, and probably DDRB staff, a Civic Council liaison.

And we need a private sector land use attorney that's practicing, using all these particular tools. That is the ad hoc committee.

2.0

We have had a lot of work to get done in the month of April -- March, I'm sorry, to make sure we meet our April time frame. So when I said this is a light agenda today, it's getting busy. We need to meet on February 28th.

Mr. Chairman, that's where we are with the CRA process. The team is working in overdrive and we're all working in overdrive. It is a tedious process, but we aim to get this done.

I need to get this to Ms. Hodges by April 30th.

That's to go. Is it aggressive? Yes, but we have a set of goals to get done. We cannot afford to allow this to slide much further.

Good summary, and I think your proposed

nomination of Mr. Saylor chairing this task

force, this ad hoc committee, based on his

background expertise is appropriate if he's

Thank you, Mr. Wallace.

21 background, expertise, is appropriate, if he's

22 willing. You can answer now or later.

THE CHAIRMAN:

But I do agree with you, given the -- some of the minutiae of all the various regulatory documents, consistency was important and now is

the time, as we put this plan to City Council.

MR. WALLACE: We only get one chance to get it right. The more we have the document prepared and it addresses everyone's questions, the better off we're going to be. It shows that board management has a grasp of what's going on in downtown and shows the confidence that we're studious enough to put in this work to get it done, and that's what we've got to do.

THE CHAIRMAN: Great.

2.0

Quickly, any questions about this timeline, the CRA update?

B/M BAILEY: So in a perfect world, if everything goes as planned, if General Counsel only needs 24 hours to produce the legislation, how much -- how much time is it going to take the General Counsel's Office?

MS. HODGES: Well, if it's a normal piece of legislation that goes through, that's about six weeks. You're talking about the City Council's process?

B/M BAILEY: No, just the General Counsel to introduce to City Council because the council is going to take six weeks. So we're

now looking at June before we --

2.0

MS. HODGES: Right. I think that's --

B/M BAILEY: If everything is --

MR. WALLACE: That's why I said, in the timeline, I want to start with document preparation in the month of March. So by the time we get to the end of March, we've got a good working document draft with everything that has to be produced as documents so that when you approve the plan in April, you're not just approving the plan, you're basically approving the documents that have to go with the actual legislation. So it's no surprise to you, it's no surprise to council. This is going to be one open, transparent process.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ms. Hodges, do you have the bandwidth to do this in the time frame? I mean, I don't know what other accommodations you have or departments or counsel, but are you in a position where you might need assistance from some of your colleagues or --

MS. HODGES: Oh, absolutely. We are committed to servicing this body as much as we need to. So if you need five lawyers working on this project to get it done, we will get it

1	absolutely done. And Jason will still be
2	involved because he's on the land use side,
3	so he represents the zoning committee, so at
4	least the two of us will be staffing it, but we
5	are committed to getting it done within that
6	time frame.
7	THE CHAIRMAN: So you can get more fire
8	power if you need it?
9	MS. HODGES: Absolutely.
10	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any other questions?
11	B/M ALLEGRETTI: Thank you.
12	To make the full redevelopment plan
13	document, you had a target date of April 7th on
14	there. I just wanted to point out that that's
15	the week of One Spark, so earlier that week
16	might be better.
17	MR. WALLACE: That is
18	B/M ALLEGRETTI: We could be a creator
19	that day.
20	MR. WALLACE: We're already the creators.
21	I'm fully aware of that. That's on the
22	schedule.
23	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Ms. Bishop.
24	B/M BISHOP: Through the Chair, would you
25	mind repeating the specific dates that you

referenced? So we can make sure we have them down.

MR. WALLACE: Sure.

2.0

2.4

Okay. Under February, bullet point number 3, I want to make sure that it gets to the chair and you by February 28th. The last bullet point under the month of February, special meeting, February 28th, at 10 a.m., for your consideration.

Let's go to the month of March. Very first bullet, week of March 3rd. The second bullet point, week of March 10th. Third bullet point is a suggested date of March 21st. Your discretion.

That last bullet point on this page, it will be discussing the market study with me, planning team, on the week of March 24th.

That's preliminary.

That last bullet point for March, Office of General Counsel, we're going to start that as soon as we possibly can as far as getting the legislation prepared, so I'm anticipating early March on that.

For the month of April, that first bullet point, as Mr. Allegretti referenced, week of

April 7th, I hear him. April 7th, April 8th would be the preferred date to get that out, as well as making bullet point number 2 available early that week as well.

We've got to schedule a public forum. I'm suggesting the week of April 21st. We need to have adoption of the plan. I'm suggesting the week of April 28th, specifically the date of April 28th so that Ms. Hodges and her team can prepare the legislation April 30th.

Okay?

2.0

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, ma'am.

B/M BISHOP: Follow-up.

Do you think that -- what kind of comments might you expect to get out of the public forum? And if you think you're going to get a lot of things, how are you going to be able to incorporate them and us react to them in that one-week period?

MR. WALLACE: I'll tell you what I want to do, if the -- once we put it on the web, have it open to people reviewing and making comments, and -- we codify a lot of those comments hopefully on the website itself. And the public forum, we will do it as we did it on

the 5th, we'll take those particular -- that information, but I think what we are going to see in the actual document itself is -- we've been consistent in providing information, taking the information, provide it on the website, putting that into the actual plan. I don't think there's going to be any surprises for the most part for what's already been discussed and what we're going to see.

2.0

So, again -- you know, look, this is a 10-year initiative, 10- or 11-year initiative. Let's be honest, there's just some things that just can't get done in that particular 10-year initiative at that point in time and we have to make some tough, hard decisions. And that's where we are beginning to have those conversations about that CRA plan piece come February 28th.

Now, on the business investment development strategy, that is market analysis driven. Professionally, I'm not going to argue with the market analysis. The market analysis is telling you exactly what the market will make. I'm not going to argue with that. So what we have to do is set our priorities based

around what that market analysis tells us. And I think that once that is put out there, I think it's -- I don't want to say simplistic. We're not going to argue with the data. It is what it is, and that's why we're bringing the market analysis to us to drive our decision making.

2.0

So from that meeting to the actual board itself -- you know, this is a timetable that staff has set. The board may see a different particular timetable, that's fine. From a management aspect, I have to deliver on a particular time frame and this is the time frame I'm trying to deliver. I'll leave it up to the board how you want to come to some decision and what is actually finally recommended.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, ma'am.

B/M BISHOP: My only thought on that is -- my question, I guess, would be to Ms. Hodges.

Based on your experience, do you think
it's -- it can't slip, right? Because if it
slips any, we're going to get into the time
period where we start -- the City Council
starts debating the budget, which is an

1 extremely -- it's a very stressful time period 2 for them and for the mayor's office, and I would hate to see it slip. So, you know, I 3 4 guess you already answered that you have all 5 the staff that you need on that and we've just got to figure out how to make sure that we're 6 7 all willing to make sure that we roll up our sleeves and make this time frame work. 8 9 MS. HODGES: Absolutely. 10 I mean, we have so many lawyers at the 11 Office of General Counsel and I know that this 12 is a very important board for Cindy, so we will 13 make it happen. 14 B/M BISHOP: Okay. 15 THE CHAIRMAN: All good points. 16 Any other comments pertaining to that? 17 (No response.) BOARD MEMBERS: 18 Thank you, Mr. Wallace, for THE CHAIRMAN: 19 the CRA plan update. 2.0 Next you were doing interviews for new 21 staff members. Will you give us an update? 22 MR. WALLACE: Yes, sir. 23 We've gone through exhaustive interviews 2.4 for the downtown redevelopment manager, as well as for the downtown real estate analyst. 25

I want to thank our chairman, who participated, along with a member from the JCCI, as well as a member from the Civic Council, and an independent panel.

2.0

2.4

I worked hand in hand with our HR

department to screen and vet -- I didn't want

to get to the number of resumes, but getting it

down to a group of four on the downtown

redevelopment manager and letting that

particular team come in -- a similar process

that you put me through -- and study them and

go through the same process. And tomorrow I

will probably sit down with a candidate or two

on the redevelopment manager piece and I'm

going to make a decision on the downtown

redevelopment manager by the 28th of this

month.

Also, tomorrow I have final interviews for the downtown real estate analyst. Again, I thank the panel. The chairman will be part of that. I tried to bring in people that -- from the development community side, so that we have a very good understanding of their skill sets.

On the real estate analyst as well as on the redevelopment manager, I will tell you,

specifically on the real estate analyst, I have put that -- those people through case studies on the spot, things that I've had to underwrite, things that I know like the back of my hand. And based upon their answers, I'd go a different way with the actual question because I really want to understand their analytical skills. I've actually given them a case study that I want them to send back, here's a project, tear it apart, redo it. Ι already know the answer, so I know exactly what I'm looking for when I get it back. So if you come back and tell me it can be done a different way, I know that you're not the right person for us.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

So those particular two individuals that will be making forward -- I feel confident whoever it is, that it's going to be a good asset to the team itself. So, again, that particular position, I'll make an offer by February 28th. So hopefully by our March board meeting we've got some staff people here. We need them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Which will help execute this timeline.

1	MR. WALLACE: Yes, it would.
2	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Great.
3	Hemming Plaza update.
4	MR. WALLACE: Again, one proposal was
5	submitted for Hemming Plaza. I'm part of the
6	negotiating team. I'm negotiating with the P3,
7	(inaudible). We're leading the actual
8	negotiation with that group. We will bring
9	back hopefully an actual contract through the
10	Parks Department, hopefully get to a negotiated
11	agreement sometime here. When I say "soon," I
12	don't want to put a date on it, but we're
13	aggressively starting a dialogue and
14	conversation about the proposal and we'll
15	continually get into that.
16	We're going to be having weekly meetings
17	on that until we reach a hopefully we reach
18	an actual agreement on that.
19	THE CHAIRMAN: And the weekly meetings
20	would be a proposed contractor?
21	MR. WALLACE: Proposed manager for the
22	(inaudible), yes, absolutely.
23	THE CHAIRMAN: Great.
24	MR. WALLACE: Riverplace Boulevard road
25	improvements. Public Works has been engaged

with them. They have an actual project manager that they are -- within Public Works that has looked at their existing contracts and they have a consultant who is preparing a scope of services, to prepare the study, to get the cost estimates for the Riverplace Boulevard road improvements.

2.0

2.4

I've given them as much as I possibly can. We need to spring a time frame of when you're going to actually get some results and give us an actual estimated cost so they will be in a position to say to City Council, hey, the funds that are there for the South Bank, we need X amount of those funds to be allocated for this particular Riverplace Boulevard improvement itself.

Mr. Robinson is very aware of that time frame and his project manager is aware of it and they are making that consultant aware of it as well. I will get a copy of the scope of services once it is produced. And in that scope of services, it will have a schedule to producing the final study that needs to be done for the Riverplace Boulevard road improvements.

THE CHAIRMAN: Board members, that is

1	South Bank TIF money that is generating a
2	surplus and this is the City Council will be
3	looking for our guidance as to where to
4	allocate those funds, and one way to describe
5	it is a use-it-or-lose-it fund. So that's why
6	there's a deadline to place the money, to make
7	our recommendation prior to the next fiscal
8	year.
9	Okay. If there are no questions on
10	information and discussion items yes,
11	Mr. Bailey.
12	B/M BAILEY: Could we get an update on the
13	South Bank Riverwalk?
14	MR. WALLACE: I'll give that to you on
15	February 28th.
16	B/M BAILEY: So no?
17	MR. WALLACE: Since I live on the South
18	Bank, I could give you an update, but I want to
19	give you the official update from Public Works.
20	B/M BAILEY: Does anybody know?
21	MR. KLEMENT: I know that they put their
22	staging area on the North Bank and have made
23	improvements over there so you can (inaudible).
24	MR. WALLACE: I will get with Mr. Robinson
25	and get a full update and provide that for you

1	at the February 28th board meeting.
2	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Wallace.
3	Mr. Klement, you asked to come back. Is
4	there a DDRB update? I assume DDRB has met.
5	Ms. Diettrich, you have a comment?
6	MS. DIETTRICH: I do, really quickly, with
7	regard to Riverplace.
8	I'm sorry, I was outside, so I apologize
9	if I'm asking a question that was already
10	answered.
11	THE CHAIRMAN: Are you making a comment as
12	our consultant or
13	MS. DIETTRICH: Consultant.
14	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.
15	MS. DIETTRICH: With regard to the funding
16	that has been that is going to be utilized
17	for the cost for Riverplace, the results from
18	that study need to be in our hands so we can
19	incorporate the analysis and the results for
20	that area plan and the BID so it can go to
21	council for approval so the TIF dollars can be
22	utilized (inaudible) in total for that
23	(inaudible), so we have to have it to put into
24	those documents.
25	And, Mr. Wallace, I would say, if we're

going to --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

THE REPORTER: Lara, I'm sorry, can you -I cannot hear you.

(Ms. Diettrich approaches the podium.)
MS. DIETTRICH: Lara Diettrich,

consultant.

With the funding that was remaining to help with the assessment of the cost, as Mr. Wallace knows -- we've talked with Jim Robinson. Doug Skiles has been a wonderful advocate in volunteering his time to help in these discussions. I'm working with Hanson (phonetic) right now and making sure that they have everything they need to put together a very rapidly produced pro forma on what the cost of the road diet and all that would be. They understand the critical nature of delivery on this because in order for the plan to be able to immediately allocate TIFF funds to it, that -- those dollars from the CIP have to be spent on this and the results have to (inaudible) so we can put it in the plan, so it can be approved because -- it's a long story and a legal one, but CIP dollars can't be spent on TIF projects until it's been removed from

1 the list for three years and vice versa. 2 So we need for this to happen so we can 3 take the results from the study, we can put it 4 in our CRA plan, and go before council and get 5 approved, and then we can execute the TIFF 6 dollars to be used for this project. 7 And if you have any questions, I can take them off line. I just want to make sure the 8 9 immediacy of the delivery of the results is 10 paramount. Two to three weeks we've got to 11 have it. 12 THE CHAIRMAN: In two to three weeks? 13 MS. DIETTRICH: Well, if we're going to go 14 before council in April with the plans -- I mean, I have to have it in full final written 15 16 form so I can put it in the plan without having 17 to edit it very much, and Mr. Wallace knows 18 that. 19 MR. WALLACE: We're dealing with Public 2.0 Works. 21 THE CHAIRMAN: All right. So we'll get an 22 update on this at the next board meeting. 23 MR. WALLACE: (Inaudible.) 24 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. 25 Back to Mr. Klement and the DDRB Okay.

update.

1.3

2.0

2.4

MR. KLEMENT: Mr. Chairman, members of the board, briefly. We had three items come before the DDRB with respect to action items.

The first one being Mr. Langton received conceptual approval on his project and he's moving forward with the site on Forsyth Street. Levels restaurant and entertainment facility on Bay Street came through and received final approval. And the duPont/Haydon Burns library facility came through and received final approval at the February meeting.

We did have an information item that dealt with the improvements to St. James/City Hall.

They are updating the ADA compliance issues and maintenance issues, so you should be seeing that pretty soon. The entryways needed to be rebricked, refurbished and maintained, so they shared that with the board. It's more of an information item.

We have a meeting, we're putting our agenda together now for the March -- March 6th meeting, and that's where we're headed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Any questions for Mr. Klement?

B/M BISHOP: Just real quick.

2.0

Is DDRB aware of the kinds of things that are in the plan, particularly -- here's my question: In terms of approval for the Haydon Burns Library to remove the large canopies of the oak trees and put in palm trees in those spots -- and I'm not trying to open this up for debate because I know the DDRB has already approved it, but I just wonder at what point do we say, wait a minute, this is something that we found is an issue and we need to stop doing it?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ KLEMENT: If I may answer requests from the board.

The action taken, the action came to the board and we do have a standard that speaks to the type of tree and types of tree and planting and location and design of that streetscape standard. They did come in and ask for relief from that standard for two purposes. One was to maintain that curvilinear planter that was on the Forsyth Street frontage and they also asked for relief in order to replace planting and trees -- specifically in three different levels there were three trees there, if I

remember correct.

2.0

And part of the action dealt with some of the sewer lines and water lines and made one tree particularly healthy and made the others less healthy, and to get some uniformity is what they were looking for and to bring in a new replacement to those trees.

They looked at the streetscape

(inaudible), which does allow for the

(inaudible), which is kind of our (inaudible)

streetscape standard. So that's what they

received approval for, that, from the board.

THE CHAIRMAN: The changing of trees is not something required in the overlay? Is it something that was asked for by the developer?

MR. KLEMENT: Correct.

We have a streetscape standard and their action was to deviate from that standard. And as part of that deviation they included a request to offer to locate the (inaudible) palms, which are considered an upgraded palm.

I know there's been some discussion and received some from Lara and she asked a quick question, and that was the shade -- and the (inaudible) does give a shade aspect to it.

It is part of the plantings that are continued down Forsyth now, so there was an intent -- and there are oaks on the south side of Forsyth, which does provide some of that shade aspect. So those were questions asked by the board and the board members and they (inaudible) for approval.

B/M BISHOP: So I guess the point is we need to, I guess, revisit or figure out how will DDRB be enforcing, let's say, the issues in the pieces of our master plan, and are we clear enough as to what kind of things modify the overlay because that's going to be an

We like to encourage shade.

MR. KLEMENT: We --

THE CHAIRMAN:

THE CHAIRMAN: If I may, that is probably good feedback for our meeting next week. It's the kind of thing the consultant ought to hear to make sure that consistency occurs.

Mr. Wallace.

2.0

2.4

issue.

MR. WALLACE: Twofold, Mr. Chairman.

It's for your board meeting on February 28th and also for us taking a look at this in this ad hoc committee process, making sure we

address that as well.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did you have a comment

3 Mr. Bailey?

2.0

B/M BAILEY: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you done?

MR. KLEMENT: I know our board is -- we've got three or four new members on the board, and we may -- we've talked about a workshop ourselves to bring everybody up to the standards and process involved, so I think we can dovetail and maybe ask for and open up a good line of communication through Mr. Wallace and this board so that we can get appropriate communication and get everybody on the same page at the same time. We're at that point as we speak.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

All right. Old business. In case you're wondering, the CBS/DDRB appeal at DIA -- at the suggestion of OGC, they recommended we defer this. The Planning Department is reviewing whether or not the building permit that the applicant has applied for can be permitted, whether they can even get a permit to build the structure. I don't know enough about why or

1 why not that may or may not occur, but the 2 Planning Department is under review. there's really no point in us reviewing whether 3 4 or not it complies with the overlay until they 5 determine whether or not a permit can be 6 granted, and that's why it's been deferred 7 indefinitely at this time. And OGC will keep 8 us updated. 9 If no questions on that, move to Okay. new business and --10 11 MR. WALLACE: New business? 12 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. MR. WALLACE: Yes. In addition to a 13 14 couple of things I'd like to bring before the 15 board on the 28th, discussions about One Spark 16 since it's completely right around the corner. I also want to bring forward the 120 East 17 18 Forsyth Street request for historic 19 preservation trust fund, and Ms. Hodges and I 2.0 will bring forth some slight modifications to 21 the retail enhancement program so we can get it 22 filed for March 5th through council 23 legislation.

So we'll take those three items before we get into the CRA plan update and downtown

2.4

25

1	incentive policies on the 28th.
2	THE CHAIRMAN: So the proposed meeting on
3	the 28th is to address the redevelopment plan,
4	but we have these other three items you just
5	listed that we need to address that are not
6	ready for this evening, so we're going to so
7	it will be a regular board meeting with all
8	these items on the list
9	MR. WALLACE: Correct.
10	THE CHAIRMAN: including the
11	development plan discussion?
12	MR. WALLACE: Absolutely.
13	THE CHAIRMAN: And I was a bit hasty. I
14	didn't ask if there was any other old business.
15	Any other old business to bring up?
16	BOARD MEMBERS: (No response.)
17	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Great.
18	Any other new business?
19	Yes, Mr. Gibbs.
20	B/M GIBBS: The meeting on the 28th, would
21	it possibly could you possibly start at
22	9:00?
23	THE CHAIRMAN: I don't have a problem with
24	that. Does anybody have an issue with that
25	that they know of, timewise, at 9 o'clock, next

1	Friday?
2	B/M MEEKS: I'm out of town the 28th. I
3	could do it the 27th.
4	THE CHAIRMAN: Well, okay. Is that
5	B/M HARPER-WILLIAMS: I'm out of town.
6	B/M BISHOP: I'm scheduled to be out of
7	town, so
8	THE CHAIRMAN: So we will have to re-poll
9	everybody to see I think I had an issue
10	earlier in the week, but we'll figure it out in
11	the next day or two and you all will be
12	e-mailed with some suggested times.
13	MR. WALLACE: That's fine with me. I'm
14	going to be here either way. I want to make
15	sure you're here, so that's fine.
16	THE CHAIRMAN: At a minimum, we need a
17	quorum. And it's an important meeting, so we'd
18	like to have as many board members as possible.
19	Okay. Any other questions on or any
20	other new business?
21	B/M SAYLOR: I don't know if it's
22	appropriate under new business, but it is
23	business. We haven't approved our minutes from
24	the last time.
25	THE CHAIRMAN: We haven't because as

you can tell, we have a court reporter here and so the minutes are rather lengthy, very lengthy. So I think we need some guidance from -- I think we're going to need some guidance from Jason as to, you know, once these are posted, since they are verbatim, whether or not they need approval. They're not a representation of the meeting, they are verbatim, so does it not require approval by the board. Once we make that determination, then we will bring it up.

2.0

2.4

Now, if -- once they are posted and you see an error or have an issue, you're welcome to bring it up, but right now we're not certain whether or not they require approval -- board approval at a meeting. So we'll know that by the next meeting.

B/M SAYLOR: That makes sense.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. No other new business items. We are now in public comment, although the only person that has filled out this card has already spoken. Sorry, Mr. -- I'm kidding, come on up.

If anybody else wants to make a public comment, please fill out a speaker request

card.

2.0

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I will have some additional comments.

(Audience member approaches the podium.)

THE CHAIRMAN: As a reminder, you have three minutes.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: It goes by quick.

My name is John Nooney, and what I'm about to say -- it's some tough love. I mean, if anybody asks me, you know, about public access and economic opportunity downtown on our waterways, I just -- it's not happening. The public trust is being just crushed.

Now, I just want to go through a couple of little things. The South Bank Riverwalk project, you know, it hasn't even been before Waterways. And, you know, right now I want to just share with you, you know, just a couple of pictures.

Look at this, on -- you know, we're tearing all that down. Look at that spartina grass next to the Main Street Bridge. I just noticed it, next to MOSH. What a potential kayak launch.

Okay. I just want to go through a few of

these things. You know, I'm going down to the Duval County School Board. There's a potential kayak launch next to the Duval County School Board and the JEA site. And I've been going to the Commission for years. The only reason I'm here is because they advised me to come here. That's really it.

2.0

2.4

And I want to share something else with you. This was the Jacksonville Waterways

Commission, you know, the agenda, and item number 3, the blueway designation request for the St. Johns River Alliance. The executive director was a no-show. Eleven other counties signed a resolution of support for that designation. We're talking about the DEP, federal agencies, you know, the Greenways and Trails Commission. And we -- Duval County did not take a lead in that action.

So going forward, you know, especially downtown on our waterways -- I can't begin to tell you how I hope that we're going to open up these nodes of activity for everybody to participate.

And also keep in mind 2007-451. It's a piece of legislation that allowed anyone the

opportunity to participate on City-owned waterway docks. And now with the expansion of a three-mile waterway zone, if you don't open these waterways to anyone -- and if they fail or succeed, just allow the opportunity to participate. And I just plead with you because there's 67 counties in Florida, and it's an embarrassment when I go outside and share with them why we can't access our waterways.

2.0

2.4

And just -- let me just finish. When you watch morning, evening news, any TV station, they show you our river downtown and it's empty, that's why. It's nothing to be proud about.

So anyway -- one other thing. The artificial reef trust fund, 2009-442, you know what, go talk to the (inaudible) guys. How about the two (inaudible) reefs out in the Fuller Warren Bridge, take an IOU. You know, just like that. You know, public/private partnership, I'm still trying to figure that one out.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. NOONEY: Thank you for listening.

THE CHAIRMAN: Appreciate your comments.

1	B/M BAILEY: There's no way to ask this
2	and have it come out right, but who recommended
3	you come to the DIA?
4	MR. NOONEY: Who?
5	B/M BAILEY: Waterways or
6	MR. NOONEY: No. The commissioners of the
7	Florida Inland Navigation District, and the
8	reason was is I really want to be a
9	cheerleader downtown.
10	B/M BAILEY: That's all I wanted to
11	MR. NOONEY: Yeah, it was them because
12	all they said is you need a sponsor.
13	B/M BAILEY: That's all I need.
14	MR. NOONEY: Yeah. That's why we go to
15	the school board because maybe somebody has
16	got to say yes.
17	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Nooney.
18	Mr. Fouracker.
19	AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes. I just have one
20	quick comment on Hemming Plaza.
21	Totally unsolicited, the director of the
22	North Florida Land Trust mentioned to me over
23	lunch last week that they were very, very much
24	in objection to removing the oak trees in
25	Hemming Plaza, so I think maybe someone, if

```
1
        it's necessary to remove them, needs to
 2
        communicate with the Land Trust and see, you
 3
        know, why they object perhaps.
             Thank you.
 4
 5
                             Is that a recommendation?
             THE CHAIRMAN:
 6
             AUDIENCE MEMBER:
                                 Recommendation, yeah.
 7
             THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Thank you,
 8
        Mr. Fouracker.
 9
             There are no other speaker request cards
10
        filled out, so at this time I'd like to
11
        adjourn.
12
             Thank you all.
13
              (The above proceedings were adjourned at
14
        6:36 p.m.)
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
1
                         CERTIFICATE
 2
 3
    STATE OF FLORIDA)
    COUNTY OF DUVAL )
 4
 5
 6
              I, Diane M. Tropia, Court Reporter, certify
 7
 8
    that I was authorized to and did stenographically report
 9
    the foregoing proceedings and that the transcript is a
10
    true and complete record of my stenographic notes.
11
12
13
14
              DATED this 1st day of March 2014.
15
16
17
                    Diane M. Tropia
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

Piang M. Tropia, Inc., P.O. Box 2375. lacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300