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```
February 20, 2019 2:14 p.m.
    THE CHAIRMAN: We start the Downtown
    Investment Authority board meeting. Has
    everyone had an opportunity to review the
    minutes?
    BOARD MEMBERS: Yes.
    THE CHAIRMAN: So --
    BOARD MEMBER GREY: Make a motion to
    approve.
    THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
    BOARD MEMBER BARAKAT: Second.
    THE CHAIRMAN: Properly moved and
    seconded.
    Any further discussion?
    BOARD MEMBERS: (No response.)
    THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor, please
    signify by saying aye.
    BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
    THE CHAIRMAN: Any opposition by like
    sign.
    BOARD MEMBERS: (No response.)
    THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. It's unanimous.
    We can move on to Resolution 2019-02-02,
    Ambassador Hotel Allocation.
```
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Mr. Parola.
MR. PAROLA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
As the preceding, there's a location map both in the agenda packet and -- and on the screen are the -- the allocation that -- the allocation corresponds with the redevelopment agreement that the City just approved and DIA approved a while ago for the redevelopment of the Ambassador Hotel and the block that it sits on.

When it went through, it was moving at a relatively fast pace. You recall Aundra's last board meeting, a lot of items came through, so this was kind of running a little behind it.

I'll explain a little bit of what the allocation does because $I$ think it sets the stage for the next resolution and why we're doing it.

The development plan is for 227 multifamily units, a 110-room hotel, and 15,000 square feet of office, as well as accessory. Because the component areas of the DRI run short on residential, we've converted an existing office building on the site to residential. That equated to 90 units. So 90
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of their 227 multifamily units are accommodated by existing development rights on the property, leaving an allocation of 137 multifamily units.

The hotel is preexisting and has been in existence since it was converted from a residential building, $I$ think, in the '30s or '40s. So that did not require an allocation of development rights. It exists simply because it's historically been a hotel.

And then we're adding 15,000 square feet of office to accommodate -- I believe they've mentioned about having a not-for-profit on the ground floor, some sort of ground floor activation, as well as if they have a gym or office or anything like that.

So the map and -- has kind of what we're doing on there, a summary of it, and I'm here to answer any questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Parola.
Mr. Moody, any questions?
BOARD MEMBER MOODY: I have no questions.
I think previously we got very comfortable with this development, and $I$ just think we need to see it through.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ms. Worsham.

BOARD MEMBER WORSHAM: I don't have any questions on the actual disposition and the reallocation. I just think, as you mentioned, this is a great case study for what we're about to talk about with the abandonment of the DRI and some other issue that we need to revisit on the DRI. So I think this sets the stage nicely for all the things that you have to do to allow this development that we all want to happen. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr. Grey.

BOARD MEMBER GREY: Nothing at this time. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Barakat.

BOARD MEMBER BARAKAT: To Mr. Parola. You usually provide us a chart of the various uses and what's being taken and what's remaining. Are you not doing that this time because of the next agenda item, and that would make that chart irrelevant?

MR. PAROLA: Through the Chair, I believe I included a chart on the back of the memorandum that accompanied this resolution. BOARD MEMBER GREY: (Indicating.)

BOARD MEMBER BARAKAT: Is that in the packet?
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BOARD MEMBER GREY: Yeah.
MR. PAROLA: But just kind of for the record, after this allocation there will be 455 units of Phase I multifamily development rights for this area and \(1,763,508\) square feet of office, post allocation.
BOARD MEMBER BARAKAT: Okay. Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Froats.
BOARD MEMBER FROATS: No questions.
THE CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion from any board members?
BOARD MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Any public comments?
AUDIENCE MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Can we get a motion, please?
BOARD MEMBER WORSHAM: I'll move to approve.
BOARD MEMBER FROATS: Second.
THE CHAIRMAN: Properly moved and seconded.
All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.
BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
THE CHAIRMAN: Any opposition like sign.
```

BOARD MEMBERS: (No response.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

We can move on to the next agenda item, which is 2019-02-03.

Mr. Parola.

MR. PAROLA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
There's a PowerPoint slide. It's going to kind of summarize what I'm talking about for this resolution.

This resolution involves the DRI, as you know; you've read it. And if you will allow me, I'm going to kind of just read from my notes here so that I'm more succinct in where I'm going with this.

The DRI essentially has served its purpose since the three downtown DRIs were consolidated in 1992. It served the development community well, and we think whatever comes after the DRI we can continue to serve the development community because we essentially exempt them from concurrency and mobility fees, at least for the time being.

However, the development order is -- it's antiquated. The uses are, as we've seen from the last resolution, compartmentalized into
office, government, institutional, retail, multifamily, and they don't reflect how downtown is developing.

And I'll get a little kind of etherial
here. In the 1990 s -- and downtowns were going to be the places where there were offices. So when you saw, even in Miami or other places where the communities adopted a downtown DRI, they stacked them with offices. That's not what we're seeing right now, thankfully. What we're seeing is a resurgence in downtown, people wanting to live downtown, and a need for more residential units inside of the DRI, more retail inside of the DRI, and a development order that isn't so antiquated.

As a way of example -- by means of example, if you will, some of the conditions in the DRI still reflect the time when cars were burning leaded gasoline and we were a non-attainment area.

You will recall that there are conditions inside of the development order that relate back to when we had to come in here and test our cars for emissions. Those days are gone. So we not only have an imbalance in the
entitlements, we have a development order that addresses things that don't need to be addressed and doesn't address things that need to be addressed.

So how do we correct this? Well, the City is very fortunate in that Bill Killingsworth, the director of Planning, was also at the Department of Economic Opportunity as, I think, the division chief of Community Development. And between Mr. Killingsworth, myself, some people in OGC, we came up with a -- kind of a strategy to guide a consultant into rectifying these issues.

The first one is to abandon the DRI. This corresponds with the way the State has been going for quite sometime now. DRIs are a thing of the past. The City of Jacksonville hasn't been required to have a DRI since it was classified as a dense urban land area, I'm going to call it eight years ago. So there's no need to keep the DRI just as a tool anymore. It's just antiquated.

But we don't want to throw out all the development rights we have. The reason we don't want to throw out those vested rights is
because they had value. They make us competitive against the suburban landscape because, when you come to downtown, if you use our Phase I development rights, and whatever they become -- again, you don't have to pay into the mobility plan. So there's already a built-in incentive to develop downtown.

Once you lose the development order of the DRI, you have to say, what is the next -what's the teeth that allows you to develop downtown the way we want to see it? And that falls back to the Comprehensive Plan and the Land Development Regulations. So you'll see in the scope of services attached to the resolution that Task 1 and Task 2 address abandoning the DRI while continuing to maintain the vested development rights as a tool for DIA, amending the Comp $P$ lan and the Land Development Code to acknowledge that, and also give us some other teeth, and then the Mobility Plan.

We feel that all roads,
transportation-wise, are going to lead to the Mobility Plan, and staff agrees that that should be the tool. We think this is going to
be a 6- to 9-month process. Probably a 9-month process. It will go back through the State. It will go locally. It will see City Council. It will see the administration. And in some form or fashion it will see both this body and DDRB again.

So what we're asking is the ability to go through the Procurement Division to issue an RFP for the scope of services attached to this resolution and go forth.

Frankly, there are questions that we don't know, we need to ask, until we get a consultant digging into this.

Also, in the resolution we're asking this body to grant the chairman two powers. The first power is to appoint a member of the board to sit on the selection panel. The second one is to authorize Mr. Hughes, or whoever is the CEO, if we have one after -- to not only sit on the board but execute any documents, contracts relating to the RFP.

I'm happy to answer any questions, and I apologize if that was long-winded.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Parola.
Mr. Froats.

BOARD MEMBER FROATS: So during that 9-month phase, do we have enough rights in there? Like, do we run the risk of running out of anything?

MR. PAROLA: Through the Chair, there are tools within the DRI that allow us to convert rights. We have also worked with the Planning Department and the General Counsel to have a policy that -- we have a lot of older buildings in town, that their development rights predate the DRI. By way of example, we converted office space on the Ambassador Hotel property to residential and then backfilled that lost office space with more office space because we have 1.7 million square feet of it, not a lot of residential. So there are tools.

We also submitted to the Planning Department yesterday -- and were told that we're good to go on it -- an extension of the Phase I development time frame, which was supposed to be November 29th of this year. We requested to take advantage of an executive order that's going to extend the development up through 2021. So we feel we've put in place enough protection that we can see this through.

BOARD MEMBER FROATS: Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Froats.
Mr. Barakat.
BOARD MEMBER BARAKAT: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

To Mr. Parola, so what we're deciding today is to agree to hire a -- excuse me -- to send out an RFP for a consultant, and then the consultant will make recommendations back to this board within that 6- to 9-month period. And until such time the development order downtown will be status quo?

MR. PAROLA: Through the Chair, that is correct.

BOARD MEMBER BARAKAT: And I don't know if
you mentioned this, but the DRI has been
antiquated for sometime. Why are we doing this
now versus two years ago or two years from now?
MR. PAROLA: Through the Chair, I think
Mr. Hughes has it right. I mean, just the volume. We've been extremely busy. As you recall, when I -- when I first interviewed for this job one of the things right out of the gate was, we need to get rid of the DRI.

As we dove into it, we said, well, let's
not do the baby in the bath water. It served us quite well, but we're just at that precipitous where right now is about a good a time as any.

BOARD MEMBER BARAKAT: And last question. Will the consultant, whoever they may be, will they be prescribing what new mandate may be among the uses? In other words, the DRI today kind of governs what uses we have in the tank, so to speak. What would -- and maybe you explained this and I didn't get it, but what would be the new methodology to help us govern what capacity we have for uses going forward? MR. PAROLA: Through the Chair, at the risk of poisoning any creative solutions out there, our end game is to convert those development rights into a credit of some sort, whether it's a Mobility Fee credit or something else, where that's agnostic to the use, where it's straight vehicle miles. And then as we apply those credits either to incentivize a project or get a project through, we're not beholden to a stagnant compartmentalization of those rights.

BOARD MEMBER BARAKAT: So determining the
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level of certain uses in the future will be --
the trips aside and the traffic implications
generated from uses, that will be governed on a
case-by-case basis by this board and by the
land use codes?
    MR. PAROLA: The assignment of the
development rights will be up to this board;
development rights as, you know, vehicle mile
trips, so however that comes out.
    But we're not going to reinvent the
Mobility Plan. That has a transportation
methodology in it, and we'll just use that.
    The mobility plan already acknowledges
that there's a downtown, and the trip
allocation and the theoretical mobility fees
have already been calculated into it, so
thankfully that wheel has been invented. We're
just trying to slip into it the best way we
can.
    BOARD MEMBER BARAKAT: Thank you.
        MR. PAROLA: You're very welcome.
        THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Barakat.
        Mr. Grey.
        BOARD MEMBER GREY: Through the Chair,
just one quick question. And we're going to
```

RFP, but our intent is to see if we can get some more flexibility from the consultant on the DRI; is that correct?

MR. PAROLA: Through the Chair,
absolutely.
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Grey.
Ms. Worsham.

BOARD MEMBER WORSHAM: Well, first of all,
I commend you for taking on this task. This is
going to be a long process. And I think getting the right consultant on board is going to be critical. And just the exercises that, obviously, you all have been going through on reallocating these units over the last many years have shown us that it's time for us to revisit this.

And through the Chair, to Oliver's question, some of the uses, of course, that we have in the DRI are governed by the master plan and the different districts that have uses allocated within those, and it probably will relate back to the effort that Councilwoman Boyer is doing on the redevelopment rights.

So I think it's absolutely the right thing to do, and I'm very pleased that you have
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incorporated the skill set of Mr. Killingsworth and the Planning Department. I think this is a huge undertaking and it's time to do it. So carry on and good luck. I mean, I know we'll all be watching and helping the consultant along and putting input, but it's a task that needs to be done.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms. Worsham. Mr. Moody.

BOARD MEMBER MOODY: Just one question, Mr. Parola. Do you expect to find this consultant on a local, regional area, or do you think we'll have to go far and wide for a consultant?

MR. PAROLA: Through the Chair, I
genuinely don't know the answer to that. I feel -- let me answer it this way: Anytime you deal with something like this, there's probably a melding of the two. Fortunately, most states are comprehensive plan states, so it's not unknown. Fortunately, most states have some requirement that mimics the DRI. So Florida is in its own special snowflake, but, you know, I don't know.

BOARD MEMBER BARAKAT: Just a follow-up to that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure.
BOARD MEMBER BARAKAT: Is this something
the DIA will be paying for?
MR. PAROLA: Through the Chair, yes, sir.
And to just build on that, that's why
our -- it's stated in the scope, is these rights are to go back to us for our use. "Our use" being the board, obviously.

BOARD MEMBER BARAKAT: Is this something already budgeted or do we have discretion within a line item?

MR. PAROLA: Through the Chair, we contemplated it in this year's budget.

BOARD MEMBER BARAKAT: Okay. Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Anyone else?
BOARD MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Can we get a motion, please?

BOARD MEMBER WORSHAM: I'll move to approve.

BOARD MEMBER BARAKAT: I'll second.
THE CHAIRMAN: Properly moved and seconded.

Do you think nine months would be long enough?
(No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Any public comments, please?

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Hearing none, seeing none, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
THE CHAIRMAN: Any opposition by like sign.

BOARD MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
We have a presentation next, Art in Public
Places, design phase of the DIA Urban Arts Project, Phase II.

MR. HUGHES: The presentation folks, I think, thought they would be further along to make the presentation and didn't get there, so that's a pass.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.
MR. HUGHES: We'll bring them back at a future date.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then we'll move on to the CEO's report.

MR. HUGHES: Thank you, board members,

Mr. Chairman.
In the packet there are a couple of items that -- there are three things that I'd like to talk to you about. On the first one there are two things in the packet. There's a copy of what was an unsolicited response to the RFP that dealt with the convention center and there's a memo from me.

And the purpose of both of these, before I sort of talk through the memo a little bit, is just that $I$ think you all may have been asked out in the world as DIA folks, and the administration and others have been asked, since the board decided to focus on the other supplemental development that was sort of advised could help the success of the convention center, if that's off the table, what's happening with the parcels that were part of that RFP. And obviously, we had a very explosive moment that has sort of contributed to that question, and now we actually are about to have parcels that are blank slates as they finish that up.

So I wanted to, in this meeting -- I don't
know that it's an action item, but $I$ wanted to
talk through -- the memo and the attached document are there to remind you, you know, that that discussion happened and some of the potential things you could consider perhaps at the next meeting or thereafter as far as options or directions that you might consider heading. So with your willingness, I'll just sort of talk through the memo.

Obviously, the history is simple enough to recollect. The board endeavored an RFP process to learn more. Ultimately, in conjunction with the chairman's communication with the mayor, the decision was made to hold, and the demolition is completed and -- well, almost completed, but obviously some big components of it were there.

The options -- essentially, there's three directions to head. One would be status quo, make ultimately no change. One would be to allow the unsolicited proposal that came in to be considered, and that would trigger a process, or the potential would be for some model of going out to the world and seeing what other uses those parcels could be -- you know, could have, and what the proposals might be for
what that could look like. Whether that's a formal RFP or something less than that, again, would all be the discretion of the board.

To that end, the second area -- the first area of the pathway, as the memo outlines, relates to the unsolicited document that came in. The second pathway, as I said, you could have a request for information. You would ultimately have a lot of the same triggers as an RFP built in to that, but it would really allow people to think creatively, make us an offer of possibilities, and perhaps lead the board in a direction to something else being there or those parcels being used for something other than what the original thought was when we talked about a convention center.

I don't know. I mean, I could go on, but the memo is there for you to think about. The reason $I$ thought there was no action item is that has more details for you about what those pathways would look like.

And again, you may come back next month and not want to do anything, but at least in between now and then perhaps consider it, think about the best and highest use, and if there's
some other pathway to take. And staff will be ready to answer any questions either now or between now and that meeting about what that could look like.

Are there any questions or anything related to that?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Demolition should be done, excavation, everything, by when?

MR. HUGHES: I think we're saying April or May.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER WORSHAM: Just a question.

At this point, we don't have any other interested parties that were -- I mean, there was a confidential -- just a question.

MR. HUGHES: The only public response or the only thing that's been responded to was what came in during the convention center time frame. There's nothing formal, but $I$ would -some of the questions that have come are people asking what now and some of the what now questioners are folks that are in the development community and elsewhere.

Yes, sir.

BOARD MEMBER MOODY: Brian, obviously, if
we -- timewise, if we look at this now, we would speed the process up, but -- certainly that would be an advantage, but are there any other major disadvantages to kind of zeroing in on this current plan?

MR. HUGHES: The current plan being the unsolicited --

BOARD MEMBER MOODY: Yes.

MR. HUGHES: -- as the trigger?

Well, yes. The 45-day trigger would be there, so it would -- there would be a speed to it. Ultimately, because of that process, I would just say the disadvantage is not having the ability to -- or having a reduced time frame for people to contemplate what the other potential uses are.

BOARD MEMBER MOODY: Okay. I think Oliver probably has a lot more information on this than most of us.

Didn't you analyze all the scenarios?

BOARD MEMBER BARAKAT: As it related to the convention center process?

BOARD MEMBER MOODY: Yes. I should say, did you analyze the unsolicited offer?

BOARD MEMBER BARAKAT: No. It was not
part of the scope.
BOARD MEMBER MOODY: Okay.

BOARD MEMBER BARAKAT: It was particularly pertaining to the convention center project, although this is the same group, I believe, that -- or a version of this group did propose the convention center project.

BOARD MEMBER MOODY: The one thing that really stood out to me, it was certainly a mixed-use development, which is absolutely what we need there, including residential, retail, hotel, restaurants, marina. I mean, it kind of does it all.

And I'm curious, in this particular setup, how would we price the land? Would that be based on an appraisal or --

MR. HUGHES: Well, I think we could certainly get appraisal value of the parcels as they stand, you know, as they will be represented post-demo. There's obviously a parcel that was in consideration of this that there's a right of first refusal out there on, but the -- $I$ think, not unlike the convention center process, you know, we would be looking to prospective -- to those interested parties
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to consider what they see and how they would incorporate that into the entire development agreement, but we could get -- we could contemplate that there would be an appraisal and --

BOARD MEMBER MOODY: Because it looked to me like the two companies that were involved in this are pretty big, heavy hitters. So they're not rookies in the process.

It looks to me, too, like if we were absolutely sure that we could sell the land at a price that is reasonable and competitive in the marketplace, and also if this accomplishes what we need there -- and we've talked about it for a long time -- that is mixed-use to provide the support for future developments, such as a convention center, then it would be nice to -timewise, it would be nice to start focusing on this unsolicited offer.

MR. HUGHES: Well, I serve at the pleasure of the board. My suggestion, for what -- or thought, for what it was worth, was the idea of just sort of reminding you what had been a part of the previous discussion and contemplating a next meeting board action. I don't think the
additional month to sort of contemplate it individually and thinking about the different ideas you may have or may have heard, you know, are worthwhile to think about prior to acting, but --

BOARD MEMBER BARAKAT: If I may,
Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure.
BOARD MEMBER BARAKAT: I think we have a Strategic Implementation Committee meeting next week.

THE CHAIRMAN: You do.
BOARD MEMBER MOODY: We do.
BOARD MEMBER BARAKAT: I don't know what's on the agenda, but, you know, putting this proposal aside, I would love to hear from board members, clean slate, what would be preferred uses on that property.

When we say "mixed-use," I agree, but
that's kind of a vague term. You know, your definition of "mixed-use" may be different than mine. Do we prescribe any requirements for greenspace or not? You know, we could decide not to. Do we discuss storm resiliency? Or just let the developer and their lender
determine storm resiliency? Do we make any requirements for integration with the storefronts along Bay Street or not?

I mean, maybe we require nothing, but I think -- I think the community looks to this board to at least have that discussion. This is probably one of the more important pieces of property that the City owns (inaudible) downtown that $I$ suggest we have that conversation. And if it makes sense to have it at next week's meeting, let's have it as an agenda item and get some input from board members, and maybe we determine this is right in line with our expectations or not, and then we determine the strategy moving forward. BOARD MEMBER MOODY: Good idea.

MR. HUGHES: I think we'll go ahead, then, with -- and have that as an agenda item for the committee.

BOARD MEMBER BARAKAT: Great.

MR. HUGHES: Okay. The second item -BOARD MEMBER FROATS: Question -MR. HUGHES: Yes, sir. BOARD MEMBER FROATS: -- for Mr. Parola. So if we issue a Notice of Disposition,
what's the process for that? And what happens if we don't get any responses that we really like?

MR. PAROLA: Through the Chair, in broad strokes, we do what we did for the shipyards. We would come here and we would ask the board's permission to issue a Notice of Disposition. We put the notice out there with the scope attached to it. It would come back.

Unlike RFPs where the Procurement Division plays a larger selection role, a validation role, this body would actually be the -- as the CRA, the selection panel.

You know, timing-wise, as Mr. Hughes kind of alluded to earlier, it's between -- anything after 30 days, longer than 30 days, response time.

Because of the value of the property, I'm going to make a guess here, it's more than $\$ 25,000$. All the roads will lead back to the legislative process.

I don't know if I'm -- it's hard to pin-point a time frame on it, but --

BOARD MEMBER FROATS: The question is, if we get five responses and we don't like any of
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them, do we have to sell it to somebody?
MR. PAROLA: Through the Chair, no.
You're not required to, but let me say this: If there's that risk or if there's that kind of thought, even ever so slight hanging out there, then maybe the request for information is something that the board considers because it comes with no expectation that it's going to lead to an agreement. It's, you know, more of a -- I wouldn't say fishing expedition, but it's asking the marketplace to kind of guide us on a future notice.

BOARD MEMBER FROATS: I can only imagine what that would turn into.

Can you put stipulations on it? Can you say, you know, a minimum investment of $X$ ?

MR. PAROLA: Through the Chair, I'm sure you can, but, again, $I$ think the request for information is supposed to be so -- kind of open, that there's no expectation on a person responding to it to put that much level of energy into giving you a proposal.

It's a lot of energy and a lot of cost to give a sincere proposal and to go through the exercise. If it's a request for information, I
don't think you're going to get anything useful out of it.

BOARD MEMBER FROATS: I agree with that.
Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Any other questions on this point?

BOARD MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
MR. HUGHES: The second item that's in your packet, again, $I$ won't -- it's there to read. It's simply the final version of what was the search information package put together by our search -- by the search firm. It looks like that, (indicating), which came -- if it's not there -- do you have them?

BOARD MEMBERS: Yes.
MR. HUGHES: Some have them, some don't?
All right. It came -- the search firm, Jorgensen, had its principal in town. Several of you had the opportunity to meet in person. And those, I think, with scheduling conflicts had individual phone calls. I hope that's accurate. That was the goal.

There were changes and ideas incorporated, I think, from several different members after
those conversations, and $I$ think our search professional has a good idea of the marketplace out there.

The latest update would be, with this information in hand, he's begun the process of searching. And $I$ think again next month, $I$ think we'll have a more formal report for you about what the next steps are going to be on what the pool is shaping up to look like, but I've -- given the timeline from when he came here to today, $I$ think it was appropriate to allow another four extra weeks for him to go out into the universe of possibilities. And I just wanted to at least give you the update of the document and send good vibes into the universe for a successful search.

Finally, for my report, it pertains to a staff member; Tom Daly, who is seated to the left, has accepted a position with the City as the chief of Housing in our Neighborhoods Department. It will be a loss for DIA, but we're happy -- with my other hat on, the City is very happy to have this slot filled in Neighborhoods. Obviously, there's a couple more steps he's got to go through because it's
a chief level position, but we anticipate no hiccups in that process.

So I'll let you sort of give more than that, but $I$ wanted to offer you the floor, with the indulgence of the Chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: Please.
MR. DALY: Thank you again, with the indulgence of the Chair.

It's been a great opportunity. I've enjoyed working with the DIA. It's been a wonderful experience. This is an opportunity that came about -- I think the chief's position has been open since the beginning of October last year. I had a couple of conversations with the director of Neighborhoods. We went to the same law school. Before coming to law school, I had a 14-year career in affordable housing. So this comes right back in my wheelhouse. So it's a great opportunity for me. To be honest, $I$ kind of hit a wall, $I$ was not going to advance at DIA any further, I was not going to be the CEO, nor did I want to be the CEO of DIA. Although it was interesting, because apparently LinkedIn --
(Simultaneous speaking.)
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MR. DALY: But it's a great opportunity, and I'm not going far, I'll be in this building. I'll be available to Brian and Guy, as needed. Jackie, our accountant, is capable hands for all the day-to-day financial stuff. So I'm not leaving DIA in a lurch, but I am moving on to a bigger opportunity.

BOARD MEMBER WORSHAM: Congratulations.
MR. HUGHES: And to finalize the report, I would just add to that, that Mr. Parola and I have talked, and it will be our desire, unless information shows otherwise, to steal Tom if we need him for an hour here or there, but to continue without the position. With the potential of a new CEO not that far off in the horizon, our goal would be to give that new leader the opportunity to work with all of you when he or she is selected and make an assessment of his or her organizational chart and how to work on that.

So with that, I'll conclude my CEO report.
THE CHAIRMAN: Tom, I know I speak for the board in saying that we certainly appreciate all the work you've done for the DIA and we're glad that you're not going far away. So thank
you for your service.
Anyone else?

BOARD MEMBER WORSHAM: Congratulations.
BOARD MEMBER BARAKAT: I'll say, you know, the community raid continues. The remaining DIA employees are not allowed to talk to anybody of any importance.

Thank you, Tom. Your role has been critical to the negotiations and supporting Aundra and all the deals that he did, and I know a lot of the creativity on the financial side has been, in part, by your efforts, so you had a really important role in everything the DIA has done since its inception, so we'll be saddened by you moving on, but congratulations.

But just an overall management comment, you know, losing Aundra and now not having Tom, it's going to put more pressure on the remaining troops, and so $I$ think it places more importance on getting that new CEO on board. I don't think it makes sense to hire the next Tom before our CEO comes on board.

So in the interim, I understand, Tom, you will be helping us run numbers, I assume, when we need you.
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The other issue, $I$ think you were responsible for what was really critical to, you know, the long-term integrity of this organization, and that is compliance. So we've approved a lot of deals in the last five years. I think, Tom, your responsibility was compliance. So I just want to make sure that that void is met while you're gone and while your position remains unfilled for an undetermined period of time.

So I'll let you synthesize that, let you designate somebody be in charge with compliance of prenegotiated transactions.

MR. HUGHES: Yes, sir.
Mr. Chairman, it's a fair point and it's one -- I will be prepared at the next meeting to sort of put more meat on the bone about, internally, what -- how we'll structure it so that you all have a level of comfort and -- for your board responsibilities. Understood.

BOARD MEMBER BARAKAT: Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you again, Tom.
The next item is the DDRB briefing.
MR. KLEMENT: Mr. Chairman, members of the board, very briefly, we met February $14 t h$ and
approved the VyStar building identification signs, and we also had a presentation by the Art in Public Places to bring our attention to Phase II, and the board supported their -actually, the program, and had a recommendation to approve. And they presented three of the artists. They were still working on the fourth artist to bring completion to their total program. We will meet again February -- excuse me, March $14 t h$, next month, and we're putting our agenda together.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Any questions for Mr. Klement?

BOARD MEMBERS: (No response.)

THE CHAIRMAN: None?

Next item on the agenda is old business.
Does anyone have old business?

BOARD MEMBERS: (No response.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Anyone have new business to bring before the board?

BOARD MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: I have no cards for public comment.

Yes.

BOARD MEMBER FROATS: Just a comment.

I'll do a plug for the Friends of Hemming Park. They're doing a lot of good things there. And I just found out in the last meeting they're doing a walk every Tuesday and Thursday at 11:30 in the morning. It's open to the public. You can go downtown and meet at Hemming Park. You can go for a half-hour walk, a guided tour of downtown. So just a little shameless plug for the Friends of Hemming Park. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any other new business? BOARD MEMBERS: (No response.)

THE CHAIRMAN: I have no cards for public comments.

Seeing none, this meeting is adjourned. (The above proceedings were adjourned at 2:55 p.m.)
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| $\begin{gathered} \text { land }[4]-9: 19,15: 5, \\ 25: 15,26: 11 \end{gathered}$ |  | met [2] - 36:8, 36:25 methodology [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & 11: 12,13: 24,25: 11, \\ & 26: 14,34: 13,35: 25 \end{aligned}$ | Oliver's [1] - 16:17 once [1] - 10:8 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Land }_{[2]}-10: 13, \\ & 10: 18 \end{aligned}$ |  | 4:12, 15:12 | needed [1] - 34:4 | once [1]-10:8 <br> one [12]-9:14, 11:17, |
|  |  |  | needs [1] - 17:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:19, 13:23, 15:25, } \\ & \text { 17:10, 20:4, 21:18, } \end{aligned}$ |
| Large [1]-1:10 | mayor [1]-21:12 | mile [1] - 15 | Neighborho | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 19,25: 8,28: 7, \\ & 36: 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| larger $[1]-29: 11$ | mean [6] - 13:20, | miles [1] - 14:20 | 32:20, 32:24, 33:15 |  |
| last $[7]-3: 12,7$ | 22:17, 23:14, 25:12, | million [1] - 12:1 | new [7] - 14:7, 14:1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { open [3]-30:20, } \\ 33: 13,38: 5 \end{gathered}$ <br> opportunity [8] - 2:5, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 14: 5,16: 14,33: 14 \\ & 36: 5,38: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $28$ | $\text { mimics }[1]-17: 2$ | $34: 15,34: 16,35: 20,$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { latest }[1]-32: 4 \\ & \text { law }[2]-33: 16 \\ & \text { lead }[4]-10: 23,22: 12, \\ & 29: 20,30: 9 \end{aligned}$ | [1] - 36 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 31: 20,33: 9,33: 11, \\ & 33: 19,34: 1,34: 7, \\ & 34: 17 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | meet [3]-31:20, 37:9, | [1] | 9, 19: |  |
|  | 38:6 | mixed [4] - 25 | :22, 26:2 |  |
|  | MEETING ${ }_{[1]}-1: 3$ | 2 | 8:11, 32 | Opportunity ${ }_{[1]}-9: 8$ opposition [3]-2:20, |
| leaded [1] - 8:19 | meetin | mix | 8, 35:21, 36:16 |  |
|  |  |  | -20:17, 20.18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6:25, 19:9 } \\ & \text { options [2]-21:6, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { learn }[1]-21: 11 \\ & \text { least }[4]-7: 21,22: 23, \\ & 28: 6,32: 14 \end{aligned}$ | 23:3, 26:25, 27:10 | mob | ce [2] - 26:17, 26:18 |  |
|  | :11, 36:16, 3 | , | cely [1] - 5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { options [2]-21:6, } \\ & 21: 17 \\ & \text { order }[7]-7: 23,8: 15, \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 38:15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mobility }[4]-10: 20, \\ & 10: 24,14: 18,15: 11 \end{aligned}$ | non [1] - 8:20 <br> non-attainment [1] - |  |
| leaving [2] - 4:3, 34:6 | melding [1] - |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { order }[7]-7: 23,8: 15, \\ 8: 22,9: 1,10: 8, \end{gathered}$ |
| left [1] - 32:19 | member [2]-11 | model ${ }_{[1]}-21: 23$ |  | $12: 23,13: 11$ |
| legislative [1] - 29:21 | 32:18 | moment [1] - 20:20 | 8:2 | organization [1] - 36:4 |
| lender ${ }_{[1]}-27: 25$ | M | month [4]-22:22, | one [4]-19:6, 37:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { organizational }_{[1]}- \\ & 34: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| 22 | 2:12, 4:21, 5:1, 5:12, | :1, 32:6, 37:10 | 38:15 |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { level }[4]-15: 1,30: 21, \\ 33: 1,36: 19 \end{gathered}$ | 6:7, 6:9, 6:17, 6:19, | months [1] - 18:25 <br> moody [2] - 4:20, 17:9 |  | original [1]-22:15 <br> otherwise $[1]$ - 34:12 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| line $[2]-18: 12,28: 14$ | 12:1, 13:1, 13:4, | MOODY ${ }_{[12]}-1: 13$, | $4: 12$ | outlines [1] - 22:5 <br> overall ${ }_{[1]}$ - 35:16 <br> own [1] - 17:23 <br> owns [1] - 28:8 |
| Linkedln ${ }_{[1]}$ - 33 | 13:15, 14:5, 14:25, | 4:21, 17:10, 23:25, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Notary [1] - 1:9 } \\ & \text { notes [2] - 7:13, 39:11 } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| live ${ }_{[1]}$ - $8: 12$ | 15:20, 15:24, 16:8, | 24:8, 24:17, 24:23, |  |  |
| local ${ }_{[1]}-17: 12$ | :10, 17:25, 18:3 | $\begin{aligned} & 25: 2,25: 8,26: 6, \\ & 27: 13,28: 16 \end{aligned}$ | notes [2] - 7:13, 39:11 <br> nothing [3]-5:12, |  |
| locally $[1]$ - 11:3 location [1] - 3:3 | 18:22, 23:12, 23:25, |  | nothing [3] - 5:12, $23: 19,28: 4$ | owns [1]-28:8 |
|  |  | morning [1] - 38:5 | Notice [2]-28:25, | $\mathbf{P}$ |
| long-term [1] - 36:3 | 24:8, 24:17, 24:21, $24: 23,24: 25,25: 2,$ | most [3] - 17:19, |  |  |
| long-winded ${ }^{[1]}$ - 11:23 | 24:23, 24:25, 25:2, $25: 3,25: 8,26: 6,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:21, } 24: 19 \\ & \text { motion }[3]-2: 9,6: 15, \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { p.m }[3]-1: 7,2: 1, \\ & 38: 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| 1 | 27:6, 27:9, 27:13, |  | 30:12 <br> November ${ }_{[1]}$ - 12:21 numbers [1] - 35:24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { pace }[1]-3: 12 \\ & \text { package }[1]-31: 12 \\ & \text { packet }[5]-3: 4,5: 25, \\ & 20: 2,20: 5,31: 10 \\ & \text { panel }[2]-11: 17, \\ & 29: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| 24:1, | 8.16, 28.20 | move |  |  |
| looked [1]-26:6 | 22, 28:24, 29:24 | 7:3, 18:20, 19:23 |  |  |
| looking [1] - 25:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 13,31: 3,3 \\ & 3,35: 4,36: \end{aligned}$ | $\operatorname{moved}[3]-2: 13,$ |  |  |
|  | 37:25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { moving [4] - 3:11, } \\ & 28: 15,34: 7,35: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { obviously }[8]-16: 13, \\ & 18: 9,20: 19,21: 9, \\ & 21: 15,23: 25,25: 20, \\ & 32: 24 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| lose [1] - 10:8 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Member }[4]-1: 14 \\ 1: 14,1: 15,1: 15 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | parcel [1]-25:21 |
| losing [1] - 35:17 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MR }_{[36]}-3: 2,5: 20, \\ & 6: 2,7: 6,12: 5,13: 13, \end{aligned}$ |  | parcels [5] - 20:18, |
| loss [1] - 32:21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { members [6] - 6:11, } \\ & \text { 19:25, 27:17, 28:13, } \\ & 31: 25,36: 24 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 20:22, 21:24, 22:14,$25: 18$ |
| lost [1] - 12:13 |  | 13:19, 14:14, 15:6, | October [1] - 33:13 |  |
| Io | MEMBERS ${ }_{[19]}-1: 12$, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15:21, 16:4, 17:15, } \\ & \text { 18:5, 18:13, 19:16, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OF }_{[4]}-1: 1,39: 1, \\ & 39: 3,39: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Park [3] - 38:2, 38:7, } \\ & 38: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| luck [1] - 17:4 |  | 18:5, 18:13, 19:16, <br> $19 \cdot 21$ 19.25, 23.9, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { offer [4]-22:12, } \\ & 24: 24,26: 19,33: 4 \end{aligned}$ | PAROLA [18] - 1:19,$3: 2,5: 20,6: 2,7: 6,$ |
| [1] - 34:6 | $6: 12,6: 14,6: 24,7: 1,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:21, 19:25, 23:9, } \\ & \text { 23:16, 24:6, 24:9, } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| M | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:17, 19:5, 19:8, } \\ & \text { 19:11, 31:7, 31:16, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25: 17,26: 20,28: 17, \\ & 28: 21,28: 23,29: 4, \end{aligned}$ | office $[9]-3: 21,3: 24$, 4:11, 4:15, 6:6, 8:1, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12:5, 13:13, 13:19, } \\ & \text { 14:14, 15:6, 15:21, } \end{aligned}$ |
| \% | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 14,37: 18,37: 21, \\ & 38: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $30: 2,30: 17,$ | $12: 12,12: 14$ | $16: 4,17: 15,18: 5$, 18:13, 29:4, 30.2, |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} 38: 12 \\ \text { memo } \end{array}$ | $31: 17,33: 7$ | ffice [2] - 1:20, 1:20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:13, 29:4, } 30: \\ & 30: 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| management ${ }_{[1]}$ 35:16 | $20: 10,21: 1,21: 8$ | multifamily [5] - 3:2 | [2]-8:6, 8:9 | Parola [9]-3:1, 4:19, |
| Manager ${ }_{[1]}-1: 19$ | 22:5, 22:18 | :3, 6:4, 8:2 | OGC ${ }_{[1]}-9: 11$ | 5:14, 7:5, 11:24, |




