

109

00:15:13.500 --> 00:15:24.900

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Alrighty, let's get started. Welcome to the Wednesday, October the 14th 2020 Downtown Investment Authority meeting and we need to start with an opening statement. And bear with me as I read it. This is something we have to do before we start these meetings. So in an effort to slow the spread of the COVID 19 Virus and to encourage social distancing Governor De Santis issued an executive order 20-69 allowing local governments to hold public meetings using communications media technology, rather than in a physical location. And keeping with the executive order the Downtown Investment Authority Board Meeting is being held via zoom teleconference which allows interested persons to view and participate in the meeting remotely. So we have that over with, let me introduce now our board committee members and staff that is in attendance. So Braxton Gilliam who's on the board. He's not quite here, but he should be here momentarily. Carol Worsham our Secretary, Carol is traveling, but I expect her to be connecting up the zoom fairly quickly. Bill Adams. Bill Adams here yet.

116

00:16:30.570 --> 00:16:31.890

Ina Mezini: He's not in here yet.

117

00:16:32.220 --> 00:16:38.070

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Okay, Oliver Barakat, raise your hand please. Jim Citrano, say hello. Hello. Todd Froats.

119

00:16:42.390 --> 00:16:43.350

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Craig Gibbs

120

00:16:44.040 --> 00:16:44.730

Craig Gibbs: Good afternoon.

121

00:16:45.270 --> 00:16:46.470

Ron Moody (DIA Board): And David Ward.

122

00:16:46.950 --> 00:16:47.580

David Ward: Afternoon.

123

00:16:48.300 --> 00:16:49.830

Ron Moody (DIA Board): All right, also.

124

00:16:51.210 --> 00:16:55.170

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Our staff Lori Boyer CEO. Steve Kelley Director of Downtown Real Estate and Development Guy Parola Operations Manager John Crescimbeni Regulatory Compliance Manager is John here. Ina Menzini Marketing Communication Specialist Lori Radcliffe-Meyers Redevelopment Coordinator Jackie Mott Financial Analysts and John Sawyer is John here with the Office of General Counsel.

127

00:17:26.820 --> 00:17:27.420

BoyerL: Yes.

128

00:17:28.140 --> 00:17:32.310

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Alright, so here's some meeting instructions for all in attendance. Agenda for this meeting can be viewed and downloaded from the City of Jacksonville website by navigating to the DIA.COJ.net. When the meeting has concluded the recorded version may be access accessed by emailing rmenzini@coj.net All right, how the public comments which are coming next to how they will be received. Number one, the public comment period occurs, obviously, at the beginning of the agenda. All public comments should pertain only to items on the agenda and are limited to three minutes in duration. That doesn't mean you have to stretch it to three minutes, but we're going to need to cut you off after three minutes. Number two. Individuals who are unable to access the meeting or who wish to submit their comments in advance may do so by submitting their comments via email to rmenzini@coj.net with the title public comments public comments should be submitted by email, and they must be received no later than 2:05 today and it is now 2:05 so we're going to have a cut off in just a sec. Number three, public comments submitted by email will be submitted into the record during the public comments portion of the meeting. Individuals attending the meeting by computer or telephone will be given an opportunity to comment, one at a time and in an orderly fashion recognized by the meeting host so Ina Menzini we now have come to public comments. Do we have any public comments today.

139

00:19:06.540 --> 00:19:11.370

Ina Mezini: Yes, we do have public comments that I have received via email and I have received handful comments that we do have, but Nancy Powell is here in the meeting and she has her hand raised. So we'll go with her first and then we'll move to the email public comments. So Nancy, I will lower your hand and you may speak.

142

00:19:25.770 --> 00:19:30.870

Nancy Powell: Actually, I would like to just go after you read them because the The zoom information changed. I didn't realize the zoom information changed when you sent out the updated package yesterday. So people have the wrong zoom information. When you press the last week you guys sent out the zoom notice, and when you click on it, it says it's on the 10

08 DDRB meeting. And so the new information that I just got. I didn't realize the zoom information changed. We had sent people the wrong information so nobody's able to get in, just by the way, and the website does not have the October meeting on it anymore. It disappears from the website on the day of the meeting. That doesn't make any sense. So I'm I'm not happy about this. And I have to send out this updated information because people are waiting to get in.

149

00:20:16.350 --> 00:20:18.270

Ina Mezini: I'm so sorry about that. I just updated.

150

00:20:18.660 --> 00:20:23.400

Nancy Powell: Maybe I'll public comments later in the meeting because this is not acceptable.

151

00:20:24.060 --> 00:20:38.130

Ina Mezini: Absolutely. I just updated the website link on there. So that was my mistake for linking the wrong thing, but it is under the upcoming DIA meetings. The link is correct. And that should take everybody here I have two people in the waiting room that I'm letting in right now as well. I can go ahead and read the public comment via email. And then, Mr Moody, if it's okay with you. We can allow the public comment as they come in as well, since that was my mistake for putting in the wrong link.

153

00:20:51.480 --> 00:20:59.130

Ron Moody (DIA Board): So we have quite a few public comments so they should give us time for everyone else to kind of plug in and catch up with us.

PLEASE NOTE: WHILE IN-PERSON PUBLIC COMMENT IS LIMITED TO 3 MINUTES, WE HAVE INCLUDED THE FULL EMAIL-SUBMITTED PUBLIC COMMENTS BELOW AS THEY WERE RECEIVED:

154

00:20:59.310 --> 00:21:06.720

Ina Mezini: Absolutely. And I've asked Lori Radcliffe-Meyers to time me as I read the public comments that I have received via email so folder that I received them. And this first one is from Belton S Wall. He's at 2571 Seventh Avenue West, Bradenton, Florida 34205. I respectfully submit this letter as interest in the above referenced proposal. Perhaps the concept of putting 335 new dwelling units on the bank of a river known to flood the entire neighborhood, is not wise. My comments will deal with a sense of place. I will leave to aesthetic consideration for others. This project will add 600 plus or minus cars into a dead-end roundabout, the additional traffic being generated appears to negatively impact the existing traffic to and from M.O.S.H. and Friendship Fountain. Where do the cars going to the M.O.S.H. park? How many parking spaces are needed and

provided? Where do the folks visiting Friendship Fountain park? How many parking spaces are needed and provided? How will these automobiles inter-face with the traffic from the proposed project? Will the isolated parcel of land to the west of the proposal continue to serve the public? How will the public gain access to the existing marina? Where is the first living level located, vertically? How will any street level enclosed space not adversely affect the displacement of flood water onto adjacent property? Is this a mixed-use zoning? Is the Planning Department ok with the proposal? Thank you for your time and consideration. End comment.

164

00:22:30.510 --> 00:22:37.500

Ina Mezini: Next comment is from Brian paradise at 13 arbor club Dr Ponte vedra beach 32082. Dear DIA, The current proliferation of private single use properties along the Southbank riverwalk result in a series of fences, locked gates and "keep out" signs, for anyone walking the Southbank Riverwalk. For this site, it should be a minimum requirement that the development be mixed use, to include at least one 5,000 square foot ground floor restaurant with outdoor seating that allows for river views and a walkway along the river. Riverfront restaurants are critical amenities that the citizens and visitors of Jacksonville desperately need and want. The building should be further set back from the river due to the critical long term resiliency needs. We should not saddle future generations with bad decisions made today about building on the river, when we know the risks. This would also allow for more riverfront park space, of which the Southbank has very little. The design of the building must be outstanding; the city should not allow not cookie cutter mediocrity. Thanks for your consideration of these comments. End comment.

172

00:23:40.410 --> 00:23:42.690

Ina Mezini: Next comment is from Natalie Soud.Hi there, I wanted to express that I do not in any way support this project unless it includes a mixed use restaurant on the waterfront. If we don't start having more vision for our riverfront, the city will remain mediocre. End comment.

174

00:23:57.060 --> 00:24:01.380

Ina Mezini: Next comment is from Laura Mann Magevney she lives at 4420 Apalachee Street. I am writing to express my concern about the River City Brewing parcel. This parcel is the key to what we have as a city on the south side. It is beautiful, and over the years I have met friends, and taken our family to this riverfront restaurant and bar because it was so well situated. River City Brewing is where my Leadership Jacksonville class would meet for happy hour, because of the central location and beautiful views and they have always been terrific about hosting special events for the non-profit community. I can't imagine why the inclusion of a restaurant would not be a requirement of building residential units at this location. My understanding of what was discussed during

the DIA meeting last week was that both concerned citizens and several DIA members seemed to grasp the importance of having a restaurant on the site, so I was completely taken by surprise at the outcome of the vote. There is so much going on in the world right now and I wonder why this needs to be pushed through without giving it the attention it needs. Jacksonville is often criticized for its poor planning and this is an amazing opportunity for us to make this right. When our family travels we are always amazed by the way other cities develop their riverfront areas, even small ones, so that the community as a whole can enjoy them. This is what we should be doing, making sure the community as a whole has access to these valuable locations. Moving forward on this parcel without considering the impact to the whole of the Jacksonville riverfront is short-sighted at best. Looking at the plans put forward by the developers it would seem there are many creative options to make this spot resilient, attractive, and welcoming to the public. We simply need to hold the developers to a higher standard instead of giving our prime parcels away. I am originally from the Nashville area and it is amazing what their leadership has done along a much smaller waterfront area, as well as the public parks they created for more resiliency after the horrific flood of 2010. I am confident we can do the same! Thank you for your consideration. End comment.

189

00:25:53.970 --> 00:25:57.270

Ina Mezini: Next comment is from Susan Aertker. And it reads, why is the city giving away land and giving property tax refunds? When the city gives property tax exemptions to some, the rest of us have to pay higher taxes in order to keep the same level of services in the city. Please do not give them property tax exemptions or refunds. If a developer can't expect to profit without the ordinary taxpayer subsidizing the project, I question the project. Free market philosophy would advise us not to subsidize such a project. It's one thing to use tax dollars for parks and public schools. It's another thing to use tax dollars to enrich a free market private development.

Quote from an article:

The notice is required before the board can consider the Miami-based developer's request for \$12.94 million in property tax refunds and be given the city-owned riverfront land at no cost for a proposed 335-unit, eight-story apartment project. End comment.

195

00:26:52.140 --> 00:26:53.880

Ina Mezini: Next comment is from Oh, I'm sorry. This is another comment from Susan Aertker and it just, it includes some reference links which I can share with the board. And it also reads: Studies have shown that as development and the amount of impervious surfaces increases in a watershed, severe flood events happen more often. The city needs to require resiliency planning on all new development and aim to have less impervious paved area, more swales and sloping run-off areas to reduce flooding.

The deal, where the Downtown Investment Authority wants to give away land where River City Brewing now sits, needs to include parking for Friendship Fountain and the Museum of Science & History and for the people that want to walk the bridges and the boardwalk. End comment.

References:

<https://www.usgs.gov/special-topic/water-science-school/science/impervious-surfaces-and-flooding>

<https://www.jaxdailyrecord.com/article/related-group-proposal-advances-for-apartments-at-river-city-brewing-co-site>

202

00:27:38.970 --> 00:27:45.930

Ina Mezini: Next comment is from Candice Rue at 1244 North 18th Street Jacksonville Beach, Florida 32250. I am opposed to the plan of selling off this property for apartments for three main reasons.

1. The flooding aspect. This property is in a flood zone. After Hurricane Irma there was much flooding downtown. The south bank area is prone to flooding. To me it is a fraud to promote individuals to spend their money whether or purchasing in a known flood area once these apartments are constructed. Is there any resiliency planning involved in this construction?

2. The giveaway of city to transfer the land to the developer at no cost with generous property tax credits. Why? What do the citizens of Duval County gain from this transaction? Will these apartments be affordable or luxury apartments? What cost will the city incur in the future for clean up when residents of the apartment building and or owners are flooded and incur damages? It is an unwise decision and does nothing for the taxpayers of Duval County and does not benefit the citizenry due to the tax credits.

3. This area borders on the Museum and Friendship Fountain area. Building apartments in this area distracts from the walkability of the area of the Fountain and Museum. It cuts off access to the public for events planned in those two areas.. This area due to the flooding should be left as riverfront park space. End comment.

212

00:29:01.920 --> 00:29:09.030

Ina Mezini: Next comment is from Steve Congro at 2339 Miller Oaks Dr. Jacksonville, Florida 32217. I'd like to thank both the developer as well as the DIA Board/Staff for revising this proposal to include a Restaurant - this was my biggest objective to the project and I'm now in favor of the proposal despite the additional incentive funding. I'd still like to raise my concern from the SIC meeting about parking in the area as now it seems that 30 public spaces will be shared by the Restaurant, MOSH, and Park goers. My ask during the SIC meeting was for the city to consider increasing incentives in exchange for adding a floor to the parking garage

that could be used for public parking. However, a simpler and cheaper solution may be just to allow for parallel parking on the roads in the area as that could add up to a fair number of spaces - plus our Downtown Master Plan encourages Parallel Parking to help create a sense of place. Based on other roads throughout downtown, the Right of Way is certainly wide enough to accommodate parallel parking on both Museum Circle and San Marco Blvd. Thank you. End comment.

220

00:30:12.150 --> 00:30:13.980

Ina Mezini: Next comment is from Laurie Scott. I am writing to convey my opposition to the development of the River City Brewing Company site for apartments. Our city has dozens of miles of waterfront, and virutally no waterfront dining. We need a casual, indoor-outdoor destination that people may visit by boat or by car. RCBC at one time met these needs, but it has grown very tired and is not known for high food quality.

The City has recently added or committed to add a significant amount of downtown apartments. The need for food, entertainment and leisure far exceeds housing needs, in my opinion. Thank you very much for considering my remarks. Many many thanks for your service to our community! It is truly appreciated. End comment.

227

00:30:54.180 --> 00:30:57.360

Ina Mezini: Next comment is from Natalie Rosenberg. My name is Natalie Rosenberg and I live at 1871 Montgomery Place. The River City Brewing parcel is perhaps the most desirable piece of real estate on the south side of the river. This is a beautiful, well located parcel that has served as a riverfront restaurant and bar for decades. Although I support building residential units on this site, I think the inclusion of a restaurant should be a minimum requirement. As a young lawyer before kids and responsibilities, I recall many Friday happy hours at River City Brewing Company. It was the place to be with easy parking, a central location and a million dollar view.

I was happy to see the article in the paper this morning outlining a new plan to include at least some dining space at this location but I do have concerns regarding the plan as outlined. Is a primarily outdoor restaurant even viable in Jacksonville? Thinking back to my young professional self, I cannot imagine heading to an outdoor restaurant in my suit on a hot day, which is basically every day from early May to late September. I would want to hear from some local restaurateurs before committing to such a plan. Let's not rush this. Let's get this right. Once this property is gone, it's gone.

My suggestion would be to move the pool to the roof and place a larger restaurant at ground level, keeping resilience in mind. It would seem that residents would prefer to utilize an elevated pool, as opposed to one that can be viewed by users of the park. And in terms of users of

the park, do they really want to look at people sitting by a pool? This current pool design seems like a textbook lose lose. As someone who is getting older and may be in the market for a riverfront condo sooner rather than later, this design would very much turn me off whereas a downstairs restaurant on the river and a more private rooftop pool would be huge pluses.

One of my biggest concerns is the uncertainty of MOSH. If MOSH moves elsewhere and a private development ends up on that parcel as well, then the Friendship Fountain park would be almost obsolete as it would be surrounded by private property, difficult to access and very unwelcoming. This gets back to the need for a holistic plan for the riverfront in Jacksonville. Construction of this residential building without allowing for a true restaurant would be taking away one of the very few places that the general public can dine along the river. You should not have to belong to a private club to comfortably dine on the river. I would ask that the city not give away this property without a viable and equal if not better restaurant substitute. Let's hold developers to a higher standard and require them to help make Jacksonville's riverfront better for all of its citizens! End comment.

247

00:33:21.150 --> 00:33:24.390

Ina Mezini: Next comment is at from Tiphonie Mattis.

248

00:33:24.810 --> 00:33:26.040

Michael Mattis: I'm actually here.

249

00:33:26.670 --> 00:33:27.690

Ina Mezini: Okay, would you like to speak?

250

00:33:28.200 --> 00:33:28.980

Michael Mattis: Yes, I would. Good afternoon Downtown Investment Board. My name is Tiphonie Madison I resided 7934 Concord Boulevard West Jacksonville, Florida 32208 I would like to comment on the River City brewery proposal. My husband and I have a 38 foot boat currently docked at River City Brewery for the last 18 months. We brought our boat downtown to enjoy the downtown entertainment experience and to navigate the beautiful St. Johns River. To date, there's been no communication between River City Brewery, and the current Marina tenants regarding this proposal. As a developer continues to fine tune their proposal, I would suggest that they develop a communication plan with timelines for the marina tenants. The existing Marina facilities include an office, laundry facility, restrooms and onsite parking, which will be impacted by the proposed plan. The tenants need at least six more months to make alternative arrangements, if there is a plan to have us vacate the premises.



Secondly, as a pleasure boater and an active member of a local boating club, I can say the downtown destination for boaters in the River City is very disappointing. Let me repeat the downtown destination for boaters in the River City is very disappointing. The temporary draw for boaters is the city Marina east of River City brewery across from dailies place when there is a Jaguars game. And that's it. Previously it was a pleasure to go to the landing and events at metropolitan park by boat. But as you know, all of these options, no longer exist. And as a 25 year resident of Jacksonville. I've heard enough for promises regarding the shipyard development, the district. The Orleck the Berkman two blight the convention center and the list goes on. The slips at River City Brewery are in serious need of repair the walkway is not level with missing boards so boaters are less inclined to come to the marina. That said, I would encourage the developer to create a boating destination for boating community for the boaters community in the River City in the downtown area. Where are the boaters now, I'm glad you asked. On the weekends. There are hundreds of boaters in the river near sisters Creek and Jim King boat ramps both city owned facilities on Heckscher drive As members of the DIA board, I would encourage each of you to take a Saturday or Sunday drive to any city owned boat ramp along Heckscher drive TO SEE THE RIVER CITY boating community. Get out of your car. Talk to boaters and ask them what will make them come down to the downtown area. Again the downtown destination for boaters and our River City does not exist for the for the proposed onsite restaurant. I hope the DIA will encourage the developer to plant to develop a plan that draws the boating community back to the downtown area. Boaters are always looking for somewhere to go a safe harbor seafood restaurant along the river is an excellent idea. In summary, future riverfront development of down of the downtown area should take into consideration the many boaters as we have in the Jacksonville and surrounding areas. This concludes my public comment. Thank you for listening.

273

00:36:31.110 --> 00:36:31.950

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Thank you, Tiffany.

274

00:36:34.530 --> 00:36:37.860

Ina Mezini: Some couple of additional public comments.

275

00:36:39.210 --> 00:36:48.240

Ina Mezini: This next one that I have received is from Gabriele Dempsey 2415 Mandarin River Lane, Jax, Fl 32223. I am a member of the Riverfront Parks Now Coalition, Late Bloomers Garden Club and Greenscape organizations. The thesaurus suggests that the synonym for holistic is... integrated, expansive, comprehensive. The site where River City Brewing resides on the southbank , is one portion of the larger area near the main street bridge anchored by the newly renovated Friendship Fountain, St Johns River Park and MOSH. Jacksonville has to stop bulldozing one building at a time, giving developers land at no cost and generous property tax credits and stop PIECEMEAL design.

The word holistic has come up at every zoom meeting I have attended. That means looking at areas as a whole, designing buildings that are set back from the St. Johns River due to critical long term resiliency needs, providing access to the riverfront for the citizens of Jacksonville, a design sensitive to what is already in the area of River City Brewing. They need a place where they can pull up their boats or kayaks and be able to walk along the Southbank, have a restaurant that is casual dining indoors and outside....we don't need another Ruth Chris restaurant serving \$ 50.00 steaks, which is already on the riverfront.

Related Companies, if I have my information correct ,developed Hudson Yards in New York city, which is the largest private real estate development in the history of the united states. Please bring a comprehensive vision for the southbank of Jacksonville that makes sense for the City of Jacksonville and its citizens that is not just another mediocre apartment building.We have had enough of that.  
Thank you. End comment.

286

00:38:12.840 --> 00:38:17.760

Ina Mezini: I did receive an additional comment via email from Susan Cavan I do believe she's on the call as well. So, Miss Cavan, if you would like to speak. You may otherwise I can read your email for you.

288

00:38:29.490 --> 00:38:31.140

Susan Caven: Can you can read it and I am

289

00:38:31.740 --> 00:38:32.010

Sure.

290

00:38:33.180 --> 00:38:36.180

Ina Mezini: So, Miss Caven is the President of Scenic Jacksonville at 2775 White Oak Lane. I would like to suggest that Jacksonville's downtown can become a thriving destination for Florida by learning from the success some of our sister cities have achieved. Ten years ago, no one would have thought downtown Tampa or St. Petersburg were ready for an economic explosion. But these Florida cities found that enhancing their waterfront transformed their communities. No longer is downtown St. Pete a sleepy, coastal community of retirees, but a dynamic urban center, and they say, their jewel of the Downtown Waterfront is a big reason the sun shines on the City of St. Petersburg. As a community they seek to be a national model for waterfront stewardship, by acknowledging that they were all connected by water. Their public, private and institutional sectors worked together to create a shared vision for the waterfront.

Today, St Pete's downtown waterfront has seven miles of landscaped waterfront parks open to the public - the third-largest urban waterfront park system in North America. This has resulted in an expected public and private investments will approach \$8 billion in the city center in the next year few years. The newly opened St. Pete Pier an expansive, multifaceted public space that serves as a natural extension of the waterfront. "The Pier does not take you to a place—the pier is the place", and it is crowded with locals and visitors alike. The Pier extends the city's green necklace of downtown parks and activities over the water, out onto the pier. It cost \$95 mil to build and expects to attract \$85 mil every year.

Not too long ago, downtown Tampa didn't have much to do along the waterfront. But now there is something for just about everyone no matter the time of day, manner of taste, level of energy or size of the wallet. A key piece in Tampa's success is the creation of riverside parks that draw people as a destination. Their Mayor Iorio said "We needed to connect all of the assets that we had in Tampa in a way that people could easily get to them," Iorio says. "We had museums and parks but no way to get to them and really enjoy the waterfront. We needed to open the river to the people, reorientate downtown to the Water. The public has access to the water surrounding downtown, Tampa is officially open for business, ready to benefit from resulting sales and property taxes. "More people want to live downtown where they can wake up in the morning and go down to the river and take a walk". Tampa's top economic development official Bob McDonough says the waterfront path was a "deciding" factor for the placement of the Riverwalk Place office and apartment building, as well as real estate development firm SoHo Capital's decision to fund the Armature Works project, along the Hillsborough River. "That represents close to \$300 million worth of investment right there, along the Riverwalk," McDonough says. "The waterfront knits our downtown together." "I think less than 10 percent of the investment happening now would have happened without the Riverwalk. That's how much of an impact I think it has made on private individuals to invest. There's a different energy and pulse about our city. When people come down here, they see what Tampa's next chapter is going to look like. That, to me, is what's most exciting."

The Jacksonville Downtown Investment Authority has the power to also help make Jacksonville's dramatic waterfront an economic driver - by creating a destination riverfront and allowing the St Johns River to full its promise to be the great jewel of our community. Riverfront Parks Now and the citizens of Jacksonville stand ready to support you to make Jacksonville to create a destination waterfront system that would transform our city.

313

00:41:34.560 --> 00:41:35.400

That's time.

314

00:41:36.510 --> 00:41:37.020

Thank you.

315

00:41:38.700 --> 00:41:45.000

Ina Mezini: And we have Nancy Powell's hands raise. So I'm complete with comment via email. And now I will lower Nancy's hand.

317

00:41:49.860 --> 00:41:56.730

Nancy Powell: I am sorry about getting frustrated. But a lot of people were texting me asking to get in. So I'm so I'm Nancy Powell, I am executive director of Scenic Jacksonville. And as you all know part of riverfront parks now. I did read in the paper today that Related is going to add a restaurant to the project. And so I want to say thank you to them for listening. And incorporating that into your plans, we are going to assume, and we're going to hopefully HEAR THAT. THAT IS GOING TO HAVE riverfront views and it is a step in the right direction to provide a benefit to the public. So last week I talked about this property as it was discussed in the 2018 riverfront investment strategy I took I spoke to somebody yesterday. Interestingly enough, who said to me, the South Bank is really just a residential district. And if you think about the last major in a project to the projects that are been going up. There large residential apartment buildings and so it's hard to disagree that that's the direction this South Bank is taking. So I went back and looked at the closer look of the ULI study that was done in 2016. And as it turns out it was done. It was a larger study on the south bank. I'm sure you're aware of it, but I'd like to read from a few pages. From the overall recommendations, the number one recommendation was to reclaim all the property along the waterfront in the study area as Park space. Number three recommendation was to add mixed use development as another activity generator in order to make redevelopment economically stable viable. But as for next steps it recommended this was done in 2016 it says what is missing is a clear vision a shared sense of what the Southbank community should become In terms of land use, density, design, diversity, public amenities, mobility and priorities. The DIA and other governmental decision makers should convene all stakeholders in a community based process to articulate a coherent and well defined vision for the South Bank and the outcomes the community desires, creating such a vision is essential if the South Bank is to realize its full potential. So my question is, is residential the vision that the DIA has for the South Bank. Is that what the community wants? If that's the case, then maybe adding residential and less mixed use make sense, but it's not what I'm hearing from people, and if not, then much more mixed use needs to happen. The point is, is that if you don't have a plan, then it will be decided on an ad hoc manner which is what's happening today. The type of planning that's recommended by the tap for the Southbank is what riverfront parks now has been advocating that

the city do for the entire riverfront, to be clear, such a plan is going to involve and assess Time of land uses in place making for buildings including parks and public space, but also for development.

336

00:45:02.310 --> 00:45:05.340

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Oh, Nancy Powell. Thank you for your comments. Very good.

337

00:45:11.700 --> 00:45:12.360

Ina Mezini: I Do not see any additional hands raised.

339

00:45:18.540 --> 00:45:27.060

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Okay, that will conclude our public comment section, let me acknowledge that Braxton Guillem has joined our meeting

Braxton take a bow. And also COUNCILMEMBER LeAnn Cumber. And I don't know if I recognize you. But, welcome. Let's go to the next section.

Community redevelopment agency. And first item is our minutes from the September 16th 2020 meeting. I'm going to assume that everyone is read those minutes and if there's any revisions. I need to hear that. Now, otherwise I need a motion to accept.

346

00:46:02.340 --> 00:46:03.150

BoyerL: Mr. Chairman.

347

00:46:03.720 --> 00:46:04.620

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Yes.

348

00:46:05.640 --> 00:46:15.120

BoyerL: This is Lori Boyer, I was just going to suggest to you that, since there was a glitch in the zoom meeting notice as it was published. That prior to taking a vote on any resolution you allow public comment from anyone who has not already spoken. So if they've already spoken, you've already heard their comment, but there may be people who joined late, who didn't have a chance to speak. So I think that in recognition of that error, it would be good to allow that. Thank you.

353

00:46:41.010 --> 00:46:45.300

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Okay, so we will allow that on our next item which will be resolution 2020 10 dash 0 one. All right, I still need a motion to accept the minutes from the last meeting.

354

00:46:52.410 --> 00:46:55.650

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Okay so Braxton made the motion and Craig Gibbs seconded.

355

00:46:57.750 --> 00:46:59.190

Ron Moody (DIA Board): All in favor say aye.

356

00:47:00.990 --> 00:47:01.290

Braxton Gillam: Aye.

357

00:47:04.590 --> 00:47:07.830

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Alright, the eyes have it. So the meeting minutes are accepted. Alright, next item on the business is resolution 2020 10 dash 01 is the term sheet FOR THE RIVER CITY Brewing Company Ina, let's stop here and if there's anyone else that has not had A chance to comment on public comments. This would be the time. Or anyone in the audience.

362

00:47:31.860 --> 00:47:35.640

Ina Mezini: I do not see any additional hands raised.

363

00:47:38.880 --> 00:47:46.200

Jimmy Citrano: Yes, um, while we're taking a pause for that I'd like to make the Board aware in consultation with Mr. Sawyer that my company does have a business relationship with Related. I'm not involved in that relationship. I did file a form 8 to reflect that. And I'm going to ask Mr Sawyer to weigh in on my position relative to voting today.

367

00:48:14.880 --> 00:48:23.280

BoyerL: Mr. Citrano, Mr. Sawyer has had to leave the call momentarily. So he will be back with us in probably 20 minutes. And I'm sure that we have enough discussion before then we can get his comments, prior to that, but we did receive your form 8 and it was circulated to all of the members.

369

00:48:34.320 --> 00:48:35.130

Jimmy Citrano: Thank you.

370

00:48:37.350 --> 00:48:44.700

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Alright so Ms. Boyer I'm going to ask you to present the resolution 2020 10 dash 01

371

00:48:46.260 --> 00:48:57.690

BoyerL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And before I go into any details of that I want to

set the stage for the Board in terms of documents and supplemental documents. So as we move forward. You have two forms of resolution 2020 10 dash 01. The first one was the form of resolution that was adopted at the strategic implementation committee meeting. The second one was distributed to you this week the point and the difference between the two is the second one does not authorize Execution of agreements and proceeding to legislation and a disposition without coming back to the Board. So that question was raised in strategic implementation. I answered Mr. Ward and said, no, the term sheet would come back to the war to the Board. After the 30 days and that is what the second form of resolution does. so it Authorizes it to be put out in a notice acknowledges that you have heard and and are generally in agreement with the terms of the term sheet. But that it will come back to the board for final approval in November, after the close of the 30 day period. That's the difference between version one and version two. Either one of those. You could make a motion that you wish to move forward with. So the second thing is to let's explain the difference between term sheet one term sheet two and actually today. There's a slight Scrivener error in version of term sheet three. The difference between term sheet. One is the version that the strategic implementation committee approved last week that was in your agenda packet and everybody has had that for over a week. The change in term sheet two that was sent out to you a supplemental information all relates to the restaurant. So, as was mentioned earlier Related came back and said they would construct an 1800 square foot heated and cooled restaurant. With 3200 square feet of outdoor dining space associated with it. The location of that was shown on a graphic, which is between the apartments and the park. So it's Park front. And it is between museum circle and the river, so it will have a river view, it is not on the water. It is not on a pier sticking out into the water, but it is kind of parallel with the fountain, if you will, on that side of the building. Now, and all of the terms in term sheet two that are changed relate to that restaurant, as you may have heard it also includes a request for a \$500,000 or 50% of construction costs, whichever is less. Completion grant from the city that would help defray the costs of construction. If I can explain that briefly. Conceptually, it is The discussion has has been that the restaurant was not an economic value to the developer that The chances of them making significant money on it and they were prepared to move forward just with the residential without it. You heard the public in A number of board members request the addition of it they committed it they would be willing to do it. But, and they will bear the costs of responsibility for having it operated maintaining it in operation, maintaining the building. However, they're taking the risk of that operation. They asked us to be 5050 partners on the construction costs which they anticipate to be 100 but are a million, but our liability is capped at 500,000. So that's the other part of the term sheet related to the restaurant. As it relates to term sheet three. I'm going to say term sheet three is exactly like term sheet two with the restaurant in it, but it just basically makes a Scriveners error change on the performance schedule. And what that does is with respect to each of the dates that were outlined in the

performance schedule where it says on or before blank. It inserts to be completed on our before blank and we can show you that. Ms. Menzini can put these up on the screen to show you but I'm just setting the stage, so that if you get to the point of making a motion or you want to make further amendments, please identify which form of resolution and which form of term sheet. You're putting on the floor for discussion so that we have that data set the proper stage. So with that, Mr. Chairman I'm going to be pretty brief on the discussion of the project. I know many of you were at strategic implementation and the strategic implementation committee. Voted last week, I believe you are just you received a copy of the Minutes of strategic implementation earlier this morning. And so you have that as your disposal as well But the strategic implementation Committee voted last week to move forward with a notice of disposition on the property. Critical point I think the board is well aware, but in response to many of the comments that came in from the public is this property is currently the subject of a 77 year remaining term of a ground lease in favor of a third party. That third party, Maritime has a contract with Related. When the discussion suggests that we are giving the property away. It is correct that there was a \$1 value assigned to our residual interest which appraises At 723 or 734,000 dollars but the majority of the value in this site. Is possessed right now and under the control of Maritime not under the control of the city. They have the rights to it for 77 years that lease also provides that the property can be used for any lawful purpose. It does not require that the restaurant remain on the site. So if someone were willing if Maritime wanted to sell their leasehold interest and someone wanted to develop apartments on Maritimes leasehold interest they could do so. That's not to say they wouldn't have to come through design standards, etc. But I just wanted to set that stage. So the proposal we have before us. Is a request to transfer fee simple title. To Related or it's assign. Of the personal that is currently subject to the ground lease and a small additional parcel of city property. In exchange, we would receive back fee simple title free and clear of the ground lease of additional Park space as well as additional space adjacent to the boat ramp turnaround, which allows us to reconfigure the access to the boat ramp. The boat ramp would remain with access through the parking lot that we acquired we DIA acquired rights to from DOT pursuant to lease so DIA has a long term lease of the parking under the Acosta bridge which has 209 spaces, more or less. We acquire that probably two to three years ago, in order to provide more parking for the Riverwalk and for MOSH. The 30 spaces that you heard reference currently the ground lease with Maritime requires that they provide 30 spaces to MOSH, that's all MOSH has rights to in the current parking lot. The agreement that we enter that we were discussing with the term sheet with Related is that those same 30 spaces would also be provided in their parking garage. And would be available to MOSH, as long as MOSH was there and if not, they would be available to the city for whoever or future tenant or operator of a museum or other experience on that site might be. So that's the 30 parking spaces. The Riverwalk currently there is currently a 10 foot easement across the front of River City or a provision for a 10 foot walk across



the front of the River City property for Riverwalk That is being expanded to 25 feet and the ownership of that is being given to the city. So it's in perpetuity. And in addition the buildings would be set back a minimum of 50 feet. Where right now, as you know, the buildings are only set back that approximately 10 to 12 feet from the waterfront. So, it expands the set back from the waterfront. The construction technique that is proposed is a concrete construction I you will recall, we discussed this in the Spandrel proposal in the Ford on Bay in their case, it was the first two floors. We're going to be block and concrete and we were happy about that from a resiliency standpoint, it is the the current proposal before us. Similarly, is not using wood construction at grade, perhaps, but for the restaurant that has now been included. At least I think in the imagery, it, it appears to have wood frame construction. In addition to that, the Developer has requested and our staff has vetted a rev grant on the property. Based on the addition of the rev grant based on the addition to the restaurant. The project now qualifies under our criteria that are in our CRA plan for a 75% rev grant, which is what they requested. However, they are requesting 20 years our maximum allowable grant without going to city council is 15. This has to go to city council anyway. So at this point the disposition would be a decision of city council, the potential completion grant on the restaurant would be a decision of city council. And the additional years of the rev grant would be a decision of city council. So all of those are beyond our decision making authority, but certainly, you have the ability to make a recommendation with respect to them. The process would be that if you suggest we move forward with this term sheet or some similar one, as you may amend it We would enter, we would publish a 30 day notice of disposition in The Daily Record and depending upon whether we received other Alternate offers or better offers, we would bring it back to you at the November meeting, assuming that we have time to review them whatever we received within that timeframe. And I am happy to answer any specific questions or have Mr. Kelly answer specific questions on the staff report or the term sheet I would like Ms Menzini to show you the pictures that we have of the Glass and Vine in Coconut Grove. For those of you who didn't have a chance to look it up to see kind of the imagery and suggested concept for the restaurant. So this shows you the covered area and then a significant amount of patio seating. I don't know. There we go. We've got a couple others that kind of give you the idea of it, which would really be you can kind of see a park area in the background. They're very similar in as much as there is a large stand of oak trees between somewhat near the location of the current underground fuel tank. And this would allow a view, not only of the fountain, but of the water there and there is a berm between the fountain and this immediate restaurant location. So contextually it's quite similar to what you're seeing on the screen. At this point I'm, I'm happy to answer questions or.

439

01:01:27.420 --> 01:01:35.400

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Okay. Thank you Ms. Boyer. Let me go to the Board now. And

folks, this There's a lot of moving parts here. So feel free to ask questions. Oliver you were chair of the strategic implementation meeting last Friday, why don't you start off with questions and or comments and I like to follow through with the Board as well.

441

01:01:50.490 --> 01:01:54.720

Oliver Barakat: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I want to Thank Related for changing their position on the retail. I know they immediately looked into this after our meeting last week and despite the fact that the Committee actually approved their proposal, they are in good faith in making a change and decided to make this improvement, which I think we all agree is going to make the entire experience on that side. Better not only for the public. But I think also for their for their residents that are there on day to day basis. I do want to just kind of staying on the retail for a second. I do want to just confirm that there will be river views I'm looking at the site plan on another screen right now. That based on the orientation of the footprint of the building and that pool that kind of juts out that there will Not that the views from the restaurant area, both on the inside and the outside will not be obstructed by the structure of the building, is it can the developer or somebody represents them confirm that is the case, or is it too early to say.

451

01:03:18.240 --> 01:03:27.630

Steven Diebenow: Am I on? Can you hear me, Oliver? Yes, sir. I can hear you. Okay Steve Diebenow one independent drive suite 12 1200 here on behalf of the developer and Many of you that were on the committee last week met Jeff Robbins, and Jeff Robbins is here in the room with me in Jacksonville. And yes, the exact location of the restaurant hasn't been determined, but I think that Ms. Boyer described it very well. It's, it's sort of in the area where the current fuel tank is the underground fuel tank and there's a grove of existing oaks that that Is the projected location. And so there will be views of the water from that location but it but it will not be as Ms. Boyer said it will not be a riverfront Restaurant, it'll be facing the park, just to the east of the new building, but you will be able to see the water, you will be able to see the skyline, and you will of course be able to see MOSH and the park and friendship fountain when it is renovated.

Oliver Barakat: And there is a group of, I think, relatively young live oaks that are abuting the Riverwalk there and Ms. Boyer, is that there's the parks department maintain or determine whether those live oaks or the amount of live oaks stay?

459

01:04:46.200 --> 01:04:52.200

BoyerL: Yes, I'm generally speaking, I mean this is a park, and so they are in control of that. I don't know if Ms. Menzini has in the supplemental information that was sent out yesterday. I provided a map that showed the general location of the restaurant. And I think if you

can I don't know if she has access to that. But what you'll be able to see is based on the site plan. There you go. If you look at the site plan of the of the And we can switch to the site plan also. But if you look at the site plan that Related has proposed the building itself. angles back, similar to the the parallel to that. There you go. So you can see how the building is angling back And now if you go back and you look at where the restaurant is you can see that because the building is angling back, you will have a view of the river. You may not be able to see all the way around the the marina, but you'll definitely have a view straight ahead, and the building is not obstructing, it in fact it's opening it up. By moving over to the side, the area in front will be expanded Park space which is can envision to be that Bertram garden area with botanical plantings. So it would be attractive. Setting between the restaurant and the water

468

01:06:14.670 --> 01:06:23.430

Oliver Barakat: Okay, thank you for that explanation. I was actually on the site last night and those existing live oaks with a Botanical Garden is going to be are pretty thick. And they do incumber you pretty significantly. But I think we can manage that. And the only reason I asked, I just don't want to check the box and say, we've got a win here with retail and then the location is less than ideal for the patrons, but I bet it sounds like we can. We've got a pretty good view corridor from this location and we can also Work around those trees, if needed, and that is something that city controls. on the half million dollars incentive to convince the developer to move forward. Can somebody comment on where that number came from and Ms. Boyer, you may have mentioned it in your presentation. What is the source of that incentive?

481

01:08:10.920 --> 01:08:14.160

BoyerL: So the, the source of that incentive is pursuant to the city's public investment policy, we would view that as a city completion grant. So that it would be paid. Upon completion of the improvements, not any kind of an upfront incentive. And so it's not TIFF money, it would be city funds, assuming that the City Council were to approve it. I, I have no information on the actual construction costs, nor have I seen a construction budget and I'm not sure the developer even has one, I mean, since this came up yesterday. However, from my perspective, I was looking at it as a 5050 partnership on the construction with our liability being capped at 500,000. They're guessing the budget is a million dollars so they may have more details on how they came up came up with the million dollar number.

Oliver Barakat: Okay, Given the limited amount of interior space. It sounds like a high number. But The 50% cap is is that in line with what we do with retail enhancement grants?

BoyerL: Well, retail enhancement grants are typically \$20 a square foot. So, you know, if you were looking at \$20 a square foot and saying this was a 5000 square

foot restaurant or if you were only saying it was an 1800 square foot rest square foot restaurant. Plus, we do not provide the retail enhancement for new construction. So it's kind of a little bit apples to.

483

01:08:34.080 --> 01:08:44.700

Oliver Barakat: Yeah, I'm just trying to align and precedent for the same type of development. I think it's \$1 per square foot, which I think we proposing increased but there's also it's \$1 per square foot or 50% correct? Cap right okay so the 50% we just didn't make out come out of thin air. For this particular proposal we've used that cap before or similar development.

485

01:08:55.410 --> 01:08:57.570

BoyerL: Correct.

486

01:08:58.590 --> 01:09:04.860

Oliver Barakat: There were some we didn't talk about this and the committee meeting much at all. But there's been number of comments regarding resiliency. And so given that this developers from South Florida as a pretty sophisticated group doing business all over the East Coast in another world. I gotta believe that's been thought through it with could someone make a comment on The issue of resiliency and and this project, not only as a relates to this particular development, but how the increase in protective services might impact the park and surrounding properties.

489

01:09:33.330 --> 01:09:44.370

BoyerL: So I'll start. And I'm going to let the developer comment on their construction technique. So number one, as you know that the site is virtually entirely paved at the moment. Between the River City improvements and the paved ASPHALT, PARKING LOT. It is, I would say 95% plus impervious surface right now so that we are not increasing the amount of impervious surface on the site by virtue of the site plan. The other thing that from a DIA perspective, we were focused on us when we discovered the underground fuel storage tank for the marina. As close to the river as it is, even though it's not leaking today and the environmental reports are are fine on it, we thought it would be prudent to relocate it To a location that is more in land and higher above ground screened appropriately. But nevertheless, if the site at any point were to have water inundation on the park or other areas adjacent to it. You wouldn't have the risk Of seepage from the fuel tank, so I'm going to let Mr. Diebenow or Mr. Robbins speak to their planed construction design.

497

01:10:48.810 --> 01:10:50.190

Steven Diebenow: So this is Steve Diebenow. I would say that, obviously we don't

have a general contractor selected. And so we don't have details but related Related group in general builds primarily water front projects. So they have expertise on all the different construction methodologies, all the different materials that are used. They are typically long time holders of property, which means that they want to build things that are going to last. For a very, very long time. That's why in this location, they're proposing to use block and plank rather than a podium with stick built above it. And so I can't point to you the exact code provisions or the exact building techniques that are going to be used, but they have great expertise in this area and they're looking to deliver a project that will last for a very very long time at this location.

503

01:11:48.510 --> 01:11:57.090

Oliver Barakat: Okay thank you want to switch back to some of the comments we talked about this a little bit of the committee meeting relating to the 30 parking spaces and there's a couple of moving parts with the notion of public parking one that MOSH is in flux, and that we don't know what's going to be replaced if MOSH does leave. But I do think and there's also the need for public parking for those who visit the park, not those who visit MOSH, but those that visit the park and the Riverwalk. There's a lot of people that that do that. So I want to ensure that the final term sheet of flexibility pertains to not just those who use whatever the occupier will be at the MOSH property, but the parking will be open to anyone, the public at visits the park as well. And the Riverwalk Because it wasn't sure on the current term sheet, which gave us that kind of flexibility and I want to make sure in the final term sheet. The city has relatively unfettered flexibility on which which member of the public can can use those 30 spaces.

509

01:12:56.940 --> 01:13:04.050

Steven Diebenow: This is Steve Diebenow Ms. Boyer already addressed that in the term sheet that was a point that she made abundantly clear that even if MOSH left this location which we personally hope they do not. But if MOSH were to leave the spots would be available to city. Because she did recognize that the park was there, there would be a public use. And so that is already built into the term sheet and Related intends to meet that that that request and that obligation.

512

01:13:24.240 --> 01:13:33.990

Oliver Barakat: Okay, to be clear, it would not be just for whoever replaces MOSH, it would just be, it would be open to the public for any any use any visitation.

513

01:13:34.470 --> 01:13:37.560

Steven Diebenow: There will be available at the city's discretion. Okay, thank you.

514

01:13:40.260 --> 01:13:44.850

Oliver Barakat: I think that is a all the questions I have, give me one second.

515

01:13:45.840 --> 01:13:54.210

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Okay, thanks, Mr. Barakat. David Ward you were at the meeting last Friday, do you have questions or comments.

516

01:13:55.350 --> 01:14:08.070

David Ward: I just also want to echo Chairman. Chairman Barakats, thanks to the Related group and Steve and your group for giving some consideration to the restaurant slash retail proposal. I think that's great. I think it's the type of thing that we're looking for. I guess One of my questions would be directed to Ms. Boyer and I want to, I know there's been a couple different iterations of this documents. I want to make sure I'm looking at the right one. Ina sent an email. Looks like yesterday at 12:03 and that has copies of the resolution and some staff report for both the DORO proposal and this one, although they're not related. I'm looking at resolution 2020-10-01 Where it's got some highlighted sections Lori, am I looking at the correct Correct. Well, excuse me, I know there's two different verses and I look at the most up to date version of this resolution.

523

01:14:58.110 --> 01:15:16.890

BoyerL: You are looking you're looking at the most up to date version that has been distributed. I can have Ina put one so I highlighted all the additions. And that's what you see there, and they all relate to the restaurant and bar. But if you will turn over to page five of the resolution.

524

01:15:19.200 --> 01:15:20.820

BoyerL: No, I said, on page five. Nope. Page four. So under Section 11 and Ina if you want to put up the version three I just want to show you the additional language that I am suggesting be added, which is more in the nature of a Scrivener's change than anything but Mr Diebenow contacted me about it earlier. And we wanted to get that Okay, so, scroll down to show the change in the nope, sorry, right there. So the blue changes are just remember we had talked about the performance schedule. And just to be clear, so what we're talking about is on final design to start 30 days after closing, but to be completed no later than blank. So in each of those cases, we were just inserting the phrase to be completed. Sure.

534

01:16:09.990 --> 01:16:12.240

David Ward: And that, I think that looks great. And I guess. My real only initial and Lori. I know we mentioned, and it may be in this version

that I'm looking at it, or the one that Ina has up on the screen, but I know we discussed last week. Some edition of Relatively cursory language or however that looks drafting wise relating to financing and some of the debt that was going to be taking on them a little property in terms of and is that included here somewhere. And I'm I'm missing it.

537

01:16:38.400 --> 01:16:43.650

BoyerL: It is not included in the term sheet. It was discussed at strategic implementation. How I mean if you would like it included in the term sheet so that you would be requiring a certain piece of information about the financing. How would you like that included that Would You Like It included as a condition to closing or a condition to commencement. What is your

540

01:17:03.000 --> 01:17:10.020

David Ward: You know i i. And that's a good question. And, you know, I'm happy to get Steve's input on this to my goal is not to be owner I'm, what I'm trying to sort of Think through and help the city through the resolution contract around is some situation. Like I said, I, I do not think it's going to be an issue from a Sophistic sophisticated group like the Related GROUP. WHO'S well capitalized and certainly well financed. I'm sure when they need to be. I just want to avoid a situation in which, for whatever reason, there is a delay in financing and obviously a lot of this. Is contingent on a large chunk of private debt and a large investment, by the way, by the Related groups. I appreciate. So I'm just trying to Maybe this is a question for Steve, I'm just trying to sort of find a way to encapsulate that here. Like I said, my goal is not to be onerous so maybe there's a way that we do that that's acceptable. It's the Related group and just gives a little assurances city.

547

01:18:04.920 --> 01:18:22.590

BoyerL: So as it stands, as I see it, there is not a financing condition. So the timeframes are all tied to other steps happening and it is not an out say to the next, or there is not an ability to avoid the clock ticking. Because one hasn't obtained financing. However, the other thing I would just say, I'm happy to let Mr. Diebnow now respond and make a suggestion. I don't know that this has to be resolved at this stage, and we could resolve that in the term sheet when it comes back at the November meeting. In as much as that would really be a term of the specific disposition and I don't know that it would be something we would be putting out in the notice of disposition.

551

01:18:51.330 --> 01:18:59.640

David Ward: Sure. And I'm and I'm fine with that too. I don't like I said, my goal is not here to insert needless steps in the process. So if

Lori, you know, I'll defer to you. If that's best handled in some way that's agreeable to everybody at a later date be that At the broader board meeting in November strategic implementation wherever this goes from here. I know there's a lot of moving pieces that's fine too. So my goal here is not to hold it up. I'm in support of it. I think it's great. I just wanted to make sure it's I would like something That to be in there in this Doc, you know, whether it's this necessarily document, but in projects going forward so that you know a lot of these things right in Section 11 that I'm looking through A lot of them are, by their nature right contingent upon somebody getting financing because the money's got to be lined up. So I'm appreciative of that. I just like to find some way to memorialize it but it doesn't have to have an here today. Lori I'll defer to you completely on when that's best to dress.

558

01:19:46.830 --> 01:19:47.280

BoyerL: Thank you.

559

01:19:49.980 --> 01:19:52.200

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Right. Mr. Ward. Any other comments or questions.

560

01:19:52.800 --> 01:19:54.060

David Ward: No sir Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

561

01:19:54.900 --> 01:19:57.450

Ron Moody (DIA Board): All right, Mr. Craig Gibbs questions, comments?

562

01:19:57.480 --> 01:19:59.460

Craig Gibbs: Yeah, just a few I do not want to hold up this project. I think it's a great asset for the city so thank you. The 30 spaces will be used at the public's discretion. Is that what I heard developer say?

565

01:20:22.500 --> 01:20:31.920

BoyerL: Through the Chair to Mr. Gibbs. Yes, you heard the developer say that, however, as long as MOSH remains a tenant of the city on that space. We have an obligation to provide those 30 spaces to MOSH if MOSH we're no longer to be a tenant on that space than we, we, the city still have the right to have those spaces and make them available to whomever we wish.

567

01:20:46.290 --> 01:20:46.800

Thank you.

568

01:20:49.110 --> 01:20:52.290



Craig Gibbs: Um, in terms of market survey. How many boats are launched from that particular boat ramp on a monthly or annual basis any idea.

570

01:21:01.680 --> 01:21:05.520

BoyerL: I do not have a statistic on that. I'm sure I could get it from the parks department. I will tell you that it is one of the busier boat ramps in town.

572

01:21:09.840 --> 01:21:12.810

Craig Gibbs: And what is the next closest boat launch ramp.

573

01:21:15.510 --> 01:21:23.400

BoyerL: Well, there is one at Goodby's on the St. John's as a public ramp. If we are talking about public as opposed to a private Marina, yes. I believe John Crescimbeni is on the call. He may know, is there one at Blue cypress, I think there's one at Blue Cyprus in Arlington. So there, there are not other boat ramp alternatives in the immediate vicinity of downtown that are public boat ramps.

576

01:21:43.560 --> 01:21:54.720

Craig Gibbs: Finally, any idea how many people did use that restaurant in its current iteration as River City Brewing on a monthly or annual basis.

577

01:21:57.210 --> 01:22:07.740

BoyerL: I again do not have those operating numbers except that the River City lease does have a base rent and then a percentage rent. And if gross revenue reaches a certain level on an annual basis. The percentage rent kicks in and I can tell you that, despite our requesting information on it, verifying information on sales on an annual basis. They have not reached the percentage rent level. In anywhere in the last five years that we have any records for I'm not aware that they've ever reached it. However, there is some correspondence that indicates there was some discussion going on in some year maybe 10 or 15 years ago as to whether in that given year, they should have reached it

581

01:22:43.920 --> 01:22:44.400

BoyerL: Okay.

582

01:22:45.390 --> 01:22:48.030

Craig Gibbs: Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

583

01:22:49.590 --> 01:22:53.580

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Okay, thank you Mr. Gibbs. Todd Froats. Questions, comments.

584

01:22:56.040 --> 01:23:02.490

Todd Froats: Thank you, Mr. Moody, I was at the Strategic Planning Committee, although I'm not a member of the committee, but I did listen to all the points there. And I think that not only from some of the members, but also the public, we've obviously heard that everybody would like something at that site to be able to enjoy, whether it's a retail space, restaurant, etc. I did go I did make a comment. During that meeting that listening to Mr or sorry council member Gaffney at a prior meeting regarding the old courthouse, you know, he encouraged us as a board to think outside the box a little bit and then we put these things out for for bid. You know, the developers make their money by currently in this current market. It's obviously real estate apartments that that seems to be the high demand money making project right now so I can understand them, not wanting to do a restaurant. from a financial standpoint, and of course we as the public would love to have some sort of amenity there to be able to use. It's on the riverfront We have something there. Now that we can access giving it away and not having something there would be a big deal. So I brought up the point that COUNCIL MEMBER Gaffney had suggested was like, if it's going to cost more. Let us know because we want we want certain things. If this was under our control, we would put it out for bid and we would require a restaurant and retail space, but it's not. It's at least set it on a 70 something years before we have control of this space. So let's not forget that the current tenant can do whatever they want with this space, they can build apartments with zero retail space zero acces They can maintain the 10 feet, instead of the 25 feet, Ms Boyer, thank you for securing that 25 feet walkway. I think that's a major deal So let's not forget that. I mean, they. This is out of our control. Now of course we could buy it back for approximately \$10 million, which I don't think we want to do that because we might be back in the same spot, putting it out for bid requiring a restaurant and we'd be spending \$10 million. So I think Part of these comments are to council member Cumber because they're the Council is going to have to vote on this. So I would strongly encourage the disposition of the property. Now that it has a restaurant included in the space and public access and it's a benefit to the public, I strongly encourage the Council to dispose of the property. Second. Thank you to Related group for coming back with the restaurant option, even though they're asking for money to do it. You know that we have a cap. You know, I don't know if it'll cost a million dollars. I'm not sure if they know it'll cost a million dollars they have, they probably have a better idea than I do. But we're capped at the 500,000 Ms Boyer also mentioned to me that they're going to be required to operate this restaurant. With certain standards through the at least the 20 year term of the property tax incentive so that that's important. We do have when I first looked at the project, I noticed three things came to mind. One,

I was immediately you know where's the riverfront access. Can we do we have access to this we walk in front of it, or does it, but up to the water. So we do have the 25 feet of riverfront access That will go around the building, you can actually walk around it. I don't think it's 25 feet on the other side of it, but we do have a walkway to the ramp. So we have complete access to the river, which is a big plus. We then I asked about the restaurant or is the new restaurant going okay there wasn't one of the first Iteration of this, however, Ms Boyer pointed out to me that adjacent to this property. We do have a space for a restaurant, and I think we want to proceed with that, according to Ms Boyer, and I agree with this. We want to proceed with developing a restaurant adjacent to the space as well. I think Ms Boyer said that is it has a footprint, similar to the safe harbor restaurant. at the beach and that would be great to have there. So we do have another restaurant, which would which kind of why I was sort of in favor of the development in the first place. Without a restaurant in it. Now that it has one. It's even better. And then third, where the docks. It's important I heard the public comments from a boater earlier on. I am a boater and there are very few spots. You can go downtown I don't think we ever come downtown to boat anymore. So this is a this is good news that we will have spaces available. And not only can you access MOSH. But you can now access this restaurant as well. The outdoor restaurant seems appealing to me. It's something we don't have and I heard the public comment about, well, it's it's Jacksonville, Florida. It's so hot. It's true. It is hot and that's why we don't have a lot of outdoor seating, but we need more outdoor seating. So anyway, I'm in favor of it and That was the only question I had. I'm assuming that this is the case, but I just did Mr Diebenow. Now I'm assuming there's access, both from the street and from the river walk to the restaurant.

616

01:28:16.500 --> 01:28:25.530

Steven Diebenow: Yeah, we have. I'm sorry. We haven't worked out the details, but yes, there will be access, it's you know, it's kind of near the circle that exists today. On the south side and then there will be a path of some sort. built, not only to the building but but also directly to the Riverwalk yes we aren't those deep, we don't have those details yet but yes, that's the intent. All right.

618

01:28:38.730 --> 01:28:39.510

Todd Froats: Thank you. That's everything

619

01:28:40.860 --> 01:28:45.990

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Okay. Thank you, Mr. Todd Froats good comments. Jim Citrano, questions, comments.

620

01:28:47.130 --> 01:28:50.010

Jimmy Citrano: Yeah, just a couple of questions. First, and I'll make a comment on The chair to Ms. Boyer. Ms. Boyer I believe the Area underneath the bridge that is owned by the DOT, that's leased through DIA has roughly 200 parking spaces today.

624

01:29:10.080 --> 01:29:10.620

BoyerL: Correct.

625

01:29:11.190 --> 01:29:21.510

Jimmy Citrano: And that number may change a little bit depending on how that areas reconfigured for the trailers as a result of the The change of the approach to the program. Correct.

627

01:29:26.400 --> 01:29:33.660

BoyerL: That is correct. I mean, we would have the same physical space under the bridge, but some of the spaces that are striped for cars right now might become double long spaces and striped for boats and trailers. So effectively you might lose, I believe there are 18 spaces for trailers right now. And some of them will remain in the current area, but we'll make up whatever the differences is of whatever is lost in that parking lot.

629

01:29:54.210 --> 01:30:10.740

Jimmy Citrano: But, but for our purposes, we're still going to have a significant number well over 100 maybe 200 maybe slightly less of public parking spaces that are available for those people that want to come down and access the river. Correct.

630

01:30:11.070 --> 01:30:13.020

BoyerL: Correct. And that's why we leased that property.

631

01:30:13.590 --> 01:30:17.100

Jimmy Citrano: Okay, then the second question is along the lines of Mr. Froat's question relative to the signing of the restaurant and access to the restaurant by the public. I wasn't sure if The, the land because I think the original iteration had the city taking ownership of the triangular piece of land is that staying now with The fee staying with the developer now. And are we going to have some kind of an easement from the restaurant so that people can leave and get down to the boardwalk.

635

01:30:55.380 --> 01:31:12.810

BoyerL: The answer is that some portion of parcel B will no longer become parkland

that's owned by the city, but it will become private land as part of the restaurant. However, I will tell you we have not changed any exhibits or anything, but we received a new legal description yesterday where the developer had moved the line between B and C again and expanded parcel B so as it went down toward the circle. So the total square footage and B got there. And then we're cutting out the restaurant. So ultimately will be pretty close to the same B maybe a little bit smaller. And yes, there will be interconnectivity between the restaurant space and the park, as well as between the restaurant space and the private apartment.

638

01:31:47.280 --> 01:32:13.260

Jimmy Citrano: Okay, I'm just, this is, this is just very anecdotal. But Mr. Gibbs asked about the background. I've been down to the site twice now one during the weekday and I also went down Saturday afternoon and that is a very, very active boat ramp. And so I am very happy that this plan includes or retains that boat ramp because it is It's very, very, very much used by the public, it's anecdotal. I've only been there twice, but both times. There were a number of people Coming in and out of the water, utilizing that boat ramp. my big picture comment I don't think is any different from a thematic standpoint than anybody else's said, I think, you know, like I said my comments and the SIC committee is on balance. This project, especially with the inclusion of the contemplated restaurant Hits, certainly, in my opinion, the major priorities that this agency should have which is either jobs or in this case residence and to add 335 residence to the south bank. That goes towards the larger goal of 10,000 units downtown is a big deal. I certainly have a lot of confidence and Just from a reputational standpoint, the developers ability to do this. And so I'm on support.

647

01:33:36.510 --> 01:33:39.750

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Okay. Thank you, Mr. Citrano. Bill Adams, are you here? Bill is not here. Carol is not here, Mr. Gillam, Braxton Gillam.

649

01:33:48.870 --> 01:33:52.170

Braxton Gillam: Well, the benefit of going last is most everything has already been said. I would echo I noted, Mr. Froats, it must have been following along my own mindset, from my perspective, you know this. I guess the politically correct comment would say this site is currently very tired. And you know 25 years ago I can date personally I routinely visited this restaurant and bar and just we don't anymore. And it's because of the condition of the facility. And the fact that they're setting five plus years worth of a lease left, and the city has got to make a decision. Do we want to, you know, try to improve this this site is improve access to the river for the citizens and, maybe, you know, improve our tax base to Or not. And I think, you know, frankly, I want to thank staff for how hard they've worked with the

developer to come up with a seems like a very smart. Well thought out plan. And I think it Related group for coming back and giving Jacksonville chance. I would say this. I think that the fact that they are here Related groups here is a function of the fact we're doing the right thing. Heard some criticism and public comment about you can criticism of tax. Benefit in rev grants and that kind of things that we're providing to developers. And I would say to you that What you see is what you get. I mean, when you don't, we don't step in and help. I mean we we have a you know a lot of unused or underused or poorly used property downtown Jacksonville and you know it's going to require help reason why this tax. CRC setup. We're doing our job. And again, I think that I think the Related groups are coming and hearing us thank the staff for for helping get us to where we are. I would say this. I also appreciate the Related groups willingness to listen to the public and give us what work what we want and what what our citizens. Once I'm in support of it.

662

01:35:45.330 --> 01:35:49.500

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Okay, Council Member Cumber any comments.

663

01:35:52.230 --> 01:35:56.190

CM Cumber: Thank you. And thank you to the chair. I do have a couple of comments. I was at the committee meeting and it was great, listening to all the committee members as well as the public and And I've also met with the developers and talked to Lori Boyer about this, you know, I think, generally it's it's a great idea. It's been well negotiated. I'm glad I'm, you know, always a little reluctant on incentives and so the 500,000 i'm glad there's a cap. On that and so it seems reasonable. I completely understand why we would do that. And just a little. And I just wanted to kind of piggyback on some things that have been said, I do think it's important for people to remember that, you know, We're not really giving the property away now really functionally did that 22 years ago when we signed the 99 year lease and so I think that that's really critical. And I'm glad that I'm really happy. The DIA has worked so hard to make sure that even though we don't have control this piece of property that we're getting a, you know, we're getting a really good deal as I see it for the city. Do you want to put my two cents in on the parking issues. I'm actually this is probably one of the not the only place that Ms. Boyer and I disagree but parking. You know, I actually, I think there's plenty of parking there. I would just kind of going forward. I always think it's important, particularly when we're developing and downtown urban areas. I think when you see around the country around the world. You know, the more parking we put in the more people will drive to these areas. And I think it's important, and certainly something that I'm working on and councils working on to, to make sure that people aren't aren't needing the parking. And so the more parking and parking structures we put in downtown, the more people will drive downtown. I think we really need to start encouraging developers to make the The developments in downtown more walkable more bikeable encourage

people to use transit, whatever that form may be doesn't need to be a bus or whatever that form may be so I would just You know, I would be on the other side of needing more parking. I think there's plenty. And I think that, you know, we could probably reduce parking and you know if it's a good product people will go so Anyway, but I just want to, I think it's, it, it looks great. And I think that the, you know, not everyone's going to be happy. But that's what happens in negotiations, and it certainly will be a ton better than what we have there and So thank you for letting me speak and it's great to hear Everyone's input. Thanks.

679

01:38:51.480 --> 01:38:57.090

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Okay, you know, LeAnn Cumber said it best when she said we gave our rights away with a 99 year lease was struck the fact of the matter is we can't control this property for 77 years. So I think this is this is probably a great decision and a great solution. You know, when you look at the million dollars that are expected be spent for the facility. There's, I guess there's 1800 square feet of indoor heated and cooled area, then there's another 5000 square feet of deck here. So we've got 5000 feet overall Of I'm sorry 1800 of indoor facility 3200 square feet of outside deck area well. So, for a total of 5000 square feet. So If you take the million dollars and divide it by just the 1800 square feet. That's about \$555 a square foot for cost. Or if you took the million dollars in divided by the overall 5000 square feet and a lot of that is outdoor seating. It'd be about \$200 per square foot. So I'm satisfied as a real estate appraiser that you know whatever is being put there, it's going to be good quality. So I think we can be happy with that. I think the other thing is, is I think will really have a home run. If we had this type of facility, together with the residential and then next door on the excess land we put in a fish camp concept. I mean, you know, that would really activate this part of the South Bank. And like we said early in the discussion. There's a lot of moving parts here not everyone's going to be happy. But I think this is a pretty good solution. So anyway. I think all of our comments and our questions have been asked, is there any last minute questions that need to be answered. But other than that, I need a motion that addresses the Resolution 2020 10 dash 01 and Ms. Boyer you're going to have to help me here. Are we going to have a motion on version three which is the very latest or is it going to be two, or is it going to be

692

01:41:08.730 --> 01:41:13.200

BoyerL: So, Mr. Chairman. What I would ask is that whoever makes the motion. selects the version of the resolution, they prefer. And I would suggest version two, which has the term sheet coming back to you for approval in November. As opposed to the one where you have essentially blessed it at this time. So I would say, version two of the resolution, which And then in terms of the term sheet that is attached the very latest one, which I showed you on the screen, which is version three which both adds the restaurant and then adds the scriveners error

change about the completion dates would be version three of the term sheet.

696

01:41:52.530 --> 01:41:54.120

Todd Froats: Sounds like a motion for Mr. Gillam.

697

01:42:00.210 --> 01:42:01.410

Braxton Gillam: That was a mouthful. I think what I heard. Is it based upon the staff recommendation that I would move to the resolution is number two we approve number two.

699

01:42:14.790 --> 01:42:17.730

BoyerL: It's which version of the term sheet version three?

700

01:42:18.660 --> 01:42:24.330

Ron Moody (DIA Board): No, he said, version two. So, this is resolution 2020 2010 01. Oh, one version two.

701

01:42:25.290 --> 01:42:27.960

Braxton Gillam: Which means to come back to us in November. Correct.

702

01:42:28.260 --> 01:42:33.330

BoyerL: Correct. And then you need to identify which version of the term sheet you want attached to that resolution.

703

01:42:33.660 --> 01:42:36.480

Braxton Gillam: That would be version three. The most recent version that.

704

01:42:37.980 --> 01:42:39.090

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Three so.

705

01:42:39.750 --> 01:42:42.240

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Here we have a motion by Mr. Braxton Gillam.

706

01:42:42.300 --> 01:42:43.590

Craig Gibbs: I think I just got a second.

707

01:42:44.100 --> 01:42:46.320

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Motion by Craig Gibbs, a second.



708

01:42:46.410 --> 01:42:47.940

Craig Gibbs: A Second. I'll second that motion.

709

01:42:48.870 --> 01:42:50.010

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Alright, so we have with.

710

01:42:50.070 --> 01:42:51.900

Jimmy Citrano: The Chairman before you call for the vote.

711

01:42:51.900 --> 01:42:56.730

Jimmy Citrano: Can, can I ask again, can I ask if Mr. Sawyer is on the phone so I know what my status is.

712

01:42:57.090 --> 01:42:57.750

BoyerL: Let's see.

713

01:42:58.740 --> 01:42:59.280

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Thank you Jim.

714

01:43:01.650 --> 01:43:02.460

BoyerL: Ms. Menzini. So, Mr. Sawyer prior to voting, Mr. Citrano announced his conflict, Mr. Crescimbeni has provided me a copy of his disclosure form, which I understand you want me to read and it is a disclosure of local officers interest saying I James Citrano junior hereby disclose on 10 19 20 Be the measure before my agency and the nature of my conflicting interest in the measure is as follows. My employer Truist Bank has a business relationship with the Related group. I have no personal involvement in the management of this relationship and it is signed and dated 10 13 20 and I believe Mr. Citrano's question to you was whether this was a voting conflict and he was required to abstain from voting or whether this was simply a disclosure.

719

01:44:00.750 --> 01:44:08.550

John Sawyer (OGC): THANK YOU, John Sawyer with the office of general counsel. So that is a voting conflict, however, State statute allows An exception and allows you to go ahead and vote, provided you declare the conflict which he has done and provided you file a Form 8 which he has done as well. So he is eligible to vote.

721

01:44:20.940 --> 01:44:21.420

Jimmy Citrano: Thank you.

722

01:44:22.680 --> 01:44:24.120

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Alright, so we have a motion. We have a Second, Let's go ahead and take the vote. Mr. Gilliam, how do you vote.

726

01:44:29.760 --> 01:44:30.450

Braxton Gillam: In favor.

727

01:44:31.650 --> 01:44:33.570

Ron Moody (DIA Board): In favor right.

728

01:44:34.680 --> 01:44:36.660

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Mr. Oliver Barakat. How do you vote.

729

01:44:38.820 --> 01:44:47.610

Oliver Barakat: Let me first state that my company does represent Related I am not involved with the transaction personally but CBRE does represent them. So I will fill out the appropriate form as Mr. Sawyer's suggestions. I do vote in the affirmative.

733

01:45:00.510 --> 01:45:03.420

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Ok. Thank you, Mr. Jim Citrano.

734

01:45:04.500 --> 01:45:05.430

Jimmy Citrano: I'm in favor.

735

01:45:06.060 --> 01:45:07.350

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Todd Froats.

736

01:45:07.800 --> 01:45:08.430

Todd Froats: In favor.

737

01:45:08.970 --> 01:45:09.810

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Craig Gibbs.

738

01:45:10.170 --> 01:45:10.890

Craig Gibbs: I'm in favor.

739

01:45:11.220 --> 01:45:11.970

Ron Moody (DIA Board): David Ward.

740

01:45:12.630 --> 01:45:13.290

David Ward: I'm in favor.

741

01:45:13.860 --> 01:45:15.750

Ron Moody (DIA Board): All right. And I like wise am in favor.

742

01:45:16.950 --> 01:45:21.600

Ina Mezini: Mr. Chairman, yes. Bill Adams also joined the call as well. So here's

743

01:45:23.400 --> 01:45:24.720

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Bill Adams, are you there.

744

01:45:25.080 --> 01:45:30.810

Bill Adams: I am, my apologies to everyone for arriving late since I missed the discussion. I'll abstain.

745

01:45:31.590 --> 01:45:33.750

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Okay, we're going to abstain with With Bill Adams. Okay, so let the record reflect that 1234567 so we have seven in favor. We have one abstain. So the motion carries.

748

01:45:56.760 --> 01:45:58.020

Steven Diebenow: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

749

01:45:59.040 --> 01:46:05.850

Ron Moody (DIA Board): All right. And thank you, staff, and thank you everyone for your hard work on this. This was, as I said, a lot of moving parts, but I think, I think the issues have been resolved. Right, let's go to the next resolution is 2020 10 02 this will be the rev grant term sheet for the Doro project so Ms. Boyer Are you ready to tee that one up.

752

01:46:24.240 --> 01:46:27.930

BoyerL: I'm going to let Mr. Kelly share that one with you.

753

01:46:30.030 --> 01:46:41.520

Steve Kelley: Mr. Chair, Steve Kelley with DIA and this is a property on A. Phillip Randolph Boulevard located in the sports and entertainment district. Known as the DORO fixture building that would that property, which is a

full city block along A Phillip Randolph Boulevard. In proximity to the current location of Intuition Ale works, Manifest distilling on the south side on the north side of this property, you have the veterans coliseum in very close proximity to the ball field as well as lot J and the development activity there and of course the stadium and dailies place all within a three to five, five block area, the request is for a rev grant of 65% and 15 years which is within the authority of the DIA board and that 65% rev grant is calculated that 5,000,751,000 and The development itself is proposed as a 247 unit multifamily mixed use apartment complex the mixed use components being the restaurant on the ground floor with an accompanying restaurant and bar or service on the upstairs with a outdoor seating area as well. The developers in negotiation with the adjacent property owner for an activated street area that would be used during games and concert activities and other activities within that sports and entertainment district. It's not in our developers or this developers unilateral authority to to make that happen. But he's in good faith negotiations with the adjacent property owner to make that happen. And those negotiations seem to be moving forward. Well, Rise is a very seasoned development company out of Valdosta, Georgia, Mr. Matt Marshall is on the line with us. He's Vice President of Development for Rise. His Council Paul Harden is also on the line with us, I believe, and this was well received by the SIC at its meeting and of course will request. Chairman Barakat of that committee to speak to it and on behalf of the Committee in a moment. With that said, I'm happy to address any questions or, as I mentioned, Mr. Marshall is on the line also accompanied by his Council Paul Harden.

767

01:49:29.820 --> 01:49:30.540

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Okay. Let's, let's go down the line and I'd like to hear your comments and your questions and Braxton, I'm going to start with you. Braxton Gillam.

769

01:49:43.590 --> 01:50:03.960

Braxton Gillam: This is an older structure that for as long as I can remember not been been been activated in it with the whole all the plans you know and changes that are going on that part of downtown, I think it's an exciting opportunity I must admit I I do have some questions about the project. And I'm just reading. It says one that's new to me. I guess I'll spend more time studying the River City project. Is it a expected \$50 million construction project, is that correct? Anybody?

773

01:50:19.740 --> 01:50:21.540

Steve Kelley: Bear with me. Just one second. Estimate construction costs on this one. The underwritten construction costs are 50.3 million There were some eliminations from the construction budget related to finance costs and reserves and such that are not reflected in that number. Mr. Marshall. I know you're on the line. You may speak to what the gross number is

if you have it. I don't have that number and actually I do.  
The gross number is 65.6 million.

780

01:51:25.290 --> 01:51:31.110

Braxton Gillam: And looks like a 6.2 proposed program since 2008

781

01:51:31.110 --> 01:51:46.800

Steve Kelley: Number that number was modified due to a miscalculation related to the 4% discount discount for early payment and following that that recalculation it's 5,751,000.

782

01:51:50.070 --> 01:51:53.580

Braxton Gillam: Now, I heard you say that I didn't understand that. That makes sense. Now I got it. I mean, I'm in favor, no further questions. Thank you.

784

01:52:00.390 --> 01:52:03.120

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Bill Adams questions or comments, please.

785

01:52:09.000 --> 01:52:14.700

Bill Adams: I don't have any I heard the presentation at the SIC I'm fully in support of the project.

786

01:52:15.600 --> 01:52:16.170

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Okay, thank you.

787

01:52:17.910 --> 01:52:19.860

Ron Moody (DIA Board): All right, Oliver Barakat.

788

01:52:28.470 --> 01:52:32.790

Oliver Barakat: Sorry, I'm in favor of this. I just want to express a little bit of frustration that you know as a broker, you, you tend to look at and analyze all the vacant property that is downtown and we've got a lot of vacant parcels, and I don't want to beat a dead horse because I know that the public and some of design meetings brought this up a lot but I do think you at least need to acknowledged the fact that the building that we're losing as a historically attractive building, whether it's quote historically significant or not, that's not for us to decide on this board But when we have so much vacant land all over the downtown and the market is clearly showing a desire to occupy historic buildings, whether it's retail or creative office. It's frustrating that we're losing this building on this side I I'M JUST BAFFLED that this land side is so valuable that given all the vacant land, we have the developer would choose

this. But we don't have anything within our criteria that based on that we should not give these incentives. I mean, our incentives clearly stated it residential is being added. And it fulfills the other mission and goals of the authority which are pretty clear. And this which which this prop, which just development does aid and abet Then we should vote in the approved, we should approve it, which I will do. But I did want to say for the record. When we update our plan, we should really think about as a board. Is it are right now not right. Is it should we be subsidizing allocating taxed at taxpayer dollars towards a development which, while, on the one hand, adds residential density. On the other hand, helps Aids in a bets towards the demolition of Our history which is becoming more and more scares as the downtown grows and evolves and the public has been pretty succinct in asking us to consider these buildings and incentivize them and preserve them. Despite any particular landmark status or not. And we also have we just approved and going through city council right now a new historic effort so that, on the one hand we save these buildings and preserve them. And on the other hand with this project. Today we're providing incentives towards a demolition of a building. So it seems a little bit inconsistent to me, and I think we need to as a board address that consistency or lack thereof. But despite all that, given what we have on the books today, we should approve this project and have this debate at some other time. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

808

01:55:37.290 --> 01:55:41.460

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Thank you. Okay. Jim Citrano. Questions, comments.

809

01:55:45.030 --> 01:56:03.480

Jimmy Citrano: I unfortunately did not was not able to stay on the line strategic implementation, but I did read the minutes. And there was a discussion about parking. I believe all the parking spaces are reserved solely for the residence and I'm okay with that. But what what was the final parking count here because I saw different numbers in in the minutes versus the staff report.

811

01:56:16.290 --> 01:56:33.720

Steve Kelley: Through the Chair to Mr. Citrano, our term sheet calls for a minimum of 280 spaces. Mr. Marshall can can confirm this, I believe that parking garages is structured today as 289 spaces. Mr. Marshall, can you confirm, please. That's correct.

812

01:56:35.430 --> 01:56:35.760

Jimmy Citrano: Okay. Um, I don't have any, any other comments i'm in favor of the project.

814

01:56:45.750 --> 01:56:48.000

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Todd Froats. Questions, comments.

815

01:56:49.500 --> 01:56:52.260

Todd Froats: No questions or comments, I'm in favor of the project. Thank you.

816

01:56:54.000 --> 01:56:54.750

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Craig Gibbs.

817

01:56:56.580 --> 01:56:58.350

Craig Gibbs: No further questions or comments.

818

01:57:00.330 --> 01:57:01.650

Ron Moody (DIA Board): All right, Mr. David Ward.

819

01:57:03.270 --> 01:57:04.410

David Ward: No questions or comments.

820

01:57:05.550 --> 01:57:07.260

Ron Moody (DIA Board): All right, council member Cumber, please.

822

01:57:10.680 --> 01:57:16.950

CM Cumber: Thank you through the chair. I'll just say I'm, I'm actually glad that the parking spaces are limited to the residents. I think we need to take up any more spots over there for parking So that's, that's it. Thanks.

825

01:57:27.210 --> 01:57:31.500

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Right, I need a motion on resolution 2020-10-02.

826

01:57:32.850 --> 01:57:33.870

BoyerL: And, Mr. Chairman. Before you procede.

827

01:57:35.460 --> 01:57:41.550

BoyerL: Mr. Kelly. Is there a any revision to the term sheet or was it just a revision to the staff report.

828

01:57:43.860 --> 01:57:53.010

Steve Kelley: The revision to the term sheet only captures the the changes related to the rev grant amount and the contribution. So those

numbers were updated in the term sheet as well.

830

01:57:57.960 --> 01:58:07.620

BoyerL: So what you'd be requesting is that the motion be on the resolution as it was distributed, together with the revised or updated term sheet. Correct.

831

01:58:07.680 --> 01:58:10.650

Steve Kelley: That is correct. Thank you. Thank you.

832

01:58:12.300 --> 01:58:13.830

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Okay, with that clarification.

833

01:58:15.570 --> 01:58:16.410

Ron Moody (DIA Board): I need motion.

834

01:58:18.030 --> 01:58:19.170

Todd Froats: Mr. Moody.

835

01:58:19.740 --> 01:58:24.150

Todd Froats: Yes, Ms. Boyer, did you say you wanted to get public comment before we voted on this one.

836

01:58:25.620 --> 01:58:40.140

BoyerL: Um, I think that since we had the issue with the login initially if Mr. Moody would just see if there's anyone else who wanted to speak before you vote, it probably would be a good idea. I'm not sure that there's anyone new that has joined the call, but perhaps.

837

01:58:40.740 --> 01:58:46.650

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Okay, I think that's a great idea, Ina, would you check to see if there's anyone that would like to make some comments.

838

01:58:47.970 --> 01:58:50.820

Ina Mezini: No hands are raised at the moment. Okay.

839

01:58:55.710 --> 01:58:58.230

Craig Gibbs: I'd like to, I like move for approval of resolution 2020-10-03.



840

01:59:01.020 --> 01:59:02.880

Craig Gibbs: With the amended term sheet.

841

01:59:03.960 --> 01:59:04.590

Craig Gibbs: Second,

842

01:59:05.670 --> 01:59:09.240

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Mr. Gibbs you said 03, but I think you meant 02.

843

01:59:11.400 --> 01:59:15.270

Craig Gibbs: Beg your pardon 2020 10 02 okay.

844

01:59:15.330 --> 01:59:18.060

Ron Moody (DIA Board): With the revised term sheet. Okay, now have a motion for approval.

846

01:59:21.810 --> 01:59:22.530

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Is there a second.

847

01:59:22.830 --> 01:59:24.780

Todd Froats: I'll second the motion. Todd Froats.

848

01:59:25.530 --> 01:59:29.370

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Todd Froats has seconded the motion any last minute discussion.

849

01:59:31.530 --> 01:59:35.010

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Right. Braxton Gillam how do you vote.

850

01:59:35.610 --> 01:59:36.090

Braxton Gillam: Favor

851

01:59:37.110 --> 01:59:38.850

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Okay. Bill Adams.

852

01:59:39.570 --> 01:59:40.200

Bill Adams: I'm in favor.

853

01:59:41.130 --> 01:59:42.000

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Oliver Barakat.

854

01:59:43.170 --> 01:59:43.440

Oliver Barakat: In favor.

855

01:59:44.940 --> 01:59:45.720

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Jim Citrano.

856

01:59:46.830 --> 01:59:47.700

Jimmy Citrano: I'm in favor.

857

01:59:48.690 --> 01:59:50.460

Todd Froats: In favor

858

01:59:51.030 --> 01:59:51.990

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Craig Gibbs.

859

01:59:52.530 --> 01:59:53.250

Craig Gibbs: I'm in favor

860

01:59:53.730 --> 01:59:54.690

Ron Moody (DIA Board): And David Ward.

861

01:59:55.380 --> 01:59:58.140

Ron Moody (DIA Board): I'm in favor and likewise i'm in favor So we have a eight for and no naves. So this motion carries resolution 2020 10 02 with the revised term sheet. Right, thank you. Let's go to the next phase of our agenda. We're at the downtown Investment Authority, and we have minutes from the September 16th meeting. Hopefully you've read the minutes. And if there are any revisions. We need to hear that, if not i'd like a motion that they'd be approved.

865

02:00:29.580 --> 02:00:30.210

A GoPro

866

02:00:31.380 --> 02:00:34.200

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Okay. Braxton Gulliam has made a motion to approve.

867

02:00:35.580 --> 02:00:36.090

Jimmy Citrano: Second.

868

02:00:37.980 --> 02:00:40.770

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Second by Jim Citrano. So, all in favor say aye.

869

02:00:42.120 --> 02:00:42.450

David Ward: Aye.

870

02:00:42.780 --> 02:00:43.380

Ron Moody (DIA Board): all opposed? No.

872

02:00:46.500 --> 02:01:02.490

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Alright. The ayes have it. Ok let's go to the last item of business today. And it's the resolution 2020 10 03 and this is the allocation of development rights for the Doro project that we just discussed so Ms. Boyer would you take the lead on that please.

873

02:01:02.550 --> 02:01:04.410

BoyerL: And Mr. Parola has this one.

874

02:01:06.240 --> 02:01:08.430

guy parola: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and And board members and you're correct. This resolution 2020 10 dash 3 is the allocation of development rights for the Doro building project if I could go over a little bit of math to tell you how we got to the allocation. That'd be great. For starters, they're looking at 247 multifamily units and 9000 square feet of commercial. So that's going to be the new development. So to capture the existing development of which there's 56,140 square feet. Of warehouse industrial we have converted those for want of a better term, vested development rights using an exchange matrix in our downtown development order to 103 multifamily units. This leaves the development plans shy of 144 multifamily units. So what's being asked of this resolution by the board is to allocate 144 multifamily units. Which will be added to the hundred and three units converted from the vested development rights for Total of 247 multifamily units. So that's The residential math. The their commercial retail math is a lot simpler. We're asking that a maximum of 10,000 square feet of commercial retail be allocated to the development, even though the development says 9000 square feet, because the retail component and restaurant components are sort of bifurcated Vertically speaking. We'd hate to come back to the board if they have 50 square feet, hundred square feet, 250 square feet. In addition, so we're asking for a maximum of 10,000

square feet. Whatever is not utilized will be returned to the DIA for later use without any further action by the DIA. I will point out that sections, four, and five of the resolution contain the performance standards. That that mimic or mirror the performance. The lines in the term sheet. With that said, I'm here to entertain any questions. Thank you for your time.

887

02:03:09.690 --> 02:03:10.620

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Thank you, Mr. Parola.

888

02:03:12.390 --> 02:03:15.600

Ron Moody (DIA Board): All right, let's go and get a motion on the floor.

889

02:03:20.580 --> 02:03:25.140

Craig Gibbs: I'd like to move resolution 2020 10 03.

890

02:03:26.760 --> 02:03:27.120

Braxton Gillam: Second.

891

02:03:28.080 --> 02:03:38.280

Ron Moody (DIA Board): I have a motion by Mr. Craig Gibbs, I have a second by Braxton Gillam. All right, let's have our comments and questions Mr. Gillam, why don't you start.

892

02:03:41.010 --> 02:03:41.670

Braxton Gillam: No questions.

893

02:03:43.050 --> 02:03:43.500

Ron Moody (DIA Board): All right.

894

02:03:44.970 --> 02:03:45.690

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Bill Adams.

895

02:03:46.800 --> 02:03:47.640

Bill Adams: Nothing for me.

896

02:03:48.570 --> 02:03:49.410

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Oliver Barakat.

897

02:03:51.090 --> 02:03:51.300

Oliver Barakat: None.

898

02:03:53.310 --> 02:03:54.150

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Jim Citrano.

899

02:03:55.050 --> 02:03:55.890

Jimmy Citrano: No questions.

900

02:03:56.250 --> 02:03:56.970

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Todd Froats.

901

02:03:57.420 --> 02:03:58.140

Todd Froats: No questions.

902

02:03:58.350 --> 02:03:59.220

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Craig Gibbs.

903

02:03:59.880 --> 02:04:02.160

Ron Moody (DIA Board): No questions and David Ward.

904

02:04:02.580 --> 02:04:03.270

David Ward: No questions.

905

02:04:03.660 --> 02:04:05.580

Ron Moody (DIA Board): And council member Cumber please.

906

02:04:06.120 --> 02:04:07.200

CM Cumber: No questions. Thank you.

907

02:04:07.860 --> 02:04:09.480

Ron Moody (DIA Board): I thank you. All right.

908

02:04:14.250 --> 02:04:21.660

Ron Moody (DIA Board): So let's go ahead and vote on this motion. This is resolution 2020 10 dash oh three.

909

02:04:22.800 --> 02:04:24.780

Ron Moody (DIA Board): All right, Braxton Gillam. How do you vote.

910

02:04:26.730 --> 02:04:27.240

Braxton Gillam: Favor.

911

02:04:29.400 --> 02:04:29.970

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Bill Adams.

912

02:04:31.110 --> 02:04:31.800

Bill Adams: In favor.

913

02:04:32.160 --> 02:04:33.090

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Oliver Barakat.

914

02:04:36.330 --> 02:04:37.170

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Jim Citrano.

915

02:04:38.010 --> 02:04:38.880

Jimmy Citrano: I'm in favor.

916

02:04:39.300 --> 02:04:40.230

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Todd Froats.

917

02:04:40.350 --> 02:04:42.450

Ron Moody (DIA Board): In favor. Craig Gibbs.

918

02:04:42.990 --> 02:04:44.850

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Approved. David Ward.

919

02:04:45.510 --> 02:04:46.020

David Ward: Approved.

920

02:04:47.580 --> 02:04:59.700

Ron Moody (DIA Board): So let the record reflect that motion resolution 2020 10 dash 03 has been approved eight to zero. There's no nays.

Alright folks. Thank you for that. Our next item of business is our CEO informational briefing Ms. Boyer, your, your turn.

922

02:05:08.820 --> 02:05:18.750

BoyerL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I have just a few items that I want to give you an update on. But before we even get to that my most important order of business is to ask your accommodation for a special meeting of the Board potentially on the 28th of this month. So I'd asked GM if there's anyone who knows right now that that is out of the question. I believe that when I discussed this with the chair. He was hoping we might be able to have it Wednesday morning, rather than Wednesday afternoon. But if we need it. Wednesday afternoon we can maybe do one o'clock. The purpose of this meeting will be to take up the rev grant For lot J and the allocation of development rights for lot J. Those are the only two parts. Of the lot J package that are coming to the DIA as I, at least as far as I know now, and we did not have the documentation yet. To process it, but I know based on the city council schedule. We had hoped to move our November meeting up a week from the 18th to the 11th and then be able to accommodate it there. The problem with that is both this current notice a disposition Won't have run its 30 day course if we move our meeting up and the 11th is Veterans Day. So the 11th is not a good meeting day. Based on that. The suggestion is to try to go to the 28th, if we do it this month we're still allowed to have a virtual meeting. We know that it's going to be a little bit more complicated. Beginning in November, when we need to find a meeting room and we are working on those logistical details. However, my request is do I have anyone who knows they cannot attend on the 28th. Can we get a quorum. Ina, do you see any hands or do we have anyone?

934

02:07:02.820 --> 02:07:03.000

Ina Mezini: I'm not seeing any.

935

02:07:04.320 --> 02:07:06.540

BoyerL: At the moment, I'm assuming, everyone's good then.

936

02:07:06.570 --> 02:07:09.030

BoyerL: Since, I'm not hearing anything to the contrary.

937

02:07:09.480 --> 02:07:09.990

Hello.

938

02:07:11.280 --> 02:07:14.520

Craig Gibbs: Ms. Boyer you, said it probably be the morning of the 28?

939

02:07:15.180 --> 02:07:19.500

BoyerL: I'm the Chair would prefer the morning, but we could do one o'clock, is the morning okay?

940

02:07:19.650 --> 02:07:20.550

Craig Gibbs: It's Good.

941

02:07:21.300 --> 02:07:29.460

BoyerL: All right, I will send out calendar times to all of you. Then, and just circulate that but if you will, tentatively pant plan on a meeting on the 28th. And we will work toward that. Okay, as far as updates go just a few quick ones. Number one is that Mr. Barakat mentioned our new downtown preservation and revitalization program it received final approval from City Council last night. So it is now waiting the mayor signature, but you should expect that we have several applicants who have expressed an interest to move forward under that program. And I anticipate, we may have one or more of those at our November board meeting. So look forward to that. The second thing is, as I mentioned that our November meetings will likely be in person, committee meetings and Board meeting and at the moment we are hoping to have a room, either the library multi purpose room or a room in the ED ball building outfitted with a camera capability to cover the entire room and also microphones individual microphones that would feed into it so that we would be able to have a Hybrid zoom meeting where members of the public could participate virtually without attending if they chose, but that all of the board would be in person. And would not have to use their own laptops or telephones or their own devices to participate in, zoom. So I think it'd be so much more streamlined approach, we just have some IT processes to go through to get that implemented.

951

02:08:53.250 --> 02:08:54.480

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Ms. Boyer?

952

02:08:54.660 --> 02:08:56.760

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Is that For our November the 18th regularly scheduled meeting.

954

02:08:58.620 --> 02:09:08.010

BoyerL: Correct. November the 18th regularly scheduled as well as whatever committee meetings we may have for the month of November, that have yet to be scheduled that will probably be scheduled the prior week I think. Okay. And then the last thing that I wanted to mention is that our bid and CRA update is going to, it has been awarded it is going to procurement tomorrow on the scope and fee approval and if we receive approval. Then, which we certainly hope we will We will be entering into the contract and doing kickoffs next week, so you will be hearing From the consultants on probably each of the tasks in this and I just want to alert you to that and give you the opportunity to engage to



whatever degree you wish. There are four distinct elements of the bid and CRA update. The first one is a update of the downtown design standards. So this relates to the downtown zoning overlay and to the details of the design standards, but if any of you have a particular interest in that, or something that you are concerned about That you think needs to change. Please let us know. The second piece is what I am calling our downtown community parks plan. As opposed to destination parks, so we are not confusing that this is not about the landing or a potential ship yards park. This is about the parks that would serve the downtown residents, such as a basketball court or a dog park or things like that. And if any of you have an interest in that, or input on that love to hear from you. The third part is branding of the downtown districts. So not only naming the districts as well as logos, as well as how that would be interpreted in the landscape and the public art and the other elements. So again, there will be public outreach on each of those. And some of you work or live in one of those districts and may want to participate. And then the final is the kind of overarching bit and CRA update with a large focus on incentives. And in particular, comments, like Mr. Barakats or I know in the past on my list. I have small residential projects because we have no grants for a residential project under 25 units. We wanted to Modify the funding level of our normal retail enhancement program. We don't have an incentive that works for we had, I had a conversation with Mr. Froats earlier today. We have nothing for new construction of restaurants. So if we want to encourage new restaurants along the riverfront perhaps that would be something that should be in our plan. So I encourage you to think about those things. Think about the goals that are in the plan right now, which is very heavily focused on residential And I think that is I think that's great that's where we've been driving. But if you want to broaden that in some way. If you want to add something to the overarching goals. Please think about that and start giving us your information or you can contact and we will put you in contact with the consultants directly, they will be interviewing each of you as stakeholders as we move forward on this. So that's really your role on that one and with that, I'm going to let us close the meeting early today. I guess I will tell you that I had a public records request for the answer and counterclaim on the MPs garage lawsuit. So you will all expect to see something about that likely in the press, but we are parties to a lawsuit regarding the ongoing dispute with MPs garages and it's being handled by OGC I will leave any further discussion to that, but you will likely see something in it about that in the news. And there you go Mr. Moody back to you.

977

02:13:02.070 --> 02:13:10.950

Ron Moody (DIA Board): Okay, thank you. Let the record reflect that Ms. Boyer has conducted this meeting in almost less than two hours which might be record. But thank you listen to special thanks for the staff. I know personally they're working very hard. Thank you Lori for your work. She works all the time. She works on the weekend. It's unbelievable. Steve Kelly, thanks for your great work Guy Parola, Ina, thanks for being so diligent and We appreciate you, you

know, the interesting thing to me is that we're now seeing development kind of both ends of the city now and it's kind of starting squeeze in the middle. This is good stuff. It's happening on the south bank and there's a lot of other stuff that is happening that you haven't heard about yet. So we've got a lot of exciting things. The work that we're doing is important. So thank you. Thank you so much for your diligence. So unless there's anything else for the good of the board. I'm going to go ahead and shut the meeting down. All right. Thank you, folks. Have a good day.