



Thursday, March 28, 2013 – 4:30 p.m.

MEETING MINUTES

Board Members Present: T. Allegretti, J. Bailey, O. Barakat, M. Bishop, K. Harper, and M. Saylor

Board Members Not Present: D. Harris and P. Perez and R. Clements

Office of General Counsel: Juliana Rowland

Council Members Present: Council Member Lori Boyer, District 5

Attendees: Paul Crawford, Office of Economic Development (OED); Eric Lindstrom, DIA Staff; and Karen Underwood, Recording Secretary.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairwoman Bishop called the meeting to order at approximately 4:30 p.m.

DISCUSSION

Chairwoman Bishop discussed the original Plan, Master Plan, and the Action plan. She handed out restructured chart with the highest number of votes and itemized listings with a prioritized listing of specific criteria organized in that order.

Chairwoman Bishop asked if the Action Plan was adopted by City Council and projects were moved forward based on that plan. Eric Lindstrom responded that it is not the plan; it is strategies to be carried out that are in the plan.

M. Bishop advised that the purpose of the redevelopment plan committee and redevelopment plan, which is to take and look at the original plans and update the plan including to comply with the State. Part of what this committee is how do we put in place so people were making decisions if it is not coming through the DIA, what is the plan. The board went over the listing to capture the directions of the various projects.

Kay Harper advised that these projects would have to be evaluated on a case by case situation. A person who does not come downtown does not know what the Laura Street Trio is. If we are trying to rebrand downtown and have downtown a destination, there has to be some effort to look at the high visibility projects and figure out a way to activate them temporarily until we get a developer in place. There has to be a discussion on high visibility projects as an indication to potential developers.

Oliver Barakat commented that periods on the criteria were good. Melody Bishop pointed out that the greatest thing that could be done Downtown is to have more people residing downtown.

If residential is very important then we need to be aware of that when we start placing very loud next to it or things that kill the ability to cross the street.

Oliver Barakat commented that he agrees that we created downtown for many years as a commerce center and has been made friendly to potential residential uses. If we separate residential as a criteria point, we will be looking at this area as a neighborhood than just an area of commerce or a mixed use neighborhood. He was not suggesting making that commitment and wanted the board to be aware of our three main criteria points.

Melody Bishop stated that she wanted feedback from the members on the points. She will email an excel spreadsheet which would be easier to read. She would like members to look over her listing as homework and if something is missing, please identify what need to be added. She reminded to the board that not everything was voted on was not shown as a high priority.

Eric Lindstrom added a comment to Oliver Barakat regarding the Action plan. When you read the full plan, some of these are more short term in nature. The short term is what builds a momentum for those to happen. When you read the plan, it shows how the short term actions affect mid-terms and how those affect long term projects.

Melody Bishop noted the vision statements that are already in the original plan, still hold up then what we are discussing is the action items. From the original plan, what redlined items need to be modified and updated. Eric Lindstrom stated that the IBM plan is the latest plan. Paul Crawford commented to the board that he believes you have the overall Downtown Action plan, CRA Plan, IBM Study. If there is, anything else needed please let him know. Tony Allegretti commented that he needed the Brooklyn Master Plan.

Melody Bishop asked Paul Crawford and Eric Lindstrom if we have structured that RFP in such a manner to get them to itemize enough so we can figure out if we needed to do that in negotiation phase. Eric Lindstrom responded that the way the RFP has been structured was to get a full response whatever the numbers and scopes were. Then negotiate what the final scopes will be with a selective consultant because everyone needs to be evaluated then will meet with DIA to negotiate that scope based on limited budgets.

Melody Bishop asked if we were going ask the consultant to put things in categories so that we can look at it or we do not want them to do it yet. Eric Lindstrom responded that he was informing her of how it has structured, however the board decide to do something different.

Melody Bishop stated that she did not want the board to wind up negotiating for three months because we are trying to figure this piece out and then we do not move forward until four months.

Eric Lindstrom noted that they went through the similar exercise with Friendship Fountain. When Friendship Fountain was designed with an out of State firm, were able to negotiate completely different scopes and commented that it does not take that long. Paul Crawford commented that any consultant here and monitoring would read the minutes and understand what the board wants.

Tony Allegretti personally did not like favoring geographic bases because the only one that was done with an economic incentive was in Brooklyn. He has some concerns if a developer comes and wants to do an area of LaVilla but it is outside of our core and not given them consideration. If we are considering something, I believe we will be active and verbal about why we think this is a better project.

Michael Saylor suggested focusing on the criteria that we think we are going to use. We can ask the experts after they get a full understanding of what we think we want downtown to be. Let them recommend to us the actual assignment of those weights to all of those criteria.

Paul Crawford stated that there were different ways to engage in project. There are projects that you may engage in but it is only for the matter of approving an entitlement. Then there are projects that would be engaged because of infrastructure adjacent to it. There are several different ways to engage in a project. The Rev Grant proposal, we bring that as one of the project tools that would hit the bottom line at the end of the day because you will realize that funding in your tax increment, which is direct cash, hit to your bottom dollar.

Melody Bishop stated to keep us from losing time; the purpose for this is for the board to be moving forward to provide something further down the road to hand to the consultant.

Paul Crawford stated that you are listing priorities for projects. If a project comes up, that is not on the prioritization list that does not mean that you cannot take it up for consideration. A project evaluation matrix is utilized to evaluate projects and determine that this is how we engage those projects.

Paul Crawford responded that we have a CRA plan, not be an updated plan. Jim Bailey stated this would be a six to eight month process. Whatever would be done would have to go through Council approval on each project and the plans. Once the plan is completed, you will not have to get council's approval.

The Board engaged in extensive conversation relative to the spreadsheet provided by Board Member Bishop.

Chairman Harris added Board member M. Saylor to the CRA Plan Committee.

Board Member Bailey departed the meeting at approximately 5:06 pm

II. DIA WORK GROUPS

Mr. Crawford introduced a proposed framework similar to the City Council Committee structure for the DIA and designed to aid in the flow of dialogue at the regularly scheduled DIA Board meetings while still allowing the Board to engage in the wide variety of issues relative to downtown (reference Downtown Committees hand out provided at the meeting). The Board members present were in concurrence with the DIA work groups, as presented.

Downtown Economy Committee: Chaired by P. Perez with Board member R. Clements and K. Harper serving on the Committee

Downtown Environment Committee: Chaired by J. Bailey with Board member O. Barakat and M. Bishop serving on the Committee

Downtown Experience Committee: Chaired by T. Allegretti with Board member D. Harris and Mike Saylor serving on the Committee

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENTS

The floor was open for public comments and advised that their time to speak was limited to three minutes.

- Bruce Fouracker, 4441 Genna Trace Ct. (Riverwalk/BRT Downtown)
- Dick Jackson, 4426 Herschel Street, Jacksonville, FL (Apartments)

IX. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chair Harris adjourned the meeting at approximately 5:45 p.m.

The next DIA meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, March 13, 2013, at 2:00 p.m.

The written minutes for this meeting are only an overview of what was discussed. For verbatim comments for this meeting, an audio CD is available upon request. Please contact Michelle Stephens, Office of Economic Development at (904) 630-1979 or by email at msteph@coj.net.