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**Meeting Convened**: 10:00 a.m.

President Hazouri convened the meeting and reviewed the agenda for the meeting. Roll call was taken and a quorum was present. Council Member DeFoor led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Downtown Investment Authority report

DIA CEO Lori Boyer recounted the board meeting held yesterday and the DIA’s recommendation to approve the Lot J proposal subject to 17 conditions, some of which are duplicated in the list because they refer to different parts of the several agreement documents. She said that the board also recommended several other items for consideration that were contained in the DIA staff report but not recommended by the board as specific conditions.

Council Auditor’s report

Council Auditor Kim Taylor reviewed several documents, including a summary of responses to her questions previously posed to the developer and City administration. She said the main terms of the agreement remain basically the same and that no Jaguars stadium lease extension has been proposed. She said concerns remain about the ownership and management of some elements of the development. Several concessions have been made by the developer in the area of parking garage operations and revenue sharing. There is still a concern about the sufficiency of the information on the guarantor’s net worth under the agreement and about what exactly the guarantor is guaranteeing since there are provisions in the agreement that permit elements of the overall project to be modified by the developer. Some of the Auditor’s concerns regarding use of cost savings have been addressed but additional concerns remain in some areas. The City has no control over the management fees for the “breadbox” loan which is still a concern and the City is still negotiating that point with the developer. Regarding the material modifications provision, Ms. Taylor cautioned the Council that the developer has the right to change certain elements of the project at its sole discretion. She expressed concern about language in the parking agreement that says the agreement cannot be terminated by either party even in the event of a breach and noted that the length of the parking agreement has been extended without specific performance standards or liquidated damage provisions being included. She noted that the time frame for project completion has been reduced from what was originally proposed, but is still subject to the time needed for the environmental remediation process which is still an unknown. She expressed a concern about the potential for the developer to profit from a transfer of the hotel property to an unaffiliated third party before the hotel is constructed without the City receiving a share of the proceeds. A change has been made to the City’s benefit with regard to access to revenues from a portion of Florida/Georgia football game weekend events. There is also a concern about the removal of all references to the television antenna tower relocation from the agreement; that issue will have to be dealt with at some point and its impact remains an unknown.

Ms. Taylor reviewed a 33-page document that captures all of the changes made to the development agreement elements by subsequent negotiation since the ordinance was first introduced. President Hazouri asked Ms. Taylor to comment on the DIA recommendations during her review as they may be related. Ms. Taylor said the DIA’s review was very thorough and their recommendations differed somewhat from her office’s recommendations, which shows the value of multiple reviews from different perspectives.

The Council discussed the appropriate procedure for considering the agreement, including whether the bill needed to be moved and seconded before questions and answers could be entertained and amendments proposed. Council Member Diamond moved the bill; the President declined to accept the motion before a question and answer period was conducted as listed on the agenda. At the request of Council Member Carlucci, Deputy General Counsel Peggy Sidman said that the President sets the agenda for the meeting but the council as a whole has the right to overrule the President by majority vote. Rules Chair Priestly Jackson urged the President to allow the motion and second to put the bill on the floor in a proper posture for discussion. The President expressed concern that allowing the motion and second would put the bill in position to be voted on immediately without a thorough discussion. Council Member Ferraro urged that a full discussion of the revised agreements take place before any vote is held. He has numerous questions that need answering before he can vote on the bill and is not ready to vote today.

Council Member Salem asked the DIA for clarification of its recommendations, the extent to which the developer agrees with those recommendations, and the process for proposing those recommendations as amendments to the ordinance. Mr. Salem recommended that all of the DIA’s points that were agreed to by the developer be proposed as amendments for the Council to vote on. Kim Taylor clarified that her spreadsheet outlining all of the changes to agreements over the past few weeks includes notations as to whether the developers proposed or agree to the Auditor’s proposed amendments.

Council Member Boylan asked for clarification from Ms. Boyer about the DIA’s discussion of, then subsequent failure to, make a recommendation on the “bread box” loan. Ms. Boyer said the DIA could not determine the necessity of the loan to the success of the overall project given the information available to it regarding vertical construction costs. They chose not to opine given the insufficiency of that information. Mr. Boylan asked the developers to state whether they agreed or disagreed with the Auditor’s proposed amendments. Paul Harden representing the developers said that in order to comment on the Auditor’s recommendations, it would be necessary to amend the bill to adopt the November 25th revised agreement and attachments as the basis for discussion since the Auditor’s recommendations apply to that version. Peggy Sidman said that the Council will be adopting changes to the bill as currently filed and will have to determine how best to undertake that process, whether to adopt all of the recommendations made by the DIA, the Council Auditor or the developer and then work from that baseline on other changes, or whether to make amendments to the bill as filed.

Council Member Dennis asked the Jaguars whether failure to approve the Lot J project would cause the Jaguars to eventually leave Jacksonville. Jaguars President Mark Lamping said the team in interested in being in Northeast Florida for decades to come, which depends on 3 pillars – better performance on the filed by the team, an NFL class stadium, and a revitalized downtown. The team will do what it needs to do to be successful based on what the Council decides. In response to a question from Mr. Dennis about the timeframe for future stadium improvements, Mr. Lamping said there are10 years left on the current lease and the team has started the process to determine what’s needed (Project Lifetime) with facility operator ASM Global, the City and the Haskell Company. Phase 1 of the 5-phase project, evaluation of the stadium’s current condition is done, and they are hoping to achieve consensus of all stakeholders by 2023 to determine what the stadium of the future should be and how to get there. The Jaguars want to stay here and have done all they can to make that work. Mr. Dennis cautioned that the next City Council will face another tremendously costly project in a few years with diminished resources to tackle it.

Council Member DeFoor thanked the DIA for its exceptional work in quickly tackling the analysis of this project. She said that despite the DIA decision not to do the “breadbox loan” analysis, the City Council should do so. With regard to the change in the length of the lease term, Ms. Boyer said that the DIA staff’s recommendation was to keep the original lease term at 35 years and Ms. DeFoor recommended that that be adopted. With regard to the completion guarantee, Assistant General Counsel John Sawyer said that the law firm Greenberg Traurig had helped the City negotiate the guarantee issues and has opined on its enforceability. Ms. DeFoor requested a copy of that legal opinion. In response to a question from Ms. DeFoor about whether audited financial statements are necessary when evaluating a potential guarantee, Orlando Evora with Greenberg Traurig said that what is needed is documentation of the guarantor’s capability. In a perfect world audited financial statements would be submitted, but sometimes audited financial statements are not available so certified statements attested by the CFO of an organization are submitted instead. He said he has not seen or reviewed what the developers have submitted to the City. Ms. DeFoor asked that the developer’s completion guarantee documentation be provided to Mr. Evora for review and an opinion. She said it appears to her that the construction costs for the project are being inordinately borne by the City.

Council Member Carlucci thanked the DIA for their thorough review. In response to a question about whether DIA got a detailed market feasibility study, Lori Boyer said it had not. In response to a question about whether negotiations on the project should be done by the DIA or by the City administration, Ms. Boyer said that is a question best directed to the Office of General Counsel to determine what the Ordinance Code provides. Mr. Carlucci asked how it can be determined if the “breadbox” loan is needed if the real construction costs aren’t known. Kim Taylor said that ultimately it’s like any project where the Council needs to make a policy call with the best information it has; having more detailed cost estimates would obviously be better. Mr. Carlucci asked Ms. Taylor for a list of recommendations about where clawbacks would be advisable and what they should be. He also asked for information on the ability of the developer, under the latest proposal, to reallocate project cost savings to a capital improvement fund for the Live! district. Ms. Taylor said that under the original proposal the developers were responsible for making future capital repairs and maintenance to the Live! district, regardless of the sufficiency of the ticket surcharge revenue to cover those costs. Mr. Carlucci asked what it would take to determine if the “breadbox” loan is needed or not. Lori Boyer said a DIA analysis would typically look at vertical construction costs, net operating revenues, and a reasonable return on investment to the developer, and then decide what financing is needed to fill the gap to make the project viable. She suggested that an analysis might be done using construction costs from other similar projects elsewhere, adjusted for Jacksonville’s cost of construction.

President Hazouri said that the Council has just received voluminous information from both the Council Auditor and the DIA and needs to digest those findings and review the suggested amendments before it can make a reasonable, informed decision. He doesn’t want the Council to be pressured into making a hasty decision without full consideration of the issues and recommended that the issue be held over to January.

Council Member Priestly Jackson asked about what covenants or restrictions the City is under for remediation and use of the Lot J site. Megha Parekh, Chief Legal Officer for the Jaguars, said that a slurry wall was constructed around the site when a large pipe was relocated in connection with the construction of Daily’s Place and there is a restrictive covenant requiring maintenance of that slurry wall. The developers have been working with the City, FDEP and an environmental consultant to determine what is needed for the cleanup to obtain a site rehabilitation completion order declaring the cleanup to be complete and the land to be available for unrestricted use. Groundwater monitoring and two consecutive quarters of clean test results will be needed before construction could begin. John Sawyer said that the City previously received a site rehabilitation completion order on the site requiring that a paved cap (the parking lot surface) encapsulate the existing contamination. There is a restrictive covenant that did not allow residential development but that has been amended to allow the site to be developed provided the developer complies with all applicable laws. The developer has agreed to assume all environmental liability for the site, but the City could be liable to repave the site if the project failed during the construction phase, the developer walked away, and FDEP pursued remedial action the City as a part of the chain of ownership of the site. Ms. Priestly Jackson said she did not understand how the City could be said to not have any liability for the site as long as it still owns the site. Ms. Priestly Jackson asked for clarification of the Auditor’s concerns about the guarantee – is the issue that we don’t think the guarantee is sufficient or that we want all parties to be co-guarantors? Kim Taylor said one concern is that the financial documentation of the guarantee (a letter, not audited financial statements) is not sufficient according to the terms of the agreement; the other is that only Mr. Khan is a guarantor and not Cordish Companies as well. If they’re co-developers it would be better if they were both co-guarantors.

Council Member Morgan asked Ms. Boyer about DIA’s calculation of the return on investment and why the 3 calculations differ. Ms. Boyer said DIA did their usual calculation based on cash in and cash out, the same as the Auditor, but also adding in the City’s $12 million value for the property donation into the equation. The administration used the Johnson economic impact statement, which is a different methodology than what the City normally uses. Mark Lamping of the Jaguars said that a lot has changed since the initial calculation of the ROI. The School District half cent sales tax will generate additional return to the school system, the Jaguars have agreed to pay property tax on the Live! lease, and the ROI calculation never included any parking revenue to the City, which the developers have subsequently agree to. Morgan wants the right deal for the taxpayers. He estimated that adding in the additional impact of the half cent sales tax for schools generated by the development would increase the Council Auditor’s ROI from 0.44:1 to 0.485:1; adding the new parking revenue to the City would increase it to $1.09:1; and adding the property taxes on the commercial property that the developers agreed to yesterday would increase it to $1.13:1. Ms. Morgan said she’s looking for a sweetheart deal for the taxpayers.

Council Member Pittman asked about the brownfield remediation and what is in the agreement in that regard. She emphasized that this deal needs to work for the taxpayers. John Sawyer said the City has no current obligation for the environmental contamination; the developer will do all environmental remediation work as part of the $77.7M infrastructure cost. The developer will be eligible for tax credits on the remediation work ($500,000/year). They will perform the work and then have to do at least 6 months of groundwater monitoring with clean test results before the site could be officially cleared for construction to begin.

Council Member Carrico asked if a brand new stadium will be required to keep the Jaguars in Jacksonville or if a stadium renovation will be sufficient. Mr. Lamping said the team and the City have done Phase 1 of Project Lifetime to assess the stadium structure and systems which found that it is structurally sound as long as it continues to be well maintained. Phase 2, currently underway, is doing as-built drawings of what currently exists. Phase 3 is to assess all stakeholder needs to determine what the stadium of the future needs to be. Phase 4 is to hire architects and engineers to develop ideas, scope and cost estimates. Phase 5 is to finance and build what is desired.

Council Member Cumber asked Ms. Boyer to explain the context of the DIA’s project review and its recommendations as she described to the DIA board yesterday. Ms. Boyer said the City Council got DIA’s draft staff report early in the week which was released in an incomplete form as the result of a public records request at the same time as the media got it. Further revisions were made before the final report was completed which was subsequently released. It is common practice for DIA to meet with developers and wordsmith language which does not mean renegotiation. They were simply clarifying language. Ms. Cumber said that, as the Council’s liaison to the DIA, she is planning on introducing an amendment to adopt the DIA’s list of recommended amendments to the bill. She asked Mr. Lamping about the developer’s position on the levy of a hotel surcharge of 1.5% Mr. Lamping said the developers are agreeable to the 1.5% and would also agree to applying that surcharge to a new Four Seasons hotel as well.

Council Member Gaffney asked Zed Smith, Chief Operating Officer of the Cordish Companies, to talk about how the project enhances downtown and local small businesses. Mr. Smith said Cordish traditionally uses local businesses in its developments. He’s met with the Eastside community about how they can be involved in the project and will be taking a tour to better understand the surrounding neighborhood. In response to a question from Mr. Gaffney about whether the Jaguars agree with all the Auditor’s recommendations, Megha Parekh said they agree with many, but not all, of the recommendations. They have tried to tighten up the language in several places in the latest discussions and just want all the parties to be obligated in the right places in the agreement.

Council Member Freeman asked about the best way for Council to consider all the amendments that have been proposed, all together if possible. Kim Taylor suggested that if there was consensus agreement by all parties on all of the DIA’s amendments then the Council could move and adopt those, then deal with the Auditor’s recommendations point by point because the developers agree with some and disagree with others. Peggy Sidman said the process has been complicated by so many sets of documents and proposals that don’t match. It would be best to choose a starting point from which to work: Option 1) incorporate the various sets of proposed amendments into one document, recognizing that some points are not acceptable to one or the other of the parties, and work from there to reach a final product by adding or subtracting items via amendments; or Option 2) start from the bill as originally filed and currently pending and consider each proposed amendment one by one to accept or reject.

Council Member Becton asked for examples of when the City has previously done this kind of deal to give up-front grants to hotels and office developments. Ms. Boyer said The District project on the Southbank is somewhat similar, but most of the City funding for that project is for infrastructure purposes, not other construction costs. Mr. Becton said that the Council has typically not contributed to construction costs on hotel and residential projects except in the form of a REV grant so as not to be seen as giving an unfair competitive advantage to some developments over others. Mr. Becton asked when the 5 year prohibition on non-transfer of the hotel takes effect; Megha Parekh said it becomes effective upon substantial completion of the hotel. Mr. Becton asked about which agreement takes precedence in the event of a conflict between agreements, i.e. the parking vs. the development agreement. Ms. Parekh said depends on which part the disagreement applies to – if it’s a parking issue then the parking agreement should prevail, if it relates to the development components, then the development agreement prevails. She said the DIA recommended that all the agreements should contain acknowledgements where appropriate of obligations in the other agreements that should help to clarify things. The City’s Jaguar game day parking revenue, for instance, will necessitate a change in the Jaguars stadium lease as a result of the negotiations over this development agreement. In response to a question from Mr. Becton about why the parking revenue sharing agreement only applies to the Florida/Georgia football game and not Gator Bowl and other events, Ms. Parekh said it’s because the Jaguars can only deal with what they have control over, which is not every event at the stadium complex. With regard to the Live! ticket surcharge revenue, Mr. Sawyer said that the City retains the surcharge revenue which goes into a Live! facility maintenance fund. Ms. Parekh clarified that with regard to Georgia/Florida game weekend, the developer and the City will split net ticket profits from game-related events. Mr. Becton said the Council has received a huge volume of new information in the last 2 days and negotiations are still ongoing among the parties, so he’s not ready to vote today until all the documents are finalized and can be reviewed.

Council Member Bowman said the REMI economic impact model assumes new construction is for new residents coming to the area, but that doesn’t apply to Lot J. He asked how active the developers will be in recruiting outside entities to come to town. Mark Lamping said they want to bring new economic activity downtown in an additive form, not just relocate what already exists. Cordish developments bring people in from outside of the market.

Council Member Diamond asked if he could move his proposed ethics amendment. The President asked that council member questions be completed first before amendments are offered.

Council Member Carlucci asked if the City is being asked to pay the same in incentives for a smaller project given the latest wording changes and the establishment of minimum sizes for the various development components. Kim Taylor said that is somewhat the case, since the proposed minimums are less than the “approximately” figures in the original agreement in most cases. Mr. Carlucci asked for assurance that the end result of the project will look like the renderings as originally presented? Zed Smith said Cordish focuses heavily on design and quality of materials, which will be equal to or better than the renderings. In response to a question from Mr. Carlucci about whether the agreement specifies the quality of materials, Ms. Parekh said the wording has been changed from “good condition” and “first class” to reference to the standard of other Coridsh developments for comparison purposes.

Council Member Salem suggested that all areas of agreement be proposed and adopted as amendments and then the Council can debate the last few points where there’s not agreement. Mayor’s Chief of Staff Jordan Elsbury agreed with that approach on behalf of the administration. He said the developers and the administration have completed negotiations so it’s down to the final few points on which there is disagreement where the Council needs to make a final decision.

President Hazouri asked John Sawyer how best to proceed, given that the Council has just received the DIA’s and Council Auditor’s recommendations yesterday and today. Mr. Sawyer said there are large areas of agreement so those amendments should be easy to pass. He recommended starting from the November 25th document as the baseline, then adding on the mutually agreeable items from the DIA recommendations, then adding on the mutually agreed items from the Auditor’s review, and then finally dealing with the remaining items where there is not consensus.

In response to a question from Council Member Ferraro about whether the development team agrees with the Sawyer methodology, Paul Harden agreed that would be a good way to proceed - collect all the agreed upon items into a single document, approve that, and then tackle the last dozen or so items where there’s not agreement yet.

President Hazouri suggested taking up the bill in early January. He thinks it would give everyone more confidence that everything has been properly considered and due diligence has been exercised. Mr. Harden said the world is constantly changing and you never know what might change negatively before final action takes place. Timing is important and the development team wanted to be done by the end of the year, and cancelled Council meetings haven’t helped the timing of the process. A delay today and at next Tuesday’s Council meeting means 6 more weeks of waiting until Council meets again in the second week of January after the holiday break. He said it should be fairly easy to deal with the vast majority of the issues on which there is agreement today and compile that into a unified document, leaving just a few items left to resolve. Council Member Carlucci said he is not ready to vote on this bill next Tuesday. This is too big a deal to rush through with unanswered questions and an inability to digest the many pages of DIA and Auditor’s Office recommendations.

Mr. Harden said he sees 10-12 items of disagreement left to resolve. The development team will meet with the Council Auditor tomorrow and hope to agree on a revised bill incorporating all the mutually agreeable points. In response to a question from Council Member Cumber about whether the developers agree with all of the DIA recommendations, Mr. Harden said they do and believe that they should be incorporated into the November 25th version of the agreement document to be used as the starting point for debate. He asked for clarification on where the revenue from the 1.5% hotel surcharge is intended to go. Ms. Cumber said into the General Fund, with the intention that it be used for the City’s Lot J-related operation and maintenance costs.

Council Member Becton expressed concern that there are still a lot of questions to be answered. He’s concerned that there is only a Live! ticket surcharge for Florida/Georgia game weekend activities and asked why it is not levied on other college football game events. Ms. Parekh stated that the surcharge is levied on all ticketed events in the Live! district. Mr. Becton said that illustrates his concern with this proposal – questions are answered and assurances are given verbally at meetings, but he does not find confirmation of some of those statements in his review of the documents. In response to a question from Mr. Becton about whether the developers would agree to paying property taxes on the parking garages, Mr. Harden said they would consider it along with the other things being proposed and will see what they can agree to and what they can’t.

President Hazouri deferred the bill.

Public Comment

James Franz suggested a new mechanism to analyze the deal and reduce the cost of development using the proprietary method of a company with which he is affiliated that converts large, complicated projects into simpler transactions that in many cases eliminates or substantially reduces the need for cash for all parties involved via an alternative funding mechanism. He requested detailed information on proposal so that the company could, within a week or so, provide a proposal on an alternative funding method.

James Tilley said he is encouraged by the delay of the bill because a slower process tends to produce better outcomes. He thinks this project fails to meet DIA standard deal guidelines and senses that there is no consensus about the deal. Jacksonville is #11 on a list of cities in a recent study facing large revenue shortfalls in the coming years. The pension sales tax for pension hasn’t kicked in yet so the pension plans are still in some peril in their underfunded status. There are lots of other big issues needing attention – evictions, food instability, septic tanks, etc.

Nikole Hamm opposed giving City funding to a billionaire given the tough economic times the city is going to be facing, with social and racial injustice, homicides, homelessness, COVID, and the like. It is not in the best interest of the citizens when there are so many other major challenges that need funding. She favors deferring the bill until after the holidays for more study. No attempt has been made to engage the public in the process. There’s been no consideration of the effect on small businesses or of resiliency concerns.

Carnell Oliver delaying the project will likely kill it because of changes the incoming Biden administration is likely to make in the Opportunity Zones after he’s inaugurated. The administration didn’t present this bill well to the Council. The project offers lots of job opportunities, but delaying until January risks failure if the Biden administration makes changes so that stadiums are not eligible to participate in Opportunity Zone benefits.

Stanley Scott agreed with the President’s decision to defer the bill today; more time is needed to make sure the citizens are protected. There’s no rush to get this bill done this week, a few more weeks won’t hurt anything. Jacksonville needs lots of development.

Blake Harper said the delay on getting the bill approved is due to the administration’s failings in getting the bill properly introduced. The Council needs to know what all the clawbacks are in the deal. The developer should not be allowed to sell the hotel after only 5 years. He believes the Lot J property should be leased rather than sold to the developer.

Ben Frazier said the Northside is still underserved, marginalized and overlooked. He doesn’t see the rush to provide benefits to a billionaire when the Northside’s concerns are still on the back burner. Slow down the process and fully consider the potential pitfalls in this deal. There’s no need to rush.

Terry Bork said he’s in favor of downtown development but this is not the right project. The COVID pandemic is going to cause tremendous financial hardship for the city. Large areas of the City still don’t have basic infrastructure. Shad Khan could get private financing for the deal. 55% of Jacksonville residents polled recently oppose the project, as reported in the media.

Nancy Powell said this is a complicated deal that can’t be rushed through. The Council needs to know what’s in the agreements in order to protect the public’s interest. She has lots of concerns about the environmental remediation and resiliency issues. Why should the developer get tax benefits for the City’s environmental remediation? Where is the stormwater going to go when the existing pond is filled in? Take all the time needed to get it right.

Brad \_\_\_ said that the deal needs more time and study and rushing it through is a mistake. The mayor is unfairly pressuring the Council to act too quickly. The City has already put in lots of money for Daily’s Place and the flex field.

David Broderly thinks there needs to be more independent analysis of the return on investment calculations. St. Johns River flooding is only going to get worse in the future and the Lot J site is vulnerable, so revenue projections could be overly inflated if flooding gets worse and hampers use of the development.

Terry Bork said the City Council should go back to first principles and not approve a project with a return on investment of less than 1:1. The fact that private investment isn’t paying for the project shows it’s not viable without the City funds. The Lot J deal needs clawbacks to protect the taxpayers. Don’t rush to approval of a deal that doesn’t return 1:1.

Council Member Gaffney announced that he will hold a noticed meeting next Tuesday afternoon prior to the Council meeting to consider final amendment proposals to be offered at the subsequent council meeting. Council Member Priestly Jackson said that each meeting generates some answers but even more questions. The Council needs to do its fiduciary duty and protect the public. She doesn’t want the Council to be rushed into action. The local NAACP chapter sent a letter during this meeting opposing the project. She is concerned that the City complies with the existing agreements concerning the environmental conditions at the Lot J site.

**Meeting adjourned:** 2:11 p.m.

Minutes: Jeff Clements, Council Research Division
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