

DIA

Staff

- DIA will have authority to add staff, set job descriptions and salaries, and fund from CRA revenues. DIA staff shall remain City employees.
- DIA will have a position for an in-house attorney that reports to the General Counsel but will be housed in DIA offices. This position will work primarily on redevelopment agreements, negotiation, drafting, and property dispositions. Other matters will be handled by OGC.

Board

- Change quorum requirement to “majority of those currently serving but no fewer than 4.”
- Allow DIA Board to set priorities for use of funds and include them in annual budget request to Council for approval.

Budget

- Expand DIA authority to spend Council approved budget for both CRA funds and City funds including right to execute contracts using either CRA or Downtown Economic Development Fund money
- Eliminate need to go to MBRC for use or transfer of DIA funds
- DIA will annually submit a five-year CIP plan adopted by DIA Board to Council. The Board can add unforeseen projects to CIP from available funds.
- DIA will submit an annual budget that will include the budgets and use of funds within the CRAs, identify projects in the pipeline, approximate General Fund needs, and focus areas within the adopted BID plan.
 - Appropriated \$ will be transferred from General Fund to Downtown Economic Development Fund
 - Remaining funds will be identified for use in the following year’s budget
 - Budget process similar to JEA/JTA

**Future of Downtown Jacksonville Committee
And The Downtown Investment Authority (DIA)
Topics for Consideration
August 12, 2024**

Performance Standards

- 1. The DIA in our City's future should have Performance Standards that are based on the objective of numbers of diverse use by the public of our downtown, during days and evenings, year-round, using objectives that are measurable, realistic with related authority and responsibility with accountability for results. How many cars are parked downtown how many people are walking on designated sidewalks during given hours of each day, in a crime free environment.**
- 2. The number of residential units under construction per year and/or over multiple years has been proven to be a failed objective based on the lifespan of our DIA.**
- 3. Recent progressively increasing subsidies of developments simply confirms that the consumer demand for the recent DIA supported projects is not adequate in our current market. The developers (and their lenders) are requiring bigger subsidies. The current DIA process has the tail wagging the dog.**
- 4. The DIA 's measurement of success should be changed to instead be the degree to which its activities contribute in a much more timely and affordable manner to making downtown Jacksonville a vibrant, active, safe, popular destination for our diverse community during the day and evenings, year-round?**
- 5. A reasonable standard of measurement of that success (or failure) may well be the number of people actually coming downtown, parking and STAYING for extended social, entertainment and business purposes, making our day and early evening parking sites and sidewalks blessed with downtown activity-engaged visitors?**
- 6. Identify the results of past/recent DIA activities of which there is well documented and widespread community support, pride that has resulted in the USE by the public of our downtown. Keep and further support such capabilities at the DIA of which you want more.**
- 7. Identify the results of past/recent DIA activities for which there is limited community support/enthusiasm for coming and STAYING downtown and ensure those processes, methods and results are changed.**

Property Development

- 1. Change the current inappropriate process of having developers “suddenly” appear with a well-developed plan for a parcel of DIA controlled land, then having 30 days thereafter for other developers to propose a competitive plan, and upon getting no response, grant the DIA’s authority to “negotiate a deal”. Many think the winner was chosen in advance and the process established to ensure that outcome (any recent exceptions?). “Advertising” for an alternative development idea within 30 days is a hopelessly inadequate time to do so and a near certain waste of an “alternate” developers’ time and money. Has such an alternative ever been submitted/accepted?**
- 2. Instead, the DIA/City should decide what they wish to have built on a selected parcel (what mix of retail, parking, residential, low-income housing, etc.) , then direct the DIA to ensure the parcel is infrastructure ready to be developed, or make it so. The parcel should then be advertised for development proposals (RFP’s), providing adequate time for public informational meetings and receipt of responsive proposals (6 months?). Each development should have a start and completion timeline.**
- 3. Included with each RFP a complete list of City incentives that have been given by the DIA in the past (even the miss-named “Completion” grant). Each developer can then respond with their proposed development, including the nature and magnitude of the incentives the developer requires for their development to proceed, if selected. Some proposals may require little or no incentives, some may require significant incentives. The best value for the City may be a very challenging decision.**
- 4. To make the project selection process FAIR, a public Evaluation Committee would be created of representatives selected by both invited and self-selected groups, including professional organizations. These representatives would attend the presentations of each proposal. These citizen representatives would rank each proposal with 0-100 scores (not a sequential ranking order), from each community group’s Board’s perspective. A weighted average project score would result, with heavier weighting going to the selected/invited civic professional groups’ scoring.**
- 5. The DIA would score each proposal from a financial and “best value” perspective.**
- 6. The Mayor would score each proposal from a financial and “best value” perspective**
- 7. The City Council would then make the decision, with full disclosure in the original RFP, that the selected proposal will be based on a multi-group scoring of perceived “best value” (NOT “lowest costs”). That open process will require that the City Council take into account the “best value” scores of the citizens group, the DIA and Mayor. Each group should have a 1/3 impact on the resulting combined scoring. The City Council would then choose between the 2 top ranked proposals meeting acceptable financial standards, unless enough proposals are submitted that a 3rd project (appropriately close enough ranked to the 2nd ranked proposals) should be considered.**

Parks

- 1. Multiple cities around our country, especially in Florida, should be reviewed by the DIA for their downtown utilization success stories. We should learn from the success of so many of them having focused on bringing the public downtown to well designed, interesting, user-friendly, safe downtown parks.**
- 2. Residential towers have NOT been a component part of those parks. Instead they have ended up being built around or near those parks. Recent comments about such developments being essential to provide ad-valorem taxes to fund the support of the parks are simply an ill-conceived theory lacking validity. How many residential towers are in New York's Central Park? How many residential towers are AROUND or NEAR that park?**
- 3. Demand for downtown residences will follow the public activating downtown, which can most effectively be accomplished with professionally designed downtown riverfront parks. Residential buildings are NOT public parks.**
- 4. The process of getting our downtown riverfront parks designed and built has been excruciatingly, painfully slow. Our most important downtown riverfront parks have been delayed for years, awaiting development of privately developed residential properties in reserved "corner" portions of those parks. The tail is wagging the dog.**
- 5. Build the parks; to do so, the residential buildings MUST be removed from the parks. Put that land that was initially so discreetly squeezed out of these downtown riverfront parks back into the park area. Have the park professionals design the park using ALL the land contiguous to a park site. Do you really think they will voluntarily design a residential building into their park?**
- 6. The only buildings that should be part of these parks should be low rise facilities serving the public's use as restrooms, food operations, and needed services such as supporting park activities, ticketing, maintenance, nearby shelter from sudden storms and police sub-stations. Paring must be adequate and very nearby.**
- 7. Modify the parks' design process to ensure that local park related volunteer groups participate in EVERY meeting with the parks designers with an equal voice in the park design. Equal means that same as to the "administrative and financial sectors of the City, whether it is the DIA or the Administration. Our waterfront parks need more REAL public park activists' input, which means much no isolation from design meetings. There is real public input and "show" public input, and we all know the difference.**
- 8. Financial limits per park should be set by the City but what those dollars create should be heavily influenced by volunteer park activist groups. It is those groups that will help get the parks utilized and sustain the public support to maintain them properly. Conservancy groups have been used in other communities in this way to significant benefit of all.**