



**OFFICE OF THE CITY COUNCIL
RESEARCH DIVISION**

117 WEST DUVAL STREET, SUITE 425
4TH FLOOR, CITY HALL
JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA 32202
904-255-5137

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON STADIUM COMMUNITY BENEFIT AGREEMENT

Meeting Minutes

**August 26, 2024
9:00 a.m.**

Location: City Council Chamber, 1st floor, City Hall

In attendance: Committee Members Raul Arias (Chair), Jimmy Peluso (Vice Chair), Will Lahnen, Nick Howland, Tyrona Clark-Murray, Ken Amaro

Also: Council Members Ron Salem, Randy White (arr. 9:37), Rahman Johnson (arr. 9:47), Kevin Carrico (arr. 11:36); Maritza Sanchez – Legislative Services Division; Phillip Peterson – Council Auditor’s Office; Jeff Clements – Council Research Division; Mary Staffopoulos – Office of General Counsel; Darnell Smith, Joe Inderhees, Mike Weinstein, Scott Wilson, Bill Delaney – Mayor’s Office; Anna Brosche – Finance Department; Ed Randolph – Office of Economic Development

Meeting Convened: 9:01 a.m.

Chairman Arias convened the meeting and the attendees introduced themselves for the record. Mr. Arias asked for a recap of the committee’s actions to date before proposed amendments are taken up. Mary Staffopoulos with the General Counsel’s Office distributed a list of the amendments proposed by council members since the last meeting and also distributed a list of the Community Benefit Agreement (CBA) terms and funding allocations. Mr. Arias said there is \$94M left in proposed City funding to discuss to leverage \$32M from the Jaguars.

Consideration of Proposed Amendments

Council Member Peluso said a primary purpose of the CBA is to prepare and protect the Eastside from the impacts of future Sports Complex developments (stadium renovation, some version of a Lot J entertainment district, fairgrounds redevelopment) so that current residents and businesses are not negatively impacted or forced out. He suggested reducing the percentage of the tax increment finance (TIF) district ad valorem reservation from the Urban Infill Redevelopment Area (UIRA) in return for a larger up-front investment in the Eastside to protect the neighborhood before the projects begin to ramp up substantially. In response to a question from Chairman Arias, Ms. Staffopoulos said that some of the

proposed amendments are competing and perhaps a broad discussion of priorities could inform the decision-making process before individual items are taken up in order and contradictory amendments are moved. Mr. Peluso said he's not so much concerned about the countywide initiatives as long as the Eastside is protected. Assistant Council Auditor Phillip Peterson clarified that Mr. Peluso's intent is allocating the funds for Eastside investment over 6 years and that the additional \$10M for the Eastside would come from the countywide allocations. Mr. Peluso explained his proposed amendments #16 and 17. He said that Council President White had said at the last meeting that he would appoint another Community Benefit Agreement special committee to discuss a UIRA and TIF.

Council Member Lahnen said nothing the Finance Committee did in its budget hearings changes the projections for future City budget deficits totaling \$332M over the next 3 fiscal years beyond FY24-25. He recommended removing the \$1M allocation per council district (amendment #1) and spreading the City's CBA commitments over the maximum years possible (\$2.4M per year over 33 years – amendment #2). Council Member Peluso asked if Mr. Lahnen would agree to funding the Eastside programs up-front and spreading the countywide spending over a longer time. Regarding #3, Ms. Lahnen advocated for a protection clause if economic conditions deteriorate to allow a 1-year pause in payments if ad valorem taxes increase less than 3% in one year, but with a commitment to appropriate the full \$80M over 30 years. Mr. Peluso suggested allowing a 2-year pause if necessary for the countywide initiatives but not doing any pauses on the Eastside spending. Mr. Lahnen said he wants the pause to be universal including the Eastside allocation.

Council Member Howland discussed his amendments #4-8. He said ad valorem revenues are on a downward trend and the use of reserve funds was the result this year. Big investments were made in salary increases and indigent care and that limits what else can be added on. He advocated for using the investments being made in the FY24-25 budget by the City and the independent authorities as the match to the Jaguars' CBA investment. He proposed an amendment that the City's CBA contribution could not exceed the dollar growth in the General Fund revenue if it is less than 3% or the CPI percentage applied to the City budget from the prior year. He also advocated for a non-funding clause in the event that funds cannot be appropriated to the CBA in a particular year. Council Member Arias said he agrees with Council Member Peluso that it's most important to fund the Eastside sooner and let the countywide initiatives be subject to pauses or reductions in bad economic times. Mr. Peluso asked Mr. Howland if he would agree to keep the Eastside whole in any case; Mr. Howland said he could not given future fiscal uncertainties and the need to fund top priorities in any case without a millage increase.

Council Member Clark-Murray asked if there is a dollar figure for amendment #4. Phillip Peterson said he doesn't know that any Eastside-specific programs have been proposed yet so doesn't have a specific figure. He distributed a list of appropriations in the new budget for the countywide affordable housing, homelessness and workforce development initiatives.

Council Member Salem reviewed his proposed amendments #13-15. He believes that any funds the City appropriates toward the 3 countywide initiatives in the next fiscal year should count toward the CBA match. He would like to see the maximum possible investment in the Eastside because that's where the maximum impact will occur. He echoed Council Member Lahnen's concern about future budget deficits. Mr. Salem said including the Talleyrand area in the Eastside TIF would negatively impact the City's overall budget and he opposes a precedent of creating more TIFs, particularly outside of the formal state process. Mary Staffopoulos said removing the TIF from discussion now does not preclude holding that discussion at a later date. Council Member Peluso said he still wants a TIF for the Eastside but at a lower percentage in return for more Eastside investment up-front. Mr. Salem said the \$14M allocation for the council districts is unnecessary and those needs can be addressed via the Council strategic priorities process.

Council Member Amaro discussed his four proposed amendments #9 – 12. He recommended appropriating \$10M per year over the first 3 years to the Eastside; making the \$50M countywide appropriation at \$6.25M per year for 8 years; if the decision is made to keep council district appropriations, then change the appropriations to \$250,000 per year over 4 years rather than \$1M in the first year, usable for any purpose; and create a full-fledged CRA and TIF reserving 80% of enhanced revenue for 20 years, 75% for 5 years, and 50% for 5 years. Any investment in the Eastside must be transformative and sustainable, and that is what the TIF would provide.

President White said he would like to see a council district allocation in some form, either \$1M at once or Council Member Amaro's \$250,000 per year suggestion. Council Member Johnson said he's disappointed that there are proposals to reduce or eliminate the 14 council district funds – those are pragmatic ways the council members can deal with the concrete needs of constituents. The spirit of the CBA is that there would be transformative benefits for everyone and that can't be done on the cheap. Council Member Peluso asked if there is an appetite for allocating even more funding to the Eastside, coming from the countywide allocations. Council Member Amaro said he agrees with having a CRA TIF because that's a known mechanism. Mr. Peluso said a UIRA is very much like a CRA and TIF and could be managed by the Office of Economic Development.

Council Member Lahnen offered the following suggestion as a starting point for the committee's consideration given the discussion that has taken place: \$35M for Eastside programs over 7 years; \$45M for countywide initiatives over 33 years or until \$45M is reached through annual allowable programs; the issue of CIP versus non-CIP uses for the council district funds will need to be decided by the committee; and no decision is needed on a CRA/UIRA/TIF if a new CBA 3.0 Committee is to be appointed to take that up.

Council Member Howland said he accepts the \$14M for council districts but doesn't want another CRA to divert revenue from the General Fund and its needs. Council Member Clark-Murray said CRAs can make a real difference over time and is supportive of an Eastside TIF to provide a consistent stream of funding for that area. She would need to know more about how a UIRA works compared to a CRA to make a choice, and she likes the idea of having a council district fund. Chairman Arias asked how long it takes to create a CRA versus a UIRA. Ms. Staffopoulos said the CRA takes a detailed study of the target area, a finding of slum and blight, and creation of a CRA redevelopment plan. She assumes a UIRA would be similar in its requirements. Mr. Peterson said it took 2 years to create the King/Soutel CRA. Mr. Arias said he supports the \$1M district funds to take care of neighborhood needs. Mr. Peterson said the administration planned to put the \$1M district funds in the CIP and to fund them with debt, so that would impact on whether those funds could go to non-profits for non-capital purposes.

Travis Williams with LiftJax and Together Eastside said the UIRA process is tougher than the CRA process, but the neighborhood is ready to do the work to make it happen through a CBA 3.0 mechanism. Council Member Peluso said either TIF mechanism will take some time to set up.

Council Member Peluso said he is generally agreeable with Council Member Lahnen's package of proposals but prefers funding of \$40M for the Eastside and \$40M for countywide initiatives. In response to a question from Mr. Peluso, Mr. Lahnen said he would be agreeable a split of \$40M apiece for the Eastside and countywide initiatives, with the countywide spending occurring over 7 years starting in FY25-26. He suggested that in bad economic times the Eastside allocation could be reduced to no less than \$3M but not eliminated entirely, to be recouped in later years. Council Member Howland said he could agree with the Lahnen #3 amendment but wants to protect the Council's ability to make budgetary decisions on a year- by-year basis as conditions may warrant. He recommended using his amendment #7 calculation with Council Member Lahnen's pause mechanism, with a provision for catching up over the succeeding 2 fiscal years. Council Member Amaro asked if Howland #8 is needed if the committee agrees

to the pause and catchup mechanism. Mr. Howland said it might not be necessary given the pause and catchup mechanism.

Council Member Amaro asked if a TIF could be drawn to exclude the Talleyrand area. Ms. Staffopoulos said Council will establish the boundaries as it sees fit for whatever district is established. Mr. Amaro said \$40M over 7 years doesn't seem like that would create enough noticeable impact in the Eastside. Council Member Peluso said he would like to see more but it's subject to balancing the needs of the rest of the city and the council members. He thinks the area will grow and the TIF will start generating funds for improvements.

Council Member Johnson asked Mr. Peterson if the funds would be less impactful if spread over a longer period of years; Mr. Peterson said he's not qualified to opine on that. Mr. Johnson asked Mike Weinstein if the distribution of the funding over a longer period is within the spirit of what the Jaguars agreed to in the negotiations. Mr. Weinstein said the intention was that the City would put in the seed money to kick off the transformation and lure developers and the Jaguars would provide the long-term investment after the start-up period. If spread out too long, the investment wouldn't have the desired impact, but that is offset by the proposed increase in the Eastside allocation from \$30 to \$40M just discussed. The Jaguars are most interested in the Eastside impact of the CBA, not so much the countywide initiatives. Mr. Johnson advocated for more up-front investment. Council Member Clark-Murry asked for clarification if the Talleyrand area is included in the proposed TIF boundary. Ms. Staffopoulos said it is in the TIF area so the tax increment would be collected from the entire TIF area, but the intention is to only spend the proceeds in the Eastside area, not in Talleyrand.

Chairman Arias asked who controls the expenditure of CBA funds. Ms. Staffopoulos said under the original CBA proposal in 2024-904, the Jaguar funds do not come to the City so are not subject to City appropriation. The Jaguars would identify a schedule of projects to which their funding would be applied, that schedule would be reviewed and approved by the Mayor's Office, and the list would be attached to the CBA agreement. The supplemental CBA currently has the same structure. In any event, the City's funds would have to be appropriated by the City Council. Mr. Arias said he wants a Council role in the project review process along with the Mayor's representative. Ms. Staffopoulos cautioned that that would involve a delegation of authority from the Council to its representative and would cause any discussions of those parties to be subject to the Government in the Sunshine open meetings requirements. She did not know if the administration or the Jaguars would have any concerns about that. Mr. Arias said he will propose that as an amendment at the appropriate time. He also said wants the full \$14M of council district funds appropriated in FY25-26 to be usable for any purpose, not restricted to capital. Council Member Peluso asked how they would be funded if not just for capital purposes. Mr. Peterson said it would have to be General Fund dollars and not debt funded via the CIP. Anything needing a contract with a third party (i.e. allocation to non-profits) would require Council approval. Mr. Arias said he wants to use FY24-25 budget appropriations to count toward the City's CBA match – about \$6M.

Mary Staffopoulos provided a summary of the items where it appears the committee has reached consensus:

- 1) \$40M to the Eastside, \$40M to countywide initiatives
- 2) The \$40M for the Eastside to be allocated over 7 years, with a minimum of \$3M per year
- 3) The \$40M for countywide initiatives to be allocated over 33 years
- 4) The Howland amendment #7 calculation will apply in fiscal years when ad valorem revenues lag and payments could be suspended for up to 2 consecutive years, with a funding catch-up provision
- 5) FY24-25 budget allocations apply to the City's CBA match as long as they fall within the countywide initiative areas
- 6) Remove the CRA/UIRA/TIF element for now and leave that to CBA 3.0 committee to resolve

Ms. Staffopoulos said the \$14M for council district allocations remains to be settled. Mr. Peterson said additional thought needs to be given to the catch-up provision for the Eastside contributions. The countywide initiatives would be easier to fund on a catch-up basis since the payout would be over 33 years. If the economic downturn occurs in year 6 or 7 of the 7-year Eastside payout, the catch-up would be problematic. Council Member Lahnen suggested extending the duration of the payout for either the countywide or Eastside funding by the number of years that payouts were reduced or suspended to allow for the catch-up.

President White said he commits to appointing a new CBA committee to discuss a TIF mechanism and CBA governance issues, possibly with the same membership plus a new member or two. Council Member Clark-Murray for clarification asked about oversight of the agreement since the ordinance references the Office of Economic Development. Ms. Staffopoulos said that oversight refers to the CBA agreement itself; the determination of the projects and initiatives to be funded will be done by the Jaguars and the Mayor's Office. Ms. Staffopoulos said the \$118M in Jaguars funding related to the original CBA does not come to Council for further action.

Mayor's Deputy Chief of Staff Joe Inderhees said the administration supports the short-term impact investment for the Eastside and wants a TIF mechanism for that area. The stadium redevelopment is the catalyst to making a CRA work there where it might not work in other places. He asked the committee not to dilute the impact of the investment by spreading it over too many years, noting that 2 CRA experts gave that testimony about why CRAs fail at an earlier committee meeting. Mike Weinstein said in the negotiations with the Jaguars, the intention was that the team's \$150M for the CBA would be above and beyond what they already do for the community through the team and its associated foundation; using next year's budget as the City match doesn't really meet that spirit. The Jaguars might ask for credit for what they're already doing in that case. He suggested instead of creating a CRA and TIF just giving the area a specific dollar amount of new tax revenue generated, for example, \$5M. Doing it the form of a REV grant instead of creating a CRA and TIF would be much simpler. Council Member Howland said he has talked to the Jaguars and they want both their dollars and the City's dollars to be incremental additions, not usual ongoing expenditures. Mr. Inderhees asked that the 7-year and 33-year payout periods be amended to read "or sooner" in case the opportunity arises to make the investments faster.

Council Member Peluso said he would move to change the UIRA method to a TIF in amendment #17 and let the subsequent CBA committee look at that or the Weinstein REV grant methodology. Council Member Amaro said \$40M over 7 years doesn't provide enough impact for the Eastside in the short term. Mr. Peluso said the investment would be "within" 7 years, so could be done sooner than that.

Amendments

Motion (Howland): allocate \$40M to the Eastside over a 7-year period beginning in FY25-26, with a minimum annual \$3M contribution; however the City's contribution may be paused if ad valorem collections are insufficient according to the methodology of the combined amendments #3 and 7 if ad valorem revenues rise less than the greater of 3% or the Consumer Price Index for the preceding 12 months, and an additional year shall be added the end of the 7-year term for each year in which the contribution was paused.

Council Member Peluso asked when new ad valorem revenue last went up by less than 3%; Mr. Peterson said he believed it last occurred in FY2010-11 and 2011-12 following the Great Recession.

Motion (Peluso): amend the Howland amendment to make the funding pause discretionary at the option of the City Council – **approved unanimously via voice vote.**

The Howland amendment as amended was approved unanimously

Motion: allocate \$40M to countywide initiatives with equal distributions over 33 years or sooner beginning in FY25-26; the amendments #3 and 7 funding pause mechanism would apply.

Motion (Lahnen): change the “equal distributions” language to “within 33 years, subject to the contribution being paused if subject to the pause mechanism” – **approved unanimously via a voice vote.**

Mr. Inderhees suggested that the “equal distributions” language be deleted since the addition of “or sooner” means that larger contributions could be made to shorten the 33-year maximum term. Mr. Peterson raised the possibility of adding a minimum annual contribution to the countywide initiatives similar to what was done for the Eastside allocation.

Mayor’s Chief of Staff Darnell Smith advocated for doing the countywide programs much sooner than 33 years. Mr. Peterson asked if the committee intended for there to be a minimum annual allocation so the funding can’t be pushed off to the distant future. Council Member Lahnen said his intent was to spread it over a number of years because of the tight budgets projected in the next few years. Mr. Peterson said the 33 years is based on when the stadium lease ends and obligations of the parties should be completed. Council Member Amaro said there should be some minimum annual allocation so the obligation can’t be put off to the very end of the term, noting that Mr. Smith requested a shorter period for greater impact. Mr. Lahnen suggested a minimum \$750,000 annual allocation to the countywide initiatives.

Motion (Lahen): require a minimum annual allocation of \$750,000 per year to the countywide initiatives.

Council Member Johnson said he believes the process has been so focused on the dollars and the match that it isn’t considering the impact on the people who are going to be most affected. The investment needs to be done with intentionality and inclusiveness in mind for the current residents.

Motion (Clark-Murray): amend the Lahnen motion to increase the minimum appropriation to \$1M per year – **approved unanimously via a voice vote**

Ms. Staffopoulos and Mr. Peterson said their understanding was that the Eastside allocation is intended to be at least \$3M per year regardless of the amount of new ad valorem revenues, except when the Howland calculation mechanism causes a contribution pause. Council Member Peluso said that was not his understanding of the Eastside motion – he thought the Eastside got at least \$3M annually in any event. Council Member Howland said his motion was that if there is not enough tax revenue in a year then there would be a contribution pause and a catch-up. A guaranteed minimum limits the Council’s ability to invest in other priorities, grant pay raises, etc. Ms. Staffopoulos said a minimum contribution floor makes it easier for administration of the funding from a contractual perspective. Adding years on the back end of a contract and administering CBA 2 differently from CBA 1 adds complexity and makes the contracts different. Mr. Howland said a minimum allocation to the Eastside would make it more important than any other priority, including core, vital city services, when fiscal times are difficult. Chairman Arias said his intention was to invest the money if it’s available but not be required to if the revenue is not there. Mr. Peluso said the Eastside is facing huge changes from the impending development and a minimum \$3M investment is not too much to ask to protect that community.

Motion (Lahnen on behalf of Arias): clarify that the Howland ad valorem revenue safety calculation overrides the minimum required appropriation for the countywide initiatives – **approved unanimously via a voice vote.**

Motion (Lahnen): approve the \$40M for countywide initiatives over 33 years or sooner, beginning in FY25-26, with a minimum \$1M annual allocation, subject to the Howland ad valorem revenue safety calculation to override the minimum payment requirement - **approved unanimously via a voice vote.**

The committee was in recess from 11:45 to 11:56 a.m.

Motion (Peluso): appropriate \$14M in FY25-26 for \$1M per council district for any council member requested use.

Mr. Peterson recommended the funds be put “below the line” because non-capital uses might require term sheets and contracts. This would require future council action for each expenditure. Council Member Howland asked if this appropriation would add to the City’s projected budget deficit in FY26-27; Mr. Peterson said it would add to the projected deficit but in FY25-26. Council Member Clark-Murray asked about the strategic initiatives funding in the proposed budget. Mr. Peterson said the Council strategic plan process is in the Ordinance Code so is independent of this action. Appropriating these district funds in lieu of deciding on Council strategic priorities would require separate legislative action to waive that Code provision. Mr. Howland supported the motion to have council district members who are closest to the voters make decisions that directly serve their constituents. Chairman Arias said his intention with these funds was that next year’s Council strategic planning process could focus on citywide needs and initiatives and not district-level projects since district council members will have these funds to address those needs. Mr. Peterson asked if there is a time frame by which these funds must be used. Mr. Arias said his preference would be that the funds could carry-over to future fiscal years.

Ms. Staffopoulos restated the motion - appropriate \$14M in FY25-26 for \$1M per council district for any council member requested use, the funds to be authorized to carry-over to future fiscal years, and the funds to initially be placed in a contingency account pending future appropriation for use.

The motion was approved 5-1 via a voice vote (Peluso opposed).

Chairman Arias offered an opportunity to reconsider the funding pause provision in the Eastside initiatives funding if the committee wanted to clarify its action. Council Member Howland advocated for the funding pause mechanism as a sensible precaution and suggested possibly increasing the annual target minimum allocations to \$4M for the Eastside and \$1.5M for the countywide initiatives. Council Member Peluso said he would like to see minimum annual targets of \$5M for the Eastside and \$2M for countywide initiatives.

Motion (Peluso): reconsider the previous vote on the Eastside strategic focus allocation – **approved unanimously via a voice vote.**

Ms. Staffopoulos stated Mr. Peluso’s proposed revised Eastside motion: \$40M for the Eastside over a period of 7 years, beginning in FY25-26, minimum \$5M allocation per year, subject to the Howland ad valorem revenue protection mechanism, with 1 year added to the end of the term for each year contributions are paused. The funding could be provided earlier than the maximum period at Council’s discretion. Council Member Howland expressed his preference for \$4M annually for the Eastside and \$1.5M annually for countywide initiatives.

Council Member Peluso asked what happens if a payment is less than the minimum but not zero and whether that would extend the maximum payment period by a year. Ms. Staffopoulos said if a year is skipped entirely then another year is added to the end of the term, but the obligation remains to allocate the \$40M total over that term. Council Member Peluso agreed to allow the Eastside allocation to be a

minimum of \$4M per year. Council Member Lahnen said he could support no more than a \$1M per year minimum allocation to the countywide initiatives since the intent was to spread the \$40M over 33 years.

Motion (Peluso): allocate \$40M for the Eastside over a maximum of 7 years, beginning in FY25-26, with a minimum \$4M allocation per year, subject to the Howland ad valorem revenue protection mechanism calculation, with 1 year added to the end of the payment term for each year in which no payment is made – **approved unanimously via a voice vote.**

Mr. Peterson said the issue of the various TIF options remains to be resolved. Council Member Peluso asked Council Member Amaro if he would be agreeable to using language committing the council to consider a TIF mechanism. Mr. Amaro said the sustainability of the Eastside initiatives is important and needs a TIF, and the Council President has committed to another CBA Committee that could consider a TIF. He would prefer that a TIF not exceed a term of 20 years. Council Member Clark-Murray said the discussion should be deferred to the CBA 3.0 committee. That would give someone time to run some calculations and develop some potential TIF length and increment percentage scenarios.

Motion (Peluso): approve his Amendment #17 to make a general commitment to explore a tax increment district, not a UIRA, for the Eastside.

Ms. Staffopoulos said the intent of the motion is to remove the specific TIF language referencing a 95% increment over 30 years and replace it with more general language regarding a commitment to explore options. Chairman Amaro asked if a time certain for the consideration should be added. Ms. Staffopoulos said she would not recommend it because that might open the door to a legal challenge by the Jaguars for breach of contract if it doesn't happen. The Council President has committed to appointing a new CBA committee to undertake the task.

The motion was approved unanimously via voice vote.

Motion (Howland): the City's FY23-24 appropriations are not intended to be part of the City's CBA match but the FY24-25 appropriations for strategic plan initiatives are to count as matching the CBA – **approved unanimously via a voice vote.**

Mr. Howland said he would like to see independent authority contributions to count toward the City's match for the CBA as well. Mr. Peterson said some kind of reporting mechanism from the authorities for their expenditures that might count as matching for the CBA initiatives would be needed for tracking purposes. Mr. Howland said his intention is to include the Jacksonville Housing Authority's expenditures, not just JEA, Jacksonville Transportation Authority, Jacksonville Port Authority and Jacksonville Aviation Authority. Ms. Staffopoulos asked if the intention is to use the JHA's and Jacksonville Housing Finance Authority's normal program expenditures as the match. Mr. Howland said he would agree to just JEA, JTA, JPA and JAA, not the housing-related authorities. Ms. Staffopoulos said the authorities get a great deal of federal funding and asked if the intent is that those federal funds be counted as City match. Council Member Amaro asked if it is proper to involve the independent authorities in this proposal. Ms. Staffopoulos said they could be inserted into the CBA, but the City would need to negotiate agreements with the various authorities to spell out exactly what would be covered. Council Member Clark-Murray opposed the amendment because it seems to exceed the scope of the CBA and she doesn't want the City to minimize its contribution to the CBA by counting the activities of others toward its commitment.

Mr. Peterson said the last item for clarification is the non-funding clause in the Howland #8 amendment. Mr. Howland said he would be willing to withdraw it if it is not needed. Ms. Staffopoulos said adding it would tighten up the language in the CBA to a degree, which already contains "subject to available appropriation" language. The OGC can develop specific language that serves the purpose.

Motion (Howland): approve Howland amendment #8 to clarify language regarding non-funding in the event the Howland #7 protective mechanism clause is invoked – **approved unanimously via a voice vote.**

Ms. Staffopoulos said the language of all the amendments will be drafted for a floor amendment to the ordinance for the first council meeting in September which will be reflected in a revised CBA that will be given to the Jaguars for comment.

Chairman Arias recapped the work of the committee to reach an agreement that supports both the Eastside and countywide needs and does so in a fiscally responsible way.

Council Member Peluso thanked the committee for its good work.

Meeting adjourned: 12:36 p.m.

Minutes: Jeff Clements, Council Research Division

jeffc@coj.net 904-255-5137

8.30.24 Posted 3:00 p.m.