



***Jacksonville International Airport
Community Redevelopment Area ("JIA/CRA")
Advisory Board***

**Hybrid Virtual & In-Person meeting
Thursday, January 21, 2021 – 4:00 p.m.
117 West Duval Street, Mezzanine, Exam Room 1
Jacksonville, FL 32202**

MEETING MINUTES

Advisory Board Members Present: Advisory Board Chair Greg Tison, Vice-Chair Tommy Ruffin and Tameka Joseph

Advisory Board Members Present via Zoom: Lad Daniels and Darryl Patterson

Advisory Board Members Absent: Stephen Swann

Staff Present: Paul Crawford, Director of Operations, Karen Nasrallah, Redevelopment Manager; Michelle Stephens, Recording Secretary

Representing the Office of General Counsel: Susan Grandin

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Tison called the Jacksonville International Airport Community Redevelopment Area (JIA/CRA) Advisory Board meeting to order at approximately 4:07 p.m. He advised that they did not have a quorum for the meeting.

II. ACTION ITEMS

APPROVAL OF THE July 16, 2020 E INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AREA (JIA/CRA) ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Due to the lack of a quorum present in the room, the July 16, 2020 JIA/CRA Advisory Board meeting minutes were not approved.

III. INFORMATION

CONSIDERATION OF BYLAW CHANGES

Ms. Grandin provided an overview of JIA/CRA Advisory Board Resolution 2021-01, which is an amendment to the JIA/CRA Advisory Board Bylaws. Ms. Grandin advised that the Office of General Counsel followed the guidance of the Florida Attorney General Legal Advisory opinion.

She added that Lawsikia Hodges, OGC put together a memo through Jason Gabriel about what we can do in terms of what we call communication media technology (“CMT”).

Ms. Grandin advised that the meeting room has to be publicly accessible and properly noticed and board members have to be physically present in the room in order to confirm a quorum for the meeting.

She commented that because of the COVID-19 pandemic, the Governor had issued an Executive Order suspending any requirements for the physical presence of quorums that expired November 1, 2020. Because the Attorney General’s opinion talks about extraordinary circumstances you cannot have a virtual attendance and voting of a member unless there is an extraordinary circumstance. In the Attorney General’s opinion that is related to COVID-19, which is why in the Resolution she included illness, injury or other health related issues such as COVID-19 and she added military duty or deployment to extraordinary circumstances. If a Board Member is not able to attend the meeting in person the board can vote that a Board Member can attend via communication media technology.

The Attorney General’s opinion was not incredibly specific, but it was related to health issues, which is why she used health issues or the board can come up with what they think is an extraordinary circumstance and add it to the Resolution and that way the Advisory Board would not have to vote on it every time. One of the pieces of advice was you can either do a resolution like the one presented, you can change your bylaws, which this particular resolution would do. She noted that another option was to do a vote at the beginning of every meeting. A quorum is four, if four members are physically present at the meeting, they can vote to let the fifth member participate virtually. She does not recommend doing that in case they are going to take a vote and you know the person out there is not going to vote your way so nobody is going to vote to allow him/her to participate. It is better to handle it either in resolution or bylaws just once and not have to deal with it anymore.

Ms. Grandin stated that it is the responsibility of each board member to advise Ms. Nasrallah prior to the meeting if they plan to attend virtually. She said that some boards take turns as far as who is going to be physically present because not everyone wants to be physically present at every meeting due to the pandemic. She reiterated that Ms. Nasrallah needs to know who is attending the meeting physically because if there are not enough Board Members for a physical quorum in the meeting room there is no reason to meet unless the Advisory Board wants to meet for discuss purposes.

Ms. Grandin suggested the board talk about what they want to consider as extraordinary circumstances.

Vice-Chair Ruffin commented that he would like the language to be more specific to include hospitalization. His suggestion for wording was, “that requires illness, injury or other health

related matters that requires hospitalization, immediate medical attention or isolation” and then continue on with such as COVID-19.

Ms. Grandin repeated the language for clarification, “That requires illness, injury or other health related matters that require immediate treatment, hospitalization, or isolation and other related matters such as the COVID-19 pandemic.”

Advisory Board Member Daniels agrees with the amendment and with what Ms. Grandin recited. He commented that the hope would be as we get through the pandemic, we will not have to address this issue as much as we are right now.

Ms. Grandin clarified that the language will be a part of the Advisory Board’s Bylaws and that a vote is only required when the Bylaws are changed again. She noted that the JIA/CRA Bylaws have not been revisited since February 2002 and contain outdated references as well as language that is unnecessarily duplicative of provisions in the Ordinance Code.

Chair Tison asked Ms. Grandin to amend the Bylaws as discussed at today’s meeting and send them out to the board again to look at between now and the next Advisory Board meeting.

Ms. Grandin concurred and will resend them out so when the board has a physical quorum next time they can vote on the amended bylaws.

Ms. Grandin reiterated that there has to be at least four board members present in the room to constitute a quorum and that it would be very helpful if the Board Members would communicate with Ms. Nasrallah a few days in advance of the meeting of their attendance plans so we know whether there will be a quorum present for action items, if the meeting should be cancelled, or have a meeting for discussion purposes only.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Chair Tison advised that the agenda reflects the election of officers, but due to a lack of an in person quorum at the meeting, the election of officers will be postponed until the next meeting. He encouraged everyone’s physical presence at the next scheduled meeting.

CONCEPT FOR MAIN STREET WIDENING PROJECT

Chair Tison noted that they have had discussions in the past related to widening Main Street. He advised that he recently had a phone conversation with CM Gaffney and it seems there is more interest in the widening of Main Street from New Berlin Road out to at least Airport Center or even out to Max Leggett Parkway. Councilmember Gaffney is receiving calls from constituents asking when the roads will be widened. Vice-Chair Ruffin commented that he has been out in the area and there is a need to widen Main Street. He commented that he understands the state authorities are starting to consider the road widening project as well.

Chair Tison commented that the JIA/CRA is scheduled to sunset in approximately 2.5 years and over that period of time there will be several million dollars in the CRA with very few projects to spend the funds. He would like the board to consider helping the road project move forward by using some JIA/CRA funds and maybe that would entice the state to come up with the balance to get the road widened. He noted that Jim Knight was in attendance via Zoom for discussion.

Mr. Knight commented that the state very much believes that Main Street should be widened and Nassau County has indicated that they want the road widened, the TPO has voiced support for having the road widened, and it is also on the City's list of projects. Just about every government entity is in support of extending the four lanes all the way up to State Road 200 in Nassau County. The older business area is on the east side and the railroad is located on the west side. The right of way is extremely tight. Mr. Knight advised that DOT is proposing to build, two lanes in each direction and a center turn lane, urban style that would have a lower type design speed similar to an urban road (appx 40-45 mph). He added that DOT would not propose a sidewalk on the railroad side. DOT would propose a multi-use path on the east side that would serve bikes and pedestrians for the corridor. He noted that DOT can fit almost all of that within the existing right of way, which is a huge plus.

Mr. Knight advised that storm water treatment and attenuation would need to be addressed requiring a need for drainage pond sites and like with a lot of intersections may need a little triangle eclipse to get all the signal poles and cabinets in. Generally, this has no impact to business frontage; however, there are a lot of people using the state right of way for parking, so they may learn what they actually own versus where the public right of way is.

Mr. Knight advised that they have cost estimates for the project.

Construction for New Berlin to Airport Center Drive is \$15 million. It breaks down as design and preconstruction \$3 million, inspection and materials testing during construction \$3 million. Approximately \$21 million for the project plus the right of way that they do not have a good estimate.

He noted that there are some vacant parcels in the area and thinks they should be able to find some pond parcels that will not break the bank. He added that DOT also looked at extending Main Street further north up to Max Leggett from Airport Center Drive to Max Leggett. He commented that the cost would be almost most identical in numbers to the previous section. Approximately, \$14 million and obviously with a little bit lower cost you have slightly lower design cost around \$2.5 - \$3 million and inspection materials approximately \$2.5 million. All in all you are looking at approximately \$20 million for each job. New Berlin to Airport Center and then Airport Center to Mag Leggett – all in all cost.

DOT is ready to proceed, but they will need agreements in place and money transferred. DOT has just gone through building their work program and their goal is to build a five year plan and spend every penny in that five years. Mr. Knight commented that he is confident giving it a couple of years down the road they could probably come up with whatever is needed. He added that it is a large job. The TPO has really not shown interest in funding the Main Street project even though they show it as a high priority. With this type of investment it would definitely put it in range of the TPO being able to take it all the way to Max Leggett.

Chair Tison asked if they had traffic counts. Mr. Knight replied that he can get them, but he does not have them available to him right now.

Mr. Crawford commented that the \$20 million does not include additional land purchases for drainage. Mr. Knight concurred. Paul commented that the land purchases would need to be figured into the overall cost. Mr. Knight concurred.

Advisory Board Member Daniels asked how far the boundary of the JIA/CRA go along Main Street. How far north does it go?

Chair Tison replied that the west side of the road is in the JIA/CRA, but does not believe the east side is.

Ms. Grandin replied north of Pecan Road.

Advisory Board Member Daniels replied that we could allocate funds and we would be safe with the funds being allocated within the boundaries of our authority.

Ms. Nasrallah replied that it is actually outlined in the Redevelopment Plan as a priority to full implementation of the Plan.

Mr. Knight commented that they count traffic every year. Just to the south project limit there are approximately 21,000 cars a day and north near Max Leggett approximately 11,000 cars per day. He does not have any counts for in between there right now.

Ms. Grandin noted that the CRA sunsets September 30, 2023. FY 2022/2023 is the last fiscal year for the JIA/CRA.

Advisory Board Member Daniels commented that we could allocate funds to be used for projects that would continue beyond that time.

Advisory Board Member Daniels asked Mr. Knight if the TPO has it in their workplan scheduled as a high priority. Mr. Knight responded that they do.

Advisory Board Member Daniels commented that the appetite for TPO to kick in some dollars will increase immeasurably if we kick in some dollars. Mr. Knight concurred. Advisory Board Member Daniels commented that the JIA/CRA does not have to fund 100% of the project.

Mr. Knight commented that the TPO gets about \$15 million a year that they control. There are certain things they do every year so that it down to \$11 million that they spend on projects. When they see a \$20 million or \$40 million price tag they just move on to the next project. If you only need few million, they are more likely to help, but they do not really like to be the first to drop the money not knowing when the project will get built.

Chair Tison commented that he was not suggesting the JIA/CRA fund the entire project. Just portions of it.

Mr. Knight added that they are like us they run a five year program with TPO funding and our last year of that five years is right now our 2025/2026 and that funding they have pretty much spent all their money through 2025/2026. It would be more likely if the City could get the southern piece done with the JIA/CRA funds and then look to DOT and the TPO to largely pitch in on the northern piece. He commented that if the DOT has money in those outer years it is much easier for the DOT and the TPO contribute.

Ms. Grandin asked if the project was currently in the CIP. Mr. Crawford replied that it is not.

Ms. Grandin commented that she would think and she would have to research this but she does not know why you could not do this that if you allocated the money this year and next year until the end of the term and said that it is for whatever year in the future, I would think you could do that for a big project like this and not have to start spending it right now. I would think that you could move it as a chunk like that. Ms. Nasrallah commented that we are doing that currently on projects.

Chair Tison asked members to think about what has been said on the subject today and they will discuss it further at the next meeting and see what kind of action we may want to as an Advisory Board.

Mr. Crawford commented that staff will provide preliminary information regarding how funding would come into the CRA and how it would come out of the CRA and the timing associated with the Main Street project and then try to figure out how much is needed from the JIA/CRA, DOT and others to make it all work.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

Ms. Nasrallah advised that Board member Steve Swann has several conflicts at the same time on the third Thursday of the month at 4:00 pm. He is asking if the Advisory Board would consider a change of day for the Advisory Board to meet so that he can attend. He does want to be a part of the board going forward, but the conflicts have made it impossible for him to attend at this time. Ms. Nasrallah is going to send an email to the Board Members with a proposed alternate date and see how the board respond.

Ms. Nasrallah commented that staff is working on some projects and advised that the next Agency Board meeting has not been scheduled yet. Could possibly be the end of February or in March.

Ms. Nasrallah advised that the meeting for next month is scheduled for February 18, 2021 and we have a project for Ranch Road coming in. The 18th will not give us enough time to prepare for the Agency Board meeting in February so that meeting will most likely have to be rescheduled.

V. OLD BUSINESS

Vice-Chair Ruffin commented that he has brought the following subject up in previous meetings. He commented that there is a portion of a community that is within the JIA/CRA boundaries that has no sidewalks. He understands that the JIA/CRA could not do sidewalks for the entire community. He wants the portion that is within the CRA that will give him leverage to work with CM Gaffney and the City to get the rest of the community done. There is no reason why a community like this one or any other community should have no sidewalks and people have to walk in the street to go next door. He does not want this to fall by the wayside. It will not take a lot of money to do the portion that is within the CRA.

Ms. Nasrallah confirmed that Vice-Chair Ruffin is referring to a residential community. She commented that the way the Plan is written sidewalks are to connect neighborhoods to commercial services. We cannot go into one particular subdivision and install sidewalks in one particular subdivision because they only serve that particular subdivision and not the JIA/CRA community as a whole. Projects must be stated in the Redevelopment Plan to be considered for funding. In the Plan, it is written that sidewalks on major roads that connect neighborhoods to commercial services benefits the entire community and makes the commercial development sustainable.

Ms. Nasrallah noted that we have to work within the parameters of the Redevelopment Plan and if it is not written in the Plan, we cannot take that project forward.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments from public.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The next regularly scheduled meeting is Thursday, March 18, 2021 at 4:00 p.m.

There being no further business, Chair Tison adjourned the JIA/CRA Advisory Board meeting at approximately 4:48 p.m.

The written minutes for this meeting are only an overview of what was discussed. For verbatim comments of this meeting, an audio file of the meeting is available in its entirety and is available upon request. Please contact Michelle Stephens at (904) 255-5452, or by email at msteph@coj.net.