



OFFICE OF THE CITY COUNCIL

117 WEST DUVAL STREET, SUITE 425
4TH FLOOR, CITY HALL
JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA 32202
904-255-5151

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE COMMUNITY BENEFITS AGREEMENT

Minutes

December 3, 2025

10:00 am

Location: City Council Chamber

In attendance: Council Members Amaro, Arias, Clark-Murray, Peluso, Salem

Also: Carla Schell and Mary Staffopoulos, Office of General Counsel; Phillip Peterson, Auditor's Office; Brandon Russell, Council Research; Brittany Norris, Administration

Meeting Convened: 10:00 am

Introductions and Welcome

Chair Arias convened the meeting and called for introductions.

Chair Arias asked whether a quorum was established, given that only three members were present. Ms. Staffopoulos said they did not have a majority for quorum and suggested reviewing updates until they had enough members to vote on items.

Chair Arias reviewed the work from the last meeting and said they would wrap up everything at this meeting. He said they would add a few things to the grants program so that they could finalize legislation to introduce.

Updates from OGC

Ms. Staffopoulos explained that each committee member was provided with a red line of the proposed legislation that had been worked on during previous meetings. She said the red lines reflect what was discussed and voted upon by the Committee in the last meeting, except for one item, which she included for discussion and would highlight when they began reviewing the draft legislation. She said the purpose of the red line was to show the changes so that the Committee could confirm they were aligned with their intentions and discuss any additional changes before finalization.

She then explained another handout, which was a chart that CM Salem requested. The chart lists the award limitations for the Public Service Grant model and the Opioid model. She said these were just ideas for their consideration when discussing limitations on grant amounts and the number of applications.

Chair Arias asked whether these documents had been sent to the public. Ms. Staffopoulos confirmed the redline of the legislation was sent out on the Friday before Thanksgiving.

Updates from the Administration

Brittany Norris from the Administration said they would be hosting a closed meeting the following day with community groups to review the Committee's recommendations from this meeting. She said they intended to review Sunshine laws and ethics, as well as have a conversation on bylaws, with the hope of establishing some consensus.

Chair Arias asked when the meeting would occur. Ms. Norris said it would start at 2:00 p.m. and that they had the Mayor's Conference Room booked until 5:00 p.m.

CM Salem asked whether the Board members of the organization created by the legislation would be subject to Sunshine laws regarding communication among themselves. Ms. Norris said that would be the Administration's desire, but deferred to OGC to explain whether that was present in the legislation. Ms. Staffopoulos noted that the bill includes a provision that all Board meetings would be subject to the Sunshine law. CM Salem asked if the Sunshine Law also applied to conversations outside of meetings. She said that Sunshine law encompasses those communications as well, but said language could be tightened up if the Committee desired. CM Salem indicated that he had heard suggestions to waive Sunshine laws for the organization and said that it was not a good idea. He urged Ms. Norris to emphasize those laws at the Administration's meeting. Ms. Norris said she would send CM Salem the proposed agenda, which included a discussion of Sunshine laws. CM Salem asked if Council Members could attend. Ms. Norris said they could not, as the meeting was closed.

Ms. Staffopoulos then identified the excerpt on page 10 of the draft legislation that references open meetings and Sunshine laws, and offered to add a provision explicitly stating that Board members' actions will be in accordance with Sunshine laws.

Finalization of the Draft Legislation Establishing the Eastside Grants Programs Grant Process

Chair Arias asked if Ms. Staffopoulos received emails from other Committee members regarding additional items to add. She said she did not, but offered to review the changes made in the legislation.

Chair Arias said that he had a few things he wanted to address, the first being an updated map with boundaries for the five neighborhoods. Ms. Staffopoulos said the current map shows the boundary for the Eastside community, which was used for the Supplemental CBA. She said she intends to work with Mr. Peterson and the appropriate department to develop a map reflecting the individual neighborhoods to be included in the legislation. Chair Arias asked if the map would be prepared before the bill goes through the committee process. Ms. Staffopoulos said the intent was to include the map in the bill that gets filed, but offered to bring it to the Committee for review if desired. Chair Arias asked which department would assist with the map; Ms. Staffopoulos said it would most likely be the Planning Department.

CM Salem asked whether the neighborhoods were well-defined. Ms. Staffopoulos said they would develop an initial map but surmised that would be a topic of discussion during the committee process, unless there was a desire to consult the community before filing the bill. CM Peluso said that individuals

attending the Mayor's meeting may have input on neighborhood boundaries, but also expressed confidence that the Planning Department would have accurate neighborhood maps.

CM Amaro concurred with CM Peluso and said that the community and the Planning Department would know the boundaries. Chair Arias requested that Ms. Norris include that item on the agenda for the Mayor's meeting and that a map be ready for those attending to review. She agreed and stated her intent to get a large map printed from the Planning Department.

Chair Arias, referencing the chart comparing award limitations for PSG and the Opioid program, asked whether similar limitations had been established for the Eastside organization. Ms. Staffopoulos said there were no limitations on awards yet, but stated that they had established eligibility requirements for applicants, which are reflected in the legislation. She said the chart was created to give them an idea of what other grant programs do. She said both models use a high-score model, where the highest-scoring applicants get funded. She noted that PSG has a maximum grant amount of \$125,000; the Opioid grant program has a limit of \$500,000. PSG allows only one application per category, while the Opioid program allows multiple applications per category; however, if an organization submits multiple applications, only the highest-ranked application receives funding. She said there are other ways to structure awards, such as establishing tiers or distinguishing between capital and programmatic grants.

Chair Arias asked Ms. Staffopoulos to explain the four funding categories. She explained that these categories were on page 7 of the draft legislation and indicated that this was the item she added to the legislation for discussion. She said the bill's language allocates funding to the four disciplines listed in the CBA, including affordable housing, workforce housing, economic development, and homelessness mitigation in the Eastside. She said those represented the funding categories that mimicked the categories established in other grant programs. She noted that it was not an item that was discussed or voted on. She explained that she included it so that the Eastside CBA Organization would come before Council annually to request their allocation through the budget process and to recommend percentages or amounts for each funding category. She said the Committee could establish those percentages or amounts. She also said they could allow it to be part of the budget process or mimic PSG, which comes earlier in the year, with their recommended percentages for their Most Vulnerable Persons and Needs categories, approved by Council and used during the budget process later in the year. She said that was not referenced in the legislation, but could be part of the discussion.

CM Peluso recommended establishing percentages or amounts during the budget process to allow the Board to request funding based on their needs. He then asked Chair Arias what he would like to see regarding capital projects. Chair Arias said he did not want to limit the cost of capital projects, but he did not want to see the bulk of award dollars go to a single capital project. He added that he wanted to see a variety of entities, small and large, receive support. CM Peluso said he was not concerned about one organization receiving all the award dollars because he anticipates the Board sharing that concern, and he also reiterated the substantial completion requirements in the legislation for capital projects. He asked if Chair Arias had a specific desire for the process. Chair Arias said he wanted to see how the first year proceeded. CM Peluso concurred and noted that other Council Members will provide input during the committee process.

Action: CM Salem moved to add language to the legislation that capital projects receive no more than 50 percent of the allocated dollars and that the project be completed with the funds received in that year, to prevent entities from expecting future dollars. He also recommended limiting operational grants to \$250,000 and allowing applications in multiple categories. Chair Arias seconded the motion.

CM Peluso agreed with the portion limiting operational grants to \$250,000, but said there should be some allowance for the Board to approve funding for capital projects that seek more than 50 percent of the

allocated dollars. He suggested requiring the Board's unanimous support in those instances. Ms. Staffopoulos said that grant processes like these use the high-score model rather than a majority vote. She also sought clarification on the 50 percent mentioned by CM Salem and inquired if he meant 50 percent of the dollars allocated to the program; he confirmed that was his intention.

CM Amaro concurred with the \$250,000 limit on operational grants and asked CM Peluso which categories he thought would see the most applications for capital funding. CM Peluso said he thought it could be a large-scale housing development as well as retail and commercial, especially on A. Philip Randolph and Florida Ave. He said he would feel more comfortable raising that 50 percent cap to 65-70 percent. He also wondered what that would look like if unspent dollars were rolled over into the following year. Ms. Staffopoulos said she thought there was language in the legislation that addressed that, but said he could make a motion to add that if it wasn't.

CM Peluso asked CM Salem if he was open to moving the cap to 65 percent. CM Salem said he was amenable to 60 percent, but expressed concern that there would be less funding available for operational projects. CM Peluso said he would accept 60 percent and offered that as an amendment. CM Salem added that he wanted to include language stating that the percentage be based on the available funding.

CM Clark-Murray asked whether the Eastside organization's funding requests to the Mayor's office will be based on successful applications. Ms. Staffopoulos said that the organization would submit its allocation request to the Mayor's office earlier in the year and added that they are not limited to requesting only what is in the CBA. She said this would happen before the grant cycle. CM Clark-Murray asked if there was a minimum amount that must be allocated. Ms. Staffopoulos said that amount was \$4 million, per the CBA. CM Clark-Murray asked if the Committee was discussing a tier model and if the 60 percent figure referred to the percentage of a project's cost that would be funded by grants. Chair Arias said the percentage referred to the total funds allocated to the Eastside organization that can be used for capital projects.

Phillip Peterson said leftover funds can also come from unspent grant money awarded to organizations. He also said they are required to spend \$40 million over seven years, so there would be years when allocations would exceed \$4 million to meet that requirement.

Chair Arias asked Ms. Staffopoulos to summarize the motions on the floor. She explained the Salem Amendment, which was moved and seconded, that would limit the overall Eastside grants program to no more than 50 percent of the annual allocation for capital projects. There is also a cap of \$250,000 on grants for programs, and multiple applications can be submitted per category. CM Salem clarified that he intended for applicants to be able to apply to one grant per category and receive awards in multiple categories. He stated that an organization should be able to apply once to all four categories and potentially be awarded in each. Still, he wanted to prohibit an organization from submitting multiple applications under a single category. Ms. Staffopoulos asked whether applications from a single organization had to be for different programs or whether it was permissible for an organization to submit an application for a single program across multiple categories. CM Salem stated that it should be different programs or projects.

Chair Arias then asked Leslie Jean-Bart whether she was in favor of the proposal. She agreed with the limits on capital projects but thought enabling multiple applications from a single entity was a bad idea since it could disadvantage smaller organizations. Chair Arias then asked Daniel Nunn for his input. Mr. Nunn clarified that the limitations discussed applied only to City dollars, not to private dollars, as he anticipated the organization would seek supplemental private funding.

CM Peluso reiterated that the legislation provided enabling language, but the Board would have control over what each program looks like and how dollars are appropriated. He added that the bill included language that favored Eastside businesses and non-profits in the scoring process. He also anticipated more entities coming online in the community that will be competitive applicants. He said there were guardrails in the bill to address the potential problem raised by Ms. Jean-Bart of grant awards going to larger entities.

Mr. Peterson, seeking clarification on the Salem Amendment, asked if the prohibition on committing more than current-year dollars was part of the Amendment; CM Salem affirmed.

CM Salem concurred that private dollars should be separate from the limitations on City dollars and reiterated that they were required to spend \$40 million over seven years, or roughly \$6 million per year. He said he landed on the \$250,000 cap to ensure multiple organizations are successful. He also reiterated that the applications would be scored and that he did not want to punish organizations doing good work. CM Peluso agreed with CM Salem and believed there would be enough funding for multiple organizations. He also suggested that the Board could conduct quality assurance on the projects and penalize applicants in the future who have not adequately completed their projects. He asked Mr. Peterson whether the Board could do that. Mr. Peterson said he would imagine that would be part of the grant application, but suggested adding language to the bill to ensure that. CM Salem noted that the two staff members for the Opioid program do site visits and monitoring to ensure projects are proceeding and compliant, and said there should be language in this bill that reflects that.

Chair Arias said he was in favor of multiple people applying and receiving awards, but noted that the PSG process allows only one grant per category due to changes by the Council. With regard to the Salem Amendment, he said he supported the \$250,000 cap, but not allowing applications in multiple categories for a single organization. He wanted to keep the cap at \$250,000 for at least the first year, but did not want to see one or two entities receive all of the dollars.

Action: Chair Arias proposed an amendment to the Salem Amendment that would keep the \$250,000 cap but limit applications by a single entity to a single category. CM Clark Murray seconded.

CM Peluso said he was comfortable with the Salem Amendment and that the Board will be able to create that limitation. He said the legislation was enabling and would give the Board the right to allow multiple applications from a single entity. He also stated that the percentages allocated to each category may change each year depending on need.

Ms. Staffopoulos clarified the Salem amendment, stating that entities must apply for different programs in each category but can receive only one grant at the end of the process. This was corrected by CM Salem, who intended for the organizations to win all if they scored the highest. Chair Arias said that is precisely what he opposes.

CM Amaro said that an organization can only win an award if it is the best in each category. He said he was in favor of a laissez-faire approach, allowing the Board to determine which is the best in each category. He understood the responsibility to protect taxpayers, but he did not want to make the process too restrictive. He said preventing qualified organizations from applying was not fair to the process.

CM Clark-Murray said she thought the Salem Amendment and the Arias Amendment to the Salem Amendment would allow applications from a single entity in multiple categories, but would only permit that entity to be awarded in one category. Ms. Staffopoulos said that was one way to structure the limitations. CM Clark-Murray noted that it seemed to be fair. Chair Arias concurred.

CM Salem disagreed with Chair Arias, explaining that he did not want to punish highly qualified organizations. He also disagreed with assertions that aspects of the grant process would be at the board's discretion. He reiterated that the Council approves percentages during the budget process and that applications are scored. He continued, explaining that the Board could not make arbitrary decisions and again emphasized that \$40 million must be spent over seven years.

CM Peluso again expressed his support for the Salem Amendment and his opposition to the Arias Amendment. He provided the example of LISC, a well-staffed organization that could feasibly apply for a grant in each category, as an organization he would not want to prohibit from receiving funding, since they would be able to do high-quality work in the area. Chair Arias stated that LISC was also an example of an organization that could potentially receive the maximum amount for capital projects and programmatic, thus illustrating his concern about larger entities receiving a bulk of allocated funding. He asked Ms. Staffopoulos if they could add language to the legislation that would prohibit receiving capital and programmatic funding. She said the Salem Amendment allows only one application per category and the potential to be awarded in each category; if an entity applied for a capital project in one category and a programmatic project in another, they could receive awards for both. Chair Arias then asked what the cap on capital projects was. Ms. Staffopoulos said there was no cap, only the 50 percent limit outlined in the Salem amendment. She also said that there would be interplay between the amounts allocated to each category and the amounts available for capital projects within each category.

CM Clark-Murray asked if an entity can win one award for a capital project and win programmatic awards in each of the four categories. Mr. Peterson said they could win one in each category, but only for different projects. Chair Arias, restating the question, asked whether an organization could win a \$2 million capital grant and also receive grants in other categories. Mr. Peterson said that there was currently no prohibition on that. CM Clark-Murray said she has reservations and supports the Arias Amendment because she does not want a single organization to receive the bulk of the funding.

CM Amaro asked if the allocation was \$4 million per year. Mr. Peterson said the minimum allocation is \$4 million, but the City is required to allocate \$40 million over seven years. CM Amaro then asked whether the amendment under consideration required that 60 percent be allocated to capital projects. Mr. Peterson said the amendment on the floor is set at 50 percent. Ms. Staffopoulos clarified that the motion on the floor was whether or not to limit applicants to only one category, and after that vote, they would vote on the Salem Amendment. CM Amaro then asked if the rest would go to grants. Mr. Peterson said 10 percent would go to administration, and the rest would go to grants.

Chair Arias restated his amendment, which was that entities could apply across all categories but could be awarded in only one. Ms. Staffopoulos indicated that the description of his amendment was at odds with her understanding, which was to limit applicants to submitting only one application in a single category. Chair Arias stated that he intended for applicants to be able to apply in each category, but they could receive only one award for their highest-scoring application.

Action: The Committee voted on the Arias Amendment to the Salem Amendment, which failed, 2-3. CMs Arias and Clark Murray voted yes; CMs Peluso, Salem, and Amaro voted no. CM Salem then offered an amendment to his original amendment that would raise the limit on capital projects to 60 percent of overall funds allocated, which was seconded and approved unanimously. The Salem Amendment, as amended, was moved and seconded. It was also approved unanimously. CM Peluso moved an amendment to allow consideration of the applicant's past performance in the scoring process for applications.

CM Salem said he was in favor but asked how it would be taken into consideration. Ms. Staffopoulos highlighted the criteria for judging applicants on page 15 of the draft legislation and said they could add past performance there, and that it would then be up to the Board to develop questions to measure it.

Action: The committee unanimously approved the Peluso Amendment to add a measure of past performance to the judging criteria.

Ms. Staffopoulos noted that CM Peluso mentioned adding language to allow unspent funds to be rolled over into the following year's appropriation. She said that she could not find language in the legislation and said it may be appropriate for the Committee to add that language if desired.

Action: The Peluso Amendment to allow unspent funds to be rolled over was moved and seconded by CM Salem. It was approved unanimously.

CM Peluso asked if the category on page 7 of the draft legislation should be listed as "workforce housing" or "workforce development." Ms. Staffopoulos said it was workforce housing, per the Supplemental CBA. CM Peluso asked if the economic development category was a catch-all that could include workforce development. Ms. Staffopoulos said they did not define economic development in the CBA, which was where they sourced the definitions for the draft legislation. She said affordable housing and workforce housing were defined, and added that economic development could be a broad range of projects that wouldn't exclude workforce development projects. She also added that the countywide strategic focus did include workforce development, but the Eastside strategic focus did not.

She then said that the Committee might want to determine when the Eastside organization would submit requests for allocation percentages in each category. She said they could do it earlier in the year, like PSG, where they would present the percentages to the Council for approval ahead of the budget process. She said they could also present their requests to the Mayor's office, which would then incorporate them into the budget to be approved by Council during the annual budget process.

CM Clark-Murray asked if they could define economic development as an item that does not fall under the other categories and added that she liked Ms. Staffopoulos's earlier explanation. Ms. Staffopoulos says that economic development was defined in the Supplemental CBA to the extent that it defined workforce and affordable housing separately. She said that she didn't want to create more limitations or broaden the definition too much because it all comes back to what is in the contract with the Jaguars.

CM Clark-Murray asked for a restatement of the options for setting percentages for the funding categories, which Ms. Staffopoulos provided. She said that the Committee could set the percentages, even if just for the first year. She also recounted the options for when the organization could request their percentages as part of the budget process. CM Clark-Murray suggested setting percentages for the first year and allowing the organization to set them in subsequent years. She then asked if the percentages applied to programmatic projects. Ms. Staffopoulos said the percentages applied to capital and programmatic grants within the four funded categories.

CM Salem, responding to CM Clark-Murray, said he anticipated debate in the other committees on the legislation and that it would take some time to select Board members. He said that the budget process would already begin by that time, and though he would like the Board to set these percentages, he did not see how that was possible. He said he was not opposed to setting percentages for the first year and wanted to ensure that the legislation reflected that it would only apply to the first year. CM Peluso said he did not want the Committee to make that decision, but said it made sense, given time constraints.

Mr. Peterson explained that the PSG Council makes recommendations to the Council by March 1, which the Council then adopts. He added that early adoption of percentages helps applicants know what funding

is available so that they can engage in the application process accordingly. CM Salem asked if he was suggesting that for year two; Mr. Peterson confirmed that it was the case. CM Salem suggested putting percentages in the bill to at least spur debate during the committee process, even if it was 25 percent in each category.

CM Amaro asked how they would know which percentages would be best, suggesting that the community would know what is best. CM Clark-Murray said she understood CM Amaro's point, but noted that the intent was to provide a starting point. CM Peluso agreed with CM Amaro but also understood the points being made by CMs Clark-Murray and Salem. Ms. Staffopoulos recommended adopting the process by which the Board would submit their percentages and amounts. She said that if they like Mr. Peterson's recommendation to follow the PSG model, then that would be the language that's currently in the bill. She explained that the recommendation would need to be submitted by March 1st for Council approval by May 1st. She also said that if they do decide to set percentages, a request could be made to the Council to adjust those once the Board has been formed.

Action: CM Clark-Murray moved an amendment that would not establish an initial percentage or amount and would retain the language in the bill that the Eastside organization would present a recommended percentage or amount for each funding category to the Council by March 1st for approval by May 1st, which was seconded. The amendment passed unanimously.

CM Amaro asked if percentages were included in the amendment that just passed. Ms. Staffopoulos said they would be presented with percentages early next year.

CM Peluso asked if administrative costs included contracted services; he wanted to ensure that the Board had the opportunity to hire a contractor to assist applicants with their grants. Ms. Staffopoulos said the 10 percent cap applied to the cost of operating the grant program, which could include processing applications, posting notices, and hiring staff. He then asked if hiring an auditor or attorney would count as an administrative cost. Ms. Staffopoulos said that if those hires supported the board in administering the grant program to distribute city dollars, they would count toward the administrative costs. CM Peluso asked how much the administration of the Opioid program costs.

CM Salem asked if staff for the Eastside organization would be City employees; Ms. Staffopoulos said they would be employees of the Eastside organization. CM Salem said the Opioid staff consisted of two people who handled the program's monitoring and administration but relied on the OGC for legal services. He asked whether the Eastside organization could use OGC for legal assistance; Ms. Staffopoulos said they would not, nor would they be able to access the Ethics office. He asked if the Eastside organization handled benefits and salaries; Ms. Staffopoulos confirmed. CM Salem said that could present a significant challenge. He then said the Opioid program's employees with benefits included costs of around \$300,000. He noted that they were looking at \$400,000 in administrative costs for the Eastside organization, but that was money that wasn't available for grants. He indicated he would not support exceeding the 10 percent limit on administrative costs.

Chair Arias calculated an annual administrative cost cap of \$571,000, equal to 10 percent of the overall \$40 million to be spent over seven years. He also noted that the organization could seek private funding to help cover administrative costs, such as hiring an attorney. He said he is opposed to raising the limit on administrative costs. CM Amaro also agreed that they must live within the 10 percent and suggested the organization seek private dollars. CM Clark-Murray noted that the amount allocated toward administrative costs may fluctuate depending on how much is allocated each year. Mr. Peterson said that was correct, but that staffing decisions could not rely on the maximum amount being allocated each year. CM Clark-Murray reiterated that private dollars will be necessary.

Action: Chair Arias moved to clarify that administrative costs shall not exceed \$400,000 each year, which was seconded.

CM Peluso suggested changing that amount to \$500,000. CM Salem said \$500,000 was high but was open to considering inflation alongside the \$400,000 limit. CM Peluso said he was good with including a CPI percentage to account for inflation. Mr. Peterson said it would be good to identify the exact CPI. CM Peluso suggested 3 percent.

Action: CM Peluso moved an amendment to Chair Arias's amendment that the \$400,000 cap on administrative costs would allow for a 3 percent annual increase, which was seconded and approved unanimously. CM Arias's amendment to cap administrative costs at \$400,000, as amended by CM Peluso's amendment, was moved, seconded, and approved unanimously.

CM Peluso said they had done the work to move the draft legislation out of the Committee, but wanted to discuss tax-increment financing (TIF) for the area. He said he wants the TIF to go toward infrastructure and to begin in 2028 or 2029. He also said it did not need to be 95 percent, as in most areas, and suggested 80 percent within the boundaries outlined on page 2 of the draft legislation. CM Arias said he would like to see how the dollars flow into the community before a more detailed conversation on a TIF, but indicated his support for the idea. CM Clark-Murray asked if Mr. Peterson had calculated projections for a TIF at 80 percent. He said they had looked at varying percentages but could provide updates at a future meeting.

CM Clark-Murray then asked whether they needed to discuss adding ethics training requirements for the Board to the legislation. Ms. Staffopoulos said they could, and also suggested that this could be addressed in the bylaws or during the meeting with the Administration. She added that there isn't anything in the legislation requiring ethics training, but they will have to ensure their membership complies with state ethics laws. CM Clark-Murray referred to CM Salem's board workshops from a prior meeting. She suggested that at least one of the two workshops be held in the evening and that they be held before the opening of the grant applications.

Ms. Staffopoulos indicated that language in the bill required mandatory application workshops within 30 days of the effective date of the legislation establishing the funded categories, which would align with what CM Clark-Murray was requesting. Chair Arias asked whether there was language requiring meetings to be held in the evening. Ms. Staffopoulos said there were no requirements regarding the time and place of the meeting, only certification that applicants attended. CM Clark-Murray said she would like it added, since there may be people interested who can only attend in the evenings.

Action: CM Clark-Murray moved to add a requirement that at least one of the applicant workshops occur after 5 p.m.

CM Peluso stated he would prefer the language not specify a time but rather aim to accommodate a variety of times. CM Amaro said he would support the amendment but thought it was unnecessary.

Action: The Clark-Murray amendment was approved unanimously.

CM Salem said he has concerns about TIF due to its implications for the City. He said he could see multiple TIFs being created, which would divert revenue away from the City for police, fire, and other services. He said he was open to debate but that it was a bit premature at this stage. CM Peluso noted that TIF had been discussed since the beginning of the CBA and added that it doesn't have to begin this year. He also stated that other counties have multiple TIFs. He continued, saying the area was fragile and that

he wanted to ensure infrastructure improvements alongside increased social services and other programs. He supported moving this bill as is and then creating a separate bill to handle the TIF.

Ms. Staffopoulos said they would adjust the legislation based on the Committee's actions. She said the bill would be introduced on January 13th, go before committees the first week of February, and then before the whole Council the second week of February. She said the Special Committee will introduce the bill.

Chair Arias thanked everyone for the time put into crafting the legislation.

Meeting adjourned: 12:00 p.m.

Minutes: Brandon Russell, Council Research
brussell@coj.net, (904) 255-5137