

NOTICE

Under provisions of Chapter 101.71, Florida Statutes, notice is hereby given of a temporary change in polling places for the Primary Election to be held August 20, 2024, and the General Election to be held November 5, 2024, in the City of Jacksonville, Duval County, Florida.

REASON FOR MOVE:	PRECINCT	FROM:	TO:
Renovations ongoing	307	Glen Kernan Golf & Country Club 4590 Glen Kernan Parkway East Jacksonville, FL 32224	Chet's Creek Church 4420 Hodges Boulevard Jacksonville, FL 32224 Precinct 305 Will be a dual precinct

Jerry Holland
Supervisor of Elections
Duval County

ATTEST:

Secretary/City Council

SEAL:

Only 44% of those offered the program took advantage which tells us that even when the City pays for the connection, there are not always good participation rates. We do not recommend making significant capital investments for expanded infrastructure without some form of mandatory connection and commitment to participate from property owners.

Proliferation of septic tanks

Current land use laws allow for septic tanks to be used on existing lots of record as long as the required minimum distances are established between any adjacent wells and septic tanks. Additionally, septic tanks are approved for lots one acre in size or greater. A summary of the current 2030 Comprehensive Plan Septic Tank Construction Policies is included in Addenda Section C.

Data was collected from 2010 through 2015 of new single family building permits issued. The building permits include the type of wastewater system to be used. Of those permits issued, approximately 6% of the total permits indicated use of septic systems.

SINGLE FAMILY PERMITS WITH SEPTIC TANKS (2010-2015)

CALENDER YEAR	# of Single Family Building Permits Issued	# of Septic Tank Per BID	"Calculated" % of New Single Family Homes w/Septic Tanks
2010	1190	85	7%
2011	855	84	10%
2012	1205	67	6%
2013	1827	93	5%
2014	2047	99	5%
2015	2271	132	6%
Average	1566	93	6%

Note: 532 Single Family Building permits had been issued for 2016 during 1st quarter 2016 utilizing 21 septic tanks per BID.

The addresses of the permit data with septic tanks were also plotted graphically. Many of the septic tanks were located in more rural areas – outside the I-295/9A beltway. Several of the new septic tanks were also located within the footprints of septic tank failure neighborhoods that are reviewed by the Health Department and the City annually. That is not surprising since these are the neighborhoods that do not have central infrastructure. A map showing new septic tanks derived from the permit data reported above is included in Addenda Section D.

DEMOGRAPHICS JULY 2023 - SEPTIC TANK PHASE OUT NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTERISTICS

Neighborhood	Total Score 2023	Home Characteristics*				Income***					Race/Ethnicity***				Gender***		Age***				
		Median Value**	Median Year Built	% Renter	% Owner	< \$25K	\$25K - \$50K	\$50K - \$100K	\$100K - \$200K	> \$200K	% White	% Black	% Asian	Other^	% Male	% Female	<18	18 - 40	40 - 60	60 - 80	>80
BILTMORE C		\$27,161	1970	84.6%	15.4%	26.5%	19.6%	27.6%	23.1%	3.2%	66.9%	33.1%	0.0%	0.0%	46.3%	53.7%	11.2%	16.8%	25.1%	43.5%	3.4%
BEVERLY HILLS		\$103,680	1954	46.5%	53.5%	27.9%	36.1%	26.8%	8.2%	0.9%	8.6%	91.4%	0.0%	0.0%	49.6%	50.4%	5.4%	28.4%	17.4%	40.5%	8.3%
CHRISTOBEL		\$48,384	1964	80.0%	20.0%	42.5%	25.3%	23.6%	7.7%	0.7%	5.0%	94.2%	0.8%	0.0%	42.3%	57.7%	9.1%	18.3%	26.8%	40.0%	5.8%
RIVERVIEW		\$85,754	1970	69.7%	30.3%	30.6%	33.1%	24.5%	10.7%	1.0%	19.3%	79.5%	0.1%	1.2%	45.2%	54.8%	5.3%	22.6%	24.8%	43.0%	4.3%
CHAMPION FOREST	78.64	\$52,274	1990	75.1%	24.9%	23.9%	27.0%	31.1%	16.9%	1.1%	37.9%	56.8%	5.0%	0.3%	50.2%	49.8%	9.7%	38.7%	26.2%	24.4%	0.9%
EMERSON	76.60	\$167,200	1975	61.8%	38.2%	13.5%	27.2%	21.9%	27.5%	9.9%	76.9%	12.0%	10.6%	0.5%	49.0%	51.0%	11.5%	30.4%	26.5%	28.3%	3.5%
ST NICHOLAS	75.83	\$112,176	1970	63.6%	36.4%	27.7%	24.4%	21.5%	23.0%	3.4%	62.6%	29.5%	7.8%	0.0%	51.0%	49.0%	7.1%	37.2%	25.4%	28.6%	1.7%
EGGLESTON HEIGHTS	75.39	\$152,254	1970	49.2%	50.8%	27.2%	27.4%	33.1%	11.0%	1.3%	63.9%	33.4%	2.5%	0.2%	46.3%	53.7%	9.2%	37.2%	22.4%	28.5%	2.7%
JULINGTON CREEK	73.98	\$258,149	1985	26.4%	73.6%	8.7%	13.4%	39.1%	31.5%	7.3%	77.0%	13.7%	9.1%	0.3%	48.1%	51.9%	17.2%	24.7%	23.1%	32.7%	2.3%
EMPIRE POINT	67.95	\$115,500	1971	48.0%	52.0%	25.1%	28.2%	19.1%	20.3%	7.2%	74.5%	21.9%	3.6%	0.0%	49.8%	50.2%	7.3%	22.1%	28.0%	38.5%	4.0%
WESTFIELD	67.94	\$335,386	1970	19.8%	80.2%	7.8%	9.8%	30.5%	33.8%	18.0%	99.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.4%	51.1%	48.9%	13.0%	12.9%	33.0%	35.3%	5.8%
KINARD	67.35	\$151,073	1968	50.0%	50.0%	38.3%	32.1%	26.0%	3.6%	0.0%	1.5%	98.5%	0.0%	0.0%	38.8%	61.2%	9.3%	30.0%	3.7%	41.2%	15.8%
OAK LAWN	67.19	\$220,570	1985	35.1%	64.9%	8.4%	29.7%	26.0%	28.5%	7.5%	95.6%	2.5%	1.6%	0.3%	50.5%	49.5%	6.1%	20.5%	24.2%	43.2%	6.0%
ATLANTIC HIGHLANDS	66.56	\$84,308	1987	78.1%	21.9%	6.8%	10.1%	40.0%	33.0%	10.0%	89.2%	6.6%	4.2%	0.0%	50.3%	49.7%	5.0%	27.7%	28.1%	37.4%	1.7%
SANS PERIL	66.48	\$199,820	2005	52.5%	47.5%	11.9%	13.8%	39.8%	25.2%	9.4%	68.1%	24.7%	7.3%	0.0%	58.9%	41.1%	4.2%	57.1%	20.7%	15.1%	3.0%
CEDAR RIVER	65.34	\$140,390	1980	44.1%	55.9%	19.8%	24.0%	37.5%	15.8%	2.8%	60.5%	38.4%	1.1%	0.0%	42.9%	57.1%	14.1%	29.5%	18.9%	32.2%	5.3%
LAKESHORE	64.76	\$132,358	1960	50.2%	49.8%	24.0%	19.3%	30.4%	21.9%	4.1%	88.6%	8.6%	2.8%	0.0%	51.1%	48.9%	7.6%	25.4%	26.1%	34.1%	6.7%
HOLLY OAKS	64.67	\$210,852	1959	21.2%	78.8%	15.8%	14.6%	32.6%	29.3%	7.5%	95.0%	2.1%	2.9%	0.0%	47.8%	52.2%	4.9%	22.9%	23.9%	43.8%	4.5%
SPRING GLEN	64.61	\$169,661	1975	50.7%	49.3%	30.0%	26.9%	26.2%	15.0%	2.1%	57.9%	31.6%	10.5%	0.0%	55.5%	44.5%	8.5%	40.0%	21.7%	25.4%	4.2%
MILL CREEK	63.45	\$195,906	1970	45.3%	54.7%	18.6%	33.1%	28.7%	12.0%	7.4%	47.0%	49.6%	3.4%	0.0%	42.2%	57.8%	17.8%	31.7%	17.7%	24.1%	8.6%
INWOOD TERRACE	63.39	\$159,322	1960	62.5%	37.5%	10.3%	44.0%	23.1%	18.4%	4.2%	60.4%	12.6%	27.0%	0.0%	55.7%	44.3%	10.9%	37.0%	26.6%	22.0%	3.5%
JULINGTON HILLS	62.02	\$280,173	1986	32.0%	68.0%	5.9%	16.5%	29.5%	33.5%	14.7%	94.3%	1.8%	3.9%	0.0%	51.7%	48.3%	6.4%	20.2%	17.2%	46.5%	9.8%
LONE STAR PARK	60.66	\$173,919	1967	34.7%	65.3%	9.4%	22.4%	37.9%	27.4%	2.9%	77.7%	16.5%	5.8%	0.0%	47.8%	52.2%	13.1%	38.6%	26.4%	19.4%	2.4%
HOOD LANDING II	59.15	\$286,821	1985	18.2%	81.8%	8.2%	9.7%	42.6%	31.1%	8.3%	85.4%	8.3%	6.2%	0.0%	51.0%	49.0%	14.0%	25.4%	16.2%	38.4%	6.0%
NORTHLAKE	58.29	\$321,841	1996	20.7%	79.3%	19.6%	18.9%	32.0%	23.9%	5.5%	53.4%	41.6%	4.8%	0.2%	42.5%	57.5%	12.8%	30.7%	25.3%	28.8%	2.3%
POINT LA VISTA	56.33	\$408,214	1974	18.3%	81.7%	5.3%	11.4%	17.3%	46.2%	19.9%	98.2%	0.6%	0.8%	0.3%	51.9%	48.1%	10.2%	25.2%	25.2%	37.5%	1.8%
BEAUCLERC GARDENS	54.98	\$345,825	1978	16.3%	83.7%	9.2%	7.1%	21.0%	36.5%	26.3%	92.2%	1.6%	6.3%	0.0%	49.8%	50.2%	8.3%	16.5%	27.4%	43.7%	4.1%
ORTEGA	53.79	\$442,162	1970	9.6%	90.4%	7.1%	11.9%	26.7%	31.1%	23.3%	99.5%	0.2%	0.0%	0.3%	51.9%	48.1%	11.4%	12.3%	30.0%	39.1%	7.1%
CLIFTON	53.62	\$211,155	1973	36.7%	63.3%	7.7%	24.9%	43.6%	19.8%	3.9%	74.4%	24.3%	1.2%	0.0%	53.5%	46.5%	8.2%	38.3%	20.7%	29.0%	3.8%
OAKHAVEN	53.29	\$166,880	1970	42.5%	57.5%	20.3%	22.2%	32.0%	19.7%	5.6%	80.0%	18.3%	1.7%	0.0%	48.0%	52.0%	6.1%	26.8%	22.4%	39.1%	5.5%
THE CAPE	52.63	\$262,548	1978	33.3%	66.7%	16.9%	18.6%	15.8%	36.5%	12.3%	84.9%	9.2%	5.9%	0.0%	50.3%	49.7%	4.8%	10.3%	20.0%	58.3%	6.7%
ODESSA	50.38	\$74,177	1949	61.9%	38.1%	48.3%	19.5%	21.6%	10.5%	0.0%	44.5%	54.8%	0.0%	0.7%	50.7%	49.3%	9.0%	33.6%	25.3%	29.8%	2.3%
SOUTHSIDE ESTATES	47.98	\$154,955	1975	44.0%	56.0%	10.1%	25.2%	47.6%	14.5%	2.6%	81.4%	13.5%	4.4%	0.7%	52.5%	47.5%	4.4%	33.3%	35.7%	23.2%	3.3%
PABLO POINT	46.70	\$296,666	1984	15.2%	84.8%	1.5%	8.1%	17.4%	59.4%	13.5%	91.6%	4.5%	3.9%	0.0%	55.1%	44.9%	8.7%	26.4%	20.8%	41.9%	2.3%
MT PLEASANT	43.98	\$298,696	1981	12.9%	87.1%	10.5%	9.8%	26.4%	36.9%	16.6%	91.7%	3.8%	4.0%	0.4%	49.9%	50.1%	7.1%	20.7%	15.8%	47.6%	8.7%

* Home Characteristics collected from 2022 Property Appraiser Dataset

** Median home values are calculated from "Just Market Value" in Property Appraisers dataset. These values lag the homes' true value but are valid for relative comparisons.

*** Income/Gender/Race/Age data collected from Census 2017 - 2021 ACS 5 Year

^ Other includes Asian Pacific Islanders and Native Americans

MyJax CRM Upgrade



Current State



User Experience

- **Complex** and **difficult** to navigate for customers and employees
- Mobile app is **outdated**, received low customer ratings, and lacks intuitiveness
- **Too many** service request (SR) type choices, customers do not know what to select
- **Lacks** ability to survey customers upon completion
- Constituents do not receive email updates on **duplicated service requests**
- Long call **wait times** during high-volume call periods



Resources

- Lacks the mechanisms to prevent **duplicate** service requests
- Requests contain **incorrect addresses** resulting in multiple customer contacts, premature request closures, and inability of field workers to locate site
- Volume, organization of knowledge base articles make **navigation challenging**
- Limited management analytics
- The complaint location data field does not retain the correct address which is **frustrating** to users and **field workers**



Inclusivity & Accessibility

- Customers are **unable** to send text messages to the Customer Service Center
- **Limited** after-hours support via phone
- **Lacks the ability** to integrate with Alexa
- Lack of communication with service request stakeholders which leads to **higher rates of escalation**
- Lacks artificial intelligence capabilities **hindering advanced automation**

Future State

Optimize User Experience

- Provide a **seamless** and frictionless interaction.
- Customers and employees can easily **navigate**, engage and complete transactions.
- Easy to use, **intuitive navigation**, secure and fast performing mobile app.
- **Simplify** the process for citizens to report their concerns with **less SR types** and call wait times.
- Obtain direct **feedback** from customers via post service request closure survey.

Maximize resources

- **Eliminating duplicate** service request results in efficient, faster resolutions and better experience.
- Data quality validation to **improve time to resolve** and collect the needed information.
- Collection and validation of location-based information and **increase service delivery efficiency**.
- **Dashboards** resulting in insight-based actions.

Inclusivity & Accessibility

- Service more citizens through **new communication channels** (mobile app, chatbot, etc.).
- City services are more **accessible** to citizens via improved citizen mobile app with embedded **Artificial Intelligence**.
- Ability to **integrate** with Alexa.
- **Increased visibility** of progress into a service request for citizens via self-service and automated updates.

Contact Us

Jonathan Jordan – ITD PMO Manager
904-726-2225



jonjordan@coj.net

Economic Development Tracking

Current State



User Experience

- **Lack** of centralized method/location for tracking clients, projects, location, agreements, and corresponding deliverables.
- Data (client and project) tracking and performance tracking is largely manual which can result in **data silos**.
- **Antiquated** cumbersome process for reporting data and deliverables.
- Clients/businesses **lack** self-service capabilities and must call or email staff with questions or to request updates.



Resources

- Analysis is **manual and time-consuming**, resulting in frustration.
- Information sharing can be **challenging** due to the current tracking mechanisms.
- Potential for **redundant effort** and reduced level of productivity with respect to projects.
- Increased need for **storage space** to accommodate data.



Accessibility & Visibility

- **Limited** ability for clients/businesses to obtain answers after hours.
- Lacks capabilities for **automation**
- Limited **visibility** for the clients/businesses and other stakeholders as it relates to project status and available resources.

Future State

Optimize User Experience

- More **efficient communication** between employees and clients/businesses.
- **Centralized** location for tracking clients, projects, agreements, and corresponding deliverables.
- Easy to use, **intuitive navigation**, and secure permissions.
- **Eliminates** data silos.
- **Improved** reporting processes and enhanced productivity.

Maximize resources

- **Eliminating the risk of redundancy** results in a more efficient use of employee time and resources.
- **Effective data governance** to improve integrity and ensure consistent information is delivered.
- **Dashboards** provide insight into key metrics and assist with analysis.
- Higher level of **productivity** resulting from enhanced efficiencies.

Accessibility & Visibility

- **Cross-functional collaboration** for more efficient problem-solving and communication.
- **Enhanced communication** with clients/businesses (via cloud-based portal).
- **Increased visibility** for the complete life cycle of projects and agreements.



Economic Development Tracking

MyJAX Upgrade



Improved Customer Mobile Application Rating



Increase Data Accuracy to Streamline Service Ticket Resolution Times



Enhance User Satisfaction and Adoption Rate

Economic Development



Improved Lead Satisfaction with User Interface



Decreased Overall Duration



Better Data Analytics for Decision Making



DOWNTOWN INVESTMENT AUTHORITY
 COMMITMENT TRACKING REPORT
 4/2/2024

PROJECT (AS PREVIOUSLY APPROVED)	DIA RES	CITY ORD	ROI	FUNDED (Y OR N)	SOURCE OF FUNDING	GENERAL FUND IMPACT (Y OR N)	FISCAL YEAR										
							23-24	24-25	25-26	26-27	27-28	28-29	29-30	30-31	31-32	32-33	
Iguana/Kids Kampus/Shipyards (Completion Grant)	2022-09-01	2022-871	1.13	N	General Fund	Y	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 25,834,886	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
One Riverside - Restaurant Completion Forgivable Loan	2021-08-01	2021-796	1.18	N	General Fund	Y	\$ -	\$ 750,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Union Terminal (DPRP)	2022-03-06	2022-0319	0.81	N	General Fund	Y	\$ -	\$ 8,285,793	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Home2Suites (DEDG)	2021-12-01	2022-0316	1.34	N	General Fund	Y	\$ -	\$ 238,522	\$ 238,522	\$ 238,522	\$ 238,522	\$ 238,522	\$ 238,522	\$ 238,522	\$ 238,522	\$ 238,522	\$ 238,522
Central Nat'l Bank Historic (DPRP)	2022-07-02	2022-841	0.53	N	General Fund	Y	\$ -	\$ 5,814,697	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
525 W Beaver Street (DPRP)	2022-09-04	2023-0268	0.71	N	General Fund	Y	\$ -	\$ 1,251,430	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Jones Bros. (DPRP)	2023-05-03	2024-37	0.50	N	General Fund	Y	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,033,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Greenleaf (DPRP)	2023-08-01	2024-36	0.60	N	General Fund	Y	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,969,900	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
SUBTOTAL (Future General Fund appropriation required)							\$ -	\$ 16,340,442	\$ 37,076,808	\$ 238,522	\$ 238,522	\$ 238,522	\$ 238,522	\$ 238,522	\$ 238,522	\$ 238,522	\$ 55,086,904

Subject Legislation

323 E Bay Street (DPRP)	2022-01-01	2022-0452	0.59	N	General Fund	Y	\$ 1,536,350	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Lofts at Cathedral (DPRP)	2022-11-06	2023-0088	0.50	N	General Fund	Y	\$ 2,398,400	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Regions Bank (DPRP)	2021-04-05	2021-210	0.50	N	General Fund	Y	\$ 314,240	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TOTAL FUTURE FUNDING THROUGH THE GENERAL FUND PROPOSED BY THIS LEGISLATION							\$ 4,248,990	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,248,990
TOTAL FUTURE FUNDING THROUGH THE GENERAL FUND (Fully Approved plus Proposed by Subject Legislation)							\$ 4,248,990	\$ 16,340,442	\$ 37,076,808	\$ 238,522	\$ 238,522	\$ 238,522	\$ 238,522	\$ 238,522	\$ 238,522	\$ 238,522	\$ 59,335,894