Council Auditor's Office Summary of Proposed Material Amendments in Lot J Development Agreement

Council Auditor's Office Recommendations that Remain Open (Developers Disagree with Recommendations):

Development Agreement

disagrees.	Investment should not	applied as a credit for the		
 Developer 	 The Minimum Developer 	\$12.5 million will still be		
	Recommendations:	is terminated then the full		
		Shortfall, and the REV grant		
	Amendment	4. In the event there is a		
	6. Developer/Administration	6.75%		
^	Amendment	increased from 3.5% to		
	5. Developer/Administration	Hotel Completion Grant is		
	Amendment	3. The discount rate of the		
	4. Developer/Administration	subtenants		
	Amendment	third party tenants or		
	3. Developer/Administration	improvements incurred by	Investment	
	Amendment	2. Includes costs of tenant	Minimum Developer	
	2. Developer/Administration	garages	garages as part of the	Cost Savings
	 Auditor Amendment 	1. Excludes residential parking	Included residential parking	Section 8.9(c)
			disbursements.	
			City could withhold any	
			but if there is a default the	
		c	each Completion Guaranty,	
	regarding City disbursements.		respective obligations under	
Developer disagrees.	Include language that was struck		the Guarantors of their	
	Recommendation:		and faithful performance by	
			conditioned upon the timely	Obligations
	Amendment	this section	disbursements that are	Developer
	Developer/Administration	The language was struck from	City obligated to make	Section 1.12
		Agreement		
Conclusion	Proposed by	November 25, 2020 Revised	As-Filed Agreement	Section

Council Auditor's Office Summary of Proposed Material Amendments in Lot J Development Agreement

Section 14.6 Mixed-Use Component Minimum Investment		Section
Minimum investment of \$95M is based on private funding	A.	As-Filed Agreement
Minimum investment of \$95M is based on Direct Costs	Developer against the shortfall. 5. At the election of the Developer, the Shortfall can be deposited into the Facility Capital Fund 6. Clarifies that any reconciliation is subject to resolution of contractor litigation	November 25, 2020 Revised Agreement
Developer/Administration Amendment Recommendation: Revise language to base minimum investment on private funding.	include the 7.5% Developer expense or the amount should be increased from \$229 million to \$257.1 million as reflected on the Sources and Uses schedule. 2. Costs of tenant improvements should not be included as part of the Minimum Developer Investment. 3. The Developer should not determine how the Shortfall is paid or deposited to the City. 4. Remove cost overruns from reconciliation calculation.	Proposed by
Developer disagrees.	 Developer disagrees. Developer disagrees. Developer disagrees. 	Conclusion

Council Auditor's Office Summary of Proposed Material Amendments in Lot J Development Agreement

	4	Component.		
	LCORE O	ownership of the Hotel		
	es of which	developer requires		
		hotel developer if a hotel		
	development rights to the Hotel.	to the Hotel Component to a		
	from the transfer of	transfer development rights		
	profits realized by the Developer	Allows the Developer to		
	The City should share in any	after substantial completion		Components
Developer disagrees.	Recommendation:	Components for 5 years		Conveyance of
		transfer Hotel or Mixed-Use	transfer after completion	Limitation on
	Auditor Amendment	 Developer agrees not to 	No limit on Developer right to	Section 16.9
		Agreement		
Conclusion	Proposed by	November 25, 2020 Revised	As-Filed Agreement	Section

Guaranty – None

Live! Lease

Section	As-Filed Agreement	November 25, 2020 Revised	Proposed by	Conclusion
		Agreement		
Section 5	1. The initial term was 35	1. The initial term is 50 years	1. Developer/Administration	
Lease Term	years with four 10-year	with two 10-year renewal	Amendment	
	renewal options	options	2. Developer/Administration	
	2. Tenant can exercise	2. Tenant can exercise renewal	Amendment	
	renewal options 180 days	options 180 days but no	3. Developer/Administration	
	prior to the termination of	more than 5 years prior to	Amendment	
	the Lease Term	the expiration of the then-		
	3. Tenant could not exercise	current lease term	Recommendation:	Developer disagrees.
	the third and fourth	3. Provides that occupancy	We recommend that	
	renewal option unless	must be 75% to renew.	performance requirements,	
	occupancy was at 85%	Provides that the Renewal	such as certain sales targets or	
	and the facility is in	Term shall be on the same	occupancy requirements, be	
	compliance with the	terms and conditions as set	included throughout the term	
	Facility Standard of Care	forth in the Lease.	of the lease.	

Council Auditor's Office Summary of Proposed Material Amendments in Lot J Development Agreement

Parking Agreement

	event of breach of contract.			
	protect both parties in the			
	Language should be added to	of the other party's breach	agreement	
Developer disagrees.	Recommendation:	the parking agreement because	Developer breaches parking	
111		terminate its obligations under	available to the City if	
	Amendment	cancel, rescind or otherwise	agreement is not a remedy	Termination
	Developer/Administration	Clarifies neither party may	Termination of the parking	Section 6.22
		Agreement		
Conclusion	Proposed by	November 25, 2020 Revised	As-Filed Agreement	Section

Air Rights Easement - None

Perpetual Access and Use Easement - None

Sources and Uses

Sources		Uses	
Live!	50.0	Live! Component	100.0
Infrastructure	77.7	Infrastructure	77.7
City Loan	65.5	Trust Deposit	13.1
Total City	193.2	Total City Owned	190.8
Developer	- 257.1	Residential North	55.0
Total Private	257.1	Residential South	56.0
		Hotel	118.0
		Total Private Owned	229.0
30		Developer Expense*	30.5
Total Investment	450.3	Total Development	450.3

^{*}Developer Expense is 7.5% of Infrastructure, Live!, Mixed-Use, and Hotel

Note:

The City could contribute up to \$15.1 million for cost overruns associated with environmental and subsurface issues as part of Infrastructure Costs. Developer Expense would increase by 7.5% of the portion of the \$15.1 million, if any, that is spent. Consistent with the agreement, the City would not be responsible for paying this Developer Expense.