



CITY OF FOREST PARK
URBAN REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, July 13, 2023 at 5:30 PM
Council Chambers

Website: www.forestparkga.gov
Phone Number: (404) 363.2454

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
745 Forest Parkway
Forest Park, GA 30297

AGENDA

Kimberly James, Chairwoman
Eliot Lawrence, Vice Chairman
Debra Patrick, Member
Marisol Sconiers, Member
Avery Wilson, Member

CALL TO ORDER/WELCOME:

ROLL CALL:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. Approval of June 8, 2023 Meeting Minutes

OLD BUSINESS:

NEW BUSINESS:

2. Financial Report
3. Old Fire Station Evaluation & Appraisal

EXECUTIVE SESSION: *(Executive Session may be called for issues concerning Personnel, Litigation or Real Estate)*

ADJOURNMENT:

*In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act,
those requiring accommodation for meetings should notify
the City Clerk's Office at least 24 hours prior to the meeting at 404-366-1555.*



CITY OF FOREST PARK
URBAN REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, June 08, 2023 at 5:30 PM
Council Chambers

Website: www.forestparkga.gov
Phone Number: (404) 363.2454

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
745 Forest Parkway
Forest Park, GA 30297

MINUTES

Kimberly James, Chairwoman
Eliot Lawrence, Vice Chairman
Debra Patrick, Member
Marisol Sconiers, Member
Avery Wilson, Member

CALL TO ORDER/WELCOME:

Chairwoman James called the Urban Redevelopment Authority meeting on June 8, 2023, to order at 5:35pm.

PRESENT:

Kimberly James
Eliot Lawrence
Marisol Sconiers
Avery Wilson

ALSO PRESENT:

Michael Williams, City Attorney
Ricky L. Clark, Jr., City Manager
Bobby Jinks, Director of Public Works
LaShawn Gardiner, Director of Planning & Community Development
Bruce Abraham, Director of Economic Development
Charise Clay, Economic Development Staff Assistant

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. Approval of May 11, 2023 Meeting Minutes
Avery Wilson made a motion to approve the May 11, 2023 meeting minutes. Marisol Sconiers seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS:

NEW BUSINESS:

2. Falcon Engineering Agreement

Bruce Abraham gave the update:

- Mr. Abraham recommends using Falcon Engineering going forward. They are the city's engineering firm. If any analysis, studies, or traffic redesigns need to occur, he recommends using Falcon. Engineering guidance is needed for the patching of roads at Gillem. He is asking for the board to approve Falcon as the URA's engineering consultants to advise the board on construction and engineering projects. Services provided in the contract include but are not limited to utility improvements and relocations, large & small transportation projects, and road repairs & maintenance.

Avery Wilson made a motion to table the approval of the agreement. Marisol Sconiers seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

3. Financial Report

Charise Clay delivered the update:

- As of April 28, 2023, the City-wide Capital Project fund account had \$37,095,757.98, the URA checking account had \$4,843,410.44, and the Sinking Fund had \$303,506.86.
 - **Other Discussion:** After discussing the escrow account with James Shelby, City of Forest Park Project Manager, he informed me that due to the Fire Station at Gillem not being completed, the escrow account is still open.

Other Discussion: Mr. Clark discussed the transactional path of the annual Kroger Pilot Payments. Attorney Michael Williams chimed in to give the group additional knowledge for a better understanding of the transaction.

4. 2023-2024 Budget

Bruce Abraham, delivered the update:

- As of March 23, the URA operating fund balance is \$4,843,410 and the URA sinking fund account had \$303,000. There is also a URA Capital Improvements Project Fund that the City runs their Capital Improvement Projects through. The Capital Project Fund isn't reflected in the URA's budget because the URA won't be using the funds to operate. \$1,100,000 from Kroger will come into the URA and comes out as an expense. The URA is used as a conduit in this transaction. There are 3 parcels that are under contract and reflected in the Sale of Property line item for \$6,322,000. The parcels are Building 500 (15 acres), 600 (97 acres), and 650 (8 acres). The anticipated revenue totals \$12,569,769. The URA supports 2 salaried employees within the Economic Development Department. The attorney fees increased by \$15,000 from the previous \$25,000 last year. The \$3,200,000 Army payment is the last payment to the Army once all properties are transferred. The Owners Association Assessment fee may increase as additional properties are turned over to the URA. An additional \$1,500 per board member was allocated for additional training and development. The expenses are anticipated to total \$4,659,000. Total capital outlay expenses are totaled at \$360,000.

Eliot Lawrence made a motion to approve the URA 2023-2024 budget. Avery Wilson seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

5. Oasis Environmental Agreement

Michael Monteleone delivered the update:

- The group was given a quick history lesson in the Army's BRAC process and how properties were transferred from the Army to the URA. Only the north & south parcels, 224 acres, have yet to be transferred to the URA from the Army. The north parcel is expected to be turned June-August 2023. The south parcel is expected to transfer September-December 2023. Oasis has been very instrumental in the coordination of the property transfer. 3,265 jobs have been created in redevelopment since the bases' closure. The

agreement that was signed last year ends June 2023. The ask is for the Oasis contract to be extended an additional year due to all the property not being transferred. The new agreement is the same amount as the previously approved agreement.

Eliot Lawrence made a motion to approve the Oasis contract. Avery Wilson seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

6. Finalization of Gillem Master Survey

Michael Williams delivered the update:

- The final survey for Gillem Logistics Center is almost done. His request to the board is for their authorization of him to submit the plat to the Planning Commission, then to City Council for the final approval. If all goes well with those 2 groups, the final plat could be submitted to the county as early as the beginning of August.

Avery Wilson made a motion to approve the submission of the survey. Marisol Sconiers seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

7. Gillem Prospects

Bruce Abraham delivered the update:

- No other properties will be sold at Gillem until the final properties are turned over from the Army. 3 different organizations have shown interest properties at Gillem. A prospect was sent from Clayton County Economic Development that's in need of 50 acres for an industrial project. Aerotropolis has a prospect in need of 30 acres. LaSalle Partners has an educational prospect needing up to 50 acres.

EXECUTIVE SESSION: *(Executive Session may be called for issues concerning Personnel, Litigation or Real Estate)*

Avery Wilson made a motion to enter executive session at 6:47pm. Eliot Lawrence seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

Avery Wilson made a motion to exit executive session at 6:56pm. Eliot Lawrence seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT:

Marisol Sconiers made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 6:56pm. Avery Wilson seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

*In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act,
those requiring accommodation for meetings should notify
the City Clerk's Office at least 24 hours prior to the meeting at 404-366-1555.*

Integra Realty Resources
Atlanta

Appraisal of Real Property

Former Fire Station
Industrial Property
2336 Hood Ave.
Ellenwood, DeKalb County, Georgia 30294

Prepared For:
Urban Redevelopment Authority

Date of the Report:
July 10, 2023

Report Format:
Appraisal Report

IRR - Atlanta
File Number: 208-2023-0151



Subject Photographs



Former Fire Station
2336 Hood Ave.
Ellenwood, Georgia

Aerial Photograph



**It is noted that the red highlighted parcel is an approximation by the appraiser and has been included for illustrative purposes only. This drawing is not warranted and/or guaranteed and should not be construed as a survey.*



July 10, 2023

Mr. Bruce Abraham
Urban Redevelopment Authority
785 Forest Parkway
Forest Park, GA 30297

SUBJECT: Market Value Appraisal
Former Fire Station
2336 Hood Ave.
Ellenwood, DeKalb County, Georgia 30294
IRR - Atlanta File No. 208-2023-0151

Dear Mr. Abraham:

Integra Realty Resources – Atlanta is pleased to submit the accompanying appraisal of the referenced property. The purpose of the appraisal is to develop the following opinions of value:

- The market value as is of the fee simple interest in the subject property as of the effective date of the appraisal, April 27, 2023
- The prospective market value as completed of the fee simple interest in the subject property as of April 1, 2024
- Market rent estimate for the as is improvements as of the effective date of April 27, 2023
- Market rent estimate for the market value as completed of the subject improvements as of April 1, 2024

The client for the assignment is Urban Redevelopment Authority. The intended user of this report is the client. The intended use of the report is for asset management. No other party or parties may use or rely on the information, opinions, and conclusions contained in this report.

Mr. Bruce Abraham
Urban Redevelopment Authority
July 10, 2023
Page 2

The subject is an existing fire station containing approximately 11,000 square feet of rentable area. The improvements were constructed in 1942 and are 100% owner occupied by the City of Forest Park as of the effective appraisal date. Reportedly, the property is being vacated. The site area is 1.60 acres or 69,696 square feet.

The appraisal conforms to the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP), the Code of Professional Ethics and Standards of Professional Practice of the Appraisal Institute and applicable state appraisal regulations.

Standards Rule 2-2 (Content of a Real Property Appraisal Report) contained in the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP) requires each written real property appraisal report to be prepared as either an Appraisal Report or a Restricted Appraisal Report. This report is prepared as an Appraisal Report as defined by USPAP under Standards Rule 2-2(a), and incorporates practical explanation of the data, reasoning, and analysis that were used to develop the opinion of value.

Based on the valuation analysis in the accompanying report, and subject to the definitions, assumptions, and limiting conditions expressed in the report, the concluded opinions of value are as follows:

Value Conclusions			
Value Type & Appraisal Premise	Interest Appraised	Date of Value	Value Conclusion
Market Value As Is	Fee Simple	April 27, 2023	\$1,760,000 to \$2,035,000
Prospective Market Value As Completed	Fee Simple	April 1, 2024	\$3,540,000 to \$3,930,000
<i>INCREASED VALUE w/ IMPROVEMENTS</i>			<i>\$ 1,780,000</i>

As detailed in the report herein, the residual value of the Prospective Market Value As Completed concluded range is not higher than the As Is Market Value of the subject via the Sales Comparison approach. Therefore, conversion of the existing improvements to retail is not considered to be reasonable due to the lack of profit for the owner.

Market Rent Conclusions			
Value Type & Appraisal Premise	Interest Appraised	Date of Value	Value Conclusion
Market Rent As Is	N/A	April 27, 2023	\$8.50 to \$10.50/Sq. Ft.
Prospective Market Rent Upon Completion	N/A	April 1, 2024	\$28.50 to \$31.50/Sq. Ft.

INCREASED RENT VALUE w/ IMPROVEMENTS *\$ 220,000 / YR*

Extraordinary Assumptions and Hypothetical Conditions

The value conclusions are subject to the following extraordinary assumptions. An extraordinary assumption is an assignment-specific assumption as of the effective date regarding uncertain information used in an analysis which, if found to be false, could alter the appraiser's opinions or conclusions.

1. As detailed herein, the appraiser was not provided accurate square footage for the subject improvements. Therefore, this appraisal has been performed under the extraordinary assumption that the appraiser's estimated square footage is correct.
2. As detailed herein, the owner is considering options to convert the subject improvements into a multi-tenant retail/restaurant property or sell/lease the property as is. Reportedly, there has been no due diligence on renovation scope or work, cost or timeline. The appraiser has estimated scope of work, construction cost and timeline based on a limited visual inspection, our experience with similar properties, development comparables and data published in Marshall Valuation Services. Therefore, this appraisal has been completed under the extraordinary assumption that the proposed cost, scope of work and timeline estimated by the appraiser is correct.
3. As detailed herein, the subject site is currently a part of the Gillem District and does not have a separate parcel number from the surrounding Gillem District. Therefore, this appraisal is completed under the extraordinary assumption that the subject site will be recorded separately at the acreage utilized herein.

The value conclusions are based on the following hypothetical conditions. A hypothetical condition is a condition, directly related to a specific assignment, which is contrary to what is known by the appraiser to exist on the effective date of the assignment results, but is used for the purpose of analysis.

1. None

The use of any extraordinary assumption or hypothetical condition may have affected the assignment results.

As discussed herein, there is currently economic uncertainty due to recent actions by the Federal Reserve. As a result, forecasts and projections contained herein may change dramatically, or differently than projected under stable market conditions. Therefore, we recommend a more frequent review of this valuation, and advise the intended user to consider the current lack of overall economic stability in evaluating the use and reliability of the opinion(s) expressed herein.

The opinions of value expressed in this report are based on estimates and forecasts which are prospective in nature and subject to considerable risk and uncertainty. Events may occur which could cause the performance of the property to differ materially from the estimates contained herein, such as changes in the economy, interest rates, capitalization rates, financial strength of tenants, and behavior of investors, lenders, and consumers. Additionally, the concluded opinions and forecasts are based partly on data obtained from interviews and third-party sources, which are not always completely reliable. Although the findings are considered reasonable based on available evidence, IRR is not responsible for the effects of future, unforeseen occurrences.

Mr. Bruce Abraham
Urban Redevelopment Authority
July 10, 2023
Page 4

If you have any questions or comments, please contact the undersigned. Thank you for the opportunity to be of service.

Respectfully submitted,

Integra Realty Resources - Atlanta



Nicklas M. Torrance
Georgia State Trainee Real Estate Appraiser
#427670
Telephone: 678.296.0866
Email: ntorrance@irr.com



Matthew V. Albigese, MAI
Georgia State Certified General Real
Property Appraiser #289780
Telephone: 404.418.4358
Email: malbigese@irr.com

Improvements Description and Analysis

Conclusion of Improvements Analysis

In comparison to competitive properties in the market, the subject improvements are rated as follows:

Improvements Ratings	
Visibility/Exposure	Average
Design and Appearance	Average
Age/Condition	Average
% Office	Average
Loading Docks	Average
Clear ceiling heights	Average
% Sprinklered	Average
Landscaping	Average

Overall, the quality, condition, and functional utility of the improvements are below average for their age and location.

As detailed herein, the owner is considering renovating the existing improvements to a multi-tenant retail/restaurant building. Currently, there are no proposed budgets or expected costs to complete. Therefore, in order to estimate the cost to convert the subject improvements, the appraiser has given consideration to costs for similar properties and Marshall Valuation Services. Given the current condition of the subject, the subject improvements would require significant interior and exterior build-out in order to convert the subject to multi-tenant retail/restaurant.

Currently, as detailed previously in the Improvements Description and Analysis section herein, the subject is in a below average condition due to the historical nature of the subject improvements. The subject currently has old/aging plumbing and electrical, with incomplete HVAC to the entire interior of the subject. Therefore, the subject improvements would require completely new MEPs (Mechanical, Electrical and Plumbing) throughout the interior. Additionally, given that the subject is a block frame building including block interior walls, any renovation or interior conversion would occur at a heightened cost. Therefore, considering the owner's proposed conversion to multi-tenant retail/restaurant and the currently nature of the subject improvements, for the purpose of this analysis the appraiser has utilized overall buildout cost for Restaurants provided by Marshall Valuation Services which have been summarized in the following table.

Improvements Description and Analysis

RESTAURANTS (350)

CLASS	TYPE	EXTERIOR WALLS	INTERIOR FINISH	LIGHTING, PLUMBING AND MECHANICAL	*HEAT	Sq. M.	COST Cu. Ft.	Sq. Ft.
A-B	Excellent	Stone, face brick, best metal walls, usually part of a building	Best plaster and paneling, highly ornamental, carpeted, deluxe quality	Special lighting fixtures and effects, deluxe restrooms	Complete H.V.A.C.	4090.28	31.85	380.00
	Good	Concrete, metal/glass or masonry panels, usually part of a building	Plaster with enamel & vinyl, carpet & vinyl flooring, decorated interior	Good lighting and outlets, good plumbing and restrooms	Complete H.V.A.C.	3056.95	23.66	284.00
	Average	Brick or concrete, usually part of a building	Plaster or drywall, acoustic tile, carpet, ceramic, rubber, or vinyl comp. tile	Adequate lighting outlets, adequate plumbing	Complete H.V.A.C.	2303.47	17.83	214.00
C	Excellent	Individual design, highly ornamental exterior	High-quality detail, best acoustics, carpeted, deluxe quality	Special lighting effects, tiled restrooms, good fixtures	Complete H.V.A.C.	3898.53	30.15	362.00
	Very good	Individual design, brick, good metal and glass, ornamentation	Typically best chain restaurants, carpeted lounge and dining room	Good lighting/restrooms with good-quality fixtures and tile	Complete H.V.A.C.	3013.89	23.32	282.00
	Good	Brick, concrete or metal and glass panels, ornamentation	Typical chain restaurant or coffee shop, vinyl and ceramic floors	Good lighting and service outlets, tiled restrooms	Complete H.V.A.C.	2346.53	18.16	218.00
	Average	Brick, block, tilt-up, plain building, stock plans	Typical neighborhood restaurant, vinyl composition, small kitchen	Adequate lighting and outlets, small restrooms	Complete H.V.A.C.	1829.86	14.18	170.00
D	Low cost	Cheap brick or block, very plain, low-cost front	Low-cost short order cafe, minimum finish, asphalt tile	Minimum lighting and outlets, minimum plumbing	Forced air and ventilation	1323.96	10.25	123.00
	Excellent	Individual design, highly ornamental exterior, stone veneer	High-quality detail, best acoustics, carpeted, deluxe quality	Special lighting effects, tiled restrooms, good fixtures	Complete H.V.A.C.	3799.66	29.40	353.00
	Very good	Individual design, brick veneer, good metal and glass, ornamentation	Typically best chain restaurants, carpeted lounge and dining room	Good fixtures, good restrooms w/good-quality fixtures and tile	Complete H.V.A.C.	2895.49	22.41	269.00
	Good	Stucco or siding, metal and glass, some ornamentation	Typical chain restaurant or coffee shop, vinyl and ceramic floors	Good lighting and service outlets, tiled restrooms	Complete H.V.A.C.	2228.13	17.24	207.00
	Average	Stucco or siding, plain building and front, stock plans	Typical neighborhood restaurant, vinyl composition, small kitchen	Adequate lighting and outlets, small restrooms	Complete H.V.A.C.	1722.22	13.33	160.00
D POLE	Low cost	Cheap stucco or siding, very plain	Low-cost short order cafe, min. finish	Minimum lighting and plumbing	Forced air/vent.	1227.08	9.50	114.00
	Low cost	Pole frame, good metal panels, lined and insulated, plain front	Low-cost short order cafe, minimum finish, asphalt tile	Minimum lighting and outlets, minimum plumbing	Forced air and ventilation	1130.21	8.75	105.00
S	Good	Insulated sandwich panels, metal and glass, some ornamentation	Comparable to typical chain coffee shop, vinyl and ceramic floors	Good lighting and service outlets, tiled restrooms	Complete H.V.A.C.	2228.13	17.24	207.00
	Average	Insulated panels, metal and glass, little ornamentation	Typical neighborhood coffee shop, vinyl comp., some ceramic or pavers	Adequate lighting and outlets, small restrooms	Complete H.V.A.C.	1688.40	12.91	155.00
	Low cost	Finished interior, some front	Low-cost finish, asphalt tile	Minimum lighting and plumbing	Forced air/vent.	1151.74	8.91	107.00

Source: Marshall Valuation Service (May 2023)

As indicated in the previous table, construction costs for Class C restaurants range from \$123.00 to \$362.00 per square foot. Given that the subject requires extensive interior and exterior buildout, but does not require structural framing, the appraiser has utilized the low-end range of \$150.00 to \$175.00 per square foot.

Additionally, consideration has been given to development cost comparables of properties which underwent similar interior and exterior buildout for conversion of existing improvements. The development cost comparables have been summarized in the following chart:

DEVELOPMENT COST COMPARABLES						
Property:	Two Tenant Retail		Two Tenant Office		Office	
Location:	Georgia		Georgia		Georgia	
Size:	15,379		7,210		16,250	
Year:	2023		2023		2023	
	Amount	\$/Sq.Ft.	Amount	\$/Sq.Ft.	Amount	\$/Sq.Ft.
Construction Costs	\$1,427,062	\$92.79	\$886,245	\$122.92	\$4,087,009	\$251.51
Total	\$1,427,062.22	\$92.79	\$886,245	\$122.92	\$4,087,009	\$251.51

Note: Construction costs include direct and indirect costs

As indicated in the previous chart the cost comparables range from \$92.79 to \$251.51 per square foot. It is of note that the cost comparables include both direct and indirect costs. Additionally, cost comparable No. 1 was an industrial building which was purchased for conversion of the existing improvements to a two-tenant retail property consisting of a brewery and a pizza restaurant. Cost comparable Nos. 2 and 3 are former multi-tenant retail properties which were purchased to convert the existing improvements to general office build out. Primary reliance is given to comparable Nos. 1 and 2 due to their similar as is characteristics and build out requirements.



The appraiser's estimated buildout cost range of \$150.00 to \$175.00 per square foot is within the range of the utilized comparables and is considered to be reasonable due to the extensive interior and exterior renovation and build out required to convert the subject to the proposed use. Additionally, we have included a conservative estimate of 10% for contingencies and 20% for profit. Therefore, utilizing the appraiser's estimated cost range of \$150.00 to \$175.00 per square foot, and 15% for contingencies and profit the estimated range for the cost to convert would be \$1,897,500 to \$2,213,750.