

## OMB Granicus Review

<b>Granicus Title</b>	Recommendation from the Tourist Development Council to fully fund the revised request from The Dali Museum for an increased total amount of \$34 million in support of the Museum's expansion project.				
<b>Granicus ID#</b>	23-0988A	<b>Reference #</b>		<b>Date</b>	11-Jul-2023

### Mark all Applicable Boxes:

Type of Review									
<b>CIP</b>		<b>Grant</b>		<b>Other</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>Revenue</b>		<b>Project</b>	

### Fiscal Information:

<b>New Contract (Y/N)</b>	Y	<b>Original Amount</b>	\$0
<b>Fund(s)</b>	1040	<b>Amount of Change (+/-)</b>	\$34,000,000
<b>Cost Center(s)</b>		<b>Total Amount</b>	\$34,000,000
<b>Program(s)</b>		<b>Amount Available</b>	<b>Total: \$0</b>
<b>Account(s)</b>		<b>Included in Applicable Budget? (Y/N)</b>	<b>N</b>
<b>Fiscal Year(s)</b>	FY23 – FY27		

### Description & Comments

This item is the Dali Museum's request for funding to expand the Museum in St. Pete. In 2019, the Museum requested \$17.5M in capital funding for the previously presented expansion project. The Board gave preliminary approval subject to final agreement for the full request amount. The original project was never started, and no agreement was reached between the County and the Museum, so the project was never included in the CVB budget. Issues were identified, the project was delayed and eventually expanded, and the Museum has submitted a new request for \$34.0M, half of the \$68.0M project cost. The Museum does not appear to have submitted an official application for this request.

According to the Museum's research and projections, the expansion would contribute \$4.1M of TDT revenue, the sole source of the funding request from the County, during the 10-year period following completion of the project. At the projected rate of growth (3.3% average after the first year) in the TDT revenue generated by the project, it would be approximately 44.5 years to recover the County's investment.

The report from Crossroads Consulting calculated a suggested investment range of \$24.0M to \$27.7M, reducing the number of years to recover the initial investment to 36.5 – 39 years.

Since this request is drastically different than the original request, in both scope and potential financial commitment, I don't think calling it a 'revised request' is accurate. I think the request should be considered a new request and the application judged/scored as such.

The Staff Report states 'there is no fiscal impact associated with this action.' This is a true statement, but I think the Board and public should be aware this action, if taken through to a signed agreement, would commit the County to up to \$34.0M which is not included in the budget.

Neither the FY23 Adopted nor FY24 Budget Request includes funding for this project.

**Analyst:**      **Jim Abernathy**

**Ok to Sign:**